

CLASSIC REPRINT SERIES

THE EPISTLE OF ST.
JUDE AND THE SECOND
EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

Greek Text With Introduction
Notes and Comments



by
Joseph B. Mayor

Forgotten Books

Forgotten Books

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

Greek Text With Introduction Notes and Comments

by

Joseph B. Mayor

Published by Forgotten Books 2014

Originally published 1907

PIBN 1000619455

www.ForgottenBooks.org

Copyright © 2013 Forgotten Books

Forgotten Books

eBook Terms & Conditions

www.forgottenbooks.org

1. This eBook* may be

- a. Copied for personal and educational use.
- b. Printed for personal and educational use.

2. This eBook* may NOT be

- a. Distributed in any form.
- b Sold individually or as part of a package.
- c. Modified in any way.
- d. Reversed-engineered.



This eBook* and all its content including images are
Copyright © 2014 FB &c Ltd - All rights reserved.
Forgotten Books is a registered trademark of FB &c Ltd.

FB &c Ltd, Dalton House, 60 Windsor Avenue, London SW19 2RR
Company number 08720141. Registered in England and Wales.

*eBook' refers to this PDF and any of its content including pages and images in either electronic or printed form.

The paperback edition of
this book can be purchased from

[amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com)

[amazon.co.uk](https://www.amazon.co.uk)

[amazon.de](https://www.amazon.de)

[amazon.fr](https://www.amazon.fr)

[amazon.es](https://www.amazon.es)

[amazon.it](https://www.amazon.it)



Over 1,000,000 eBooks
are available to read at

Forgotten Books

www.forgottenbooks.org



484,473 eBooks
are available to read at

Forgotten Books

www.ForgottenBooks.org



Alchemy

“In changing the base metals into gold and silver by the projection of the Stone, it follows (by an accelerated process) the method of nature, and therefore is natural.”

The New Pearl of Great Price, by Peter Bonus, 1338 AD

www.ForgottenBooks.org/Alchemy



Forgotten Books

Free App Download



Available on the
App Store



Windows
Store



ANDROID APP ON

Google™ play

Enjoy

484,473 Books

wherever you go

www.ForgottenBooks.org/apps



THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE
AND THE
SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

THE
EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE
AND THE
SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

GREEK TEXT
WITH
INTRODUCTION NOTES AND COMMENTS

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

~~6791003~~

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

d from

THOMAE · ARNOLDO

ΦΙΛΑΛΗΘΕΙ ΦΙΛΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΙ ΦΙΛΟΘΕΩΙ

CVIVS · ETIAMNVN · 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

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

PREFACE

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 χρησιμὸς φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εσπουδάσθη 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 Θεω to Ἰησοῦ; *2 P.* 1¹², where Field proposes μελησω for μελλησω and Spitta suggests παραδοθειση for παρουση; *3*¹⁰, where Vansittart and Abbott suggest

PREFACE

πυρωθήσεται for ευρεθήσεται; besides 2¹³, where it is proposed to read αγαπήν for ήδονην; and 3⁶, where δι ου is proposed for δι ων.

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.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

- P. 22.—On *επαγωνίζεσθαι* add Clem. *Strom.* iii. p. 553 *επαγωνιζομενος τι, ἀθέω δόξῃ.*
- P. 23, l. 9 up.—For '1 Cor. 2' read '1 Cor. 13.'
- P. 24, l. 4.—Add Clem. *Strom.* v. p. 666 *ὁ Κύριος δια τῶν παθῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἀρρήτου γνῶσιν παρεισδύμενος.*
- 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 *ζῶουσιν ὑπ' αὐγᾶς ἡλίου.*
- P. 32.—After § 2 add Soph. *Ant.* 640 *γνώμης πατρώας παντ' ὀπισθεν ἐστάναι.* On *προκεινται* add Jos. *B.J.* vi. 2. 1 *καλον υποδειγμα σοι πρόκειται βασιλεὺς Ἰεχονίας,* Demosth. p. 1078 *νομίζετε τὸν παῖδα τουτον κητηρίαν ὑμῖν προκείσθαι ὑπερ τῶν τετελευτηκοτων.*
- P. 33, last l.—For repeated *δέ* compare 1 Cor. 1¹², 12^{8t.}, 15³⁹.
- P. 40, add to note.—Euphorion ap. Clem. *Al. Strom.* v. p. 673 *fin.* *ζαψ (=θαλασσα) δε ποτι σπιλάδεσσι νεων ολετειρα κακυνει.*
- P. 46.—After § 1 add: See Hort on 1 P. 2¹¹ 'Sometimes desires, as such, are implied to be evil, as in 4^{2, 3} and 1¹⁴. Sometimes they are implied to be evil in so far as they are individual and so separate and ultimately selfish, as in James 1¹⁴ *υπο τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκομενος:* cf. Jude 16 and 18, 2 Pet. 3³ *κατα τας ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.* Sometimes a desire is called evil (*κακή* Col. 3⁶, *σαρκικῆ* 1 Pet. 2¹¹, *κοσμικῆ* Tit. 2¹²).'
- P. 46, l. 5 up.—Om. ref. to Hort's note. I had carelessly omitted to notice that he laid the stress on *καιρῶ* not on *ἐσχατῶ.*
- P. 48.—On *εποικοδοῦντες* add Clem. *Strom.* v. p. 644 *ἡ κοινὴ πίστις κοθαπερ θεμελιος ὑπόκειται.*
- P. 51, l. 3.—For 'προ' read 'πρὸς.'
- P. 52.—On *απταιστος* add Epict. *Fr.* 62 Schw. *ἡκιστα πταίσεις ἐν ταῖς κρίσεσιν εαν αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ βίῳ απταιστος διατελῆς,* Antoninus v. 9.
- P. 80.—First l. of § 3 add after *δουλος* 'in 1¹, though we read of Θεου δαῦλος in 2¹⁶.'
- P. 81.—Add after § 2 'Col. 1¹² *τὴν μερίδα του κληρου τῶν ἀγίων* with Light-foot'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 ελευθερίας και κυριωτατης ἀγάπης.*
- P. 88, l. 5.—After *δόξαν* add 4 Macc. 18³ *θείας μερίδος κατηξιωθησαν.*
- 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 *στρατοπεδον.* l. 17, for 'Polyb. iii. 78' read 'Polyb. iii. 68.' l. 1 up, after *κλίμαξ* add, Cf. the Sorites in Wisdom 6^{16 t.} *ἀρχη σοφίας ἢ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντις δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη δὲ τηρησις νομων αὐτης, προσοχή δὲ νομων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιει Θεοῦ ἐπιθυμία ἀρα σοφίας ἀνάγει ἐπὶ βασιλειαν.*

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 92, l. 24.—For '5²⁶' read '5²³.' l. 10 up.—On ευσέβεια 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 13¹ ματαιοὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει οἷς παρῆν Θεοῦ ἀγνωσία, Aesch. *Pers.* 391 φόβος δὲ πασι βαρβάροις παρῆν, *Eum.* 385 θάυμα δ' ὄμμασιν παρῆν.

P. 98, last l.—After 5¹⁰ add Dan. 7²⁷ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰωνίου, Isa. 45¹⁷ σωτηρία αἰωνίου, 1 Macc. 2⁶⁷ θρόνον βασιλείας εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος, Wisdom 10¹⁴ δόξα αἰωνίου.

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 σκηνωμα see quotations from Eus. *H.E.* in *Intro.* 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. 40⁹ (33⁹) and 3 Esdr. 1⁴.

P. 105, § 5.—τοιοσδε also occurs in Ezra 5³. Other exx. of the use of μεγαλοπρέπεια occur in Ps. 20⁶, 144^{5, 12}. The phrase μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξα occurs in two of the early Greek liturgies (Swainson, pp. 129, 268).

P. 107, § 3.—The reading in Mt. 12¹⁸ is doubtful: WH. and Ti. omit εἰς and read ὄν with B⁸; Treg. reads ἐν ᾧ with C¹D, vg. etc.: εἰς ὄν is supported by C²L etc., Clem. *Hom.* iii. 53, Eus. *Dem. Ev.* p. 452 C. § 5.—Dr. Chase states that the phrase ἁγίου ὄρος is always followed by a possessive genitive in the O.T. but there seem to be some exceptions, e.g. Ps. 87¹ οἱ θεμελιοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις, Isa. 27¹², Dan. 9²⁰, 1 Macc. 11³⁷ (of a document) τεθῆτω ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐν τοπῷ ἐπισήμῳ. In Isa. 11⁹ it stands for the Messianic kingdom. § 6.—εχομεν βεβαιωτερον, compare the exx. of βεβαιον παρεχειν τὴν ὄνην in the index of Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscriptionum*.

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

P. 118, l. 6 up.—For '15' read '18.'

P. 124, l. 24 up.—After 'Cf.' insert 2 Tim. 2¹⁴ λογομαχεῖν . . . ἐπὶ καταστροφή τῶν ακουοντων, Gen. 19²⁹ ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν ἄωτ ἐκ μεσοῦ 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 ἀκρατοῖς.

P. 135, last line.—Read δίδωμι.

P. 138, § 4.—φθεγγόμενοι, cf. Acts 4¹⁸ παρήγγειλαν μὴ φθεγγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι.

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

P. 143, l. 8 up.—See *Intro.* 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. 1¹² we have a similar reference to missionaries in the plural, διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων υμᾶς.

P. 148, l. 19.—Read 'Pet. 4¹⁸.'

P. 151, § 2.—Add R.V. 'compacted out of water and amidst water' and the explanation of Oecumenius ἡ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος μὲν ὡς ἐξ ὑλικου αἰτίου, δι' ὕδατος δὲ ὡς διὰ τελικου· ὕδωρ γὰρ τὸ συνεχὸν τὴν γῆν, αἶον κολλὰ τις ὑπάρχον αὐτῇ.

P. 160, n. 3.—Read 'Dr. Bigg.'

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.

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. xcvi, and uses *περιεχει* and *παρεδιδου* in a curious way, p. xcvi. 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 Pseud-epigrapha, 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX

USE OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS BY JUDE

The Book of Enoch, p. clii; 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. clxxxii. 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-exci. 2 P. 1¹, p. exci, 1^{2,4}, p. excii, 1^{12,17}, p. exciii, 1^{19,21}, 2⁴, p. exciv, 2^{6,8}, p. excv, 2^{11,13}, p. excvi, 2¹⁴, p. excvii, 2^{15,18}, p. excviii, 3^{6,10}, p. excix 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 *φθινοπωριός*, pp. 55-59

JUDE: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

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

vv. 3, 4. Reasons for Writing, p. 60. *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 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' ἑσχατου χρονου*, pp. 77 f.
vv. 20—23. Final Charge to the Faithful: *ἐν πνευματι ἀγίῳ προσευχομενοι*, 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 *φθορα*, pp. 175—179 •

2 PETER: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

- ¹ Address. *Συμεων Πέτρος*, pp. 180 f. *ταῖς ἰσοτιμον ἡμῖν λαχουσιν πιστιν*, p. 181. *ἐν δικαιοσυνη του θεου*, p. 181.
¹²⁻⁴ Salutation. Complexity of the passage, p. 182. How Grace and Peace flow from the knowledge of God, pp. 183—187. *τα πρὸς ζωην και εὐσεβειαν*, pp. 187—189. *του καλέσαντος ἡμας ἰδία δοξη και ἀρετην*, p. 189. *δι' ὧν τα τίμια και μεγαιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγελματα δεδωρηται*, pp. 189 f. *θειας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, p. 190. *τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς*, pp. 190 f.
¹⁵⁻⁷ 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.
¹⁶⁻¹¹ Remarks on the importance of these virtues, p. 193.
¹¹²⁻¹⁵ The writer's promise, p. 194.
¹¹⁶⁻²¹ 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 *ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως*, pp. 196—198.
²¹⁻³ The false teachers of the new dispensation answer to the false prophets of the old, p. 198.
²⁴⁻¹⁰ Examples of judgment joined with mercy, p. 199.
²¹⁰⁻¹⁶ 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.
²¹⁷⁻²² Mischiefs caused by the Libertines, p. 205.
³¹⁻⁴ Warning of the spread of unbelief in the last days, p. 205.
³⁵⁻¹⁰ 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.
³¹¹⁻¹⁸ Final exhortation, p. 212. *σπενδοντας την παρουσίαν*, pp. 212, 213.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON *κατα περιφασιν*, p. 213.

INDEX

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

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

RELATION OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER TO THE EPISTLE OF JUDE¹

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 *ελεος* into the wider *χαρις*. 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 λαχουσιν πιστιν*) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remarkable phrases, (1) that, through the justice³ 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 *πιστῶ κτίστη* in 1 Pet. 4¹⁹, Rom. 2⁶ (*ἀποκάλυψις*) *δικαιοκρισία-του Θεου, ἧς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, and 2¹¹ *οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ*.

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 3¹⁵, 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 1² P. introduces a topic which is of great importance in his eyes, *ἐπιγνωσις*. '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. 1²⁰), 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 *ισότιμος* 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^{6.11}.

² The word *κοινήν* here may have suggested to P. his phrase *ισότιμον πίστιν*.

³ Cf. J. *v.* 1 *κλητοίς*.

through lust.' *φθορά* here (cf. *φθείρονται* in J. 10) is opposed to *ζωή* in v. 3. It is not original evil, but *ἡ ἐπὶ το χεῖρον μεταβολή*. Here we find the writer freely using expressions borrowed from Greek philosophy, such as *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, the *ἀρετῆ* 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 (1⁵) to speak of the corresponding duty on man's part. We are to use every effort to build up the Christian life in its seven-fold¹ completeness on the rock of faith. Towards the end of J. we find words which may very possibly have suggested to P. this idea of the seven ascending tiers rising on the foundation of faith and culminating in love (J. v. 20) *ἐποικοδομουντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ υμῶν πίστει . . . ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρησατε*. The phrase *σπουδῆν πᾶσαν* of P. 1⁵ occurs also in J. 3. The philosophic *ἀρετῆ* occurs twice in P. 1⁵. It has been suggested by Dr. Chase that the association of *γνώσις* with *ἐγκρατεία* in the next verse may be pointed at the antinomianism of some of the Gnostics. The mention of *εὐσεβεία* in P. 1^{3, 6, 7} may be due to the prevalence of *ἀσεβεία* so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (1⁸⁻¹¹) dwell on the importance of the cultivation of these virtues or graces. 'Their continued growth will tend to make us not unfruitful (cf. J. v. 12) in regard to that knowledge of God out of which they grow. Their absence causes blindness, or at least limits us to narrow earthly views, and makes us forgetful of the baptismal cleansing from the sins of our old life. Remember that it is not enough simply to have been baptized. We have to make sure the calling and election of which baptism was the seal. If you are diligent in doing this, you will never stumble, but will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Here too we find connecting links with the later verses of J. 'Eternal life' is the goal in J. 21, 'the eternal kingdom,' in P. 1¹¹. The *οὐ μὴ πταίσητε* and the *πλουσιῶς 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 21⁸), and 7 pillars in the house of Wisdom (Prov. 9¹), cf. also the spirits in Isa. 11², and Clem. Al. p. 813.

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

P. continues (1¹²⁻¹⁵), '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 1¹⁶⁻²¹ 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 *ιδίας επιλυσεως ου γινεται*? 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. 11⁹ and 65²⁵ 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.

we read below (3⁴), doubts were entertained of any Second Coming, some affirming, like Hymenaeus and Philetas, that the Resurrection was past already (2 Tim. 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 (3²¹, 10⁴³) and 1 Pet. (1¹⁰⁻¹²) than by anything in the Epistle of Jude, though the latter refers to Enoch's prophecy of the future Coming to judgment (*vv.* 14, 15) and speaks of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (*v.* 20) as aiding our prayers.

The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second chapter of P. In both, this section begins with a short Introduction (J. *v.* 4, P. 2¹⁻³), 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 3¹⁻¹²); and these false teachers will introduce destructive heresies and bring on themselves swift destruction. [The word *απώλεια* does not occur in J., but in the next verse he says that the Lord *τους μη πιστευσαντας απωλεσεν.*] P. adds the Pauline epithet *αγοράσαντα* before *δεσποτην*. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. 119³⁰) will be evil spoken of (Isa. 52⁵). He speaks of their covetousness, cf. J. *v.* 11 on Balaam [*εμπορευσονται* in P. 2³ perhaps contrasted with *αγοράσαντα* in 2¹], and of their glozing words. While J. speaks of *οί παλαι προγεγραμμένοι εις τουτο το κρίμα* (where the reference in *τουτο* is obscure), P. has the fine phrase *οίς το κρίμα ουκ αργεί και η απώλεια αυτων ου νυσταζει*. On the other hand we lose J.'s *την του Θεου χάριτα μετατιθεντες εις άσελγειαν*, for which perhaps *έλευθερίαν αυτοίς επαγγελόμενοι, αυτοί δουλοι υπάρχοντες τής φθοράς* (P. 2¹⁹) was intended as an

¹ Dr. Abbott compares Christ's warning against those who say, 'Lo here is the Christ, or there,' Mt. 24²³.

equivalent, cf. Gal. 5¹³ ἐπ' ἐλευθερία ἐκληθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆ 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. 2⁴⁻⁹, 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. 17²⁶⁻²⁹), 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 *το δευτερον* 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. 1⁹ ληθην λαβων του καθαρισμου τῶν πάλαι αὐτου ἁμαρτιων as well as in P. 2²⁰. 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 Θεος 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 *σαρκος ἐτέρας*, as the men of Sodom did afterwards (*του ομοιου τροπον τουτοις* 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 *ταρταρωσας*,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 2⁴. The simple verb *ταρταρώω* occurs in Amphilochius (fl. 370 A.D.) *Patrol. Graeca* vol. xxxix, p. 41 Δ, διὰ παρθενικοῦ τοκετοῦ τεταρτάρωται δαιμονίων ἀνράτων 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 ἐπαιρεῖται ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανός; *ib.* i. 4 παραδοθήσομαι κατ' ἐνίων φιλοσόφων λόγους Πυριφλεγέθοντι καὶ Ταρτάρῳ . . . καὶ ἔσομαι ἐν ἄδου τὸν αἰῶνα κολαζόμενος, *ib.* xx. 9 ὁ πονηρὸς σκότος χαιρεῖν κατὰ τὴν κρασιν γεγονώς μετὰ τῶν διοδοῦλων ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸ του Ταρτάρου σκότος κατελθὼν ἤδεται, *ib.* *Ep. ad Jac* 14 ταρτα-

The Deluge is described in P. 2⁶, where he uses the words *φυλασσω* and *ἀσεβης* 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 (3⁵⁻⁷) 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. 3²⁰ (*κιβωτου*) *εἰς ἣν ολιγοι, τουτ εστιν οκτω ψυχαί, διεσωθησαν δι υδατος*.¹ The ark is here regarded as a symbol of the Church. What was the writer's motive in adding that it contained only a few, and further that these few, on being reckoned up, were found to amount to 8? Must he not have intended to signify that, while the visible Church consisted of a mere 'remnant,' a 'little flock,' yet these few represented all who share the Resurrection of Christ, 'the general assembly and church of the first-born,' which would be continually recruited not only from the living, but also from the dead by the ever-present, ever-active Spirit of Christ (3¹⁹)?² In the account of Sodom (P. 2⁶) 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 (*τεφρωσας καταστροφη κατεκρινεν*),³ while

ρείαν χάρυβδιν. The force of the verbal termination is the same as in *ουρανῶω*, *ποντῶω* and *καταποντῶω*, *καταθαλαττῶω*, *χαρακῶω*, cf. Eustath. (*de Thessalon.* 403 c. ed. Tafel) *τὸ ἐν ἐμοὶ χθόνιον οὐρανῶσας*, Nicol. Damasc. 445 ed. Val. *τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οἷα ἀθεοὺς ἐπόντωσεν*.

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

² Cf. Clement on this subject in *Str.* vi. § 44-§ 52, esp. § 47 *ἴν. ου γαρ ἐνταυθα μόνον η δύναμις η ἐνεργητικὴ (του Θεου) φθάνει, πάντη δέ εστι καὶ ἀεὶ ἐργάζεται*.

³ In my note on 2⁶ 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?

J. speaks of its present state as a warning to future ages. As regards this warning P.'s *υποδειγμα μελλοντων ασεβέσιν* is better expressed than J.'s rather confused *προκεινται δείγμα πυρος αιωνιου δίκην υπεχουσαι*. 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. 5¹⁴). These men (*v. 10 οὔτοι δε*) rail at things beyond their ken, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction.¹ P. (2¹⁰) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went *οπίσω σαρκος ετερας* (for which he substitutes *ὀπίσω σαρκος ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμου πορευομενους*) 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. *ετολμησεν J. v. 9*) men that shrink not from railing at glories' (2¹⁰). In 2¹² he goes on, as J. does in *v. 10*, with a *ουτοι δέ*, 'these are like brute beasts.' Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s *οσα φυσικως ἐπίστανται, ἐν τουτοις φθείρονται* by the periphrasis *γεγεννημενα φυσικα εἰς ἀλωσιν και φθοράν* and *εν τη φθορα αυτών φθαρησονται*. 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 τουτοις 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. 1²¹⁻²⁸.

² It will be noticed that, while J. couples *κυριοτητα* 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.

We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. 8 and 10, P. 2¹⁰ and 2¹². In J. it runs 'Michael, the archangel, when he was disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, did not venture to bring a judgment of railing, but said, "the Lord rebuke thee"': in P. 'whereas angels, though greater in power and might, do not venture to bring against them a railing judgment before the Lord.' The former is a little difficult, but with the help of the *Ascensio Mosis* we can understand that, if the chief of the archangels abstained from using any contemptuous expression against Satan, and contented himself with making his appeal to God, much more should frail and sinful mortals abstain from slighting language about the powers of the invisible world. What however is to be made of P.? Standing by itself, it is merely a riddle, for which the answer is to be found in J. That is to say, P. wrote with J.'s sentence in his mind, but for some reason or other chose to eliminate the points essential for its intelligibility. What was his reason? The same, I think, which led him to omit the details as to the fall of the angels, which are mainly derived from the Book of Enoch, in 2⁴, and the reference to the preaching of Enoch below. He objects, that is, to make use of these apocryphal writings, and generalizes the story by dropping the proper names and by twice changing a singular into a plural (*αγγελουι, αυτων*). So too a vague *παρα Κυριω* takes the place of *ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κυριος*, 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. 2¹³⁻¹⁷, but, in the latter, the

order is considerably altered and there are various additions and omissions. Balaam (who is also prominent in the Apocalypse 2¹⁴) 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 (2¹) between the false prophet of the O.T. and the false teacher of the N.T., and brings out again the motive of covetousness (see above 2³ and 2¹⁵). Has he any special reason for introducing the story of the ass rebuking the prophet? We may compare other passages in which God is represented as choosing the foolish things of this world to confound the wise (1 Cor. 1²⁷, Ps. 8²), or in which men are called upon to learn a lesson from animals, as Isa. 1³, Jer. 8⁷, Prov. 6⁶, Job 12⁷. Possibly P. may be thinking of the scorn entertained for simple believers by those who called themselves Gnostics (see below 2¹⁸).

J. v. 12 appears with some remarkable alterations in P. 2¹³, *σπιλοι καὶ μῶμοι εντρυφῶντες ἐν ταις ἀπαταις αὐτῶν συνευωχουμένοι υμῖν*. Here *σπίλοι* and *ἀπαταις* are substituted for *σπιλαδες* and *ἀγάπαις* in J. Some editors read *ἀγάπαις* with B, but the addition of *αὐτῶν* suits much better with *ἀπαταις*. J. speaks of *ἀγάπαις υμῶν*. 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—*ἀγαπή*? In the chapter on the Readings I have suggested that *ἀγάπην* was the original reading, instead of *ἡδονην*, in the earlier part of this verse (*ἡδουήν ἡγουμένοι την ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφήν*); where my explanatory note will show how hard it is to make a satisfactory distinction between *ἡδουήν* 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. 13¹³). I account for *ἡδονην* by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on *τρυφήν*. The word

απατη is often joined with *τροφη*, 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 *σπιλαδες* should have been changed to *σπιλοι*. The former word is a daring metaphor even among the metaphors which accompany it in J., but quite out of place here, and P. substitutes for it the similar sounding *σπιλος* found in Eph. 5²⁷, of which the derivatives *ασπιλος* and *σπιλω* 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 2¹⁷, where he splits up *νεφελαι ανυδροι υπο ανεμων παραφερομεναι* into two, *πηγαί ανυδροι* and *ομίχλαι υπο λαιλαπος ελαυνομεναι*, 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 ο ζόφος του σκοτους τετηρηται*. 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. (2¹³), *αδικουμενοι μισθου αδικίας*, which commences the loose series of participles ending in 2¹⁵. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls J. 11 *τη πλανη του Βαλααμ μισθου εξεχυθησαν* and is repeated again in 2¹⁵; but *αδικουμενοι* is difficult. Apparently P. intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to J.'s *ουαί*: 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, *ὄφθαλμούς εχοντες μεστούς*

μοιχαλίδος και ἀκαταπαυστους αμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχας αστηρίκτους (cf. γεγενημενα εἰς ἀλωσιν, 2¹²), καρδιαν γεγυμνασμενην πλεονεξίας εχοντες, κατάρας τεκνα. Perhaps P. may intend this partly to take the place of J.'s fine figure *κυματα αγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τας ἐαυτῶν αισχυνας*.

In *v.* 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 υπερουργα, and who flatter others for the sake of advantage.' To the same effect P. (2¹⁸) speaks of them as uttering *υπέρογκα ματαιότητος*, by which they seduce through the lusts of the flesh those who were just escaping from heathen error. In 2¹⁹⁻²² P. is mostly independent of J., but I have already noticed that *ἐλευθερίαν επαγγελλομενοι* may be an echo of J. 4 *χαριτα μετατιθεντες εἰς ασελγειαν*. He continues *εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγοντες τα μιάσματα του κοσμου εν ἐπιγνωσει του κυρίου και σωτήρος Ἰησου Χριστου*, words which recall what he had said in 1⁴ *ἀποφυγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, . . . διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνωσεως . . . του Θεου και Ἰησου του κυρίου ἡμῶν*, and goes on to give an impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which he borrows from J. 3, *υποστρεψαι εκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αυτοις ἀγίας ἐντολης*, concluding with the proverb of the dog and the sow returning to their foulness after being cleansed from it.¹ This may have a reference, like 1⁹, 2²⁰, to post-baptismal sin, and seems to have been applied to the torments of the unseen world in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, §§ 11 ο *ιχωρ και η δυσωδία τῶν κολαζομενων κατερρεε και ωσπερ λιμνη ἐγενετο ἐκεῖ· κακεῖ ἐκάθηντο γυναικες εχουσαι τον ἰχωρα μεχρι τῶν τραχήλων*, and §§ 8, 9, 16, quoted on p. cxxxii.

In the third chapter of P. we return again to J. The readers are addressed as *ἀγαπητοί* in P. 3¹ 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) ναυτιωντες . . . ἀπεμωντες (al. απερωντες) τουτεστιν εξομολογούμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὡσπερ νοσοποιους χολᾶς, τὰς ἐκ πικρίας αμαρτίας λεγω και τὰ ἐξ ἐπιθυμιων ἀτάκτων σωρευθέντα κακά, ἅτινα τῷ ὁμολογήσαι ὡσπερ ἀπεράσαυτες (cf. ἐξέραμα in 2 P. 2²²) κομφίζεσθε τῆς νόσου.*

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 1¹⁶ 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 1¹⁹. 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 ἐλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' εσχατοῦ χρόνου εἰσονται ἐμπαικταὶ 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 3² and 3³ by inserting the phrase *τοῦτο πρῶτον γνωσκόντες*, which he had previously used in 1²⁰, 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 3², bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. 1¹⁰⁻¹² *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζητήσαν . . . προφήται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητευσάντες . . . οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ εαυτοῖς, ὑμῖν δὲ διηκονοῦν αὐτά, ἀ νυν ἀνηγγελη ὑμῖν δια τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς πνευματικῶν ἀγίων* (cf. 1 P. 1¹⁶), we shall find an exact correspondence to what is stated here. The words *τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων* (J. 17, P. 3²) 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. 2³ *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργει*. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ*, which may be compared with *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται* of 2¹² and with the reiterated *ἀσεβεῖς* of J. 15 and *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι* of J. 16 and 18.

In 3⁴, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure *v. 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες*, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the *ἐμπαίκται* consisted. They said that

the promise of the coming of Christ (to which P. had borne witness in 1¹⁶) remained unfulfilled, and that the world was not liable to the catastrophic changes predicted as accompaniments of the final judgment. There is a little awkwardness in P.'s wording, *απ' αρχης κτίσεως* following *αφ' ἧς εκοιμηθησαν*, 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 3⁵⁻¹⁰: (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 3¹⁰ P. bids his readers make a practical use of the knowledge that the Lord is about to come unexpectedly. 'Do not be blind to the symptoms of the breaking up of the frame of nature (perhaps a reference to volcanic eruptions and earthquakes). Make ready for the coming of the day of God by the practice of holiness and piety. Look forward to the fulfilment of the promise of the reign of righteousness in a new earth and heaven.'

At this point J. and P. again come together in J. 20 and P. 3¹⁴, both commencing a new section with *αγαπητοί*. J.'s exhortation to his readers 'to build themselves up on their most holy faith and keep themselves in love' has been already used by P., as we have seen, in 1⁵⁷. His reference to the Spirit's help in prayer may be compared with P. 1²⁰ on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in v. 21 *προσδεχομενοι το ελεος του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου εις ζωην αιωνιον* is taken up in the *προσδοκωντας* of P. 3¹² and *προσδοκωμεν* of 3¹³, and again in 3¹⁴, while the goal *εις ζωην αιωνιον* may be compared with *εις την αιωνιον βασιλειαν* in P. 1¹¹. P. inserts *ασπιλοι και αμωμητοι* (cf. 1 P. 1¹⁹) from J.'s *αμωμους* in v. 24, and in contrast to his own *σπιλοι και μωμοι* in 2¹³, and to J.'s *εσπιλωμενον* in v. 23. *εν ειρηνη* looks back to J. v. 2 and P. 1². While in vv. 22, 23 we have J.'s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (3¹⁵) to the more hopeful

¹ Reading *δι' ου*, for which see Chapter on the Text.

view of 3⁹, and claims for it the inspired support of Paul. ' Yet Paul's letters, wise and good as they are, offer some difficulties, which have been misunderstood and perverted, like the rest of the Bible,¹ by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction.' The word *σωτηρία* in 3¹⁵ reminds us that J. had originally intended to write *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας* (v. 3) and that his purpose is apparently carried out to a certain extent in these last verses from 20 onwards. In v. 24 J. begins an Ascription partly borrowed from St. Paul, addressed 'to Him who is able to *keep His people* free from *stumbling* (cf. P. 1¹⁰) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy' (cf. P. 1¹¹). P. bids his readers, 'knowing these things beforehand (see above 1¹², 3²) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the *error* (J. 11, P. 2¹⁸) of the wicked (P. 2⁷, cf. J. 23 *ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ*), and so fall from their own steadfastness' (cf. P. 1¹², 2¹⁴, 3¹⁶). J.'s *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθῆσεται* of 1¹¹. P. continues his exhortation in 3¹⁸ *αυξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνῶσει*, for which we may compare *χάρις πληθυνθειῆ* in 1² and *ταυτα πλεονάζοντα* in 1⁸, also J. 4. The Ascription in P. is much simpler than that in J., being addressed to our Saviour Jesus Christ, while J.'s is addressed *μονῶ Θεῶ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. P. has *δοξα* only, while J. has the full liturgical form *δόξα, μεγαλωσυνη, κράτος, καὶ ἐξουσία*. P. has *καὶ νυν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος*, while J. has *προ παντος του αἰῶνος και νυν και εἰς παντας τους 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. 1¹ *λαχουσιν πιστιν*), the foundation of the Christian life (J. 3, 20, P. 1¹⁻⁵): both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. 1, P. 1³⁻¹⁰). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. 10¹⁻², P. 1⁹), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. 1¹⁰), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. 20, P. 1⁵⁻⁷), 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.

Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to present us before his glory unblemished in joy (J. 24, 25). P. does not expressly mention prayer, and he lays more stress on personal effort than J. in the words 'give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight' 3¹⁴, 'beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace' 3^{17, 18}. So in 1⁵⁻⁸ 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 *πνευμα μη εχοντες* (v. 19).

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

needed for life and godliness (1³), of the Divine nature in which man may share (1⁴). 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' (1¹⁷). God is the source of the inspiration of the prophets (1²¹). 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 (2⁴⁻⁹). The angels do not venture to utter a railing judgment in His presence (2¹¹). 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 (3⁵⁻⁷). In 2¹ it would seem, from the ordinary use of the word *δεσποτης* in early Christian writers, that we must understand *τον ἀγοράσαντα δεσποτην* as used, at any rate in the first instance, of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. 7²³), though there is probably also some reference to the Christian use of *ἀγοράζω*. Measures of time have no relation to Him (3⁸). 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 1¹¹, 2²⁰, 3², 3¹⁸, 'our Lord' simply in 1² where grace and peace are said to be multiplied through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, in 1¹⁴ where He is said to have announced to Peter his approaching death, in 1¹⁶ where the Transfiguration is described. In 1¹ P speaks of himself as a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ. Jesus has called us *ἰδία δοξη και ἀρετη* 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' *υπο πνευματος ἁγίου φερομενοι* (1²¹).

Many have drawn attention to the frequent use in 2 P. of what Dr. Bigg has called 'reverential periphrases,' *η θεία δυναμις, θεία φυσις, ἡ μεγαλοπρεπης δοξα*. 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 *θεοτης* and *το θειον* used by St. Paul (Col. 2⁹, Acts 17²⁹), with the 'Word' of St. John, and with such phrases as 'the Deity,' 'Providence,' 'Heaven,' 'the Author of Nature,' 'the

supreme Being,' which were common with the writers of the 18th century, or with the striking phrase of Matthew Arnold 'A stream of tendency which makes for righteousness.' If they stood alone, such phrases might be regarded as in a way equivalent to the *αγνωστος θεος* of the Athenians: they have an air of coldness and remoteness which cannot but strike one on passing from 1 P. to this epistle; but they all express different aspects of God's revelation of Himself; and our author is only following St. Paul and St. John when he recognizes these different conceptions as all included in the Christian faith.

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

(3) *Man under grace.* While still in this ignorant, degraded state, man is made conscious of a call (P. 1^{3,10}) and of an answering faith, which is itself a gift from God (1¹). The call consists in the appeal made to us by the exhibition of Divine goodness in the life of Jesus Christ (1³), which is the foundation and embodiment of all the promises of future good contained in the Gospel (1⁴), promises which are summed up in our being made partakers of the Divine Nature (1⁴). This call is sealed in baptism for the washing away of sin (1¹⁰). The more we know of God and of Jesus Christ, the more we shall grow in grace and peace (1², 3¹⁸). The Divine power has granted to us all that is needed for life and godliness (1³). The goal which we have in view is 'the entrance into the eternal Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (1¹¹), otherwise described as the 'new heavens and new earth in which righteousness dwells' (3¹³).

On this subject J. says that those to whom he writes are holy and called, beloved by God the Father and kept safe in Jesus Christ (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

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. 2²⁰). To have thus turned away from the holy law once delivered to us is worse than never to have known the way of righteousness (2²¹). The danger arises from sloth and unfruitfulness as regards the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, from forgetting the baptismal cleansing, from blindness or short-sightedness (1⁹). We fall from our own steadfastness, being carried away by the surrounding evil (3¹⁷). We must make our calling and election sure or else we shall stumble (1¹⁰). For this purpose it is necessary to use every effort to build up the Christian character on the foundation of faith, adding to our faith energy and knowledge and self-denial and endurance and piety and brotherly kindness, all crowned with love to God and man (1⁵⁻⁷). 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 (3¹¹). At the present time there is a special danger impending from false teachers who will steal into the church and assault both your faith and practice by denying the Master who bought them and indulging their lusts without restraint (2^{1,2}). They seduce the ignorant and unwary by their confident words (2¹⁴) 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 (3¹⁵). 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

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. 2³⁹). They are reserved under punishment for the day of judgment, which will be the day of their final destruction (2⁹, 3⁷). Similarly J. speaks of the judgment long ago prepared for these impious men (*v.* 4), compares them to trees twice dead, to falling stars for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved.

(6) *Possibility of repentance after falling away*—Both P. and J. speak somewhat doubtfully on this point. P. says that if men, after having escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ, are again entangled in these pollutions and overcome by them, their last state is worse than the first, since men become slaves to that by which they are overcome (2^{19,20}). So he speaks of those who have forgotten the cleansing of baptism (1⁹). On the other hand the delay of punishment is a token of the long-suffering patience of God, who would not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance (3⁹). Hence we are told that we are justified in regarding the long-suffering of God as a token of our own salvation (3¹⁵). The tone of J. is less hopeful: he speaks of Israel once for all saved from Egypt, but destroyed in the wilderness when they again fell into unbelief (*v.* 5); and though he bids the faithful to do their best to convert those who were going astray, yet he mentions one class in whose case trembling pity combined with abhorrence of their sin seems to be all that is possible (*vv.* 22, 23).

(7) *Eschatology and the Evidences of Christianity* are two subjects on which P. speaks at considerable length. The mockers denied the Second Advent (*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 (3⁴). P. answers generally that God is not limited by measures

of time which are merely relative to man; but he had already given a more precise answer in 1¹⁶ where he declared that he had been himself an eye-witness of *την του κυρίου δυναμιν και παρουσίαν*. He might also have answered that the fall of Jerusalem was itself a *συντελεια του αιῶνος*, another fulfilment of the prophecy of the *παρουσία*, which, like all prophecies, was a matter *ουκ ιδίας επιλυσεως*. 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 (3⁵⁻¹³). On that great day the offending angels and ungodly men will meet their doom (2⁴, 2⁹). J. quotes the prophecy of Enoch that the Lord will come with hosts of angels to execute judgment on impious men and impious deeds (*v.* 14). For that judgment the rebel angels are reserved in chains under darkness, and sinners shall then be punished in eternal fire (*vv.* 6, 7), while the righteous enter into eternal life, being presented before the throne of God in exceeding joy (*vv.* 21, 24).

P. speaks of the evidence of prophecy in 1¹⁹⁻³². 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 (1¹⁶⁻¹⁹), and by the contemplation of his goodness as manifested in the record of his acts and words (1³).

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 Dollinger, who in his *First Age of*

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 παλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τουτο το κρίμα . . . τον μονον δεσποτην αρνουμενοι and in *v.* 17, 18 μνησθητε τῶν ρηματων των προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν αποστολων του κυρίου ἡμων Ἰησου Χριστου, οτι ελεγον υμιν Ἐπ' ἐσχατου χρονου εσονται ἐμπαικται κατα τας ἑαυτων ἐπιθυμίας πορευομενοι, the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.'s 2³ ἐν ὑμῖν εσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι . . . τον αγοράσαντα αὐτους δεσποτην αρνουμενοι . . . οἷς το κρίμα εκπαλαι ουκ αρχει, the latter to P. 3^{2,3} μνησθηναι τῶν προειρημενων ρηματων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν καὶ της των ἀποστολων υμῶν ἐντολης του κυρίου καὶ σωτηρος, τουτο πρῶτου γινωσκοντες οτι ἐλευσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων των ημερων ἐν εμπαιγμονη ἐμπαικται κατα τὰς ιδίας επιθυμίας αυτων πορευομενοι.

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

¹ I agree with Dr. Bigg that it is superfluous to consider theories which suppose 2 Pet. to be made up of two independent epistles. Its unity, as shown in the earlier part of this chapter, forces itself on the mind of any careful reader.

or the present, cf. P. 2¹ *εσονται, παρεισάξουσιν*, 2² *εξακολουθήσουσιν, βλασφημηθησεται*, 2³ *ἐμπορευσονται* with J. *v.* 4 *παρεισεδυησαν*, *v.* 8 *μιαίνουσιν*, *v.* 10 *βλασφημουσιν* 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 *παλαι* 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 *ασεβεις* (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 3² does not profess to utter any new prophecy, but simply adds to what Jude had said, that the teaching of the Apostles rested upon the authority of Christ, and that it was in agreement with the teaching of the prophets. As regards obj. (3), the difference of tense, P. is not consistent in his use of the future. We have the pres. in 2¹⁰ *τρέμουσιν*, 2¹⁷ *εἰσίν*, 2¹⁸ *δελεάζουσιν*, 3⁵ *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. xcvi. to cii. The reason however

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*, *αγιος* (= Christian), *πνευμα* (= 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 *κλήσις* is found in 2 P. 1¹⁰ and *καλέω* of the Divine calling four times in 1 P. as well as in 2 P. 1³. The synonymous *εκλεκτός* is found in 1 P., as *ἐκλογή* is found in 2 P. 1¹⁰, both being thoroughly Pauline words. When it is said that *αγιος* 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 αγιον* used in 1 P. 2⁹. As to *πνευμα*, 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 *πνευμα καὶ ψυχὴν*. And what are we to say of 1 P. 4⁶ *ζωσιν κατα Θεὸν πνευματι* and 3³ *ὁ κρυπτος τῆς καρδιας ανθρωπος εν τω αφθάρτῳ του ησυχίου πνευματος*, where *καρδια* and *πνευμα* are both preferred to *ψυχη*? So 3¹⁵ *Χριστον ἀγιάσατε εν ταις καρδιαις υμῶν*. The 'indwelling spirit' is surely indicated in 1 P. 1¹¹ *το εν αυτοις πνευμα Χριστου*. Again the word *ψυχικός* is not exclusively Pauline. It occurs in the least Pauline of the books of the N.T., written by Jude's own brother (James 3¹⁵, where see note). Dr. Bigg denies that it could have been used in the Pauline sense by Peter, because to him '*ψυχη* means the soul in relation to the religious life,' but we meet the phrase *ψυχὰς αστηρίκτους* in 2 P. 2¹⁴, and in 1 P. 3²⁰ *οκτὼ ψυχαί* stands simply for 'eight persons' without

any allusion to the religious life, while on the other hand we find the phrase *οἶκος πνευματικός* and *πνευματικὰς θυσίας* in 1 P. 2⁵. Dr. Hort commenting on 1 P. 2¹¹ ('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 σαρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.*' *ψυχή*, as Hort says, 'answers very nearly to our modern word and conception "self."' See my note on 2 P. 2⁸ *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν.* Other Pauline words which occur in Peter are *αγοράζω*, *αιρεσις*, *ἄνομος*, *γνωρίζω*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *δουλω*, *ἐγκρατεία*, *εἰλικρινής*, *ελευθερία*, *ἐπιγνωσις*, *παραδίδωμι*, to name a few from 2 P., and similarly we find *ἁγιασμός*, *αἷμα Ἰησοῦ*, *Χριστοῦ παθήματα*, *εὐλογεῶ*, *εὐλογητός*, *εὐλογία*, *κληρονομία*, *προγνωσκῶ*, *γαλα*, *συνείδησις*, *συνκληρονομος*, *χάρισμα*, *σάρξ*, *σαρκικός* in 1 P. On the other hand I have vainly searched for any specially Petrine word such as *ἀναστροφή* (though that is not un-Pauline) in the epistle of Jude.¹

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

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

CHAPTER II

GRAMMAR AND STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER¹

UNUSUAL INFLEXIONS.²

Jude v. 4 *παρεισεδυσαν* read by WH. after B for *παρεισεδυσαν* read by Ti. Treg. after N A etc., see explanatory note. 2 Pet. 2⁵ *ἐπαξας* for the usual *ἐπαγαγων*, cf. Blass p. 43. 2 Pet. 1¹⁶ *ἐγενηθην* for *εγενομην*. On the other hand it might seem that hybrid aorist forms such as *έβαλαν*, *επεσαν*, which are found in other books of the N.T., and the termination *-σαν* in impf. or 2nd aor. as *είχουσαν*, *παρελάβουσαν*, and *-αν* for *-ασι* in the pf. as *είσεληλυθαν*, 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 *οἶδασιν* 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 *-εω* 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 δε Μιχαήλ*, 11 *του Καίν, του Βαλααμ, του Κορε*, also in 2 Pet. 2¹⁵ *του Βαλαάμ*.

It is omitted in J. v. 14 *έβδομος άπο 'Αδάμ, 'Ενωχ, v. 1 'Ιακωβου, v. 5 Αίγυπτου, 'Ιησου Χριστου passim*.³ So in 2 Pet. 2⁵ *Νωε, 2⁷ Λωτ*.

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. Conyheare and Stock have brought out *Selections from the Septuagint* with a useful introduction on Grammar.

³ Dr. Abbott has discussed the reasons for the presence or absence of the article, *Johannine Grammar*, pp. 57 f. Cf. J. H. Moulton *Gr. of N.T. Prolegomena*, p. 83.

(2) Before a name which is applicable only to one as ὁ Θεός, ο Κύριος: always so with the nom. and often with other cases in St. James; but found in St. Jude only where the word is defined by a genitive, as in *v.* 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα, *v.* 17 and *v.* 25 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. In 2 Pet. 1¹ we find ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1² ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3¹² τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 1¹⁶ 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 ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι Κύριος. So 2 Pet. 1¹⁷ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, *ib.* *v.* 21 ἐλάλησαν ἀπο Θεοῦ, 2⁹ οἶδεν Κύριος ἀσεβείας ρυεσθαι, 3⁹ οὐ βραδυνεὶ Κύριος, 2⁹, 3¹⁰ ἡμέρα Κυρίου, 2¹¹, 3⁸ παρὰ Κυρίῳ. When Κύριος (nom.) is used as a proper name without the article, it must be understood of God; but in oblique cases it is often used of Christ, as in 1 Cor. 7²² ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δούλος ἀπελευθερὸς Κυρίου ἐστίν, 1 Cor. 10²¹ ποτηρίον Κυρίου.

This use is widely extended in the N.T. owing to the growth of a special Christian terminology, *e.g.* πνεῦμα ἁγίου 2 Pet. 1²¹: σὰρξ, Jude *v.* 8 σαρκα μὲν μαιίνουσιν, 2 Pet. 2¹⁰ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πόρευομένους, 2¹⁸ σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις: γραφή, 2 Pet. 1²⁰ προφητεία γραφῆς.¹

Use of Article with a Qualified Noun.

The noun may be qualified by the addition of an adjective or participle, or of a genitive, or an adverb or adverbial phrase. If the article is used, a noun thus qualified may take one of four forms—(1) the ‘compact,’ where the qualification is placed between the article and the noun as in ὁ τότε κόσμος 2 Pet. 3⁶; (2) the ‘appositional,’ where the qualification stands in apposition to the noun, the article being prefixed both to the qualifying phrase and to the noun (*a*), or to the former only (*b*), as in Jude *v.* 17 τῶν ρημάτων 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 ζοφὸς τοῦ σκοτοῦς, *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 ἀπαξ παρα-

¹ See below under *Irregular Omission of Article.*

δοθείση τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, *v.* 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χαριτα, *v.* 7 αἰ
περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, *v.* 9 περὶ τοῦ Μωυσεως σωματος, *v.* 23 τον απο
τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα, *v.* 12 [οἱ] εν ταις ἀγάπαις υμῶν
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, σπιλαδες becomes the predicate to the
sentence.)

2 Pet. supplies many elaborate instances of the compact form,
which is used by him, as Dr. Bigg remarks, with exceptional freedom
and elegance: so 1⁴ τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς, 1¹⁶ τὴν
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν, 2¹ τον ἀγοράσαντα αυτοὺς δεσποτην,
2⁷ ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 2¹⁰ τους οπίσω
σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμου πορευομενους, 2¹³ τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα
τρυφήν, 2¹⁶ τὴν τοῦ προφητου παραφρονίαν, 2²¹ ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης
αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 3² τῆς των ἀποστολων υμῶν εντολῆς,
3¹⁵ κατα την δοθείσαν 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. 1¹ τοις ἰσοτιμον ἡμῖν
λανουσιν πίστιν. Such a clause may be called 'semi-compact.'
Other examples are Jude *v.* 4 οἱ παλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τουτο
τὸ κρίμα, *v.* 7 τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις, *v.* 18 κατα τας εαυτῶν
ἐπιθυμίας πορευομενοι των ἀσεβειων, 2 Pet. 3² μνησθῆναι των
προειρημενων ρημάτων υπο τῶν ἁγιων προφητῶν, *ib.* τῆς τῶν
ἀποστολων ἐντολῆς του Κυρίου.

Sometimes we have the converse irregularity. A word from
the outside is inserted in the inclosure, *e.g.* 2 Pet. 1⁴ τα τιμια καὶ
μεγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρηται, 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
τους μη τηρησαντας την ἑαυτῶν ἀρχην, *v.* 11 τη ὁδῷ του Καίν, τη
πλάνῃ του Βαλαάμ, τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ* του Κορε, *v.* 17 μνησθητε τῶν
ρηματων τῶν προειρημενων υπο τῶν ἀποστολων, *v.* 21 το ελεος του
κυρίου ἡμῶν. 2 Pet. 1³ διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνωσεως του καλέσαντος
ἡμᾶς ἰδία δοξη (where the desire of compactness would have
resulted in the less simple διὰ τῆς του ἰδία δοξη ημᾶς καλεσαντος
ἐπιγνώσεως), 1⁹ του καθαρισμου τῶν πάλαι αὐτου ἁμαρτιῶν, 1¹¹ η
εισοδος εἰς την αἰωνιον βασιλείαν του κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1¹⁴ η ἀπόθεσις
του σκηνωματός μου, 2¹⁵ τη ὁδῷ του Βαλαὰμ του Βοσορ, 2¹⁸ τους

ολίγως ἀποφευγοντας τους εν πλάνη ἀναστρεφομενους (where the compact form would have been less clear), 3¹² τὴν παρουσιαν τῆς του Θεου ἡμερας.

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 του Θεου ἡμῶν . . . τον κυριον ἡμῶν (also vv. 17, 21, 25), v. 12 ἐν ταις ἀγαπαις υμῶν, v. 16 κατα τας ἐπιθυμίας αυτῶν, το στομα αυτῶν, v. 24 τῆς δόξης αυτου.

2 Pet. 1¹ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 1² του κυριου ημων (also in vv. 8, 11, 14, 16, iii. 15, 18), 1³ τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αυτου, 1⁵ ἐν τῇ πίστει υμῶν, 1¹⁴ του σκηνωματος μου, 1¹⁷ ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητος μου, 1¹⁹ εν ταις καρδιαις υμων, 2³ η ἀπωλεια αυτῶν, 2¹² ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αυτῶν, 2¹³ ἐν ταις ἀπαταις αυτῶν, 3² τῶν αποστολων υμῶν, 3⁴ τῆς παρουσιας αυτου, 3¹³ το ἐπάγγελμα αυτου.

Where the noun is preceded by an adjective or quasi-adjective, the possessive genitive sometimes follows the noun, as in 2 Pet. 1³ quoted above; sometimes the adjective, as in Jude v. 3 τῆς κοινης ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, v. 20 τῇ ἀγιωτατη υμῶν πίστει, 2 Pet. 1⁹ τῶν πάλαι αυτου ἀμαρτιῶν, 3¹⁵ ο ἀγαπητος ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, 3¹⁶ την ἰδίαν αυτῶν ἀπωλειαν.

Where the possessive genitive follows immediately on the article, as in Jude v. 6 την εαυτῶν ἀρχην, v. 13 τας εαυτων αἰσχυνας, v. 18 τας εαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας, the effect is to give special emphasis. Since εαυτου is in itself emphatic, it is usually found in this emphatic position, as in Mt. 8²² τους εαυτῶν νεκρους, Lk. 2³ εκαστος εἰς την εαυτου πολιν, 9⁶⁰ θάψαι τους εαυτων νεκρους, 11²¹ φυλάσσει την εαυτου αὐλήν, 14²⁶ καὶ την εαυτου ψυχὴν, Rom. 4¹⁹ το εαυτου σωμα ηδη νενεκρωμενον, 8³ ὁ Θεος τον εαυτου υιον πεμφσας, 16⁴ τον εαυτῶν τράχηλον υπεθηκαν, 1 Cor. 7² εκαστος την εαυτου γυναικα ἔχετω, etc., but there are also cases in which it is found after its noun, as in Mt. 25⁷ ἐκοσμησαν τας λαμπάδας ἐαυτῶν, Lk. 14²⁷ ὅστις οὐ βασταζει τον σταυρον εαυτου. An examination of the passages quoted under εαυτου in the concordance shows that in general the latter position is less emphatic than the former, and that, in many cases of the latter, αυτου and αυτῶν occur as various readings. The more emphatic position is naturally assigned to τουτων in 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ την τουτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, and to ἐκείνου in 2 Pet. 1¹⁶ τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. So Joh. 5²⁷ τοις ἐκείνου γραμμασιν, 2 Cor. 8⁹ τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχεια,

8¹³ το εκείνων περισσευμα, 8¹⁴ το εκείνων υστερημα, 2 Tim. 2²⁶ το εκείνου θελημα, Tit. 3⁷ τῆ εκείνου χαριτι. In 2 Pet. 3⁷ some MSS. have τῶ αυτου λογω, which resembles James 1¹⁸ τῶν αυτοῦ κτισματων, 1 Pet. 1³ το πολὺ αὐτου ελεος, Tit. 3⁵ το αὐτου ελεος, 1 Joh. 2²⁷ το αυτου χρίσμα, Rom. 3²⁴ τῆ αυτου χάριτι, 3²⁵ τῶ αυτου αιματι, 1 Thess. 2¹⁹ εν τῆ αυτου παρουσία, Heb. 2⁴ κατα την αυτου θελησιν (quoted by Abbott, *Joh. Gr.* p. 415); but there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. 3⁷ αὐτω is right, see explanatory note. The possessive pronoun in this position has the same emphatic force as the genitive of the personal pronoun, e.g. 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ μετα την ἐμὴν εξοδου contrasted with the preceding υμᾶς.

In two passages of 2 Pet. we find the possessive genitive preceding the articular phrase, 2² πολλοὶ ἔξακολουθησουσιν αυτωνταις ἀσελγείαις, and 3¹ διεγείρω υμων ἐν υπομνησει τὴν εἰλικρινη διάνοιαν. Clauses of this form are common in St. John's Gospel, and Dr. Abbott has christened them 'the vernacular possessive.' See *Joh. Gr.* pp. 414 foll., where many examples are quoted, e.g. Joh. 1²⁷ ἵνα λυσω αυτου τον ἱμάντα του υποδηματος (corresponding to Lk. 3¹⁶ λυσαι τον ἱμάντα τῶν υποδημάτων αυτου), Joh. 4¹⁶ φωνησον σου τον ανδρα, as well as from other books. In most cases the preceding possessive genitive seems to throw special stress on the following noun, but I do not think that this is so in the examples above quoted from 2 Pet.; and Dr. Abbott allows that in some cases the genitive is itself made emphatic by contrast, as in Joh. 13⁶ συ μου νιπτεις τοὺς πόδας; 13¹⁴ εἰ ουν εγω ενιψα υμῶν τοὺς ποδας . . . και υμεις οφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τους ποδας.

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 την τῆς μεγάλης ημερας κρίσιν: but the phrase μεγάλη ἡμερα, as well as the word κρίσις, has acquired a technical sense, which

allows of the omission of the article without causing ambiguity, and this omission is further facilitated by the preposition. We may compare the phrase *ἐν ἡμερα κρίσεως*, which occurs four times in Mt., *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως* 2 Pet. 2⁹, 3⁷, *ἥξει ἡμερα Κυρίου* 3¹⁰, *εἰς ἡμεραν αἰωνος* 3¹⁸, cf. *οὐκ ἀναστησονται ἀσεβεῖς ἐν κρίσει* Ps. 1⁵, *μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως* Enoch x. 11 (Gizeh), p. 339 ed. Charles. On the other hand we find the full form *τῆς του Θεου ἡμέρας* 2 Pet. 3¹², *ἐν τῇ ἡμερα της κρίσεως* 1 Joh. 4¹⁷, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα τῇ μεγαλη* (MS. *τῆς—λης*) *της κρίσεως* Enoch p. 337. Jude v. 14 *ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτου*: the parallel in Enoch has *σὺν τοῖς (?) μυριάσιν αὐτου καὶ τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτου* (p. 327 Charles); but the article is omitted in Heb. 12²² *προσεληλυθατε . . . μυριάσιν ἀγγελων*, Ps. 3⁶ *οὐ φοβηθήσομαι ἀπο μυριάδων λαου*, and in Deut. 33² *σὺν μυριάσι Καδης* (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 ἐργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν*, the Gizeh Greek (followed by **Σ** and others) omits *ἀσεβείας αὐτων*, and Treg. brackets *ἀσεβείας*. The omission of the article is awkward but not more so than in Job. 31¹⁸ *δι ἀσεβειαν δωρων ὧν ἐδέχοντο*, and other examples cited in my Introduction to St. James, p. cxiii. So Jude v. 7 *πυρος αἰωνιου δικην υπέχουσαι* (R.V. 'suffering the vengeance of eternal fire'), where we should have expected *τὴν του αἰωνιου πυρος δικην*, cf. Heb. 6² (*θεμελιον καταβαλλομενοι*) *βαπτισμων διδαχὴν, ἐπιθεσεως τε χειρῶν, ἀναστασεως νεκρων καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου*. Jude v. 21 *ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεου* (R.V. 'keep yourselves in the love of God'). We find similar examples in 2 Pet.

2 Pet. 1¹ *ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ του Θεου ἡμων* (R.V. 'in the righteousness of our God'), cf. Rom. 4¹³ *διὰ δικαιοσυνης πίστεως* and even the nominative in Rom. 1¹⁷ *δικαιοσυνῇ Θεου ἐν αὐτω ἀποκαλυπτεται*: so 2 Pet. 1² *ἐν ἐπιγνωσει του Θεου* and 2²⁰, but we meet the full form just below 1⁸ *εἰς την του κυρίου ἡμων ἐπίγνωσιν* and 1³ *δια τῆς ἐπιγνωσεως του καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς*, as in Rom. 2²¹ we have *την οδον της δικαιοσυνης*. 2 Pet. 1²¹ *οὐ γαρ θεληματι ἀνθρωπου ηνεχθη προφητεια* (R.V. 'by the will of man'), cf. Joh. 1¹³ *ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός*, 1 Pet. 4² *θεληματι Θεου βιώσαι*: so the phrase *διὰ θελήματος Θεου* occurs seven times in St. Paul. 2 Pet. 2⁵ *κατακλυσμον κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας* (R.V. 'the world of the ungodly'): we might translate 'a world of ungodly men,' but

κοσμος is often anarthrous, not only in prepositional phrases such as *απο καταβολῆς κοσμου, απ' αρχης κοσμου, αμαρτία ἦν ἐν κοσμῳ*, but in such cases as Rom. 11¹² *το παραπτωμα αυτου πλουτος κοσμου*, and even in the nominative, as Gal. 6¹⁴ *δι οὔ εμοι κοσμος ἐσταυρωται καγω κοσμῳ*. 2 Pet. 2⁶ *πολεις ζοδομων και Γομόρρας κατεκρινεν* (R.V. 'the cities'), cf. Lk. 2⁴ *ανεβη ἐκ πολεως Ναζαρέτ*. 2 Pet. 2¹⁰ *τους ὀπίσω σαρκος ἐν επιθυμία μiasμου πορευομένους* (R.V. 'after the flesh in the lust of defilement'), cf. 2¹⁸ *εν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκος ασελγείαις* (R.V. 'in the lusts of the flesh,' but see explanatory note), Gal. 5¹⁶ *ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκος ου μη τελεσητε*, 1 Pet. 4² *ανθρώπων επιθυμίαις . . . βιωσαι*. 2 Pet. 2^{13, 15} *μισθον αδικιας* (R.V. 'the hire of wrong-doing'), cf. Acts 1¹⁸ *εκτησατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθου τῆς ἀδικιας*. 2 Pet. 3⁴ *απ ἀρχης κτισεως* (R.V. 'from the beginning of the creation'), cf. above *ἀπ ἀρχῆς κοσμου*.

(2) Other examples of omission. Jude v. 21 *εἰς ζωνν αἰώνιον*, which is more usual than the full phrase, *την ζωνν την αἰωνιον* in 1 Joh. 1², 2²⁵. Jude v. 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου* (R.V. 'in the last time'), cf. 2 Tit. 3¹, James 5³ *ἐν ἐσχαταις ἡμεραις*, 1 Pet. 1⁵ *ἐν καιρω εσχατω*, 1 Joh. 2¹⁸ *ἐσχάτη ὥρά ἐστιν*, 2 Pet. 3³ *ἐπ ἐσχατων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, where see note. Jude v. 25 *μονῳ Θεῷ σωτήρι ημῶν δοξα* (R.V. 'to the only God our Saviour,' Rom. 16²⁷ *μόνω σοφῷ Θεῷ*, 1 Tim. 1¹⁷ *μονῳ Θεῷ τιμή*; but in Joh. 5⁴⁴ *τὴν δοξαν την παρα του μόνου Θεου ου ζητετε*, *ib.* 17³ *ινα γινωσκωσίν σε τον μονον ἀληθινον Θεόν*, Jude v. 4 *τον μόνον δεσποτην*. Cf. Thuc. iii. 57. 4 *ημεῖς τε, ω Λακεδαιμόνιοι, η μόνη ἐλπίς, δέδιμεν μη ου βέβαιοι ητε*, *Joh. Gr.* p. 10. 2 Pet. 2⁵ *ἀρχαίου κοσμου ουκ ἐφεισατο* (R.V. 'spared not the ancient world'), cf. Ps. 78⁸ *μη μνησθῆς ημῶν ἀνομιων αρχαίων*, Job 21²⁸ *ὑπερ την φρονησιν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων*. 2 Pet. 2¹⁵ *καταλειποντες ευθείαν οδον* (R.V. 'the right way'): elsewhere in this epistle *ὁδός* is joined with the article, as in 2², 2²¹, and in Jude v. 11; but it is anarthrous in Mt. 21³² *ἐν οδῷ δικαιοσυνης*, Lk. 1⁷⁹ *εἰς οδον εἰρηνης*, James 5²⁰ *ἐκ πλανης οδοῦ αυτου*, and in the following quotations from the LXX., Acts 2²⁸ *ἐγνωρισάς μοι ὁδους ζωῆς*, Rom. 3¹⁷ *οδον εἰρηνης ουκ εγνωσαν*, and constantly in the poetic books of the O.T. *e.g.* Ps. 1⁶ *οδον δικαίων, οδος ἀσεβῶν*, Ps. 2¹² *εξ ὁδου δικαίας*, Prov. 2¹⁶ *ἀπο οδου ευθείας*, 2⁸ *οδον ευλαβουμενων αυτον διαφυλάξει*. 2 Pet. 2¹⁶ *ελεγξιν εσχεν ιδίας παρανομίας*, 1³ *ιδία δοξη*, cf. Acts 13³⁶ *ιδία γενεα υπηρετησας*, 1 Cor. 9⁷

τίς στρατευεται ἰδίῳ ὀφωνίῳ; Gal. 6⁹ καιρῷ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, Tit. 2⁹ δούλους ἰδίῳ δεσπόταις υποτάσσεσθαι, *Evang. Petri* § 6 λαβὼν τὸν Κύριον εἰσηγάγεν εἰς ἰδίον τάφον. In 2 Pet. 1²⁰ προφητεία ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται is indefinite in scope, 'Prophecy is not a matter of private interpretation.' In 2²² and 3¹⁷ we have the article ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἔξεραμα, ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, and in 3^{3, 16} this is further strengthened by the addition of αὐτῶν. 2 Pet. 2⁸ ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνομοῖς 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. 2⁷ δίκαιον Λωτ . . . ἐρυσάτο, which must be translated 'saved just Lot,' not 'a just man named Lot,' and Ps. 111^{6, 7} ἰσχυρῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἀνήγγειλε . . . ἔργα χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀληθεῖα καὶ κρίσις, Wisdom 3¹ ψυχαὶ δικαίων ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ. 2 Pet. 1⁴ 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. Οὐρανός¹ is anarthrous in 2 Pet. 1¹⁸ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθείσαν, 3⁵ οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαί, 3¹² οὐρανοὶ λυθησονται, 3¹³ καινοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσδοκῶμεν. Here 3⁵ and 3¹³ are indefinite, but 1¹⁸ and 3¹² refer definitely to a known heaven. The article is rightly used in 3⁷ οἱ νῦν οὐρανοί as contrasted with the former heavens, but in 3¹⁰ there is no special occasion for it, as it is followed by the anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ and also by οὐρανοί in 3¹². 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 οὐ δεῖ οὐρανὸν δεξασθαι Acts 3²¹, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς Κύριος Acts 17²⁴, and the nominative οὐρανὸς ὑψηλός, γῆ δὲ βαθεῖα (R.V. 'the heaven for height, and the earth for depth') Prov. 25³. 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διανυγία καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη (R.V. 'the day,' 'the day-star'), cf. Job. 38¹² εὐσφόρος ἐπειδὴ τὴν εαυτοῦ τάξιν, Mal. 4³ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης, and the phrases ἡμέρα Κυρίου, ἡμέρα κρίσεως mentioned above. ἀγγελος is used without the article in Jude v. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρησαντας 'angels, viz. those that kept not,' and 2 Pet. 2⁴ ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο 'spared not angels when they sinned,'

¹ Cf. *Joh. Gr.* pp. 49 foll.

2 Pet. 2¹¹ *οπου ἄγγελοι* 'whereas angels, though greater,' etc. So *ευσεβείς* and *αδίκους* in 2 Pet. 2⁹ *οἶδεν Κυριος ευσεβεις ρυεσθαι, αδίκους δὲ κολαζομενους τηρειν*, 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, *μαλιστα δε τούς ὀπίσω σαρκος*.

It is sometimes a little difficult to see why the article is used, as in 2 P. 1⁴ *δι' ὧν τα τιμια υμιν ἐπαγγελματα δεδωρηται*, where definite reference is made to the promises of Christ. So in 1¹⁵ *εχειν υμᾶς την τουτων μνήμην ποιεισθαι* '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, *επειδηπερ πολλοι ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διηγησιν περι των πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*, the latter resembling the broken utterances of the Sibyl, *του δουναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αυτου ἐν ἀφεσει ἁμαρτιων αὐτῶν διὰ σπλάγγνα ελεους Θεου ημων*. 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. 1¹⁸ *ετι τουτου λαλουντος αλλος αγγελος ερχεται λεγων τω Ἰωβ, Των υἱῶν σου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐσθιοντων καὶ πινοντων παρὰ τω ἀδελφῷ αυτων τω πρεσβυτερω, εξαίφνης πνευμα μεγα ἐπήλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐρημου καὶ ἤψατο των τεσσάρων γωνιῶν τῆς οικίας, και επεσεν η οἰκια ἐπὶ τὰ παιδία σου καὶ ετελευτησαν*, while in the drama itself we meet such phrases as *συνεκλεισε πυλας γαστρὸς μητρός μου* 3¹⁰, *ἰσχὺν ρηματων σου τις υποίσει*; 4², *στόνος λεοντος, φωνή δε λεαινης, γαυρίαμα δε δρακοντων ἐσβέσθη* 4¹⁰, *ἄφρονα ἀναιρεῖ ὀργη, πεπλανημένον δε θανατοῖ ζῆλος* 5². There is a similar contrast between the style of the narrative portion of Judges, e.g. 4²¹ *συνεκαλυψεν αυτον ἐν τῇ δερρει αυτῆς, καὶ ελαβεν . . . τον πάσσαλον της σκηνης και εθηκε τὴν σφυραν ἐν τη χειρὶ αυτης . . . καὶ ενέκρουσε τον πάσσαλον ἐν τη γνάθῳ αυτου καὶ διηλασεν ἐν τη γῆ*, and the song of Deborah 5⁵ *ορη ἐσαλευ-*

θησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, τουτο Σινᾶ ἀπο προσώπου Κυρίου, οὗ σοφαὶ ἀρχουσων αὐτῆς ἀνταπεκριναντο πρὸς αὐτην.

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

Article belonging to more than one Noun.

2 Pet. 1¹¹, 2²⁰, 3², 3¹⁸ του κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Here the ordinary rule holds good: substantives subordinated to the same article are simply different names for the same subject; but in 2 Pet. 1¹ ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ του Θεου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστου (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 του Θεου καὶ Ἰησοῦ του κυρίου ἡμῶν; so too in Jude v. 4 τον μονον δεσποτην καὶ κυριον Ἰησουν Χριστον, where see note.¹ In 2 Pet. 1¹⁰ βεβαίαν υμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, 1¹⁶ την του κυρίου ἡμῶν δυναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, 3¹⁶ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι, the single article is sufficient because the connected nouns belong to one category (see Winer, p. 154).

CASES.

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. 3¹⁻³ διεγείρω υμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν,

¹ J. H. Moulton, p. 84, understands τοῦ Θεοῦ 2 P. 1¹ of Christ.

μνησθῆναι τῶν ρημάτων . . . γινωσκοντες, 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 το δευτερον μη πιστευσαντας, v. 7 τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις ἐκπορνευσασαι; (2) *with prepositions*¹: εἰς, v. 4 οἱ παλαι προγεγραμμενοι εἰς τουτο το κριμα; χαριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ασέλγειαν; v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετηρηκεν; v. 13 εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται; v. 25 Θεῷ δοξα εἰς παντας τους αἰῶνας; v. 21 προσδεχομενοι το ελεος εἰς ζωην αἰωνιον. περί c. acc. v. 7 αἱ περί αὐτας πόλεις. υπο, Jude v. 6 υπο ζοφον τετηρηκεν, cf. Moulton p. 63.

2 Pet. (1) *Adverbial*: 1⁵ αὐτὸ τουτο δε† . . . επιχορηγήσατε αρετην. *Acc. of duration of time*: 2⁸ ημεραν εξ ἡμερας† ψυχὴν εβασάνιζεν. *Cognate Acc. after passive verb*: 2 Pet. 2¹³ αδικουμενοι μισθον αδικιας. (2) *with preposition*: εἰς eleven times, the more remarkable instances being 1⁸ ἀκάρπους εἰς την επίγνωσιν, 1¹⁷ εἰς ον ευδοκησα * 2²² (επιστρέψας) εἰς κυλισμον βορβόρου, 3⁹ μακροθυμεί εἰς υμας. δια c. acc. 2² δι' οὗς ἡ ὁδος βλασφημηθησεται, 3⁶ δι' ον (λογον) ὁ κοσμος απωλετο (MSS. δι' ὧν), 3¹² δι' ἣν (παρουσίαν) ουρανοὶ λυθησονται, 3⁹ μακροθυμει δι (αἰ. εἰς) υμᾶς. ἐπί c. acc. 1¹³ ἐφ' οσον, 2²² ἐπιστρεψας ἐπὶ το ἴδιον εξεραμα. μετα c. acc. 1¹⁵ μετα την ἐμην εξοδον. κατα c. acc. 3³ κατα τας επιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, 3¹³ κατα το ἐπάγγελμα προσδοκωμεν, 3¹⁵ κατα την σοφίαν εγραψεν. προς c. acc. 1³ τα προς ζωην,† 3¹⁵ στρεβλουσιν προς ἀπώλειαν.

Complementary construction with factitive verb. 2 Pet. 2⁶ τας πολεις ὑποδειγμα μελλοντων ἀσεβειν τεθεικως, of which we have the passive in Jude v. 7 αἱ πολεις προκεινται δειγμα; 2 Pet. 1⁸ ταυτα ουκ ἀργούς (υμᾶς) καθιστησιν; Jude v. 24 στήσαι υμᾶς ἀμωμους; 2 Pet. 2¹³ ηδουην ἡγουμενοι την ἐν ημερα τρυφην, 3¹⁵ την μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεισθε; Jude v. 24 φυλάξαι υμας ἀπταίστους.

GENITIVE.—The most noteworthy examples in Jude are (*after substantive*) *Possessive*: v. 6 κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμερας, v. 15 περί τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αυτων, v. 18 κατα τὰς εαυτῶν επιθυμίας

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.

τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. *Qualitative*: v. 9 κρίσιν βλασφημίας * *Material*: v. 6 πυρὸς αἰωνίου δικῆν * (*After verb*): v. 17 μνησθητε ρημάτων. *Gen. of Price*: Jude v. 11 μισθοῦ ἐξεχυθησαν. *With prepositions*: ἀπο twice, ἐκ twice, ἐπί once, v. 18 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου, περί four times, δια once, προ once, v. 25 προ παντος τοῦ αἰῶνος, κατα twice, esp. v. 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ παντων,* υπο twice, esp. v. 12 νεφελαι υπο ἀνέμων παραφερομεναι, οπίσω* v. 7 ἀπελθουσαι οπίσω σαρκος, κατενωπιον* v. 24 στῆσαι κατενωπιον τῆς δοξης, χαριν v. 16 ωφελίας χάριν.

2 Pet. Noteworthy examples of the gen. are (*after substantive*) the *Possessive*, 1¹⁷ ὁ υἱος μου, ὁ ἀγαπητος μου, 3¹⁰ ἡμερα Κυρίου, 3¹² ἡμερα Θεοῦ, 3¹⁸ ἡμερα αἰῶνος, 2², 3⁷ ἡμερα κρίσεως, 1²⁰ προφητεία γραφῆς, 2² ἡ οδος τῆς ἀληθείας. *Objective*: 1³ ἐπιγνωσεως του καλεσαντος, 1¹³ ἡ ἀποθεσις του σκηνωματος, 1¹⁵ την τουτων μνημην, 2¹⁶ ελεγξιν παρανομίας. *Reduplicated genitive* *: 3² μνησθῆναι τῆς των αποστολων υμων ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, where υμων depends on αποστολων, αποστολων οἱ τῆς ἐντολῆς του Κυρίου, and this last οἱ μνησθῆναι. *Gen. of Quality*: 2¹ αἵρεσεις απωλειας,* 2¹⁰ ἐπιθυμία μiasμου,* 2⁴ σειροῖς ζοφου,* (reading σειραις it is easier to explain it as a *Gen. of Material*). *Gen. of Apposition*: 2⁶ †πολεις Σοδομων καὶ Γομορρας, (cf. Hes. Sc. Herc. 469 πολιν Τρηχινος, Aesch. Ag. 29 Ἴλιου πολις, Thuc. iv. 130 ἡ Μενδη πολις). *Hebraistic*: 2¹⁴ κατάρας τεκνα.* *After neuter article*: 2²² †τὸ τῆς παροιμίας. *After neuter adjective*: 2¹⁸ υπερογκα ματαιοτητος. So Heb. 3⁸ αγια ἀγίων, 1 Cor. 5⁸ ἐν ἀζυμοις εἰλικρινίας. This construction is common with the article, as in Rom. 1²⁰ τα ἀορατα του Θεου, Eph. 6¹² τα πνευματικα τῆς πονηρίας, 1 Cor. 4⁵ τα κρυπτα του 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 υπερογκα and in Dan. 11³⁶. So even in Soph. Ant. 1209 τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοης and 1265 ὦμοι ἐμῶν ἀνολβα βουλευμάτων.¹ Cf. such Tacitean phrases as vana rimatoris, inania honoris. *With adjective*: of the sphere 2¹⁴ ἀκαταπανστος ἀμαρτίας, γεγυμνασμένος πλεονεξίας*; of possession or privation, 2¹⁴ μεστος μοιχαλίδος ὀφθαλμός. *With verb*: 2⁵ κοσμου φειδεσθαι, 3² μνησθῆναι ρημάτων, 3¹⁷ εκπιπτειν

¹ I am indebted to Mr. Herbert Richards for the following additional examples, Eur. Phoen. 1485 προκαλυπτομενα βοτρυχάδεος ἀβρα παρηίδος, Hes. 192 πως φθέγγει ἀμεγαρτα κακων; 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 suspitionum.

στηριγμου, 1⁴ αποφευγω τῆς φθορας* (but with acc. 2²⁰ απ. τα μιᾶσματα and 2¹⁸); of the sphere 1²⁰ προφητεία ἰδίας επιλυσεως ου γινεται, 3⁷ βραδυνω επαγγελίας * *Genitive absolute*¹: 2 Pet. 1³ τῆς θείας δυνάμεως τὰ προς ζωην δεδωρημενης, 1¹⁷ φωνῆς ευεχθείσης, 3¹¹ τουτων πάντων λυομενων. *With prepositions*: ἀπο three (or four if we read ἀπο for υπο in 1¹⁷), esp. 1²¹ ἐλάλησαν ἀπο Θεου * 3⁴ ἀφ' ἧς (ἡμερας) ἐκοιμήθησαν.† εκ five, esp. 2⁸ ἡμεραν εξ ἡμερας.† υπο five (or four if we read απο in 1¹⁷), 1²¹ υπο πνευματος φερόμενοι, 2⁷ καταπονουμενον υπο τῆς τῶν αθεσμων αναστροφῆς (where we should rather have expected διά or the dative, but see my Introd. to St. James, p. cc, and the note on James 3⁴), 2¹⁷ ὀμιχλαι ὑπο λαιλαπος ἐλαννομεναι. οπίσω* once, 2¹⁶ τους οπίσω σαρκος πορευομενους. εως once, 1¹⁹ εως οὔ (χρονου) ἡμερα διαυγάση.† διά five times (six if we read δια δόξης in 1³, four if we read δι ου in 3⁶), esp. 3⁵ γη δι υδατος συνεστωσα * where it seems to have the force of μεταξυ. ἐπί once, 3³ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερων. κατά once, 2¹¹ ου φερουσιν κατ αυτῶν βλάσφημον κρισιν * παρά once, 1¹⁷ λαβων παρὰ Θεου τιμήν. περί twice.

DATIVE.—Jude. *Of Indirect Object*: v. 3 γράφειν υμῖν *bis*, v. 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τετηρηται, v. 1 Χριστω τετηρημένοι (?), v. 3 ἡ παραδοθεισα τοις ἀγίοις πίστις. *Dativus commodi*: v. 2 ἐλεος υμῖν. *Of the Agent*: v. 1 Θεῷ ἠγαπημένοι (al. ἐν Θεῷ). *After εἰμι understood* v. 25 μονω Θεῷ δοξα. *Following compound verbs*: v. 3 επαγωνιζεσθαι τη πιστει, v. 20 εποικοδομουντες εαυτοὺς τη πιστει, v. 9 επιτιμήσαι σοι. *Following adjective*: v. 7 τροπον ομοιον τουτοις. *With exclamation*: v. 11 ουαὶ αυτοις, cf. Epict. iii. 19. 1 ουαί μοι.

Of Instrument: v. 6 εις κρισιν δεσμοις τετηρηκεν. *Of Cause*: v. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ του Κορε ἀπωλοντο. *Of Manner**: v. 11 τῇ ὁδῷ του Καϊν ἐπορευθησαν, τη πλάνῃ του Βαλαὰμ εξεχυθησαν.

With Preposition: ἐν eight times, three being unclassical, viz. the dat. of the *instrument* in v. 10 ἐν τουτοις φθείρονται, that of *association* in v. 14 ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν ἦλθεν, that of *divine influence* v. 20 ἐν πνευματι προσευχομενοι. See Index.

2 Pet. *Dat. of Indirect Object*: after δωρέομαι 1³, 1⁴, ἐπιχορηγεω 1¹¹, παραδιδωμι 2⁴, 2²¹, δίδωμι 3¹⁵, δηλωω 1¹⁴, γνωριζω 1¹⁶, ἐπάγω 2¹, 2⁵, επαγγέλλομαι 2¹⁹, δουλωω 2¹⁹, γράφω 3¹, cf. 1¹ τοις ἰσοτιμον λαχουσιν πίστιν, where χαίρειν λεγει 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.

correspondence (unless we prefer to say that *χαιρειν* is changed into *χάρις υμιν* in *v.* 2, see note on James 1¹), *προσέχοντες λυχνω* 1¹⁹, *φέρω* 1¹⁷, *τίθημι* 2⁶ (*υποδειγμα ασεβειν τεθεικως*), 2³ *οἷς το κρίμα ουκ ἄργει*. *Dat. with εἰμι*, etc.: 1⁸ *υμῖν υπάρχοντα*, 1⁹ *ω πάρεστιν ταυτα*, 2²⁰ *γένονεν αυτοις*, 2²¹ *κρειττον ἦν αυτοῖς*, 2²² *συμβέβηκεν αυτοῖς*, 3¹⁸ *αυτῶ η δοξα* (verb understood), 1² *χάρις υμιν πληθυνθείη*. *After words implying agreement*: *ἐξακολουθεω* 1¹⁶, 2², 2¹⁵, *ἰσοτιμος ἡμιν* 1¹. *After words implying destination*: 2¹⁷ *οἷς τετήρηται*, 3⁷ *πυρὶ τεθησαυρισμενοι*. *Ethical Dative*: 3¹⁴ *ἄσπιλοι αυτῶ ευρεθῆναι*.

Dat. of Instrument: 1³ *ἰδία δοξη καλεῖν*, 2³ *λόγοις υμας*. *ἐμπορευσονται*, 2⁶ *καταστροφῇ κατεκρινεν* * 2¹⁸ *ἀσελγείαις δελεάζω*, 2¹⁹ *ὧ ἥττηται*, 3⁶ *κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθείς*. *Dat. of Cause*: 1²¹ *θελήματι ἀνθρωπου ηνεχθη*, 2⁸ *ψυχην ἀνομοις εργοις ἐβασάνιζεν* * 3⁵ *γῆ συνεστῶσα τω του Θεου λογω*, 3⁷ *ουρανοὶ τω αυτω λογω τεθησαυρίσμενοι*. *Dat. of Respect*: 2⁸ *βλεμματι δικαιος* * 2¹¹ *ισχυῖ μείζονες*.

With Prepositions:¹ *ἐν* forty instances, many being unclassical, e.g. the *dat. of the instrument*, 2¹⁶ *ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνη φθειγξάμενον*, 2³ *ἐν πλεονεξια υμας ἐμπορευσονται*, 1¹ *λαχων πίστιν εν δικαιοσυνη*, *dat. of manner*, 1¹³ *διεγείρειν υμᾶς ἐν υπομνήσει*, 3³ *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐλευσονται*. *παρὰ Κυρίω bis*. *συν* once. *With prep. in compound verb*: 2¹³ *συνευχουμενοι υμιν*, 2²⁰ *τουτοις ἐμπλακεντες*, 3¹⁷ *πλάνη συναπαχθεντες*.

Number and Gender.

The rule as to neuter plurals being followed by a singular verb is not strictly adhered to in the N.T. (see Blass *Gr.* p. 78), but it holds good in 2 Pet. 1⁸ *ταυτα καθίστησιν*, 1⁹ *πάρεστιν ταυτα*, and 3¹⁰ *στοιχεῖα λυθησεται* (where some MSS. have *λυθησονται*). Where two or more subjects are joined each may have a separate verb, (1) as in 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ *ἕως οὗ ἡμερα διαυγάση καὶ φωσφορος ἀνατειλη*, 3¹⁰ *ουρανοὶ παρελευσονται στοιχεια δε λυθησεται*, 3¹² *ουρανοι λυθησονται καὶ στοιχεῖα τηκεται*. Or (2) where the subjects are names of things and in the singular number, they may be followed by one verb in the singular, provided that the subjects belong to the same general category, as Jude 2 (and 2 Pet. 1²) *ελεος καὶ εἰρηνη καὶ χαρις πληθυνθείη*. A singular verb is also found where the compound subject is made up of a singular and a neuter

¹ See Index.

plural, as 3¹⁰ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐργα εὐρεθῆσεται (where some MSS. have the plural). Elsewhere, as a rule, (3) the compound subject is followed by a plural verb, as 3⁷ οἱ νυν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν. In 3¹ a plural relative follows a singular noun δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολὴν ἐν αἷς διεγείρω*, because δευτέραν carries with it the thought of a first letter. A collective noun in the singular is followed by a plural participle in Jude v. 5, if we omit the article, λαὸν σωσας [τούς] μὴ πιστευσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. Cf. *Evangel. Petri* § 28 ο λαὸς γογγυζει καὶ κοπτεται τα στήθη λέγοντες κ.τ.λ.

Plural of Abstract Nouns to express the various concrete manifestations of the abstract idea: Jude v. 18 τας ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν, v. 8 δοξας βλασφημοῦσιν ('glories' for 'glorious beings'): so 2 Pet. 2¹⁰ δοξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 2² πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθησοῦσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, 2¹⁸ δελεάζουσιν σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ἀποφευγοντας, 3¹¹ ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις, where there may be an intentional reference to Jude v. 18; see explanatory note. Other examples are James 2¹ μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἐχετε τὴν πίστιν, Col. 3²² ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις, 1 Pet. 2¹ ὑποκρίσεις, φθόνους.

Gender.—Exceptional examples are 2 Pet. 3⁵ οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι 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 3⁷ οἱ δε νυν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν the gender agrees with that of the more important, though more distant, noun. So in 3¹³ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν προσδοκῶμεν ἐν οἷς κ.τ.λ. the gender of the relative agrees with οὐρανοῦς. In Jude v. 12 the reading of the best MSS., οἱ . . . σπιλάδες ἐνωχούμενοι, 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 (α) Substantival (masculine) used as in Demosthenes, of opponents, in Jude 8, καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, 10 οὗτοι δε

βλασφημουσιν, 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν σπιλάδες, 16 οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσται, 19 οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ αποδιορίζοντες, 14 ἐπροφητεύσεν δε και τουτοις. 2 Pet. 2¹² ουτοι δε ως ἀλογα ζωα, 2¹⁷ οὗτοι εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἀνυδροι. Used of others, Jude v. 7 τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις (the fallen angels). 2 Pet. 1¹⁸ ουτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου (of Christ).

(b) Substantival (neuter) Jude 10 οσα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τουτοις φθείρονται. 2 Pet. 1²⁰, 3³ τουτο πρωτον γινωσκοντες, 3⁵, 3⁸ τουτο λαμβάνει, 2¹⁹ τουτω δεδουλωται, 1⁸, 9, 10, 3¹⁴ ταυτα, 1⁴ δια τουτων, 1¹², 3¹⁶ περὶ τουτων, 1¹⁵ τὴν τουτων μνήμην, 3¹¹ τουτων λυομενων, 2²⁰ τουτοις ἐμπλακεντες.

(c) Adjectival, Jude v. 4 (retrospective). 2 Pet. 1¹⁸, 3¹, 1⁵, 1¹³. ἐκεινος substantival, with emphatic reference to preceding subject. 2 Pet. 1¹⁶ τῆς ἐκεινου μεγαλειότητος.

For αὐτος and εαυτου, see Index under these and under ἴδιος, εαυτους is used of the 2nd person in Jude 20 and 21.

τοιουτος is not found in either epistle, though common in other parts of the N.T. τοιόσδε, found in 2 Pet. 1¹⁷ alone in the N.T., retains its classical prospective use, as it does in Ezra 5³ τοιάδε εἶπεν αυτοις, and in Josephus *Ant.* ii. 2. 1 αἱ οψεις τοιαίδε ἦσαν, xvii. 13. 3 Ἀρχελαος οναρ τοιουδε εκδιηγεται, repeated in § 4.

ος μεν . . . ος δε used as demonstratives,† Jude 21, 22.

Relative.

ος. Attracted: Jude v. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν (=α) ἠσέβησαν και περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρων ὧν ἐλάλησαν. 2 Pet. 2¹² ἐν οἷς (=ἐν τουτοις α) ἀγνοουσιν βλασφημουντες.

With ambiguous antecedent, 2 P. 1⁴ δι' ὧν referring to the immediately preceding δοξη και ἀρετῇ but misunderstood by many editors; 3⁶ δι' ὧν ὁ τοτε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, where various antecedents have been suggested, but where I think we should read δι' ον, see note. A similar ambiguity is found in the use of the demonstrative, cf. note on Jude v. 4 τουτο το κρίμα, and 2 Pet. 2^{11, 12} φερουσιν κατ' αὐτων . . . ἐν τῇ φθορα αὐτων, *ib.* 1³ τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτου.

Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2 Pet. 2³ οἷς το κρίμα ουκ ἀργεῖ, και η ἀπώλεια αὐτων ου νυστάζει, cf. 1 Cor. 8⁶ ἐξ οὐ τα πάντα και ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτον, Winer, p. 186, Jelf § 833.

Elliptical: 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ εως οὗ (*sc.* χρονου) ἡμερα διαυγάση, 3⁴ ἀφ' ἧς (*sc.* ἡμέρας) οἱ πατερες ἐκοιμηθησαν.

For *ος μεν . . . ὃς δε* see under Demonstratives.

ὅστις : 2 Pet, 2¹ *οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν*,† ‘men that will bring in heresies.’

οσος : Jude v. 10 *οσα μεν . . . οσα δε . . . ἐν τουτοις*. 2 Pet. 1¹³ *ἐφ’ οσον*† (*sc. χρονου*) *εἶμι ἐν τουτω τω σκηνωματι*.

Interrogative : *τίς, ποσος, ποιος* do not occur in these epistles. *ποταπος*, 2 Pet. 3¹¹.

Indefinite : emphatic Jude v. 4 *τινες ἄνθρωποι*. 2 Pet. 3⁹ *ως τινες βραδυτήτα ἡγουνται, ἰβ. μη βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι*.

ADJECTIVES.

Neuter Plural as Object. Jude v. 15 *σκληρα ἐλάλησαν*, v. 16 and 2 Pet. 2¹⁸ *λαλεῖ υπερογχα*.

Neut. Pl. followed by Gen. 2 Pet. 2¹⁸ *υπερογχα ματαιοτητος*, 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 3⁴, though it retains its proper superlative force in 1 Cor. 15⁹. Possibly this may explain the combination of *μέγιστα* with *τιμια* in 2 Pet. 1⁴. J. H. Moulton goes so far as to say that *μεγιστος* is ‘practically obsolete in Hellenistic,’ p. 78. It occurs however in Job 26³ *τίμι ἐπακολουθησεις ; ουχ ᾧ μεγιστη δυναμις ;* and 31²⁸ *ἀνομία η μεγίστη*. In the same page he gives an example of the comparative *μειζων* used in the elative sense, which would account for the omission of the gen. after *μείζονες* in 2 Pet. 2¹¹.

SPECIAL USES OF SOME COMMON ADJECTIVES.

πας. Qualitative : Jude v. 3 *πασαν σπουδην ποιουμενος*, 2 Pet. 1⁵, cf. James 1². *πασα . . . ου = ουδεμια* 2 Pet. 1²⁰.

ετερος. Qualitative : Jude v. 7 *ἀπελθουσαι οπίσω σαρκος ἐτέρας*, cf. Acts 2⁴ *λαλεῖν ἑτεραις γλώσσαις*.

ιδιος, used without the article, see above p. xxxii f., with *αυτῶν* 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 v. 14, 15 *ἐπροφητευσεν Ἐνωχ λέγων Ἴδου ἦλθεν Κυριος ποιῆσαι*

κρίσιν. Varying use of fut. aor. and pres. in 2 Pet. 2¹ εσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2¹⁰ δόξας ου τρέμουσιν, 2¹² φθαρησονται, 2¹⁵ ἐπλανήθησαν, 2¹⁷ ουτοί εισιν, 2¹⁸ δελεάζουσιν, 3³ ἐλευσονται ἐμπαικται, 3⁵ λανθάνει αυτους, 3¹² ουρανοι λυθησονται και στοιχειά τηκεται (αλ. τακήσεται ου τηξεται).¹

Imperfect Indicative used without *αν* where condition has failed, 2 Pet. 2²¹ κρειπτου ην† αυτοίς μη επεγνωκεναι, cf. Moulton, pp. 199 f. and, for Latin parallels, references under *Indicative* in my Index to Cic. *N.D.*

Future: Doubt as to 2 Pet. 1¹², where most MSS. read μελλήσω ἀεὶ υμας υπομιμνησκειν, 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 μελησω * 'I shall take care.'

Aorist answering to English Perfect:² Jude v. 4 παρεισδυησαν 'there are certain men crept in privily,' R.V. J. v. 11 τῆ οδω του Καϊν ἐπορευθησαν και . . . ἐξεχυθησαν και . . . ἀπόλωντο. 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. 1¹⁷ ο ἀγαπητος μου ουτος ἐστιν εἰς ου ἐγω ευδοκησα 'in whom I am well pleased,' R.V. I believe that no instance of the perf. of this verb has been discovered. The aorist is used of God in Mt. 3¹⁷, 12¹⁸, 17⁵, Mk. 1¹¹, Lk. 3²², and in every case R.V. has the perfect rendering 'is well pleased.' It is a statement not referring to the past, but to the 'eternal now.' In Jude v. 15 ἐλέγξαι τους ασεβείς περὶ των εργαων ὧν ησεβησαν και . . . ἐλάλησαν the aorists, as they refer to a time previous to that denoted by ἐλεγεξαι, 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 τηρησατε. In v. 17 μνησθητε

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.

τῶν ρημάτων, it is perhaps better to translate 'call to mind,' rather than 'remember' with the R.V. The present imperatives in *vv.* 21, 22 ἐλέγχετε, σωζετε, ελεατε prescribe a course of conduct. So in 2 Pet. 1⁵ επιχορηγησατε, 1¹⁰, 3¹⁴ σπουδάσατε have the quality of urgency,¹ while the present imperatives in 3⁸ μη λανθανετω, 3¹⁵ ἡγείσθε, 3¹⁷ φυλάσσεσθε, 3¹⁸ αυξάνετε have a continuous force.

Aor. Subjunctive is correctly used in 2 Pet. 1⁴, 3¹⁷ after *ωα* (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 *ου μη* in 1¹⁰ (for which the fut. ind. is sometimes used in other books of the N.T., see Blass 209, *Joh. Gr.* 205); and *εως ου* in 1¹⁹ *εως ου ἡμερα διανύσῃ 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 *επιτιμησαι σοι Κυριος*, and in *v.* 2 *ελεος πληθυνθειη*, repeated in 2 Pet. 1². Usually the verb is omitted in the salutations of the Epistles, as in Rom. 1⁷ *ναρις υμιν απο Θεου πατρος*.

Aor. Inf. is contrasted with *Pres. Inf.* in Jude *v.* 3 *πασαν σπουδὴν ποιουμενος γράφειν . . . ἀνάγκην εσχον γράψαι*, the present implying continuous action, the aorist a momentary act, so in 3 Joh. 13 *πολλα εἶχον γράψαι σοι* 'I had much that I wanted to say,' *ἀλλ' ου θελω δια μέλανος καὶ καλάμου σοι γράφειν* 'but I do not care to be writing to you by pen and ink,' *v.* 5 *υπομνησαι υμᾶς βουλομαι* 'I wish to give you a reminder,' *v.* 24 *τω δυναμενω υμᾶς φυλάξαι ἀπταίστους καὶ στήσαι ἀμωμους*: here *στησαι* 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. *ἐφυλαξεν* in 2 Pet. 2⁵), but as an action now to commence, with a particular end in view, viz. *στήσαι*. In 2 Pet. the present infinitives *ποιεῖσθαι* 1¹⁰, *υπομιμνησκειν* 1¹², *διεγείρειν* 1¹³, *ἐκάστοτε εχειν . . . ποιεῖσθαι* 1¹⁵ are all continuous. Similarly *ρυσθαι* and *τηρεῖν* in 2⁴, and *υπάρχειν* in 3¹¹. On the other hand *υποστρεψαι* 2²¹, *μνησθῆναι* 'call to mind' 3², *απολε-*

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

σθαι, χωρῆσαι ('to arrive at' not 'to keep going'), 3⁹ ασπιλοι εὐρεθῆναι 3¹⁴, all denote a single act.

Unusual constructions of Infinitive: After verbs of motion, as Jude v. 15 ἦλθεν ποιῆσαι κρίσιν; so Mt. 2² ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι, 11⁸ τι ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; Mk. 2¹⁷ οὐκ ἦλθον καλεσαι δικαίους, Lk. 3¹² ἦλθον βαπτισθῆναι, 2³ επορευοντο απογράφεσθαι, Gen. 25³² πορευομαι 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 ἤκομεν, Eur. *Medea* 1303 ἐμῶν δε παίδων ἦλθον ἐκσῶσαι βίον, where some read the more regular ἐκσώσων. After verbs of knowing, 2 Pet. 2⁹ οἶδεν Κυριος ευσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ τηρεῖν, cf. James 4¹⁷ εἰδως καλον ποιειν, Mt. 7¹¹ οἶδατε ἀγαθὰ διδόναι, Mt. 16³ το μεν προσωπον του ουρανου γινώσκετε διακρίνειν Phil. 4¹² οἶδα περισσευειν, 1 Th. 4⁴, 1 Tim. 3⁵; also found in classical writings. After εχω = δυναμαι, 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ σπουδάσω εχειν υμας μνημην ποιεισθαι. *Infinitive of Result* 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ σπουδάσω εχειν υμᾶς, 2 Pet. 3^{1, 2} διεγείρω υμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει την διάνοιαν, μνησθῆναι τῶν ρημάτων, cf. Acts 5³ διὰ τί ἐπληρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψευσασθαί σε; Apoc. 5⁵ ενικησεν ὁ λεων . . . ἀνοίξαι το βιβλίον, Col. 4⁶ ὁ λογος ἄλατι ἤρτυμενος, εἶδεναι υμᾶς πως δει ἀποκρίνεσθαι, also in classical writings, e.g. Thuc. vi. 69. 3 μαχουμενοι ἐχώρουν περι τῆς ἀλλοτριας, οἰκειαν σχεῖν.

Infinitive as subject: 2²¹ κρειττον ἦν μη ἐπεγνωκεναι η ἐπιγνουσιν υποστρεψαι.

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 οτι. The following exx. are found in 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ σπουδάσω εχειν υμας την τουτων μνημην ποιεισθαι, 3^{1, 2} διεγείρω υμῶν την εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν μνησθῆναι τῶν ρημάτων, 3⁹ μη βουλομενός τινας απολεσθαι, 3¹¹ ποταπούς δεῖ υπάρχειν υμᾶς, 3¹⁵ την του κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (εἶναι) ηγεισθε. It is not used at all by Jude.

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

Aor. Part., as contrasted with the Present or Perfect Participle, is to express priority of time, as in Jude v. 5 *απαξ σωσας ἀπώλεσεν* 'after once saving destroyed,' 'once saved and then destroyed.' 2 Pet. 1⁴ *ἵνα γενησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς φθορας* 'after escaping from,' 'that ye may escape from φθορά and thereby become partakers of a divine nature.' 1⁵ *σπουδην παρεισ-ενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγησατε* 'contribute all diligence and so add energy to faith.' 1⁶ *οὐ μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθησαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐποπταὶ γενηθέντες* 'it was not from any reliance on fables but from eye-witness that we were empowered to declare the second coming.' 1⁷ⁱ *λαβὼν τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιασδε . . . ἤκουσαμεν κ.τ.λ.* (the last words standing here by anacoluthon for the logical apodosis *ἐβεβαίωσε τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον*) 'when he received honour through the voice that came from heaven, he confirmed the truth of prophecy in us who heard it.' Here the finite verb follows as a consequence on the *τιμῆ*, which itself was a consequence of the *φωνή*. 2⁴ *σειραῖς τάρταρωσας παρέδωκεν* 'he cast them down to Tartarus and then delivered them to chains.' 2⁵ *Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν ἐπάξας* 'when he brought a flood upon the earth, he saved Noah.' 2⁶ *τεφρώσας καταστροφή κατεκρινεν*, first came the showers of ashes, then the earthquake which overthrew the cities, see explanatory note. 2¹⁵ *καταλείποντες ὁδὸν ἐπλανηθήσαν*, where some MSS. have the aorist, which would mean 'they forsook the road and wandered,' the force of the present being 'they strayed from (literally 'leaving') the road.' 2¹⁶ *φθεγγόμενον ἐκώλυσε* 'it spoke and so hindered,' lit. 'by speaking it hindered.' 3⁶ *ὁ κόσμος κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο* 'the world perished by the flood.' 3¹⁷ *ἵνα μὴ τῆ πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπεσητε 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. 1¹⁸ *φωνὴν ἤκουσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν* 'we heard a voice that came from heaven.' 2⁴ *ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων 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. 15³⁶ *δραμῶν δε τὶς, γεμισσας σπογγόν, περιθεὶς καλάμῳ, ἐποτιζεν.*

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 1¹⁷ 'The temporal relation of the participles is not to one another, but to the main verb.

See Thuc. iv. 133 ὁ νεὸς τῆς Ἡρας 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 2¹⁵, where he reads καταλιποντες, 'the aorist part. and the aor. verb are contemporary,' and again on 2¹⁶ 'aor. part. contemporary with aor. verb.' It is the present part. which expresses contemporaneousness, as in Jude 3 σπουδὴν ποιούμενος . . . ἔγραψα, v. 4 παρεισεδύσαν . . . μετατιθέντες . . . ἀρνούμενοι, v. 8 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι μιαίνουσιν, v. 9 διακρινόμενος διέλεγετο, v. 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων, v. 21 ἑαυτοὺς τηρήσατε προσδεχομενοι. 2 Pet. 1²¹ ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν 'spoke under inspiration,' 'as inspiration came to them,' 2⁸ δικαίος ἐγκατοικῶν ψυχὴν εβασανίζεν, 3^{15, 16} εγραψεν . . . λαλῶν περὶ τούτων 'he wrote touching this matter,' 1¹⁰ ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητε 'while you do this.' So too when the part. agrees with the object of the verb, as 2⁷ Ἄωτ καταπονόμενον ἐρυσάτο '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 προκείνται δειγμά '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. 22¹) ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, (Acts 10³⁸) καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος. He adds that 'the latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri . . . εἰ 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. 2⁷ ἑαυτὸν ἐκενώσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών means 'He put on the form of a servant and thereby emptied himself.' κενώσας ελαβεν 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 ἐπήνεσα, ἀπεπτύσα, 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 ἀκολουθήσαι δοκεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ, ὅξως δέ τι λέγοντος προεπαινεσαι.

themselves over to fornication are set forth as an example,' R.V. *v.* 12 οὐτοί εἰσιν . . . δένδρα . . . δις αποθανοντα εκριζωθεντα '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 κατα τας επιθυμίας πορευομενοι, θαυμάζοντες προσωπα, and *v.* 20 εποικοδομουντες . . . προσευχομενοι. 2 Pet. 1¹ τοις ἰσοτιμον λαχουσιν πίστιν (*subaud.* γράφει) 'to them that have obtained a like precious faith,' R.V. 2¹⁵ ἐπλανηθησαν εξακολουθησαντες τῆ ὁδῷ του Βαλαάμ, 'having followed the way of Balaam,' R.V. 1⁹ τυφλος εστιν, λήθην λαβων 'is blind, having forgotten,' R.V. 2²⁰ ει γαρ ἀποφυγοντες τὰ μιάσματα του κοσμου, τουτοις δε πάλιν εμπλακεντες ηττώνται '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} ἀδικουμενοι . . . ἡγουμενοι . . . εντρυφῶντες συνευωχουμενοι . . . ὀφθαλμοις ἐνοντες μεστους μοιχαλιδος . . . δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς . . . καρδίαν γεγυμνασμενην εχοντες. I am inclined to think that these suspended nominatives are intended to have something of the effect of the historic infinitive in Latin, giving, as it were, in successive scenes, characteristic qualities or actions, apart from the particular circumstances in which they occur. Compare what is said above as to the omission of the article. Blass (p. 284) refers to St. Paul's free use of the participle instead of the finite verb, quoting 2 Cor. 7⁵ ουδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ημῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβομενοι, Rom. 12⁹fol. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυποκριτος, ἀποστυγουντες το πονηρον, κολλωμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ . . . προηγουμενοι . . . ζεοντες . . . δουλευοντες κ.τ.λ. See 1 Pet. 3¹ ομοίως γυναικες υποτασσομεναι, 3^{7, 9} Lightfoot on Col. 3¹⁶ διδάσκοντες, J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, pp. 180-183, 222-225.

Participle used instead of Infinitive 2 P. 2¹⁰ ου τρέμουσιν βλασφημουντες, where see note.

A participial clause is changed into a finite clause in Jude *v.* 16 ουτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί . . . πορευομενοι, καὶ το στομα αὐτων λαλεῖ υπεροργα, θαυμάζοντες προσωπα.

Voices.

Active for Middle 2 Pet. 1⁵ σπουδην παρεισενέγκαντες instead of the usual σπουδην εἰσενεγκάμενοι.¹ 2¹ ἐπάγοντες εαυτοῖς

¹ The aor. mid. of φερω does not seem to occur in biblical Greek.

απωλειαν instead of ἐπαγομενοι. 2 Pet. 1¹⁵ σπουδάσω for the classical σπουδάσομαι, cf. ακουσω Mt. 12¹⁹, 13¹⁴, ἀμαρτησω 18²¹, ἀπαντησω Mk. 14¹³, Blass, p. 42. So we find μεταπεμπω for μεταπέμπομαι in Thuc. i. 112. 3, iv. 30, vi. 52, etc., also μεταχειρίζω, ληίζω quoted in Poppo's n. on i. 13. See Blass, pp. 183 f.; Moulton, pp. 154–160.

ποιεῖν act. Jude v. 15 ποιησαι κρίσιν 'to execute judgment': 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσεχοντες. ποιεῖσθαι mid. with periphrastic force Jude v. 3 σπουδην ποιουμενος 'hasting'; 2 Pet. 1¹⁰ βεβαίαν την κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι 'to confirm,' 1¹⁵ μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 'to call to mind' or 'to mention.'

διακρίνεσθαι 'to contend.' Jude v. 9 τῷ διαβολῷ διακρινομενος, 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 1⁶ μηδεν διακρινομενος.

φθειρεσθαι pass. Jude v. 10 ἐν τουτοις φθείρονται 'in these things they are destroyed' or 'corrupted' ('they corrupt themselves' A.V.): 2 Pet. 2¹² ἐν τῇ φθορα αυτων καὶ φθαρησονται, see Appendix, p. 177.

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

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

δεδωρηται deponent, perhaps used with passive force 2 Pet. 1⁴ though δεδωρημενης has an active force in 1⁴, 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. 2⁸ ψυχην δικαίαν ανόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν. Cf. J. H. Moulton *Prol.* p. 87 and J. A. Robinson there cited.

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

ἐκοιμήθησαν pass. with middle force 2 Pet. 3⁴.

τηκεται (αλ. τακησεται or τήξεται) pass. 2 Pet. 3¹².

λουομαι, 2 Pet. 2²² ὅς λουσαμενη, 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 Ἐπιτιμησαι σοι Κυριος, v. 14 λεγων Ἴδου ἦλθεν Κυριος, v. 18 ελεγον . . . εσονται ἐμπαικται. 2 Pet. 1¹⁷ φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιασδε . . . Ὁ υἱός μου ουτος ἐστιν, 3⁴ λεγοντες Που ἐστὶν η ἐπαγγελία ;

(b) *Indirect Statement* introduced by *οτι*, Jude v. 5 *υπομνήσαι υμάς βουλομαι οτι Κυριος απωλεσεν*, vv. 17, 18 *μνησθητε οτι ελεγον*. 2 Pet. 1¹⁴ *ειδως οτι*, 1²⁰, 3³ *γνωσκοντες οτι*, 3⁵, 3⁸ *λανθανετω οτι*.

(2) *Adjectival Clauses* introduced by relative, Jude v. 10, v. 13, v. 15 *bis*, 2 Pet. 1⁴, 1⁹, 1¹³, 1¹⁷, 1¹⁹, 2¹², 2¹⁵, 2¹⁷, 2¹⁹ 3¹, 3⁶, 3¹⁰, 3¹², 3¹³, 3¹⁶ *bis*.

(3) *Adverbial Clauses*.

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

(α) Jude v. 9 *οτε διελέγετο*. 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ *εως ου̐ ήμερα διαυγάση*, 3⁴ *αφ' ής εκοιμηθησαν*, 1¹³ *εφ' οσον ειμί*.

(β) 2 Pet. 2¹¹ *οπου αγγελου ου φέρουσιν* (tropical force).

(γ) Jude v. 7 *ως αι πολεις προκεινται*. 2 Pet. 1¹⁴ *καθως εδήλωσεν*, 2¹ *ώς εν υμίν εσονται*, 3⁹ *ως τινες ήγουνται*.

(b) *Causal*, Jude v. 11 *ουα̐ αυτοις οτι έπορευθησαν*.

(c) *Final*, 2 Pet. 1⁴ *δεδωρηται να γενησθε*, 3¹⁷ *φυλασσεσθε να μη εκπεσητε*.

(d) *Conditional*, 2 Pet. 2⁴ *ει ο̐ Θεος ουκ εφείσατο . . . οιδεν ευσεβείς ρυεσθαι, αδικους δε τηρείν* (irregular apodosis), 2²⁰ *ει ήττωνται . . . γέγονεν αυτοίς*.

No other form of the conditional clause occurs in either epistle. *εάν, αν, οταν* are not found either here or in 1 Pet., except *εάν* once in 1 Pet. 3¹³.

NEGATIVES.

There is nothing unusual in the use of *ου* in either epistle, except that *πᾶς . . . ου = ουδείς*, 2 P. 1²⁰, *ου . . . ποτε = ουποτε* *ib.* 1²¹. It occurs twice only in Jude vv. 9 and 10. It is found after *ει* in 2 P. 2^{4,5} *ει γαρ ο̐ Θεος ἀγγελων ουκ εφείσατο—και̐ ἀρχαίου κοσμου ουκ εφείσατο* in accordance with the predominant use in the N.T. See Blass, p. 254, and my note on James 1²³. For *μή* see Index. It is used with the relative where *qui* would take subjunctive, as in 2 P. 1⁹ *ω μη πάρεστιν*, 1 Joh. 4³ *παν̐ πνευμα ο̐ μη ομολογει*, Tit. 1¹¹ *διδάσκοντες α̐ μη δεί*. More commonly the relative is followed by *ου* as in Joh. 4²² *προσκυνείτε δ̐ ουκ ο̐ιδατε*, Lk. 14²⁷ *οστις ου̐ βαπτίζει*. As a rule *μή* is used with the participle, as in Jude v. 19 *πνευμα μη̐ έχοντες*, 2 P. 3⁹ *μακροθυμεί̐ μη̐ βουλομενος*

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. 1¹⁰ οὐ μὴ πταίσητε and in classical Greek, with the aor. subj., but is also found with the future indicative, as in Mt. 26³⁵ οὐ μὴ σε ἀρνησομαι, and in Aristoph. *Ranæ* 508 οὐ μὴ σ' ἐγὼ περιοψομαι.

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 κηρυκὰ ἐφύλαξεν, thus preparing the way for the general apodosis οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ρυεσθαι, 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 ἐπηξεν, οὐδοὺ Νῶε σωσας, with some such apodosis as πῶς τουτων φείσεται;

γὰρ 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 δε is repeated. μέν is not found in 2 Pet. though it occurs five times in 1 Pet.

δε occurs 21 times in 2 Pet. twice with καί, 1¹⁵ σπουδάσω δε καί, 2¹ ἐγένοντο δε καί, which is also found in Jude v. 14. Rarer uses in 2 Pet. are καὶ αὐτοῦ τουτο δε 1⁵, and the repeated ἐν δε in 1⁵⁻⁷, where see notes.

ἤδη. The idiomatic use of ἤδη with the numeral is found in 2 Pet. 3¹ ταυτην ἡδη δευτεραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, where see n. καθως * 2 Pet. 1¹⁴, 3¹⁵, once in 1 Pet.

καί. See Index. τε not found in 2 Pet. or 1 Pet., once in Jude v. 6 τοὺς μὴ πιστευσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, ἀγγέλους τε τετηρηκεν. καίπερ. 2 Pet. 1¹² καίπερ εἰδότας.†

καλως. The idiomatic *καλῶς ποιείτε* occurs in 2 Pet. 1¹⁹; cf. Moulton, pp. 228 f.

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

ουτως, idiomatic, 2 Pet. 3⁴ *παντα ουτως διαμενει* — *in statu quo*: cf. Joh. 4⁶ *εκαθεζετο ουτως*, *ib.* 13²⁵, Abbott *Joh. Gr.* pp. 26 f.

παλαι. Jude v. 4 *οι παλαι προγεγραμμενοι*, 2 Pet. 1⁹ *των παλαι αυτου αμαρτιων*.

εκπαλαι. Used in 2 Pet. 2³, 3⁵ alone in biblical Greek. Lobeck (*Rhryn.* p. 47) quotes Philo M. 1 p. 323 *ταις ομολογηθεισαις εκπαλαι παρθενοις ες ομιλιαν ερχομενοι*, Plut. *V. Aristid.* p. 328 *εκπαλαι προς την μαχην σπαργων*, *V. Them.* p. 127 *α παρεσκευακως εκπαλαι τινας αποκτενουντας*, Josephus *Ant.* xvi. 8. 4 *εκπαλαι μεν συνεδρευων αυτω προσεκειτο*. See also Wetstein's n. on 2³.

που. Rhetorical use.† 2 Pet. 3⁴ *που εστιν η επαγγελια της παρουσιας*; cf. Isa. 33¹⁸ *που εισιν οι γραμματικοι*; Ps. 42^{3,10} *που εστιν ο Θεος σου*; Eur. *Heracl.* 369 *που ταυτα καλως αν ειη παρα γ ευ φρονουσιν*; where Paley quotes Elmsley 'Particula interrogativa *που* non sine indignatione negat, ut saepe apud tragicos,' cf. *Alc.* 1075, *Phoen.* 548 *που 'στιν η δικη*; Soph. *Aj.* 1100 *που συ στρατηγεις τουδε*; *Oed. T.* 390 *που συ μαντις ει σαφης*; Sibyl. viii. 75 *που τοτε σοι το κρατος*;

ως with gen. abs., 2 Pet. 1³ *ως παντα της θειας δυναμεως δεδωρημενης*, following *χαρις υμιν πληθυνθειη*, 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,' *ως* would have kept its usual force. Winer (pp. 770 f.) and others prefer to connect the gen. abs. with the imperative *επιχορηγησατε* in v. 5, but this involves us in greater difficulties. See explanatory note. For the other uses of *ως* see Index.

ELLIPSIS.

Of Verb in the Salutation, Jude v. 1 *Ιουδας τοις κλητοις sc. χαιρειν λεγει*, so 2 Pet. 1¹ *Πετρος τοις λαχουσιν*. *Of the substantive verb* in the Ascription, Jude v. 25 *Θεω δοξα sc. εστω*, so 2 Pet. 3¹⁸ *αυτω η δοξα*, and 3¹⁵ *την μακροθυμian σωτηριαν (ειναι) ηγεισθε*. *Of Noun* in agreement with relative 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ *εως ου (χρονου)*, 1¹² *εφ' οσου (χρονου)*, 3⁴ *αφ' ης (ημερας)*; of Antecedent understood from relative 2 Pet. 1⁹ *ω μη παρεστιν ταυτα (ουτος)*

τυφλός ἐστίν, 2¹² ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες by attraction for ἐν τοῦτοις α ἀγνοοῦσιν. Noun or pronoun expressed with one verb and understood with another, 2 Pet. 1⁸ ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα οὐκ ἄργους (ὑμας) καθίστησιν. 1 Pet. 2⁸ προσκοπτοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθουντες (τῷ λόγῳ). Verb of subordinate clause understood from the verb of the principal clause, 2 Pet. 3¹⁶ (Παῦλος ἐγράψεν) ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει). Participle understood in a later clause from a preceding clause, 2 Pet. 3⁹ μὴ βουλομενος τινὰς ἀπολεσθαι ἀλλὰ (βουλομενος) πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι, 2²² κυῶν ἐπιστρεφσας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἕξερμα καὶ ὅς λουσαμένη (ἐπιστρεφσασα) εἰς κυλισμον. Also κυῶν is without a verb, which may be thus supplied, οὐ πάλιν ἐμπλακεῖς (v. 20) ἐστίν ὡς κυῶν.

PLEONASM.

Jude v. 3 ὑμῖν repeated after γράψαι; v. 5 ὑμας repeated emphatically after εἰδότας; v. 4 ἀνθρώποι after τινες, after ἀσεβεις 2 Pet. 3⁷; redundant pronoun after ἴδιος, 2 Pet. 3³ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευομενοι, 3¹⁶ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπωλειαν; in resumption of preceding noun 2 Pet. 3¹⁶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει) λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων. Compare the similar redundant use after a relative (Blass, p. 175). The fourfold repetition of πας and of the cognates of ἀσεβης 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. 27³³ ἕξεστη Ἰσαὰκ ἕκστασιν μεγάλην, Lk. 22¹⁵ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθυμησα, James 5¹⁷ προσευχῇ προσηξασατο, where see my note, also Vorst De Hebraïsmis pp. 610–635. Two remarkable instances are found in 2 Pet. where ἐν is joined to the dative, viz. 2¹² ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῶνται, where αὐτῶν appears to refer to the preceding ἄλογα ζῶα, and ἐν implies that their destruction will be shared by the libertines; and 3³ ἐλευσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαικται, where ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ is equivalent to the participle, as in Lam. 1² κλαίονσα ἐκλαυσεν.

PERIPHHRASIS.

With εχειν, Jude v. 3 ἀνάγκην εσχον (= ἠναγκασθην) γράψαι ὑμῖν, 2 Pet. 1¹⁹ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τοῦ λόγον = perfect of βεβαιῶ, 2¹⁶ ἐλεγξιν ἔσχεν παρανομίας = ἠλεγχθη περὶ π., 2¹⁴ καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας εχοντες = γεγυμνασμενοι πλεονεξίας.

ποιεῖσθαι,† 2 Pet. 1¹⁰ βεβαίαν την κλησιν ποιείσθαι = βεβαιουν, 1¹⁵ τουτων μνημην ποιείσθαι = τουτων μνησθῆναι, Jude v. 3 σπουδην ποιουμενος = σπευδων. λαμβάνειν, 2 Pet. 1⁹ ληθην λαβων = ἐπιλαθόμενος, 2 Pet. 1¹⁷ λαβων τιμην = τιμηθείς. 2 Pet. 1¹³, 3¹ διεγείρειν υμᾶς ἐν υπομνήσει = υπομνήσαι.

Hendiadys. 2 Pet. 1¹⁶ την του Κυρίου δυναμιν και παρουσίαν = τὴν ἐν δυνάμει παρουσίαν, see Mt. 24³⁰ and Mk. 9¹ quoted in explanatory note.

ANACOLUTHON.

Jude v. 16 οὔτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, κατὰ τας ἐπιθυμίας πορευομενοι, και τὸ στομα αυτῶν λαλει υπερογκα, θαυμάζοντες προσωπα. Here the construction would have been regular, if we had had ὦν το στομα, instead of και το στομα αυτῶν. 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 αυτων, 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. 3¹ below.

2 Pet. 1¹⁷⁻¹⁹ λαβων . . . δοξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης τοιαῦδε . . . και ταύτην την φωνήν ηκουσαμεν . . . και εχομεν βεβαιωτερον του λόγον. Here λαβων prepares the way for such an apodosis as ἐβεβαίωσεν του λογον, 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. 2⁴⁻⁹ εἰ γαρ ὁ Θεος . . . ουκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ παρεδωκεν . . . και . . . ουκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ . . . ἐφυλαξεν, . . . και πολεις . . . κατέκρινεν, . . . και δικαιον . . . ἐρυσατο, . . . οἶδεν Κυριος ευσεβεις ρυεσθαι, ἀδικους δε . . . τηρεῖν. The natural apodosis to the first protasis would be τουτων ου 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 καταπονουμενον.

2. Pet. 3¹⁻³ διεγείρω υμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, μνησθῆναι τῶν ρημάτων τοῦ κυρίου, γινώσκοντες οτι ἐλευσονται εμπαικται. Here we

should have expected *γνωσκοντας* 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. 2¹⁶ *ελεγξιν εσχεν παρανομίας· υποζυγιον ἄφωνον εκωλυσεν την του προφήτου παραφροσίαν.*

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 $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ¹ *καὶ* $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\nu\eta$ ² *καὶ* $\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ ³ *πληθυνθειη*. In *v.* 4 ‘the men who were designed for this judgment’ are described as $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, ¹ *την του Θεου* $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\alpha$ ² *μετατιθεντες* *εις* *ασελγειαν*, *τον* *μονον* *δεσποτην* *αρνουμενοι*. 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* *μεν* *μιαίνουσιν*, *κυριότητα* *δε* *ἀθετουσιν*, *δόξας* *δε* *βλασφημουσιν*. [In *vv.* 9, 10 we have two couplets *οὐκ* *ετολμησεν*—*ἀλλὰ* *εἶπεν*: *οσα* *μεν* *οὐκ* *οἶδασιν*—*βλασφημουσιν*, *οσα* *δε*—*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*—*ἐλεγξαι*, *περὶ* *πάντων* *ὧν* *ἠσεβησαν*—*ὧν* *ελάλησαν*.] In *v.* 16 we return to the triplet *πορευομενοι*—*λαλουντες* (disguised in the form *καὶ* *το* *στομα* *λαλει* *υπερογκα*)—*θαυμάζοντες*. So in *v.* 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. *v.* 18 does not admit of subdivision. *v.* 19 has the triplet *αποδιορίζοντες*, *ψυχικοί*, *πνευμα* *μη* *εχοντες*. *vv.* 20 and 21 have a double triplet *εποικοδομουντες*—*προσευχομενοι*—*προσδεχόμενοι* and *πνευμα* *αγιον*—*Θεος*—*Ἰησοῦς* *Χριστος*. *v.* 22 has the marked triplet *ους* *μεν*—*ους* *δε*—*οὗς* *δέ*. *v.* 24 has a couplet *φυλάξαι*—*στήσαι*. *v.* 25 has a quartet *δοξα*, *μεγαλωσυνη*, *κράτος*, *ἐξουσία*, followed by the triplet *πρὸ* *παντος* *του* *αἰῶνος*, *καὶ* *νυν*, *καὶ* *εἰς* *πάντας* *τους* *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 1¹⁴

εκαστος πειράζεται υπο τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας—εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία τικτει ἀμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀμαρτία ἀποκνει θάνατον, v. 19 εστω δὲ πας ἄνθρωπος ταχύς εἰς το ἀκουσαι, βραδύς εἰς το λαλήσαι, βραδύς εἰς οργην, 2²³ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσυνην, καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἐκληθη, 3⁶ ἡ γλῶσσα ἡ σπιλουσα, καὶ φλογίζουσα—καὶ φλογιζομένη, 4⁸ ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ—καθαρίσατε χειρας—ἀγνίσατε καρδίας, so 4⁹, 5^{17, 18}. Perhaps we may find a septet in the beautiful description of heavenly wisdom (3¹⁷) πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνη, ἐπειτα εἰρηνικὴ, ἐπιεικὴς, εὐπειθὴς, μεστὴ ἐλεους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυποκριτος. 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} το δοκιμιον υμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται υπομονήν, ἡ δὲ υπομονη εργον τελειον εχεται, ινα ἦτε τελειοι. See pp. ccxxii f. of my edition.

There is something analogous to this last in 2 Peter, as in 1⁵⁻⁷ 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 υμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνωσιν, 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. 2⁵) for Jude's Enoch the seventh (J. v. 14). A less elaborate refrain, if we like to call it so, is found in 2 P. 3¹⁰⁻¹² οὐρανοὶ παρελευσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσουμένα λυθησεται καὶ γῆ πυρωθήσεται (?). τούτων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεὶ ὑπάρχειν υμᾶς . . . σπυδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν . . . δι ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρουμένοι λυθησονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσουμένα τηξεται (?). Not unlike is the intensive force of the reduplication of ἐμπαικτής in 3³ ἐλευσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαικται, and of φθορά in 2¹² γεγεννημένα εἰς ἀλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, . . . ἐν τῇ φθορα αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρησονται. The same idea is dwelt on 1⁴ ἀποφύγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς, 2¹⁹ δούλοι 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.

desire to give emphasis by the use of 'line upon line' or from both. Such repeated words are *απώλεια* in 2¹ *παρεισάξουσιν αίρεσεις απωλείας . . . ἐπάγοντες εαυτοίς ταχινην απωλειαν*, 2³ *ἡ ἀπώλεια αυτων οὐ νυστάζει*, 3¹⁶ *προς τὴν ἰδίαν αυτῶν απωλειαν*, and *ἀπολλυμι* in 3⁶ *ὁ κοσμος ἀπωλετο*, 3⁹ *μη βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι*. So we have the word *ἐπίγνωσις* four times, *γνωσις* twice, *ἐπιγινώσκω* twice,¹ *ἐπιθυμία* four times, *κολαζομενους τηρεῖν* twice, *τουτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες* twice, *διεγείρειν ἐν υπομνήσει* twice, *ὑπομιμησκω* once, *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* once, the tropical use of the rare *ἐξακολουθεω* thrice, the rare *ἄθεσμος* twice, *σπουδάζω* thrice, *βεβαιος* twice, *επαγγελία* twice, *ἐπάγγελμα* twice, *ἐπάγω* twice, *πάρειμι* twice, *κρίσις* four times, *βλασφημεῖν* thrice, *βλάσφημος* once, *εκπαλαι* twice, *προσδοκάω* three times, *ὁδός* (tropical) four times, *κοσμος* four times, *παρουσία* thrice, *ἐπιχορηγεω* twice, *σωτηρ* four times (of Christ), *στηρίζω* 1¹², *ἀστηρικτος* 3¹⁶, *στηριγμος* 3¹⁷. It is worth noting how frequently the repetition occurs in the same sentence, as in 1^{3,4} *ὡς πάντα ἡμιν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδωρημενης . . . δι' ὧν τα τίμια επαγγελματα δεδώρηται* (where the verb seems to be used first as middle and then as passive), 1^{13,14} *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμι ἐν τουτω τῷ σκηνωματι . . . ἡ ἀπόθεσις του σκηνώματός μου*, 1^{17,18} *λαβὼν δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθεισης ἀπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεπους δοξης . . . καὶ ταυτην τὴν φωνην ηκουσαμεν ἐξ ουρανου ἐνεχθεισαν*, 2^{7,8} *δικαιον Λωτ ἐρυσατο, βλεμματι γαρ καὶ ακοη δικαιος ψυχὴν δικαίαν εβασάνιζεν*, in the next verse comes *ρυεσθαι*, 2¹³ *ἠδονην ἡγουμενοι την ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφην, ἐν τρυφῶντες ἐνταις ἀπάταις*, 3⁹ *ου βραδυνει ὡς τινες βραδυτῆτα ηγουνται*. There is the same impressive fourfold repetition of *ἀσεβεια* and its cognates in Jude v. 15. We also meet with pairs of synonyms, as 1⁷ *ἐν δε τη φιλαδελφια την ἀγάπην*, 1¹⁰ *κλησιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν*, 2¹³ *σπίλοι καὶ μωμοι*, 3¹⁴ *ἄσπιλοι καὶ αμωμητοι*. The only triplets I have noticed in 2 Peter are the three examples of judgment in 2⁴⁻⁸, and the constituents of the Cosmos (*ουρανοί, στοιχεια, γῆ*) in 3¹⁰

I have alluded to the influence of rhythmical considerations on the choice and order of words in my edition of the epistle of St. James (pp. ccxxvi foll.). As examples of fine rhythm I would cite 2 P. 1^{16,17} *οὐ γαρ σεσοφισμένοις μυθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες* |

¹ See the quotations in the Index.

ἐγνωρισάμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἰδύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν
 || ἀλλ' ἐποπταί γενηθέντες ἰ τῆς ἐκεῖνου μεγαλειότητος ||¹
 λαβὼν γὰρ ἰ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός ἰ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἰ φωνῆς
 ἐνεχθείσης τοιαυτοῦ ὑπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης || Ὁ υἱὸς
 μου ἰ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου ἰ οὗτός ἐστιν, where the alliteration in *m*, *p*
 (*β*, *φ*), and *s* may be noted. An equally fine rhythm is to be found
 in 1¹⁹⁻²¹ καὶ ἐχομεν βεβαιότερον ἄτον προφητικὸν λόγον ἰ ὧ καλῶς
 ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ἰ ὡς λυχνῶ φαίνονται ἐν αὐχμηρῶ τοπῶ ἰ εὖ
 οὐ ἡμέρα διαυγάση ἰ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη ἰ 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 2⁴⁻⁹ and 3¹³; also Jude
vv. 20, 21 ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπητοί ἰ ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ
 ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει ἰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχομένοι ἰ
 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρησατέ ἰ προσδεχομένοι τὸ ελεος τοῦ
 κυρίου ἡμῶν ἰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰ εἰς ζωῆν 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 μιαινόμενοι, κυριότητα
 δὲ ἀθετοῦμενοι, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦμενοι, and in *vv.* 10 and 11:
 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδαμεν, βλασφημοῦμενοι, ὅσα δὲ . . . ἐπί-
 σταυται, ἐν τοῦτοις φθείρονται οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ὅτι . . . ἐπο-
 ρευθησαν καὶ . . . ἐξεχυθησαν. We may compare the
 occasional iambic fragments to be found in 2 P. as 1¹⁹ τὸν
 προφητικὸν λόγον, ἐν αὐχμηρῶ τοπῶ, ἡμέρα διαυγάση, 2⁴ εἰς
 κρίσιν τηρουμένων, 2⁸ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, ψυχὴν δικαίαν, 2²²
 κυλισμα 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 1¹⁹, καὶ αὐτοῦτο δὲ 1⁵,
 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας 2⁸, τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν 1³, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας 2²², εὖ
 οὐ διαυγάση 1¹⁹, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκοιμηθησαν 3⁴, ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμι 1¹³, and

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

the subjunctive after *ἵνα* and *οὐ μὴ*. 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 *μὲν*, 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, καυσουσθαι, μελλήσω, μνημὴν ποιείσθαι, παρεισφερῶ, φωνῆ*. Taking these in order, we must allow that, if we retain the old reading, and the old translation of 2⁸, *βλεμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνομοῖς ἐργοῖς ἐβασάνιζεν* ('For that righteous man dwelling among them vexed his righteous soul, in seeing and hearing, with their unlawful deeds'), *βλεμματι* 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 auiditu justus* with the Vulgate, we get rid of the difficulty. The objection to *καυσομαι* is that it is elsewhere used only of fever, but the same objection might be made to the word *καυματιζω*, which also is commonly used of fever in profane Greek, but occurs four times in the N.T. (Mt. 13⁶, Mk. 4⁶, Apoc. 16^{8,9}) of external heat, as in Epict. i. 6. 26 *ἐν Ὀλυμπία δ' οὐ καυματιζεσθε; οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε;* A similar explanation may be given of *μνημὴν ποιείσθαι* in 1¹⁵. 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* (1¹²), 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 παρεισνεγκαντες* (1) that the verb regularly used in periphrasis with *σπουδὴν* is the middle *εἰσφερεσθαι*, and (2) that, in the compound *παρεισφερῶ*, *παρά* must mean 'secretly,' as in *παρεισεδυσαν* Jude v. 4 and *παρεισάξουσιν* 2 P. 2¹. As to the second objection, *παρά* in composition is not limited to the meaning 'secretly;' cf. Rom. 5²⁰ *νόμος παρεισῆλθεν* 'the law came in beside,' and see Schweighauser *Lex. Polyb.* under *παρεισάγω*. Compare also the compounds *παρεισβάλλω, παρεισδέχομαι, παρεισφρῶ, παρεισχεῶ* and other compounds quoted in my note on

2 P. 1⁵. As to the voice, in Hellenistic Greek the force of the middle was very much forgotten, as we may see from the forms *σπουδασω* and *ἐπάγοντες* quoted above (pp. xlviij 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. 1¹⁸ of the divine utterance at the Transfiguration. This account of *φωνη* however only applies when it is contrasted with *λόγος*, as in Ignat. *Rom.* 2: by itself *φωνη* stands not only for the bare sound, but also for the significant utterance, as in the Homeric *ὡς ἄρα φωνησεν*, and even for the thought apart from the utterance, as in Plato *Protag.* 341 B *την Σιμωνιδου φωνήν* 'the saying of Simonides,' Epict. iv. 1. 32 (after a quotation from Diogenes) *τουτ εστιν ἑλευθερου ανδρος φωνη*, Plut. *Mor.* 106 B *ἐνταυθα ἄν τις ελκυσειε την του Σωκρατους φωνην, εἰ συνεισευέγκαιμεν εις το κοινόν τας ἀτυχίας ωστε διελεσθαι το ἴσον εκαστον, ἀσμενους αν τούς πλείους τας εαυτῶν λαβόντας ἀπελθεῖν*. So Acts 13²⁷ *αγνοησαντες τας φωνας των προφητῶν τας κατα παν σάββατον ἀναγνωσκομένας*, Gen. 45¹⁶ *διεβοηθη η φωνη* (R.V. 'the fame thereof) *εἰς τον οἶκον Φαραω, λεγοντες οτι Ἕκασιν 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. 1⁹ *τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων*, the last word defines or limits the first: he who is without the virtues mentioned in 1⁵⁻⁷ is blind, or, to put it more exactly, is short-sighted; he cannot see the things of heaven, though he may be quick enough

in regard to worldly matters. Cf. what is said of the libertines in 2¹². The same characteristic is noted in Plato *Rep.* vi. 508 C *αμβλυωτουσι καὶ ἔγγυς 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, *οφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστους μοιχαλίδος* (2¹⁴). In the note I have compared the saying of Timaeus *οὐκ εφη κορας εν τοις δμμασιν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ πορνας*, which gives the origin of *μοιχαλίδος* in 2 P.; and the quotation from Arcesilaus, ‘*oculos inlecebrae voluptatisque plenos,*’ which supplies the remaining words *ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστους* in the phrase of 2 P. Other words of extreme rarity are *παραφρονία*, *ἐξεραμα*, *ταρταροω*, *κυλισμός* on which see explanatory notes. The first is an irregular derivative from *παράφρων* instead of the ordinary *παραφρονησις*. It was probably used in 2 P. 2¹⁶ for the sake of the assonance with *παρανομία* (*ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· υποζυγιον αφωνον . . . ἐκωλυσεν την του προφήτου παραφρονίαν*). The second takes the place of *εμετον* in the quotation from Prov. 26¹¹. The verb *εξεραω* is used by Aquila in translating the same word, and the cognates *ἀπεράω*, *ἐξεράω* are comparatively common.¹ The simple verb *ταρταροω* occurs elsewhere only in Amphilochius (A.D. 370), the compound *καταταρταροω* is found in Sext. Empir. The substantive *τάρταρος* occurs more than once in the LXX. and in Philo and Josephus, and is not unfrequent in later Christian writings. *κυλισμός* is found in Theodotion’s version of Prov. 2¹⁸.

One reason for the use of these out-of-the-way forms may have been the desire of euphony, as *παραφρονία* to correspond with *παρανομία*. So *εξεραμα* gives a better rhythm than *εμετον*, and *κυλισμον* than *κυλισιν* in 2²², *Κυων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ το ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καὶ Ὑς λουσαμενη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβορου*. So too the word *ταρταρωσας* contributes greatly to the fine rhythmical effect of 2⁴⁻⁸. 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. 2²² is an inexact quotation of two iambic lines

*εἰς ἴδιον ἐξέραμ ἐπιστρέψας κύων,
λελουμένη θ’ ὕς εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου,*

this would account for two out of these rare words.

but take such a case as our English Prayer book, who could dispute that the thought is made more, not less impressive, from the perfection of the rhythm? There is no inconsistency between the two. Noble thought naturally tends to clothe itself in noble form, as we see in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and in St. James (see p. ccxxviii of my Introduction to the latter). The difficulty which many of us have found in using the Revised Version arises just from this cause, that the form does not correspond to the thought. The general effect is at times weakened or destroyed by too close attention to insignificant detail, and by the erroneous assumption that every word or construction in one language must have an exact correspondencce 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 *αλωσις, αμαθης, αποφευγω, αργεω, βορβορος, βραδυτής, εκαστοτε, επαγγελμα, εποπτης, κατακλυζω, ληθη, μεγαλοπρεπής, μεγιστος, μίασμα, μνημη, όμίχλη, παρανομία, πλαστος, σειρά, τοιοσδε, ύς, 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 *ενκατοικεω, τολμητής*. Others are fairly common in post-Aristotelian Greek, as *αθεσμος* (Diod. Plut. Macc.), *άκαταπαυστος* (Polyb. Plut.), *διανυγάζω, εκπαλαι, έντρυφάω, εξακολουθέω, επίλυσις, ίσοσιμος, παρεισάγω, σπιλος, ταχινος, τεφρω*. Some bear an unusual sense, as *αύχμηρος*, 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 *άμωμητος*, used in Homer and elsewhere for 'unblamable,' means 'unblemished' in 2 P; *στρεβλω* 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 *άστηρικτος*, 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; *δυσνοητος* Luc. and Diog. L.; *ελεγξις* LXX. and Philostr.; *έμπαιγμονη απ.λεγ.*; *μιασμος* found elsewhere only in Wisdom and 1 Macc., *Test. Levi* 17, *Test. Benj.* 8; *ολίγως* occurs only thrice elsewhere; *ροιζηδου* twice, see notes; *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος* apparently first used in 2 P.,

found in later writers. If we read *μελησω* with Dr. Field in 2 P. 1¹², we have another extremely rare word to add to our list. We have also to take account of such rare constructions as *ἀποφευγω* with the genitive in 1⁴, though it is joined to the ordinary accusative in 2¹⁸ and 2²⁰; *βραδυνω* followed by *ἐπαγγελίας* (3⁹) and *ἀκατάπαυστος* followed by *αμαρτίας* (2¹⁴), both being classified above under the 'genitive of the sphere.' The combination of positive and superlative in 1⁴ *τα τιμια 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 *ακαταπαυστος*, *ἀστηρικτος*, *δυσνόητος*, *ελεγξις*, *μοιχαλῖς*, *στηριγμος*, *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος*; some to be unnecessary, such as the Hebraic *ἐμπαιγμονή* and perhaps *καυσουσθαι*, which however does not read to me like an invention, but rather like a colloquialism or provincialism. *ροιζηδον* is a poetical word, which may be compared with the phrase *υπερογκα ματαιοτητος* (2¹⁸) 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 *ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος*, *ἀνάχυσις*, *ἀνεκκάλητος*, *ἀπροσωπολήμπτως*, *δεδοξασμένα*, *ἐγκομβοομαι*, *ἐμπλοκη*, *επερώτημα*, *περιθεσις*, *συνπρεσβυτερος*. 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. *ως* in 1³, which in my opinion refers to what precedes; but there is something to be said for putting a full stop at the end of

the preceding verse, and a comma at the end of the 4th verse. So in the use of prepositions, we have *ἐν επιγνωσει* in (1², 2²⁰), *δια τῆς επιγνωσεως* (1³), *εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν* (1⁸) where it may be puzzling to catch the precise shade of meaning. If we read with WH. *δια δοξης* in 1³, we have a succession of four phrases introduced by *διά*—*δια τῆς επιγνωσεως του καλέσαντος ημας δια δοξης και ἀρετῆς, δι ὧν τα μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρηται, ινα δια τουτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, and it is difficult to get a clear conception of this quadruple causal relation. In the next clause *αποφυγοντες της ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν επιθυμία φθορας*, the first *εν* has a local, the second a causative sense. Again, the sense varies in 1¹³ *δικαιον ἡγουμαι, ἐφ' οσον εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνωματι, διεγείρειν υμᾶς ἐν υπομνησει*, 2¹² *ἐν οἷς ἀγνοουσιν βλασφημουντες, ἐν τῇ φθορα αὐτῶν φθαρησονται*, 2¹⁸ *δελεάζουσιν ἐν επιθυμiais τους ἐν πλανη ἀναστρεφομενους*, 3¹ (*επιστολας*) *ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν υπομνήσει την διάνοιαν*. The force of the repeated *ἐν δε* in 1⁵⁻⁷ is not clear. So the meaning of *διά* in 3^{5,6} *ουρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι και γη ἐξ υδατος και δι υδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ του Θεοῦ λογῷ δι ὧν ὁ τότε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις ἀπώλετο* is not easy to make out. I think that in the former verse it is equivalent to *μεταξυ*, in the latter the plural *ων* is so ambiguous that it seems necessary to read *ον*, referring to the preceding *λογῷ*. In 1¹⁷ *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης υπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεπους δοξης* we should probably read *απο*. In 3² Blass thinks it necessary to insert *διά* after *τῆς*, 'the Lord's command given through the apostles.' In 3⁴ the repeated *ἀπο* 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 *ἀρετη* in 1³ and 1⁵, and as to the force of *ταχινη* in 1¹⁴ and 2¹, whether it should be translated 'sudden' or 'speedy,' also as to the allusion contained in the words *καθως ὁ κυριος ἐδηλωσεν μοι*. In 1⁴ are we to take *δεδωρηται* as passive or middle? The latter is in accordance with *δεδωρημενης* in 1³, the former makes better sense. In 1³ is *ο καλεσας* to be understood of God or of Christ? How are we to understand *τας λοιπὰς γραφὰς* (3¹⁶)? In 1¹², *ἐν τη*

παρουση ἀληθεία should we read *παραδοθείση* with Spitta? In 2¹⁸ how is *τοὺς ολίγως ἀποφευγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλανῇ ἀναστρεφόμενους* related to the words which follow (2²⁰), *ἀποφυγοντες τα μιάσματα του κοσμου*?

I must refer to my notes for the questions which have been raised as to the interpretation of 1¹ *τοῖς ἰσοτιμοῦ λαχουσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ του Θεου ἡμῶν*, 2¹ *τον ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσποτην ἄρνούμενοι*, 2¹⁰ *δοξας βλασφημοῦντες*, 1¹⁹ *εχομεν βεβαιοτερον του προφητικου λογον*, 1¹⁹ *εως οὗ ἡμερα διανυγῆσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατειλῃ*, 3¹⁸ *εἰς ἡμεραν αἰωνος*.

Sometimes the difficulty lies in determining the construction, as in 2¹⁸, *δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμῖαις σαρκος ἀσελγείαις*: does *σαρκος* depend on the preceding or on the following word? In 3⁵ *λανθάνει αὐτοὺς τουτο θελοντας* is *τουτο* subject to *λανθάνει* or object to *θελοντας*? In 3⁷ *τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρουμένοι εἰς ἡμεραν κρίσεως*, on which of the participles does *πυρὶ* depend? The difficulties culminate in 2¹⁰⁻¹³, which might seem to be intentionally left obscure. For an attempt to deal with them I must refer to my notes, but I will add a further remark about the remarkable antithetical phrase *ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας*. This evidently refers on to Balaam in 2¹⁵, who was tempted to do wrong by the rewards offered by Balak, but afterwards missed those rewards on account of his failure to curse Israel. It must however have some connexion with 2¹², which speaks of brute beasts born for capture and destruction, and it would seem that the bait, which brings about their death, is compared to the pleasures of sin by which the libertines are tempted to their own ruin (cf. *δελεάζουσιν* in 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 συλλαβούσα τικτεῖ ἀμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκτεῖ θάνατον*. The meaning of the words *ἀδικία*, *ἀδικεω* 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, *πασα προφητεία γραφῆς*

ιδίας επιλυσεως ου γίνεται ου γαρ θελήματι ανθρωπου ηνεχθη προφητεία ποτε. 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.

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: 'Scriptis 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 caractere 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 *Μαρκος μὲν ερμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος οσα ἐμνημονευσεν ακριβῶς εγραψεν, ου μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἠκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.* So Irenaeus *iii. 1* (after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome) *Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητῆς καὶ ερμηνευτῆς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσομένα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδεδωκε.* To the same effect Clement of Alexandria in the Sixth Book of the *Hypotyposes* (*ap. Eus. H.E. ii. 15*) says *τοσουτο δ' ἐπελαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ακροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοαῖς ευσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἰκανῶς εχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ακοῇ μῆδε τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κηρυγματος διδασκαλία, παρακλήσεσι δε παντοαῖς Μάρκον, οὐ το εὐαγγελιον φερεται ακολουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρήσαι ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι (? καταλείψαι) διδασκαλίας, μὴ προτερον τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τον ἄνδρα, καὶ ταυτη αιτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατα Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς* (cf. 2 Pet. 1¹⁵). And Tertullian (*Adv. Marc. iv. 5*): 'Marcus quod edidit Evangelium Petri affirmatur, cuius interpres Marcus.' We read of another interpreter of Peter named

Glaucias, by whom Basileides claimed to have been taught (Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. § 106).

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

2 P 1² *χαρις υμιν καὶ εἰρηνη πληθυνθείη*, is found also in 1 P 1². 2 P 1³ *του καλέσαντος ημᾶς ἰδιᾶ δοξῆ* may be compared with 1 P 1¹⁵ *κατα τον καλεσαντα ημας αγιον, ἰδ.* 2⁹ *του ἐκ σκοτους υμας καλεσαντος εις το θαυμαστον αυτου φως, ἰδ.* 2²¹, 3⁹ *εἰς τουτο εκληθητε, ἰδ.* 5¹⁰ *ο καλεσας υμας εις την αιωνιον αυτου δοξαν.* 2 P 1¹⁰ *βεβαιαν υμῶν τήν κλήσιν καὶ εκλογήν ποιεισθαι*, cf. 1 P 1¹ *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδημοις*, 2⁴ *παρα Θεῶ εκλεκτος*, 2⁹ *γένος ἐκλεκτον.* 2 P 1²¹ *ου γαρ θελήματι ανθρώπου ηνεχθη προφητεία ποτε, αλλα . . . ἐλάλησαν απο Θεου ανθρωποι*, cf. 1 P 2¹⁵ *ουτως ἐστιν το θελημα του Θεου*, 3¹⁷ *εἰ θελοι το θελημα του Θεου*, 4² *θελήματι Θεου τον ἐπίλοιπον βιωσαι χρονον*, 4¹⁹ *κατα το θελημα του Θεου.* 2 P 2¹⁸ *δελεάζουσιν ἐν επιθυμίαις σαρκος ασελγειαίς, ἰδ.* 2² *πολλοὶ εξακολουθήσουσιν αυτῶν ταῖς ασελγείαις*, cf. 1 P 4³ *πεπορευμενους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις.* 2 P 1¹⁶ *ἐποπται γενηθεντες τῆς εκείνου μεγαλειότητος*, cf. 1 P 2¹² *ἵνα εκ τῶν καλων εργαων ἐποπτευοντες δοξάσωσι τον Θεόν*, 3² *εποπτευοντες την ἀγνην ἀναστροφην υμων.* 2 P 3¹⁴ *ασπιλοι καὶ ἀμωμητοι*, 1 P 1¹⁹ *ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος.* 2 P 2¹⁴ *ακαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας*, cf. 1 P 4¹ *πεπανται ἀμαρτίας.*

Other resemblances may be more summarily given.

ἀγαπάω 2 P (1), 1 P (4). *ἀγάπη* 2 P (1), 1 P (3). *ἀγαπητος* 2 P (6), 1 P (2). *ἅγιος* 2 P (5), 1 P (8). *ἀδελφος* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἄδικος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *αἰεὶ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *αἰών* 2 P (1), 1 P (3). *αἰωνιος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀλήθεια* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *αληθης* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀμαρτία* 2 P (1), 1 P (6). *ἀμαρτάνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀναστρέφομαι* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ἀναστροφη* 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. *απολλυμι* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἀρετη* 2 P (3), 1 P (1) pl., only once besides in N.T. *ἀσεβής* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *ἀσελγεια* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *ἄσπιλος* 2 P (1), 1 P (1), only twice besides in N.T. *αυξάνω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *βλασφημεω* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *γνώσις*

2 P (3), 1 P (1). *γραφή* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *γράφω* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *δεσποτης* 2 P (1) of God, 1 P (1) of man. *δηλω* 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). *διο* 2 P (3), 1 P (1). *δόξα* 2 P (5), 1 P (10). *δουλος* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *δύναμις* 2 P (3), 1 P (2). *ειρήνη* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *έκπίπτω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *έλευθερία* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *έπιθυμία* 2 P (4), 1 P (4). *έπιστρέφω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *εργον* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *έσχατος* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *εύρισκομαι* 2 P (2?), 1 P (2). *ζωή* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *ήμέρα* 2 P (11), 1 P (3). *θέλημα* 2 P (1), 1 P (4). *θέλω* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *ίδιος* 2 P (7), 1 P (2). *ίσχυς* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *καθως* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *καλέω* 2 P (1), 1 P (6). *καρδιά* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *κλεπτης* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κοινωνός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κομίζομαι* 2 P (1?), 1 P (2). *κοσμος* 2 P (5), 1 P (3). *κρειττον* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κρίμα* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *κτίσις* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *λαλεω* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *λαμβάνω* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *λαος* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *λόγος* 2 P (4), 1 P (7). *μακροθυμία* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *οίδα* 2 P (3), 1 P (2). *οστις* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ουδέ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ούρανός s.* 2 P (1), 1 P (2), *ρλ.* 2 P (5), 1 P (1). *ούτως* 2 P (2), 1 P (2). *όφθαλμός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *παραδιδωμι* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *παρερχομαι* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *πειρασμος* 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). *πνευμα* 2 P (1), 1 P (8). *πορευομαι* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *ποτε* 2 P (2), 1 P (3). *που* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *προγινωσκω* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *προφητης* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *πρώτον* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *πυρ* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *ρημα* 2 P (1), 1 P (2). *σάρξ* 2 P (2), 1 P (7). *σκοτος* 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). *ύδωρ* 2 P (2), 1 P (1). *υιός* 2 P (1), 1 P (1). *φαίνω act.* 2 P (1), *m.* 1 P (1). *φερομαι* 2 P (4), 1 P (1). *φιλαδελφια* 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

αγαθος (7), *άγαθοποιέω* (4), **άγαθοποιία* (1), **άγαθοποιός* (1), *άγαλλιάω* (3), *άγιάζω* (1), *αγιασμός* (1), *άγνιζω* (1), *άγνος* (1), *άγνοια* (1), *άγνωσία* (1), **αδελφοτης* (2), *άδικως* (1), **άδολος* (1), *άθέμιτος* (1), *αίμα* (2), **αισχροκερδως* (1), *αίσχυνομαι* (1), *αίτεω* (1), *άκρογωνιαίος* (1), *αλλήλων* (4), **άλλοτριοςέπισκοπος*

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

(1), *ἀμαράντινος (1), *ἀμάραντος (1), ἄμαρτώλος (1), ἀμίαντος (1), ἀμνος (1), ἄμωμος (1), ἀναγγελω (1), *ἀναγεννάω (2), *ἀναγκαστως (1), *ἀναζωννυμι (1), *ἀναπαυομαι (1), ἀνάστασις (2), ἀναφέρω (2), *ἀναχυσίς (1), *ἀνεκκλαλητος (1), ἀνευ (2), ἀνῆρ (3), ἀνθίστημι (1), ἀνθος (2), ἀνθρωπινος (1), ἀντι (1), ἀντιδικος (1), *ἀντιλοιδορῶ (1), ἀντιτάσσομαι (1), ἀντίτυπος (1), ἀνυποκριτος (1), ἀπαξ (1), ἀπειθεω (4), ἀπειλεω (1), ἀπεκδέχομαι (1), ἀπεχω τ. (1), ἀπιστεω (1), *ἀπογίνομαι (1), ἀποδίδωμι (2), ἀποδοκιμάζω (2), ἀποθνησκω (1), ἀποκαλυπτω (3), ἀποκάλυψις (3), ἀπολογία (1), *ἀπουεμω (1), ἀποστελλω (1), ἀποτιθεμαι (1), *ἀπροσωπολημπτως (1), ἀργυριον (1), ἀρκετός (1), ἄρτι (2), *ἀρτιγεννητος (1), *ἀρχιποίμην (1), ἄρχομαι (1), ἀσθενής (1), ἀσπάζομαι (2), ἀσωτία (1), ἄφρων (1), ἄφθαρτος (3), βάπτισμα (1), βασιλευς (2), βασιλῆιος (1), *βιω (1), βουλημα (1), βρεφος (1), γαλα (1), γενος (1), γενομαι (1), γλῶσσα (1), γογγυσμος (1), γρηγορέω (1), γυνη (3), *γυναικείος (1), γωνία (1), δέησις (1), δεον (1), δεξια (1), διαβολος (1), διακονεω (3), διασπορά (1), διασωζω (1), δικαίως (1), διοτι (3), διωκω (1), δοκιμάζω (1), δοκιμιον (1), δολος (3), δοξάζω (4), ἐγγίζω (1), ἐγείρω (1), *ἐγκομβόομαι (1), εθνος (3), εἰδωλολατρία (1), ειτε (2), εκαστος (2), εκδίκησις (1), εκζητέω (1), εκκλίνω (1), ἐκλεκτος (4), εκουσίως (1), *εκτενης (1), εκτενωσ (1), ελεέω (2), ελεος (1), ελευθερος (1), ελπίζω (2), ἐλπις (3), *εμπλοκή (1), *ευδυσίς (1), ἐγκοπτω (1), ευνοια (1), ευτιμος (2), ενώπιον (1), *ἐξαγγελω (1), *ἐξεραυνάω (1), εξουσία (1), εξωθεν (1), επαινος (2), επακολουθεω (1), *επερώτημα (1), ἐπηρεάζω (1), ἐπιεικης (1), επιθυμew (1), ἐπικαλεω (1), *επικάλυμμα (1), *ἐπίλοιπος (1), *ἐπιμαρτυρεω (1), ἐπιποθεω (1), ἐπιρίπτω (1), ἐπισκοπεω (1), επισκοπη (1), ἐπισκοπος (1), ἐπιτελεω (1), ἐποικοδομew (1), *ἐποπτεω (2), εραυνάω (1), ετοιμος (2), ετοίμως (1), εὐαγγελίζομαι (3), εὐαγγέλιον (1), ευλογέω (1), ευλογητος (1), ευλογία (1), εὐπροσδεκτος (1), εὐσπλαγχνος (1), ζω (7), ζηλωτης (1), ζητεω (2), ζωοποιew (1), ἡγεμών (1), ησυχιος (1), θανατω (1), θαυμαστος (1), θεμελιω (1), θρίξ (1), θυσία (1), ἰάομαι (1), *ἱεράτευμα (2), ἰμάτιον (1), ἰστημι (1), ἰχνος (1), καθο (1), καιρός (4), κακια (2), κακοποιέω (1), κακοποιός (3), κακός (4), κακω (1), καλος (3), καλυπτω (1), καταβολη (1), καταισχυνω (1), κατακυριεω (1), καταλαλεω (2), καταλαλία (1), καταπινω (1), καταρτιζω (1), κατασκευάζω (1), κατεργάζομαι (1), κερδαινω (1), κεφαλη (1), κηρυσσω (1), κιβωτος (1), *κλεος (1), κληρονομέω (1), κληρονομία (1), κλῆρος (1), κοινωνew (1), κολαφίζω (1), κοσμέω (1), *κραταιός (1),

κρυτος (2), κρίνω (4), κρυπτος (1), *κτίστης (1), κωμος (1), λεων (1), λίθος (5), λογίζομαι (1), λογικος (1), λογιον (1), λoidoreω (1), λoidορία (1), λυπέω (1), λυπη (1), λυτροομαι (1), μακαριος (2), μάρτυς (1), μάταιος (1), μελει (1), μενω (2), μέριμνα (1), μηδε (3), μηδείς (1), μηκετι (1), μολις (1), μονον (1), *μωλωψ (1), νεκρός (4), νεος (1), νηφω (3), ξενίζω (2), ξενος (1), ξηραίνω (1), ξυλον (1), οϊκέτης (1), οικοδομέω (2), οικονομος (1), οϊκος (2), *οϊνοφλυγία (1), οκτω (1), ολίγος (4), ομοίως (3), *όμόφρων (1), ονειδίζω (1), όνομα (2), *όπλίζομαι (1), οπως (1), οραω (1), οσφυς (1), οϋς (1), πάθημα (4), παρακαλεω (3), παρακυπτω (1), παρατιθιμι (1), παρεπίδημος (2), παροικία (1), πυροικος (1), πάσχω (12), *πατροπαράδοτος (1), παυω (2), πεμπω (1), περιεχω (1), *περιθεσις (1), περιπατεω (1), περιποιήσις (1), πέτρα (1), πιστευω (3), πιστος (3), πληθος (1), πνευματικος (2), ποικιλος (2), ποιμαίνω (1), ποιμήν (1), ποιόμνιον (2), ποιος (2), πολυτελης (1), πολυτιμος (1), *ποτος (1), πραυς (1), πραυτης (1), πρεσβυτερος (2), προβατον (1), προγνωσις (1), *προθυμως (1), *προμαρτυρομαι (1), προσάγω (1), προσερχομαι (1), προσκομμα (1), προσκοπτω (1), προσωπον (1), προτερον (1), προφητεω (1), *πτοησις (1), πυρωσις (1), ραντισμός (1), *ρυπος (1), σαρκικος (1), *σθενώ (1), σκανδαλον (1), σκεϋος (1), σκολιός (1), *σπορά (1), στερεος (1), στεφανος (1), στομα (1), στρατευομαι, (1), *συμπαθής (1), συνείδησις (3), *συνεκλεκτος (1), συνκληρονόμος (1), *συνοικεω (1), *συνπρεσβυτερος (1), συνσχηματιζομαι (1), συντρεχω (1), σωζω (2), σῶμα (1), σωφρονεω (1), ταπεινος (1), ταπεινοφροσυνη (1), *ταπεινόφρων (1), ταπεινώ (1), τaráσσω (1), *τελειως (1), τελος (4), τιμάω (2), τουναντιον (1), τυπος (1), υπακοη (3), υπακουω (1), υπερεχω (1), ύπερηφανος (1), *υπογραμμός (1), υποκρισις (1), *υπολιμπάνω (1), υπομενω (2), υποτάσσω (6), υποφερω (1), υψωω (1), φανερω (2), φθαρτος (2), φθόνος (1), *φιλάδελφος (1), φοβέομαι (3), φόβος (5), φονευς (1), φρουρέω (1), φυλακή (1), φως (1), χαίρω (1), χαρα (1), χαρισμα (1), χειλος (1), χείρ (1), χορηγεω (1), χορτος (3), χρηστός (1), Χριστιανος (1), χρονος (4), χρυσιον (3), *ωρουμαι (1), ὤστε (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.

άγνωεω (1), άγοράζω (1), άδικεω (1), άδικια (2), *άθεσμος (2), αΐρεσις (1), άκαρπος (1), *άκατάπαυστος (1), άκοη (1), ακουω (1), άλογος (1), *αλωσις (1), *άμαθής (1), άμάρτημα (1), *άμωμητος (1),

ανατελλω (1), *ανομος* (1), *ἄνυδρος* (1), *απάτη* (1), **ἀποφευγω* (3),
απώλεια (5), **αργεω* (1), *αργος* (1), *αρνεομαι* (1), *αρχαιος* (1),
αρχη (1), **αστηρικτος* (2), *αὐθάδης* (1), **αὐχμηρος* (1), *άφωνος* (1),
βασανίζω (1), *βασιλεία* (1), *βεβαιος* (2), *βλάσφημος* (1), **βλεμμα*
(1), **βόρβορος* (1), *βουλομαι* (1), *βραδύνω* (1), **βραδυτης* (1),
γενναω (1), *γη* (4), *γινωσκω* (2), *γνωρίζω* (1), *γυμνάζω* (1), *δει* (1),
δευτερος (1), *διαμενω* (1), **διαυγάζω* (1), *διεγειρω* (2), *δουλω* (1),
**δυσνόητος* (1), *δωρεομαι* (2), *εἰλικρινης* (1), *εἰς* (3), *εἴσοδος* (1),
**ἐκιστοτε* (1), *εκλογη* (1), **ἐκπαλαι* (2), *ελαυνω* (1), **ελεγξις* (1),
εμος (1), **εμπαιγμονή* (1), *εμπαίκτης* (1), *ἐμπλεκω* (1), **ἐνκατοι-*
κέω (1), *ἐντολη* (2), **εντρυφάω* (1), **εξακολουθεω* (3), **ἐξεραμα* (1),
εξοδος (1), *ἐπαγγελία* (2), *ἐπαγγέλλομαι* (1), **ἐπάγγελμα* (2),
επάγω (1), *ἐπιγινωσκω* (2), *ἐπιγνωσις* (4), **ἐπίλυσις* (1), *ἐπιστολη*
(2), *ἐπιχορηγέω* (2), **ἐποπτης* (1), *ερχομαι* (1), *ετος* (2), *ευδοκεω*
(1), *εὐθυς* adj. (1), *ευσεβεια* (4), *ευσεβης* (1), *εως* prep. (1), *ζόφος*
(2), *ζων* (1), *ηγέομαι* (4), *ἤδη* (1), *ηδονή* (1), *ἦκω* (1), *ἠττάομαι* (2),
θεις (2), *θησαυρίζω* (1), **ἰσότιμος* (1), *καθαρισμός* (1), *καθίστημι*
(1), *καινός* (2), **καίπερ* (1), *καλως* (1), **κατακλυζω* (1), *κατακλυσμος*
(1), *κατακρινω* (1), *καταλείπω* (1), *καταπονεω* (1), *κατάρα* (1), *κατα-*
στροφή (1), *καταφρονεω* (1), *κατοικεω* (1), **καυσόομαι* (2), *κῆρυξ*
(1), *κλήσις* (1), *κοιμάομαι* (1), *κολαζω* (1), *κρίσις* (4), **κυλισμός*
(1), *κυων* (1), *κωλυω* (1), *λαγχανω* (1), *λαυθανω* (2), *λεγω* (1),
**ληθη* (1), *λοιπος* (1), *λουω* (2), *λυχνος* (1), *λυω* (3), *μακροθυμew*
(1), *μαλιστα* (1), *μαλλον* (1), *ματαιιοτης* (1), *μεγαλειοτης* (1), **μεγα-*
λοπρεπης (1), **μεγιστος* (1), *μείζων* (1), *μεστος* (1), *μετάνοια* (1),
**μίασμα* (1), **μιασμός* (1), *μιμνήσκομαι* (1), *μισθός* (2), **μνημη*
(1), *μοιχαλίσ* (1), *μυθος* (1), **μυωπάζω* (1), **μωμος* (1), *νυσταζω* (1),
ὄγδοος (1), *οδος* (4), **ολιγως* (1), **ὀμίχλη* (1), *οπίσω* (1), *οπου* (1), *ορος*
(1), *οσος* (1), *παλαι* (1), *πάλιν* (1), **παρανομια* (1), **παραφρονια* (1),
πάρειμι (2) **παρεισάγω* (1), **παρεισφερω* (1), *παροιμία* (1), *παρου-*
σία (3), *πηγή* (1), *πλάνη* (2), **πλαστός* (1), *πλεονάζω* (1), *πλεονε-*
ξία (2), *πλουσίως* (1), *πόλις* (1), *ποταπός* (1), *προειρημενος* (1),
προσδοκαω (3), *προσεχω* (1), *προφητεια* (2), *προφητικος* (1),
πρωτος (1), *πταίω* (1), *πυρω* (1), **ροιζηδόν* (1), *ρνομαι* (2),
**σειρά* (al. *σειρός*) (1), *σκηνωμα* (2), *σοφία* (1), *σοφίζω* (1), *σπευδω*
(1), *σπίλος* (1), *σπουδαζω* (3), *σπουδή* (1), **στηριγμός* (1), *στοι-*
χειον (2), **στρεβλόω* (1), *συναπάγω* (1), *συνευαχεομαι* (1),
συνίστημι (1), *σωτήρ* (5), **ταρταρώ* (1), *ταχιнос* (2), **τεφρώ* (1),
**τήκομαι* (1), **τοιόσδε* (1), **τολμητης* (1), *τοπος* (1), *τοτε* (1),
τρέμω (1), *τρυφη* (1), *τυφλός* (1), *υπάρχω* (3), *υποδειγμα* (1),

υποζυγιον (1), υπομιμνησκω (1), υπομνησις (2), υπομονη (2), υποστρεφω (1), *υς (1), φείδομαι (2), φθεγγομαι (2), φθείρω (1), φθορα (4), φυλασσω (2), φυσικος (1), φυσις (1), φωνη (3), *φωσφόρος (1), χείρων (1), χωρεω (1), *ψευδοδιδασκαλος (1), ψευδοπροφητης (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 1¹⁶, *ἐγνωρίσαμεν υμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δυναμὶν καὶ παρουσίαν*, *i.e.* it formed the subject of the Apostles' teaching; in 3⁴ it is said that in the last days scoffers shall appear who will make a mock of the promised Advent, asking *ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*; and in 3¹² 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. 2²⁸, and by Paul in 1 Cor. 15²³, 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 *ἀποκαλυψις* for the Advent in 1⁷ that the trial of your faith may be found for praise and honour and glory *ἐν ἀποκαλυψεί Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; in 4¹³, where it is said that the joy of sharing in the sufferings of Christ leads on to the joy *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλυψεί τῆς δοξῆς αὐτοῦ*; in 1¹³ *ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλυψεί 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. 1⁵, 'kept through the power of God' *εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*, 5¹ *ο τῆς μελλουσης ἀποκαλυπτεσθαι δοξῆς κοινωνος*. Hort adds that the phrase goes back to our Lord's words in Lk. 17³⁰ 'In the day when the Son of Man is revealed.' It is used by St. Paul in the same sense 1 Cor. 1⁷, 2 Th. 1⁷. There can be no doubt

that, of the two, *αποκάλυψις* is the finer and richer phrase, implying, in Hort's words (on 1 P 1⁵), that 'Revelation is always in the strictest sense an unveiling of what already exists, not the coming into existence of that which is said to be revealed.' If 2 P preceded 1 P, we might suppose that the writer subsequently adopted the superior phrase, but, as we shall see, the facts of the case are decidedly in favour of the priority of 1 P.

Another word used for the Second Advent with much the same force as *ἀποκαλυπτω* is *φανερω* in 1 P 5⁴ *φανερωθεντος του αρχιποιμενος κομιείσθε τον αμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στεφανου*. It is also used of the First Advent in 1 P 1²⁰.

It is perhaps worth noting that while *ἀγαθος*, *ἀγαθοποιος*, *ἀγαθοποιεω*, *ἀγαθοποιία*, and *κακος*, *κακία*, *κακω*, *κακοποιος*, *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*, *δικαιοσυνη*, *ελευθερία*, *μακροθυμία*, *γνώσις*. Found in 2 P only are *ευσεβής*, *ευσέβεια*, *εγκρατεια*, *ἐπίγνωσις*, *μετάνοια*; *σοφία*, *στηριγμός*. Found only in 1 P are *ἄγνος*, *ἀνυποκριτος*, *ἀγαλλιόμαι*, *ἐπιεικής*, *ευσπλαγχνος*, *ευλογεω*, *ἥσυχιος*, *καλός*, *νηφω*, *ομοφρων*, *πιστος*, *πιστευω*, *πνευματικος*, *πραυς*, *πραυτης*, *προθυμως*, *στερεὸς τη πίστει*, *συμπαθης*, *σωφρονεω*, *συνείδησις* *ἀγαθη*, *ταπεινος*, *ταπεινόφρων*, *ταπεινοφροσυνη*, *υπακοή*, *υποτασσομαι*, *φόβος*, *χαίρω*, *χαρά*, *χάρισμα*, *χρηστος*, *Χριστιανος*. Words denoting bad qualities found in both are *ἀμαρτάνω*, *ἀμαρτια*, *ἄδικος*, *ἀσεβης*, *ἀσελγεια*, *βλασφημέω*, *επιθυμια*, *σάρξ*. Found in 2 P only are *ἀγνοεω*, *ἀδικια*, *ἀδικεω*, *ἄθεσμος*, *αιρεσις*, *ἀμαθης*, *ἀμάρτημα*, *ανομος*, *ἀπατη*; *ἀπωλεια*, *ἀργος*, *-εω*, *αστηρικτος*, *αυθάδης*, *βλάσφημος*, *εμπαιγμόνη*, *ἐμπαικτης*, *μυωπαζων*, *παρανομια*, *παραφρονία*, *πλεονεξία*, *τολμητής*, *τρυφη*, *ἐντρυφαω*, *τυφλος*, *φθορά*. Found in 1 P only are *ἄγνοια*, *ἀθεμιτος*, *ἀπειθεω*, *ἀπιστεω*, *ἀγνωσία*, *ἄφρων*, *ἀμαρτωλός*, *ἄλλοτριοεπισκοπος*, *αἰσχροκερδως*, *ἄσωτία*, *γογγυσμος*, *εἰδωλατρία*, *ἐπηρεαζω*, *καταλαεω*, *-λαλία*, *κερδαίνω*, *κῶμος*, *λοιδορεω*, *-ρία*, *λυπεω*, *οινοφλυγία*, *ποτος*, *προσκομμα*, *προσκοπτω*, *πτοησις*, *ρυπος*, *σαρκικος*, *σκανδαλον*, *σκολιός*, *ταράσσω*, *υπερηφανος*, *υποκρισις*, *φθονος*, *φονευς*. 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 *συν*, such as *συμπαθης*, *συνείδησις*, *συνεκλεκτος*, *συνκληρουόμος*, *συνοικεω*, *συνσχηματιζομαι*, *συν-*

πρεσβυτερος, συντρεχω, while 2 P has only *συναπαγω, συνευωχεομαι* 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 *αθεσμος* 2 P for *αθεμιτος* 1 P; *ἐξακολουθεω* 2 P for *επακολουθεω* 1 P; *επιχορηγεω* 2 P for *χορηγέω* 1 P; *ηγέομαι* 2 P for *λογίζομαι* 1 P; *ἡμέρα* 2 P for *ἡμερα, καιρός, and χρόνος* 1 P; *ἀγοραζω* 2 P for *λυτροομαι* 1 P; *ἀπ' ἀρχης κτίσεως* 2 P with Mk. for *προ καταβολῆς κοσμου* 1 P with Paul; *ἐποπτης* 2 P for *μάρτυς* 1 P; *υποδειγμα* 2 P for *υπόγραμμος* 1 P; *αἱ παλαι αμαρτίαι* 2 P for *αἱ προτερον ἐπιθυμίαι* 1 P; *ποταπος* 2 P for *ποιός* 1 P; *πταίω* 2 P for *προσκοπτω* 1 P. Words significative of a difference of mind and feeling are *ελπίς* and *ἐλπίζω* in 1 P, which are inadequately represented by *υπομονή* and *προσδοκαω* 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 *ραντισμός αιματος* 1 P 1², *τίμιον αίμα ως αμνου άμωμου* 1¹⁹, *επαθεν υπερ ἡμῶν* 1 P 2²¹, *περί άμαρτιῶν απεθανεν, δίκαιος υπερ αδικων* 3¹⁸, *παθηματα* (cf. especially 1^{18f.}, 2²¹⁻²⁵, 3¹⁸, 4^{1, 13}, 5¹), *αναστασις εκ νεκρῶν* 1³, cf. 1²¹ *ὁ ἐγείρας αὐτον εκ νεκρων καὶ δοξαν αυτω δους*, 3²¹ *δι αναστάσεως Ἰησου Χριστου*, 3²² *ος ἐστιν εν δεξια Θεου πορευθεις εις ουρανον, ὑποταγεντων αυτω ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιων.*

Sometimes we have particular scenes in our Lord's life, or sayings of His called up before us. Thus the phrase *αναζωσάμενοι τὰς οσφύας τῆς διανοίας* (1¹³) reminds us of Lk. 12³⁵ *εστωσαν υμῶν αἱ ὀσφνες περιεζωσμένοι*, while that most picturesque and remarkable phrase *εγκομβωσασθε ταπεινοφροσυνην* (5⁵) reminds us of Christ's girding himself before washing the feet of His disciples (Joh. 13⁵) and of His injunction to them to follow His example (13¹⁴). The word *ἀρχιποίμην*, with its accompaniments, *ποιμαίνω, ποιμην, ποίμνιον, προβατα*, reminds us of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Good Shepherd, and of the charge to Peter *ποίμαινε τὰ προβατιά μου*. Perhaps *αυτὸς στηρίξει* in 1 P 5¹⁰, and the cognate words in 2 P may have a reference to another charge in Lk. 22³², *στήρισον τους ἀδελφους*. And the phrase *ὃν ουκ ιδοντες ἀγαπατε, εἰς ον ἄρτι*

μη ὀρώντες πιστευοντες δε αγαλλιᾶτε (1 P 1⁸) naturally recalls the words addressed to Thomas, *οτι εωρακάς με πεπίστευκας ; μακαριοι οί μὴ ιδοντες καὶ πιστευσαντες*. When we read *υποτάγητε πάση ανθρωπίνη κτίσει δια τον Κυριον . . . ως Θεου δούλοι* (1 P 2¹³⁻¹⁶), our thoughts naturally go back to the rule laid down by the Master in Mt. 17²⁴, as to the payment of the half-shekel, and the words in Mt. 22²¹, 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.' So when we read 1 P 5⁸ *νηψατε, γρηγορήσατε, οτι ὁ ἀντιδικος υμῶν διάβολος περιπατει, ζητῶν τινα καταπιειν*, we naturally think of our Lord's warnings in Lk. 22³¹ and in Mt. 26⁴¹, *γρηγορειτε καὶ προσευχεσθε, ἵνα μη εἰσελθητε εις πειρασμον*. The words *κληρος, κληρονομεω, κληρονομία* (1 P 1⁴), *συνκληρονομος* bring to our minds Mt. 19²⁹ *ζωὴν αἰωνιον κληρονομησει*, along with 5⁵ and 25³⁴. So *ἀναγεννησας* 1 P 1³, *ἀναγεγεννημένοι ουκ εκ σπορας φθαρτης, αλλα αφθάρτου* 1 P 1²³, and *ως ἀρτιγεννητα βρέφη το λογικον αδολον γάλα επιποθησατε* 1 P 2², suggest a reminiscence of the words recorded in Joh. 1¹³ *οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος ουδε εκ θεληματος ἀνδρὸς, αλλ' εκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν*, and 3³ *ἐὰν μη τις γεννηθῆ ανωθεν, ου δυναται ιδεῖν την βασιλείαν του Θεου* foll., taken with 1 Joh. 3⁹ *πας ο γεγεννημενος εκ του Θεου ἁμαρτιαν ου ποιει, οτι σπερμα αυτου ἐν αυτω μενει*, and Lk. 18¹⁷ *ος αν μη δεξηται την βασιλείαν του Θεου ως παιδιον, ου μη εἰσελθη εις αυτην*. 1 P 4¹⁴ *εἰ ὀνειδιζεσθε ἐν ονοματι Χριστου, μακάριοι* reminds us of Mt. 5¹¹ *μακαριοί ἐστε οταν ονειδίσωσιν υμας . . . ενεκεν εμου* (cf. 10²², 19²⁹); 1 P 1⁶ *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ολιγον λυπηθέντες κ.τ.λ.* of Mt. 5¹² *χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, οτι ὁ μισθος πολλὸς ἐν τοις ουρανοις*. 4¹⁹ *οι πάσχοντες κατα το θελημα του Θεου πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθεσθωσαν τὰς ψυχάς*, recalls Lk. 23⁴⁶ *Πατερ, εἰς χειράς σου παρατίθεμαι το πνευμά μου*. So 3¹⁴ *μηδε ταραχθητε* recalls Joh. 14^{1, 27}. 4¹⁰ *εκαστος ως ελαβεν χαρισμα, ὡς καλοὶ οικονομοι* recalls Lk. 12⁴² *τις ἐστιν ὁ πιστος οἰκονομος ὁ φρονιμος*, 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' (2²⁰), 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. 14⁶⁵? Again 5³ *μηδ' ως κατακυριευοντες των κληρων* recalls Mt. 20²⁵ *οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνων κατακυριευουσιν αυτων . . . ουχ ουτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμιν*. So 2¹² *ἵνα ἐκ των καλῶν εργαων ἐποπτευοντες δοξάσωσι τον Θεόν* seems

to be a reminiscence of Mt. 5¹⁶ οὕτως λαμψατω τὸ φῶς υμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἴδωσιν υμῶν τὰ καλά ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα υμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: 1²² ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε, of Joh. 13³⁴, 15¹²: 1¹⁰ περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζητήσαν καὶ ἐξηραυνησαν προφηταί, of Mt. 13¹⁷.

The quotation from Ps. 118²² in 1 P 2⁴⁻⁶ was also used by our Lord (Mt. 21⁴²), who specially applied the word ἀποδοκιμάζω to his own treatment by the Jews, after Peter had made his great confession (Mk. 8³¹); and by Peter himself in Acts 4¹¹. The thought of the living stones which are to be joined to the corner stone and built up into the spiritual temple (1 P 2⁴ 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. 16¹⁸).

Similarly the quotation from Isa. 8¹⁴ in 1 P 2⁸ must have been connected in the writer's mind with many sayings of Christ; cf. Mt. 11⁶, Mk. 14²⁷, Joh. 6⁶¹. Also the quotation from Lev. 11⁴⁴ in 1 P 1¹⁶ as compared with Mt. 5⁴⁸; that from Isa. 10³ in 1 P 2¹² ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς compared with Lk. 19⁴⁴; that from Ps. 110⁵ in 1 P. 3²² compared with Mt. 22⁴⁴, 26⁶⁴ and Acts 2³⁴.

It may be said that we have similar reminiscences in 2 P., such as the account of the Transfiguration, of which the writer was a witness on the holy Mount (1¹⁶⁻¹⁸) and the use of the words ἐξοδος and σκῆνωμα in the preceding verses (1^{13,15}) reminding us of words then spoken; the warning as to his own approaching death (1¹⁴); the stealthy intrusion of false prophets (2¹, cf. Mt. 7¹⁵, 24¹¹), denying their Lord (2¹, cf. Mt. 10³³); the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (2²⁰, cf. Mt. 12⁴⁵); ἤξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλεπτῆς (3¹⁰, 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 (δυναμὶς and μεγαλειότης 1¹⁶), 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 (2⁹). How different is the tone in which our Lord is spoken of in 1 P. What a warmth and intensity of feeling is shown throughout the whole epistle, especially in such passages as 1⁸ 'Whom, not having seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory' (χάρα ἀνεκλάλητω

καὶ δεδοξασμένη); 1¹⁸ '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.' 1²² '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'; 2⁹ '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.' 1¹¹ 'Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.' 2²¹ '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

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 *ὁδος αληθείας*, *οδος δικαιοσύνης*, *εὐθεία ὁδός*, the Gospel is spoken of as the *ἐντολή του κυρίου*, *η παραδοθείσα αγία εντολή*; *απωλεία* occurs five times, *απολλυμι* twice; the warning against forgetfulness is often repeated, as in 1^{9, 12, 13, 15, 31} (the last of which, *διεγείρω υμῶν ἐν υπομνήσει τὴν ειλικρινὴ διάνοιαν*, may be contrasted with 1 P 1¹³, *αναζωσαμενοι τας ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας υμῶν, νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίζατε*), also in 2 P 3⁵⁻⁸. I have before referred to the 'reverential periphrases' to be found in 2 P, as *θεία φύσις*, *θεία δυναμεις*, *μεγαλειότης*, *μεγαλοπρεπῆς δοξα*, *κυριοτήτης*; and to the frequent recurrence of *ἐπίγνωσις*, *ἐπιγνωσκω* used especially of our knowledge of God. These things may be good, but they lack the personal tie that marks the first epistle, the devoted affection which binds the disciple to his Master and the penitent to his Saviour, as well as the tender sympathy shown not merely for his own countrymen, but for churches which lay outside his own special sphere of work. I venture to think that the distinction which Dr. Bigg draws between the 'disciplinarian' Peter and the 'mystic' Paul would be more appropriate if used to contrast James or 2 P with 1 P. Another difference between the two epistles is the amount of space given in 1 P, as in Eph. 5²²⁻²⁴ 6⁵⁻⁸, Rom. 13¹⁻⁸, to the exposition of relative duties between husbands and wives, rulers and subjects, servants and masters, elder and younger. This however is easily explained by the difference of circumstances in which the two were written.

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

One of the most prominent topics in both epistles is the Second Coming of the Lord. In 2 P it is described as the day of judgment (2⁹, 3⁷) when heaven and earth shall be destroyed by fire,

when evil men and angels shall be finally judged and punished, while the righteous will be admitted into the eternal kingdom in the new heavens and earth, in which dwelleth righteousness (1¹¹, 3¹³). To this day of God they are urged to be continually looking forward (3¹²). In 1 P we read of an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for those who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* (1^{4,5}); their tried faith will eventually redound to praise and honour and glory in the revelation of Jesus Christ (1⁷); at the revelation of the glory of Jesus Christ they will rejoice with exceeding joy (4¹³); when the chief shepherd appears, they will receive the crown of glory which fadeth not away (5⁴); the God of grace has called them to his eternal glory in Christ (5¹⁰). The wicked shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead (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 (4⁷); remembering that the end of all things is at hand (4⁷). On the contrary, 2 P tells us that the continued delay in the Second Coming had led some to scoff at the idea of any future Coming. He seems himself to look forward to its being put off for an indefinite period (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 (3⁵⁻⁷); and in 2⁵ he refers again to the destruction of the ancient world, when God brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, but spared Noah, the eighth, a preacher of righteousness. In 1 P 3¹⁹⁻²¹, 4⁶ 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 (*ο καὶ υμας ἀντίτυπον νυν σωζει*), even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (*ἐπερωτημα*) of a good conscience toward God.' We will first notice some points of connexion with 2 P. The *μακροθυμία* of God, which is here

said to have been at work in the first destruction of the world by water, is spoken of in connexion with the second destruction by fire in 2 P 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 3²⁰, and Noab the 8th in 2 P 2⁵. The former writer takes the deliverance from the flood by means of the Ark sailing over the waters to be typical of the deliverance from final condemnation of all who were united with Christ by the baptism of the Spirit. The same typical character is ascribed to it in Mt. 24²⁷⁻³⁹ ὥσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι του Νωε, οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία του υἱου του ανθρωπου. See also the comparison of the cloud and the sea to baptism in 1 Cor. 10^{1,2} οἱ πατερες ἡμων: παντες υπο την νεφελην ησαν και παντες δια της θαλάσσης διηλθον και πάντες εις τον Μωυσην ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφελῇ και ἐν τη θαλάσσει. In this last passage there appears to be a play on the meaning of the preposition *δια*, 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, *εις ἣν οκτω ψυχαὶ διεσωθησαν δι υδατος*, 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 *εις* in its later sense, as equivalent to *εν* (see Blass, p. 122). The question then arises, How are we to understand *δι' υδατος* 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 *μεταξυ*, which it seems to bear in 2 P 3⁵, *ἐξ υδατος και δι υδατος συνεστωσα*. In my note there I have explained it of the position assigned to the earth by Jewish tradition, between the waters of

the deep and of the firmament. Similarly in 1 Cor. 10¹ *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 υδατος* 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 (3²⁰) but also to the dead generally (4⁶)? Probably the reference to those who were lost in the Deluge is due to P's allegorical treatment of the story of the Ark. If that is a type of the Church, then those who were not in the Ark are a type of those who are outside of the Church. In Acts 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. 16²⁰. Other early allusions to the 'Harrowing of Hell' are *Test. Levi. 4*, where amongst other accompaniments of the Judgment Day—*πασης κτισσεως κλονουμένης και των αοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομενων*—we read *του ἄδου σκυλευομένου ἐπι τω πάθει του υψιστου*; perhaps Mt. 27^{52t}. *πολλά σωματα τῶν κεκοιμημενων ἁγίων ηγερθησαν, και ἐξελθόντες ἐκ των μνημείων μετα την εγερσιν αὐτου εισήλθον εις την ἁγίαν πολιν και ενεφανισθησαν πολλοις*¹; certainly *Ignat. Magn. ix. οὐ* ('*Ἰησου Χριστου*) *οι προφήται μαθηταὶ οντες τῷ πνευματι ως διδάσκαλον αυτον προσεδωκων. και διὰ τούτο, ον δικαίως ἀνεμενον, παρων ἤγειρεν αυτους εκ νεκρων*, 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 των ἐν ἄδου ψυχῶν παρῆει, ἐκ μακρου αἰωνος την ἄφιξιν αὐτου περιμενουσων, και κατῆει γε θύρας χαλκας συντρίψων . . . και τοὺς πρὶν δεσμίους ἄδου ελευθέρους ἀνήσων. ὃ και γεγονεν, ὅτε πολλα σώματα των κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἀναστάντα συνεισήλθον αὐτῷ εἰς την ἀληθως ἁγίαν του Θεου πόλιν.*

72 (p. 298) quotes a passage from Jeremiah, ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ (αἰ. ὁ ἅγιος) Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χῶματος, 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 ουρανῶν λεγουσῆς Ἐκκηρυξας τοῖς κοιμωμένοις; καὶ υπακοη ἤκουετο ἀπο τοῦ σταυροῦ οτι Ναι.

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 (1¹¹); in 2 P 1²¹ that no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit. In 1 P the subject of prophecy is said to be salvation, the grace that should come upon believers in Christ, whether Jew or Gentile; Christ's sufferings and the glory that should follow; in a word, the Gospel preached by Apostles speaking under inspiration of the same Holy Spirit. In 2 P the Transfiguration is said to have been a manifestation of the power and Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the voice from heaven 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' is quoted in confirmation of the word of prophecy, implying that such was the essence of the prophetic teaching. As to the meaning which the prophets attached to the message they conveyed,—whether, as Philo believed, they were merely unconscious channels of the prophetic spirit within them; or spoke, as St. Paul desired for himself, with the spirit and the understanding also,—1 P tells us that, while the message intrusted to them transcended their own powers, and had a signification which they could only vaguely surmise, a meaning not limited to their own day, but reaching far into the future, still by diligent search they were able to learn 'what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto.' To the same effect, 2 P says

that prophecy is like a lamp shining in a dark place, to which we must give diligent heed if we would understand its teaching; that it is not limited to any one particular interpretation, but declares the mind and will of God extending through all time; that, if rightly used, it prepares us for the full light of the Gospel and for the inner witness of the Spirit. Much the same is the teaching of Peter in Acts 3^{18,21} '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 2² *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν* appears also in 2 P 3¹⁸ *αυξάνετε ἐν χαριτι καὶ γνωσει του Κυριου ημῶν*, which may be compared with Eph. 4¹⁵ and Col. 2¹⁹. The reference to angels in 1 P 1¹², where it is said of the mysteries of the Gospel *εἰς α ἐπιθυμουσιν αγγελοι παρακυνφαι*, and in 3²² *υποταγεντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων*, may be compared with those in 2 P 2⁴ *ἀγγελων ἀμαρτησαντων ουκ εφεισατο*, 2¹¹ *αγγελοι ἰσχυῖ καὶ δυνάμει μειζονες ὄντες ου φέρουσιν κατ αυτων βλάσφημον κρίσιν*, in all of which the word *ἄγγελος* is anarthrous. In 2 P 2⁴ the reference is to fallen angels, who appear to be also referred to under the name *δοξαι* in 2 P 2¹⁰.

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 1¹⁶ *αγιοι εσεσθε οτι ἐγω ἄγιος*, taken from Lev. 11⁴⁴ 19², 20⁷. 1¹⁷ *εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε* from Jer. 3¹⁹ *πατερα καλεσετε με*. 1¹⁸ *οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ ἐλυτρώθητε*, from Isa. 5²³ *ου μετα ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε*. 1²³ *δια λόγου ζωντος Θεου καὶ μενοντος*, from Dan. 6²⁶ *αυτος ἐστι Θεος ζῶν καὶ μένων εἰς τους αἰῶνας*. 1²⁴ *πᾶσα σαρξ ὡς χορτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξεπesev· τὸ δε ρῆμα Κυρίου μενει εἰς τον αἰῶνα*

where the words spaced are quoted exactly from Isa. 40⁶⁻⁸. 2³ εἰ ἐγευσασθε ὅτι χρηστος ὁ Κυριος, from Ps. 34⁸ γευσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι κ.τ.λ. 2^{4, 6, 7} λίθον ζωντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον, παρα δε Θεῷ ἐκλεκτον . . . ἰδοὺ τιθημι ἐν Σιων λίθον ἐκλεκτον ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστευων ἐπ αὐτω οὐ μὴ καταισχυνη. ὑμῖν οὐν ἡ τιμη τοῖς πιστευουσιν, ἀπιστοουσιν ὁ λίθος οὐν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομουντες, οὗτος ἐγενηθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, from Ps. 118²² λίθον οὐν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομουντες οὗτος ἐγενηθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, and Isa. 28¹⁶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλλω εἰς τα θεμέλια Σιων λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτον ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐντιμον, εἰς τα θεμελια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστευων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνη. 2⁷ καὶ λίθος προσκομματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδαλου, from Isa. 8¹⁴ καν ἐπ αὐτῷ πεποιθως ἦς, ἐσται σοι ὡς ἀγίασμα καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκομματι συναντήσεσθε οὐδε ὡς πετρας πτώματι. 2⁹ ὑμεῖς δε γενος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἁγιον, λαος εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τας ἀρετας ἐξαγγείλητε, from Isa. 43^{20, 21} ποτίσαι το γενος μου το ἐκλεκτον, λαον μου ὃν περιεποησάμην τας ἀρετάς μου διηγήσθαι, Exod. 19^{5, 6} ἐσεσθε μοι λαος περιούσιος . . . βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἁγιον, ἰδ. 23²², Deut. 7⁶. 2¹⁰ οἱ ποτε οὐ λαος, νυν δε λαος Θεου, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημενοι, νυν δε ἐλεηθεντες from Hos. 1^{6, 9} καλεσον το ὄνομα αὐτῆς Οὐκ ἠλεημενη . . . καλεσον το ὄνομα αὐτου, Οὐ λαος μου, ἰδ. 2¹ εἶπατε τῷ ἀδελφῷ ὑμῶν Λαος μου, καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμων Ἠλεημενη, ἰδ. v. 28. 2¹¹ παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπίδημους, from Ps. 39¹² πάροικος ἐγὼ εἶμι ἐν τῇ γῆ καὶ παρεπίδημος καθως πάντες οἱ πατερες μου. 2¹² ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς, from Isa. 10³. 2¹⁷ του Θεου φοβεισθε, του βασιλεα τιματε, from Prov. 24²¹ φοβου του Θεου καὶ βασιλεα. 2²² ὁς ἀμαρτιαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδε εὐρεθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στοματι αὐτου, quoted exactly from Isa. 53⁹. 2²⁴ ὁς τας ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτος ἀνήνεγκεν . . . οὐ τῷ μωλωπι ἰάθητε, from Isa. 53¹² αὐτος ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν, ἰδ. v. 5 τῷ μωλωπι αὐτου ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. 2²⁵ ἦτε γαρ ὡς προβατα πλανωμενοι, from Isa. 53⁶ παντες ὡς προβατα ἐπλανηθημεν. 3⁶ Σαρρα υπηκουεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, κυριον αὐτον καλουσα, from Gen. 18¹². 3⁶ μὴ φοβουμεναι μηδεμίαν πτοησιν, from Prov. 3²⁵ οὐ φοβηθησῃ πτοησιν ἐπελθουσιν. 3¹⁰⁻¹² ὁ γὰρ θελων ζωὴν ἀγαπαν καὶ ἰδεῖν

ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι 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 ποιούντας κακά, from Ps. 34¹²⁻¹⁶ τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῆν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθὰς (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 παραχθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε, from Isa. 8^{12, 13} τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ παραχθῆτε. Κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σου φόβος. 3²² ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ, from Ps. 110¹ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. 4⁸ ἀγάπη καλυπτει πληθος ἁμαρτιῶν from Prov. 10¹² 'Love covereth all transgressions' (R.V.), where LXX. has τους μὴ φιλονεικούντας καλυπτει φιλία. 4¹⁴ εἰ ὀνειδίξεσθε . . . μακαριοι, οτι . . . το του Θεου πνευμα ἐφ' υμας ἀναπαυεται. 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. 5¹¹; see above, p. lxxvii. For the latter part of the verse Hort compares Isa. 11² ἀναπαυσεται ἐπ αὐτὸν πνευμα του Θεου. 4¹⁷ καιρος του ἄρξασθαι το κριμα ἀπο του οἴκου του Θεου, from Ezek. 9^{6,7} ἀπο των ἀγίων μου ἄρξασθε . . . καὶ εἶπεν προς αυτους Μιάνατε τον οἶκον. 4¹⁸ εἰ ο δικαιος μολις σωζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλος που φανεται; quoted exactly from Prov. 11³¹. 5⁵ Θεος υπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοις δε διδωσιν χαριν, from Prov. 3³⁴ with the change of Κυριος into Θεος. 5⁷ την μεριμιναν υμῶν ἐπιρρίψαντες ἐπ αὐτον, οτι αυτω μελει περι υμῶν, from Ps. 55²² επιρριψον ἐπὶ Κυριον την μεριμνάν σου, καὶ αὐτος σε διαθρέψει.

Perhaps we may add to these, as probably in the mind of the writer, 1² εἰρήνην πληθυνθείη, from Dan. 4¹ (3³¹) and 6²⁵. 1⁴ ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον: 'These three words are all absent from the LXX. and are all found in Wisdom (12¹, 18⁴, 3¹³, 4², 8²⁰, 6¹²)' Hort. 1⁷ ἵνα το δοκιμιον υμῶν τῆς πιστεως πολυτιμοτερον χρυσιου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρος δε δοκιμαζομένου ευρεθῆ εἰς επαινον, from Zech. 13⁹ πυρώσω αυτους ως πυρουται το ἀργυριον, καὶ δοκιμω

αυτους ως δοκιμάζεται το χρυσίον. 1¹⁰⁻¹² περί ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζητήσαν . . . προφήται . . . ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τινα . . . καιρον ἐδηλου το πνευμα ἑπρομαρτυρομενον τα εις Χριστον παθηματα και τας μετα ταυτα δοξας, . . . εις α επιθυμουσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι, from Dan. 8¹³⁻¹⁵, 9²⁴⁻²⁶, 12⁶⁻⁹, Isa. 52¹³–53¹², 1¹⁷ κρίνοντα κατα το εκαστου εργον, from Ps. 62¹² συ ἀποδωσεις εκαστῷ κατα τα εργα αυτου. 1¹⁸ see above, and add Ps. 49⁸. 1¹⁹ αμνου ἀμωμου, from Lev. 22²¹ ἄμωμον εσται εἰσδεκτον, πᾶς μωμός ουκ εσται ἐν αυτω. 3^{19, 20}, from Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 4¹⁷ see above, and add Jer. 25 (32)²⁹ ἐν πολει ἐν η ὠνομάσθη το ονομά μου ἐπ αυτην εγω ἄρχομαι κακῶσαι. 4¹⁹ πιστω κτιστη παρατιθεσθωσαν τας ψυχάς, from Ps. 31⁵ εις χεῖράς σου παραθησομαι το πνευμά μου ἐλυτρώσω με Κυριε ὁ Θεος τῆς ἀληθείας. 5⁸ ὁ ἀντιδικος υμῶν διάβολος . . . περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν, from Job. 1⁷ ἀποκριθεις ὁ διάβολος εἶπε, Περιελθων την γῆν και ἐμπεριπατήσας την υπ' ουρανον πάρεμι, *ib.* 2².

In 2 P Hort reckons the following as quotations: 2² δι ο θς η ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθησεται, from Isa. 52⁵ δι' υμᾶς . . . το ονομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς εθνεσι. 2²² κυων ἐπιστρεψας ἐπὶ το ἴδιον ἐξεραμα, from Prov. 26¹¹ ωσπερ κυων οταν ἐπέλθη ἐπὶ τον εαυτου εμετον και μισητὸς γένηται, ουτως ἄφρων τη εαυτου κακια ἀναστρεψας επι την εαυτου ἀμαρτιαν. 3⁸ μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ως χίλια ετη, και χίλια ετη ως ἡμερα μία, from Ps. 90⁴ χιλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοις σου ως η ἡμερα ἡ ἐχθὲς ἦτις διηλθε. 3¹² ουρανοὶ πυρουμενοι λυθησονται και στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα τηκεται, from Isa. 34⁴ και τακησονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν ουρανῶν, και ἐλιγησεται ὁ ουρανος ως βιβλίον και πάντα τα ἄστρα πεσειται. 3¹³ καινοὺς δε ουρανοὺς και γῆν καινην προσδοκωμεν, from Isa. 65¹⁷ εσται γὰρ ὁ ουρανος καινὸς και η γῆ καινη, *ib.* 66²². Perhaps we may add the following: 1² τυφλος ἐστιν μυωπάζων, compared with Isa. 59¹⁰ ως ουχ υπαρχοντων ὀφθαλμῶν ψηλαφησουσι. 1¹⁹ τῷ λογω προσεχοντες ως λυχνω φαίνοντι ἐν αυχηρηῷ τοπω, cf. Ps. 119¹⁰⁵ λυχνος τοῖς ποσί μου ὁ νομος σου, 2 Esdras 12⁴² tu nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis . . . sicut lucerna in loco obscuro. 2² ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. Ps. 119³⁰. 2⁴ σειραις ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρέδωκεν εις κρίσιν τηρουμένους, cf. Wisdom 17¹⁶ μία ἀλυσει σκότους πάντες ἐδεθησαν. 2⁵ saving of Noah, cf. Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 2⁶ πόλεις Σοδόμων και Γομορρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῆ κατεκρινεν, υπο-

δειγμα μελλοντων ἀσεβειν τεθεικως, cf. Gen. 19^{24f}. Κυριος ἐβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σοδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θείον καὶ πυρ παρὰ Θεου ἐξ ουρανου, καὶ κατεστρεψε τὰς πολεις ταυτας καὶ πασαν την περίχωρον, Numb. 26¹⁰ (of the destruction of Korah) καὶ ἐγενηθησαν ἐν σημείῳ. 2⁷⁻⁹ saving of Lot, cf. Gen. ch. 18, Wisdom 10^{6,7} 2^{15,16} Balaam, cf. Numb. 22²¹⁻²⁸. 3⁹ οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος της ἐπαγγελίας, ὡς τινες βραδυτήτα ἡγουνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεί, cf. Sir. 35¹⁸ καὶ ὁ Κυριος ου μη βραδυνη ουδε μὴ μακροθυμηση ἐπ' αυτοις. 3⁹ μη βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολεσθαι ἀλλὰ παντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρήσαι, cf. Ezek. 18²³, Wisdom 11²⁴ ελεεις δε παντας, ὅτι παντα δυνασαι, καὶ παρορας ἀμαρτηματα ἀνθρωπων 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. βιωσαι (4²), found also in Aristotle and Plutarch, instead of the classical βιωναι. The fut. pass. κερδηθησονται is found only in 1 P 3¹. κερδησω occurs in James 4¹³, ἐμπορευσομεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν (where see my note), and the aor. ἐκερδησα is common in the N.T. The form κερδανῶ (WH.) or κερδάνω (Blass) occurs after ἵνα in 1 Cor. 9²¹. 1 P has three examples of the form ἐγενηθην (1¹⁵, 2⁷, 3⁶). It keeps the classical προσαγαγη in 3¹⁸ as contrasted with ἐπάξας in 2 P 2⁵. In 2¹⁵ WH. (Introduction § 410, App. p. 166), read φιμοῖν with \aleph comparing κατασκευοῖν read by BD in Mt. 13³², by B in Mk. 4³², and ἀποδεκατοιον read by BD in Heb. 7⁵, while Ti. Treg. read φιμουν 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

noun.¹ Of the former we have examples in 1 P 1⁵ τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους, 1¹⁰ οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς υμᾶς χάριτος προφητευσαντες, 1¹⁴ ταῖς προτερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ υμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις, 3² τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφὴν υμῶν, 3³ ὁ ἐξώθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσιῶν ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κοσμος, 3¹⁶ τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴν, 4² εἰς τὸ μηκετι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θεληματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιωσαι χρόνον, 5¹ ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλουσης ἀποκαλυπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνος, 5⁴ τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στεφανον, 5⁹ τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ υμῶν ἀδελφοτητι. Of the latter in 1² ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ραντισμον αιματος, 1³ δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1⁵ ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ, ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1⁷ ἐν ἀποκαλυφει Ἰησοῦ, 1¹² (εὐαγγελιστάμενοι) υμᾶς πνευματι ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλεντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, 1²⁰ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, 1²³ διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μενοντος, 3²¹ οὐ σαρκὸς ἀποθεσις ρυπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερωτημα, 2⁶ περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ (cf. 2 P 1²⁰ πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς), 4¹ Χριστοῦ παθόντος σαρκί, 4² εἰς τὸ μηκετι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι, 4¹⁰ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ, 4¹⁴ ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, 5⁸ ὁ ἀντιδικὸς υμῶν διαβολὸς περιπατεῖ, 5¹² ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταυτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3¹² προσωπον Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιουντας κακά. We find also in 1 P examples of the looser constructions which we have seen in 2 P, e.g. 1 P 1¹³ τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας, 1²¹ τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1²² τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας, 2¹⁵ τὸ θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 4³ τὸ βουλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν, 4¹³ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλυφει τῆς δόξης, 4¹⁷ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ: of the 'appositional' form in 1²⁵ τὸ ρῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθεν, 1¹⁰ προφήται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς υμᾶς χάριτος προφητευσαντες: of the 'semi-compact' in 1⁵ τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους δια πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ετοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1¹⁷ τὸν ἀπροσωπολημπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, 1¹³ τὴν φερομένην υμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλυφει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1¹⁸ τῆς ματαιίας υμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδοτου, 4¹² τῇ ἐν υμῖν πυρῶσει πρὸς πειρασμον υμῖν γινομένην. 4¹⁴ τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνευμα 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 5¹ ὁ συμπρεσβυτερος καὶ μάρτυς.

¹ See for 2 P above, p. xxvi foll.

CASES.

ACCUSATIVE. We find the Adverbial Accusative in 1 P 3⁸ το τέλος παντες ὁμόφρονες, 3⁹ τουναντίον, 1⁶ ολιγον; the Acc. of Duration of Time in 1¹⁷ εν φόβω τὸν τῆς παροικίας χρονου ἀναστράφητε, 4² τὸν ἐπίλοιπον βιώσαι χρόνον; Cognate Acc. in 3⁶ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν, 3¹⁴ τον φοβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, 4¹ ὀπλίσασθε ἔννοιαν (some take these as Accusative of the Object). Double Acc. in 3¹⁵ αἰτει υμας λογον.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: διὰ 1 P (4), 2 P (4); ἐπι 1 P (5), 2 P (2); κατα 1 P (9), 2 P (3); μετά 1 P (1), 2 P (1); προς 1 P (3), 2 P (2). Especially noticeable are the following: 1 P 3²⁰ εἰς ἣν (κιβωτον), διεσωθησαν, 1²¹ πιστος εἰς Θεόν, ἰδ. τὴν πίστιν εἶναι εἰς Θεόν, 5¹² εἰς ἣν στήτε; 1¹¹ τα εἰς Χριστον παθήματα; 1¹⁵ κατα του καλέσαντα ὑμας αγιου καὶ αυτοὶ αγιοι γεννηθητε, and 4⁸ ἵνα κριθῶσι μεν κατὰ ἀνθρωπους, ζῶσι δε κατὰ Θεόν, which are unlike anything in 2 P with the exception of εἰς in 2 P 1¹⁷ εἰς ου ἔγω ευδοκησα. So 1¹³ ἐλπίσατε ἐπι την χάριν, is copied from the Hebrew use: see Hort's n.

GENITIVE Possessive. 1 P 1¹ αποστολος Χριστου, παρεπιδημοι διασπορᾶς Ποντου; 3⁴ ὁ κρυπτος τῆς καρδιας ἄνθρωπος (not Gen. of Apposition, as Alf.). *Subjective* 1² προγνωσιν Θεου, ἀγιασμος πνευματος, 1²² τῇ υπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας (see Hort's n.), 3²¹ συνειδησεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερωτημα. *Objective* 1² ραντισμὸς αιματος, 1⁷ δοκιμιον της πιστεως, 2¹⁴ εκδικησις κακοποιων, 3³ ενδυσις ιματιων, ἐμπλοκη τριχῶν, 3²¹ ἀποθεσις ρυπου, 4⁴ ἀσωτιας ἀνάχυσις. *After Comparative* 1⁷ πολυτιμοτερου χρυσίου. *Hebraistic* 1¹⁴ τεκνα υπακοῆς, 2⁸ λιθος προσκόμματος, πετρα σκανδάλου, 2¹² εν ημέρα ἐπισκοπῆς. *Gen. of Material* 'consisting in' 3³ ο ἐμπλοκης τριχῶν κόσμος, 3⁷ χαρις ζωης, 5⁴ τον της δοξης στεφανου. *Gen. of Quality* 5¹⁰ ὁ Θεος πάσης χάριτος. *With Verb* 4¹ πεπαυται ἀμαρτιας (al. ἀμαρτιας) cf. 2 P 2¹⁴ ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτιας, 2¹¹ ἀπεχεσθαι ἐπιθυμιων, 2¹² καταλαλουσιν υμῶν, 5³ κατακυριευοντες τῶν κληρων. *Gen. of Purpose (Infinitive)* 3¹⁰ παυσάτω χειλη του μὴ λαλήσαι δολον. *Gen. Absolute* 3²⁰ κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτου, 3²² υποταγεντων αυτω ἀγγέλων, 4¹ Χριστου παθοντος, 4⁴ μη συντρεχοντων υμων, 5⁴ φανερωθεντος του αρχιποίμενος, 4¹² ως ξένου συμβαίνοντος. Of prepositions which take the genitive, ἀντι occurs twice in

1 P, never in 2 P; *ἀνέν* twice in 1 P, not in 2 P; *ἀπο* occurs five times in 1 P, thrice in 2 P (or four times if we read *ἀπο* in 1¹⁷); *ἐκ* 1 P (8), 2 P (5); *διά* 1 P (15), the most remarkable being 5¹² *δι ολίγων εγραψα*, and 3²⁰ *διεσωθησαν δι υδατος*, 2 P (5), or 6, if we read *δια δοξης* in 1³, the most remarkable being *δι' υδατος 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); *οπισω* 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); *υπο* 1 P (1), 2 P (5) (or 4, if we read *ἀπο* in 1¹⁷).

DATIVE. *Indirect Object* 1 P 1¹ *εκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδημοῖς* (*λέγει χαίρειν*), cf. 2 P 1¹, 1² *χαρὶς ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη*, 1 P 1¹² *οἷς ἀπεκαλυφθη ὅτι ὑμῖν διηκουοῦν αὐτὰ α νυν ἀνηγγελῆ ὑμῖν*, 1¹³ *τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χαρὶν*, 1²¹, 5⁵ after *διδῶμι*, 2¹³, 18, 3¹, 5, 22, 5⁵ after *υποτάσσομαι*, 2²¹ *ὑμῖν υπολιμπάνων υπογραμμῶν*, 2²¹ *ἐπακολουθεῖν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ*, 2²³ *παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι*, 3¹, 4¹⁷ *ἀπειθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ*, 3⁶ *υπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ*, 3⁷ *τῷ γυναικείῳ (σκευεῖ) ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν*, 3¹⁹ *τοῖς πνεύμασιν ἐκηρυξεν* 4⁰ *ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ κρίνοντι*, 4⁶ *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη*, 4¹⁹ *πιστῶ κτιστῇ παρατιθεσθῶσαν τὰς ψυχὰς*, 5⁵ *ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε*, 5⁵ *υπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται*, 5⁹ *ὦ ἀντιστήτε, τὰ αὐτὰ τῇ ἀδελφοφῶντι ἐπιτελεῖται*, 3¹⁸ *ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ*, 2⁵ *εὐπροσδεκτὸς Θεῷ*, 3¹⁵ *πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν τῷ αἰτοῦντι*; with *εἰμι*, etc., 4¹¹ *ὧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα*, 4¹² *πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη . . . ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος*, 2⁷ *ὑμῖν (ἐστὶν) ἡ τιμὴ*, 5¹¹ *αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος (ἐστῶ)*, 5⁷ *αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ἡμῶν*. *Dat. of Reference* 2²⁴ *ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενομένοι τῇ δικαιοσυνῇ ζήσωμεν*, 4¹ *πέπανται ἀμαρτίαις* (*αἰ. ἀμαρτίας*); with compound verb 2⁸ *προσκοπτειν τῷ λόγῳ*, 1¹⁴ *συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*. *Dat. of Instrument* 1¹² *εὐαγγελιστάμενοι πνευματὶ ἀγίῳ*, 1¹⁹ *τιμῇ αἱματὶ ἐλυτρωθητε*, 2²⁴ *οὐ τῷ μωλωπι ἰάθητε*; *Dat. of Cause* 4¹² *μη ξενίζεσθε τῇ πυρῶσει*; *Dat. of Respect* 4¹ *παθῶν σαρκὶ*, 4⁶ *ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ πνευματὶ*, 3¹⁸ *θανατωθεῖς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεῖς δὲ πνευματὶ*, 4¹³ *κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς παθήμασιν*, 5⁹ *στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει*; *Dat. of Manner* 1⁸ *ἀγαλλιατε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλητῶν*, 4² *μηκετι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις*, *ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι*. *With Prepositions* *ἐν* 1 P (49), 2 P (44), *ἐπι* 1 P (1), 2 P (0), *παρά* 1 P (2), 2 P (2), *συν* 1 P (0), 2 P (1). The most noteworthy examples in 1 P are *ἐν Χριστῷ* (3), 4¹⁴ *ονειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*, 4¹⁶ *δοξαζέτω του Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνοματὶ τουτῶν*, 5¹⁴ *ἀσπάσασθε ἐν φιληματὶ*.

The accumulation of prepositions is even more noticeable in 1 P than in 2 P, hardly less than in Romans, *e.g.* 1² ἀποστολος κατὰ πρόγνωσιν ἐν αγιασμῷ εἰς υπακοήν, 1³ ὁ κατὰ τὸ ελεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζώσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς κληρονομίαν τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχατῷ. Cf. 2 P 1² 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 δοξῆς (αἰ. ἴδια δοξῆ) καὶ ἀρετῆς, δι' ὧν τὰ τιμια καὶ μεγιστα ἐπαγγελματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γενησθε θείας κοιωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς. and Rom. 1¹ Παῦλος ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγελίον Θεοῦ, ὁ προεπηγγειλάτο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν εἰς υπακοήν πίστεως ἐν πασὶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνοματός 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 2¹ ἀποθεμενοὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δολὸν καὶ υποκρίσιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πᾶσας καταλαλίαις. Here it would have been easy to make the construction regular by putting πάντα δολὸν after υποκρίσιν. WH. give υποκρίσεις in the margin, which seems to me the better reading, and this is supported by NC etc. The plural would be easily assimilated to the preceding singulars. In 4¹⁰ (ἐκαστος καθὼς ἐλάβεν χάρισμα) εἰς εαυτοὺς διακονοῦντες we have a mixture of singular and plural, depending upon the imperative σωφρονησατε in *v.* 7. This would be regular if the phrase in brackets had been placed after διακονοῦντες. 2¹ also affords examples of the Plural Abstract in φθόνους and καταλαλίαις. So we find δοξαὶ 1¹¹, ἀσελγειαὶ 4³.

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

a pivot for a following explanation, as in 2¹⁹ *τουτο χαρις ει δια συνειδησιν υποφερει τις λυπας*, 3⁹ *εις τουτο εκληθητε, "να κληρονομησητε*, 4⁶ *εις τουτο ευηγγελισθη, "να κριθωσιν*; and so with *ουτως* in 2¹⁵ *ουτως εστιν το θελημα του Θεου*, followed by the appositional infinitive *αγαθοποιουντας φιμουν*. The pronoun is retrospective in 2^{20, 21} *τουτο χαρις παρα Θεω, εις τουτο γαρ εκληθητε*, 2⁷ *λιθος ον απεδοκιμασαν . . ουτος εγενηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας*. And so *ουτως* in 3⁵ *ουτως γαρ αι αγιαι γυναικες εκοσμου εαυτας*.

Neither *οδε* nor *εκεινος* occurs in 1 P.

εαυτους is used in 4⁸ *την εις εαυτους αγαπην εκτενη εχοντες*, and in 4¹⁰ for *αλληλους*, as in Col. 3¹³ *χαριζομενοι εαυτοις*, and elsewhere both in the N.T. and in classical writers. It is curious that it is coupled with *αλληλους* in 4⁹ *φιλόξενοι εις αλληλους*, as in Col. 3¹³ *ανεχομενοι αλληλων*. It keeps its usual reflexive sense in 1¹², 3⁵.

There is a remarkable use of *τα αυτα* followed by a genitive in 5⁹ *ειδοτες τα αυτα των παθημάτων τη εν κοσμου υμων αδελφοτητι επιτελεισθαι* '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 *τα αυτα παθηματα*, 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 *επι το αυτο της αναισχυντίας εφθασεν τω Θερσιτη, οτ τα αυτα των θλίψεων αντλησαντες*? I do not mean that the last is exactly equivalent to *τας αυτας θλιψεις*: it is rather 'the same sort of persecutions,' there was an identity in the persecutions they had to endure.

Relative. Sometimes the antecedent is not clearly defined, as in 1⁶ *εν ω αγαλλιασθε*, where some find it in *καιρω*, some in *Θεω*, some in the general sense of the preceding clause; 4⁴ *εν ω ξενιζονται*, where it sums up the preceding clause; 2⁸ *εις ο και ετεθησαν*, where the antecedent is suggested by the preceding

προσκοπτουσιν. Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2²² *ος αμαρτιαν ουκ ἐποίησεν ουδε ευρεθη δολος ἐν τω στοματι αυτου. ὅστις* occurs once, 2¹¹ *ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν επιθυμιῶν αἴτινες στρατευονται κατα 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.} (Χριστος) *ος αμαρτιαν ουκ ἐποίησεν . . . ος λοιδορουμενος ουκ ἀντελοιδορει . . . ος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ημῶν αυτος ἀνήνεγκεν . . . ου τω μωλωπι ἰάθητε* : 1⁸ *ὃν ουκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρῶντες πιστευοντες δε ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* : 1¹² *οἷς ἀπεκαλυφθη οτι ουχ αυτοῖς υμιν δε διηκουουν αὐτά, ἀ νυν ἀνηγγελη υμιν . . . εἰς α ἐπιθυμουσιν ἄγγελοι παρακυψαι* : 3¹⁹⁻²¹ *εν ᾧ πνευμασι ἐκήρυξεν . . . κατασκευαζομενης κιβωτου, εἰς ἣν ολιγοι διεσάθησαν δι' υδατος, ο και ημᾶς σωζει. Attraction, 2¹² ἵνα ἐν ᾧ (=εν τουτω ο) καταλαλουσιν υμῶν . . . δοξάσωσι τον Θεόν, 3¹⁶ ἵνα εν ᾧ καταλαλουσιν υμων . . . καταισχυθῶσιν. οσος does not occur in 1 P.*

Interrogative. τίς and ποιος, 3¹³ *τις ὁ κακωσων υμᾶς* ; 4¹⁷ *τί το τελος* ; 1¹¹ *ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον χρονον εδήλου. ποταπος*, found in 2 P, does not occur in 1 P.

ADJECTIVES.¹

Neuter used as a substantive (1) with article 3⁴ *το ἄφθαρτον τοῦ ησυχίου πνευματος*, (2) without article 1²⁰ *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρονων*, 3¹¹ *εκκλινάτω απο κακου και ποιησάτω ἀγαθον. ιδιος* is preceded by the article without *αυτων* in the two places where it occurs (3^{1, 5}). The distributive *πας* is found with the article in the singular, 3¹⁵ *παντὶ τῷ αἰτουντι*.

VERBS.

TENSES. *Future Indicative* after ἵνα, 3¹ *ἵνα εἴτινες ἀπειθουσιν . . . κερδηθησονται*, cf. Blass, pp. 211 f.

Aorist Indicative answering to English Perfect. 1¹² *α νυν ἀνηγγέλη* 'these things which have now been announced unto you' (R.V.), 2²⁵ *ἐπεστράφητε νυν ἐπὶ τον ποιμένα* 'are now returned' (R.V.), 2³ *εἰ εγευσασθε οτι χρηστος ὁ Κυριος* 'if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious' (R.V.), 2²⁵ *ἦτε ως προβατα πλανωμενα ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νυν ἐπὶ τον ποιμενα* 'ye were going astray . . . but are now returned' (R.V.), 3⁶ *ἧς ἐγενηθητε τεκνα ἀγαθοποιουσαι*

¹ See below under 'Participles.'

' whose children ye now are if ye do well ' (R.V.). We have two examples of what is called the Gnomic aorist in 1²⁴ ἐξηράνθη ὁ χορτος, το αὐθος ἐξεπεσεν.

Aorist Imperative (of urgency). Much commoner than the present in 1 P., the latter being used nine times, the former twenty-four. In 2¹⁷ we have them combined, πάντα τιμῆσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν Θεὸν φοβείσθε, τὸν βασιλεῖα 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 3⁹ εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε ἵνα κληρονομήσητε, 3¹⁸ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσάγαγῃ τῷ Θεῷ. After οὐ μὴ 2⁶.

Optative. The true optative occurs in 1 P. 1² εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, as in 2 P. 1². Its use to express a pure hypothesis is rare in the N.T., but is found in 1 P. 3¹⁴ εἰ πάσχοιτε . . . μακαριοί (ἐστε), 3¹⁷ κρείττον (ἐστὶν) ἀγαθοποιούντας, εἰ θελοὶ τὸ θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιούντας. The latter parenthetical use may be compared with 1 Cor. 14¹⁰ τοσαῦτα, εἰ τυχοί, γενῆ φωνῶν εἰσὶν, 15³⁷ σπεῖρεις . . . γυμνὸν κοκκόν, εἰ τυχοί. Luke is more free in the use of the optative than the other writers of the N.T.; cf. Acts 24¹⁹ οὓς ἐδεῖ . . . κατηγορεῖν εἰ τι ἐχοίεν πρὸς ἔμε, ἰδ. 17²⁷, 20¹⁶, 27¹², etc.

Infinitive after verb: 1¹² ἐπιθυμοῦσιν παρακνῆσαι, 2¹¹ παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι, 5¹ μελλουσα ἀποκαλυπτεσθαι, 5⁸ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν. Accusative with infinitive 5⁹ εἰδοτες 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 1¹⁸ εἰδοτες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοὶς ἐλυτρώθητε, some understand οἶδα in the

sense in which it is used in 2 P. 2⁹ οἶδεν Κυριος ευσεβεις ρυεσθαι, but Blass (p. 231) prefers the usual translation which he illustrates from Luke 4⁴¹ ηδεισαν τον Χριστον αυτον εἶναι. Another example of acc. with inf. is 1 P. 5¹² ἐπιμαρτυρων ταυτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χαριν του Θεου. Infinitive after adjective: 1⁵ ετοιμος ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, 4³ ἀρκετος ο χρόνος κατειργάσθαι.

Exegetic Infinitive. 2⁵ οἰκοδομεισθε . . . εἰς ιεράτευμα αγιον ἀνευέγκαι θυσιας, 2¹⁵ ουτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα του Θεου, ἀγαθοποιουντας φιμουν. After ὡστε 1²¹.

Infinitive with Article: 4¹⁷ ο καιρος του αρξασθαι, 3⁷ εἰς το μη εγκοπτεςθαι τας προσευχὰς υμων, 4² εἰς το μηκετι βιώσαι, 3¹⁰ παυσατω την γλώσσαν ἀπο κακου και χείλη του μη λαλήσαι δολον, where the genitive implies purpose, as in Mt. 13³ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων του σπείρειν, see Blass, pp. 284 f.

Infinitive as subject without article: 3¹⁷ κρειττον ἀγαθοποιουντας πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιουντας.

Participle used for Imperative 2¹⁸ (following imperative τιματε in v. 17) οἱ οἰκεται υποτασσομενοι τοις δεσποταις, 3¹ ομοίως γυναικες υποτασσομεναι τοις ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (no imperative in the preceding eight verses); 3⁷ (following imperative εστω in v. 3) οἱ ἄνδρες ομοίως συνοικουντες κατα γνωσιν, 3⁹ μη ἀποδιδόντες κακου, 4⁸ (after νηψατε in v. 7) προ πάντων δε την εἰς εαυτους ἀγάπην εκτενῆ εχοντες.

The adjective is sometimes used for a participle, as in 3¹⁵ τον Χριστον ἀγιάσατε ετοιμοι (οντες) προς ἀπολογίαν, 4⁷⁻⁹ νηψατε . . . τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ εχοντες . . . φιλοξενοι (οντες) εἰς ἀλλήλους, and thus gains an imperative force in 3^{8,9} το δε τέλος παντες ὁμόφρονες συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, ευσπλαγχοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μη ἀποδιδόντες κακου.

We have a remarkable instance of the combination of the aorist and perfect participle in 2¹⁰ οἳ ποτε ου λαος, νυν δε λαος Θεου, οἳ οὐκ ἠλεημενοι, νυν δε ἐλεηθεντες, where it might seem, on a first glance, that the perfect, that is, the completed present, should have gone with νυν; only that νυν is joined with the aorist in two other passages of 1 P., viz. 1¹², 2²⁵. 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 teuse is that between the long antecedent state and the single event of conversion which ended it,' and he illustrates it from Rom. 11³⁰, ὡσπερ γαρ υμεῖς ποτε ηπειθησατε τω Θεῷ, νυν δε ηλεηθητε. Foi

other instances of the perfect participle used with pluperfect force, see Joh. 2⁹ *οι διακονοι ηδεισαν οι ηντληκοτες*, Acts 18² *ευρων Ιουδαιον . . . προσφατως εληλυθοτα απο της Ιταλιας*, Heb. 2⁹ *τον δε βραχυ παρ' αγγελου ηλλαττωμενον βλεπομεν Ιησουν . . . εστεφανωμενον*, quoted by Winer, p. 430.

VOICES.

Instead of the classical *αγάλλω, -ομαι*, the N.T. has *αγαλλιάω, -ομαι*, the middle being the form in most common use, as in 1 P. 1⁶, 4¹³. In 1⁸ however WH. read *αγαλλιετε χαρα ανεκλαλητω*, and this form occurs also in Lk. 1⁴⁷, Apoc. 19⁷. Perhaps the distinction which I have drawn between *αίτειν* and *αίτείσθαι* in James 4³ 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 *ἐπικαλειν* is used in the N.T. in the sense of 'to call by name,' as in Mt. 10²⁵ *ει τον οικοδεσποτην Βεελζεβουλ επεκαλεσαν*, the middle in the sense 'invoke,' as in 1 P. 1¹⁷ *ει πατερα επικαλεισθε τον απροσωπολημπτως κρινοντα* 'if ye invoke as Father,' or, as Dr. Bigg prefers, 'invoke the Father,' *πατηρ* being frequently anarthrous; cf. 3¹⁵ *Κυριον δε τον Χριστον αγιασατε*. The active *λυτρωω* is not found in the N.T., the middle being used in the sense 'to ransom,' Lk. 24²¹, Tit. 2¹⁴. The passive *ελυτρωθητε* is used in 1 P. 1¹⁸ in the sense 'were ransomed.' Similarly the middle *ευαγγελίζομαι* (very rarely the active *ευαγγελίζω*) is used with the accusative either of the thing or the person, in the sense to 'preach good tidings to,' as in 1 P. 1¹² *οι ευαγγελισαμενοι ημας*, and the passive is used of the word preached in 1 P. 1²⁵, 4⁶. Another passive of a deponent verb is *ιάθητε* 1 P. 2²⁴. The verb *επιστρέφω* bears the same sense 'to turn' or 'to be converted' in the active (2 P. 2²²), middle, and passive (1 P. 2²⁵). The passive forms *υποτάγητε* and *ταπεινωθητε* have a middle force in 5^{5,6}.

Two curious uses of the active voice are found in 1 P., one where *περιεχω* might be thought to have a passive force (2⁶) *περιεχει εν γραφη*. The original phrase is *περιέχει η γραφη τουτο* '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 *η περιοχη της γραφης*. In 2²³ we find the unique *παρεδιδου τω κρινοντι*,

where we should have expected *παρεδίδου εαυτον*. We may compare the use of *παρέχω* in Plato *Gorg.* 456 B *ουχι ἐθελοντα ἢ τεμεῖν ἢ καυσαι παρασχεῖν τῷ ἱατρῷ*, 475 D *γενναίως τῷ λόγῳ ὡσπερ ἱατρῷ παρέχων αποκρίνου*, 480 C, *Protag.* 348 A, *Theaet.* 191 A, and the full construction in *Apol.* 33 B *ομοίως καὶ πλουσίῳ καὶ πένητι παρέχω εμαυτον ἐρωταν*.

COMPOUND SENTENCES.

(1) *Substantival Clauses.*

(a) *Direct Statement*, subordinated to verb of saying. 1¹⁶ *γεγραπται [οτι]* Ἄγιοι εσεσθε οτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος, 2⁶ *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ Ἰδοῦ τίθημι λίθον*.

(b) *Indirect Statement*. 1¹² *ἀπεκαλυφθη οτι ουχ* εαυτοῖς *διηκουνουν αυτα*, 1¹⁸ *εἰδοτες οτι ου φθαρτοις ελυτρωθητε*, 2³ *εγευσασθε οτι χρηστος ο Κυριος*.

(c) *Indirect Question*. 1¹¹ *ἐραυνῶντες εις τινα καιρον ἐδήλου το πνευμα*.

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

(3) *Adverbial Clauses.*

(a) *Causal Clause*, introduced by *διοτι* 1¹⁶, 2⁴, 2⁶, by *οτι* 2¹⁵, 2²¹, 3⁹, 1², 1⁸, 4¹, 8, 17, 5⁵, 7.

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

(a) 3²⁰ *οτε απεξεδεχετο*, (β) does not occur, (γ) 4¹³ *καθως κουνωνεῖτε χαιρετε*, 5¹² *πιστος, ως λογίζομαι*.

(c) *Final Clause*. After *οπως*, 2⁹ *υμεῖς λαος εις περιποιησιν (εστε)*, *οπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγελίητε*; after *ινα*, 1⁷ *λυπηθέντες . . . ἵνα το δοκίμιον . . . ευρεθη*, 2² *γάλα επιποθήσατε, ἵνα . . . αὐξηθῆτε*, 2¹² *ἀναστροφην εχοντες καλήν, ἵνα δοξάσωσι*, 2²¹ *Χριστος επαθεν . . . ἵνα ἐπακολουθησητε*, 2²⁴ *τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἀνηνεγκεν . . . ἵνα ζήσωμεν*, 3⁹ *εις τουτο εκληθητε, ἵνα κληρονομησητε*, 3¹⁶ *(ἀγιάσατε) . . . ἵνα καταισχυθῶσιν*, 3¹⁸ *ἀπεθανεν . . . ἵνα ημᾶς προσαγάγη*, 4⁶ *εις τουτο ευηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν*, 4¹¹ *(διακονεῖτω) ὡς ἐξ ἰσχυος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεος, ἵνα δοξάζεται ὁ Θεος*, 4¹³ *παθήμασιν χαιρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλυψῇ χαρῆτε*, 5⁶ *ταπεινωθητε . . . ἵνα ὑμᾶς υψώση*. It will be noticed that in all these cases *ἵνα* is followed by the subjunctive, even though the principal verb may

be in the past, the final optative never occurring in the N.T. In 3¹ *ἵνα* is followed by the future indicative *κερδηθήσονται*, as in Aroc. 3⁹ *ποιησω ἵνα ἡξουσιν*, and even in Gal. 2⁴ *οἵτινες παρεισ-ηλθον . . . ἵνα ἡμας καταδουλωσουσιν*. and Acts 21²⁴ *δαπάνησον ἐπ' αυτοῖς ἵνα ξυρησονται την κεφαλην*.

(d) *Conditional Clause.* *εἰ* with present ind. both in protasis and apodosis: 2¹⁹ *τουτο χαρις (ἐστιν), εἰ υποφέρει τις λύπας*, 4¹⁴ *εἰ ονειδίζεσθε μακαριοι (ἐστε)*; with pres. ind. in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 4¹⁷ *εἰ πρῶτον (ἀρχεται) ἀφ' υμῶν τί το τελος (εσται)*; 4¹⁸ *εἰ ὁ δικαιος μολις σωζεται, ὁ ασεβης που φανεται*; pres. ind. in protasis and imperative in apodosis 1¹⁷ *εἰ πατερα επικαλεῖσθε . . . ἐν φόβῳ αναστράφητε*, 4¹⁶ *εἰ δὲ ως Χριστιανος (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνεσθω*; fut. ind. both in protasis and in apodosis, 2²⁰ *ποιου κλέος (εσται), εἰ ἀμαρτάνοντες υπομενειτε*; aor. ind. in protasis, imperative in apodosis, 2³ *εἰ ἐγευσασθε, ἐπιποθήσατε*. With pres. opt. in protasis, pres. ind. (understood) in apodosis, 3¹⁴ *εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε μακαριοι (ἐστε)*, and where the apodosis is dependent on the principal verb as in 3¹⁷ *κρειττον (ἐστιν) ἀγαθοποιουντας, εἰ θελοι το θέλημα του Θεου, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιουντας*. Here if we liberate the dependent clause, we should have, in the classical construction, *εἰ θελοι το θελημα, πάσχοιμεν αν*, which subordinated to *κρειττον εστιν*, becomes *πασχεῖν*. A similar case of dependence is 1⁶ *ολίγον ἄρτι εἰ δεον λυπηθεντες*, where the conditional sentence, if freed from its surroundings, would be *εἰ δεον ἐστί, λυπηθησεσθε*; but the apodosis is subordinated as a participle to the principal verb *ἀγαλλιασθε*.

εάν with subjunctive in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 3¹³ *τις ο κακωσων υμᾶς (εσται), εάν του ἀγαθου ζηλωται γένησθε*;

NEGATIVES.

μή is used with the imperative in 3¹⁴ *μὴ φοβηθητε*, cf. 4^{12, 15, 16}; with participle or adverb in imperatival sentence, as 3⁹ *μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακον*, following *το δε τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες (εστωσαν)*, 1¹⁴ *(ἐλπιστατε) ως μη συνσηματιζομενοι*, 2¹⁶ *ως ελευθεροι καὶ μὴ ως επικαλυμμα εχοντες . . . ἀλλ' ως δουλοι Θεοῦ παντας τιμησατε*, 5² *ποιμάνατε επισκοπουντες μη αναγκαστῶς . . . μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς . . . μηδ' ὡς κατακυριευοντες τῶν κληρῶν*; also with participles where there is no imperative, as in 1⁸ *ὃν ουκ ιδοντες ἀγαπατε, εις ὃν μὴ ὄρωντες, πιστευοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιασθε*, 'whom, not having

seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice' (R.V.), where *ου* denotes a fact, *μή* a concession; 4⁴ ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μη συντρεχόντων υμῶν, where *μη* denotes the cause; 3⁶ ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα . . . μη φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτοήσιν 'if ye are not put in fear' [for the double negative compare Mk. 11¹⁴ μηκετι εκ σου μηδεις καρπον φάγοι]; with infinitive 3⁷ εἰς το μή ἐγκοπτεσθαι, 4² εἰς το μηκετι βιώσαι.

Sometimes we find *ου* where the principal verb is in the imperative as in 1^{22, 23} ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορας φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, 2¹⁸ οἱ οἶκεται ὑποτασσομενοι τοις δεσποταις, οὐ μόνου τοις ἀγαθοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοις σκολιοις, 3³ ὧν ἐστὼ οὐχ ὁ ἐξῶθεν κόσμος . . . ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτος ἀνθρωπος. In these cases *ου* negatives, not the principal verb, but a word or clause dependent upon it. It is also used with a participle in 2¹⁰ οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νυν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, and so with the article or relative, when it simply negatives a fact, as in 2¹⁰ οἱ ποτε οὐ λαος, and 2²² ος ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν.

ου μη is used with the subjunctive in 2⁶ ο πιστευων ου μη κατασχυνθη with the negative sense as in 2 P. 1¹⁰.

OTHER ADVERBS AND PARTICLES.

ἀλλά is generally used to contrast a positive with a negative conception as in 1¹⁵ μή συσχηματιζόμενοι . . . ἀλλά, 1¹⁹ οὐ φθαρτοῖς . . . ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι, 1²³ οὐκ ἐκ σπορας φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, 2¹⁶ μη ὡς ἐπικαλυμμα ἔχοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δούλοι, 2¹⁸ οὐ μόνου . . . ἀλλὰ καί, 3⁴ οὐχ ὁ ἐξῶθεν κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτος, 3²¹ οὐ σαρκος ἀποθεσις . . . ἀλλὰ συνειδησεως ἐπερωτημα, 4² μηκετι ἐπιθυμιας, ἀλλὰ θεληματι Θεοῦ βιώσαι, 4^{12, 13} μη ξενιζεσθε . . . ἀλλὰ χαίρετε, 5^{2, 3} μη ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως, ἰδ. μηδε αἰσχροκερδως, ἀλλὰ προθυμως, μηδε ὡς κατακυριεύοντες . . . ἀλλὰ τυποὶ γινόμενοι. The negative side is less prominent in 2²⁰ ποῖον κλεος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τουτο χαρις, which is equivalent to 'suffering when guilty is not praiseworthy, but suffering when innocent is praiseworthy.' In 3^{13, 14} τις ὁ κακῶσων υμᾶς, εἰ ἐὰν του ἀγαθου ζηλωταὶ γενησθε; ἀλλ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσυνην, μακάριοί (εστε), 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 (τις ὁ κακῶσων), but positive blessedness (μακαριοι). With the contradictory

ουκ—αλλά may be compared the contrasting *μεν—δε*, which is common in the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, and that to the Hebrews, but is not found elsewhere in the N.T. except once in James, thrice in Jude, and in the following passages of 1 P., 1²⁰ (*ελυτρωθητε αιματι Χριστου*) *προεγνωσμένου μεν προ καταβολῆς κοσμου, φανερωθεντος δε ἐπ' εσχατου τῶν χρονων*, 2⁴ *λιθον υπο ανθρωπων μεν αποδεδοκιμασμένου, παρα δε Θεω εκλεκτον*, 2¹ *οἴ ποτε οὐ λαός, νυν δε λαος Θεου, οἱ ουκ ἤληθμενοι, νυν δε ελεθηεντες*, 3¹⁸ *θανατωθεῖς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεῖς δε πνευμασι*, 4⁶ *ἵνα κριθωσι μεν κατα ανθρωπους σαρκι, ζῶσι δε κατα Θεον πνευματι*. Sometimes *μεν* is omitted, as in 1⁷ *χρυσιου του ἀπολλυμένου, δια πυρος δε δοκιμαζομενου*, 2¹⁴ (*πεμπομένοις*) *εἰς εκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, επαινον δε ἀγαθοποιῶν*, cf. Jelf § 767. In 1 P. we, not unfrequently, find *δε* opposed, as a weakened *αλλά*, to a preceding negative as in 1⁸ *εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μη ορωντες, πιστευοντες δε αγαλλιᾶτε*, 1¹² *ουχ εαυτοις, ὑμιν δε διηκονουν*, 2²³ *ουκ ηπειλει, παρεδίδου δε τω κρίνοντι*, 3⁹ *μη ἀποδίδοντες λοιδορίαν, τουναντιον δε εὐλογουντες*, 3^{14, 15} *τὸν φόβον αυτῶν μη φοβηθητε, Κυριον δε τον Χριστον ἀγιάσατε*, 4¹⁶ *μη αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζετω δε τον Θεόν*. Occasional examples may also be found in the Acts 12⁹ *ουκ ἤδει . . . εδοκει δε*, 12¹⁴ *ουκ ἤνοιξε . . . εισδραμουσα δε*, and in some of the Epistles, as Eph. 4²⁸, 5¹¹ *μη . . . μάλλον δε*, but not in 2 Pet. or Jude. *δε και* 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.

που occurs once in 1 P. 4¹⁸ *ο ἀσεβης που φανεται*; where it has the same rhetorical force as in 2 P. 3⁴.

Dr. Bigg has called attention (p. 4) to the 'refined accuracy' of the use of *ως* in 1 P. 1¹⁹ *ως ἀμνου ἀμωμου και ασπιλου Χριστου*, 2¹¹ *παρακαλω ὡς παροικους ἀπεχεσθαι (υμᾶς) τῶν σαρκικων επιθυμιῶν*, 3⁷ *συνοικουντες ως ἀσθενεστέρω σκευει τω γυναικειω (σκευει)*, 2¹⁶ *μη ως επικαλυμμα εχοντες τῆς κακίας την ελευθερίαν*, in all of which the comparison precedes the thing which is compared to it. He illustrates this from Heb. 12⁷ *ως υἱοῖς υμιν προσφερεται ὁ Θεος* and Plato *Legg.* x. 905 B *ως εν κατοπτροισ ταις πράξεσιν*, where Stallbaum quotes *Rep.* iii. 414 E *ως περὶ μητρὸς της χωρας εν ἧ εἰσὶ βουλευεσθαι* and other examples. The more usual order of words is found in 1 P. 2¹² *καταλαλουσιν ἡμῶν ως κακοποιων*. In 4¹² *ως* is used with the gen. abs.

εἴτε—εἴτε is not found in N.T. except in the Epistles of Paul and in 1 P. 2^{13, 14} υποταγητε πάση ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτισει, εἴτε βασιλεῖ . . . εἴτε ηγεμοσιν. The phrase is properly used with a finite verb, as in 2 Cor. 1⁶ εἴτε θλιβομεθα . . . εἴτε παρακαλουμεθα, but the verb is more frequently omitted, both in the N.T. (as in 1 Cor. 3²¹. πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν, εἴτε Παυλος εἴτε Ἀπολλως), and in classical Greek.

ωστε followed by infinitive 1 P. 1²¹, by imperative 4¹⁹ ωστε οἱ πάσχοντες . . . παρατιθεσθωσαν τὰς ψυχας.

ELLIPSIS.

Of verbs. εἶμι: 2²⁰ ποῖον κλεος (ἐστίν), εἰ υπομενεετε; 3¹³ τις ὁ κακῶσων ὑμας (ἐστίν); 3¹⁴ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε μακαριοι (εστε), 4¹⁷ καιρος (ἐστι) του ἄρξασθαι, 4¹⁴ εἰ ονειδίζεσθε μακαριοί (εστε), 3¹² οφθαλμοὶ Κυριου ἐπι δικαίους (εἰσιν), 1³ εὐλογητός (ἐστιν) ὁ Θεος, 2⁹ ὑμεῖς δε γενος ἐκλεκτον (εστε).

Of other verbs. 1¹ Πητρος ἐκλεκτοῖς (χαίρειν λεγει), 4¹¹ εἴ τις λαλει, ὡς λόγια (λαλειτω), εἰ τις διακονει, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχυος ἧς χορηγει ὁ Θεος (διακονεῖτω), 4^{15, 16} μὴ γὰρ τις πασχέτω ὡς φονευς . . . εἰ δε ὡς Χριστιανος (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, 4¹⁷ ὁ καιρός (ἐστιν) του ἄρξασθαι . . . εἰ δε πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν (ἄρχεται) τί το τέλος (ἐσται);

Of noun (subject of infinitive). 2¹¹ παρακαλῶ (ὑμᾶς) ἀπεχεσθαι, (of object) 2²³ παρεδίδου (εαυτον) τω κρίνοντι, 3⁷ ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκευει τω γυναικείῳ (σκευει) ἀπονεμουτες τιμην.

PLEONASM.

3¹⁷ εἰ θελοι το θελημα του Θεου, cf. James 3⁴ οπου η ὁρμὴ του ευθυνοντος βουλεται, 4¹¹ εἰς τους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, cf. Jude v. 25.

ANACOLUTHON.

1 P. 2^{11, 12} ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροικους . . . ἀπεχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν επιθυμιῶν . . . την ἀναστροφην ὑμῶν εχοντες καλην. Here we should have had εχοντας to agree with the (understood) subject of ἀπεχεσθαι; but the periphrastic imperative παρακαλῶ ἀπεχεσθαι suggests the simple imperative ἀπεχεσθε, just as in 2 P. 3¹⁻³ the periphrastic διεγείρω ὑμῶν την διάνοιαν μνησθῆναι suggests the simple μνησθητε and is followed by the nominative γινωσκοντες.

Asyndeton, confirmatory, 1 P. 5⁸ γρηγορήσατε· ὁ ἀντίδικος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν, where some MSS. insert *οτι*.

REITERATION.¹

As in 2 P. so in 1 P. we find a marked liking for iteration. Thus *αποκαλυπτω* and *αποκαλυψις* occur in 1^{5,7,12,13}, ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δοξῆς in 4¹³, cf. 5¹; *δοκιμιον* and *δοκιμαζομένου* in 1⁷; *δοξα* in 1^{7,11}, *δεδοξασμένη* in 1⁸; *σωτηρια* in 1^{5,9,10}. *ἐξεραυνάω* in 1¹⁰, *ἐραυνάω* in 1¹¹; *αγιος* four times in 1^{15,16}, also in 2^{5,9}; *ἀναστροφή* in 1^{15,18}, 2¹², 3^{1,2,16}. *ἐλπίς* (3), *ἐλπίζω* (2); *ἀναγενναω* (2); *ἁμαρτια* (6); *λογος* (7); *χάρις* (10); *ἀγαθος* (7); *ἄφθαρτος* (3); *ἐποπτεω* (2); *ευαγγελιζομαι* (3); *ιεράτευμα* (2); *κακοποιός* (3); *κρινω* (4); *λιθος* (5); *νηφω* (3); *νεκρός* (4); *ολίγος* (4); *πάσχω* (12); *συνείδησις* (3); *τέλος* (4); *υπακοη* (3); *υποτασσω* (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 1⁶⁻⁹ *εν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε | ὀλίγον ἄρτι | ει δεον | λυπηθεντες | εν ποικιλοις πειρασμοῖς | ἵνα το δοκιμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως | πολυτιμοτερον χρυσιου τοῦ απολλυμενου | δια πυρος δε δοκιμαζομένου | ευρεθῆ | εἰς επαινον καὶ δοξαν καὶ τιμην | εν ἀποκαλυφει Ἰησου Χριστου || ον | ουκ ιδοντες | ἀγαπᾶτε | εις ον | ἄρτι μη ορωντες | πιστευοντες δε | αγαλλιατε | χαρᾷ ανεκλαλητῶ καὶ δεδοξασμενῇ | κομιζομενοι το τελος τῆς πιστεως | σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν ||*. The reader will notice here the repetition of *l* (14), *p* (12), *d* (8), and of the syllables in *απολλυμένου*, *δοκιμαζομένου*, *ἔν*, *εἰς ἔν*, *ιδόντες*, *ορῶντες*, *πιστευοντες*, *ἀγαπατε*, *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.

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 *ωα*, while 1 P. in one place has the future indicative. 2 P. is also more idiomatic in the use of such elliptical forms as *εως ου*, *ἐφ' οσον*, *ἀφ' ἧς*. On the other hand 1 P. shows special elegance in his use of *ως* in comparisons, and emphasizes the contrast between the aorist and the present imperative by coupling *τιμησατε* with *τιματε* in 2⁷.

Nor is 1 P. quite free from the ambiguities and the difficulties which are objected to in 2 P. Compare what is said above as to the relative and its antecedent, the construction of *περιέχω* and *παραδίδωμι*, not to mention phrases such as 2² *το λογικον αδολου γαλα*, 3⁶ *μη φοβουμεναι μηδεμίαν πτοησιw*, 3^{20,21} *διεσωθησαν δι υδατος· ο και υμας αντιτυπον νυν σωζει βαπτισμα, ου σαρκος ἀπόθεσις ρυπου, ἀλλα συνειδησεωσ ἀγαθῆσ ἐπερωτημα εἰσ Θεόν*. In the last I am disposed to agree with Hort that we should read *ὦ* (or else *οὐ*) for the MS. *ο*. 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 *του πιστου ἀδελφου, ως λογιζομαι*, which seems to suggest that the writer was not quite sure how far Silvanus was to be trusted; *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταυτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριw τοῦ Θεου*, 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 εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη 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.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE PETER OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS AND THE PETER OF THE TWO EPISTLES

THE author of 1 P. is steeped, as we have seen, in the Gospel story, which possesses his mind and heart. Almost every sentence he has written calls up in our minds some word or some scene, in which His Master is concerned. No one could say this of 2 P. It may be interesting however to go further and inquire whether the character of Peter as we know it from the Gospels agrees with the character of the author of 1 P., as it is shown in that epistle; because it is perhaps conceivable that 1 P. might have been written by some other disciple who had had Peter's experience and yet was not Peter himself. But is it really conceivable that any other could have shared Peter's very unusual experiences? And looking at the question from the other side, is it consistent with the deep earnestness, the intense affection, and the transparent simplicity of 1 P. that it should be written by one who was not uttering his own genuine experience? In the present day we find no difficulty in supposing that the drama of Job was written by a man who was not Job, and that the book of Wisdom was written by one who was not Solomon, though he claims as his own in chapters 7 and 9 the experiences ascribed to Solomon in the historical books of the O.T. We see nothing to be surprised or shocked at in the appearance of pseudonymous writings of Peter in the second century. Supposing that the evidence should eventually lead us to conclude that what we know as the Second Epistle of St. Peter was one of these pseudonymous writings, would that prove it unworthy to hold a place in our canon? This question will come on for consideration in another

chapter. At present I will only say that, while in my opinion the author is an eminently wise and good man, and the writing itself one that deserves our careful attention, yet the voice does not sound to me like the voice of the author of 1 P., nor does the teaching agree with my idea of a genuine product of the Apostolic age. But though we may feel satisfied that 1 P. is a sufficient guarantee for its own authenticity, still it will be interesting to compare our impressions of the Peter of the Gospels and the Peter of the Epistle; and it seems to me all the more necessary to do this in some detail because the picture given of the former by the latest editor of the Epistles is not, to my mind, in harmony with the facts of the case. Dr. Bigg says (p. 54) that St. Peter 'was a married, uneducated labourer. Such men . . . are tender-hearted but slow. They have seen too much of the hard realities of life to be greatly elated or greatly depressed . . . St. Peter is often spoken of as ardent and impulsive, but our Lord called him Cephas "Rock," and the fiery apostles were James and John. He was often the first to speak, because he was the leader and mouthpiece of the Twelve.' 'We may imagine Peter as a shy, timid, embarrassed man, apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing, not because he was hasty, but because he was not quick.' 'His defect had been want of readiness and decision.'

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

Take first the phrase 'uneducated labourer.' Peter was a fisherman, an occupation fitted beyond all others to call out energy, promptitude, courage, and comradeship, a life full of adventure and vicissitude bringing him into contact with a great variety of races and characters, Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Romans, in fact a life the very opposite to that of our ordinary agricultural labourer. Next as to education. The Jews of that time seem to me to have had a better system of elementary education than we have yet got in England, perhaps better than we shall ever get. Those who lived in the neighbourhood of the Sea of Tiberias had the further

advantage of knowing two languages.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. 5⁸), his walking on the water (Mt. 14^{28¹}), his refusal to allow his Master to wash his feet (Joh. 13⁸), 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. 6⁶⁷), 'Who say ye that I am?' (Mt. 16¹⁶), 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.

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. 1⁴¹) 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. 13⁶, '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 10¹³^t, on hearing the voice 'Rise, Peter, kill and eat,' he breaks out with 'Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean.' But his behaviour to Cornelius shortly afterwards shows how thoroughly he had imbibed the spirit of the words 'What God has cleansed, make not thou common.' His self-confidence is seen in such words as, 'I will lay down my life for thee,' 'Though all men should be offended, yet will not I,' 'Even if I must die with thee, yet will I not deny thee.' Nor was this mere empty boasting. When the armed band of the chief priests appeared, he drew his sword and attacked them. How was it, then, that his courage so soon failed him? We must remember the circumstances of the case. A few days before, Jesus had entered Jerusalem in triumph amid the Hosannas of the multitude. He had spoken mysterious words about the coming of the kingdom of God: he had warned his disciples to provide themselves with swords. But now he bids Peter put up his sword into its sheath: he tells his disciples to leave him alone with the powers of darkness. And at the word they all forsook him and fled, two only venturing to follow at a distance into the Judgment-Hall. Under these circumstances, is it right to regard the denial as proving timidity in Peter? Is Elijah to be called timid because he fled from Jezebel, and was for a brief space inclined to despair of the triumph of right? Both Elijah and Peter were suffering from reaction: the spirit was

willing, but the flesh was weak. It is as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with Peter. But one look of his Master's was sufficient to recall him to himself. His deep repentance was followed by no false shame on his own part, and by no reproaches on the part of his fellow-disciples. He is the one to whom the Magdalene first brings the news of the empty tomb. He and John are the first of the Apostles to visit the tomb. At the sea of Tiberias we find Peter as usual taking the initiative, and the others as usual following, 'I go a fishing,' 'We also go with thee.' Impetuous as ever, on hearing that it was 'the Lord,' who had foretold the miraculous draft of fishes, Peter leaps into the sea and makes his way to Jesus on the shore. One phrase, in our Lord's colloquy with him, suggests his energetic, independent character: 'When thou wast young, thou walkedst whither thou wouldest.' The question about John, which followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquillity and his thought for his friends.

The beginning of the Acts shows Peter in a position of unquestioned authority, even before the day of Pentecost, in regard to the election of Matthias. When he denounces the Jews for having crucified the Holy and Just one (cf. 1 P. 3¹⁸), the Prince of Life (Acts 2^{23, 36}, 3¹³), 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' (3¹⁷), reminding them (as Joseph reminded his brethren in Gen. 45⁵) that God had made use of their evil action to fulfil His eternal purpose declared by the prophets, that Christ should suffer and be raised from the dead and received up into heaven till the time of the restoration of all things. He calls upon them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. He testifies before the Sanhedrin that the miracle done to the impotent man was done in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they, the rulers, had crucified, but whom God had raised from the dead. When the Apostles were charged to keep silence, and when they were brought again before the

Sanhedrin for disobedience, it was Peter who on each occasion answered 'We must obey God rather than men: We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard': 'We are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him' (Acts 4¹⁹, 5²⁹⁻³²).

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. 5¹, Acts 1^{8, 22}, 2³², 3¹⁵, 10³⁹⁻⁴¹). 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.* 5⁴¹ *επορευοντο χαίροντες οτι κατηξιωθησαν υπερ του ονοματος ατιμασθηναι* compared with 1 P. 4¹²⁻¹⁶: and the quotation from Ps. 118²² in Acts 4¹¹ which is repeated in 1 P. 2⁷.

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. 5⁵, 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 *απόθεσις ρυπου* and the *ἐπερωτημα συνειδησεως αγαθης* in baptism (1 P. 3²¹). I have

already referred to the story of Cornelius in Acts 10. Particularly deserving of notice are *v.* 28 *αθεμιτον ἐστιν ανδρὶ Ἰουδαιφ κολλᾶσθαι αλλοφυλω*, compared with 1 P. 4³, the only other passage in the N.T. in which the word *αθεμιτος* occurs; and the succeeding words of the same verse, 'God hath showed to me that I should not call any man common or unclean,' which may be compared with 1 P. 2¹⁷ 'Honour all men.' Again Acts 10³⁴ *ἐπ' αληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι οτι ουκ εστιν προσωπολημπτης ὁ Θεος* may be compared with 1 P. 1¹⁷ *εὶ πατερα επικαλεισθε τον απροσωπολημπτως κρινοντα κατα το εκαστου εργον*; and 10⁴² 'This is he which is ordained of God to be judge of quick and dead' with 1 P. 4⁵ *αποδωσουσιν λογον τω ετοιμως εχοντι κρῖναι ζωντας και νεκρους*. The phrase *ἰσοτιμον πίστιν* in 2 P. 1¹ may be illustrated by Acts 10⁴⁷ 'Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' also with 11^{12, 17, 15⁹}. 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 *χαρις* used by Peter. It was no doubt borrowed by him from Paul, and occurs frequently in 1 P. The view of the Law as a yoke is also Pauline, and agrees with the absence of any mention of law in either epistle, but is hardly reconcilable with the description of Peter as a disciplinarian.

To these references in the Acts we must add one from Gal. 2¹¹ foll. Shortly after the meeting of the Council at Jerusalem, Peter was staying at Antioch, mixing freely with the Gentile converts and sharing their meals; but when certain members of the Jewish Church came there, professing to speak with the authority of James, Peter with the other Jews, including even Barnabas, separated himself from the Gentiles 'fearing them that were of the circumcision,' and was severely rebuked by Paul for dissembling his real views. There can be little doubt that Paul was in the right here; yet there was no surrender of essentials on the part of Peter. There was nothing in his action here to contradict his declaration that God made no difference between Jew and Gentile, both being alike saved by faith, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. His fault was that he failed to see the full

consequence of this acknowledgment. Probably he regarded the eating with Gentiles as a question of expediency, and endeavoured to decide it by acting on the Pauline principle of becoming all things to all men. If Paul was ready to abstain from meat for fear of offending the weak brother, was it so very wrong of Peter to abstain from eating with Gentiles for fear of hurting the conscience of the Jewish converts?

To sum up again the main features of St. Peter's character, as they are presented to us in the rest of the N.T. We have seen that he is distinguished from all the Apostles by his simplicity and naturalness and by the strong and ardent feeling, which shows itself especially in his intense affection for his Master. How does this agree with what we gather from the two Epistles? We should expect that the writing of such a man would be characterized by a natural and simple eloquence, not entering into elaborate arguments, as St. Paul does, but appealing throughout to the hearts of his readers, dwelling upon the salvation wrought by Christ, and holding up before them His life as the example which they should follow. This is exactly what, it seems to me, we find in 1 P. His mind is fixed on the sufferings of Christ: they form the subject of prophecy (1¹¹); it is through them that the Christians to whom he writes were redeemed from their vain manner of life handed down from their fathers (1¹⁹); servants are to suffer patiently because Christ suffered for them, without reviling or threatening (2²¹⁻²⁴); 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 (4¹); we should rejoice if we are partakers of His sufferings (4¹³); 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 (5¹⁻³). 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 (1⁵⁻⁸). 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, αγαλλιάω*); instead of it we are urged to aim at knowledge and further knowledge of God and Christ (*γνώσις* and *ἐπίγνωσις*), while in 1 P. *γνώσις* alone is used, and that only once in

3⁷, 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 2¹⁰⁻¹³. 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 (1³); his reference to the joy unspeakable and full of glory, produced by the consciousness that they were already receiving the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls (1⁸); his earnest warning to his readers to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things is at hand (4⁷), 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 3¹³, 'according to his promise we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' and again in 3¹⁸, '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' (5¹). 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,

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 reuicitur*. 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 *εγραψεν επιστολην, ολιγοστιχου μέν, πεπληρωμένην δε τών της ουρανιου χαριτος έρρωμένων λογων*. In the same treatise (xvii. 30) he quotes Jude 6, adding words which signify that it was not universally received, *ει δε και την 'Ιουδα προσοιτο*

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

τις ἐπιστολην. 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, διδασκαλικωτατα ἐκτίθεται τας εἰκονας τῶν κρινομενων. 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 μη τηρησαντας την εαυτων αρχην. (Of the angels some) ἔμειναν ἐφ’ οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν καὶ διαταξεν ὁ Θεος, οἱ δὲ ἐνυβρισαν καὶ τῆ της ουσιας υποστάσει 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 ελεος καὶ εἰρηνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθειη 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 οὐς μὲν ἐλεγξεις, περὶ δὲ ὧν προσευξῆ, 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

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 λεγόμενη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολογῆται ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ παλαί πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλεκτῶ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακεχρημέναι συγγράμμασι. τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρελήφαμεν, ὁμῶς δὲ πολλοὶς χρήσιμος φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδασθῆ γραφῶν. τὸ γὰρ μὴ τῶν ἐπιτεκμημένων αὐτοῦ Πράξεων καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ὠνομασμένου Ἐυαγγελίου, τὸ τε λεγόμενον Κηρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκαλυψιν οὐδ' ὁλῶς ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταις ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, ὡν μίαν μόνην γνησίαν ἐγνων 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 (1³) *ἰδία δοξὴ καὶ ἀρετῇ* as from the Catholic Epistles; and (1⁴) *θείας κοινωνοῦ φύσεως* in

¹ In his note Westcott gives examples (α) of 'Differences from the general renderings' of the Vulgate: *κοινωνός* †*consors* (1⁴); *ἐγκρατεία* †*abstinentia* (1⁶); *ἀρχαῖος* †*originalis* 2⁵. (β) 'Differences from renderings in 1 Peter: *πληθύνεσθαι* *adimpleri* (1²), *multiplicari* (1 P. 1²); *ἐπιθυμία* *concupiscentia* (1⁴, 2¹⁰, 3³), *desiderium* (1 P. 1¹⁴, 2¹¹, 4^{2,3}) and in 2 P. 2¹⁸; *τηρεῖν* *reservare* (2^{4,9,17}, 3⁷), *conservare* (1 P. 4³). (γ) Differences from the translation of Jude, *ἄλογος* †*irrationalis* (2¹²), *mutus* (J. 10); *φθίρεσθαι* *perire* (2¹²), *corrumpi* (J. 10); *συνευχεῖσθαι* *luxuriare vobiscum* (2¹³), *convivari* (J. 12); *δόξαι* *sectae* (2¹⁰), *majestates* (J. 8); *ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους* *caligo tenebrarum* (2¹⁷), *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.

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^{10t}, 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. 3¹⁵ by name, and in p. 291 refers to 2 P. 2¹⁹.

Methodius, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the third century quotes from 2 P. 3⁸ in a fragment of his *de Resurrectione* cited by Dr. Chase (*Hastings’ D. of B.* p. 804) χίλια δε ετη τῆς βασιλείας ωνομασεν, τον απεραντον αιωνα δια τῆς χιλιαδος δηλων. γέγραφεν γαρ ὁ αποστολος Πέτρος ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρα Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ετη καὶ χίλια ετη ὡς ἡμερα 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 execrati 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 ἐπιστολήν ομολογουμένην καταλείπειν· ἐστὼ δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γὰρ. There are several references to 2 P. in the Latin translation of Origen, which are thought doubtful by Dr. Chase and others, because of the license elsewhere taken by the translator, Rufinus. Westcott however notes that some of these passages are very characteristic of Origen, especially the allegorical use made of the fall of Jericho before the blasts of the trumpets (*Hom. in Jos.*

vii. 1, Lomm, xi. 62): Dominus noster mittit sacerdotes, Apostolos suos, portantes tubas . . . Sacerdotali tuba primus in Evangelio suo Matthaeus increpuit . . . Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis. Jacobus quoque et Judas . . . Novissime autem ille veniens, qui dixit "puto autem nos Deus novissimos Apostolos ostendit," et in 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 οδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας as taken from 2 P. 2²; *Str.* i. p. 374 σαρκὸς ἀποθεσις (cf. *ib.* iv. 636 τελειὸς καθαρισμὸς . . . ἡ δι' ὑπακοῆς πάσης ἀγνεία συν καὶ τῇ ἀποθροῦσι των κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν . . . εὐχαριστοῦ του σκηνοῦς ἀποδοσιν) as taken from 2 P. 1¹⁴ ἡ ἀποθεσις του σκηνοματος μου; *Raed.* iii. p. 280 ἑνὸς δε ὑποδείγματος μνησθησομαι . . . το Σοδομιτων πάθος κρίσις μεν ἀδικήσασι, παιδαγωγία δὲ ακουσασι. As Clement quotes Jude by name in the following §§, it might be supposed that the reference here was to Jude v. 7, Σόδομα καὶ Γομορρα . . . προκεινται δειγμα πυρος αἰώνιου, but there is a much closer resemblance to 2 P. 2⁶ πολεὶς Σοδομων καὶ Γομόρρας . . . κατεκρινεν, υποδειγμα μελλοντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, καὶ δίκαιον Ἄωτ καταπονουμενον ἐρυσάτο κ.τ.λ. *Ecl. Proph.* 20 ἀγοράζει δε ημᾶς Κυριος τιμίῳ αἵματι, δεσποτων πάλαι τῶν πικρῶν ἀπαλλάσσων ἀμαρτιων is like 2 P. 2¹ τον ἀγοράσαντα αυτοὺς δεσποτην ἀρνούμενοι and 1 P. 1¹⁹ ελυτρωθητε . . . τιμω αιματι; *Str.* ii. p. 458 βασανίζων δε ἔφοις ημαρτεν τὴν εαυτου ψυχὴν ἀγαθοεργει like 2 P. 2⁸ ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις εργοις 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 δυναμις*, *θεια φυσις*, *θεία ἀρετη* 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 διὰ τε τῆς προφητειας διὰ τε τῆς παρουσίας τῷ μη ψευδομενω Θεῷ . . . καὶ το τέλος τῆς επαγγελίας βεβαιῶς κατέληφεν· ὁ δε τὴν εν οἷς ἐστι καταστασιν βεβαίαν κατάληψιν εἰδως δι' ἀγάπης προσπαντα τῷ

μελλοντι, 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. 1¹⁶⁻¹⁹ ἐγνωρίσαμεν υμιν την του κυρίου ημων δυναμιν και παρουσιαν. . . και ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τον προφητικον λόγον, κ.τ.λ. There seems to be an allusion to the same passage in *Str.* v. 663, ἡ μιν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ εκ τῆς θρυαλλιδος εοικεν λαμπηδουι, ἣν ἀνάπτουσιν ἄνθρωποι παρα ἡλίου κλεπτοντες εντεχνως το φως· κηρυχθεντος δε του λογου παν ἐκεινο το ἅγιον εξελαμψεν, where philosophy is compared (like prophecy in 2 P. 1¹⁹) to the light of a candle which disappears before the sun. The latter part of the verse, εως ου ημερα διαυγάση και φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη εν ταις καρδίαις υμῶν, 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 του ἀνθρωπου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, το φως. The words εωσφόρος 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 1⁴ ἵνα γενησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φυσεως, which is often referred to by Didymus.

There appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1¹³ in Eus. *H.E.* iii. 31 Παυλου και Πητρου . . . τῆς μετα την απαλλαγην του βιου τῶν σκηνωματων ἀποθεςεως ὁ χῶρος δεδηλωται, and *H.E.* ii. 25, speaking of the site where τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστολων τα ιερα σκηνωματα κατατεθειται. In the same writer's *c. Hieroclem.* c. 4 there seems to be an allusion to 2 P. 1³ του καλεσαντος ημας ἰδία δοξη και ἀρετῇ in the words τη ἰδία θεοτητι τε και ἀρετῇ πᾶσαν εσωσε την οἰκουμενην; and the same treatise abounds in such phrases as θεία δυναμεις, φυσεις, ἀρετη (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) οὐδὲ προς μεν ωραν αἰδουμενοι και υπο τῆς ἀληθειας συναγομενοι (? συνεχομενοι) ωμολογουν, μετ ου πολὺ δε επι τον αυτον βόρβορον ἀνεκυλιοντο, cf. 2 P. 2²² and Clem. Al. *Prot.* p. 75 οἱ δε περι τελματα και βορβόρους, τὰ ηδουῆς ρευματα, καλυπνουμενοι ἀνονητους εκβοσκονται τροφάς, υωδεις τινες ανθρωποι. ὕες γαρ, φησίν, ηδονται βορβορω μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρῳ ὕδατι. Hippol. x. 34 μη προσεχοντες σοφίσμασιν εντεχνων λογων μηδε ματαίοις ἐπαγγελίαις κλεψιλογων

αιρεσεων, ἀλλ' ἀληθείας ακομπου απλοτητι σεμνή, δι' ἧς ἐπιγνωσεως ἐκφευξεσθε επερχομενην πυρος κρισεως απειλην καὶ ταρτάρου ζοφερου ομμα ἀφωτιστον, cf. 2 P. 1¹⁶, 2^{4,17}. *In Dan.* iii. 22, ὦ γαρ ἄν τις υποταγῆ, τουτω δεδουλωται, cf. 2 P. 2¹⁹. *De Antichristo* 2 ου γαρ εξ ιδιας δυναμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, ουδε ἄπερ αυτοὶ ἐβουλοντο ταυτα εκηρυττον, ἀλλὰ . . . ελεγον ταυτα ἄπερ αυτοῖς ην μόνοις υπο του Θεου ἀποκεκρυμμενα, cf. 2 P. 1^{20, 21}.

Clementine Literature. *Recognitiones* v. 12 unusquisque illius fit servus cui se ipse subiecerit, cf. 2 P. 2¹⁹. *Homiliae, Epist. Clem.* 2 ἐπει, ως εδιδάχθην ἀπο του με ἀποστείλαντος κυρίου τε καὶ διδασκαλου Ἰησου Χριστου, αἱ του θανάτου μου ηγγίκασι ημεραι Κλήμεντα τουτον επίσκοπον υμιν χειροτονῶ, cf. 2 P. 1¹⁴. So, in *Ep. Petri ad Jac.* 2, St. Peter complains that his own writings were misinterpreted, and in § 2 prays "να του τῆς ἀληθείας κανονα παραδῶσιν, ερμηνευοντες τα πάντα προς την παράδοσιν ἡμῶν καὶ μη αυτοὶ υπο ἀμαθιας κατασπωμενοι ἄλλους εἰς τον ομοιον τῆς απωλειας ἐνεγκωσι βοθυνον, cf. 2 P. 3¹⁶ α οἱ ἀμαθεις στρεβλουσιν προς την ιδίαν ἀπωλειαν.

Apocalypsis Pauli 13 τας τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλων ἐξόδους; 15 θεωρησον την ψυχην του ἀσεβους πῶς ἐξερχεται εκ του σκηνωματος αυτῆς, cf. 2 P. 1^{14,15}; 18 παραδοθήτω ἡ ψυχη αυτη ταρταρουχω ἀγγέλω καὶ φυλαττέσθω εως της μεγάλης ημερας τῆς κρισεως, cf. 2 P. 2⁹, 3⁷, 2⁴; 4 ἡ μακροθυμια μου πάντων τουτων ἀνέχεται οπως μετανοησουσιν, cf. 2 P. 3⁹.

Irenaeus (*fl.* 180) iii. 1. 1, μετὰ την τουτων (i.e. Peter and Paul) ἐξοδον Μάρκος τα υπο Πετρου κηρυσσομενα ἐγγραφως ἡμῖν παραδεδωκε, cf. 2 P. 1¹⁵; iv. 36 Noe juste diluvium inducens, cf. 2 P. 2⁴ κατακλυσμον ἐπαξας. Irenaeus has the same adaptation of Ps. 90⁴ χιλια ετη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ως η ἡμερα ἡ ἐχθες, as we find in 2 P. 3⁸ μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυριω ως χιλια ετη, 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.) συνηκαμεν καὶ το εἶρημενον οτι Ἡμερα Κυριου ὡς χιλια ετη, which has, with him, the same double application as with Irenaeus. So Barnabas (xv. 4) commenting on

Gen. 2² συνετελεσεν ὁ Θεος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, explains it as meaning that ἐν ἑξακισχιλίους ἔτεσιν συντελεσεὶ Κύριος τὰ συμπάντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη· αὐτὸς δὲ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λεγὼν· Ἴδου σημερον ἡμέρα ἐστὶν 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 *τον καιρον τουτον*, 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. 90⁴; 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. 3⁸ 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. 1¹⁹ in the words ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὡσπερ λυχνος ἐν οἰκηματι συνεχομενω ἐφωτισεν τὴν ὑπ οὐρανον; while ii. 9 οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι, πνευματοφοροὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφηταὶ γενομενοὶ, ὑπ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδιδάκτοι, and ii. 33 ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου διδασκόμεθα τοῦ λαλησαντος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις προφηταῖς remind us of 2 P. 1²¹.

Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 51) ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ('in the interval before His Second Coming') γενησεσθαι αἵρεσεις (MS. ἱερεῖς) καὶ ψευδοπροφῆτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε, (*ib.* 82) οὐπερ δὲ τροπὸν καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐπὶ τῶν παρ ὑμῖν γενομενων ἁγίων προφητῶν ἦσαν, καὶ παρ ἡμῖν νυν πολλοὶ εἰσι καὶ ψευδοδιδασκαλοὶ remind us of 2 P. 2¹ ἐγενοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.

Heracleon (*c.* 130) *ap. Orig. in Joh.* tom. 13, τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἀνωθεν ἐπιχορηγοῦμενου πλουσίως καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκβλῦσαι εἰς τὴν ἑτερον αἰώνιον ζωὴν τὸ ἐπιχορηγοῦμενον αὐτοῖς, *cf.* 2 P. 1¹¹ οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος.

Aristides (c. 130) *Apol.* xvi. ἡ οδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἣτις τοὺς ὀδονοῦντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, cf. 2 P 1,¹¹ 2².

Epistle of the Gallic Churches (A.D. 177), *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* v. 1, p. 24, Hein. ὁ δια μέσου καιροῦ οὐκ ἀργὸς οὐδὲ ἀκαρπὸς ἐγένετο, cf. 2 P. 1⁸.

Polycarp *Ep. ad Phil.* 3 κατακολουθήσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου, cf. 2 P. 3¹⁶.

2 Clem. Rom. (c. 150) 11 (a quotation from a προφητικὸς λόγος) ταῦτα πάντα ἤκουσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἕξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἐωρακάμεν, cf. 2 P. 1¹⁹, 2,⁸ 3⁴; *ib.* 16 ἐρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος, καὶ τακησονται αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πασα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλυβδος τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανησεται τὰ κρυφία καὶ φανερα ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Cf. 2 P. 3^{7,10,12}.

Hermas (c. 140) *Vis.* iii. 8 ἐκ τῆς πίστεως γενναταὶ ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἀπλοτης, ἐκ τῆς . . . ἐπιστημῆς ἀγάπη; a similar climax occurs in *Mand.* v. 2. 4, cf. 2 P. 1⁵ ἐν τῇ πίστει τὴν ἀρετὴν, κ.τ.λ.; *Mand.* xi. 12 ὁ δοκῶν πνεῦμα ἔχειν νυφοῖ εαυτὸν καὶ ἀναιδὴς ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς ἀναστρεφόμενος καὶ ἐν ἑτεραῖς πολλαῖς ἀπάταις, καὶ μισθοὺς λαμβάνει τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 2¹³.

Clement of Rome 9 τελειῶς λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ ἁδοξῇ αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 1¹⁷. *Ib.* 35 ἀγωνισώμεθα εὐρεθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν υπομενουμένων αὐτοῦ, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπιγεγελεμένων δωρεῶν. πῶς δὲ ἐστὶ τούτο, ἀγαπητοί; εἰ ἐστηριγμένη ἡ ἡ διάνοια ὑμῶν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν . . . εἰ ἐπιτελέσωμεν τὰ ἀνηκουστά τῇ ἀμωμῇ βουλήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. 2 P. 3¹⁴ 1^{4,12} 2². *Ib.* 27 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δυνατὰ αὐτὰ καταστρεφῆναι, cf. 2 P. 3⁵⁻⁷. *Ib.* 23 πορρωγενεσθῶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφή αὐτοῦ λέγει Ταλαίπωροι εἰσιν . . . οἱ λεγοντες, Ταῦτα ἤκουσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηρακάμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβεβηκεν, cf. 2 P. 3⁴ and 2 Clem. Rom. 11 quoted above.

INTRODUCTION

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 φανείσα μετα τῶν ἄλλων εσπουδάσθη 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.

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

¹ It is, I think, from not making due allowance for the judgments and practices of a different age that some modern writers have argued in favour of the genuineness of 2 P. on the ground that, if it is not genuine, the author must have been guilty of deliberate forgery in claiming to have witnessed the Transfiguration. As I have said elsewhere, he is in this only following the example of the author of the Book of Wisdom, who writes throughout in the character of Solomon and professes to have gone through the experiences of Solomon. In the same way the author of the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter says §60 ἐγὼ δε Σίμων Πητρος καὶ Ἀνδρεας ὁ ἀδελφός μου λαβόντες τα λῖνα ἀπῆλθομεν 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 ἐνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν . . . τῶν ἐξεληθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποὶ εἶσι 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* xcvi.) 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.

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 1¹⁵ 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 2⁵ 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 Νωε ἔσωσά σε, he goes on to explain that το μυστηριον των σωζομένων ἀνθρωπων ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμου γεγονεν . . . those that were saved being eight in number συμβολον εἶχον τῆς ἀριθμῶ μεν ογδοης ημερας εν ἣ ἐφάνη ὁ Χριστος ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστας . . . δι' ὕδατος καὶ πιστεως καὶ ξυλου οἱ μετανοουντες ἐφ' οἷς ημαρτον εκφευξονται την μέλλουσαν κρίσιν. And so Irenaeus (i. 18. 3) in his account of the heresy of Marcus says την τῆς κιβωτου οικονομίαν εν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ εν ἡ οκτῷ ἀνθρωποι διεσωθησαν φανερωτατα φασι την σωτηριον ογδοάδα μνηνειν. It would however naturally form a subject for discussion, as soon as the Christians were called on to show a reason for their observance of the Lord's day as possessing a superior holiness to the Jewish Sabbath; so I think we may fairly leave this point out of consideration. In my note on 2⁶ I have suggested that the author may have been indebted to Pliny for his description of the overthrow of Sodom, τεφρωσας καταστροφῇ κατεκρινεν. If so, it must have been written after 80 A.D. In my note on 3² I have assumed that the writer is included in τῶν ἀποστολων υμων, 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. 3⁸ and with the passage in Ps. 90 (from which it was derived by later Christians), proves the early date of the Epistle; but we learn from Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 80) that there were many orthodox believers in his time who refused to accept it.

In my note on 3¹⁶ I have argued that the phrase τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς must mean 'the remaining scriptures,' which assumes the

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

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 *Θεοφυσιν*¹ *κατανοῆσαι.* From this point it will be more convenient to quote the Greek, *καὶ τῶν ἐργῶν τῶν ἐκείνου θεατὴν τῶν γενομένων οὕτως παράδειγμα τοῦ παντῶν ἀριστοῦ μιμῆσθαι . . . οὐτε γὰρ αὐτῷ ποτ' ἀνγενεσθαι νοῦν ἀγαθὸν τῶν νομοθετησάντων ἀπολειπομένων τῆς θεᾶς, οὐτε τῶν γραφῆσομένων εἰς ἀρετῆς² λόγον οὐδὲν ἀποβῆσθαι τοῖς λαβούσιν, εἰ μὴ προπαντός ἄλλου διδάχθαι, ὅτι παντῶν πατήρ τε καὶ δεσποτῆς ὁ Θεὸς ὢν καὶ πάντα ἐπιβλεπὼν τοῖς μὲν ἔπομενοις αὐτῷ δίδωσιν εὐδαίμονα βίον, τοὺς ἐξω δὲ βαινόντας ἀρετῆς μεγάλας περιβάλλει συμφοραῖς. τοῦτο δὲ παιδεύσαι βουληθεὶς Μωσῆς τὸ παιδεύμα τοῦ εαυτοῦ πολίτας, τῆς τῶν νομῶν θεσεως οὐκ ἀποσυμβολαίων καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαίων ἡρξάτο τοῖς ἄλλοις παραπλησίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευὴν τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν ἀναγαγὼν καὶ πείσας, ὅτι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλλίστον ἐσμὲν ἄνθρωποι, ὅτε πρὸς τὴν εὐσεβείαν³ ἐσχέον ὑπακούοντας, ῥαδίως ἤδη περὶ παντῶν ἐπειθεν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθετοῦσι τοῖς μυθοῖς⁴ ἕξ ακολοῦθησαν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν λόγων τὴν αἰσχύνην μετεθεσαν καὶ πολλὴν ὑποτιμήσιν τοῖς πονηροῖς ἔδωκαν· ὁ δ' ἡμετέρος νομοθετῆς ἀκραιφνῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐχούσα τὸν Θεόν⁵ ἀποφῆνας ὡς δεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνης πειρασθαι μεταλαμβάνειν, καὶ τοὺς μὴ ταῦτα φρονούντας μὴδὲ μὴ πιστεύοντας ἀπαραιτητῶς ἐκόλασε.⁶ πρὸς ταύτην οὖν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ποιῆσθαι τὴν ἐξετάσιν τοῦ ἀναγνωσόμενου παρακαλῶ· φανείτω γὰρ σκοπούμενοις οὕτως οὐδὲν οὐτ' ἄλογον αὐτοῖς οὐτε πρὸς τὴν μεγαλειότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ⁷ καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἀνάρμοστον.*

The connexion between this passage of Josephus⁸ and our epistle does not seem quite so close as has been suggested. The only reason for the reference to natural science in the last chapter of 2 Peter is to meet the objection that the regularity and unchangeableness of the course of nature forbade the expectation of a great Day of Judgment. The author endeavours to disprove

¹ 2 P. 14.² 2 P. 13.³ 2 P. 16.⁴ 2 P. 116.⁵ 2 P. 13⁶ 2 P. 29.⁷ 2 P. 116.

⁸ Notice also the repetition of the words *σπουδή* (twice) and *σπουδαῖω* (thrice) in the preceding sections of Josephus, together with the words *δεσπότης*, *ευσέβεια*, and *ψευδῆ πλασματα*,

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 τοιάδε¹ ἄνδρες . . . τῆς μακρας κοινωνοῖ² ταλαιπωρίας, ἐπεὶ . . . χρόνον ἔτων εἴκοσι καὶ εκατον ηἠυσμενον δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν,³ καὶ . . . οὐ μελλω⁴ βοηθος ὑμῖν εσεσθαι . . . δίκαιον⁵ ἡγησάμην μηδε νυν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τοῦμον ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας ευδαιμονίας. προθυμον, ἀλλ' αἰδῖον πραγματευσασθαι . . . μνημην⁶ εμαυτω . . . μήτε νομιμῶν των παροντων⁷ ἄλλην προτιμησητε διάταξιν μητ εὐσεβείας,⁸ ἧς νυν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εχετε (*al.* εχοντες), καταφρονησαντες⁹ εἰς ἄλλον μεταστήσησθε τροπον. ταυτα δε πράττοντες εσεσθε . . . μηδενὶ των ἐχθρων ευάλωτοι¹⁰ . . . ὧν (*sc.* Eleazar and Joshua) ἀκροασθε μη χαλεπως, γινώσκοντες οτι πάντες οἱ ἄρχεσθαι καλῶς εἶδοτες¹¹ καὶ ἄρχειν εισονται . . . την τελευθερίαν¹² ἡγεισθε¹³ μη το προσαγανακτεῖν οἷς αν υμας οἱ ἡγεμόνες πράττειν ἀξιῶσι . . . ταυτα δ' ουκ ονειδίζειν υμας προεθεμην, ου γαρ ἐπ' ἐξοδου¹⁴ τοῦ ζῆν δυσχεραίνοντας καταλιπεῖν ηξιουν εἰς την ἀνάμνησιν¹⁵ φερων . . . βεβαια¹⁶ γαρ αν οὔτως ὑμῖν υπάρξειεν η τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀσφάλεια· να δε μὴ δι' ἀμαθίαν¹⁷ η φυσις υμῶν προσ το χειρον απονευση, συνεθηκα υμῖν καὶ νόμους, υπαγορευσαντος μοι τοῦ θεοῦ.¹⁸ In the same treatise xi. 6. 12 we find the phrase οἷς καλως ποιησετε μη προσεχοντες, closely resembling 2 Pet. 1¹⁴ ω καλως ποιειτε προσεχοντες.

Similar resemblances might be quoted from Philo (M. 1. 70) on 2 P. 1¹ ἰσοτιμον αυτο ηγουμενος ψυχῇ, *ib.* M. 1. 165 τον σοφον ἰσοτιμον κοσμῶ, so ἰσοτιμία in M. 1. 160, 2. 86; on ἀρετη Θεου

1 2 P. 1 ¹⁷ .	2 2 P. 1 ⁴ .	3 2 P. 1 ¹⁴ .	4 2 P. 1 ¹³ .	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 .		

(2 P. 1⁹), M. 1. 75, 222, 488, 489, 635; on *θεία φύσις* (2 P. 1⁴), M. 1. 51, 647, 2, 22, 143, 329, 343; on *πλουσιως ἐπιχορηγηθησεται* (2 P. 1¹¹), M. 2. 476; on *τον προφητικον λόγον* (2 P. 1¹⁹), 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 πολιν ἄνωθεν τῆ τῶν προεστώτων αὐτῆς μεγίστων¹ θεῶν [προνοία, Διος Π]ανημε[ρίου καὶ Ἑ]κατῆς, ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ συνεχῶν κινδυνῶν σεσῶσθαι, ὧν καὶ τὰ ἱερά ἄσυλα καὶ ἰκεταὶ καὶ ἡ ἱερά συνκλητος, δογματι Σε[βαστου Καίσαρος ἐπὶ]² τῆς τῶν κυρίων Ῥωμαίων αἰωνίου³ ἀρχῆς, ἐποίησαντο προφανεῖς ἐναργείας· καλῶς δὲ ἐχει πασαν σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεισθαι⁴ εἰς τὴν πρὸς [αὐτοὺς εὐσεβ]εῖαν· καὶ μηδενα καιρὸν παραλιπεῖν τοῦ εὐσεβεῖν καὶ λιτανεῦν αὐτοὺς· καθίδρυται δὲ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῷ σεβαστῷ βουλευτηρίῳ τῶν προειρημενω[ν θεῶν ἐπιφαν]εστάτας παρεχοντα τῆς θείας⁵ δυνάμεως ἀρετας· δι'⁶ ας καὶ τὸ συνπαν πλῆθος θυεῖ τε καὶ ἐπιθυμία ('offers incense') καὶ εὐχεται καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ ἀ[εὶ τοις]δε τοῖς οὕτως ἐπιφανεστάτοις θεοῖς κακ τῆς δι' ὑμνωδίας προσοδου καὶ θρησκείας εὐσεβειν⁷ αὐτοὺς [εἰθίσται]. ἐδοξε 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. 1⁴.

² The words in brackets are Dr. Deissman's conjectural fillings-up of gaps in the inscription.

³ 2 P. 1¹¹.

⁴ 2 P. 17.

⁵ 2 P. 13.

⁶ 2 P. 14.

⁷ 2 P. 16, 3¹¹.

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

Αποκ. § 1. πολλοι εξ αυτων εσονται ψευδοπροφηται (2 Pet. 2¹), *ιβ.* δογματα ποικιλα τῆς απωλειας διδούσουσιν (2 P. 2¹), *ιβ.* κρινει τους υιους τῆς ανομιαις (2 P. 2¹⁴ κατάραις τεκνα), *ιβ.* ταις ψυχαις εαυτων δοκιμάζοντας (2 P. 2⁸). *Αποκ.* § 2. The twelve Apostles having gone up with the Lord εις το ορος (2 P. 1¹⁸) desire to see one of the departed saints in his glorified body, εδεηθημεν οπως δειξη ημιν ενα των αδελφων ημων των δικαίων [των] εξελθοντων απο του κοσμου (2 P. 1¹⁵), "να ιδωμεν ποταποι (2 P. 3¹¹) εισι την μορφήν, και θαρσησαντες παραθαρσυνωμεν και τους ακουοντας ημων. § 3 και ευχομενων ημων α[φνω φαιν]ονται δυο ανδρες εστωτες εμπροσθεν του κυριου προς ε[ω οϊς] ουκ εδυννηθημεν αντιβλεψαι· εξηρχετο γαρ απο τῆς [ο]ψεωσ αυτων ακτιν ωσ ηλιου, και φωτινου ην αυ[των ολον το] ενδυμα. This answers to the account of the Transfiguration in so far as it takes place on a mountain, as it exhibits the glorified bodies of two saints, and so inspires the Apostles with a confidence in the life to come, which they are able to infuse into their hearers (2 P. 1¹⁶ εγνωρισαμεν υμιν, 1¹⁹ εχομεν βεβαιοτερον). 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. 27⁵³ than of the Transfiguration of the Lord. Further resemblances are *Αποκ.* § 6 ειδον και ετερον τον αυχηρον (2 P. 1¹⁹) παννυ, και ην τον κολασεωσ· και οι κολαζομενοι εκει και οι κολάζοντες αγγελοι σκοτινου ειχον αυτων τον ενδυμα κατα τον αερα τον τον (2 P. 2⁹), *ιβ.* (and § 13) οι βλασφημουντες την οδον τῆς δικαιοσυνης, cf. 20 οι αφεντες την οδον του Θεου (2 P. 2²⁻¹⁵⁻²¹). *Αποκ.* § 8 λιμνη πεπληρωμένη βορβορου (also in § 9, *bis*, § 16), *ιβ.* § 15 εκυλιοντο κολαζομενοι (2 P. 2²² and *Acta Thomae* 52 ειδου βορβορον . . . και ψυχαις εκει κυλιομενας). *Αποκ.* § 9 το μίαισμα τῆς μοιχειαις and § 17 μιάναντες τα σώματα εαυτων ωσ γυναικες αναστρεφόμενοι (2 P. 2^{20, 210}). *Αποκ.* § 13 (and § 15) πεπυρωμενος (2 P. 3¹²). *Αποκ.* § 15 αμελησαντες τῆς εντολης του Θεου (2 P. 2^{21, 32}). *Fragm.* 1 η γη παραστησει

πάντας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρα κρισεως καὶ αὐτὴ μελλουσα κρίνεσθαι συν καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι οὐρανῷ. *Fr.* 2 καὶ τακῆσεται πασα δυναμις οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐλιχθήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίου καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται (2 P. 3¹⁰⁻¹²). *Fr.* 5 παρα τοῦ θεσμὸν (ἄθεσμος 2 P. 2⁷, 3¹⁷) τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης φυσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 1⁴). *Ib.* καταφρουνησαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς (2 P. 2¹⁰, 2²¹). *Fr.* 6 δια τας αμαρτίας ἐπράθη ὁ λαός (2 P. 2¹⁹ ὧ τις ἠπτηται, τουτω δεδουλωται). 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 Ἀποκαλυψει 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

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, *τα σωματα αυτων ην λευκοτερα πάσης χιονος και έρυθροτερα παντος ροδου, συνεκεκρατο δε το έρυθρον αυτων τω λευκω, και απλως ου δυναμαι εξηγήσασθαι το κάλλος αυτων· η τε γάρ κομη αυτων ουλη ην και ανθηρα και επιπρεπουσα (επιτρέχουσα?) αυτων τω τε προσωπω και τοις ωμοις, ωσπερ ει στεφανος εκ ναρδοστάχυος πεπλεγμενος και ποικίλων αυθων, η ωσπερ ιρις εν αερι, τοιαυτη ην αυτων η ευπρέπεια.* 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 (*αποστρεφοντες την δικαιοσυνην*). Comparing this list with that in the Apocalypse of St. John (21⁹) 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. 5¹⁹). If the author of 2 Pet. had made out such a list, must he not have mentioned the *αιρεσεις απωλειας* and *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* of 2¹, the *αργία* and *ακαρπία* of 1⁸, the *πλεονεξία* and falsehood of 2³, the proud, the presumptuous, and rebellious of 2¹⁰, the boastful of 2¹⁸, the backsliders of 2²⁰, the mockers of 3³? And there is nothing in our Epistle to suggest that its author would have allowed his fancy to revel in the grotesque ugliness of the tortures depicted in the Apocalypse called by his name. It appears to me therefore very improbable that the author of our Epistle wrote the Apocalypse, and I doubt very much whether he was in any way

indebted to it. On the other hand I think it highly probable that the writer of the Apocalypse was acquainted with our Epistle, and that the phrase *κυλισμος βορβόρου* (2 P. 2²², Ps. 40²), along with the undying worm (Isa. 66²⁴), the darkness (2 P. 2⁴), and the unquenchable fire, formed the substratum of his idea of hell. Thus the worm appears in §§ 10, 12 and *Fr.* 6; the darkness in §§ 6, 12; the fire in §§ 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20; the mire in §§ 8, 9, 11, 16; rolling or wallowing in § 15 *έκυλίοντο επί χαλίκων πεπυρωμένων*; § 10 (murderers) *πλησσομένους υπο ερπετών πονηρών και στρεφομένους εκεί έν τη κολάσει ταυτη*, § 20 *φλεγόμενοι και στρεφομενοι*. 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 gurgēs aestuat*); also that it shows signs of being written under stress of persecution: cf. § 12 *ουτοι ησαν οί διωξαντες τους 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.

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 ἰσοτιμον ἡμῶν λαχοῦσιν πιστῶν*, 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. 5¹², Silvanus. The mention of the latter in that Epistle suggests that Peter may have been induced by him to write to the Christians of a region which, as far as we know, Peter had not personally visited, in addressing whom he might therefore be glad to use the name of Silvanus as an introduction. It is easy to understand why Silvanus should have wished to bring St. Peter's influence to bear on the Churches of Asia Minor, if these, during the long absence of St. Paul, caused by his imprisonments in Caesarea and in Rome, had been led away by Judaizing teachers, who magnified the authority of St. Peter at his expense.¹ These Churches, as we learn from the

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. 1¹², 4¹⁵, Gal. 2, 3,

Acts, were made up of Jews and Gentiles, and the latter are plainly alluded to in 1 P. 1¹⁸, *ἐλυτρωθητε εκ τῆς ματαίας υμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδοτου*. The vague language of 2 P. 1¹ seems to imply a similar division, with an assumption of higher privileges on the part of the Jewish section, which made it necessary to insist on the *ἰσοτιμία* of Jew and Gentile; but the most pressing danger seems to have been one which would probably affect the latter more seriously than the former, viz. the anti-nomianism which professed to rest itself on the authority of Paul (2 P. 3¹⁶). The phrase *ἀποφυγόντες τα μιάσματα του κοσμου* in 2²⁰ seems also more appropriate to Gentile than to Jewish converts.

It has been argued from 1¹⁶, *εγνωρίσαμεν υμιν την του κυρίου ημών δυναμιν και 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 3². It would seem also from 1¹⁶, *ἐποπται γενηθεντες τῆς εκεινου μεγαλειοτητος*, 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. 1⁴ *ταυτα γράφομεν*, Heb. 6³ *ποιήσομεν*, 6⁹ *λαλουμεν*, etc.), and to suppose the writer to refer simply to his own personal experience, though we may still hold, in accordance with 3², 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. 3¹ 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 (1¹⁶ *εγνωρίσαμεν υμιν την του κυρίου ημών Ἰησου Χριστου δυναμιν και παρουσίαν*) and whom he felt bound to be continually reminding of the teaching they had received from the holy prophets, and

of the law of Jesus Christ in which they had been instructed by their Apostles (1¹²⁻¹³, 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. 3¹ has been lost, thus sharing the fate, as Zahn thinks, of hundreds of other letters written by the Apostles. Another of these lost letters he considers to be that of St. Paul, referred to in 2 P. 3¹⁵ *καθως και ο αγαπητος ημων Παυλος εγραψεν υμιν*. I have suggested in my note that the Epistle referred to is that to the Romans, on the ground that *καθως* must be explained by the immediately preceding admonition *την του κυριου ημων μακροθυμιαν σωτηριαν ηγεισθε*, which is more distinctly stated in Rom. 2⁴, 3^{25,26}, 9²² than elsewhere, though we find an echo of it in other Epistles, such as 1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 4¹, 6¹, Eph. 2^{4,8}, 2 Th. 2¹⁶. If this is so, the writer of 2 P. intends us to understand that his letter is addressed to Rome.

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

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

Several thousands of Jews had been uprooted from their native land and transplanted to Rome by Pompeius. In this new soil they had spread rapidly, and now formed a very important element in the population of the metropolis. Living unmolested in a quarter of their own beyond the Tiber, protected and fostered by the earlier Caesars, receiving constant accessions from home, they abounded everywhere, in the forum, in the camp, even in the palace itself. Their growing influence alarmed the moralists and politicians of Rome. 'The vanquished,' said Seneca bitterly, 'have given laws to their victors.' Immediately on his arrival the Apostle summoned to his lodgings the more influential members of his race, probably the rulers of the synagogues. In seeking this interview he seems to have had a double purpose. On the one hand he was anxious to secure their good-will and thus to forestall the calumnies of his enemies; on the other hand he paid respect to their spiritual prerogative by holding out to them the first offer of the Gospel. On their arrival he explained to them the circumstances which had brought him there. To his personal explanations they replied, in real or affected ignorance, that they had received no instructions from Palestine; they had heard no word of him and would gladly listen to his defence; only this they knew, that the

sect of which he professed himself an adherent, had a bad name everywhere. For the exposition of his teaching a day was fixed. When the time arrived, he 'expounded and testified the kingdom of God,' arguing from their scriptures 'from morning till evening.' His success was not greater than with his fellow-countrymen elsewhere. He dismissed them, denouncing their stubborn unbelief and declaring his intention of communicating to the Gentiles that offer which they had spurned. It is not probable that he made any further advances in this direction. He had broken ground and nothing more (pp. 14, 15).

But where he had failed other teachers, who sympathized more fully with their prejudices and made larger concessions to their bigotry, might win a way. The proportion of Jewish converts saluted in the Epistle to the Romans, not less than the obvious motive and bearing of the letter itself, points to the existence of a large, perhaps a preponderating, Jewish element in the Church of the metropolis before St. Paul's arrival. These Christians of the Circumcision for the most part owed no spiritual allegiance to the Apostle of the Gentiles: some of them had confessed Christ before him; many no doubt were rigid in their adherence to the law. It would seem as though St. Paul had long ago been apprehensive of the attitude these Jewish converts might assume towards him. The conciliatory tone of the Epistle to the Romans—conciliatory and yet uncompromising—seems intended to disarm possible opposition. . . . He had good reason to 'thank God and take courage,' when he was met by one deputation of Roman Christians at the Forum of 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. 1¹⁵ 18.

² Col 4¹⁰, 11.

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. 4¹⁰); (4) the reference to Mark in 1 P. 5¹³ *ασπαζεται υμας η εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη και Μάρκος ο υιος 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. 14⁸, 16¹⁹, 17⁵, etc. and also *Orac. Sib.* v. 143, where Nero is described as

*τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης βασιλευς μέγας . . .
ὅστις παμμουσῶ φθογγῶ μελιηδεᾶς ὑμνοῦς
θεατροκοπῶν ἀπολεῖ πολλοὺς συν μητρὶ ταλαινῇ.
φευξεται ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἄναξ φοβερός καὶ ἀναιδὴς,*

and v. 158,

*φλέξει αὐτὴν Βαβυλῶνα
Ἰταλῆς γαίαν θ, ἧς εἰνεκα πολλοὶ ολουτο
Ἑβραίων ἅγιοι πιστοὶ καὶ ναοσ ἀληθῆς.*

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

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

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 (*μαρτυρησάντα*) 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^{22 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^{11–4¹⁶}). If the churches saw the Apostle of the Gentiles and the leader of the Apostles of the Circumcision working together at Rome, they would learn the lesson of the unity of the Church, as they could learn it in no other way. Moreover St. Paul was pledged to distant journeys, so that the Church in Rome would be deprived of his immediate guidance, and as the far-reaching needs of that Church pressed upon him, he might well realize how manifold would be the gain resulting from the presence there of St. Peter. Hence it is probable that St. Peter may have arrived there at St. Paul’s request in the spring of 61. His absence from Rome when St. Paul wrote 2 Tim. we may perhaps explain on the supposition that

¹ What follows is taken chiefly from Chase in *D. of B.* iii. 769 foll.

he had been summoned to Jerusalem in connexion with the appointment of a successor to St. James.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. 5¹³) 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 (5¹² ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταυτην εἶναι την αληθῆ χάριν του Θεου· εις ἣν στήτε). 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 crucified⁵ 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 ἀνωθεν in the phrase which we find in the *Acta Pauli* cited by Orig. *Tom. xx in Joh.* ἀνωθεν μελλω σταυροῦσθαι, itself borrowed from Heb. 6^b ἀνασταυρουντας ἑαυτοις τον υιδν του Θεου. See Zahn *Einl.* ii. 25, *G.K.* ii. 846.

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* 1¹⁶, and *τῶν ἀποστολων υμῶν* 3²). It may be said that the writer was not one to have overlooked the certainty that, if Peter wrote to the Church at Rome during the captivity of Paul, he must have sent some message of condolence or comfort or congratulation. This difficulty however is obviated, if he was aware that St. Paul was then on a missionary journey in Spain or elsewhere. But such hypotheses are not simply groundless, but altogether unnecessary. There is no reason to suppose that the author of 2 P. any more than the author of the Book of Wisdom desired to deceive his readers. The object of both was the same, to put before them the teaching which they supposed that Solomon in the one case, Peter in the other, would have given under the same circumstances. So far as they introduce historical or biographical allusions beyond what was essential to the actual teaching, these were added only by way of avoiding any startling disillusion.

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

Supposing this Epistle to have been written by St. Peter himself, why might he not have referred to a forthcoming life of Christ, as a treatise which would enable his readers to make mention of the Christian virtues and graces of which he had before spoken? He had already referred (1³) to Christ, as having called them

ἰδία δοξη καὶ ἀρετῇ: surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that he should leave behind the picture of this *δοξα καὶ ἀρετῇ* drawn up from his own recollection by his favourite disciple. And the following words *οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθησαντες, ἀλλ' ἐποπταὶ γεννηθεντες* 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 ἀγραφῷ τοῦ θείου κηρυγματος διδασκαλία), *παράκλησεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὐ το εὐαγγέλιον φερεται, ἀκολουθούοντα Πέτρου λιπαρήσαι, ὡς ἀν καὶ δια γραφῆς ὑπομνημα τῆς διαλογου παραδοθείσης αυτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, μὴ προτερον τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τον ἀνδρα, καὶ ταυτη αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς του λεγομενου κατα Μάρκον εὐαγγελιου γραφῆς. γνουντα δὲ το πραχθεν φασὶ του ἀποστολον, ἀποκαλυψαντος αυτω του πνευματος, ἤσθηται τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμία κυρῶσαί τε την γραφην εἰς ἐντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς. Κλήμης ἐν ἐκτῷ τῶν Ὑποτυπωσεων παρατεθειται την ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αυτω καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολιτης ἐπίσκοπος ονοματι Παπίας.* Much the same account is given in Eus. *H.E.* vi. 14, according to the traditions τῶν ἀνεκαθεν πρεσβυτερων 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 *Μαρκος ὁ μαθητης καὶ ἐρμηνευτης Πέτρου καὶ αυτος τα υπο Πέτρου κηρυσσομενα ἐγγράφως ἡμιν παραδεδωκε.* 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 του πρεσβυτερου Ἰωάννου, an actual disciple of the Lord: *καὶ τουτο ὁ πρεσβυτερος ελεγε. 'Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτης Πέτρου γενομενος ὅσα ἐμνημονευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἐγραψεν, οὐ μεντοι τάξει τα υπο του Χριστου ἢ λεχθεντα ἢ πραχθεντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε του Κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολουθησεν αὐτῷ, υστερον δὲ, ὡς εφην, Πέτρω, ὡς προς τας χρειας ἐποιεῖτο τας διδασκαλιας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡσπερ συνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιουμενος λογων· ὡστε οὐδεν ἤμαρτεν Μάρκος, οὕτως*

ενια γράψας ως απεμνημονευσεν. ενος γαρ εποιησατο προνοιαν του μηδέν ὦν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψευσασθαί τι εν αυτοῖς.' 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 1¹⁵ was written by St. Peter, we naturally suppose the allusion to be to the words of Christ recorded in Joh. 21¹⁸, but it is not easy to see how those words can be construed as implying that Peter, writing some thirty years afterwards, was shortly to die. Yet this must be the sense here, for it is given as a reason for making the most of the short time which remained. If stress is laid on the words *οταν δε γηράσης*, 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. 4⁶, so it seemed natural that a similar intimation should be made to St. Peter.

The phrase *το αγιον ὄρος* (2 P. 1¹⁸) seems to imply a later date than the simple *εις ορος υψηλόν* (Mk. 9², Mt. 17¹) or *εις το ορος* (Lk. 9²⁶), 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 *τον αγοράσαντα αυτους δεσποτην* (2 P. 2¹) is to be under-

stood of Christ, as I think it is by most commentators, this is probably the first instance of its being so used. Some scholars deny such a use previous to the fourth century.

In 3² 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 1¹⁶ that Peter himself is to be counted as one of these, and from 3¹⁵ 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) *οτι ελεγον υμιν 'Επ' εσχατου χρονου εσονται εμπαικται*, 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, *παρακαλων επαγωνιζεσθαι τη απαξ παραδοθειση τοις αγλοις πιστει*, as contrasted with such passages as Lk. 4²¹ *σημερον πεπληρωται η γραφη αυτη*, 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 *πιστις*.

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

CHAPTER VIII

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

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

The name Judas (*Ἰουδᾶς*) 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. 14²²), who is also called Judas son of James (*οἱ Ἰακωβου*, Lk. 6¹⁶, Acts 1¹³) and Thaddaeus (Mt. 10³, Mk. 3¹⁸, where some MSS. add *Λεββαῖος*). Besides these we meet with a Judas among the Brethren of the Lord (Mt. 13⁵⁵, Mk. 6³), Judas of Galilee (Acts 5³⁷), Judas surnamed Barsabbas (Acts 15²²), Judas of Damascus (Acts 9¹¹). It is therefore not surprising that the writer should have added a note of identification, *δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφός δε Ἰακωβου*. 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 *δουλος (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 δε* in Tit. 1¹, 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.

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. 13⁵⁵ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβὸς καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας, and last but one in Mk. 6³ ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακωβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Ἰουδα 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. 9⁵), but that they differed from him in the fact that they were married and were accompanied by their wives, and also, as we may suppose from Gal. 2⁹, Mt. 10²³, 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 αἰρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσι τινες Συμεῶνος . . . ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαβίδ καὶ Χριστιανου. καὶ οὕτως μαρτυρεῖ ἐτῶν ὧν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν ἐπὶ Τραϊανου Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικῶν Ἀττικῶν).

Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 19) quotes again from Hegesippus an interesting story of the grandsons of Judas: τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ Δομετιανου τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους Δαβίδ ἀναιρεῖσθαι προστάξαντος, παλαιὸς κατεχει λόγος τῶν αἰρετικῶν τινὰς¹ κατηγορῆσαι τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰουδα (τούτου δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφὸν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτήρος) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυγχανόντων Δαβίδ καὶ ὡς αὐτοῦ συγγένειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόντων. ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδε πῶς λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος. (20) ἐτι δὲ περιῆσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰουδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, οὓς ἐδηλατορευσαν² ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαβίδ, τούτους δ' ὁ Ἰουδοκᾶτος³ ἤγαγε πρὸς Δομετιανὸν Καίσαρα. ἐφοβείτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης. καὶ ἐπληρωτῆσεν αὐτοὺς εἰ ἐκ Δαβίδ εἰσι καὶ ὠμολογήσαν. τότε ἠρωτῆσεν αὐτοὺς ποσὰς

¹ Perhaps provoked by this epistle of their grandfather.

² From *delator*. ³ *Evocatus*.

κτῆσεις εχουσιν ἢ ποσων χρηματων κυριευουσιν. οι δε ειπον αμφοτεροι εννεακισχίλια δηνάρια υπάρχειν αυτοῖς μονα, εκαστω αυτών ανήκουτος του ημίσεως. και ταυτα ουκ εν αργυριοις εφασκον εχειν, ἀλλ' εν διατιμήσει γῆς πλεθρων τριακοντα εννέα μονων, εξ ὧν και τούς φόρους αναφερειν και αυτους αυτουργουντας διατρεφεισθαι. εἶτα δε και τας χείρας τας εαυτών ἐπιδεικνυμαι μαρτυριον τῆς αυτουργίας, την του σωματος σκληριαν και τους απο τῆς συνεχους εργασίας ἐναποτυπωθεντας επι τῶν. ιοιων χειρῶν τυλους παριστάντας. ἐρωτηθεντας δε περι του Χριστου και τῆς βασιλείας αυτου, οποῖα τις εἶη και ποτε και ποι φανησομενη, λογον δουναι ως ου κοσμικη μεν οὐδ' ἐπιγειος, ἐπουρανιος δε και ἀγγελικη τυγχάνει, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ του αἰῶνος γενησομενη, σπηνίκα ἐλθων εν δοξῃ κρινεῖ ζωντας και νεκρους και αποδωσει εκάστω κατα τα ἐπιτηδευματα αυτου. ἐφ' οἷς μηδεν αυτών κατεγνωκοτα τον Δομετιανον ἀλλὰ και ως ευτελων καταφρονησαντα ἐλευθερους μεν αυτους ἀνεῖναι, καταπαυσαι δε δια προστάγματος του κατα τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωγμον. τους δὲ ἀπολυθεντας ηγήσασθαι (became bishops) των ἐκκλησιῶν ως αν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμου και ἀπὸ γενους οντας του Κυρίου, γενομένης τε ειρηνης μεχρι Τραϊανου παραμείναι αυτους τω 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

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 1¹, 2¹, 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 3²).

(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-

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 2¹⁹, 3¹⁵, 4^{1–5}⁶. For noble and weighty expression we may compare *vv.* 20, 21, *υμεις δε, αγαπητοι, εποικοδομουντες εαυτους τη αγιωτατη υμων πιστει, εν πνευματι αγιω προσευχομενοι, εαυτους εν αγαπη Θεου τηρησατε, προσδεχομενοι το ελεος του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου εις ζωην αιωνιον* and the final doxology, with the passages which I have selected from St. James in p. ccxxviii. The appealing *αγαπητοι*, which is thrice found in St. James, is also thrice repeated in Jude. The warning against Respect of Persons is found in James 2^{1–9} and in Jude 16: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James 1¹³, 4¹, 5⁹ in Jude 15, 16; that against the misuse of the tongue in James 3^{1–10}, 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, *οσα μεν ουκ οιδασιν βλασφημουσιν, οσα δε φυσικως ως τα αλογα ζωα επιστανται, εν τουτοις φθειρονται*. As regards vocabulary, the most striking resemblance is the occurrence of *ψυχικος* as opposed to *πνευματικος*, of which the earliest biblical example is in James 3¹⁵, but this had been adopted by Paul (1 Cor. 2¹⁰ 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 *σωτηρ* and *σωτηρια* (*vv.* 3 and 25):

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 *αγιοι* (*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 1⁸ (*διψυχος*) and 4^{8, 9} *ἀγνίσατε καρδίας διψυχοι· ταλαιπωρήσατε*, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 *ἡ γραφή αὕτη, οπου λεγει Ταλαιπωροί 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 4¹⁴, *ατμῖς γαρ ἔστε πρὸς ολίγον φαινομενη*, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 *εγω δε εἰμι ἀτμῖς απο κυθρας*, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. The phrase *κοσμος ἀδικίας* in James 3⁶ is found in Enoch 48⁷. The *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as *Sim.* 5 *εώρακα ἐν χαρακτηριστήρι γραφης Ἐνωχ, Levi* 10 *βιβλος Ἐνωχ του δικαίου, ib.* 14, *εγνω ἀπο γραφης Ἐνωχ οτι ἐπὶ τελει ασεβησετε, ib.* 16, *Juda* 18,

¹ The quotation, as given more fully in Clem. Rom. ii. 11, contains the somewhat rare word *ακαταστασία*, which is also used by James 3¹⁶.

Benj. 9, *Zab.* 3, *Nephht.* 4, ἐν γραφῇ ἀγία Ἐνωχ ὅτι . . . ποιησέτε κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν Σοδομων), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on *James* 4⁷ ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φευξεται 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 ἐγγύς Θεὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδατ καὶ Μωδατ τοῖς προφητευσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. *James* has also been credited with a knowledge of the Sibylline writings on the ground of the phrase ἰου θανατηφόρου which occurs in 3⁸ and also in *Sib. Proem*, 71

εἰσὶ θεοὶ μεροπων δηλητορες¹ <ουτοι> ἀβουλων,
τῶν δὴ κακ στοματος χεῖται θανατηφορος ἰος.

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

(3) Another difference which strikes one on reading the two epistles is that while the former is full of instruction for the present time, the bulk of the latter is made up of denunciations, which have very much lost their force. To a modern reader it is curious rather than edifying, with the exception of the beginning and end (*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 δόλφ ηγητήρες.

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 Enoch¹ is now lost. It was translated into Greek, of which only a few fragments remain, and this was again translated into Ethiopic, probably about 600 A.D. A copy of the last was found in Abyssinia in 1773 by Bruce, the famous traveller, and an English version was published by Abp. Laurence in 1821, followed by the Ethiopic text in 1838. The composite nature of the book is generally recognized. The latest editor, R. H. Charles, who is my authority for what follows, divides it into five sections and recognizes many interpolations in these. He considers that the larger portion of the book was written not later than 160 B.C., and that no part is more recent than the Christian era. It exercised an important influence on Jewish and Christian literature during the first three centuries A.D., being probably used by the author of the *Assumption of Moses* (written about the Christian era), also by the writers of the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Mr. Charles traces its influence in the N.T. not merely in the epistles of St. Jude and the two epistles of St. Peter, but above all, in the *Apocalypse*;

¹ On which see Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, vol. iii. pp. 54-73.

also in the Acts, and the epistle to the Hebrews, in some of the epistles of St. Paul, and in the Gospels. It is quoted three times (twice as Scripture) in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, is referred to, though not named, in Justin and Athenagoras, is cited by Irenaeus iv. 16. 2: 'Enoch . . . cum esset homo, legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis iudicii Dei, quoniam angeli quidam deciderunt in terram in iudicium' (En. 147). Tertullian quotes it as Scripture, calling Enoch the oldest of the prophets (*Idol. xv, Apol. xxii*). He allows that its canonicity was denied by some, 'quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur,' and also because it was thought that, if it were a genuine writing of Enoch, it must have perished in the Deluge. He considers however that it should be received, because of its witness to Christ, and because it has the testimony of the Apostle Jude. It is twice quoted in Clement's *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 φερεται ὡς θεία τα ἐπιγεγραμμενα του Ἐνωχ βιβλία, and *In Johannem* vi. 25, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνωχ γεγραπται, εἰ τῷ φίλον παραδέχασθαι 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 φθοροποια 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.

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. 9¹ is derived from the *Assumption*, Jude v. 16 from the *Testament* (p. lxii). On the latter Charles compares οὗτοί εἰσι γογγυσταί, μεμφιμοιροὶ, καὶ τὸ στομα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπεροργα, 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 ἐμπαικται 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 *impij* in the latter: see vi. 1 *facient facientes impietatem*, vii. 3 *pestilentiosi et impij*, *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, ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστερες οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἐθνη πλαυηθέντα καὶ ἀφεντα κυριον ἠλλοίωσαν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἐξακολουθησαντες πνευμασι πλάνης. Ὑμεῖς μὴ οὕτως . . . ἵνα μὴ γενησθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἣτις ἐνήλλαξεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ομοίως καὶ Ἐγγήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὐς κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, *Test. Aser.* 7 μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα ἣτις ἠγνοήσε τοὺς ἀγγέλους κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο εἰς αἰῶνος. There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7, and 13, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρησαντας τὴν εαυτῶν ἀρχὴν . . . 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 θελῶν ἀπατήσαι, λεγὼν ὅτι Ἐμὸν ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζων· καὶ ἤκουσεν τὸ Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοὶ Κύριος, τούτεστιν ὁ Κύριος ὁ παντῶν τῶν πνευμάτων δεσπόζων· ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς δεῖξαι ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἐνθενδε ἀπαλλαγὴν, ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς ἀνθιστάμενοι <ἦσαν> δαίμονες πορευόμεναι τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω πορείαν, τοῦτο οὖν συνεχώρησεν ὄρασθαι ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσεως ταφῆς· ἐβλασφήμει γὰρ καὶ ὁ διάβολος κατὰ Μωσεως, φονεὴ τούτου καλῶν διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον· ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, μὴ ἐνεγκῶν τὴν αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν, εἶρηκεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεός, διάβολε. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐψεύσατο ὁ Θεὸς εἰσαγαγὼν τὸν Μωσῆν ἐνθα ὤμοσεν αὐτὸν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.

τον ομοιον τροπον εκπορνευσασαι και απελθουσαι οπισω σαρκος
ετερας προκεινται δειγμα πυρος αιωνιου . . . αστερες πλανηται.

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): 'Scrispisse 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. 10⁴), gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses before Pharaoh (2 Tim. 3⁸), recognizes the instrumentality of angels in the giving of the Law (Gal. 3¹⁹, cf.

Heb. 2², Acts 7⁵³). So, too, Stephen speaks of Moses as learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7²²), the author of the ep. to the Hebrews (11³⁷) alludes to the tradition as to the death of Isaiah (see Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xlv foll.), and James (5¹⁷) limits the drought predicted by Elijah to 3½ years.

CHAPTER X

THE STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

ST. JUDE (*vv.* 5–8) introduces as examples of the divine wrath against those who had sinned after receiving favours from God (1) the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for unbelief after they had been saved from Egypt; (2) the angels who abandoned their original office and habitation, being led away by fleshly lusts, and are now kept in chains under darkness till the day of judgment; (3) the people of Sodom, who inhabited a land like the garden of the Lord (Gen. 13¹⁰) 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*

ηρξαντο οι ανθρωποι πολλοι γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ θυγατερες εγεννηθησαν αὐτοῖς, ἰδοντες δε οἱ αγγελοι του Θεου τας θυγατερας τῶν ανθρωπων οτι καλαὶ εἰσιν ελαβον εαυτοῖς γυναῖκας απο πασῶν ὧν ἐξελεξαντο . . . οἱ δε γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εν ταις ἡμεραις ἐκείναις, και μετ ἐκείνο, ως ἂν εἰσεπορευοντο οἱ υἱοὶ του Θεου προς τας θυγατερας τῶν ανθρώπων και ἐγεννωσαν εαυτοῖς, ἐκείνοι ησαν οι γιγαντες οι απ αιωνος, οἱ ανθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί (LXX.). That the version *αγγελοι* gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase 'sons of God' occurs, Job 1⁶, 2¹, 38⁷, Dan. 3^{25,28}, Ps. 29¹, 89⁶. It has been suggested that the phrase *μετ ἐκείνο* may be a marginal note having reference to Num. 13³³, 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 pre-historic 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. 16⁷ *ουκ ἐξιλιάσατο περὶ τῶν αρχαίων γιγάντων οὐ ἀπέστησαν (? ἐπίστευσαν) τη ἰσχυῖ αὐτῶν*, Wisdom, 14⁶ *απολλυμένων υπερηφάνων γιγάντων, η ελπίς του κοσμου ἐπὶ σχεδίας καταφυγουσα ἀπελιπεν αἰῶνι σπερμα γενεσεως τη ση κυβερνηθεῖσα χειρι*, 3. Macc. 2⁴ *σὺ τους εμπροσθεν ἀδικιαν ποιησαντας, εν οἷς καὶ γίγαντες ἦσαν ρωμη καὶ θρασει πεποιθοτες, διέφθειρας, ἐπαγαγων αὐτοῖς ἀμετρητου υδωρ*, Baruch

320-28, Josephus *Ant.* 1. 3. 1, πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀγγελοὶ Θεοῦ γυναιξὶ συνιόντες υβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παιδᾶς καὶ παντοῦς ὑπεροπτᾶς καλοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει πεπολιθῆσιν. ὁμοία τοῖς ὑπο γιγαντῶν τετολμησθαι λεγομένοις ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ οὗτοι δρασαὶ παραδίδονται. Philo (*Vit. Cont.* p. 472) ridicules the idea of angels being open to such temptation, ἦν τολμῶσιν οὐκ εὐαγῶς προσάπτειν ταῖς μακαρίαις καὶ θελαῖς δυνάμεσιν, εἰ γυναιξὶ θνηταῖς ἐπιμανέντες ὠμίλησαν οἱ παντοῦς πάθους ἀμέτοχοι. A knowledge of the sin of the angels seems to be implied in Job 4¹⁸, 'Behold he put no trust in his servants and his angels he charged with folly,' and also in the story of Sarah and Asmodeus (*Tobit* 6¹⁴ etc.). Tertullian (*De Virg. Vel.* 7) explains St. Paul's injunction (1 Cor. 11¹⁰) by reference to the same history 'propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob 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, Ἐγγρηγοροὶ as they are called in the Greek versions of Dan. 5¹³ 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 ἐτεκνωσαν Ναφηλεῖμ . . . μετα δε ταυτα ἠρξαντο 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 (10⁹): the watchers will be bound under the hills for seventy generations, and then be confined for ever in the abyss of fire: the spirits of the slain giants become demons. In c. 19, however, the demons are represented as existing before the fall of the watchers.

The prevailing demonology of the Book of Enoch is thus summed up by Dr. Charles (*Enoch*, p. 52). The angelic watchers who fell from lusting after the daughters of men have been

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

In c. 54 there appears to be an attempt to connect the two different stories of the Fall: the guilt of the Watchers is said to have consisted in their becoming subject to Satan, who was either identified with the Serpent, as in Apoc. 12⁹ *καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφης ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διαβόλος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην—ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἀγγελοὶ 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.

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 2²⁴ we read 'By the envy of the devil death entered into the world.' This envy is explained in rabbinical writings sometimes as occasioned by the dignity of Adam and his lordship over the creation, but more frequently by Satan's desire for Eve:¹ cf. 4 Macc. 18⁸ *ουδε ελυμνηατο μου τα άγνα τής παρθενίας λυμεων άπάτης όφης*. Sometimes again his fall is ascribed to the less ignoble motive of pride, as in the pseudepigraphic Life of Adam: 'When God created Adam, He called upon the angels to adore him as His image . . . Satan however refused, and on being threatened with the wrath of God said that he would exalt his throne above the stars of heaven' (Isa. 14¹³). In other writings (*Life of Adam, Secrets of Enoch*) Satan refuses to worship God Himself, 'entertaining the impossible idea that he should make his throne higher than the clouds over the earth, and should be equal in rank to [God's] power.'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^a.

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 1⁶ and Zech. 3^{1, 2}, and in the N.T., as in James 4⁷, 1 P. 5⁸, Eph. 6^{11, 12} (we have to stand against the wiles of the devil, . . . our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but) *προς τας αρχας, προς τας ἐξουσίας, προς τους κοσμοκράτορας του σκότους του αἰῶνος τούτου, προς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, see Lightfoot on Col. 2¹⁵. In 2 Cor. 4⁴ Satan is spoken of as the god, in John 12³¹ and 16¹¹ 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. 4³).

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. Nephth.* iii. οἱ Ἐγγρηγορες ἐνηλλαξαν τάξιν φυσεως αυτων, οὗς κατηράσατο Κυριος ἐπὶ του κατακλυσμου, and with a rationalistic explanation in *Test. Rub.* v. where the watchers are said to have been seduced by women, *ουτω γαρ εθελξαν τους Ἐγγρηγόρους πρὸ του κατακλυσμου· κακεινοι συνεχῶς ορωντες αυτας ἐγενοντο ἐν επιθυμία ἀλληλων καὶ συνέλαβον τῇ διανοία την πρᾶξιν καὶ μετεσχηματίζοντο εἰς ἀνθρωπους καὶ ἐν τη συνουσία των ανδρῶν αυτῶν συνεφαινοντο αυταις, κακεῖναι επιθυμουσαι τῇ διανοία τῆς φαντασίας αυτῶν ἔτεκον γιγαντας.* So Justin M. *Apol.* i. 5, *το παλαιον δαίμονες φαυλοι ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι καὶ γυναικας ἐμοιχευσαν καὶ παῖδας διέφθειραν καὶ φοβητρα ανθρωποις εδειξαν, ως καταπλαγήναι τους οἷ, . . . μη ἐπιστάμενοι δαίμονας εἶναι φαυλους, θεους προσωνομαζον, Apol.* ii. 5, *οἱ δ' αγγελοι, παραβάντες τηνδε την τάξιν, γυναικων μίξεσιν ἠττηθησαν καὶ παιδας ετεκνωσαν, οἱ εἰσιν οἱ λεγομενοι δαιμονες,* Heracleon ap. Orig. (*in Joh.* tom. 13, Lomm. vol. ii. p. 125) *ζητεῖσθαί φησι περι τινων ἀγγελων, εἰ σωθήσονται, τῶν κατελθουτων ἐπι τας των ἀνθρωπων θυγατερας, 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, *δειγμά σοι τουτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, του Θεου τὸ κάλλος ἀπολελοιποτες δια κάλλος μαραινομενον, καὶ τοσουτον ἐξ ουρανῶν ἀποπεσόντες χαμαί, ib.* p. 280, *Strom.* iii. p. 538, *Str.* v. 650, *οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐκεῖνοι οὐ τον ανω κλήρον εἰληχοτες κατολισθησαντες εἰς ηδονὰς, ἐξειπον τα ἀπορρητα ταις γυναιξιν κ.τ.λ.* Celsus having made use of the story in his attack on the Christians,

Origen in his reply (v. 54) states that the Book of Enoch was not regarded as authoritative in the Church, and quotes Philo's explanation of Gen. 6 to the effect that it gives an allegorical account of the fall of the soul through temptations of sense: he does not however pronounce any definite opinion of his own. In his comment on Joh. 6²⁵ he seems to accept the ordinary view in the words *ου μονον δε ο ανθρωπος εξεπεσεν εκ τελειου επι το ατελές, αλλά και ιδόντες οι υιοί του Θεού τας θυγατέρας των ανθρώπων 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 *εί δέ έπ' αγγελων νοοιτο τουτο, τους περι μαγείας και γοητείας . . . εσχολακοτας συνιέναι χρη των μετεωρων ταις γυναιξι την γνωσιν δεδωκεναι.* 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 . . . matrimonii se mortalibus miscuerunt.' Julian, like Celsus, used this belief as a ground for attacking Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply (ix. p. 296) repudiates the belief as altogether unworthy, and injurious to morality, since men plead the angels' sin as excuse for their own, and adopts the interpretation of 'sons of God' previously given by Africanus. Chrysostom deals at length with the subject in his 22nd homily on Genesis. He calls the old interpretation blasphemous, and holds that it is precluded by the words of Christ, that 'in the

¹ It is also found in the apocryphal *Conflict of Adam and Eve* of uncertain date, on which see the art. 'Adam, Books of,' in the *D. of Christ. Biog.* i. 36 foll.

resurrection men shall be like angels, neither marrying nor given in marriage.' Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xv. 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. 3²², 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. 5²¹⁻⁴³, 19⁶, Lk. 9⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶. In the last passage the reading supported by the best MSS. is Κύριε θελεῖς εἰπωμεν πυρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς; στραφὲς 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 οἶδατε οὐοῦ πνεύματός ἐστε υμεῖς. 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 T'ennant, *l.c.* p. 4.

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.

- For further information on this subject see Suicer's *Thesaurus* under ἀγγελος, and Ἐφθύοπος, 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.

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.

They are like sunken rocks which cause the shipwreck of heedless souls by the bad examples they set in your love-feasts; like rainless clouds scudding before the wind; like trees in autumn which are yet without fruit, twice dead, torn up by the roots; like wild waves foaming up their own shame; or falling stars destined to disappear in eternal gloom. It is of these that Enoch prophesied that the Lord would come to convict the impious of their impiety and of all their murmuring against Him. Against these the Apostles used to warn you that, in the last time, there would come mockers walking after their own lusts. They are the causes of division, carnal, without the Spirit. (To resist them) it is necessary that you should build up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Spirit, keeping yourselves in the love of God, looking for everlasting life. As for those who are in danger of falling, it is your duty in some cases to convince them when they dispute (or 'are in doubt'), in others to snatch them from the fire which threatens them, in others to feel towards them a trembling pity joined with abhorrence of their impurities.

2 Peter.

Here the mischief-makers are characterized as *ψευδοπροφήται* and *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

themselves be utterly destroyed, 'defrauded of the hire of fraud.' They count it pleasure¹ to spend the day in carnal gratification; they are spots and blemishes, indulging themselves in your feasts, to which they gain admission through their wives. 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 ἀγαπῆν should be read for

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. 3¹⁸^f, πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὓς πολλακίς ελεγον ὑμῖν, ὑνν δε καὶ κλαίων λεγω, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὧν το τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχυνῇ αὐτῶν, οἷ τα ἐπίγεια φρονουντες, 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 20²⁹, '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 ψευδάδελφοὶ in Gal. 2⁴, of ψευδαποστολοὶ in 2 Cor. 11¹³, of a mystery of iniquity already at work in 2 Th. 2⁷, of those that deny the resurrection from the dead in 1 Cor. 15¹², 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. 1¹⁷⁻¹³, 8¹³, who think they may take part in idolatrous feasts on the ground that all things are lawful unto them (1 Cor. 6¹², 10²³), who defy their teachers and even the Apostle himself (1 Cor. 4⁸⁻¹³, 5², 8¹⁻¹³, 9¹⁻¹², 10¹⁴⁻³³), innovators in doctrine, serving their own belly, indulging in carnal lusts (Rom. 16^{17, 18}, 1 Cor. 6⁹⁻²⁰), deceiving the simple through their plausible speeches (Eph. 4¹⁴, περιφερομενοι παντι ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργία πρὸς τὴν μεθοδίαν τῆς πλάνης, ἰβ. 5⁶ μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατατῶ 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.

hidden wisdom, its exclusive mysteries, its privileged class . . . St. Paul in this Epistle feels himself challenged to contend for the universality of the Gospel.' 'Only in the light of such an antagonism can we understand the emphatic iteration with which he claims to *warn every man and teach every man in every wisdom, that he may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus* (1²⁸). It will be remembered that *wisdom* in Gnostic teaching was the exclusive possession of the few, . . . that *perfection* was the term especially applied to this privileged minority, and thus it will be readily understood why St. Paul . . . should express his intense anxiety for the Churches of Colossae and the neighbourhood, lest they should be led astray by a spurious wisdom to desert the true knowledge' (2⁴). 'This false wisdom is . . . speculative, vague and dreamy' (2^{4, 8, 18}). [We may compare the phrase *ευνπνιαζομενοι* 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. 4². St. Paul in his warning against the new heretics does not dwell on the contrast of law and grace, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, but denounces their ascetic practices as concentrating the thoughts on earthly things, while they are found valueless against sensual indulgence, which can only be overcome by the elevation of the inner life in Christ.

I proceed to cite the relevant passages from the Pastoral Epistles. 1 Tim. 1^{6, 7} some have turned aside into *ματαιολογίαν, θελοντες ειναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μη νοουντες μητε α λέγουσιν μητε περι τίνων διαβεβαιουνται;* (v. 19) Some *have made shipwreck* concerning the faith, of whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander; (3⁶) *μη νεόφυτον, ίνα μη τυφωθεις εις κριμα εμπεση του διαβολου;* (4¹) *το δε πνευμα ρητως λεγει οτι εν υστεροις καιροις αποστησονται τινες της πιστεως προσεχοντες πνευμασι πλανοις και διδασκαλιας δαιμονίων, εν υποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμενων την ιδίαν συνείδησιν,*

κωλυοντων γαμειν, απεχεσθαι βρωματων; (*ver.* 7) τους βεβηλους και γραωδεις μυθους παραιτου; (6³) εἴ τις ετεροδιδασκαλει καὶ μη προσερχεται υγιαίνουσιν λόγοις, . . . τετυφωται . . . νοσῶν περὶ ζητησεις καὶ λογομαχιας, εξ ου γίνεται . . . διαπατριβαὶ διεφθαρμενων ανθρωπων του νου . . . νομιζόντων πορισμον εἶναι την εὐσεβειαν; (*ver.* 20) την παραθηκην φυλαξον εκτρεπομενος τας βεβηλους κενοφωνίας καὶ αντιθεσεις τῆς ψευδωνυμου γνωσεως. 2 Tim. 1¹³ *Hold the pattern of sound words, etc.*; (2¹⁴) *Of these things put them in remembrance*; (*v.* 16) *Shun profane babblings . . . Their word will eat as a canker, of whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, men who, concerning the truth, have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already.* (2²⁵) *In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves, if peradventure God may give them repentance . . . and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil*; 2 Tim. 3¹ foll. ἐν ἐσχαταις ημεραις ἐστησονται καιροὶ χαλεποι. εσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι φιλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, αλαζονες, υπερηφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονευσιν απειθεῖς, ἀχαριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ασπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεις, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδοται, προπετεῖς, τετυφωμενοι, φιληδονοι μᾶλλον η φιλοθεοι, εχοντες μόρφωσιν ευσεβείας, την δε δυναμιν αυτῆς ἀρνούμενοι. καὶ τουτους ἀποτρεπου. ἐκ τουτων γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ ενδυνοντες εις τὰς οἰκίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτιζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρευμενα ἁμαρτιας ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις . . . ον τροπον Ἰωαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωυσει, ουτως καὶ οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμενοι του νου, ἀδοκιμοι περὶ την πίστιν . . . (*v.* 13) *πονηροὶ δε ἄνθρωποι καὶ γόητες προκοψουσιν ἐπὶ το χειρον, πλανῶντες και πλανώμενοι. σὺ δε μενε εν οἷς εμαθες . . .* (4³) *εσται γὰρ καιρος οτε τῆς υγιαίνουσης διδασκαλίας ουκ ἀνεξονται, ἀλλὰ κατα τὰς ιδίας ἐπιθυμίας εαυτοις ἐπισωρευουσιν διδασκάλους, κνηθομενοι την ακοην.*

Titus 1¹⁰ εἰσὶν πολλοι ἀνυποτακτοι, ματαιολογοι καὶ φρεναπάται μάλιστα οἱ εκ περιτομῆς, οὓς δεῖ επιστομίζειν, οἱτινες ολους οικους ἀνατρεπουσιν διδάσκοντες α μη δεῖ αἰσχρου κερδους χάριν; (*v.* 16) *Θεὸν ὁμολογουσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δε εργοις ἀρνουνται, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ προς παν εργον αγαθον*

ἀδοκιμοί ; (3⁹) μωρας ζητησεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ μάχας νομικας περιστασο . . . αίρετικον ἄνθρωπον μετὰ . . . νουθεσίαν παραιτου, εἰδως οτι ἐξεστραπται ὁ τοιουτος καὶ ἀμαρτάνει, ων αυτοκατάκριτος.

Apocalypse.

2² (Ephesus) ἐπείρασας τους λέγοντας εαυτους αποστολους ειναι καὶ ουκ εἰσίν, καὶ ευρες αυτους ψευδεις ; (ver. 6) μισεις τα εργα τῶν Νικολαϊτων 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) εχεις ἐκει κρατουντας την διδαχὴν Βαλααμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλακ βαλειν σκάνδαλον ἐνωπιον τῶν υἱων Ἰσραηλ, φαγειν εἰδωλοθυτα 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 εἰδωλοθυτα ; ‘the depths of Satan’ as they say ; (3⁴ Sardis) ‘they have not defiled their garments’ ; (3⁸ Philadelphia) ‘thou didst keep my word and didst not deny my name.’

Epistles of John.

1 Joh. 2¹⁸ ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν, καὶ καθως ηκουσατε οτι ἀντίχριστος ἐρχεται, καὶ νυν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγονασιν, οθεν γνωσκομεν οτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, ἀλλ’ ουκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν . . . (v. 22) τις ἐστίν ὁ ψευστης εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησους ουκ ἐστίν ὁ Χριστος ; ουτος ἐστίν ὁ ἀντίχριστος ὁ ἀρνούμενος τον πατερα καὶ τον υἱόν. πας ὁ ἀρνούμενος τον υἱόν ουδε τον πατερα εχει . . . (v. 26) ταυτα εγραψα υμῖν περὶ των πλανωντων υμᾶς ; (4¹) πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐξεληλυθασιν εἰς τον κοσμον. (2 Joh. 7) πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τον κόσμον οἱ μὴ ομολογουντες Ἰησουν Χριστόν ἐρχομενον ἐν σαρκι. (3 Joh. 9) ὁ φιλοπρωτευων Διοτρεφης οὐκ ἐπιδεχεται ἡμας. διὰ τουτο, ἐὰν ἐλθω, υπομνησω αυτου τὰ εργα α ποιεῖ λογοις πονηροῖς φλυαρων 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

Christ. This falling away is to take place in the last times (Jude ¹⁸, 2 P. ²¹, ³³, 1 Tim. ⁴¹, 2 Tim. ³¹, ⁴³, 1 Joh. ²¹⁸, ¹⁹, 2 Th. ²³¹², Matt. ²⁴¹¹⁻¹³), 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. ²¹⁰, ¹⁵, ¹⁷⁻²², ³⁴, 1 Tim. ¹⁶, ⁷, ¹⁹, ⁶³, 2 Tim. ³⁶⁻⁹, Tit. ¹¹⁰⁻¹⁶, Apoc. ²², ⁶, ¹⁴, 1 Joh. ²¹⁸, ¹⁹, ²², ⁴¹, ³, 2 Joh. ⁷. In some passages the stress is laid more upon practice, in others more upon the erroneous belief which lay at the root of the evil practice and was developed and strengthened by it. St. Jude, for instance, speaks more of practice and less of belief, but it seems to me unnecessary to suppose, as some have done, that the dangers against which he warns the Church are different from those against which St. Peter's warning is directed. The moral corruption described in the two epistles is the same even in its minutest points: the cause of this corruption is the same, the misinterpretation and misuse of St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Jude ⁴, 2 P. ²¹⁹, ³¹⁶, cf. Rom. ³⁵⁻⁸). The agents use the same methods and are described in the same terms: they are Christians in name and steal into the Church in each place without divulging their impious views (Jude ⁴, ¹², 2 P. ²¹, ²⁰, ²¹). They join in the love-feasts (Jude ¹², 2 P. ²¹³, 1 Cor. ¹¹¹⁸), are greedy of gain (Jude ¹¹, ¹⁰, 2 P. ²¹², ¹⁵, ¹⁶), are disputatious (Jude ²², 2 P. ³⁴, ¹⁶), plausible (Jude ¹², 2 P. ²²), boastful, disobedient, irreverent (Jude ⁸, ¹¹, ¹⁶, 2 P. ²¹⁰, ¹¹, ¹⁸), speaking evil of things and persons beyond their knowledge (Jude ¹⁰, 2 P. ²¹²), seducing the simple by their confident and scornful assertions (Jude ¹³, ¹⁶, ¹⁸, ¹⁹, 2 P. ²², 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. ²¹). It is true that in 2 P. the mischief-makers are distinctly called 'false-teachers' and charged with introducing *aípeσεις* (²¹), while these terms are not used by St. Jude; but the language used by the latter seems to imply something more than a mere indulgence in the lusts of the flesh. The faithful are bidden not simply to abstain from the sins of impurity, disobedience, irreverence, covetousness, murmuring, impiety, self-seeking; they are not simply told to keep the commandments, but to defend the faith once delivered to the saints, and build themselves up upon its foundation (*vv.* 3, 20); they are to answer opponents (*v.* 22) who use the doctrine of grace to justify sin (*v.* 4), who deny God and Christ—a phrase which cannot, I think, mean less

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.* 1¹¹, *1 Tim.* 6⁵).

6. This state of things had been prophesied long before.

Comparing together Jude ¹¹, 2 P. 2^{15,16} and Apoc. 2¹⁴, 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 *είδωλοθῦτα* 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. 10²⁰ 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. 2¹²⁻¹⁵ 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, *το δειν παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἀλλ ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολουεῖν δειν ἔδηλου τὰς τε ἡδονὰς τὰς τε ἐπιθυμίας . . . οἱ δὲ εἰς ἡδονὴν τραγῶν δικήν ἐκχυθέντες οἶον ἐφουβρίζοντες τῷ σωματικῷ καθηδυπαθουσιν*. 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.

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 Epiphanius *Haer.* xxxviii. 1, Irenaeus *i.* 31. 1, Hippolytus *Ref.* v. 16 (on the Peratae). Hippolytus says of the Naassenes or Ophites, that they called themselves Gnostics, *φάσκοντες μόνον τα βάθη γινώσκειν* (*Ref. Haer.* v. 6), which reminds us of the words addressed to the Church in Thyatira (Apoc. 2¹⁸⁻²⁵), where we read first of a false prophetess who tempts the believers to commit fornication and eat things offered to idols, which is also the teaching of the followers of Balaam and of the Nicolaitans (*vv.* 14, 15), and secondly of those who say that they know *τα βάθη του Σατανά*, where the addition *του Σατανά* 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 (*αποσπασμα*) 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, descendente 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 τσαυγῶδίας καὶ ληρολογίας, ὡς δια ὑπνου λεγομένης καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ ἐρρωμένης διανοίας.*

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, *λεγων εἶναι τινα εαυτον μέγαν*; that the Samaritans of all classes believed his professions and agreed in holding that *οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δυναμις τοῦ Θεου 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 *το αργυριον σου σὺν σοὶ εἰη εἰς ἀπωλειαν*. The story ends with Simon's entreaty that the Apostles would pray for him *οπως μηδεν ἐπελθη ἐπ' εμε ὧν εἶρηκατε*.

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 *ως του πρώτου θεου*, and again (*Dial.* 120 *fin.*) *ὄν θεον υπεράνω πασης αρχῆς και ἐξουσίας και 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.

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, *ου γαρ μη κρατείσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπι τινι νομιζομένῳ κακῷ λελυτρῶνται γαρ*, Hippol. vi. 19).² Indeed the difference between good and evil was only conventional, depending on the arbitrary will of the angels (*ου γαρ ἐστι φύσει κακον ἀλλα θέσει εθεντο γαρ, φησίν, οι 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, *οτι ουδαμως του Ἰησου ομολογουσιν υιον Θεου Σιμωνιανοι, ἀλλὰ δυναμιν Θεου λεγουσι τον Σιμωνα* (*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 *αλογίστως φάσκοντες δειν μίγνυσθαι...*, *ἀλλὰ καὶ μακαρίζουσιν εαυτους ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ μίξει, ταυτην εἶναι λέγοντες την τελειαν 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) *αυτοὺς μὴ δια 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.*

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. 5²⁶). What follows is more clearly given in the Greek of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 38. 2, *εκαστος ἄρρητα ποιῶν καὶ αἰσχρουργίας ἐπιτελων ἐπικαλεῖται ἐκάστου ἀγγελου ονομα καὶ εκαστω τουτων προσάπτει τι εργον ἀθεμιτον . . . ὁ δεινα ἄγγελε καταχρωμαί σου το εργον η δεινα ἐξουσια πραττω σου την πράξιν.* Epiphanius asserts that these abominations were common to the Nicolaitans with other sects, and professes that he learnt this, not merely from books, but from actual intercourse with those who practised them and tried to induce him to join their society (*Haer.* 26. 17). Strong as is St. Jude’s language, it would probably have been stronger still, if the evil had reached this height when he wrote. Like the other N.T. writers he saw the germs of intellectual licence and moral laxity which were destined to show such a frightful development in a later generation.¹

¹ On the Nicolaitans see Ramsay, *Expositor*, vol. ix. pp. 401–422, 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).

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

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 AB⁸, several cursives and versions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. *al.*, while *ηγιασμένοις* 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 εἰνεσι [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 = *en* 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. 3¹²) that in the New Testament the word *ηγαπημένοι* 'seems to be always used of the object of God's love,' it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase 'Brethren beloved by God in God.' Omitting the preposition we have the dative of the agent,

¹ Dr. Gwynn adds: 'It is important to distinguish the readings of the *text* of *h* from those of the *margin*. In other parts of the N.T., especially Gospels and Acts, the latter are often of value, though in the four Minor Catholic Epistles they are usually merely copied from *p*, and therefore add nothing towards the determination of the Greek text.'

as in Nehemiah 13²⁶, *αγαπωμενος 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. 2³, Apoc. 3¹⁰. 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 *εν αγάπη* and *καὶ αγαπη*, 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 αγάπη*.

v. 4. Θεον καὶ Κυριον *h* and all the best MSS. of *p*: the later ones *om. καί*, thus making *δεσποτην Θεόν* refer to Jesus Christ.’ G.]

v. 5. *υπομνήσαι δὲ υμας βουλομαι εἰδότας ἀπαξ πάντα, οτι Κυριος λαον εκ γῆς Αἴγυπτου σωσας το δευτερον τους μη πιστευσαντας ἀπόλεσεν*. 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.

εἰδοτας ‘*add. υμᾶς* 5 31 KL. syr., *om. ABC*² 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Arm.,’ and so Tisch.

In point of fact however B reads *εἰδότας υμας*, 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 *υμᾶς* emphasizes the contrast between the readers (‘to remind you, *you* who know it already’) and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated *υμῶν* of v. 3.

ἀπαξ ante παντα ABC. 13. 31. L. vv. Ante οτι K. Ante λαον . (Syr.) Arm. Ante εκ γῆς Αἴγ. Clem. 280 (and 997, Did. Cassiod.). οτι κυριος σωσας τον λαον εκ γῆς Αἴγ. ἀπαξ Sah., οτι ἀπαξ κυριος σωσας λαον αυτου Boh. Om. ἀπαξ Lucif. 28. [ἀπαξ is so placed in Syr. as to be connected with σωσας ‘when he had once saved them,’ G.]

πάντα ABCN 13 Vulg. Syr^b, Boh. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the *App.*

to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for *παντας* (cf. 1 John 2²⁰) found in Syr^p.¹ *τουτο*] 5. 31. KL. Sah.

στι] *add.* δ 5.C.² 31. KL. Arm. Clem. 280. *Om.* AB⁸ 13.
κυριος] *8CKL.* Syr^h. *Θεος* C² Tol. Syr^p. Arm. Clem. Lucif. *Ἰησους*
 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
 στικς (*στι Κύριος*), and στικ (*στι Ἰησους*) for στιο (*στι ο*).']
γῆς om. Syr^p.

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is *υπομνησαι δε υμας βουλομαι, ειδοντας υμας παντα, οτι Κυριος απαξ λαον εκ γῆς Αιγυπτου σωσας το δευτερον [τους] μη πιστευσαντας απωλεσεν*. I see no difficulty in *παντα*, which gives a reason for the use of the word *υπομνησαι*, 'I need only remind you, because you already know all that I have to say.' It was easy for the second *υμας* to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word *απαξ* might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after *ειδοτας*: 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, *απαξ* is very appropriate if taken with *λαον σωσας* (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for *το δευτερον*. For the reading *παντας* 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 *κυριος*, that the original was *οτι ο* (*λαον σωσας*), I think the fact of the variants is better explained by Spitta, who considers that the abbreviations *IC*, *KC*, *ΘC* might easily be confused, if the first letter was faintly written, and that the mention of *τον μονον δεσποτην και Κυριον* 'I.X. in the preceding verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer *IC*, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, *ειρηται γαρ προ τουτων περι αυτου, ως ειη αληθινος θεος ουτος ο μονος δεσποτης ο κυριος* 'I.X., *ο αναγαγων τον λαον εξ Αιγυπτου δια Μωσέως*. Spitta himself however holds that *ΘC* is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter 2⁴, *ο Θεος*

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

ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησαντων ουκ εφείσατο, 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 49¹⁰, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, τον και τους πατερας υμων ἐξ Αἰγυπτου ἐξαγαγοντα, 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, Ἰουδας καθολικῶς γράφει, ἀπαξ γὰρ κυριος Ἰησοῦς λαον ἐξ Αἰγυπτου σωσας κ.τ.λ.; Jerome, *C. Iov.* 1. 12; Lact. *Inst.* 4. 17, 'Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Ausus vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentens iussit eum Jesum vocari'). In the explanatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the article before μη did not belong to the original text.

v. 6. ἀγγελους τε] ἀγγ. δέ A boh.¹, και ἀγγ. sah. boh².

[v. 7. ρ and h punctuate προκεινται δειγμα πυρος αἰωνίου, δικην υπεχουσαι, h interpolates τέφρα bef. προκεινται: so Lucifer (*de non conu. c. haereticis*) reads 'cinis propositae sunt exemplum.' G.]

v. 12. οὔτοι εἰσιν [οι] ἐν ταις ἀγάπαις υμων σπιλάδες συννευχουμενοι ἀφόβως εαυτους ποιμαίνοντες. The article here is omitted by NK and many inferior MSS. with vg. (but not syrr. or sah. or boh.), and some of the patristic quotations. I agree with Dr. Chase in thinking that it is out of place here, as in v. 5 above. There is not only the difficulty of construction (οἱ... σπιλαδες), but the very bold assumption that the signification of σπιλαδες will be at once apparent. If we omit the article, ἀφόβως should be attached to συννευχ. as by Ti. In syrr. it is joined with ποιμαίνοντες.

συννευχουμενοι] C sah. boh. add υμιν.

[v. 18. Syrr. ρ and h agree with KLP in prefixing οτι to ἐν εσχάτω or ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρονων; but this is only in accordance with the Syriac usage in introducing a quotation, and is no evidence as to the Greek reading. G.]

Mr. Horner sends me the following Greek rendering of a

fragment from a Fayoum papyrus, which is supposed to belong to the fifth or sixth century, containing *vv.* 17–20, τῶν ρημάτων του κυρίου ημῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστου [τῶν προειρημενων υπο τῶν αποστολων, οτιπερ εἶπον οτι ἐν ἐσχατῶ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐμπαικται ελευσονται πορευομενοι κατὰ τας ἐπιθυμίας ασεβείας· οὔτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, μὴ ἔχοντες πνευμα. Ἔμεις δέ, ἀγαπητοί, εστε οἰκοδομουντες εαυτους ἐν πίστει υμῶν [ἀγία το ελεος] προσευχομενοι ἐν πνευματι αγίῳ, which agrees exactly with *sah.* except that, for the bracketed words, the latter has ἀγιωτατη omitting το ελεος.

v. 19. οὔτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί πνευμα μη ἔχοντες.

ἀποδιορίζοντες *add.* εαυτους C vulg. syrr. *Om.* \aleph ABKL 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in *Arist. Pol.* iv. 48, ὡσπερ ουν εἰ ζῶον προηρουμεθα λαβειν εἶδη, πρῶτον αν ἀποδιορίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν εχειν ζῶον ('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 ψυχικοί πνευμα μη 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 ποιουντες; 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* 6²² 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

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 *αποδιορίζοντες* :—

ψυχικούς ὑμᾶς (οἱ τοὺς πιστοὺς) λεγόντες, οὐτεσ 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 redarguti² et iterum [non]³ discernentes sancta⁴ 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 μεταδιδουαί τοῖς κυσῶν ἀπαγορευεται, 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. 11²⁹, ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως κρίμα εαυτῶ εσθίει 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, ἀγίους δὲ αὐτῶν 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').

the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James 3¹⁵), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 15⁴⁴), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. 2^{14f}) *ψυχικος ανθρωπος ου δέχεται τα του πνευματος του Θεου, μωρια γάρ αυτῶ ἐστιν . . . ὁ δε πνευματικος ανακρίνει παντα.* 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, *την του Θεοῦ χαριτα μετατιθεντες εις ἀσελγειαν*), professing a knowledge of the *βαθη του Θεου* (1 Cor. 2¹⁰), though it was really a knowledge only of *τα βάθεια του Σατανα* (Apoc. 2²⁴), 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 ους μεν ἐλεγγετε διακρινομενους, ους δε σωζετε ἐκ πυρος ἀρπάζοντες, ους δε ἐλεατε ἐν φόβῳ, μισουντες καὶ τον ἀπο τῆς σαρκος εσπιλωμενον χιτῶνα.* (Text of WH. and B. Weiss) *καὶ οὗς μεν ελεατε διακρινομενους σωζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, ους δε ελεατε ἐν φοβῳ, μισουντες καὶ τον ἀπο τῆς σαρκὸς εσπιλωμένον χιτωνα.* In *App.* to WH. it is added, 'Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first *ελεατε* an interpolation' (*Sel. Readings*, p. 107).

22 *ἐλέγγετε* AC* 13. Vulg. Boh. Arm. Aeth. (Eph. Theophyl. Oec. *Comm.* Cassiod.). *ἐλεάτε* BC². Syr^h. *ελεειτε* KLP (Theophyl. Oec. *txt.*), *εκ πυρος ἀρπάζετε* (hic) Syr^p. Clem. 773.

διακρινομενους ABC⁸. 13. Vulg. Syrr. Boh. Arm. Clem. 773, *διακρινώμενοι* KLP+.

23. *οὗς δε* (1st) A⁸ C 13 KLP Vulg. Syr^h. Boh. Arm., *Om.* B., *δε* Syr^p. Clem. *σώζετε* NABC 13 Vulg. Boh. Arm. Aeth., *εν φόβῳ σωζετε* KLP+, *ελεειτε* Clem. 773 (quoted below), *ελεατε ἐν φόβῳ* Syr^p. *ἐκ πυρος* ABC⁸ KLP⁸ 13 Arm., *εκ του π.* Boh. *Om.* *σωζετε εκ πυρὸς αρπάζοντες* Syr^p.

ἀρπάζοντες ους δε ἐλεατε ἐν φόβῳ AB⁸ 13. Vulg., Arm., *om.* *ἀρπάζοντες* Boh., *ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φοβῳ* C. Syr^h, *ἀρπάζοντες* KLP+

Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. *Et hos quidem arguite iudicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore.* Ar^o. *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-*

dam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) et salvate quosdam territione, abripite eos ex igne. Aeth. quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est (Aeth^p. propter peccatum eorum), et est qui et servabitur ex igne et rapiunt 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 misereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execratione fugiant. Mr. Horner states that vv. 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows: καὶ οὓς μὲν ελεγχετε διακρινομενους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρός (al. om. τοῦ), οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε (al. φερετε) ἐν φόβῳ. Commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, κακείνους δὲ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδιῶστανται ὑμῶν—τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι—ελεγχετε, τουτεστι φανεροῦτε τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν ἀσεβειαν αὐτῶν· εἴτε δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορωσι, μὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλεῶ προσλαμβάνεσθε, σωζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αυτοῖς πυρός· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αυτοὺς 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, *ους μὲν ελεγχετε διακρινομενους, οὓς δὲ σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεατε ἐν φόβῳ*, and B, *ους μὲν ἐλεατε διακρινομενους, οὓς δὲ σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες, 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 ελεγχεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσευξῆ (οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπερ τὴν ψυχὴν 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 πυρός ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομενους δὲ ἐλεατε ἐν φόβῳ*. *Syr^h. et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes, hos autem servate de igne rapientes in timore*, representing *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεατε διακρινομενους, οὓς δὲ σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ*. *Clem. Adumbr. quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremini in timore*,¹ representing *ους δὲ σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες, 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

ελεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 773, καὶ οὓς ἄνθρωποι ἐκ πυρός ἀρπαζετε, διακρινομένους δε 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 ελεεῖτε διακρινομένους σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δε ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὓς μὲν ελεεῖτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δε σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὓς μὲν ελεεῖτε διακρινομένοι, οὓς δε ἐν φόβῳ σωζετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπαζοντες.

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 \aleph 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 μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεᾶτε, depending on the principal verb σωζετε; while οὓς δε, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ελεᾶτε 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 ελεγετε, 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 \aleph) caused the omission of the second ελεᾶτε, and therefore of the second οὓς δε. The reading διακρινομένοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἀρπάζοντες, 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.

and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühn 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 *ελέγχειν* 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 *ελεος*, 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: *εάν τις ἐν υμῖν πλανηθῆ ἀπο τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτοῦ, γνωσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἀμαρτωλοῦ ἐκ πλάνης οδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου*. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, *διακρινομενοί*, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 1⁶), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John 16^{8,9}, *ἐλέγξει περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστευουσιν 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. 5⁵), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

2 P. i. 1. *Συμμεων* **NAKLP** syrr '*al. longe plu.*' Ti Treg WH.^m, Spitta, Weiss, Kühn, von Soden, *Σιμων* B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that *Σιμων* was a correction of *Συμμεων*

than the reverse, as *Συμεων* 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 *Σιμων*. 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. *του θεου και Ἰησοῦ του κυρίου ημῶν* MSS. generally Ti Treg WH., *Ομ. του θεου και 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 *ως παντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτου δεδωρημενου* 'in as much as He has given all things of divine power,' syr^h *ος . . . δεδωρημενος*; both connect vv. 3, 4 closely with v. 2, not with v. 5. G.]

ιδία δόξη ⚭ ACP 13 vg sah boh syrr Ti Treg WH.^m, v. Soden, Weiss, Spitta, Kuhl, Keil +, *δια δοξης* BKL 31 '*al. longe plu.*' WH. The recurrence of *δια* in the sentence *πάντα ημιν της θείας δυνάμεως αυτου τὰ προς ζωνν . . . δεδωρημενης δια της ἐπιγνωσεως του καλεσαντος ἡμας δια δόξης και ἀρετῆς δι' ὧν τα μεγαιστα . . . ἐπαγγελματα δεδωρηται, "να δια τουτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φυσεως,* makes it more likely that *διά* should have been written by mistake for *ιδία* than the reverse; *δοξη* would then be corrected to *δοξης*. Again *δια δοξης* is too vague to convey a meaning; while *ιδιος* is a favourite word with 2 Peter and *ιδία δοξη* 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 ων τα τιμια και μεγαιστα ημιν* B syr^h spec (*bis*) WH. Weiss, *δι' ὧν τὰ τιμια ημῖν και μέγιστα* ⚭ KL+Ti, *δι' ὧν τὰ μεγαιστα και τιμια ημιν* ACP 13. 31. 68 syr^p Treg (*sed* A 68 syr^p *υμῖν προ ημῖν*¹). As regards the order of the epithets, ⚭BKL 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 και προθυμων*, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in ⚭ is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of *τιμια*. The order in A seems to have originated in

¹ Syr^h has *ημιν* but, as usual, gives the reading of syr^p in marg.

the accidental or intentional omission of *τίμια καί* and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading *υμιν*, as we can hardly understand the following *γένησθε* without it. Confusion between *ἡμεις* and *υμεις* is very common, and the change here is explained by the preceding *ἡμας* in *v. 3*. Spitta, reading *τιμια ημιν*, inserts *υμιν* after *ἐπαγγελματα*.

i. 12. *μελλησω* & ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, *οὐκ αμελήσω* KL syr, *ου μελλησω* tol Cass, *μελήσω* Field (*Otiism Norv.* ii. p. 151). The insertion of the negative is an attempt to get over the awkwardness of *μελλησω*, 'I shall be about to,' the only other example of which in the N.T. is Mt. 24⁶ *μελλησετε ακουειν 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 *μελω* and *μέλλω* are John 12⁶, 1 P. 5⁷, Mt 22¹⁶, where many MSS. have the incorrect *μέλλω*. Field quotes Suidas *μελησω σπουδασω, φροντίσω*. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to *μελλησω*, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (*Curr. Nov.* p. 227) 'pro *μελλησω* necessario reponendum est *μελησω*.' Other instances of the personal construction, *μελω* for *μελει μοι*,¹ are found in Eur. *Herc. F.* 772 *θεοὶ τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουσι καὶ των οσίων ἐπαίειν*, Plut. *Vit.* 395.

ἐν τῇ παρουσῇ ἀληθεία. For the difficult *παρουσῇ*, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests *παραδοθείσῃ*, as in ii. 21 *ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αυτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς*, and Jude 3 *τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ πίστει*.

i. 17. *φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιασδε ὑπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεπῶς δόξης*. So all the authorities, except syr, which give *απο*, and vg which has *delapsa a* (in Sabatier's Old Latin *del. de*). It is difficult however to see the force of *υπο*, 'a voice brought by the excellent glory.' We have an example of the proper use of *φερομαι υπο* just below in *v. 21*, *υπὸ πνευματος ἁγίου φερομενοι ἐλάλησαν*. Surely the excellent glory is the *source*, not the *vehicle* of the voice. I think we should read *απο* with syr. In like manner *υπο* has been substituted for *απο* in most MSS. of Lk. 8²⁹ and Acts 15⁴.

i. 19, *αυχμηρῶ*] *ι χμηρω* A 26 *al.* There is the same peculiarity

† Suidas explains *μελω* by *ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ εἰμί*.

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

i. 21. ἀπο θεου BP syr^h+WH Ti, ἀπὸ θελήματος θεου boh, αγιοι θεου **Ⲭ** KL syr^p+Treg, αγιοι του θεου A, ἅγιοι sah, αγιοι ἀπὸ θεου al. Evidently αγιοι is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. σιροῖς **Ⲭ** Ti (σειροις ABC Treg), σειραῖς KLP vg syr^r boh+. Sah translates freely, 'For God spared not the angels when they sinned, but cast them down to the abyss in darkneses infinite, he gave them to be kept for the judgment being punished,' which seems to represent αβυσσῶ ἐν ἀπείροις (cf. J. 6 αἰδίους) ζόφοις ταρταρωσας παρεδωκεν εις κρίσιν κολαζομενους τηρεῖν. If σειραις 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 σιροις. Why should he not have used a Septuagint equivalent, αβυσσος, λακκος, βοθυνος etc., unless indeed the former was the word employed in Enoch? See further in the explanatory note.

ζοφου BCKLP**Ⲭ** Ti Treg WH Weiss, ζόφοις **Ⲭ**A Spitta, Kuhl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal -οις intended to correct σειραῖς, but wrongly applied to ζοφου. Spitta would read ζοφοις contracted from ζοφεις, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρουμενους BCKLP syr^h+Ti Treg WH, κολαζομενους τηρεῖν **Ⲭ** 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 ὑπομνησει in i. 13 and iii. 1; τουτο πρωτον γιωνσκοντες in i. 20, iii. 3; εξακολουθεω in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; φθορά, ii. 12 bis; μισθον ἀδικίας, ii. 13, 15; δελεάζω, ii. 14, 18; ουρανοί . . . παρελευσονται στοιχεια δὲ καυσουμενα λυθησεται in iii. 10, and ουρανοί . . . λυθησονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα τηκεται in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of **Ⲭ** A is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. καταστροφή κατεκρινεν **Ⲭ** AC²KL vg syr^r (ἐν κατ.

where *ἐν* merely marks the dative)+Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, *κατεκρινεν* BC WH, *κατεστρεψεν* P. It seems more likely that *καταστροφή* should have been accidentally omitted than inserted. It was a natural word for the author to use, as *καταστρεφω* 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, *κατακρινουσιν αυτον θανατω*, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits *θανατω*), *Martyr. Andr. prius* 13 *ανδρα μηδεν αδικησαντα κατεκρινεν σταυρω*, Diod. xiv. 4 *τους πονηροτατους κατεδικαζου θανατω*, Ael. V.H. xii. 49 *κατεγνώσθη θανατω*.

ασεβειν BP syr^h (exemplum eorum quae impiis futura sunt ponens) syr^p (exemplum impiis futurorum ponens, *al.* exemplum impiis futuris ponens) WH, *τοις ασεβειν* sah boh, *ασεβειν* Ⲭ ACKL_v vg Treg Ti. The infinitive *ασεβειν* is naturally suggested by *μελλοντων*, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. *ασεβειν*. As a rule, *υποδειγμα* takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16 *Ενωχ υποδειγμα μετανοιας ταις γενεαις*; 2 Macc. vi. 31 *τοις νεοις υποδειγμα γενναιοτητος καταλιπων*; 3 Macc. ii. 5 *παράδειγμα τοις επιγνωμενοις καταστησας*. 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 *περι μελλοντων ευλογησεν*, and *v.l.* in Heb. ix. 11 *των μελλοντων αγαθων*, Col. 2¹⁷ *α εστιν σκια των μελλοντων*, *Petri Apoc.* (*ap. Clem. Al. Str.* vi. § 48) *αποστολους δηλουντας τα μελλοντα*] than to say 'an example of persons about to do wrong,' which would be better expressed by the simple *παράδειγμα ασεβειας*.

ii. 8. *ο δικαιος* Ⲭ ACKLP syr^r Treg Ti, *om.* *ο* B WH. The latter reading gives an easier construction for the datives *βλεμματι και ακοη*, '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 *ο δικαιος*, we should have to govern *βλέμματι* by *ψυχην δικαίαν εβασάνιζεν*, 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.'

11. 11. ου φερουσιν κατ' αυτων παρα κυρίω βλάσφημον κρισιν
 ⲛ BCKLP syrr Ti, om. παρα κυρίω A vg+, παρα κυριου *minusc.*
et. verss. al. Spitta, [παρὰ κυριῶ] Treg WH. Here αὐτῶν refers
 to δόξας (= τῷ διαβολῷ), and παρὰ κυρίῳ, refers to ἄλλα εἶπεν
 ἐπιτιμησαι σοι κυριος in Jude 9. It is implied that reverence for
 God was the motive which restrained the angel from presumptu-
 ous 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 παρα κυρίου. If it is 'from the
 Lord,' how can it be a βλάσφημος κρίσις?

ii. 13. ἀδικουμενοι ⲛ BP syr^p arm+ WH, κομιουμενοι ⲛ^c ACKL
 vg sah boh syr^h (ementes)+Ti Treg. The future κομιουμενοι is
 out of place here, where we want a present (or even a past)
 participle synchronizing with the verb φθαρησονται, and can only
 be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood ἀδικουμενοι,
 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.

ἡδουνην ἡγουμενοι all MSS. and edd. I have endeavoured to
 explain this reading in the note. But I am inclined to think
 that ἡδουνην, which may have been a marginal gloss on τρυφην,
 has taken the place of a half-obliterated ἀγάπην. Cf. Clem. Al.
Str. iii. 10 ου γαρ ἀγάπην εἶποίμ' αν την συνελευσιν αυτῶν, and
 just below μεθ' ημεραν ἤδη (= 2 P. εν ημερᾷ) παρ ὧν αν ἐθελη-
 σωσι γυναικῶν ἀπαιτεῖν την του Καρποκρατείου νομου ὑπακοην.
 So *Paed.* ii. 4 (p. 165) τὴν ἀγάπην την ἡγιασμένην . . . καθυβρί-
 ζοντες, *ib.* τὰς τοιαυτας εστίασεις ὁ κυριος ἀγάπας ου κεκληκεν,
ib. § 7 ἀγάπη μὲν οὖν δεῖπνον ουκ εστιν, ἡ δε εστίασις ἀγάπης
 ηρτησθω, 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 τρυφη and ἀπάται were often connected.

ἐν ταις ἀπάταις αυτῶν ⲛ A¹C¹KLP syr^h+WH, for ἀπάταις
 A²BC² vg syr^p (and mg of syr^h) Treg Zahn Nestle Lightfoot (on
Ign. Smyrn.), WH mg. read ἀγάπαις. The gen. αυτῶν is in favour

of ἀπαταις. 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 σπιλαδες in the same verse. The reading of B is probably a correction from Jude 12.

ii. 14. ἀκαταπαυστους **ΣCKLP** 13 31 Ti Treg, ἀκαταπάστους 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. = ἀναπαυονται, he continues: 'fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάζεν = παυειν.' 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 αχμηρω, 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 εσχατα 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, ἐπαναπαησεται Luke x. 6, and εκαην from κείω. Cf. *New Sayings of Jesus*, 1 βασιλευσας ἀναπαησεται. Schaefer in the Index to Bast's *Comment. Palaeogr.* (s. αυ et a confusa) refers to the reading πίφασκον for πίφασκον in Hom. *Od.* 12. 165 with Porson's note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that εατου and τατο are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for εαυτου and ταύτο. He also mentions that Ἄγουστος often stands for Ανγουστος in papyri, that two examples of πάω for παυω occur in the *C.I.G.*, viz., 5984 A 3 ἀναπαομενος and 6595, 4 ἀναπάεται, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Cronert's *Memoria Herculanensis*, p. 126.¹ Hort in his *Notes on Orthography* (*Appendix*, p. 170) mentions the form ἀναπαμος = 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 πατεομαι). After pointing out that in Homer it means no more than "to taste," Athenaeus adds in contrast (i. 43, p. 24 A) οί δε νεωτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ του πληρωθῆναι τιθεασι το πάσασθαι . . . Ἀκαταπαστος is exactly similar to απαστος, ἀπαστία, απαστί.' There is no evidence however that

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

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

ii. 15. *καταλειποντες* **Σ** AB Ti WH, *καταλιποντες* B³CKLP syr^r + Treg WH^m. If we assume that the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb *ἐπλανηθησαν*, 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 *ειλικρευνη*, 8 *χειλια bis*.

Βοσορ **Σ**^cACKLP boh syr^h Ti Treg, *Βεωρ* B syr^p sah WH Weiss, *Βεωροσορ* **Σ** (arising from a confusion between *Βοσορ* 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 *Βοσορ* should have been changed to *Βεωρ* than the reverse.

ος μισθον ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν ACKLP **Σ**^c syr^r WH Ti Treg, *μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησαν* B arm Treg^m WH^m. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (*ελεγξιν εσχεν*) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of *ος* may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. *ολιγως* AB **Σ**^c vg syr^r ('propemodum' White, 'paululum' Poc., Gwynn is doubtful), sah boh render 'slightly' Treg Ti WH, *οντως* **Σ** CKLP, *ολίγον minusc. al.* The reading *δντως* (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 *οντως*, the reading *ολίγον*,

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

iii. 6. *δι ὧν ὁ τότε κοσμος ὑδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπωλετο*. Commentators explain *δι ὧν* as referring to the *ἐξ υδατος καὶ δι υδατος* 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 *υδατι* 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' ου* with minusc. 31,¹ which would refer to the immediately preceding *τῶ του Θεου λόγω*, 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 αὐτου* ⚭ 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 *Θεου*.

iii. 9. *δι'* ⚭ A 5. 13. 69 + vg Aug. spec. sah syrr aeth, *εἰς* BCKLP arm boh Oecum., *ημας* KL boh Theoph. Oec., *υμας* ⚭ ABCP sah syrr arm aeth vg spec +. *δι' υμας* Treg^m, *εἰς υμᾶς* Treg WH Weiss, *εἰς ημᾶς* KL. I am inclined to think that *δι' ημᾶς* 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 *υμεῖς* and *ημεῖς* in MSS. is generally recognized, cf. Winer, p. 330 n. So in v. 11 below I am inclined to think that *ημας* (read by ⚭) must have been what the author wrote and not the *υμας* of ACKL omitted by B.

iii. 10. *ἡμερα κυρίου* BC Treg Ti WH, *ἡ ἡμέρα* κ. ⚭ AKLP Weiss. The phrase *ἡμερα 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. 1²⁰ f. *φανερῶθέντος ἐπ' ἔσχατου των χρόνων δι' ὑμας, τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν*, which Hort explains of the Gentiles generally.

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 ουρανοί* ABC Treg WH Weiss, *ουρανοί* & KL Ti, *add. μεν* & 13. The anarthrous *στοιχία* and *γῆ* which follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In *v.* 7 the article is required by the following *νυν*.

ευρεθησεται & BKP syr^p, *ουχ ευρεθησεται* sah, *κατακαησεται* AL boh syr^h Ti, *καυθησεται* vel *κατακαυθησονται* al., *ἀφανισθησονται* C, *om. καὶ γῆ*—*ευρεθησεται* vg, *om. ευρεθήσεται* spec, Weiss reads *ευρεθησεται* with a question, *ex ruysetai corr. putat* H (*S.R.* p. 103). The phrase *ουχ ευρίσκεται* is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36 *ουχ ευρεθη ὁ τοπος αὐτου*, Job xx. 8 *ὥσπερ ἐνυπνιον εκπετασθεν οὐ μη ευρεθη*, Dan. xi, 19 *πεσειται καὶ οὐχ ευρεθησεται*, 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 *ευρεθησεται*: so probably in the case of *κατακαησεται* and the other readings. The required sense would be given by *καταρυησεται* or *διαρυήσεται*, but not, I think, by the simple *ρυήσεται*. Buttman's suggestion, *α εν αυτῇ εργα ευρεθησεται*, 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 *ευρεθησεται* than *καταρυήσεται*. He suggests however that possibly *ιαθησεται* or *ἐξιαθησεται* may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, *ιασον τὴν γῆν ἣν ηφανισαν οἱ ἐγγρηγοροι*, and in anticipation of *καινην γῆν* in ver. 13 below (the three clauses in *vv.* 12b, 13, answering to the three clauses in *v.* 10); but he allows that 'ver. 11 seems to require some verb implying destruction at the end of ver. 10.' Could this be *αρθησεται*? There is much to be said for *πυρωθησεται* 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]θησεται, while *θ* also had disappeared when the third scribe conjectured [κατακα]ησεται.

iii. 11. *τουτων ουν* & AKL syr^p Ti Treg, *τουτων ούτως* B

syr^h (*mg.* ουν) WH Weiss, *τουτων δε ουτως* CP. There seems no special reason for *ουτως*. 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 *ουτως* and *ουν* are scarcely distinguishable, the former appearing as *o* in the London medical papyrus, as *o* in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while *ουν* = *ó* in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16 *πασαις ταῖς* Ⲛ KLP Ti, *om.* *ταις* ABC Treg WH Weiss. 'In all letters' seems to me too indefinite: *ταις* 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*) *παρεισεδυσαν.* 5 (*β*) *υμας απαξ παντα* (instead of *υμας παντα*). 9 (*β*) *οτε Μιχαηλ . . . τοτε.* 13 (*β*) *πλάνητες οἷς ζόφος σκοτους.* 14 (*α*) *επροφητευσεν.* 23 (*β*) *om.* 1st *οὗς δε.*

2 PETER.

i. 1 (*β*) *Σίμων.* i. 4 (*α*) *τίμα καὶ μεγαιστα ημῖν.* i. 17 (?) *ο υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ουτος ἐστιν.* ii. 8 (*α*) *ακοή δίκαιος.* ii. 15 (*β*) *Βεωρ μισθον ἀδικίας ἠγαπησαν.* ii. 16 (*β*) *ανθρωποις.* ii. 18 (*β*) *ματαιοτης Β', ματαιοτητης Β³.* ii. 20 (*β*) *ἐσχα.* iii. 5 (*β*) *συνεστώσης.* iii. 11 (*β*) *τουτων ουτως, ib. om. υμας.* Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by Ⲛ and the other MSS.

Readings of B supported by one other uncial MS.:

JUDE.

5 (?) *Ἰησοῦς* BC. 18 (?) *ἐπ' ἐσχατου χρονου* BC. 21 (*β*) *τηρησωμεν* BC.

2 PETER.

i. 18 (?) *τω ἀγίῳ ορει* BC. i. 21 (*α*) *ἀπὸ θεου* BP. ii. 6 (*β*) *om.* *καταστροφῇ* BC. ii. 13 (*β*) *ἀγαπαις* BA². ii. 14 (*β*) *ἀκαταπα-*

στους ΒΑ. ii. 15 (β) *om. os* ΒΝ. ii. 19 (?) *τουτω* ΒΝ (omitting *και*). ii. 20 (?) *κυρίου* (omitting *ήμῶν*) ΒΚ. ii. 22 (?) *κυλισμον* · ΒC. iii. 10 (α) *ημερα* (omitting *η*) ΒC.

Readings of B supported by two other uncial MSS. :

2 PETER.

i. 3 (β) *δια δοξης και αρετης* ΒΚΛ. ii. 4 (?) *σειροις* ΒΑC. ii. 12 (α) *αδικουμενοι* ΒΡΝ. ii. 15 (?) *καταλείποντες* ΒΑΝ. ii. 21 (α) *υποστρεψαι* ΒCΡ. ii. 22 (α) *συμβεβηκεν* (omitting *δε*) ΒΑΝ. iii. 7 (α) *τω αυτω* ΒΑΡ. iii. 9 (β) *εις υμας* ΒCΡ. iii. 10 (β) *οι ουρανοι* ΒΑC. (?) *ευρεθήσεται* ΒΚΡ. iii. 16 (β) *πασαις* (omitting *ταις*) ΒΑC.

EPISTLE OF JUDE
AND
SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

EPISTLE OF JUDE

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 \aleph , 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 \aleph ABCKLP. 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 Θεω . . . καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, 2 Pet. 1² *om.* του Θεου και Ἰησου, 1³ *om.* αυτου, 1⁴ υμιν, 1⁹ αμαρτηματων, 1¹² μελήσω, 1¹⁷ απο, 2⁴ σειραις, *ιβ.* κολαζομενους τηρειν, 3⁶ δι' ον, 3⁹ ἡμας, 3¹² τήξεται.

ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

2 P. 1. 1 1 Ἰουδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφός δὲ
 2 P. 1. 17 Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ
 2 P. 1. 3, 10 Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς· 2 ελεος ὑμῖν καὶ
 2 P. 1. 2, 7 εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεῖη.

1. τοῖς θεοῖς...καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ conj. H (*Sel. Read.* p. 106). ἠγαπημένοις AB N, ἠγαπασμένοις KLP.

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β

1 Συμεων Πετρος δουλός και αποστολός Ἰησοῦ ^{J. 2}
 Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσοτιμοῖν ἡμῖν λαχουσὶν πίστιν ἐν ^{J. 3, 20}
 δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηροῦ 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 δυναμείως αὐτοῦ τα
 πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσεβειαν δεικνύμενης διὰ τῆς ἐπι- ^{J. 21}
 γνώσεως τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, ^{J. 1, J. 24}
 4 δι' ὧν τα ἅπαντα καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα
 δεικνύονται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γενήσθε θείας κοινωνοὶ
 φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίας ^{J. 16, 18}
 φθοράς. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δεσποῦδην πασαν ^{J. 10, J.}
 παρεισενεγκάτε ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ^{J. 3, 20}
 ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, 6 ἐν
 δὲ τῇ γνῶσει τὴν ἐγκρατείαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ
 τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσεβειαν,
 7 ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ
 φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. 8 ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπαρ- ^{J. 2, 21}
 χοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργούς οὐδὲ ἀκαρπούς ^{J. 12}
 καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

1. Συμεων Ν ΑΚΛΡ syrr. + Treg. Ti. WH.^m, Σιμων Β vulg. sah. boh. + WH. εἰς δικαιοσυνὴν Ν. τοῦ θεοῦ] τ. κυρίου Ν.

2. ἡμῶν, WH., ἡμῶν. Treg. Ti.

3. πάντα ΒCKLP + Treg. WH., τα πάντα Ν Α + Ti. ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ Ν ΑCP 13 vulg. spec. syrr. sah. boh. Ti. Treg. WH.^m, διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς ΒΚΛ 31 WH.

4. τιμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν Β syrr.^h spec.

WH., τιμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα Ν ΚΛ Ti. WH.^m, μέγιστα καὶ τιμια ἡμῖν ΑCP syrr. (sed Α syrr. ὑμῖν) 13, 31 + Treg. τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίας] τὴν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίαν Ν. φθοράς. syrr. WH. Ti. Treg., φθοράς, Weiss.

5. καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δε ΒCKLP, καὶ αὐτοὶ δε Α vulg. +, καὶ αὐτὸ δε τοῦτο Ν C² syrr., κατ' (προ καὶ) conj. Blass.

8. ὑπαρχοντα] παροντα Α +.

2 P. 3. 1, 8, 3 *Αγαπητοι, πασαν σπουδην ποιου-*
 14, 17 *μενος γραφειν υμιν περι της κοινης ημων*
 2 P. 1. 5, 10 *σωτηριας αναγκην εσχον γραψαι υμιν παρα-*
 2 P. 3. 1, 15 *καλων επαγωνιζεσθαι τη απαξ παραδοθειση τοις*
 2 P. 2. 21 *αγιοις πιστει.*
 2 P. 3 2 2 P. 1. 1, 2

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

επιγνωσιν. 9 ὡ γὰρ μὴ παρεστὶν ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἐστὶν
 μυωπαζῶν, λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι J. 4
 αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν. 10 Διὸ μάλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδασάτε
 βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· J. 1, J. 3
 ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταισητέ ποτέ· J. 24
 11 οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ
 εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν J. 7, 21
 καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. J. 25

12 Διὸ μέλλησω αἰεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνησκεῖν περὶ J. 5
 τούτων, καίπερ εἰδοτάς καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ J. 5
 παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δίκαιον δὲ ἡγούμαι, ἐφ' ὅσον
 εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνωματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπο- J. 5
 μνησει, 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχὺν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποθεσις τοῦ
 σκηνώματος μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς
 Χριστὸς ἐδηλώσεν μοι. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκασ-
 τὸτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἔμην ἐξοδὸν τὴν τούτων
 μνημὴν ποιεῖσθαι. 16 οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μυθοῖς J. 3
 ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἀλλ'
 ἐποπταί γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17 λαβὼν
 γὰρ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς J. 1, J. 24
 ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαῦσδε ὑπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης
 Ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου οὗτος ἐστὶν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ
 εὐδόκησα,—18 καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκουσαμεν
 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθείσαν συν αὐτῷ οὐτε ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὀρει·
 19 καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ὡ J. 14
 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσεχόντες ὡς λυχνῶ φαίνονται ἐν
 αὐχμηρῷ τοπῷ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαύγαση καὶ φωσφορὸς

9. ἀμαρτιῶν BCLP+WH., ἀμαρτημα-
 τῶν N AK Ti. Treg. WH^m.

10. σπουδασάτε] *add.* ἵνα δια τῶν καλῶν
 ὑμῶν ἔργων N A syrr. sah. boh. (*sed* ὁμ.
 ὑμῶν N) +. ποιεῖσθαι] ποιείσθε A, ποιήσθε
 syrr. vulg. cf. WH. (*App.* p. 103).

12. μέλλησω N ABCP vulg. sah. boh.
 +, οὐ μέλλησω tol. Cassiod., οὐκ ἀμελήσω
 KL syrr. +, μελήσω Field. αἰεὶ ὑμᾶς
 BCKL+, ὑμᾶς αἰεὶ A vulg., αἰεὶ περὶ
 τούτων ὑπομιμνησκεῖν ὑμᾶς N.

12, 13 ὁμ. καίπερ—διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς N.

13. ὑπομνησει] τῇ ὑπ. A N.

14. καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ὁμ. N.

15. σπουδάσω] σπουδάσω N syrr., σπου-
 δασάτε sy¹.

17. ὑπο] ἀπο syrr. ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπη-
 τὸς μου οὗτος ἐστὶν B WH., οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ
 υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ACKL N sah. (*adding*
 μου after αγ.) Treg. Ti.

18. τῷ ἁγίῳ ὀρει BC+WH. Treg., τῷ
 ὀρει τῷ ἁγίῳ ACKLP N+Ti.

2 P. 2. 1, 8. 7 4 παρεισεδυσαν γαρ τινες ανθρωποι, οι
 2 P. 1. 9, 2. 3 πάλαι προγεγραμμενοι εις τουτο το κριμα, ασε-
 2 P. 8. 7, 2 P. βεις, την του Θεου ημων χαριτα μετατιθεντες εις
 2 P. 2. 2, 7 ασελγειαν και τον μονον δεσποτην και κυριον
 2 P. 2. 1 ημων Ιησουν Χριστον αρνουμενοι. 5 Υπο-
 2 P. 1. 12 μνήσαι δε υμας βουλομαι, ειδοντας υμας παντα, οτι
 2 P. 2. 1 Κυριος απαξ λαον εκ γης Αιγυπτου σωσας το δευτερον
 2 P. 2. 1, 3. [τους] μη πιστευσαντας απωλεσεν, 6 αγγελους
 2 P. 2. 4 τε τους μη τηρήσαντας την εαυτων αρχην αλλα απολι-
 2 P. 1. 3, 2. ποντας το ιδιον οικητηριον εις κρισιν μεγαλης
 16, 22, 3. 8
 2 P. 2. 4, 9, 8. η μέρας ο εσμοις αιδιους υπο ζοφον τετή-
 10, 1
 2 P. 2. 6 ρηκεν· 7 ως Σοδομα και Γόμορρα και αι
 2 P. 2. 10 περι αυτας πολεις, τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις εκ-
 2 P. 2. 6, 1. ρας, προκεινται δειγμα πυρος αιωνιου δικην
 2 P. 2. 10, 20 σαρκα μεν μαινουσιν, κυριότητα δε αθε-
 2 P. 2. 11 τουσιν, δοξας δε βλασφημουσιν. 9 Ο δε
 2 P. 2, 10, 11 Μιχαηλ ο αρχαγγελος, οτε τω διαβολω διακρι-
 νομενος διελεγετο περι του Μουσεως σωματος, ουκ
 ετολμησεν κρισιν επενεγκειν βλασφη-

4. παρεισεδυσαν B WH., παρεισεδυσαν
 NACKLP+Ti. Treg. δεσποτην] *add.*
 θεον KLP syr. +.

5. υμας παντα N KL 31 syr. Clem.
 Theoph. Oecon. +, υμας απαξ παντα B,
 απαξ παντα AC² 13 vulg. + Ti. Treg. WH.,
 απαξ παντας H. (*Sel. Recd.* p. 106). *οτι*
 N AB syr^h., *add.* ο C²KL syrP. κυριος
 N CKL syr^h., Ιησους AB+, θεος C² syrP.
 Clem. απαξ λαον N 68 tol. syr. boh.

(οτι απαξ Ιησ. λαον) sah. arm. Did.
 Cassiod., λαον απαξ Clem., λαον ABCL
 Ti. Treg. WH.

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

8. κυριότητα]—τητας N Orig.

9. ο δε Μιχαηλ...οτε ACKL N, οτε
 Μιχ....τοτε B. κυριος] ο θεος N.

ανατειλη εν ταις καρδιαις υμων· 20 τουτο πρωτον
 γινωσκοντες οτι πασα προφητεια γραφῆς ἰδιας επι-
 λυσεως ου γινεται· 21 ου γαρ θεληματι ανθρωπου
 ηνεχθη προφητεια ποτε, αλλα υπο πνευματος J. 20
 αγίου φερομενοι ελαλησαν απο Θεου ανθρωποι.

II

1 Ἐγένοντο δε και ψευδοπροφήται εν τῷ λαῳ, ως J. 5
 και εν υμιν εσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι, οιτινες παρεισ- J. 4
 ἄξουσιν αιρεσεις απωλείας, και τον αγορασαντα
 αυτους οεσποτην αρνουμενοι, επαγοντες εαυτοις J. 4
 ταχινην απωλειαν· 2 και πολλοι εξακολουθησουσιν J 5
 αυτων ταῖς ασελγείαις, δι ους η οδος τῆς J 4, J 11
 ἀληθείας βλασφημηθησεται· 3 και εν πλεονεξία J. 8,
 πλαστοῖς λογοις υμᾶς εμπορευσονται· οἷς το κριμα J 4
 εκπαλαι ουκ ἀργει, και η ἀπωλεια αυτων ου J. 4, J 5
 νυστάζει. 4 ει γαρ ὁ Θεος ἀγγελων ἀμαρτη- J. 6
 σάντων ουκ εφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειροῖς ζοφου ταρ- J. 6
 ταρωσας παρεδωκεν εις κρίσιν τηρουμενους, J. 6
 5 και ἀρχαίου κοσμου ουκ εφείσατο, ἀλλα ὄγδοον Νωε
 δικαιοσυνης κηρυκα εφυλαξεν, κατακλυσμον κοσμῳ J. 24
 ἀσεβῶν επάξας· 6 και πολεις Σοδομων και J. 4, 15, J. 7
 Γομόρρας τεφρωσας καταστροφη κατεκρινεν, υπο-
 δειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβειν τεθεικως, 7 και δίκαιον J. 7 J. 4
 Λωτ καταπονουμενον υπο της των αθεσμων εν ασελγεία J. 4
 ἀναστροφης ερυσατο,—8 βλεμματι γαρ και ακοῇ
 δικαιος ενκατοικων εν αυτοῖς ημεραν εξ ἡμερας ψυχην
 δικαίαν ἀνομοις εργοις εβασάνιζεν,—9 οιδεν Κυριος J. 15

20. προφητεια γραφης] γραφη προφη-
 τειας syrh. επιλυσεως] επιλυσις syrr.

21. προφητεια ποτε BCKP + WH. Treg.,
 ποτε προφ. N AL Ti. απο θεου BP
 syrh. boh. WH. Ti., αγιοι θεου N KL
 syrP. + Treg., αγιοι sah., αγιοι του θ. A,
 αγιοι απο θ C.

II 1. εν τω λαῳ] om. sah.

2. οδος] δοξα A N^c.

4. σειροις ABC WH. Treg., σιροις N
 Ti., σειραις KLP vulg. syrr. boh. +.

ζοφου] ζοφοις A N. τηρουμενους] κολαζο-
 μενους τηρειν A N vulg. syrP. boh. (ex.
 v. 9?).

6. καταστροφη κατεκρινεν] N AC²KL
 vulg. syrr. + Treg. Ti., κατεκρινεν BC
 boh. WH., κατεστρεψεν P. ασεβειν BP
 syrr. WH., ασεβειν N ACKL + Treg. Ti.

7. ερυσατο B WH., ερρυσατο N ACKLP
 Trsg. Ti.

8. δικαιος B vg. WH. ὁ δικ. N ACKLP
 syrr. boh. Treg. Ti.

2 P. 2. 12 μίας, αλλά ειπεν Ἐπιτιμησαι σοι Κύριος.
 10 Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφη-
 μουσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἀλογα ζῶα
 2 P. 2. 15 ἐπίστανται, ἐν τοῦτοις φθείρονται. 11 οὐαὶ
 2 P. 2. 13, 3. αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορευθῆσαν, καὶ τῇ
 2 P. 3. 8, 9 πλανῆ του Βαλααμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχυθῆσαν, καὶ
 2 P. 2. 18 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορε ἀπώλοντο. 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν
 2 P. 2. 17 [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγαπαῖς ὑμῶν σπιλαδὲς συνευ-
 2 P. 1. 3 χουμένοι ἀφοβῶς ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφελαι
 2 P. 2. 17 ἀνδρῶν ὑπο ἀνεμῶν παραφερομένοι, δέν-
 2 P. 3. 13 δρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἀκαρπὰ δις ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζω-
 2 P. 2. 17 θέντα, 13 κύματα ἀγρία θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς
 2 P. 3. 13 ἑαυτῶν αἰσχυρὰς, ἀστερεὲς πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζοφὸς
 2 P. 1. 19, 3. τοῦ σκοτοῦ εἰς αἰῶνα τετηρηται. 14 Ἐπρο-
 2 P. 2. 8 φητευσεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις ἐβδομὸς ἀπὸ Ἄδαμ Ἐνωχ
 2 P. 2. 4, 18 λέγων Ἴδου ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριασίν αὐτοῦ,
 2 P. 3. 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλεγεῖν πάντας
 2 P. 2. 8 τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσεβείας
 2 P. 2. 10; αὐτῶν ἠσεβῆσαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν
 2 P. 2. 18 ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατὰ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.
 16 Οὗτοι εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς
 ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ
 στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπερογκὰ, θαυμάζοντες
 πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.

12. οὗτοι εἰσιν] *add.* (ex v. 16) γογγυσταί—πορευόμενοι \aleph C². οἱ ἐν ταῖς] *om.* οἱ \aleph K vulg. Luc. Theophl. Oecon. + Chase. ἀγαπαῖς \aleph BKL syrg. sah. boh. +, ἀπαταις AC. ὑμῶν] αὐτῶν A vulg. syrg. +. συνευχόμενοι, ἀφοβῶς syrg. Treg. WH., συνευχ. ἀφοβῶς, Ti. παραφερομένοι B.

13. πλανῆτες οἱς ζοφὸς σκοτοῦ B.

14. ἐπροφητευσεν B¹, ἐπροεφ. B², προε-
 πρυφ. \aleph , προεφ. ACKL *al.* ἁγίαις μυριασίν]
 μυριασίν ἁγίων ἀγγελῶν \aleph syrg. sah.
 arm. +.

15. πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς] *add.* αὐτῶν
 KL Ti. (ἰσχυρία!), πᾶσαν ψυχὴν \aleph syrg.
 sah. ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν] *om.* \aleph sah. +,
 [ἀσεβείας] αὐτῶν Treg. σκληρῶν] *add.*
 λογῶν \aleph C Ti.

ευσεβεις εκ πειρασμου ρυεσθαι, ἀδικους δε εις ἡμε- J. 6
 ραν κρίσεως κολαζομενους τηρειν, 10 μάλιστα
 δε τους οπίσω σαρκος εν επιθυμία μiasμου J. 7, 8, 16, 18
 πορευομενους καὶ κυριοτητος καταφρο-
 νουντας. τολμηταὶ αυθαδεις, δοξας ου τρεμου- J. 8
 σιν βλασφημουντες· 11 οπου ἄγγελοι J. 9
 ἰσχυι καὶ δυναμει μείζονες ὄντες ου φερουσιν
 κατ αυτων παρα Κυρίῳ βλασφημον κρισιν.
 12 ουτοι δε, ως αλογα ζωα γεγεννημενα φυ- J. 10
 σικα εις αλωσιν καὶ φθοραν, εν οἷς αγνοου-
 σιν βλασφημουντες, εν τῇ φθορα αυτων
 καὶ φθαρησονται, 13 ἀδικουμενοι μισθον
 αδικιας· ηδονην ἡγουμενοι την εν ημερα τρυφην,
 σπιλοι και μωμοι εντρυφωντες εν ταῖς απαταις J. 12
 αὐτων συνευωχουμενοι υμιν, 14 οφθαλμους
 εχοντες μεστους μοιχαλίδος καὶ ακαταπαυστους αμαρ-
 τιας, δελεαζοντες ψυχας αστηρικτους, καρδίαν γεγυμ-
 νασμενην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, καταρας τεκνα· 15 κατα- J. 11
 λείποντες ευθείαν ὁδον επλανηθησαν,
 εξακολουθησαντες τη ὁδῷ του Βαλααμ του Βοσορ
 ος μισθον ἀδικίας ηγαπησεν, 16 ελεγξιν δε J. 15, 22
 ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· υποζυγιον ἄφωνον εν ανθρω-
 που φωνη φθειξαμενον εκωλυσεν την του προφητου
 παραφρονιαν. 17 ουτοί εισιν πηγαὶ ανυδροι καὶ J. 12
 ὀμιχλαι υπο λαίλαπος ελαυνομεναι, οἷς

9. πειρασμου] -σμων N+Ti.

10. επιθυμία] -as N, -ais CP syr^h. +. τολμηται αυθαδεις Ti. Weiss, τολμηται, αυθαδεις Treg. WH.

11. παρα κυριῳ N BCKLP syrr. +Ti., om. A+, παρα κυριου *minusc. et versiones plur.* Spitta, [παρα κυριῳ] WH. Treg.

12. γεγεννημενα ABCP+WH. Treg., γεγεννημενα N A² KL+Ti. γεγ. φυσ. N ABCP, φυσ. γεγ. KL. και φθαρησονται] καταφθαρ- KL+.

13. αδικουμενοι N BP syr^p. +WH., κομιουμενοι ACKL N^c. boh. spec. syr^h. +Ti. Treg. απαταις N ACKLP syr^h. (mg. αγαπαις), WH. Ti., αγαπαις A²B sah. syr^p. +Treg. WH^m.

14. μοιχαλιδος BCKLP+, μοιχαλιας A N vulg. sah. boh., ακαταπαυστους N CKLP syrr. +Ti. Treg., -παυστους AB WH. -παυστου Vulg. +. αμαρτιας] αμαρτιας N spec.

15. καταλειποντες N AB WH. Ti., καταλιποντες B³CKLP +Treg. WH^m. Βοσορ ACKLP N^c. vulg. boh. syr^h. aeth., Ti. Treg. WH^m, Βεωρ B syr^p. +WH., Βεωρσορ N. os ACKLP N^c syrr. WH., om. B N WH^m. ηγαπησεν] ηγαπησαν B WH^m.

16. ανθρωπου] ανθρωποις B.

17. και ομιχλαι] νεφελαι (ex Jud. 12) L+, om. και—τετηρηται K. σκοτους add. εις αιωνα (ex Jud. 13) ACLP.

2 P. 3. 1
12
2 P. 3. 2

17 Ὑμεῖς δέ, αγαπητοι, μνησθητε των ρηματων των προειρημενων υπο των αποστόλων του κυρίου ημων Ιησου Χριστου.

2 P. 3. 3
2 P. 2. 10

18 οτι ελεγον υμιν Επ εσχατου χρονου εσονται εμπαικται κατα τας εαυτων επιθυμιας πορευομενοι των ασεβειων. 19 Ουτοί εισιν οι αποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοι, πνευμα μη εχοντες.

18. επ' εσχατου N B, οτι επ' εσχ. AC, [οτι] επ' εσχ. Treg., *οτι εν εσχατω* KL mg. P sah. χρονου BC, του χρονου N A, χρονω KL τω χρονω P sah., των χρονων

boh. al. εσονται N BCKLP, ελευσονται N² AC² sah. boh. των ασεβειων] οπισω ασεβειων syr^h., οπισω ασεβειας syr^p.

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

ο ζοφος του σκοτους τετηρηται. 18 υπερ- J 13
 ογκα γαρ ματαιοτητος φθειρομενοι δελεαζουσιν J. 16
 εν επιθυμιαις σαρκος ασελγειαις τους ολι- J. 7
 γως αποφευγοντας τους εν πλανη αναστρεφομενους, J. 11
 19 ελευθεριαν αυτοις επαγγελλομενοι, αυτοι δουλοι
 υπαρχοντες της φθορας· ω γαρ τις ηττηται, τουτω
 δεδουλωται. 20 ει γαρ αποφυγοντες τα μiasματα J. 8
 του κοσμου εν επιγνωσει του κυριου και σωτηρος J. 25
 Ιησου Χριστου, τουτοις δε παλιν εμπλακεντες ηττωνται,
 γεγονεν αυτοις τα εσχατα χειρονα των πρωτων.
 21 κρειττον γαρ ην αυτοις μη επεγνωκεναι την οοον
 της δικαιοσυνης η επιγνωουσιν υποστρεψαι εκ της
 παραδοθεισης αυτοις αγιας εντολης· J. 3
 22 συμβεβηκεν αυτοις το της αληθους παροιμιας, Κυων
 επιστρεψας επι το ιδιον εξεραμα, και Ύς λουσαμένη J. 6
 εις κυλισμον βορβορου.

III

1 Ταυτην ηδη, αγαπητοι, δευτεραν υμιν J. 3, 17, 20
 γραφω επιστολην, εν αις διεγειρω υμων εν υπο- J. 3
 μνησει την ειλικρινη διανοιαν, 2 μνησθηναι J. 5
 των προειρημενων ρηματων υπο των αγιων
 προφητων και της των αποστολων υμων εν- J. 14, J. 17
 τολης του κυριου και σωτηρος, 3 τουτο J. 25
 πρωτον γνωσκοντες οτι ελευσονται επ εσχα- J. 18
 των των ημερων εν εμπαιγμονη εμπαικται
 κατα τας ιδιας επιθυμιας αυτων πορευο-

18. ματαιοτητος] ματαιοτης B', -οτητης
 B^s μαθηταιοτητος N*. ασελγειαις] ασελ-
 γειας P vulg. syrr. boh. + . ολιγως AB N^c
 syrr vulg. sah. boh οντως N CKLP +
 αποφονοντας KI,P

+ 19. τουτω N B sah. boh. + WH. Ti,

20. κυριου BK + WH. Treg., add.

in fine versus.

21. επιγνωουσιν] add. εις τα οπισω A
 N + . υποστρεψαι BCP+, επιστρεψαι
 KL+, ανακαμψαι A N. εκ BCKLP, απο

22. συμβεβηκεν N AB, add. δε CKLP

III 2. υμων N ABCKLP, ημων minusc.

3. εσχατων N ABC², εσχατου KLP+,
 εν CP), om. KL.

μενοι 4 και λεγοντες Που εστιν ἡ επαγγελία τῆς παρουσιας αυτου; ἀφ ἧς γαρ. οἱ πατερες ἐκοιμήθησαν, παντα ουτως διαμένει απ αρχῆς κτίσεως. 5 λανθάνει γαρ αυτους τουτο θελοντας οτι ουρανοὶ ησαν εκπαλαι και γῆ ἐξ υδατος και δι υδατος συνεστωσα τω του Θεου λογω· 6 δι ὧν ο τοτε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις απωλετο· 7 οἱ δε νῦν ουρανοι και η γῆ τω αυτω J. 11 λογω τεθησαυρισμενοι εἰσιν πυρὶ τηρουμενοι εἰς J. 6, J. 7 ἡμεραν κρίσεως και ἀπωλειας των ασεβων J. 6, J. 4 ανθρωπων. 8 Εν δε τουτο μὴ λανθανέτω υμας, αγαπητοι, οτι μία ἡμέρα παρα Κυρίῳ ως χιλια J 3, 17, 20 ετη και χιλια ετη ως ἡμερα μία. 9 ου βραδυνει Κυριος τῆς επαγγελιας, ως τινες βραδυτήτα ἡγουνται, αλλα μακροθυμῆ εἰς υμας, μη βουλομενος τινας απολεσθαι αλλα παντας εἰς μετανοιαν χωρήσαι. 10 Ηξει J. 11 δε ἡμερα Κυριου ως κλεπτης, εν η οἱ ουρανοὶ J. 6 ροιζῆδον παρελευσονται, στοιχεια δε καυσουμενα λυθησεται, και γῆ και τα εν αυτη εργα ευρεθησεται. 11 Τουτων ουν παντων λυομενων ποταπους δει υπαρχειν υμας εν αγίαις αναστροφαις και ευσεβείαις 12 προσδοκωντας και σπενδοντας την παρουσίαν τῆς J. 21 του Θεου ἡμερας, δι ην ουρανοὶ πυρουμενοι J. 6 λυθησονται και στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα τηκεται. 13 καινους δε ουρανους και γῆν καινην κατα το επαγγελμα αυτου προσδοκωμεν, εν οἷς δικαιοσυνη κατοικεῖ. J. 21

5. συνεστωσα ACLP N^c, συνεστωσης B, -στωσαι K, -στωτα N WH^m.

6. δι' ὧν] δι' ὧν 31.

7. τῷ αυτῷ ABP vulg. sah. boh. WH. Ti., τῷ αυτου N CKL syrr. Treg.

8. και χιλια ετη] ομ. N.

9. εἰς υμας BCP boh. WH. Treg., δι υμας N A vulg. sah. syrr. + Ti., εἰς ημας KL.

10. ἡμερα BC Ti. Treg. WH., η ἡμερα N AKLP. κλεπτης N ABP+, κλ. εν νυκτι CKL (ex 1 Th. v. 2). οἱ ουρανοὶ ABC WH. Treg., ομ. οἱ N KL. Ti., add. μεν N 13. ροιζῆδον BCLP, ρυζῆδον N AK, ρυζιδον vel ρηζιδον vel ριζῆδον al. λυθησεται N BCP, λυθησονται AKL. ευρεθησεται N BKP syrP. (Sah. 'non invsnien-

tur'), κατακαησεται AL syr^h. Ti., καυθησεται vel κατακαυθησονται al., αφανισθησονται C, ομ. και γη—ευρεθησεται vulg., ομ. ευρεθησεται spec., ex ρυησεται corr. ρυῖται H. (S.R. p. 103).

11. τουτων ουν N AKL syrP. vulg. boh. Ti. Treg., τουτων ουτως B+WH., τουτων δε ουτως CP. υμας ACKL N^c syrr. Ti. Treg., ημας N, ομ. B, [υμας] WH.

12. τηκεται N ABKL, τακησεται C, τακησονται P, corr. ex τηξεται ρυῖται H. (S.R. p. 103).

13. γην καινην BCKLP WH. Treg., κ. γ. N ATi. κατα] και A sah. +. το επαγγελμα BCKLP syrP. WH. Treg., τα επαγγέλματα N A sah. boh. syr^h. + Ti.

2 P. 8. 17 20 Ὑμεῖς δε, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες εαυτοὺς
 2 P. 2. 21; 1. τῆ ἀγιωτατῆ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνευματι ἀγίῳ προσ-
 2 P. 1. 7 εὐχομένοι, 21 εαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρησατέ
 2. P. 3. 12, προσδεχομένοι τὸ ἐλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
 2 P. 1 3, 11 Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 22 Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεγ-
 2 P. 2. 16 χετε διακρινομένους, 23 οὓς δε σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς
 2 P. 3. 7 ἀρπαζόντες, οὓς δε ἐλεατέ ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες καὶ
 2 P. 2. 13, 3. τὸν ἀπο τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

2 P. 3. 17, 2. 5 24 Τῷ δε δυναμένῳ φυλαξάει ὑμᾶς ἀπταιστοὺς
 2 P. 1. 17 καὶ στησαι κατενωπίον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώ-
 2 P. 3. 14; 1. 1 μους ἐν ἀγαλλιασει, 25 μονῷ Θεῷ σωτήρῃ ἡμῶν
 2 P. 3. 18 δια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δοξα μεγα-
 2 P. 3. 18 λωσυνῆ κρατος καὶ ἐξουσία προ παντός τοῦ αἰῶνος
 καὶ νυν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμην.

21. τηρησατέ] τηρησωμεν BC.

22. ἐλεγχετε AC vulg. boh. arm. +, ἐλεατέ N BC², ἐλεείτε KLP +. διακρινο-
 μένους N ABC, διακρινομένοι KLP.

23. οὓς δε (1) N ACKLP, om. B. σώζετε
 N ABC, ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε KLP. οὓς δε (2)
 ἐλεατέ ἐν φόβῳ N AB., om. KLP., ἐν

φόβῳ C.

24. ὑμᾶς N BCL vulg. syrr. boh., ἡμᾶς
 A syrr²*, αὐτοὺς KP. ἀπταιστοὺς] ἀδ.
 καὶ ἀσπίλους C. ἀμώμους] ἀμεμπτοὺς A.

25. μονῷ] ἀδ. σοφῷ KLP +. δια Ι.Χ.
 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν] om. KP. εἰς πάντας]
 εἰς N.

14 Διο, αγαπητοι, ταυτα προσδοκωντες σπουδα- J. 17, J. 21
 σατε ασπιλοι και αμωμητοι αυτω ευρεθη̄ναι εν J. 28, J. 24
 ειρηνη, 15 και την του κυριου ημων μακροθυμian αω- J. 2, J. 3, 25
 τηριαν ηγεισθε, καθως και ο αγαπητος ημων αδελφος
 Παυλος κατα την δοθεισαν αυτω σοφian εγραψεν
 υμιν, 16 ως και εν πασαις τᾱις επιστολαῑς λαλων εν
 αυταῑς περῑ τουτων, εν αῑς εστιν δυσνοητα τινα, α
 οι αμαθεις και αστηρικτοι στρεβλουσιν ως και τας
 λοιπας γραφας προς την̄ ιδian αυτων απωλειαν. J. 6

17 Υμεις ουν, αγαπητοι, προγινωσκοντες φυ- J. 20
 λασσεσθε ινα μη τη̄ των αθεσμων πλαυη συν- J. 24, J. 11
 απαχθεντες εκπεσητε του ιδιου στηριγμου, 18 αυξα-
 νετε δε εν χαριτι και γνωσει του κυριου ημων και J. 4
 σωτηρος Ιησου Χριστου. αυτω η̄ δοξα καῑ νυν J. 24, J. 25
 καῑ εῑς ημεραν αιωνος. J. 25

14. αμωμητοι] αμωμοι A.

16. πασαῑς ABC WH., Treg., add. τᾱις
 & KLP Ti. αυταῑς] αυτο̄ις A. αῑς & AB,

ο̄ις CKLP.

18. αυξανετε] αυξανεσθε CP. fin. αμην
 & ACKLP, om. B WH. Ti, [αμην] Treg.

· NOTES ON ST. JUDE

1. 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος.] 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 ἀποστολος Ἰ. X., in 2 Pet. δούλος καὶ ἀποστολος. It is, I think, a mistake to translate δούλος by the word 'slave,' the modern connotation of which is so different from that of the Greek word (cf. 2 Cor. 4⁵). 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. 1¹ δούλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δε Ἰ. 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. 1². The easier reading of some MSS., ἠγιασμένοις for ἠγαπημένοις, is probably derived from 1 Cor. 1² ἠγιασμένοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ. 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 Χ. Ἰ. Rom. 8¹, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ ἰβ. 16¹¹, ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ 2 Cor. 12², εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτισθημεν Gal. 3²⁷, τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Phil. 1¹, δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ Gal. 2¹⁷, ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. 1 Tim. 1¹⁴, σωτηρίας τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. 2 Tim. 2¹⁰. 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. 1¹ Παῦλος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ κ. Κυρίῳ Ἰ. X., cf. 1 Joh. 4¹⁶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὲνων ἐν τῇ ἀγαπῇ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ, Joh. 17²¹ ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὧσιν, καθὼς συ, Πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοί, καγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, below ver. 25 μονῷ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν δια Ἰ. X. There would therefore have been no difficulty in the expression ἐν Θεῷ. Π. καὶ Ἰ. X. τετηρημένοις, cf. Joh. 17¹¹ πατέρ ἁγίε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνοματι σου ὃ δέδωκας μοι... Ὅτε ἤμην

μετ' αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ., also ver. 15. But it is different with ἡγαπημένοις. Lightfoot, commenting on Col. 3¹² ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, says that in the N.T. the last word 'seems to be used always of the objects of *God's* love,' which he illustrates by 1 Th. 1⁴ εἰδοτες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπο Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, and 2 Th. 2¹³, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπο Κυρίου. Cf. 2 Cor. 13¹³, Rom. 5⁸, 1 Joh. 4^{9, 10, 19}, Hos. 14⁴. 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 ἡγαπημένων τοὺς ταφους ναοὺς 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. 1⁷ ἀγαπητοὺς Θεοῦ, κλητοὺς 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 εαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, the latter in ver. 6 εἰς κρισὶν δεσμοῖς τετήρηκεν. The former is the sense required in this verse, but the force of the dative is not quite clear. Alford, Spitta, Keil, Kühn take it as *dat. commodi* 'kept for J. C.' (cf. 2 Cor. 11⁹ ἐμᾶντον ὑμῖν ἐτήρησα, Athanas I. 393 A τὴν ἀκροασὶν τῷ βασιλεὶ τηρεῖν). This might also mean kept safe 'for the sake of' or 'at the request of J. C.': cf. Joh. 17¹¹ 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. 3³ πιστὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος, ὃς στηρίζει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπο τοῦ κόσμου. Below (ver. 24) it is said of the Father that He is able φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταιστοὺς and so in Rom. 16²⁵ we read (μονῶ σοφῷ Θεῷ) τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζειν. 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. 13²⁶ ἀγαπῶμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν, and my note on James 3⁷ δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ. Others suppose the dat. to be governed by the ἐν which precedes Θεῷ, but the interposed ἡγαπημένοις 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. 1⁵ τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρούμενους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν.

Dr. Chase defends the MS. reading in the following note which he allows me to insert :—

Israel in the Old Testament is represented as differing from other nations in that Jehovah 'loved' him or 'loved' the 'fathers'—Deut. 4³⁷, 10¹⁵, 23⁵ 2 Chron 2¹¹, 9⁸, Is. 43⁴, Hos. 2²⁸ (LXX. ; cf. Rom. 9²⁵), Mal. 1²; comp. Pss. Sol. 9¹⁶.

Hence [δ] ἡγαπημένος becomes a title—or of the nature of a title—for the people : Deut. 32¹⁵, 33⁵ 12⁻⁶, 2 Chron. 20⁷, Ps. 28⁸(?), Is. 5¹, 44², Bar. 3³⁷.

Further, it is used in the singular of certain typical Israelites, Abraham (Dan. 3³⁵, Th. and LXX.), Moses (Ecclus. 45¹), Samuel (Ecclus. 46¹³), Solomon (Neh. 13²⁶); 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. (6¹¹) it is in the plural used of a body of Israelites as opposed to heathen—*μη τοῖς ματαλοῖς οἱ ματαιόφρονες εὐλογησάτωσαν ἐπὶ τῇ των ἡγαπημένων 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 ἡγαπημένοι is used I think confirm this view of the word. (a) In 1 Thess. 1⁴ (*εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγ. ὑπὸ του Θεου, τὴν ἐκλογὴν υμῶν*) 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. 1¹, 2⁴ [Messianic use]⁹). (b) 2 Thess. 2¹³ (*αδ. ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ὅτι εἰλατο υμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κ.τ.λ.*), where WH give the words as a quotation from Dent. 33¹². Here also we have the O.T. idea of God's choice for the word εἴλατο in reference to Israel, see Dent. 26¹⁸. (c) Col. 3¹² (*ἐνδύσασθε ὁδν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ του Θεου, ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι*). St. Paul had just said *οὐκ ἐνι Ἑλλην 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, ἡγαπημένοι*. The use of ἡγαπημένος (and -οἱ) 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. 1⁴ 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. 1¹ (to the Theocracy), 1 Pet. 1¹ (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. 3b*.

For the phrase *ἐν [τῷ] Θεῷ* compare Ps. 43⁸ *ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἐπαινεσθησόμεθα*, 59¹⁴ *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 *ἐκκλησία ἡγαπημένη καὶ πεφωτισμένη ἐν θελήματι τοῦ θελήσαντος τὰ πάντα ἃ ἐστιν*—a parallel which gives part of the meaning. Perhaps one might paraphrase St. Jude—'who through the will and the working of God have attained to the being numbered among the Beloved.'

I quite agree with all that is here said on the application of *ἡγαπημένοις* in this passage. Jude speaks to the Christians as inheriting the privileges of God's ancient people. But the use of *εν* in the phrase *ἡγαπημένοις 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 *πεφωτισμένη* after *ἡγαπημένη*, and the use of *εν θεληματι* instead of *Θεῷ*. Then, are we justified in assuming that those addressed are Gentiles? Zahn (*Einleitung* II. 75, 51) holds that Jude's mission was limited to the circumcision (Gal. 27-9, 1 Cor. 9⁵), 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 *ἡγαπημένοις* and *τετηρημένοις* are predicated. We find the same use in Apoc. 17¹⁴ (*νικησουσιν*) *οἱ μετ' αὐτου κλητοὶ κ. εκλεκτοὶ κ. πιστοὶ*, in St. Paul's epistles, as in Rom. 1⁶ *εν οἷς ἐστε καὶ υμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησου Χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. 1²⁴ *κηρυσσομεν Χριστον ἐσταυρωμενον, Ἰουδαιοις μεν σκανδαλον . . . αυτοις δε τοις κλητοις . . . Χριστον Θεου δυναμιν*. The calling is sometimes specially defined, as in Rom. 1.¹ *Παῦλος κλητος ἀποστολος*, *ιβ.* 1⁷ *κλητοις ἀγίοις*. At other times its nature is further explained, as in Rom. 8²⁸ *τοις κατα πρόθεσιν κλητοις ουσιν*, 1 Cor. 1²⁶ *βλεπετε τὴν κλήσιν υμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατα σάρκα . . . ἀλλα τα μωρα του κοσμου ἐξελεξατο ο Θεος*, Eph. 1¹⁸ *εις το εἶδεναι υμας τισ εστιν ἡ ελπις τῆς κλήσεως αουτου, τίς ὁ πλουτος τῆς δοξῆς τῆς κληρονομιας αουτου ἐν τοις ἀγίοις*, 2 Tim. 1⁹ *Θεου του σωσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἀγία*, Heb. 3¹ *κλησεως ἐπουρανίου μετοχοι*. In Matt. 22¹⁴ a distinction is made between calling and election (*πολλοὶ γαρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλιγοι δε εκλεκτοι*) but Lightfoot (Col. 3¹²) denies that this distinction is to be found in the Epistles.

We have many examples of the divine calling in the Gospels, as in the case of the Apostles (Mt. 4²¹, Mk. 1²⁰) and in the parables of the Great Supper and the Labourers in the Vineyard. This idea of calling or election is derived from the O.T. See Hort's n. on 1 Pet. 1¹ *Ἰησου Χριστου εκλεκτοῖς*: '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 *εκλεκτος* never stands at the beginning of St. Paul's Epistles, as it does here: . . . his corresponding word is

κλητος and he often uses *καλεω* 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 (4³⁷) 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. 48¹², 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 2⁷ *το καλον ὄνομα το ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμας*, and 1 Pet. 2⁹ *ὑμεῖς δε γένος ἐκλεκτον, βασιλειον ιερατευμα . . . 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 *χαιρειν* James 1¹, and Hort's excellent note on 1 P. 1² *χάρις . . . πληθυνθείη*. We find *ελεος* and *εἰρήνη* joined in Gal. 6¹⁶, and with the addition of *χαρις* in 1 Tim. 1², 2 Tim. 1², 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. 6²⁵ (in the letter of Darius) *ειρηνη υμῖν πληθυνθειη*, cf. 1 Thess. 3¹² *υμας δε ὁ κύριος πλεονασαι και περισσευσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους*. 'Αγάπη (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. *ἡ χαρις τ. κυριου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and in Eph. *εἰρηνη τοις ἀδελφοις καὶ ἀγάπη μετα πιστεως ἀπο Θεοῦ πατρος και Κυριου Ι. Χ.* Cf. 1 Joh. 3¹ *ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγαπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατηρ ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθωμεν*, 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. 13¹⁰). 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 και εἰρηνη καὶ ἀγάπη Θεου πατρὸς και Κυριου ἡμῶν Ι. Χ. πληθυνθείη*. The thought of *ελεος* and *ἀγάπη* recurs again in ver. 21.

3. *ἀγαπητοί* occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 P. 31. 8, 14, 17, 1 Pet. 2¹¹, 4¹², and James. It is common in the Epistles of John and of Paul, sometimes with *μου* attached, as in 1 Cor. 10¹⁴, Phil. 2¹², 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.

πασαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος.] For *πᾶσαν* see my n. on James 1², and cf. 2 Pet. 1⁵ *σπουδην πᾶσαν παρεσενέγκαντες*, 1¹⁵ *σπουδάσω ἔχειν υμας*

μνήμην ποιείσθαι, also Isocr. *Orat.* v. p. 91 b *πάσαν την σπουδην περι τουτου ποιεισθαι*, Plato, *Euthyd.* 304 E *περι ουδενος ἀξίω ἀναξίαν σπουδην ποιουνται*. 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. 3¹ to an earlier letter now lost. Compare Barn. 4⁹ *πολλα δε θελων γραφειν . . . γράφειν ἐσπουδασα.*

κοινῆς σωτηρίας.] Cf. n. on 2 P. 1¹ *ισότιμον*, Tit. 1⁴ *κατα κοινην πιστιν*, Ign. *Eph.* 1 *υπερ του κοινου ονοματος και ελπιδος* with Lightfoot's n., Jos. *Ant.* 10. 1. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) *υπερ της 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.

ανάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι.] Cf. Luke 14¹⁸ *εχω ἀναγκην ιδεῖν αυτον*, Heb. 7²⁷, *al.*, also Plut. *Cato Mi.* 24 *ἀνάγκην εσχεν εκβαλεῖν ασχημονουσαν την γυναικα*. There is a similar combination of *γραφειν* 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. 3¹⁷⁻¹⁹, 3³⁶⁻⁹).

επαγωνίεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει.] 'to contend for the faith,' almost equivalent to the *αγώνισαι περι της αληθείας* in Sir. 4²⁸, see 1 Tim. 6¹² *ἀγωνίζου τον καλον αγώνα της πίστεως*, and *εἰς ὃ κοπιῶ αγωνιζομενος* Col. 1²⁹. We may compare *ἐπαμυνειν*, *επαναπαυειν νομῳ* Rom. 2¹⁷. Bengel connects this with the parallel phrase *εποικοδομουντες τῇ πιστει* in ver. 20 by the thought borrowed from Nehem. 4¹⁶ 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 *επαγ.* is rare in this sense (1): it is found in Plut. *Mor.* 1075 D *ἐπαγωνιζομενος ὁ Κλεάνθης τη ἐκπυρωσει*. Stephanus quotes Maximus *Schol. in Dion. Areop.* p. 54 *ταυτη τῇ δοξῇ ἐπαγωνιέται*. Philo (M. 2. 495) uses it in the same sense with the dative understood, *επαγωνιζομενος (τω αἰδιον ειναι τον κόσμον) ὁ Κριτολαος εχρητο και τοιοντω λόγῳ, ib.* p. 228 *fin.* (2) Closely connected with this sense is that which we find in Plut. *V.* 65 C. *ἐτεροις ἐπαγωνίζονται τεκμηριοις* 'lay stress upon other proofs.' Aristid. *τεχνη ρητορικῆ* p. 658 (D. vol. ii. p. 756) *κατα λέξιν γινεται βραχυτης, οταν τις . . . μὴ ἐπαγωνίζηται τῇ λεξει . . . οταν τις μὴ φιλοτιμηται προς την λεξιν, ἀλλα και προς τα*

πραγματα αποβλέπη. (3) Libanius (*Arg. in Androt.* p. 587 δευτερος ο Διόδωρος επαγωνίζεται τουτω τω λόγω) seems to use it in the sense of 'following up the argument of the previous speaker,' λογω being the instrumental dative. So Philostr. *V. Soph.* i. 17 ἔδωκε τῷ Πτολέμῳ ὁ Ἡρωδῆς 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 ἰσῶς ἐν τοῦτοις περατοῦν τ. ἀντιρρησιν, ὁμῶς δὲ επαγωνιζόμενοι (ulterius decernentes) πειρασόμεθα διδάσκειν, Dion. Hal. *Ars Rhet.* vii. 6 'urge those who have taken few prizes ὅτι δει μὴ τοῦτοις ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ . . . ἐπαγωνίσασθαι καὶ προσλαβεῖν ἑτέρουσ. (4) 'Fighting against,' so translated in Plut. *V.* 187 Φάβιος, ὡσπερ ἀθλητῆς ἀγαθὸς ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τῷ Ἀννίβα, *ib.* 486 Κίμων ὡσπερ ἀθλητῆς δεινὸς δυο καθηρηκῶς ἀγωνίσματα . . . ἐπηγωνισατο ταῖς νικαῖς by L. and S. but probably to be understood as (3) 'followed up.'

τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πιστεῖ.] The word πιστις 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. 1²³ ὁ διωκὼν ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πιστίν ἣν ποτε ἐπορθεῖ, also Gal. 3²³, Phil. 1²⁷ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, where see Lightfoot, Acts 6⁷. In the same way ἐλπις is used in a concrete sense for the object of hope (as in Col. 1⁵ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν, 1 Tim. 1¹ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, Tit. 2¹³ προσδεχομένοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and φόβος for the object of fear, Rom. 13³, 1 P. 3¹⁴.

ἀπαξ.] Used here in its classical sense 'once for all,' as below v. 5, and in Heb. 6⁴ τοὺς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας, *ib.* 9^{26, 27}, 10², 1 P. 3¹⁸. This excludes the novelties of the libertines, cf. Gal. 1⁹. The later sense 'on one occasion' is found in 2 Cor. 11²⁵ ἀπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, 1 Th. 2¹⁸ καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις ἠθελήσαμεν ἔλθειν.

παραδοθείῃ.] Cf. Philo M. 1. 387 πιστεῖ τοῖς ἀπαξ παραδοθείσι, 2 P. 2²¹. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers, as by Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. where we read of ἡ ἀληθῆς 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. 11² καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατεχετε, 2 Th. 2¹⁵, 1 Tim. 6²⁰ τὴν παραθήκην φυλάξον. 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. 1¹, 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 ἐφυν, ἐρρυν. The aor. is here used with the perfect force, as in v. 11 ἐπορευθήσαν, 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

occurs in Demades 178 *αδικος παρεισδυνων λογος εις τας των δικαστων γνώμας ουκ εα συνοραν την αλήθειαν*, Clem. Al. p. 659 *οπως εις την τῶν αινιγμάτων ἔννοιαν ἢ ζητησις παρεισδυουσα ἐπὶ την ευρεσιν τῆς αληθειας αναδράμη*, D. Laert. ii. 142 *λαθραιως παρεισδύς εις την πατριδα*, Plut. *M.* p. 216 *Β τα ἀρχαῖα νομιμα ἐκλυομενα εωρα, αλλα δε παρεισδυομενα μοχθηρα*, other *exx.* in Wetst. The noun *παρεισδυσις* occurs in Barn. 2¹⁰, 4⁹ *αντιστώμεν ινα μη σχη παρείδουσιν ο μελας*, Clem. Al. p. 189 *ἀκροσφαλῆς ἢ του οἴνου παρείδουσιν*. Similar compounds are *παρεισφέρω* in 2 P. 1⁵, *παρεισάγω* in 2 P. 2¹, *παρείσακτος* in Gal. 2⁴ *δια τους παρεισακτους ψευδαδελφους οιτινες παρεισήλθον κατασκοπήσαι την ἐλευθερίαν υμων*, Rom. 5 , 2 Macc. 8¹ *παρεισπορευομενοι λεληθοτως εις τας κωμας*, so *παρεισερπω*, *παρεισπέμπω*, *παρεισπίπτω*. The earliest prophecy of such seducers comes from the lips of Jesus Himself Mt. 7¹⁵ *προσέχετε ἀπὸ των ψευδοπροφητῶν, οιτινες ερχονται προς υμας ἐν ἔνδυμασι προβάτων, εσθθεν δε εισι λυκοι αρπαγες*, cf. Acts 20²⁹, 30 and Introduction on the Early Heresies.

τινες ἄνθρωποι.] For the position of the indefinite *τις* see Acts 3² *καί τις ἀνὴρ χωλος...εβαστάζετο*, 14⁸, 15¹, 17⁶, 34, 1 Tim. 5²⁴ *τινων ἀνθρώπων αἱ αμαρτιαι προδηλοι εἰσιν*: and for pleonastic *ἄνθρωπος* Lk. 15⁴ *τις ἄνθρωπος εχων προβατα κ.τ.λ.* Mt. 7⁹, 18¹², Jn. 5⁵. [For *τινες*, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 10¹², Gal. 1⁷. C. Compare also Gal. 2¹² *προ του ἔλθειν τινας ἀπο Ἰακωβου*, 2 P. 3⁹ *ὡς τινες βραδυτήτα ηγοῦνται.*] It has often a contemptuous signification.

οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.] Cf. 2 P. 2⁸ *οἷς το κριμα εκπαλαι ουκ ἀργει*. Clem. Al. *Adumbr. in ep. Judae* translates 'homines impii qui olim...praedestinati erant in iudicium...non ut fiant impii; sed existentes jam impii in iudicium 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. 1⁷ with Lightfoot's n., Lk. 18⁹ *ειπεν δε προς τινας τοὺς πεποιθотας ἐφ' εαυτοῖς*. For *προγ.* cf. Rom. 15⁴ *οσα γαρ προεγραφη εις την ἡμετεραν διδασκαλιαν ἐγράφη*. Bp. Lightfoot in his note on Gal. 3¹ *οἷς κατ' οφθαλμοὺς Ἰ. Χ. προεγράφη ἔσταυρωμενος* seems to give to the word here the same sense 'placard' which it bears there, quoting in support Demosth. 1151 *τοὺς πρυτανεις προγραφειν αὐτῷ την κρίσιν ἐπι δυο ἡμερας* and Plut. *Camill.* 9 *τῆς δικης 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. 32³², Isa. 4³ *οι γραφεντες εις ζωῆν*, Dan. 12¹, and the passages quoted from Enoch below. In any case

¹ Zahn, it is true, following Schott and others, argues in favour of this reference, holding that *πάλαι* may be equivalent to '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.

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. 2⁸ εἰς ο καὶ ἐτέθησαν. By 'this' Spitta understands 'that judgment which I am now about to declare,' i.e., the condemnation contained in the word ἀσεβεις used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that οὗτος usually refers to what precedes, and he would take τουτο here (with Hofmann) as referring to παρεισεδυησαν. I agree that the classical distinction between the prospective use of οδε and τοιόσδε, and the retrospective use of οὗτος and τοιουτος prevails also in the N.T., as in the τάδε λέγει of Apoc. 2¹. 8. 12. 18. 31. 7. 14 contrasted with the μετα ταῦτα of Apoc. 4¹, 7¹. 9, 15⁵, 18¹, 19¹, and the solitary instance of τοιόσδε in 2 P. 1¹⁷ (where φωνῆς τοιασδε is explained by the following ὁ υἱός μου οὗτος ἐστιν), as contrasted with the common retrospective use of τοιούτος. 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. 6³ οὐδὲ τουτο ἀνεγνωτε ο ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ; Phil. 2⁵ τουτο φρονεῖτε ἐν υμῖν ο καὶ ἐν Χριστῶ, or by a conjunction such as ἵνα (Lk. 1⁴³) or οτι (Lk. 10¹¹), or εἰ (1 P. 2¹⁹ τοῦτο χάρις εἰ), or μὴ (2 Cor. 8²⁰ στελλόμενοι τουτο μὴ τις), or what approaches more nearly to the use here, by a verb or noun in apposition as Lk. 3²⁰ προσεθηκεν καὶ τουτο, κατεκλεισεν, ἰδ. 12¹⁸ τουτο ποιησω, καθελῶ, 1 Th. 4³ τοῦτο ἐστιν θέλημα Θεοῦ ὁ ἀγιασμος υμῶν, Lk. 2¹² τουτο υμῖν σημεῖον, ἐρῆσετε βρέφος, Rom. 14¹³ τουτο κρίνατε, το μὴ τιθεῖναι προσκομμα, 2 Cor. 2¹ ἐκρῖνα τουτο, τὸ μὴ ἔλθειν. None of these is quite like our text, where every reader naturally looks back for an explanation of τουτο. I think however παρεισεδυησαν 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 παρακαλων ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι of ver. 3, which is then further explained by the participles in ver. 4. The sin itself is its own judgment (Joh. 3¹⁹). Dr. Bigg considers that τουτο το κρίμα is meaningless here, and can only be explained by the supposition that it was hastily borrowed by Jude from 2 P. 2³, but why should he have added τουτο, which makes the difficulty?

We may compare *Enoch* 108⁷ '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. 81⁴ 'blessed is the man who dies in righteousness, concerning whom there is no book of unrighteousness written,' ch. 106¹⁹ '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 47³ *Test. Patr. Aser.* 7 ἀνεγνῶν ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ των ουρανων οτι ἀπειθουντες ἀπειθησετε αὐτῷ (the Messiah) καὶ ἀσεβουντες ἀσεβήσετε εἰς αὐτον, ἰδ. *Levi* 14 ἐγνων ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνωχ οτι ἐπι τέλος ἀσεβησετε, ἐπὶ Κυριον χειρας ἐπιβαλλοντες ἐν παση κακια, *Apoc. Baruch.* 24¹ 'aperientur libri in quibus scripta sunt peccata omnium qui

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.'

ἀσεβείς.] 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 ἀσελγείαν.] With this we may compare 1 P. 2¹⁶ *μη ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν,* 2 P. 2¹⁹, *ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλομενοι,* 3¹⁶ *δυσνοητα τινα, α οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπωλείαν,* 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}, 8²¹, 1 Cor. 6¹², 10²³ foll., Joh. 8³²⁻³⁶, Gal. 5¹³ *ὑμεῖς ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆ σαρκί.* For *μετατιθέντες* see Gal. 1⁶, for *ασελγείαν* 2 P. 2² *πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις,* *ib.* 2^{7.18}, 1 P. 4³, and Lightfoot on Gal. 5¹⁹ 'A man may be *ἀκαθαρτος* and hide his sin: he does not become *ασελγης* until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word *ἀσελγεία* generally signifies insolence or violence towards another...In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality...cp. Polyb. 37. 2 *πολλὴ δε τις ἀσελγεία καὶ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξήκολουθει.* Thus it has much the same range of meaning as *υβρις*.' On the meaning of *χάρις* see Robinson *Ephes.* p. 221 f. The form *χαρῶν* is used elsewhere in the N.T., except in Acts 24²⁷.

τον μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνοῦμενοι.] So 2 P. 2¹ *τον ἀγορασαντα αὐτοὺς δεσποτὴν ἀρνοῦμενοι.* On the denial of God and Christ see Mt. 10³³ *ὅστις ἀν ἀρνήσῃται με ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καγὼ αὐτὸν ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου,* *ib.* 26⁷⁰ (Peter's denial), 1 Joh. 2²² *οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν,* Tit. 1¹⁶ *Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἶδεναι, τοῖς δὲ ἐργοῖς ἀρνοῦνται, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς παν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδοκιμοί,* 1 Tim. 5⁸ *τὴν πίστιν ἠρνήται.* This denial is one of the sins noticed in the book of Enoch. 38² '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.* 41², 45², 46⁷, 48¹⁰ 'They will fall and not rise again . . . for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed.'

Two questions have been raised as to the meaning of the text, (1) is τ. μόνον δεσποτὴν to be understood of the Son, (2) what is the force of ἀρνεῖσθαι? The objection to understanding δεσποτῆς of our Lord is that in every other passage in the N.T., where δεσποτῆς occurs, except in 2 P. 2¹ (on which see n.), it is spoken of God the Father; that, this being the case, it is difficult to understand how Christ can be called τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν.¹ It seems to me a forced explanation to say that the phrase μόνος δεσποτῆς has reference only to other earthly masters. No Jew could use it in this connexion without thinking

¹ It is true that the use of the word δεσπόσωνοι, 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 δεσποτῆς must have been used of our Lord at an earlier period, but I am not aware of any example of this use in the Apostolic Fathers.

of the one Master in heaven. Again *μονος* is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in Joh. 5⁴⁴ *την δόξαν τὴν παρα τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε*, 17³ *ἵνα γνωσκωσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, Rom. 16²⁷ *μονῶ σοφῶ Θεῶ δια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1 Tim. 1¹⁷ *τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰῶνων . . . μονῶ Θεῶ τιμῆ κ. δόξα*, *ib.* 6^{15, 16} *ὁ μακάριος κ. μόνος δυναστής, ὁ μόνος ἐχὼν ἀθανάσιαν*, and by Jude himself, below 25 *μονῶ Θεῶ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν δια Ἰ. Χ., τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα*. Wetst. quotes several passages in which Josephus speaks of God as *ὁ μόνος δεσποτής*. 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 (*κυριον*) belongs to the class of words which may stand without the article, see Winer pp. 147–163. A similar doubtful case is found in Tit. 2¹³ *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χ. Ἰ. ὃς ἐδωκεν εαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρωσῆται ἡμᾶς*, where also I should take *τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ* to refer to the Father. Other examples of the same kind are Eph. 5^ο *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. 1¹² *ὅπως ἐνδοξασθῆ το ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ υμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ υμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; 1 Tim. 5²¹ (cf. 2 Tim. 4¹) *διαμαρτυρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων*, which Chrysostom explains *μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*; 2 P. 1¹ *ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ 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 εαυτοῦ καὶ Κυριὸν ἀρνούμενον*. The denial of the only Master and Our Lord J. C. may be implicit, shown by their conduct, though not asserted in word, as in Tit. 1¹⁶; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 Joh. 2²², 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 δεσποτὴν* might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 33, x. 21) *οὐχ ὑπο τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ τὸν κόσμον γεγενεῖαι ἠθέλησεν ἀλλ’ ὑπο δυναμείως τινος ἀγγελικῆς*, and Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 26). See Introduction on Early Heresies.

5. *ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότες ὑμᾶς πάντα.*] ¹ Cf. 2 P. 1¹² *διὸ*

¹ On the readings see Introduction.

μελλήσω ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ υπομνήσκειν καιπερ εἰδοτας, ἰδ. 1¹³ διεγειρεῖν ὑμᾶς ἐν υπομνήσει, ἰδ. 3¹ διεγειρω ὑμῶν ἐν υπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, Rom. 15¹⁴ πεπεισμαι δε οτι και αυτοὶ μεστοι ἐστε αγαθωσυνης, πεπληρωμενοι πάσης τῆς γνωσεως . . . τολμηροτέρως δε ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπο μερους ὡς ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς. The word εἰδοτας justifies υπομνήσαι: 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 ἀπαξ 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 ἀπαξ. Instead of πάντα some MSS. have τουτο. The former finds some support in Enoch 1² 'I heard every thing from the angels,' 25² '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,' 61² (quoted by Chase in *D. of the Bib.*). It should probably be understood of all that follows, including the historical allusions, implying that those addressed were familiar not only with the O.T. but with rabbinical traditions, so Estius 'omnia de quibus volo vos 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 ἀπαξ with σωσας, '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, ἀπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν.] 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. 49¹⁰, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατερας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγυπτου ἐξαγαγοντα, 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. 11²⁶. Clem. Al. p. 133 says (of Exod. 23²⁰) ὁ μυστικὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀγγελὸς Ἰησους. 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. 1¹², 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.

Ἰησοῦς is recognized by Jerome (*Jovin.* 1. 12) but explained by him of Joshua. With this we may compare Sir. 46¹ foll. κραταιος ἐν πολεμῷ Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ...ος ἐγενετο κατα το ονομα αυτου μεγας επι σωτηρια ἐκλεκτων αυτου, 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 τις ουν εις τὴν γῆν εισήγαγε. τους πατερας ἡμῶν; ἤδη ποτε νοησατε οτι ὁ ἐν τῷ ονοματι τουτω επονομασθεις Ἰησοῦς, προτερον Αὐσῆς καλούμενος (see Numb. 13¹⁶), *ib.* 106, 132, Clem. Al. 134, Lactant. *Inst.* 4. 17 Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus; qui cum primum Ausus vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentens 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. 16⁷⁻¹⁰, Heb. 3¹⁶⁻¹⁹, and 1 Cor. 10¹⁻¹⁰.

τὸ δευτερον has given rise to much discussion. If we place απαξ before λαον with Sin., or before εκ γῆς with Clem. Al. p. 280 (ὁ Θεος ἀπαξ εκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου λαὸν σωσας, το δευτερον...ἀπόλεσεν), we might then regard it as contrasting the preceding *saving* with the following *destruction*. I think Ewald is right in connecting απαξ with this later clause rather than with ειδοτας, as it agrees better with the ἀπαξ 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. 14²⁷⁻³⁷). 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 απαξ with ειδοτας: ἡδη would have been more suitable. For the opposition to το δευτερον cf. Heb. 9²⁸ ὁ Χριστος απαξ προσενεχθεις εις το πολλων ἀνεγκεν ἀμαρτίας εκ δευτερου χωρις ἀμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται, Theoph. *Αὐτολ.* ii. 26 ἵνα το μεν απαξ ἡ πεπληρωμενον οτε ετεθη, το δε δευτερον μέλλη πληροσθαι μετα τὴν... κρίσιν, Liban. *ap.* Wctst. εμοι δε απαξ ορκει γέλωτα οφλειν, δευτερον ε ουκετι.

I am inclined to think that the article before μή is an intrusion, as it seems to be before εν in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take δευτερον with μη πιστευσαντας, 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 τους as facilitating the plural construction after λαον. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. 10²⁶ ἐκουσιως

¹ Cf. Exod. 2¹⁴, 4¹, 5²¹, 6⁹, 14^{11, 12}.

αμαρτανοντων ημων μετα το λαβειν την ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς αληθείας ουκ ετι περι αμαρτιων 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 τον ουν εὐληφοτα τὴν αφεσιν των αμαρτιῶν ουκ ετι αμαρτάνειν χρη. ἐπι γαρ τῇ πρωτῇ και μονῇ μετανοία των ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῆ αν εἰη... ἐδωκεν ουν αλλην ετι τοις καν τῇ πιστει περιπεπτωκοσι τινι πλημμελήματι, πολυέλεος ὢν, μετάνοιαν δευτέραν. Hence sprang the custom of postponing baptism till the approach of death. For the emphatic δευτερον compare δις αποθανοντα in ver. 12, also 2 P. 1⁹, 2²⁰⁻²², Heb. 6⁴⁻⁸, Tit. 3¹⁰ αἱρετικον ἄνθρωπον μετα μιαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσιαν παραιτου.

Others join το δευτερον with σωσας, 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 σωσας λαον 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. 12⁴⁸). 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 be-thought 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 το δευτερον simply equivalent to υστερον, as is done by many interpreters. In Nonnus *Dionys.* 46. 189 καὶ τοτε μιν λιπε λυσσα νοσοφαλεος Διονουσου, και προτερας φρένας ἐσχε το δευτερον it is nearly 'again.' For the combination σωσας—ἀπόλεσεν B. Weiss compares James 4¹² εἰς ἔστιν—ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολεσαι.

6. ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν εαυτων αρχήν... 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 parceret 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. 2⁴, and in Enoch, chapters 6–10.

αρχήν.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. 40²¹ of the chief butler: here perhaps of the office of Watcher, though Spitta takes it more generally of the sovereignty belonging to their abode in heaven = τον ἄνω κληρον in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term ἀρχή is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. 6¹². Cf. Enoch 12⁴, of the Watchers (angels) who have *abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place* and defiled themselves with women, *ib.* 15³. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. 1, p. 268) καλον μὴ λιποτακτῆσαι μεν τῆς τοῦ Θεου ταξέως, ἐν ἡ τους τεταγμενους παντας ἀριστευειν ἀναγκη, αὐτομολῆσαι

δε προς την ανανδρον ἡδονήν. So Just. M. *Apol.* ii. 5 οἱ δ' ἀγγελοὶ παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν ταξιν γυναικῶν μίξειςιν ἡττηθησαν with Otto s n.

ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον.] Cf. 2 Cor. 5² το οἶκ. το ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, and the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For οἰκητήριον cf. Enoch 15⁷ (the message of Enoch to the Watchers) 'the spiritual have their dwelling in heaven'...η κατοικησις αὐτῶν ἐστὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. C.]

εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοὺς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.] Cf. 2 P. 2⁴ σειροὺς ζόφου ταρταρωσας, *ib.* 2⁹ ἀδίκους εἰς ἡμέραν κρισεως κολαζομενους τηρειν, *ib.* 3⁷ τηρουμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρισεως...των ασεβῶν ανθρωπων, Joel 2³¹ ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκοτος...πριν ελθειν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυριου την μεγαλην και ἐπιφανή, *Αποκ.* 6¹⁷ ἦλθεν η ἡμερα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς οργῆς αὐτοῦ, *ib.* 16¹⁴ συναγαγειν αὐτοὺς εἰς τον πόλεμον τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκρατορος. Enoch 10⁵ ἐπικάλυψον αὐτω (Azazel) σκοτος, και οικησατω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 10¹² δῆσον αὐτους...μεχρι ημερας κρίσεως αὐτῶν, *ib.* 22¹¹ (Gr. in Charles' *App.* C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ημέρας τῆς κρισεως, *ib.* 54⁶, note on xlv. 1. So ἡμέρα του κυρίου 1 Cor. 1⁸, 2 P. 3¹⁰ *al.*, ἐκείνη η ἡμερα 2 Th. 1¹⁰. On δεσμοὺς see En. 54³⁻⁵ '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. δεσμοὶ σκοτους (Wisd. 17²) of the plague of darkness.

For the use of the acc. after ὑπο to express 'rest under,' instead of the earlier dat. or gen. cf. Joh. 1⁴⁹ οντα ὑπο την συκῆν, *Jannaris Gr.* § 1698^b, *Schmid Attic.* iv. p. 467 f.

αἰδίοις.] 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 αἰωνιος in ver. 7. So too in the only other passages in which it occurs in the Bible, Wisdom 7²⁶ ἀπαυγασμά ἐστι φωτος αἰδιου, and Rom. 1²⁰ η αἰδιος αὐτοῦ δυναμις και θειοτης. After ζοφον *Clem. Al.* p. 280 adds αγρίων αγγέλων, 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. ως Σόδομα και Γόμορρα και αἱ περι 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 ἀγγελοὺς τε...ως Σοδομα. Cf. 2 P. 2⁶ πολεις Σοδομων και Γομορρας καταστροφῆ κατεκρινεν. The destruction was not limited to these two cities, but extended to all the neighbouring country (*Gen.* 19²⁵, called Πενταπολις in *Wisd.* 10⁶), including the towns of Admah and Zeboim (*Deut.* 29²³, *Hos.* 11⁸). Zoar was spared at the request of Lot.

τον ὁμοιον τροπον τούτοις ἐκπορευσασαι.] For the adverbial acc., which repeats the preceding ως = *sicut* (*Clem. Adumbr.*), cf. Mt. 23³⁷ ὃν τροπον ἐπισυνάγει ορνις τα νοσσια, 2 Macc. 15³⁹ ον τροπον οἶνος...αποτελει, οὕτω και, *Luc. Catapl.* 6 τεθνασι τον ομοιον τροπον. 'Like them,' i.e. the fallen angels. The two judgments are similarly joined in *Test. Nepht.* 3 μὴ γένησθε ὡς Σοδομα, ητις ἐνήλλαξε ταξιν φυσεως αὐτῆς. Ομοιως δε και οἱ Ἐγγρηγορες ἐνήλλαξαν ταξιν φυσεως αὐτων, οὓς κατηρασατο Κυριος, 3 Macc. 2⁴⁻⁵. Others understand τουτοις of the libertines who are subsequently referred to as οὔτοι (vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19); but the beginning

of ver. 8 (μεντοι και οὔτοι) seems to distinguish between them and the preceding. The verb εκπ. occurs in Gen. 38²⁴ of Tamar, Exod. 34^{15, 16} (μή ποτε) εκπορνεωσιν οπισω των θεών αυτών, Lev. 17⁷, Hos. 4¹², Ezek. 16, 28, 33

απελθουσαι οπισω σαρκός ετέρας.] 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. 1²⁷), what Philo calls ἀνομοις και έκθεσμοις μίξεις (*de Gig.* M 1, p. 267), cf. Exod. 30⁹ ουκ ανοισεις θυμιαμα ετερον. For the post-classical phrase cf. 2 P. 2¹⁰ τοὺς οπισω σαρκος εν επιθυμια μiasμου πορευομενους, Deut. 4³ επορευθη οπισω Βεελφεγωρ, Jer. 22³.

πρόκεινται δείγμα πυρός αιωνίου δικην υπέχουσαι.] Cf. Enoch 67¹² 'this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty,' 2 P. 2⁶ υποδειγμα μελλοντων ασεβειν τεθεικως, 1 Cor. 10^{6, 11} τυποι εγενοντο, Heb. 4¹¹ ινα μη εν τῷ αυτω τις υποδειγματι πειση τῆς απειθειας, 3 Macc. 2⁵ συ τους υπερηφανιαν εργαζομένους Σοδομιτας... πυρί θειω κατεφλεξας, παραδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις καταστησας, Clem. Al. p. 260 δείγμά σοι τουτων οι αγγελοι, του Θεου το κάλλος ἀπολελοιποτες δια κάλλος μαραινομενον, Ael. V.H. vi. 12 *fin.* ἦν δείγμα ου το τυχον τοῖς ἀνθρωποις εις σωφροσυνην ἢ του Διονυσιου εκ τῶν τηλικουτων εις ουτω ταπεινα 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. 19²⁰, 20¹⁰, 21⁸. It is questioned whether πυρος is governed by δείγμα or δικην. If by δικην, 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. 10⁷ (πυρ Πενταπολεως) ἥς ἔτι μαρτυριον τῆς πονηρίας καπνίζομενη καθέστηκε χερσος, Philo (*De Abr.* M. 2. 21) μεχρι νυν καιεται. το γαρ κεραυνιον πυρ ἦκιστα σβεννυμενον ἢ νέμεται ἢ εντυφεται. πιστις δε σαφεστατη τα δρωμενα, του γαρ συμβεβηκοτος πάθους σημειον ἔστιν ὃ τε αναδιδομενος αιει καπνος και ο μεταλλευουσι θεῖον, *ib.* V. *Moys.* M. 2, p. 143. Some disallow this sense of αιωνιος and think it can only be used of hell-fire, as in 4 Macc. 12¹² (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor) ταμιευεται σε η θεια δικη πυκνοτερω και αιωνίω πυρί, και βάσανοι εις ολον τον αιῶνα ουκ ἀνησουσι 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, 65} (on the restoration of Sodom), 47^{1, 12} (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. 10⁵ and 12, where the εις αιῶνα of the former verse is equivalent to 70 generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where ζωη αιωνιος is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of δειγμα is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with πυρος in the sense of 'an example or type of eternal fire,' which would escape the difficulty connected with αιωνιον, but leaves δικην υπεχουσαι (for which cf. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1, 8, 2, Macc. iv. 48) a somewhat otiose appendage. In the book of Enoch (67⁴ foll.) the angels who sinned are said to be imprisoned in a burning valley (Hinnom, ch. 27) in which there was a great swelling of waters, accom-

panied by a smell of sulphur; and 'that valley of the angels burned continually under the earth.' Charles notes on this that 'the Gehenna valley here includes the adjacent country down to the Dead Sea. A subterranean fire was believed to exist under the Gehenna valley.'

8. ομοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι.] Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μαιίνουσιν.] 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 ο of MS.) γὰρ νῦν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβαλλουσιν. Cf. parallel in 2 P. 2¹⁰⁻¹³, 1 Th. 5⁶, Rom. 13^{11, 12}, Ps. 73²⁰, 126¹. Can there be any reference to the blindness with which the men of Sodom were smitten? The verb is used in Acts 2¹⁷ (a quotation from Joel 2²⁸) οἱ πρεσβύτεροι υμῶν 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 ψευδοπροφήται and ψευδοδιδασκαλοὶ of 2 P. 2¹. Those who take the opposite view (viz. that 2 P. was copied from Jude) will see nothing to justify the article. Moffatt (*Hist. N.T.*) translates 'these men of sensual imagination,' but in the introduction to the epistle (p. 589) regards it as implying a 'claim to possess visions.' The word is used by Isaiah 56¹⁰ in connexion with the words οὐκ ἐγνώσαν, 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.* 29¹⁰, Jer. 23²⁵⁻³² where lying dreams are contrasted with the word of the Lord, *ib.* 27⁹ (LXX. 34⁹) μὴ ἀκούετε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν υμῶν . . . καὶ τῶν ἐνυπνιαζόμενων υμῶν ('nor to your dreamers') καὶ τῶν οἰωνισμάτων υμῶν, Deut. 13^{1, 3, 5} προφήτης ἢ ἐνυπνιαζόμενος. Compare Gen. 28¹², 41⁵.

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. 2¹⁸ ἀέρα κενεμβατευων. 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 ποτερον συμβαίνει αἰ τοῖς καθευδουσιν ἐνυπνιάζειν, ἀλλ' οὐ μνημονεουσιν; *Probl.* 30. 14. 2 οἱ ἐν τῷ καθευδειν ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι ἰσταμένης τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἤρεμι, ονειρωπτοουσιν, 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 μαιίνουσιν but ἀθετοουσιν and βλασφημοουσιν. We must also interpret μαιίνω here by the ἀσέλγειαν of v. 4, the ἐκπορνεύσασθαι and σαρκὸς ἑτέρας of v. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. 1¹⁵ τοῖς μεμιασμένοις οὐδὲν καθαρὸν, ἀλλὰ μεμικται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνειδήσις. The heretics condemned by St. Paul for forbidding marriage (1 Tim. 4³) regarded it as μiasmos σαρκος.

κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοουσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοουσιν.] On first reading one is

inclined to take the words *κυριότης* and *δοξαί* 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 θαλασσης*, 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 *οσα φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται* and the phrase *κυριοτητα ἀθετουσιν*, *δοξας δὲ βλασφημουσιν* by *οσα ουκ οιδασιν βλασφημουσιν*, we seem to require a more pointed and definite meaning, not simply 'majesty,' but 'the divine majesty,' not simply 'dignities,' but 'the angelic orders.' Cf. 2 P. 2¹⁰, Eph. 1²¹ (having raised him from the dead and set him on his right hand) *υπερανῶ πάσης αρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος*, Col. 1¹⁶ *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτισθῆ τα παντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τα ορατα καὶ τα αορατα, εἴτε θρονοὶ εἴτε κυριοτητα εἴτε αρχαὶ 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, θεν γαρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεὶ κύριος ἐστιν*, Herm. *Sim.* v. 6. 1 *εἰς δούλου τροπον ου κείται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσιαν μεγάλην κείται καὶ κυριοτητα*. 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 *την κυριοτητα* of Christ *καὶ το ομοτιμον το προς τον πατερα*,' Greg. Nyss. c. *Eunom.* vi. p. 180 C *ἡ κυριότης οὐχι ουσιας ονομα ἀλλ' ἐξουσιας ἐστι*. It was also used as a complimentary address, *ἡ σὴ κυριότης* 'your lordship.' The verb *αθετέω* has God or Christ for its object in Lk. 10¹⁰, Joh. 12⁴⁸, 1 Th. 4⁸, etc. We have then to consider how it can be said that the libertines (*οὔτοι*) '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. 19⁵). Cf. Joseph. *Ant.* i. 11. 2 *εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἦσαν*

υβρισται καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβεις, and *Test. Aser* 7, where the sin of Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μη γίνεσθε ὡς Σοδομα ἣτις ἤγνοησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος.

δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.] Cf. 2 P. 2¹⁰ *τολμηταὶ αὐθαδεις δοξας ου τρεμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες.* The only other passage in the N.T. in which the pl. occurs is 1 P. 1¹¹, where the sense is different. Dr. Bigg compares Exod. 15¹¹ *τις ὁμοιος σοι ἐν θεοις, Κυριε; τίς ὁμοιος σοι; δεδοξασμενος ἐν ἁγίοις, θαυμαστος 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 *δοξα* in the singular is used for the Shekinah, see my n. on James 2¹. 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 δε σὴν εἶναι νομιζω τας σε δορυφορουσας δυνάμεις.* See *Test. Jud.* 25 *Κυριος ευλογησε τον Δευι, ὁ ἀγγελος του προσωπου εμε, αι δυνάμεις τῆς δόξης τον Συμεων,* also Luke 9²⁶, 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 *η κυριότης* of the true Deity, whom they practically deny by their dual God; *αι δόξαι* are the angels, whom they blaspheme by supposing that they had created the world in opposition to the will of the true God, whereas Michael himself submitted everything to Him. This last clause would then be an appendage to the preceding, with special reference to the case of the Sodomites (cf. Joh. 13²⁰). There may also be some allusion to the teaching or practice of the libertines. If we compare the mysterious reference in 1 Cor. 11¹⁰ *δια τουτο ὀφείλει η γυνη ἔξουσιαν εχει ἐπι τῆς κεφαλῆς δια 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 ἀρχαγγελος.] The term *αρχ.* occurs in the N.T. only here and in 1 Th. 4¹⁶. The names of seven archangels are given in Enoch. The story here narrated is taken from the apocryphal *Assumptio 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. Isaiæ*, pp. 47, 49 foll. ed. Charles.

an apocryphal book. In Cramer's *Catena* on this passage (p. 163) we read *τελευτησαντος εν τω ορει Μωυσεως, ο Μιχαηλ αποστελλεται μεταθήσων το σώμα, ειτα του διαβολου κατα του Μωυσεως βλασφημουτος και φοιεα αναγορευοντος δια το παταξαι τον Αίγυπτιον, ουκ ενεγκων την κατ αυτου βλασφημιαν ο αγγελος, 'Επιτιμήσαι σοι ο Θεός προς τον διάβολον εφη.* 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. 34⁶ (R.V.) 'he buried him (*mg.* he was buried) in the valley...but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.' Compare the vain search for Elijah (2 K. 2¹⁶ 17). Further details in Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8. 48) *νέφους αϊφνιδιον ύπερ αυτου σταντος άφανιζεται κατα τινος φάραγγος. γεγραφε δε αυτον έν ταις ιεραϊς βιβλοις τεθνεωτα, δείσας μη δι υπερβολην τής περι αυτον άρετής προς το θεϊον αυτον αναχωρήσαι τολμήσωσιν ειπέιν*, 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. 15¹⁰ *ανδρα διακρινομενον παση τη γη*, Joel 3², Acts 11². See my note on James 1⁶ and below ver. 22.

διελέγετο.] Cf. Mk. 9³⁴ *προς άλλήλους διελεχθησαν, τις μείζων.*

ουκ ετόλμησεν κρίσιν επενεγκέιν βλασφημίας.] Cf. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 856 *προδοσεως αιτιαν επιφέρων, ιδ.* 943 *τιμωρίαν επιφ.* The word occurs elsewhere in N. T. only in Rom. 3⁵. Field (*On Translation of N.T.* p. 244) compares Acts 25¹⁸ *οι κατήγοροι ουδεμιαν αιτιαν εφερον ών έγω υπενοουν*, Diod. 16. 29 *δίκην επηνεγκαν κατα τών Σπαρτιατων, ιδ.* 20. 10 *κρισεις άδικους επιφέροντες*, 20. 62 *φοβηθεις τας επιφερομενας κρισεις*, tom. x. p. 171 ed. Bip. *επήνεγκαν κρισιν περι υβρεως*, 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 1²⁵ *άκροατής επιλησμονής*, 2⁴ *κριται διαλογισμών πονηρών*, 3⁶ *ό κοσμος τής άδικιας*, also 2 P. 2¹ *αιρέσεις απωλείας*, 2¹⁰ *επιθυμια μιασμου.*

κρίσις, like *κρινω*, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, cf. Lycurg. 31 where *οι συκοφαντουντες* are distinguished from *των δικαίως τας κρίσεις ενισταμένων.*

επιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.] These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (3¹⁻¹⁰) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words *επιτιμήσαι Κυριος εν σοι*,

διαβολε, καὶ επιτιμήσοι Κυριος ἐν σοι, ὁ εκλεξαμενος τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 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. 17¹⁸ ἐπιτιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

10. οἱ τοὶ δὲ ὄσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν 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. 2¹⁻. The common verb βλασφ. shows that the δόξαι of ver. 8 are identical with οσα οὐκ οἶδασιν here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom cf. 1 Cor. 27¹⁶, 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 ἐγνώκεν· εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώσαν οὐκ ἂν τὸν κυριὸν τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. See too Joh. 8¹⁹, 1 Tim. 6⁴ τετυφῶται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος. For the form οἶδασιν see my ed. of St. James p. clxxxiii.

ὄσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται.] This stands for σαρκα in ver. 8 and is explained by ἀσελγειαν in ver. 4, ἐκπορνευσασαι in ver. 7, μαινοῦσιν in ver. 8, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευομενοι 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 ἐπιστάμενους, ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ τὰλλα ζῶα ἐπίσταται τίνα μάχην ἕκαστα οὐδὲ παρ' ἑνὸς ἄλλου μαθόντα ἢ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως.

ἐν τούτοις φθίρονται.] 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. 3¹⁹ 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 αἰσχυνῇ αὐτῶν, Eph. 4²² ἀποθῆσθαι . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον 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 παρεῖσεδυσαν : for the phrase cf. Blass *Gr.* p. 119, and 2 P. 2¹⁵ ἐξακολουθησαντες 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. 9¹⁰. 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 φιλάνθος ἐπικλησὶν Καὶν εὐρηκεν (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 ἐσφάξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἐσφάξεν αὐτόν ; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δικαία, of unbelief in Heb. 11⁴ πιστεῖ πλειονα θυσίαν Ἀβελ 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. 4⁷ cited by Schneckenburger, in which Cain is represented as saying 'non est iudicium, nec iudex, nec est aliud saeculum, nec dabitur merces bona iustis, 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. 3²³. Euthym Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοκτονοῦ

εἰσι, οἱ 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 (Epiphanius, *Pan.* i. 3. 37. 1 οἱ Ὀφίται τὰς προφασεῖς εἰληφασιν ἀπο τῆς Νικολαοῦ καὶ Γνωστικῶν καὶ τῶν προτουτῶν αἰρέσεων). They held that the Creator was evil, that the Serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epiphanius, *ib.* 38. 1, οἱ Καιανοὶ φασὶ τὸν Καὶν ἐκ τῆς ἰσχυροτέρας Δυναμῆος ὑπάρχειν καὶ τῆς ἀνωθεν αὐθεντίας, and boast themselves to be of kin to Cain, καὶ τῶν Σοδομιτῶν καὶ Ἡσαῦ καὶ Κορε, see too Iren. i. 31, Clem. *Str.* vii. § 108).

τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.] Westcott on 1 Joh. 1⁸ says that 'the idea of πλάνη is always that of straying from the one way; not of misconception in itself, but of misconduct [as in Rom. 1²⁷]. Such going astray is essentially ruinous. The cognate terms are used of the false Christs and prophets (Mt. 24⁴ ff., Apoc. 2²⁰, 13¹⁴, 19²⁰, 1 Joh. 4⁶, 2 Joh. 7), of Satan (Apoc. 12⁹, 20³ ff.), of Babylon (Apoc. 18²³), of Balaam in Jude 11.' See also his n. on 4⁶ ἐκ τουτου γινωσκομεν 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. 37²⁹ μὴ ἐκχυθῆς ἐπ' ἐδεσμάτων, *Test. Reub.* 1 πορνεία ἐν ἡ ἐξεχύθη, Clem. *Al. Str.* ii. p. 491 εἰς ἡδονήν, τράγων δικήν, ἐκχυθεντες καθηδυναθουσιν, Plut. *V. Ant.* 21 εἰς τὸν ἡδυναθῆ καὶ ἀκολαστὸν βίον ἐκκεχυμενος. Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with μισθοῦ, which implies cool self-interest. That covetousness, *αισχροκέρδεια*, 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 'væ 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. 2¹⁵. What then are we to understand by

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

'they were hurried along on the line of Balaam's error'? What was his error? From Numb. 22, 25¹³, and 31¹⁶, Nehem. 13² *Μωαβίται ἐμισθωσαντο ἐπ' αὐτον τον Βαλααμ 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. 2⁶) 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. 2¹⁴ we read of some in Pergamum that held the teaching of Balaam, *ος ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλακ βαλεῖν σκανδαλον ἐνωπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλοθῦτα και πορνεύσαι*. 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. 2³ where Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was *ουκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδε ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδε ἐν δόλῳ . . . ουτε γαρ ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, ουτε ἐν προφασει πλεονεξίας, ουτε ζητουντες ἐξ ἀνθρωπων δοξαν*, 1 Tim. 3^{8,9} *διακονους μη διλόγους, μη οινῶ πολλῶ προσεχοντας, μη αἰσχροκερδεις, εχοντας το μυστηριον τῆς πιστεως ἐν καθαροσυνειδησει*, Tit. 1^{7,11} *διδασκοντες α μη δει κερδους χάριν*, 1 Pet. 5². For the gen. *μισθου* cf. Winer, p. 258, Plat. *Rep.* ix. 575 B *μισθου ἐπικουρουν*, 1 Cor. 7²³ *τιμῆς ἡγορασθητε*.

On the whole I understand the passage thus: Balaam went wrong because he allowed himself to hanker after gain and so lost his communion with God. He not only went wrong himself, but he abused his great influence and his reputation as a prophet, to lead astray the Israelites by drawing them away from the holy worship of Jehovah to the impure worship of Baal Peor. So these false teachers use their prophetic gifts for purposes of self-aggrandisement and 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. 16¹ foll. and compare, for the same rebellious spirit in the Christian Church, 3 Joh. 9, 10 (of Diotrephes), Tit. 1^{10,11}, *εἰσὶ πολλοὶ ἀνυποτακτοὶ . . οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν*, *ib.* 1¹⁶; *ib.* 3^{10,11}, 1 Tim. 1²⁰ (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenæus and Alexander) *ους παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανα ἵνα παιδευθωσιν μη βλασφημεῖν*, *ib.* 6³⁻⁶, 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.

ο λογος αυτων ὡς γάγγραινα νομην ἔξει, ὧν ἐστιν Ὑμεναιος καὶ Φίλητος, οἵτινες περι την ἀλήθειαν ηστοχησαν, 4¹⁴ where the opposition of Alexander the coppersmith is noted; but especially 31⁹, 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. 12³ ἀναλογισασθε τον τοιαυτην υπομεμενηκοτα υπο των αμαρτωλων εις ἑαυτον ἀντιλογίαν. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Numb. 20¹³ *al.* and (in relation to Korah) in *Protev. Jac.* 9 μνήσθητι ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεος τοις Δαθάν, Κωρε, καὶ Ἀβειραμ, πῶς ἐδιχάσθη η γη καὶ κατεπιεν αυτοις δια τὴν ἀντιλογίαν αυτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these examples. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ἐπορευθησαν ὁδῳ, that of Balaam the gentile prophet by ἐξεχυθησαν πλάνη, that of the Levite Korah by ἀπωλοντο ἀντιλογία.

12. οἱτοι εἰσιν [οἱ] εν ταῖς ἀγάπαις υμων σπιλαδες συνευωχουμενοι.] Dr. Chase quotes Zech. 1¹⁰, Apoc. 7¹⁴, Enoch 46³, *Secrets of Enoch*, 7³, 18³, 19³, etc for the phrase οἱτοι 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 ἀπαταις for ἀγαπαις and σπιλοι for σπιλαδες. 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, υφαλός πετρα, see Thomas Mag. σπιλας, Ἀττικῶς υφαλός πετρα, Ἑλληνες, Etymol. M. σπιλαδες...αἱ υπο θάλασσαν κεκρυμμεναι πετραι, οθεν καὶ υφαλός ανθρωπος λεγεται ο κεκρυμμενος και πανοῦργος, *ib.* κατασπιλαζοντες, κατακρυπτοντες, ἀπο μεταφορας των υφάλων πετρῶν, αιτινες ὑπο υδατος καλυπτομεναι τοις απρουπτως προσπελαζουσι κινδυνον ἐπιφερουσι (both cited by Wetst.). The same explanation is given by the scholiast on Hom. *Od.* 5. 401-405 καὶ δη δοῦπον ακουσε ποτι σπιλάδεσσι θαλάσσης...ἀλλ' ακταὶ προβλήτες ἔσαν σπιλαδες τε παγοι τε. See Plut. *Mor.* 101 B εὐδία σπιλάδος which Wytt. translates 'tranquillitas maris caecam rupem tegentis,' *ib.* 476 A, Oecumenius on this passage αἱ σπιλαδες τοις πλεουσιν ολεθριοι ἀπροσδοκητως ἐπιγενόμεναι (?-νοις), and ἐξαιφνης, ωσπερ σπιλάδες, ἐπάγοντες αυτοις τὸν ολεθρον των ψυχων. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31 θαλάσση προσεικασας αν τοὺς ανδρας αἰφνιδίῳ σπιλάδι κατασεισθεντας. The compound κατασπιλάζω joined with the parallel case of υφαλός 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. 1¹⁹, and the description of drunkenness

¹ Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. *Od.* 3. 298 ἀταρ νῆας γε ποτι σπιλάδεσσι ἔαζαν κύματα, where, he says, the σπιλάδες are identical with λισσὴ αἰπειά τε εις ἄλα πετρῆ of 293; and Anthol. xi. 390 φασὶ δὲ καὶ νῆεσσι αλιπλανέεσσι χερείους τὰς υφάλους πέτρας των φανερων 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 δε ταύτη παράκειται κατὰ μὲν τὴν κορυφὴν πετρας ἀποτομάδας ἔχον καὶ τοῖς ὕψει καταπληκτικὰς, ὑπὸ δὲ τας ρίζας σπιλάδας οξείας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐνθαλάττους.

(perhaps suggested by the text) in Clem. Al. *Paed.* 183 *fin.* ὁρᾶτε του ναυαγίου τον κινδυνον... ὁ νοῦς περιφερεται τῷ κλυδωνι... ἐνθαλαττευων εἰλιγγιᾷ τῷ ζοφῷ τῆς καταγιδος, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας αστοχησας λιμενος, ἕως ἀντιπεριπεσων ὑφάλοις πετραις αυτος αυτον εξοκειλας εις ηδονας διαφθειρη. *Scorpius* is used in a similar metaphoric sense, see Cic. *in Pis.* 41 where Piso and Gabinius are called ‘*geminae voragine scorulique reipublicae.*’ On the other hand *σπιλας* is sometimes used loosely of a rock of any kind, as we find it joined with *ὑψηλος* in Soph. *Laoc. fr.*; sometimes of gravel, as in *Trach.* 678 (= *χθοι* 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 σπιλαδεσσιν, see also Suidas and Apollon. *lexx.* Others take *σπιλαδες* in the very rare sense of ‘spots,’ or ‘stains’ like *σπιλοι* in 2 P. The only example of this sense seems to be in Orph. *Lith.* 614, but Hesych. gives the interpretation *σπιλας, 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 . . σπιλαδες συνευωχουμενοι? 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. 11⁴ οὗτοι εἰσιν αἱ δυο λυχνιαι αἱ ἐνωπιον του κυριου εστῶτες and B’s reading *παραφερόμενοι* below? Or may we take *σπιλάδες* as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to *συνευωχουμενοι*? 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. 799b, 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.

ἀφοβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.] If we take *σπιλαδες* as complementary to *συνευωχουμενοι*, it is better to take *ἀφοβως* with *ποιμ.*: if we omit the article and take *σπιλαδες* to be the predicate, *συνευωχουμενοι* 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. 19²³ φόβος Κυριου εις ζων ανδρι, ὁ δε αφοβος κ.τ.λ. *ib.* 15¹⁶ κρεισσον μικρα μερις μετα φόβου Κυρίου η θησαυροὶ μεγάλοι μετα ἀφοβιας, Sir. 5⁵ περὶ ἐξίλασμον μη αφοβος γίνου, προσθεῖναι αμαρτίαν ἐφ’ ἀμαρτιας. The phrase *ἑαυτοὺς ποιμ.* recalls Ezek. 34⁸ ἐβοσκησαν οἱ ποιμένες ἑαυτοὺς, τα δε προβατα μου ουκ ἐβοσκησαν,

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. 28⁷ ὅς δε ποιμαίνει ἀσωτιαν, ἀτιμαζει πατερα, ἰδ. 29³ ὅς δε ποιμαίνει πόρνas, ἀπολει πλουτον, Plut. *Mor.* 792 B Ἄτταλον ὑπ' ἀργίας μακρας ἐκλυθέντα κομιδῇ Φιλοποιμην ἐποιμαινεν ἀτεχνῶς παινόμενον. We may compare 1 Cor. 11²⁷ ¹⁰¹¹, James 5⁵, 1 Tim. 5⁶.

νεφέλαι ἀνδροι 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 παντων των σκληρων ων ἐλαλησαν κατ αὐτου*) with your impure mouths against his greatness.' For the metaphor cf. Eph. 4¹⁴. Clement's paraphrase in the *Adumbr.* is 'Nubes sine aqua, hoc est qui 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 ἀνδροι, δμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαιλαπος ἐλαννομεναι*. 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 *δις ἀποθανόντα, ἐκριζωθεντα*. We find the same comparison in Prov. 25¹⁴ 'As clouds and wind without rain, so is he that boasteth himself of his gifts falsely.' [The LXX. is less like our text, suggesting that Jude was acquainted with the original Hebrew. C.] For the use of *υπο* with *ἀνεμων* see my n. on James 3⁴.

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

δις 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. 2¹³), he who has apostatized is twice dead,' cf. Apoc. 21⁸, Heb. 6⁴⁻⁸, 2 P. 2²⁰⁻²², and the n. on *το δευτερον* above, ver. 5. This

does not however explain the words in their first application to the trees. These may be called doubly dead, when they are not only sapless, but are torn up by the root, which would have caused the death even of a living tree. The figure of a tree is often used to illustrate the consequences of a good or evil life, as in Ps. 1³, Mt. 3¹⁰, 7¹⁹, 15¹³ *πασα φυτεια ην ουκ ἐφυτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου . . . κριζωθησεται*, Joh. 15^{2, 6}.

13. *κυματα ἀγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς εαυτῶν αἰσχυνας.*] 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. 57²⁰ 'the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.' See my n. on James 1⁶. The phrase *ἀγρια κυματα* is found in Wisdom 14¹. 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. 17⁴), the *ρυπαρία καὶ περισσεια κακίας* condemned by James 1²¹, 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. 3¹⁹ *ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχυνῇ αὐτῶν*.

ἀστέρες πλανῆται.] Clement's paraphrase is '*Errantes et arostatas 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.* 90²⁴ '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 18¹⁴ (where the Greek has been preserved, see Charles, p. 354) *δεσμωτήριον τουτο ἐγενετο τοις αστροις και ταις δυναμεσιν του ουρανου και οι αστερες οι κυλιόμενοι ἐν τῷ πυρὶ οὗτοι εἰσιν, οι παραβαντες πρόσταγμα Κυριου ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἀνατολῆς αὐτῶν, οτι ουκ ἐξῆλθον ἐν τοῖς καιροις αὐτῶν, και ωργίσθη αὐτοις και ἔδησεν αὐτους μέχρι καιρου τελειωσεως ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐνιαυτῶν μυρίων, ib.* 21²⁴ *ἔωρακα . . . τοπον ἀκατασκευαστον και φοβερόν . . . και ἐκει τεθεαμαι ἐπτα ἀστερας τοῦ ουρανου δεδεμενους . . . οἱ οὗτοι εἰσιν τῶν ἀστέρων του ουρανου οι παραβαντες την ἐπιταγην του Κυρίου, και ἐδέθησαν ὡδε μέχρι τοῦ πληρῶσαι μυρια ἐτη.*

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

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 δε τῶν αστρων θεσις οικονομίαν καὶ τάξιν ἔχει των δικαιων καὶ ευσεβων καὶ τηρουντων τον νομον...οι δ' αυ μεταβαίνοντες και φευγοντες τόπον ἐκ τοπου, οι καὶ πλανητες καλουμενοι, και αυτοὶ τυπος τυγχάνουσιν των αφισταμένων ἀνθρωπων απο του Θεου.

Some commentators take it as applying to comets; perhaps the quotations from Enoch 44 and 80 fit better with shooting stars, ἀστερες διαπτοντες (Arist. *Meteor.* i. 4. 7) which seem to rush from their sphere into darkness; compare Hermes Trism. quoted in Stob. *Ecl.* i. 478, κατωθεν τῆς σελήνης εἰσὶν ἕτεροι αστερες φθαρτοὶ ἀργοὶ . . . οὐς καὶ ἡμεῖς ορωμεν διαλυομενους, την φυσιν ομοίαν ἔχοντες τοις ἀχρηστοις τῶν ἐπι γῆς ζῶων, ἐπὶ ἕτερον δε ουδεν γίγνεται ἢ ἵνα μονον φθαρῆ. For the close relationship supposed by the Jews to exist between the stars and the angels see my n. on James 1¹⁷ φωτων. 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 κοσμῳ Phil. 2¹⁵), but who are only blind leaders of the blind, centres and propagators of *πλανη* (ver. 11), destined to be swallowed up in everlasting darkness. Cf. Apoc. 6¹³, 8^{10.12}, 9¹, 12⁴.

οἷς ὁ ἕσφοσ του σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.] See the parallel in 2 P. 2¹⁷, and above ver. 6.

14. ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τουτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδαμ Ἐνώχ.] 'It was for these also (as well as for his own contemporaries) that the prophecy of Enoch was intended, far as he is removed from our time, being actually the sixth (by Hebrew calculation seventh) descendant from Adam.' For Enoch compare Kalisch's n. on Gen. 5²¹ and the allusions in Sir. 44¹⁶, 49¹⁴, Heb. 11⁵, Charles *Introduction to Book of Enoch*. The prophecy is contained in En. 1⁹ (Greek in Charles *App. C.* p. 327) οτι ἔρχεται συν τοις (?ταις) μυριασιν αὐτου και τοις ἁγιοις αὐτου ποιῆσαι κρισιν κατα πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἐλεγεῖ πασαν σάρκα περι πάντων <τῶν> ἐργων αὐτῶν ἡσέβησαν κατ αὐτου ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. The phrase *ἕβδομος ἀπο Ἀδάμ* is also found in En. 60⁸ 'My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam,' *ib.* 93³ '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. 5⁴⁻²⁰, 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.

ἴδου ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριασιν αὐτου.] 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. 12²², Ps. 68¹⁷, Deut. 33². For the use of ἐν denoting accompanying circumstances see Blass *Gr. N.T.* tr. p. 118, and Lk. 14³¹ εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν ἐν δεκα χιλιασιν ἀπαντησαὶ τῷ μετὰ εικοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτον. The aorist here is the preterite of prophetic vision, as when Micaiah says, 'I saw all Israel scattered,' cf. Apoc. 10⁷, 14⁸. 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. 3⁴.

15. ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.] Follows exactly the Greek translation of Enoch given above, cf. Ael. *V.H.* ii. 6 Κρίτων ἐπειθεν αὐτον ἀποδρᾶναι καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ κρίσιν διαφθεῖραι. On the distinction between the active ποιεῖν κρίσιν 'to execute judgment' (as in Joh. 5²⁷) and the periphrastic middle = κρινεῖν (as in Isocr. 48 D) see my nn. on αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖσθαι, ἰδε and ἴδου (James 4³, *ib.* 3³).

ἐλέγξει 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 27². Charles p. 366 (To Gehenna shall come) πάντες οἰτινες ἐρουσιν τὸ στοματι αὐτῶν κατὰ Κυρίου φωνὴν ἀπρεπὴ καὶ περὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σκληρὰ λαλήσουσιν, cf. *ib.* 5⁴ '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.* 101³, *al.*, Gen. 42⁷ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς σκληρά, 1 Kings 12¹³ ἀπεκριθῆναι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν σκληρὰ, Mal. 3¹³⁻¹⁵.

16. οὗτοι εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι.] Charles thinks that we have here another case of borrowing from the *Assumption of Moses*, see *Introduct. on Apocryphal Quotations*. The word γογγυστής is used in the LXX., Exod. 16⁸, Num. 11^{1, 14-27, 29}. The verb γογγύζω is found in Joh. 7³² 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. 10¹⁰ of the murmurings of the Israelites in the wilderness; Mt. 20¹¹ (where see Wetst.) of the grumbling of the labourers who saw others receiving a day's pay for an hour's labour; Joh. 6⁴¹⁻⁴³ 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. 4⁹. 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 φερεῖν οὐκ ἐθέλετε, τῶν δὲ ἀπόντων ἐφίεσθε, χειμῶνος μὲν θερὸς 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 1¹³.

κατα τας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτων πορευόμενοι.] Cf. 2 P. 3³ and 2¹⁰, 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. 2¹⁻²⁰.'

τὸ στόμα αὐτων λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.] See Enoch 5⁴ quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch 101³ 'ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness,' Ps. 12⁴, Ps. 73⁸, Dan. 7⁸ στομα λαλουν μεγάλα and ver. 20 of the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James 3⁵ foll. In classical writers *υπέρογκα* 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. 2¹⁸ and Plut. *Mor.* 1119 B (Socrates) τὴν ἐμβροντησιαν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸν τυφὸν ἐξήλανε καὶ τὰς ἐπαχθεὶς καὶ ὑπερογκοὺς κατοίησεις καὶ μεγαλαυχίας, *ib.* 7A, where ἡ θεατρικὴ καὶ παρατραγωδὸς λέξις is styled *υπέρογκος* in contrast with *ισχυρὴ λέξις*, Plut. *Vitae* 505B τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ φρονημα τραγικὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον ἐν ταῖς μέγαις εὐτυχίαις ἐγεγονε. It is found in 2 P. 2¹⁸ and in Dan. 11³⁶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεόν, καὶ λαλήσει ὑπερογκα.

θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ωφελίας χάριν.] The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. 19¹⁵ οὐ μὴ θαυμασῆς προσωπον, Job 13¹⁰, see my n. on James 2¹ μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἐχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. X., and cf. 1 Tim. 3⁸ 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 στομα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ—θαυμάζοντες) compare Col. 2² ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν εἰρηνῇ 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. 17¹⁰ τὸ στομα αὐτῶν ἐλάλησεν ὑπερηφανίαν, or Ps. 144^{8,11} where a similar phrase occurs.

17. ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ρημάτων 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. 3³, 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 ἐμπαικταί.] The parallel in 2 P. 3³ is ἐλευσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαικταί, where see n. on the use of the article with *εσχάτος*, etc. Hort in his note on 1 P. 1⁵ 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. 3¹ ἐν εσχαταῖς ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ

χαλεποί, which would thus become merely tautological. There can be no doubt that in 2 P. 2²⁰ τα εσχατα compared with τῶν πρωτων means 'latest in time,' and so in Apoc. 1¹⁷, 2^{8, 19}, 22¹³, Mt. 12⁴⁵, 19³⁰, 20⁸, etc. So Joh. 6^{39 f.} αναστησω αὐτο τη εσχατη ἡμερα, 7³⁷ ἐν τη εσχατη ἡμέρα, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς, 11²⁴ ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τη εσχατη ἡμερα, 1 Cor. 15^{8, 26, 45, 52}, Heb. 1¹ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἰῶ. So I should take Acts 2¹⁷, 1 P. 1²⁰, 1 Joh. 2¹⁸ where see Westcott, and Isa. 2². For ἐπι cf. Arist. Pol. iv. 3 ἐπι τῶν ἀρχαίων χρονων.

The prophecy of this mocking, as a mark of the future trials of the Church, has not come down to us. An example of it in the very beginning of the Church is given in Acts 2¹³ ἑτεροι χλευαζοντες ελεγον οτι γλευκους μεμεστωμενοι εἰσι. In the O. T. we have such exx. as 2 Chron. 36¹⁶ (the summing up of the attitude of the Jews towards the prophets) ἦσαν μυκτηριζοντες τους ἀγγέλους αὐτου και ἐξουθενοῦντες τους λόγους αὐτου και ἐμπαιζοντες ἐν τοις προφήταις αὐτου, Jer. 20⁸ ἐγενηθη λογος Κυριου εἰς ὄνειδισμον ἐμοὶ καὶ εἰς χλευασμον πασαν ἡμέραν. Cf. also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Mt. 10^{25 f.} εἰ τον οἰκοδεσποτην Βεζεβουλ επεκαλεσαν ποσω μαλλον 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 ἐμπαικτης and its cognates see n. on 2 P.

των ἀσεβειων.] (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 2¹ μη ἐν προσωπολημψιαις ἔχετε την πιστιν του κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστου, τῆς δοξῆς, where some connect τῆς δόξης with κυρίου in a qualitative sense. I am rather disposed to take των ἀσεβειῶν here as a subjective gen. 'lusts belonging to or arising from their impieties,' cf. Rom. 1²⁸ καθως οὐκ εδοκιμασαν τον Θεον εχειν ἐν ἐπιγνωσει, παρεδωκεν αὐτους ὁ Θεος εἰς ἀδόκιμον νουν.

19. οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιωριζοντες.] 'These are they that make invidious distinctions.' See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀποδιωριζοντες is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle Pol. iv. 43, ὡσπερ οὐν εἰ ζωου προσηρουμεθα λαβεῖν εἶδη, πρῶτον ἀν ἀποδιωριζομεν σπερ ἀναγκαῖον παν εχειν ζων ('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 το μὲν φυσικὸν ὠρισεν ἐπ' αὐτου, το δε γνωμικον ἀποδιωρισε translated 'naturali in eo (Christo) constituta voluntate, arbitrariam dispunxit,' *ib.* p. 131 C ὡς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτου μονον το ἐμπαθές, ἀλλ' οὐ το φυσικον ἀποδιωρισασθαι θελημα 'quod

dixerat hoc solum spectare ut libidinosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a Salvatore eliminaret,' Severus *de Clyst.* 32. 25 *οταν ταυτα τα συμπτωματα οψη παροντα, αποδιοριζε την οργανικην νοσον εκ της ομοιομερους.* 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 αποδιορισμος to Hermias in *Plat. Phaedr.* p. 166 is valueless, as the true reading there is απομερισμός (so stated in Couvreur's ed. 1901). The simple διοριζω is found in Lev. 20²⁴ διωρισα υμās απο τῶν ἐθνῶν 'I separated you from the nations,' Job 35¹¹: so αφορίζω Mt. 25³² ἀφορίζει τα πρόβατα απο τῶν ἐριφων, Acts 19⁹ (Paul left the synagogue) καὶ ἀφώρισεν τους μαθητας, 2 Cor. 6¹⁷ ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μεσου αυτων καὶ αφορισθητε, Lk. 6²² (of excommunication) οταν αφορισωσιν υμας, Gal. 2¹² (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) ὑπεστελλεν και ἀφωριζεν ἑαντον.

ψυχικολ.] Used of worldly wisdom in James 3¹⁵, where see note, distinguished from πνευματικος in 1 Cor. 2¹³⁻¹⁵, 15⁴⁴, cf. the teaching of the Naassenes (*ap. Hippol.* p. 164) εἰς τον οἶκον θεου ουκ εἰσελευσεται ακαθαρτος οὔδεις, ου ψυχικός, ου σαρκικός, αλλα τηρειται πνευματικοις.

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 μὴ is much more widely extended in late than in classical Greek, cf. such phrases as ἐπει μῆ, οτι μῆ. It is simplest to understand πνευμα here of the Holy Spirit, cf. Rom. 8⁹ υμῆις ουκ εστε ἐν σαρκι ἀλλ' ἐν πνευματι, εἰπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οικει ἐν υμιν, 1 Cor. 2¹³, 7⁴⁰, 1 Joh. 3²⁴, 4¹³, and the contrast in ver. 20 ἐν πνευματι αγιω προσευχομενοι. 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. 4³⁻⁴, σπουδαζοντες τηρειν την ἐνοτητα του πνευματος .

εν σωμα και ἐν πνευμα, and 1 Cor. 3³ οπου γαρ ἐν υμιν ζῆλος . . . και διχοστασαι, ουχι σαρκικοι εστε;

20. ὑμῆις δὲ, ἀγαπητοί.] Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17.

ἐποικοδομουντες ἑαυτοῦς τη αγιωτάτη ὑμων πιστει.] These words, descriptive of earnest effort to build up the one spiritual temple, are contrasted with the ἐμπαικται of ver. 18, and οἱ αποδιορίζοντες in ver. 19. For the construction of verbs compounded with ἐπί see Winer pp. 535, 536. For the spiritual temple, cf. 1 Pet. 2³⁻⁵, Col. 1²³, Eph. 2²⁰⁻²² ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τω θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστολων και προφητῶν, οντος ακρογωνιαιου αυτου Χριστοῦ Ἰησου κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. 3⁹⁻¹⁷, 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, *δυνηθησεσθε οικοδομῆσθαι εἰς την δοθεισαν υμιν πιστιν.* Usually Christ is spoken of as the foundation or corner-stone of the Church, and we should probably assign an objective sense to τῇ πιστει here, as in ver. 3 above (ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πιστει). Otherwise it might be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation

with the spiritual realities (Heb. 11¹ πιστις ἐλπίζομένων υπόστασις, πραγμάτων ελεγχος ου βλεπομένων), that which is the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see n. on 2 P. 1⁵, and which leads to eternal life (1 P. 1⁵, and ⁹ κομιζόμενοι το τέλος τῆς πίστεως υμῶν, 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. 5⁴ 5). Cf. 1 Pet. 5⁹ ὡ ἀντιστήτε στερεοὶ τῇ πιστεῖ.

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

ἐν πνευματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.] These words, contrasted with πνευμα μῆ εχοντες in ver. 19, show how they are to build themselves up upon their faith. I understand them as equivalent to James 5¹⁶ δεησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη, where see n. Compare also Eph. 6¹⁸ δια πασης προσευχῆς προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι, Rom. 8²⁶, 27.

21. ἑαυτοῦς 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 φυλαξαι): 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 1²⁷ ἀσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν, Phil. 2¹² τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. Θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν υμῖν. 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. 5⁵ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκεχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν δια πνεύματος ἀγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν, ἰβ. 8³⁸, 39 πεπεισμαι ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ . . . οὔτε τις κτισὶς ἕτερα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρῖσαι ἀπο τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, Joh. 15⁹ καθὼς ἠγάπησεν με ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἠγάπησα, μέναιτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῆ ἐμῆ. εἰάν τις ἐντολὰς μου τηρήσῃτε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου. The aor. imper. is expressive of urgency, see n. on ἠγγασαθε James 1².

προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος.] Cf. Tit. 2¹³ προσδεχομενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. X., and 2 P. 3¹², 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. 15⁴³, Lk. 2²⁵, 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. το ελεος: cf. 1 P. 1³-7 εὐλογητος ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ελεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς . . . φρουρουμενοὺς . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμὴν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.

22. οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους.] On the reading see the Introduction. For the form οὓς μὲν instead of ὁ μὲν, cf. Mt. 13⁸, 22⁵, Lk. 23³³, Acts 27⁴⁴, Rom. 14⁵, 1 Cor. 7⁷, 11²¹, 2 Cor. 2¹⁶, 2 Tim. 2²⁰, not used in Heb., 1 and 2 P., James or John. The doubled οὓς δέ is found in Mt. 21³⁵ ὃν μὲν ἐδειραν, οὓν δὲ ἀπεκτεῖναν, οὓν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν, ἰβ. 25¹⁵ ὧ μὲν ἔδωκεν πεντετάλαντα, ὧ δὲ δυο, ὧ δὲ εν. 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 ἐλεγμω

ἐλεγξεις τον αδελφόν 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 ἐλεγχος is a chastening, a punishment.' Compare Grote's life-like account of the Socratic Elenchus in his *Hist. of Greece*. This verse seems to be referred to in *Can. Apost.* vii. 4 ου μισησεις παντα ανθρωπων ἀλλ' οὐς μὲν ἐλεγξεις, ους οε ελεήσεις, περι ων δε προσευξῃ, ους δε ἀγαπήσεις υπέρ την ψυχην σου, which is also found in the *Didache* ii. 7 with the omission of οὐς δὲ ελεήσεις. Cf. *Joh.* 16⁸ εκεινος ἐλεγξει τον κόσμον περι ἀμαρτίας και περι δικαιοσύνης και περι κρισεως, 1 *Cor.* 14²⁴ ἐλέγχεται υπο παντων (the effect of the prophets' teaching on an unbeliever), *Tit.* 1¹³ ἐλεγε αυτους ἀποτομωσ ινα υγιαινωσιν ἐν τη πιστει, *ιβ.* 1⁹ τους αντλεγοντας ἐλεγειν, 2 *Tim.* 4² (the charge to Timothy) ἐλεξον, παρακάλεσον ἐν παση μακροθυμια, *Αποκ.* 3¹⁹ οσους ἐαν φιλω ἐλέγχω και παιδευω, *Eph.* 5¹³ τα δε παντα ἐλεγχομενα υπο του φωτος φανερουνται. There is a tone of greater severity in the ποιησαι κρίσιν και ἐλεξαι 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 ἀρπάζοντες and μισουντες in the following clauses, and so the *text. rec.* has διακρινομενοι, 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 ἐλεγχετε (as we find in *Plato Theaet.* 171 D ἐμε ἐλεγξας ληρουντα, *Xen. Mem.* 1. 7. 2 ἐλεγχθησεται γελοιος ὢν, *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* 1⁶, 2⁴? In that case we might translate 'convict them of their want of faith,' taking the participle as complementary to the verb; or 'reprove them because of their doubts.' It seems more probable however that the meaning here is 'convince them when they dispute with you,' which we may compare with 1 *P.* 3¹⁵ ετοιμοι αει προς απολογιαν παντι τῷ αιτουντι ὑμᾶς λογον . . . ἀλλα μετα πραύτητος και φοβου (cf. εν φόβω below). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of διακρινομενος being the same as that in ver. 9 τῷ διαβολῳ διακρ., and in *Socr. E.H.* v. 5 ὁ λαος ἔρχεν ομονοιαν και ουκετι προς ἀλλήλους διεκρίνοντο.

23. σώζετε.] Here again a word which is strictly applicable to God is transferred to him whom God uses as his instrument, cf. 1 *Pet.* 4¹¹ and notes on τηρησατε, ἐλεγχετε above, especially *James* 5²⁰ ο ἐπιστρεψας ἀμαρτωλὸν εκ πλάνης ὁδου αυτου σώσει ψυχην εκ θανάτου.

ἐκ πυρὸς αρπάζοντες.] The expression is borrowed from Amos 4¹¹ κατέστρεψα υμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ Θεὸς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα, καὶ ἐγενεσθε ὡς δαλος ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρος, καὶ οὐδ' ὡς ἐπεστρεψατε πρὸς με, λέγει Κύριος, and Zech. 3³ οὐκ ἴδου οὗτος δαλος ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρος; 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 ἐπιτιμησαὶ σοὶ 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. 16³⁵, Ps. 106¹⁸ ἐξεκαυθη πυρὲν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλοξ κατέφλεξεν ἀμαρτωλοῦς. 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. 3¹³⁻¹⁵ ἐκάστου τοῦ ἔργου ὁποῖον ἔστιν τὸ πυρὸς αὐτοῦ δοκιμασεῖ . . . εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαησεται, ζημιωθησεται, αὐτος δὲ σωθησεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς δια πυρος. 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.

ελεᾶτε 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 2¹³⁻¹⁶. 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. 7¹ καθαρισωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπο παντος μολυσμου σαρκος καὶ πνευματος ἐπιτελουντες ἀγιωσυνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, Phil. 2¹², 1 P. 1¹⁷, 3¹⁵. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in -εω and -άω in late Greek see Jannaris § 850, § 854 foll., Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read ἔλεα in Prov. 21²⁶, and ελεώντος Rom. 9¹⁶, but ἔλεει in Rom. 9¹⁸.

μισούντες 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. 30²², Lev. 15¹⁷, perhaps too from Zech. 3⁴ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος ἱμάτια ρυπαρά. Cf. Apoc. 3⁴ οὐκ ἐμολυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, and Apocal. Pauli quoted by Spitta ὁ χιτῶν μου οὐκ ἐρυνώθη. The derivatives of σπιλος are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of σπιλω in Biblical Greek are James 3⁶ ἡ γλῶσσα . . . ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα and Wisd. 15⁴ εἶδος σπιλωθεν χρωμασι διηλλαγμένοις. Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. 2^{25, 26} ἐν πραυτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους μηποτε δώῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπιγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν, ἐκ τῆς του διαβολου παγιδος.

24. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξει ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους.] Apparently a reminiscence¹ of Rom. 16²⁵ *τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηριξάτω . . . μονῶ σοφῷ Θεῷ οἰα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἡ δοξολογία εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.* Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. 3²⁰ commences τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ. The reading *ὑμᾶς* is confirmed by the evidence of *Σ* and *B*, which were unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading *αὐτοῦς*, found in *KP* and some inferior MSS.

ἄπταιστος.] Occurs in 3 Macc. 6³⁹ *μεγαλοδοξῶς ἐπιφάνας τὸ ελεος αὐτοῦ οὐ τῶν ὀλῶν δυναστικῶς ἀπταίστους αὐτοῦς ἐρρυσάτω*: used here only in the N.T. The verb *πταίω* has the same figurative sense in James 2¹⁰, 3² *εἰ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τελείος ἄνθρωπος*, 2 P. 1¹⁰ *ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητε ποτε*.

στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιασει.] Cf. Mt. 25³¹⁻³³ *ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ . . . στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἄκτ. 6⁶ οὐς ἐστήσαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων, Κολ. 1²² παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλητοὺς κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ* which Lightfoot refers to present approbation rather than to the future judgment of God, comparing Rom. 14²², 1 Cor. 1²⁹, 2 Cor. 2¹⁷, 4², 7¹², 12¹⁹. In the present passage the addition of the words *τῆς δόξης* shows that the final judgment, the goal of *φυλάξει*, is spoken of. Lightfoot remarks that *ἀμώμους* is 'without blemish' rather than 'without blame,' being a sacrificial word like *τελείος* and *ολοκληρος*. Hort gives a fuller account of the word in his interesting note on 1 P. 1¹⁹ *τιμῶν αἱματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ*, where he traces the way in which the words *μωμος* 'blame,' and *ἄμωμος* 'blemishless,' 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. 1⁴ 5²⁷, Heb. 9¹⁴. In 2 P. 3¹⁴ *ἀμώμητος* seems to be used in the same sense. The word *κατενώπιον* is apparently confined to the Bible, where it occurs in Jos. 1⁵, 21⁴², Lev. 4¹⁷, Eph. 1⁴, *ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ*: *κατενώπιον* is found in Hom. *Π.* xv. 320. For *ἀγαλλιασις* see Hort's n. on 1 P. 1⁶ *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιασθε* '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 *ἀγαλλομαι*, properly "to be proud of," but often combined with *ἠδομαι* and such words . . . Clem. *Str.* vi. p. 789 says *τὴν δὲ ἀγαλλιασιν εὐφροσύνην εἶναι φάμεν, ἐπιλογισμὸν οὐσαν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀρετῆς διὰ τίνος ἐστιάσεως καὶ διαχυσσεως ψυχικῆς . . .* See also *Str.* vi. p. 815 *εὐφρανθῶμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιαθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ, τοῦτέστι . . . τὴν θεῖαν ἐστιασιν εὐωχηθῶμεν.* Dr. Chase notes that it occurs in Enoch 5⁹ *τὰ ἔτη τῆς χάρας 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.

25. μονω Θεω σωτήρι ἡμῶν.] See above on ver. 4 τον μονον δεσποτην. God is called σωτήρ in Is. 45¹⁵ σὺ γὰρ εἶ Θεος, ... ο Θεος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρ, *ib.* ver. 21, Sir. 51¹ αἰνεσω σε Θεὸν τον σωτήρά μου, Philo *Confus. Ling.* § 20, 1. p. 418 *fin.* τις δ' ουκ αν... προς τον μονον σωτήρα Θεὸν ἐκβοσηση (? -σαι); *cf.* Lk. 14¹ ἡγαλλιασεν το πνεῦμα μου επι τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτήρι μου, elsewhere in N. T. only in Tit. 1³, 2¹⁰, 3⁴ οτε η χρηστότης...επεφάνη τοῦ σωτηρος ημῶν Θεοῦ...κατα το αυτοῦ ελεος εσωσεν ημᾶς δια...πνευματος αγιου οὐ ἐξέχεεν εφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσιως δια Ἰ. X. τοῦ σωτήρος ημῶν, 1 Tim. 1¹ Παῦλος αποστολος Ἰ. X. κατ ἐπιταγην Θεου σωτήρος ημῶν και X. Ἰ. *ib.* 2⁸, 4¹⁰. 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 διὰ with δοξα and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, *cf.* 1 Pet. 4¹¹ ινα ἐν πασιν δοξάζεται ο Θεος δια Ἰ. X. ω εστιν η δόξα και το κράτος εις τοὺς αιῶνας.

δόξα.] The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, *cf.* 2 P. αυτῷ ἢ δόξα, Rom. 11³⁶, 16²⁷, Gal. 1⁵, Lk. 2¹⁶ δόξα εν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ. In 1 P. 4¹¹ it is inserted, ὧ εστιν η δόξα και το κρατος, and, as we find no case in which εστω 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 χαρις ὑμῖν και εἰρήνη απο Θεου πατρος, where we must supply ἔστω or γενοιτο. De Wette maintained that the following words προ παντος 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 γενηθητω το θέλημα σου ὡς ἐν ουρανῷ και επι γῆς. The omission of the verb allows of either or both views in varying proportion. δοξα by itself is the commonest of all ascriptions. It is joined with τιμη in 1 Tim. 1¹⁷ and elsewhere, as here with μεγαλωσυνη. It is joined with κράτος in 1 Pet. 4¹¹, 5¹¹, Apoc. 1⁶. Fuller ascriptions are found in Apoc. 4¹¹ αξιος ει, ο κυριος...λαβειν την δοξαν και την τιμην και την δυναμιν, 5¹³ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ...η ευλογία και ἡ τιμη και ἡ δοξα και το κρατος εις τοὺς αιῶνας τῶν αιῶνων, 7¹² ἡ εὐλογια και ἡ δοξα και η σοφια και η ευχαριστια και η τιμη και η δυναμις και ἡ ισχυς τῷ Θεῷ ημῶν. Just before (ver. 10) we have the remarkable ascription η σωτηρια τῷ Θεῷ ημῶν. Compare with this the ascription of David (1 Chron. 29¹¹) σοι Κυριε η μεγαλωσυνη και ἡ δυναμις και το καυχημα και η νικη και η ισχυς, οτι συ πάντων τῶν εν ουρανῷ και επι γῆς δεσποζεις. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man

see Rom. 2¹⁰ δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ εργαζομένῳ τοῦ ἀγαθόν.¹ An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 65 ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' υμῶν καὶ μετα πάντων πανταχῆ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ δι' οὐ αὐτῷ δοξα, τιμη, κρατος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

[μεγαλωσύνη.] Only found elsewhere in N. T. in Heb. 1³ ἐκαθισεν ἐν δεξιά τῆς μεγαλοσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, repeated in 8¹. Dr. Chase notes that occurs in Enoch 5⁴ κατελαλήσατε μεγαλους και σκληρους λογους εν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν κατὰ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ, 12³ τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης, 14¹⁶ (a house excelling) ἐν δοξῇ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλωσίῃ. It is coupled with δοξα, of which it may be regarded as an extension, in the doxology used by Clem. Rom. 20, 61. I am not aware of any other example of ἐξουσία in a doxology: compare however Matt, 28¹⁸ ἐδοθη μοι πασα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

[πρὸ πάντων τοῦ αἰῶνος.] Cf. 1 Cor. 2⁷ (τὴν σοφίαν) ἣν προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν, Prov. 8²³ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσε με (i.e. σοφίαν), ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τῆν γῆν ποιῆσαι. An equivalent expression is πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου found in Joh. 17²⁴ ἠγάπησάς με π. κ. κ. also Eph. 1⁴ ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ π. κ. κ. and 1 Pet. 1²⁰ (Χριστοῦ) προεγνωσμένου με π. κ. κ., φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' εσχάτου τῶν χρόνων. St. Jude speaks of one past age and of several ages to come. On the other hand St. Paul speaks of many ages in the past (1 Cor. 2⁷), and St. John of only one age in the future.

[εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.] This precise phrase is unique in the Bible, but εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is common enough, as in Lk. 1³³. Rom. 1²⁵, 5⁵, 11³⁶, 16²⁷, 2 Cor. 11³¹, etc., so in LXX. Dan. 2⁴⁴, 6²⁶. The stronger phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs in Gal. 1⁵, Phil. 4²⁶, 1 Tim. 1¹⁷, 2 Tim. 4¹⁸, Heb. 13²¹, 1 P. 4¹¹, 5¹¹, Apoc. 1⁶, etc. John uses only εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα apparently with the same meaning. Other variations are found in Eph. 3²¹ αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χ. Ἰ. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, 2 P. 3¹⁸ 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 (σου ἐστὶν 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.'

APPENDIX TO ST. JUDE

THE force of this word seems to me to have been generally misunderstood by the commentators on Jude¹², δένδρα φθινοπωρινα ακαρπα δις αποθανοντα εκριζωθέντα, 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 δρύς φθινοκαρπος (Pindar, *P.* iv. 471) used of a tree which sheds its fruits before they ripen, and φθινοπωρίς ανεμων χειμερίω καταπνοά (Pindar, *P.* v. 161), 'the fruit-withering blast of stormy winds,' also by ιτεαι ὠλεσικαρποι (*Od.* x. 510). There can be no doubt however that φθινοπωρινός is an adjective² derived from το φθινόπωρον, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of φθινουσα σπώρα (cf. φθίνοντος μηνος), meaning the concluding portion of the σπωρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of ὄπ-, connected with οπισω, οπισθεν, and ὄρα = 'the later prime.' We find ωρα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ὄρα ζτους. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of σπωρα, 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 αστηρ σπωρινος *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, αληθινός) are perhaps of different formation, cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergl. Gramm.* ii. pp. 135, 147.

recognized only three seasons—winter, spring, summer; and that the last was indifferently named *θερος* or *σπωρα*: compare Arist. *Aves* 709, *πρῶτα μὲν ὄρας φαίνομεν ἡμεῖς ἦρος, χειμῶνος, σπώρας*, with Aesch. *Prom.* 453, *ἦν δ' οὐδεν αὐτοῖς οὔτε χειματος τεκμαρ οὐτ' ανθεμῶδους ἦρος οὔτε καρπιμοῦ θέρους βέβαιον*. But though *σπωρα* 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) *μηδε μενειν οἶνον τε νέον καὶ ὄπωρινον ομβρον καὶ χειμῶν' ἐπιοντα*: and *σπωρα* 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 *σπωρα*¹:—

φίλης τ σπώρας διπτυχοῦς 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 *μετοπωρον*²) for the new season, the word *σπωρα* being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on *Il.* v. 5, *σπωρα ὄρα μεταξυ κειμενη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτην μετοπωρον*. And so we find it used by Aristotle (*Meteor.* ii. 5) *αι χαλαζαι γίνονται εαρος μὲν καὶ μετοπωρον μάλιστα, εἶτα καὶ τῆς σπώρας, χειμῶνος δε ολιγακίς*, and by Theophrastus (*περὶ Σημειῶν*, 44) *ἐὰν το εαρ καὶ το θέρος ψυχρα γινηται, η ὄπωρα γινεται καὶ το μετοπωρον πνιγηρον*.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. Sept.* (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 ομβρήσαντος Ζηνός*.

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

⁴ See Varro, *R.R.* i. 28 (where Keil quotes *Geoponica*, i. 1. 3, *μετοπωρον ἐρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸ ἑξ εἰδῶν Αὐγούστῶν, ἡλίου ὄντος ἐν λέοντι*); Columella, *R.R.* xi. 2. 57, 84; Plin. *N.H.* xviii. 68. 7; Ov. *Fasti*, ed. Peter, pp. 20-22.

the generally accepted standard of the Roman world, we find that autumn begins on August 11 and ends on November 10. There are however other reckonings which it may be worth while to compare with this. Thus in the *Diaeta* we read (p. 366. 38) φθινοπωρον ἀπὸ Ἄρκτουρου (*i.e.* his morning rising about Sept. 15) μέχρι Πλειαδων δυσσεως (the morning setting about Nov. 9), giving less than two months to this season. As the same treatise (Bk. iii. *init.*) says τὸν ενιαυτον ες τεσσαρα μερεα διαιρουσιν, απερ μαλιστα γινωσκουσιν οι πολλοί . . . εἰαρ δε απο ισημερινης (March 21) μέχρι Πλειαδων ἐπιτολῆς (May 10), his summer must have extended over more than four months. Another reckoning was that from the autumnal equinox, φθινοπωρινη ισημερια (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 φθινοπωρος, has the following blundering account of its duration, απο τῆς πεντεκαιδεκατης Αυγουστου μηνος εως τῆς πεντεκαιδεκατης Δεκεμβριου, οἱ δε απο τῆς εἰκοστῆς δευτερας Αυγουστου εως πάλιν εἰκοστῆς δευτερας Δεκεμβριου. 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 Αυγουστου to Σεπτεμβριου. [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 Δεκεμβριου to Νοεμβριου, 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 ὄπωρα (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name παρα το φθινεσθαι την οπωραν, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits. . . . The deceivers of whom St. Jude speaks are likened to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone.'

I have stated above what I hold to be the origin of the word φθινόπωρον. Trench's explanation is ambiguous and unsuited to the facts of the case, as will be seen from the criticisms in Lightfoot's *Fresh Revision*, p. 135: 'In the phrase "autumn-trees without fruit" there appears to be a reference to the parable of the fig-tree. . . . At all events the mention of the season when fruit might be expected is significant.' He adds in a note, 'Strange to say, the earliest

versions all rendered *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 gadinge (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 *φθινοπωρινα ακαρπα* 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 autumnne unfruitful." The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives "corrupt trees and without frute." . . . The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, "trees withered (*φθινειν*) at fruite gathering (*οπωρα*) and without fruite," which is explained in the margin, "Trees withered in autumnne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth."

The correctness of the interpretation, given by Lightfoot alone among modern commentators, is confirmed by a consideration of the context. The writer has just been comparing the innovators, who have crept into other Churches, to waterless clouds driven past by the wind. Just as these disappoint the hope of the husbandman, so do fruitless trees in the proper season of fruit. If *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 *ακαρπον*? 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 (*οπωρα*) to the autumn, and cannot act again (as Trench supposes) to change autumn into late-autumn, it follows that *φθινοπωρινα* would have been a most unsuitable word to express the bareness of winter. How unsuitable it would have been, how little corresponding to the *Spatherbst* 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 *ετι τῆς ὥρας ούσης κανματωδους*, in i. 28 of the ripening of the grapes, *μετοπωρον δ' ακμάζοντος και του βοτρυος*. 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, *ηρος ροδα, κρίνα . . . θέρους μήκωνες και μήλα πάντα νυν ἀμπελοι και συκαί και ροιαι και μυρτα χλωρά*. Similarly Philostratus (*Heroic.* i. 5, 6, p. 663) dwells on the delights of autumn, *ως ποικίλη σοι*

¹ This agreement is probably owing to their dependence on the Vulgate "*arbores auctumnales infructuosae.*"

ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὡς ἐκδεδωκασιν ἰλαροὶ οἱ βοτρυς, τὰ δένδρα θ' ὡς διακεῖται πάντα καὶ ὡς ἀμβροσία ἢ ὄσμὴ 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 μετοπωρον; *Hor. C.* iv. 7. 11, pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, *Erod.* ii. 17 decorum mitibus pomis caput autumnus agris extulit; *Macrobius (Somn. Scip.* i. 20. 6) mollities autumnalis auræ.

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 danger¹ 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.

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

πασαν σπουδὴν ποιουμενος.

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 (παραδοσις, παραδοσεις) in the Apostolic age, appears from 2 Th. 2¹⁵ κρατειτε τας παραδόσεις as ἐδιδάχθητε είτε δια λόγου είτε δι' επιστολῆς ἡμῶν, *ib.* 3^ο κατα τὴν παραδοσιν ἣν παρελαβετε παρ' ἡμῶν, 1 Cor. 11² καθως παρεδωκα υμιν τας παραδοσεις κατεχετε. In contrast with this there was a Jewish παραδοσις of which we read (Mt. 15⁶) ἠκυρώσατε τον λογον τοῦ Θεου δια τὴν παραδοσιν υμῶν, Mk. 7⁸ αφεντες τὴν ἐντολην του Θεου κρατειτε τὴν παραδοσιν των ανθρωπων, Gal. 1¹⁴ ζηλωτῆς υπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων, and also such oral traditions as those to which the Christianized Essenes of Colossae made their appeal, see Col. 2⁸ κατα τὴν παράδοσιν των ανθρωπων with Lightfoot's note. The cognate verb was similarly used, as in 1 Cor. 11² quoted above, *ib.* v. 23 παρελαβον ἀπὸ Κυριου ὁ καὶ παρεδωκα υμιν (viz. the institution of the Eucharist), *ib.* 15³ παρεδωκα γαρ υμῖν ἐν πρωτοις ο καὶ παρελαβον (viz. the Resurrection of Christ), Lk. 1² καθως παρέδωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ ἀρχῆς αυτοπται και υπηρεται γενομενοι του λόγου, 2 P. 2²¹ υποστρεψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθεισης αυτοις ἀγίας εντολῆς.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. 2¹⁵). Sometimes he says that he received a tradition from the Lord, as in 1 Cor. 11²³ (as to the meaning of which see *Class. Rev.* viii. 149 foll., 267 foll.), with which we may compare Gal. 1^{11, 12} γνωρίζω υμιν το εναγγελιον το εναγγελισθεν υπ' ἔμου οτι ουκ εστιν κατα ανθρωπον· οὔδε γαρ εγω παρα ανθρωπου παρελαβον αυτο, ουτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλα δι' αποκαλυψεως Ἰησου Χριστοῦ. Some understand in the same way 1 Cor. 15³, but the details that follow (και οτι ωφθη Κηφα, εἶτα τοις 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*).

The converse term to παραδιδωμι is παραλαμβάνω, of which some examples have already been given (2 Th. 3⁶, 1 Cor. 11²³, 15³, Gal. 1¹²); others are Mk. 7⁴ (of Jewish tradition) *αλλα πολλά ἐστιν α παρελαβον κρατειν*, 1 Cor. 15¹ *το ευαγγελιον ο ευηγγελισαμην υμιν, ο και παρελαβετε, . . . δι' ου και σωζεσθε*, Gal. 1⁹ *ει τις υμας ευαγγελιζεται παρ' ο παρελαβετε, αναθεμα εστω*, Phil. 4⁹ *α και εμαθετε και παρελαβετε και ηκουσατε και ειdete εν εμοι, ταυτα πρασσετε*, Col. 2⁶ *ωσ παρελαβετε τον Χριστον, εν αυτω περιπατειτε*, 1 Th. 2¹³ *παραλαβοντες λογον ακοης παρ' ημων του Θεου εδεξασθε ου λογον ανθρωπων, αλλα, καθωσ αληθωσ εστιν, λογον Θεου*, *ιβ. 4¹ παρακαλουμεν υμας εν κυριω 'Ιησου, ινα καθωσ παρελαβετε παρ' ημων το πως δει υμας περιπατειν . . . ινα περισσευητε μαλλον.*

(1 b) It is a definite type of teaching, cf. Rom. 6¹⁷ *υπηκουσατε εκ καρδιας εις ον παρεδοθητε τυπον διδαχης*, Rom. 16¹⁷ *παρακαλω υμας σκοπειν τους τας διχοστασιας και τα σκανδαλα παρα την διδαχην, ην υμεις εμαθετε, ποιουντας*, 1 Cor. 11¹⁶ *ημεις τοιαυτην συνηθειαν ουκ εχομεν, ουδε αι εκκλησιαι του Θεου*, Gal. 1⁸ 'though we or an angel from heaven should preach to you any other Gospel, let him be anathema', 2 Cor. 11⁴, 2 Tim. 1¹³ *υποτυπωσιν εχε υγαινοντων λογων ων παρ' εμου ηκουσας εν πιστει*, 1 Tim. 1³ *ινα παραγγελιησ τισιν μη ετεροδιδασκαλειν*, 1 Tim. 4⁰ *εντρεφόμενος τοις λόγοις της πιστεωσ και της καλης διδασκαλιας η παρηκολουθηκασ*, 2 Tim. 3¹⁴ *συ δε μενε εν οις εμαθεσ και επιστωθησ, ειδωσ παρα τινων εμαθεσ*, Tit. 1³ (το κήρυγμα) *ο επιστευθην εγω κατ' επιταγην του σωτηρος ημων Θεου.*

(1 c) Sometimes it is spoken of as a deposit (*παραθήκη, παρατιθεμαι*), cf. 1 Tim. 6²⁰ *ω Τιμοθεε, την παραθηκην φυλαξον, εκτρεπομενοσ τασ βεβηλους κενοφωνιασ*, 2 Tim. 1¹⁴ *την καλην παραθηκην φυλαξον δια πνευματοσ αγιου*, 1 Tim. 1¹⁸ *ταυτην την παραγγελιαν παρατιθεμαι σοι*, 2 Tim. 2² *α ηκουσασ παρ' εμου . . . ταυτα παραθου πιστοις ανθρωποισ οιτινεσ ικανοι εσονται και ετερουσ διδαξαι.*

(1 d) In the pastoral epistles we also meet such phrases as *υγιης, υγαινων, πιστοσ λογοσ* or *διδασκαλια*, cf. 1 Tim. 1^{10, 11} *ει τι τη υγαινουση διδασκαλια αντικειται κατα το ευαγγελιον . . . ο επιστευθην εγω, ιβ. 6^{3,4} ει τις ετεροδιδασκαλει και μη προσερχεται υγαινουσιν λογοισ τοισ του κυριου 'Ιησου Χριστου και τη κατ' εσβεβειαν διδασκαλια, τετυφωται*, 2 Tim. 4³ *της υγαινουσης διδασκαλιασ ουκ ανεξονται αλλα κατα τασ ιδιασ επιθυμιασ εαυτοισ επισωρευουσιν διδασκαλουσ*, Tit. 1⁹ *αντεχομενον του κατα διδαχην πιστου λογου, ινα δυνατοσ η και παρακαλειν εν τη διδασκαλια τη υγαινουση*, *ιβ. 2¹ συ δε λαλει α πρεπει τη υγαινουση διδασκαλια, ιβ. 2⁸ λογον υγη ακαταγνωστον.* The phrase *πιστοσ ο λογοσ* is used with more freedom, sometimes with reference to salvation through Christ, as 1 Tim. 1¹⁵, sometimes of a proverb or maxim, as apparently in 1 Tim. 3¹ *ει τις επισκοπησ ορεγεται, καλου εργου επιθυμει.*

(2) A comparison with the parallel passage in 2 P. 2²¹ suggests that this tradition had two sides: Jude speaks of it as *πιστισ*, teaching what we should believe, Peter as *εντολη*, 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.}

ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρυσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμενον, Ἰουδαιοῖς μὲν σκανδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωριαν, αυτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . . Χριστον Θεου δυναμιν καὶ Θεου 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^{18c}. So in 1 Tim. 1¹⁵ πιστος ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιος, οτι Χριστος Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τον κοσμον αμαρτωλοῦς σῶσαι, and still more briefly in Rom. 10^{8c}. *τουτ εστιν το ῤημα τῆς πιστεως ο κηρυσσομεν' οτι, ἐαν ομολογησης το ρημα ἐν τω στοματι σου οτι Κυριος Ἰησους, καὶ πιστευσης ἐν τη καρδια σου οτι ὁ Θεος αὐτον ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθηση, 1 Cor. 12³ ουδεις δυναται εἰπειν Κυριος Ἰησοῦς εἰ μὴ ἐν πνευματι ἀγίῳ.* Much to the same effect St. John says (1 Jo. 4²) *παν πνεῦμα ο ομολογει Ἰ.Χ. ἐν σαρκι ἐληλυθота ἐκ του Θεου ἐστιν,* of which the converse is given in 2 Jo.⁷, *πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθαν εἰς τον κοσμον, οἱ μὴ ομολογοῦντες Ἰ.Χ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκι.* We may compare Dr. Armitage Robinson on Eph. 5²⁶. 'The confession οτι Κυριος Ἰησους was the shortest and simplest statement of Christian faith (compare Acts 16³¹ *πιστευσον ἐπι τον Κυριον Ἰησουν, καὶ σωθηση συ καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου . . .*). That some confession was required before baptism is seen from the early glosses on the baptism of the eunuch, Acts 8³⁷, and that this soon took the form of question and answer (*ἐπερωτημα*) is suggested by 1 Pet. 3²¹, 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 (*συ εἰ ο Χριστος ο υιος του Θεου του ζώντος*). *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησους εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακάριος εἶ, Σιμων Βαριωνα, οτι σαρε καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκαλυψεν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατηρ μου ο ἐν ουρανοῖς' καγω δε σοι λεγω οτι συ εἰ Πητρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταυτη τῇ πετρα οἰκοδομήσω μου την εκκλησιαν (Mt. 16^{16c}).* Compare 1 Cor. 3¹¹ *θεμέλιον ἄλλον ουδεις δυναται θείναι παρα τον κειμενον, ος ἐστιν Ἰησους Χριστος.*

(2 b) But the tradition also included rules of action. Thus in 2 Th. 3⁶ St. Paul warns his converts *στελλεσθαι ἀπὸ παντος ἀδελφου ἀτακτως περιπατουντος καὶ μὴ κατα την παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν.* His own conduct was to be a *τυπος* to them (*ib.* ver. 9). See also Rom. 6¹⁷ *χαρις τῷ Θεῷ οτι ἠτε δουλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας, υπηκουσατε δε ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ον παρεδοθητε τυπον διδαχῆς, ἐλευθερωθεντες δε ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐδουλωθητε τη δικαιοσυνη.* 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. 13¹⁰), that love, of which St. John says (1 Jo. 3¹¹) *αυτη ἐστιν η ἀγγελια ἣν ηκουσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπωμεν ἀλληλους,* to which he refers again in 3²³ 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. 22⁴⁰), but also from the words reported by St. John, (13³⁴) *ἐντολην καινην διδωμι υμιν ἵνα ἀγαπατε ἀλληλους, καθως ἠγάπησα υμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ υμεῖς ἀγαπατε ἀλληλους,* to which the Apostle refers in 1 Jo. 2⁸.

Sometimes the word *παράδοσις* is used of less fundamental matters,

as in 1 Cor. 11¹ *επαινώ υμᾶς ὅτι . . . καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδοσεις 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. 11⁵) and venture to speak in the congregation (1 Cor. 14³⁴). He settles the former question summarily by appeal to the universal practice of the Churches (11¹⁶), the latter by appeal to a *Κυρίου ἐντολή* (14³⁷).

It may be worth while here to consider some of the terms which are used to express the contents of the *παραδοσις*, 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.* 10¹⁸ the 'power to lay down His life and take it again' is spoken of as an *ἐντολή* from the Father: *ἰδ.* 12^{49, 50}, *My Father has given Me an ἐντολήν τι εἶπω καὶ τι λαλήσω καὶ οἶσα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐστίν*: also of a command of our Lord, *ἰδ.* 13³¹ *ἐντολήν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπάτε ἀλλήλους*, 1 Joh. 4²¹. The widest significance of the term is found in 1 Joh. 3²³ *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστευσωμεν 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. 7¹⁹ the *τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ* is distinguished from the ceremonial law. In 1 Tim. 6¹⁴ *τηρῆσαι σε τὴν ἐντολήν ἀσπιλον μέχοι 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 2²¹ already quoted under *παραδίδωμι*, and 3² *μνησθῆναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος*, implying that the Lord spoke through his apostles; and so, apparently, in 1 Cor. 14³⁷, 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. 4¹⁰): sometimes of rules laid down by men and condemned by the Apostle (Col. 2²², *τα ἐνταλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, Tit. 1¹⁴ *μὴ προσεχόντες Ἰουδαίκοις μυθοῖς καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀληθειαν*).

A similar word is *παραγγελία* found in 1 Th. 4² *οἴδατε τίνας παραγγελίας ἔδωκαμεν ὑμῖν δια τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* (warnings against impurity as appears from the context), 1 Tim. 1⁵ *τὸ δε τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη*, *ἰδ.* 1¹⁸ *ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατιθεμαί 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. 4²³, etc., the good news of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1¹), of God (Mk. 1¹⁴); men are called to believe in it (Mk. 1¹⁵), to sacrifice home and life for it (Mk. 10²⁹, 8³⁵); it is to be preached to all nations (Mk. 13¹⁰, Mt. 24¹⁴). Paul was especially called to bear witness of the good news of the grace of God to the Gentiles (Acts 20²⁴, Gal. 2⁷). He speaks of it as *my* or *our* Gospel, Rom. 2¹⁶, where it is said to

include the coming of Christ to judge the world, *ib.* 16²⁵ τῷ δε δυναμηνῶ στηρίξαι υμᾶς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίον μου καὶ τὸ κηρυγμα Ἰ.Χ. κατὰ ἀποκαλυψιν μυστηρίου . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν πιστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, 2 Cor. 4²⁻⁵ τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνισταντες εαυτοὺς πρὸς πασαν συνειοσησιν ἀνθρωπων ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰ δε καὶ ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ημῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον, ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰωνος τούτου ἐτυφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπιστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγασαὶ τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρυσσομεν ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κυριον, 1 Th. 1⁵ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ημῶν οὐκ ἐγενετο εἰς υμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μονον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνευματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πληροφορία πολλῇ, 2 Th. 2¹³ εἰλατο υμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνευματος καὶ πιστεὶ ἀληθείας εἰς ὃ ἐκαλεσεν υμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ημῶν, 2 Tim. 2⁸ μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγγεγερμενον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπερματος Δαυειδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίον μου. Its nature is further shown by Rom. 10⁹ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὸ ρῆμα τῆς πιστεως ὃ κηρυσσομεν. ὅτι εἰαν ὁμολογησῃς ἐν τῷ στοματί σου Κυριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστευῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθησῇ. 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 πεπιστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς (Gal. 2⁷). It would take too long to go through other terms which are employed to express the new message of salvation, such as ἀλήθεια, κηρυγμα, τὸ ρῆμα, τὰ ρήματα, ζωή, ἐλπις, λογος, πιστις.

(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. 3¹⁸) and St. Paul 'one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on towards the goal

unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus' (Phil. 3¹⁴). And again, he declares it to be his aim *γινωσκει αυτον* (not simply 'know,' but 'recognize' 'feel' 'appropriate' L.) *και την δυναμιν της αναστασεως αυτου* (Phil. 3¹⁰). 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. 13⁵²) 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. 3¹¹). The whole constitution of the Church, all its offices and all its ministers are *εις οικοδομην του σωματος του Χριστου, μεχοι κατανησωμεν οι παντες εις την ενοτητα της πιστεως και της επιγνωσεως του υιου του Θεου, εις ανορα τελειον, εις μετρον ηλικιας του πληρωματος του Χριστου* (Eph. 4^{12, 13}). So too our Lord looking forward to the future says *ετι πολλα εχω υμιν λεγειν, αλλ' ου δυνασθε βασταζειν αρτι οταν δε ελθη εκεινος, το πνευμα της αληθειας, οδηγησει υμας εις την αληθειαν πασαν* (Joh. 16^{12, 13}), and in his final charge *ιδου εγω μεθ' υμων ειμι πασας τας ημερας εως της συντελειας του αιωνος*. We must beware therefore of laying too great a stress on the *απαξ* of Jude, as though it forbid 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 (*η ιδεα του αγαθου*), the perfection of man consists in *ομοιωσις θεω κατα το δυνατον* and with the old Hebrew Scriptures that man is made in the image of God; if we believe that the Eternal did at a certain point in the world's history manifest Himself in the form of man and under the conditions and infirmities of humanity; if we further believe that we have in the Gospels a true picture of this life, and in the remaining books of the N.T. a true account of the way in which His first followers, animated by His Spirit, strove to carry out His plans and build up the spiritual temple founded by Him—then the record of His life and teaching and those of the acts and words of the men whom He had Himself trained to carry on His work after His departure,—these records can never be superseded: in every age the eyes of all who are striving for the elevation of our race must continue to turn back to them as furnishing the highest ideal of humanity, the clearest conception of divinity. One main instrument of the growth and development, of which we have spoken, will consist in the ever deeper understanding, and the ever wider realization of the lessons of that life, as well as in the openness to see and hear the signs of the divine Presence still at work within us and around us. This is perhaps meant by the concluding words of St. John's Gospel. For the full understanding of Christ's life and teaching there needs the entire experience of humanity, and even so, its significance will still be unexhausted.

(4) There are various ways of misusing the Apostolic tradition. It may be openly denied, as it seems to have been by the innovators here condemned (ver. 4). It may be entirely neglected without being specifically denied (as in Tit. 1¹⁶ 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 ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἀγνά, ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὐφήμα· εἴ τις ἀρετῆ, καὶ εἴ τις ἐπαινος, ταῦτα λογιζέσθε, and his favourite refrain from the Psalms τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς. Men such as Justin and Clement of Alexandria, who had been taught of God, not merely through the religious emotions, but through the word received into the heart and interpreted by conscience, reason, and experience,² such men saw and recognized the work of the Spirit in the poetry and philosophy of Greece, as well as in the tradition of

¹ Compare the teaching of the *Eternal Gospel* ascribed to the Abbot Joachim towards the end of the twelfth century, in which it was prophesied that a new dispensation, that of the Holy Ghost, was about to replace the dispensation of the Son, as that had replaced the dispensation of the Father.

² In my Introduction to the Seventh Book of the *Stromateis* (p. xxii foll.) I have commented on the seeming preference shown for Montanism, as compared with Catholicism, by writers whose views would generally be regarded as more or less rationalistic, such as Harnack and Hatch. Here, it seems to me that a writer, whose judgment is in general less to be relied on than Harnack's, has yet come nearer to the truth. See Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 124 'Prophets are amongst the distinctive marks of this first Age of Christianity. But we learn at the same time that their authority was secondary . . . The ultimate authority, the foundation, was in all cases the tradition of Jesus. This might be supplemented by the prophetic word, by the spirit, but never transformed. . . To make the spirit of the prophets the ultimate authority would have been tantamount to subjecting oneself to the whims and fancies of men whose religious nature was powerful, while their moral character was immature and undisciplined.'

the Hebrews, and drew from all quarters material for the building up of the Church.

It is not of course implied that the developments of Christian teaching which we find in the writers named or in later Catholic writers at any particular period in the Church's history were necessarily in the right direction. Speaking generally, these developments are owing partly to the Spirit of Christ working in individuals, and so leavening the Church; and partly to the interaction of the Church and the World. The Spirit of God bloweth where it listeth; and secular improvement has often reacted with advantage upon the Church tradition. On the other hand there can be no doubt that a considerable portion of the beliefs and practices of the mediæval Church was affected for the worse by Pagan or Jewish associations. In the Reformation appeal was made from the existing Church traditions to the traditions of the earliest Church, and above all to the original tradition preserved in the Bible, on the ground that whatever was really alien from this could be no genuine work of the Spirit. A sad experience has taught us that no Father, no Council, no Pope, no reformer, is infallible. Every generation, every individual, is sent into the world as a new organ of divine truth to deal with new circumstances and new difficulties, and is bound to exercise the right of private judgment on the conclusions left by preceding generations, to the best of his, or their, opportunities and ability. This does not preclude the attainment of practical certainty in religion, any more than in science: nay, as the subject matter of religion is mainly of the nature of inward experience, the sincere Christian, though unlearned, has surer ground for confidence in matters of religion, than the mass of mankind have in regard to matters of science.

As time passes, the Church as a whole ought to be growing in knowledge as well as in grace. It would be sad indeed if all the increase in knowledge of men and things, of God's universe and of His mode of dealing with mankind, together with the recorded experience of the past ages of Christianity and all the fresh difficulties and troubles of to-day, not to mention the subordinate helps to the understanding of the written word by means of archaeology and criticism—if all this had been given in vain and left us no further advanced than Christians of long vanished centuries. We do not, it is true, expect to meet in our day the equals of a St. Paul or a St. John, any more than we expect to meet the equals of a Plato or a Shakespeare; but, since we have Christ's own word that He will be with us all the days till the end of the world, and that His Spirit will lead us into all the truth, we are surely justified in the hope that the sorely protracted fermentation of our times may yet issue in an outpouring of light and life, of knowledge and of earnestness, proportioned to the preceding birth-pangs of a new day of the Lord.

To return to the immediate point, perhaps the most dangerous misuse of the Christian tradition, as it is the easiest and the commonest, is that which, whether from indolence and indifference, or ignorant

superstition, or a suicidal theory of religion, transforms it into a mere dead fetish, to be regarded with reverence indeed, but not to be made the subject of thought, for fear that thought may land us either in the Scylla of dogmatism or the Charybdis of rationalism. The repetition of a creed is worse than useless, unless the mind finds there food for imagination, thought, and feeling, as well as a stimulus and ground for action. It is, I suppose, from an exaggeration of this danger that Deissman (*Bible Studies*, p. 59) makes the extraordinary assertion 'The beginnings of Christian literature are really the beginnings of the secularization of Christianity: the Church becomes a book-religion.'¹

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 ἀπαξ 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) *ὄπῃσα βεβούσι κακοὶ σφετέρῃσιν ἀνόμοιοις*. 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.

επαγωνίζεσθαι.

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 *ουαί* 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. 3¹⁵) *ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραυτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν*. 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. 5⁹), yet our Lord ate with publicans and sinners. He could do this because, though tempted like as we are, He was yet immune from the poison of temptation, carrying about with Him an atmosphere of purity which called out good even

from the most degraded. But in ordinary circumstances there can be no doubt of the wisdom of St. Paul's rule, not merely for safety, or to avoid scandal, but to supply a further motive to the weak, in the fear of forfeiting their Christian fellowship, and to those who have fallen, in the sorrow for its loss and the yearning for its renewal. This discipline is extended to those who taught erroneous doctrine by St. Paul himself in Tit. 3¹⁰ and by St. John in 2 Joh. 10, 11 'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house nor bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' Does this mean that we are to have no dealings with those who do not hold the articles of the faith as embodied in the Creeds? Plainly it has no reference to those who have never heard of Christianity. It is limited to those who are, or have been, professed Christians. Is it true, then, of such, if they can no longer conscientiously repeat the Creed, that they are to be excluded from the society of their fellow Christians on this ground only, apart from other considerations? So far as doubt arises from a high sense of what belief means, from scrupulous fear of saying with our lips more than we believe in our hearts to be true, from a consciousness of our own ignorance, and the incapacity of man to fathom the councils of the Most High, or again from open-mindedness and readiness to welcome light from all quarters, and not prematurely to shut the eyes to what may prove to be a very ray from heaven—to deny admittance to our homes and churches in the case of such a doubter, would be blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. But where disbelief, as in the case referred to by Jude, is confident, loud and boastful, eager to startle and shock the simple-minded, without reverence, or seriousness, or sense of responsibility, above all where it distorts religion in the interest of the baser lusts—there, who can hesitate to say that the sentence of St. John is fully justified?

A special kind of ostracism was excommunication, which was practised by the Jews (cf. the words ἀφορίζω, εκβαλλω, αποσυνάγωγος, Lk. 6²², Joh. 9²²) and sanctioned by our Lord (Mt. 18¹⁷). St. Paul uses this as a regular instrument of Church discipline in a case of immorality in 1 Cor. 5^{3,5} ἐγώ μιν ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἤδη κεκρικαὼς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος συν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, παραδουναί τον τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὀλεθρον τῆς σαρκος, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου, and in a case of misbelief in 1 Tim. 1²⁰, where he says (speaking of Hymenaeus and Alexander) οὗς 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

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 ὁμολογεῖν. The N.T. use is illustrated in the Homily 139, on the Adoration of the Cross, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: ὁ αρνουμενος ετερον οἶον ἢ ἀδελφον η φίλον . . . κἀν μαστιζομενον ἴδῃ τουτον . . . κἀν οτιουν πασχοντα, ου προισταται, ου βοηθεῖ . . . ἀπαξ γαρ αυτου ἡλλοτριῶται, *i.e.* it is equivalent to repudiation. So Peter repudiated our Lord. The sin and its punishment are spoken of in Mt. 10³³ οστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ εμπροσθεν τῶν ανθρωπων, ὁμολογήσω καγω ἐν αυτῷ εμπροσθεν του πατρος μου του ἐν τοις οὐρανοις· οστις δε αρνησεται με εμπροσθεν τῶν ανθρωπων, ἀρνήσομαι καγω αυτὸν εμπροσθεν του πατρος μου. In Mk. 8³⁸ and Lk. 9²⁶ the phrase οστις αρνησεταιί με is replaced by ὅς αν επαισχυνθη με καὶ τους 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 Κυριος Καισαρ, and offer incense to Caesar or swear by his name. In Apoc. 2¹³ it is said of the church at Pergamum ουκ ηρνησω τὴν πιστιν 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) αλλον θεον παρευρισκουσιν καὶ τον Χριστον ουχ ως αι προφητειαι παραδιδοασιν εκδεχονται, and the Introduction on the Early Heresies. Confession being a main element in baptism (cf. Rom. 10¹⁰ καρδια πιστευεται εις δικαιοσυνην, στοματι δὲ ὁμολογείται εἰς σωτηριαν), the subsequent denial was an ἀποστασια.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SIN AND JUDGMENT DERIVED FROM HISTORY AND FROM NATURE (*vv.* 5-13).

The judgment impending over these men is borne witness to by well known facts of the past, and may be illustrated from the phenomena of nature. God showed his mercy in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, but that was no guarantee against their destruction in the wilderness when they again sinned by unbelief. The angels were blessed beyond all other creatures, but when they proved unfaithful to their trust,

they were imprisoned in darkness, awaiting there the judgment of the great day. The men of Sodom (lived in a land of great fertility, they had received some knowledge of God through the presence and 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 inf[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 σκοτοῦς

(Lk. 22⁶⁸ Col. 1¹⁸), and of the ruler τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος (Eph. 2²). 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. 2⁷¹¹ το 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. 13¹⁷ '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 creaturæ Dei habent bonitatem . . . et in sua natura præstantissima, quam a Creatore acceperunt, characterem retinent indubilem majestatis.'

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 *βλασφημεω*, 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 *βλασφημεω* bear the sense of *χλευαζω* or *λοιδορέω* or *ἐπισκωπτω*? I think the following quotations tend to show that it may: Clem. Al. *Paed.* p. 297 πολλους βλασφημουντες εις γελωτα ου πανονται, Herodian iv. 12. 1 εις τουτον πολλακις απεσκωψε και μεχρι αισχροσ βλασφημιας. The more common meaning of *βλασφημεω* ‘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. 3⁸), a murderer from the beginning, a liar and the father of it (Joh. 8⁴⁴), a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (1 P. 5⁸), the

Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil (1 Joh. 3⁸). 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}) ἐνδυσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ δυνασθαι ὑμᾶς στήναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδίας τοῦ διαβόλου· οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκοτοῦς τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. So too our Lord (Lk. 12^{4, 5}) μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινοντῶν τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχοντων περισσοτερον τι ποιῆσαι. ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τινα φοβηθῆτε· φοβηθῆτε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείνειν ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γεινναν, 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. 2¹⁴ 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. 3²⁷.

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) ἔωρα τὴν ὄρασιν τοῦ ἀγίου . . . ἣν ἔδειξαν μοι ἀγγελοὶ καὶ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτῶν πάντα καὶ ἐγνων αὐτὸ θεωρῶν. καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν νῦν γενεάν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πόρρω οὐσαν γενεάν (cf. J. 14 καὶ τοῦτοις) . . . καὶ ἐξέλυσεται ὁ ἅγιος ὁ μέγας ἐκ τῆς κατοικίσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐπὶ γῆν πατήσῃ ἐπὶ τὸ Σίνα 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,

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. 2¹⁸. 'The successive partial dawns 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. 3¹; 2 Pet. 3³; Jude 18; 1 Pet. 1⁵, 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. 49¹ 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. 24¹⁴ 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' ἐσχάτω τῶν ἡμερῶν a time of restoration should come if they turned to God with all their heart and with all their soul (Deut. 4³⁰). In a later chapter (31²⁹) the phrase ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν is used to denote the period of the previous falling away. In Job 19²⁵ 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. 2² and Micah 4¹ 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 (48⁴⁷) and of Elam (49³⁹), and twice over of the repentance of Israel, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν νοήσουσιν αὐτο (23²⁰, 30²⁴). It is used by Ezekiel of the

invasion of Gog and Magog (38⁸. 16), by Daniel in explaining the vision of the four kingdoms (2²⁸), 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 (9²⁵, 12¹²). Hosea, after announcing that the children of Israel would abide many days without a king, or sacrifice, or ephod, prophesies that afterwards in the latter days they should return, and seek the Lord, and David their king (3⁵).

THE FINAL CHARGE TO THE FAITHFUL (vv. 20-23).

Use all diligence to escape this danger. Make the most of the privileges vouchsafed to you. Build yourselves up on the foundation of your most holy faith by prayer in the Spirit. Do not rest satisfied with the belief that God loves you, but keep yourselves in His love, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ which leads us to eternal life. And do your best to help those who are in danger of falling away by pointing out their errors and giving the reasons of your own belief; and by snatching from the fire of temptation those who are in imminent jeopardy. Even where there is most to fear, let your compassion and your prayers go forth toward the sinner, while you shrink from the pollution of his sin.

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.

It is not enough to use the words of prayer. Prayer must be heartfelt, dictated by the Holy Spirit, who makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered, and through whom we are enabled to cry Abba, Father, and to worship, as the Father would have us worship, in spirit and in truth. Thus we shall be enabled to build ourselves up as stones in the spiritual temple of which Christ is the corner-stone, to realize to ourselves the love of God and to be always looking for the mercy of Christ which leads us on to eternal life. Nor must we forget that we are bound to show that same mercy towards our brethren who are tempted, striving for them as we strive for ourselves.

But what, if we are not conscious of the Spirit in our hearts? Are we then to give up praying and striving? The parables of the leaven and the mustard seed show us that there are many degrees of spiritual growth. In no one is there an entire absence of the good seed. He who is faithful to that he hath, shall find more given to him. Every good thought, every good resolution, every aspiration after better things, every feeling of sorrow and shame for past misdoing or uselessness, is at least the earnest of the Spirit within us, and should be

thankfully recognized as such, and turned to practical use, as by him who brought his child to Jesus with the prayer 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'

FINAL BENEDICTION AND ASCRIPTION (vv. 24-25).

I have bidden you to keep yourselves in the love of God; I have warned you against all impiety and impurity. But do not think that you can attain to the one or guard yourselves from the other in your own strength. You must receive power from above; and that it may be so, I offer up my prayer to Him, who alone is able to keep you from stumbling, and to present you before the throne of His glory, pure and spotless in exceeding joy. To Him, the only God and Saviour, belong glory, greatness, might, and authority throughout all ages.

NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

I. 1. Συμεών.] See Introduction on the Text. The writer of the First Epistle calls himself simply Πετρος. In every other passage of the N. T., where the double name occurs, it is Σιμων Πετρος. Indeed Συμεών is used of Peter only in one other passage, viz. Acts 15¹⁴, the address of James at the Council of Jerusalem. The hellenized form Σιμων appears for the first time in post-Alexandrine writings, e.g. Sirach 50¹, 1 Macc. 15²⁴, 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.

δουλος και ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστου.] The first epistle omits δουλος; Jude, who is followed so closely in our epistle, omits αποστολος. 'By the addition of the common appellative δουλος 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 ισότιμον 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 ισοτιμον below.

τοῖς ισότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν.] Field seems to be right in holding that ισοτιμος and ὁμότιμος 'invariably borrow their meaning from τιμη honour,' and not from τιμη in the sense of price.¹ He quotes Jos. Ant. xii. 3. 1 εν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Αντιοχείᾳ πολιτειας αυτους ηξίωσε και τοις ἐνοικισθειῶσιν ισοτιμους ἀπεδειξε 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 ισότιμον κόσμῳ ὃ θεὸς ηγεῖται quoted in Salmon's *Introd. to N. T.* p. 502.

privileged, a faith which carries equal privileges, so putting them on an equality with us, whether *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, 21²⁰⁻²⁸, Rom. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, Ephes. 2¹⁴⁻²², esp. ver. 14 *αὐτος γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὃ ποιήσας τα ἀμφότερα ἔν, καὶ το μεσοτοιχον του φραγμου λυσας, την εχθραν εν τῇ σαρκι αυτου*, 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 *ισότιμον* and *ἐν δικαιοσυνη*. It is true that those here addressed are warned against the *τολμηται αυθάδεις* who speak evil of dignities (2¹⁰) and that they are bidden to remember the teaching of the Apostles (3²); 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 (*ἡμιν = τη ἡμων*) 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.* 8¹⁹ *ψυχῆς ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς*, *Plato Phileb.* 55 B *ἀνδρίαν ἡ σωφροσυνην... ἢ τι των αλλων οσ ἀγαθα ειληχε ψυχῆ*, *Polit.* 269 C *φρόνησιν εἰληχος*, cf. Eph. 2^{8.9}.

ἐν δικαιοσυνη.] Does this form one phrase with *πιστιν*? Does it mean 'faith in the righteousness of Christ as our justification'? Cf. Eph. 1¹⁵ *την καθ' ὑμᾶς πιστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*, 1 Tim. 3¹³. Or should it be connected with all the preceding words 'those who have received a faith no less highly privileged than ours through the justice of God,' who is no respecter of persons? The latter seems to me the more natural way of taking it. For this narrower sense of *δικαιος* cf. Heb. 6¹⁰ *ου γαρ αδικος ὁ Θεος επιλαθεσθαι του ἔργου υμῶν*, 1 Joh. 1⁹ *ἐαν ομολογῶμεν τας ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστος ἐστιν και δικαιος ἵνα ἀφή ημιν τας αμαρτίας*, and Clem. Al. p. 116 *οτι γε μία καθολικη τῆς ανθρωποτητος σωτηρια ἢ πιστις, ισοτης δε καὶ κοινωνία του δικαιου και φιλανθρωπου Θεοῦ ἡ αυτη προς πάντας, ὃ ἀπόστολος σαφειστατα ἐξηγήσατο*, shortly after which follows the quotation from Gal. 3²⁶⁻²⁹.

του Θεου ἡμων και σωτήρος Ἰησου Χριστοῦ.] See n. on Jude v. 4 *τον μόνον δεσποτην*. If we take Θεοῦ of Christ with Spitta, we may compare 2¹ below *τον ἀγοράσαντα αυτους δεσποτην*, Joh. 20²⁸ (the words of Thomas) *ὁ κυριός μου και ὁ Θεός μου*, Tit. 2¹³, and Lightfoot's n. on Clem. Rom. 2 where similar examples from the early Fathers are collected. On the other hand the next verse clearly distinguishes

between God and Christ, and it is natural to let that interpret this, as there seems no reason for identity here and distinction there.

σωτηρ is used of Christ in four other passages of this epistle, 1¹¹, 2²⁰, 3², 3¹⁸, but does not occur at all in 1 Pet. Apart from its use as predicate, it occurs without the article in 1 Tim. 1¹ Παῦλος ἀποστολος . . . κατ ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, and in Jude v. 25 μονῶ Θεῶ σωτήρι ἡμῶν, Ps. 24⁵, Isa. 45¹⁵.

2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.] See n. on Jude 2. The same formula is found in 1 P. 1² and (without πληθυνθείη) in Rom. 17, 1 Cor. 1³, 2 Cor. 1², Gal. 1³, Eph. 1², Phil. 1², Col. 1², 1 Th. 1¹, 2 Th. 1², Philem. 3 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπο Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. In 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit. we have the same salutation with ελεος added. The salutation in Apoc. 1⁴ is χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπο οὐρανῶν; the final salutation in Heb. 13²⁵ is simply ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, as in Eph. 6²⁴, Col. 4¹⁸, 1 Tim. 6²¹, 2 Tim. 4²², Tit. 3¹⁵, to which the words τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μεθ' ὑμῶν are added in Rom. 16²⁰, 1 Th. 5²⁸, 2 Th. 3¹⁸. In Gal. 6¹⁸ and Phil. 4²³, we have the fuller form ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. In 2 Cor. 13¹³ 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. 1².

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ.] The word ἐπιγνῶσις occurs four times in this epistle (here and 1³, 1⁸, 2²⁰), once in Heb. 10²⁸, fifteen times in the later epistles of St. Paul, and nowhere else in the N.T. It is found in the LXX., as in Prov. 2⁵ ἐπίγνωσιν Θεοῦ εὐρησεῖς, Hos. 4¹ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθεῖα . . . οὐδε ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ib. 6⁷. For its meaning see App. below.

The preposition ἐν denotes that grace and peace are multiplied in and by the fuller knowledge of God, cf. Joh. 17³ αὐτὴ δε ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα γινώσκωσι σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ οὐ ἀπεστελῆς 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 κυρίου¹ read by BCK, and by \aleph AL+ with the addition of Χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ. He compares 1 Th. 1¹, where the editors agree in a short form against the preponderating weight of MS. authority in favour of a longer form, and Col. 1² εἰρήνη ἀπο Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, of which Lightfoot says it is 'the only instance in St. Paul's epistle where the name of the Father stands alone in the opening benediction without the addition of Jesus Christ. The omission was noticed by Origen and by Chrysostom. But transcribers naturally aimed at uniformity, and so in many copies we find the addition καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.'

¹ The phrase Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου (without Χριστοῦ) is only found elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. 4²⁴ and 1 Cor. 9¹, though the converse order δ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is frequent in the epp. to the Thessalonians.

The use of the sing. αὐτοῦ in the 3rd verse is perhaps in favour of the short form here.

3. *ως 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 *ως*, 2 Cor. 5²⁰ *υπερ Χριστοῦ πρεσβενομεν ως τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι ἡμῶν*, Acts 27³⁰ *τῶν ναυτῶν χαλασαντων την σκαφην . . . προφάσει ως εκ πρωρας ἀγκυρας μελλόντων εκτείνειν*, 1 Cor. 4¹⁸ *ως μὴ ἔρχομενου μου εφυσιωθησαν τινες*, 1 Pet. 4¹² *μη ξενίζεσθε ως ξενου υμιν συμβαίνοντος*. In all these cases *ως* 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 Kühn, Keil, Weiss, Hundhausen, the subjective force of *ως* 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 αὐτο τουτο δε*, on which see n. below.

Spitta, Weiss, and Nestle read *τα παντα* with **Ν** A Ti., preferring it as the *lectio difficilior*, and explaining it as meaning 'die Gesamtheit welche zu Leben und Frommigkeit dient.' This seems to me very unnatural. I think the reading simply originated in a ditto-graphia of the 1st syllable of *πα-ντα*. Spitta further carries out his idea of the opposition between the Apostles and the community by insisting on the contrast between *υμῖν* in *v.* 2 and *ἡμῖν* in *v.* 3. In my opinion there is no opposition, the *υμεις* of the former are included in the *ἡμεις* of the latter.

τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.] Cf. 2 Macc. 3²⁹ (of Heliodorus) *ὁ μὲν δια την θεϊαν ἐνέργειαν αφωνος ἔρριπτο*, Job 27³ (and elsewhere) *πνευμα θεϊον*.

¹ I do not understand Nestle's reading. He puts a full stop at the end of the second and also of the fourth verse.

Besides this verse the adj. only occurs in the N.T. in *v.* 4 (where see n.) and in Acts 17²⁹ οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομιζειν χρυσῷ το θειον ειναι ὁμοιον. The phrase θεία δύναμις appears in the Carian inscription quoted in the Appendix, ἀγάλματα ἐπιφανεστάτας παρέχοντα τῆς θειας δυναμειως αρετας, and is common in philosophic writings, e.g. Plato *Ion* 534 c (the poets speak) θεία δυνάμει, *Legg.* iii. 691 E, Arist. *Pol.* vii. 4 θείας τοῦτο δυνάμειως ἔργον, ἥτις καὶ τόδε συνέχει το παν, Justin *Apol.* 1. 32, Clem. Al. *Str.* i. p. 376 χωρίζεται ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ ἀληθεια τῆς καθ' ἡμας και μεγαθει γνωσεως και αποδείξει κυριωτερα και θεια δυναμει, *ib.* vii. p. 853. The addition of the gen. αυτου 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 θεια a more general force, such as μεγαλοπρεπῆς in *v.* 17. Cf. Eus. *c. Hierocl.* 4 Ἰησους πλειους ἐπὶ τον τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας λογον προουτρέψατο, *ib.* μύρια πληθη ἐπὶ τὴν θείαν ἑαυτοῦ διδασκαλιαν επαγομενος, *ib.* θεία καὶ αρρητω δυνάμει τους μὲν ἐπανισταμένους αυτου τη θεια διδασκαλια ραδιως μετιών, τον δε παγεντα καὶ παραδοθέντα θειον λογον κρατυνων, ουδ' ὡς εισετι καὶ νυν τῆς ἐνθεου δυνάμειως τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδεικνυται κ.τ.λ. If two Persons are mentioned in *v.* 2, it would seem most natural to understand αυτου of the nearer, but Keil, de Wette, Bruckner, 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 του καλεσαντος, see n. below.

τα πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ ευσεβειαν.] 'All that tends to, or is needed for, life and godliness,' cf. Jud. 17¹⁰ 'I will give thee thy victuals' (τα προς ζωὴν σου), Acts 28¹⁰ τὰ προς την χρειαν, Lk. 19⁴² τα προς εἰρηνην σου, Jos. *Ant. prooem.* 6 παιδευθεντες τα προς ευσεβειαν καὶ την αλλην ἀσκησιν αρετης. Weiss explains 'es handelt sich um alles was dazu gehort um in uns das durch die Wiedergeburt erzeugte wahre geistliche Leben, dessen Hauptcharakterzug die ευσεβεια ist, zu erzeugen.' ευσεβης 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. 3¹⁶ Christ, the Incarnate, Risen Lord, is spoken of as το τῆς ευσεβειας μυστήριον, 'the secret of piety.'

δεδωρημενης.] See n. on δωρημα James 1¹⁷. The only other passage, besides this and the following verse, in which the word is found in the N.T. is Mk. 15⁴⁵. It occurs also in Gen. 30²⁰ δεδωρηται ὁ Θεός μοι δῶρον καλον, Prov. 4² δωρον αγαθον δωρουμαι υμιν.

δια τῆς ἐπιγνωσεως τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς.] There is a considerable resemblance between this passage and Col. 1⁹⁻¹¹ αιτουμενοι ινα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπιγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αυτου ἐν παση σοφια και συνεσει πνευματικη . . . ἐν παντι εργω καρποφοροντες (see below *v.* 8 οὐκ ακαρπους) καὶ αυξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνωσει τοῦ Θεου· ἐν πάση δυνάμει δυναμουμενοι κατα το κρατος τῆς δοξης αὐτοῦ, where we have ἐπιγνωσις repeated as here, and the words underlined correspond to words in our text. For καλέσαντος see below *v.* 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαιαν υμων τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι, and cf. 2 Tim. 1⁹ (Θεοῦ) τοῦ σωσαντος ἡμας και καλεσαντος κλήσει ἁγια οὐ κατα τα ἔργα ημῶν ἀλλα κατ' ἰδίαν προθεσιν, 1 Pet. 1¹⁵ κατα τον

καλεσαντα υμας αγιον και αυτοι αγιοι . . γενηθητε, *ib.* 2⁹ οπως τας ἀρετας ἐξαγγελητε του ἐκ σκοτους υμᾶς καλέσαντος εις το θαυμαστὸν αυτου φως. 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. 9¹³ οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, 2 Clem. Rom. 9 εἰ Χριστος ὁ κυριος . . ἐγενετο σαρξ και ουτως ημας εκαλεσεν. In other passages of this epistle Christ is mentioned as the object of *επιγνωσις* (1⁸, 2²⁰). Cf also Herm. *Sim.* 14. 5 εἰ οὖν πασα η κτίσις δια του υἱου του Θεοῦ βασταζεται, τι δοκεις τους κεκλημένους υπ' αυτοῦ; 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 κλητοις J. 2.

ιδία δοξη και απρη.] See Introduction on the Text. For the use of *ιδιος* as a possessive pronoun, see Blass *N.T.Gr.* tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22⁵ απηλθον ος μὲν εις τον ιδιον αγρον, ος δε επι την ἐμπορίαν αυτοῦ, below 2²² ἐπι το ιδιον ἐξέραμα compared with Prov. 26¹¹ ἐπι τον ἐαυτου εμετον, Barn. v. 9 τους ιδίους ἀποστολους ἐξελέξατο. It is found also in LXX. Job 2¹¹ παρεγένοντο ἕκαστος εκ τῆς ιδίας χωρας, Prov. 27⁸, Herm. *Vis.* i. 3. 4 ὁ Θεος . . τῇ ιδία σοφια και προνοία κτισας τὴν ἐκκλησιαν. Plut. *Mor.* 237 D τους νέους τους ιδιους αιδεισθαι πατερας, Chariton *Aphr.* iv. 6 ιδιω δεσποτη χαίρειν with D'Orville's n. Cf. Phrynichus p. 441 Lob. 'τα ἴδια πράττω' οι πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, δεον 'τα ἐμαντου πράττω' λέγειν. The article is frequently omitted, as in Acts 13³⁶ Δαυειδ ἴδια γενεᾷ υπηρετησας, Gal. 6⁹ καιρω ιδίω θερισομεν (so καιροῖς ιδιοις 1 Tim. 2⁶, 6¹⁵, Tit. 1³, as compared with Polyb. i. 30. 10 χρωμενοι τοις ιδίοις καιροις), 2 Tim. 1⁹ οὐ κατα τα ἔργα ημων ἀλλὰ κατα ιδιαν πρόθεσιν, Tit. 2⁹ δουλους ιδιοις δεσποταις υποτασσεσθαι and below 2¹⁶ ελεγξιν εσχεν ιδίας παρανομιας. By *δοξα* we are probably to understand the manifestation of the Divine character, which compels the veneration, the love, and the worship of men. It is used of Christ below (*v.* 17), and in Joh. 1¹⁴ ὁ λόγος σαρξ εγενετο . . . και ἐθεασάμεθα την δοξαν αυτου, δοξαν ως μονογενους παρα πατρος, which is explained immediately afterwards by saying that He was πληρης χάριτος και αληθειας. *αρητή* 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. 2⁹ οπως τας ἀρετας ἐξαγγελητε του εκ σκοτους υμας καλεσαντος,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. 4⁸ οσα ευφημα, ει τις αρητη και ει τις επαινος, ταυτα λογιζεσθε, where Lightfoot comments 'some treat *ἀρητη* and *επαινος* as comprehensive expressions, recapitulating the previous subjects under two general heads, the intrinsic character and the subjective estimation.' He himself prefers the explanation 'whatever value may reside in your old heathen

¹ See Hort's excellent note in p. 129 of his commentary.

conception of virtue, whatever consideration is due to the praise of men.' The fact that philosophical terms like *θεία φύσις* are used in 2 Pet. leads one to suppose that *αρετή* has its usual Greek meaning, as in Wisdom 87, 4 Macc. 124, 8, 1318, where the cardinal virtues are recounted, cf. Justin M. *Apol.* ii. 2 το διδασκάλιον τῆς θείας αρετῆς, Clem. Al. p. 438 παραδειγμα θείας αρετῆς, Eus. c. *Hierocl.* 4 τη ἰδια θεοτητι καὶ αρετη πασαν εσωσε την οἰκουμενην. It was a debated question whether *αρετή* 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 ἐνεπαροίει τη αρετη του θειου 'abused the goodness of Providence,' *ib.* *Prooem.* 4. 11 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι νομοθεται τοῖς μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες των ανθρωπινων αμαρτηματων εις τους θεους τῷ λόγῳ την αισχυνην μετεθεσαν . . . ὁ δε ημετερος νομοθέτης, ακραιφνη την αρετην εχοντα τὸν Θεον αποφηνας, ωήθη δειν τους ανθρωπους εκείνης πειρασθαι μεταλαβειν, *ib.* i. 3. 8 (the words of God to Noah after the Flood) οἷς ἐξύβριζον εις την εμὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ αρετήν, τουτοις εξεβιασαντό με ταυτην αυτοις ἐπιθειναι την δικην. Philo *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 14 (M. 1. p. 75) speaks of τὴν αρετην καὶ σοφίαν του Θεοῦ ας την μητέρα των συμπαντων, *Q. det. pot.* § 44 (M. 1. p. 222) τῶν αρετῶν, η μεν Θεοῦ προς αληθειάν εστι . . . η δὲ Μωυσεως σκηνη, συμβολικῶς ουσα ανθρωπου αρετη . . . μίμημα καὶ απεικονισμα τῆς θείας εκείνης, *ib.* 1. p. 635 *in it.* 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 *αρετη* and *δοξα*, *e.g.* Plut. *Mor.* 535 (*De Vit. Pudore*) πῶς ου παρισταται δεινὸν εἶναι το της ἰδιας δαξης και αρετης αφειδεῖν;

4. δι ὧν τα τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν επαγγέλματα δεδώρηται.1 The verb may be taken here in the middle sense, as before, with Θεος (understood from τῆς θείας δυναμειως αὐτοῦ) for the subject; but the perf. of deponent verbs frequently bears a passive sense, as in Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 73 οὗ μείζον ουδεν ἐκ Θεου δεδωρηται, *Paed.* i. p. 133 καινω λαω καινη διαθηκη δεδωρηται, *Str.* iii. 1. 4 οἷς τουτο δεδωρηται ὑπὸ Θεου, and the article suits the subject. For the combination of positive and superlative epithets, see Plato *Rep.* 450 E περὶ των μεγίστων τε καὶ φίλων, where H. Richards proposes to read *φιλιτατων* (*C.R.* vii. 349). He has supplied me with the following exx. taken from Rehdantz's n. on Lysurgus 29, δοκεῖ δικαιοτατον καὶ δημοτικον εἶναι, Thuc. i. 1 ελπισας μέγαν τε εσεσθαι καὶ αξιολογωτατον τῶν προγεγεννημενων, i. 84 ἐλευθεραν καὶ ευδοξοτάτην πολιν νεμόμεθα, Xen. *Hell.* v. 3. 17 ευτακτους καὶ ευοπλοτάτους, Eur. *Cycl.* 315 κομψος γενήσει καὶ λαλιστατος, Plato *Legg.* 808 D επίβουλον και δριμυ καὶ υβριστοτατον θηρίων, Plato *Symp.* 205 D ο μεγιστος καὶ δολερος ερωσ παντι, Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 4. 29 δυνατωτατων καὶ προθυμων, Aesch. ii. 11 ὅθεν δ' ἡγοῦμαι σαφεστάτους μοι τους λόγους εσεσθαι καὶ γνωριμους ὑμιν. 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 *τιμια* and *μεγιστα*, 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

μεγιστα καὶ τιμιώτατα which might suggest reading τιμιωτατα here. The forms επαγγελμα and επαγγελια are both classical; the latter alone is found in biblical Gr., excepting this verse and 3¹³ below.

Three explanations of δι' ὧν have been given. Spitta would understand them of ἡμιν in vv. 1 and 3 (i.e. the Apostles, according to his view): he then reads τα μεγαστα καὶ τίμια ἡμιν επαγγέλματα <υμιν> δεδωρηται, '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 παντα τα προς ζωην καὶ ευσεβειαν: 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 kostliche 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 τα προς ζωην, but are included in them. The 3rd view (held by Kühn, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner) is far the simplest, connecting the relative δι' ὧν with the immediately preceding ἰδία δόξη και αρετη, '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 επαγγέλματα see below 3¹³. I should prefer however to read υμιν with A 68 syr^p, instead of ἡμιν, on account of the following γένησθε. See Lightfoot (Philemon 6) on the confusion between the 1st and 2nd persons 'though υμῖν 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 ἡμας would easily lead to ἡμῖν being written for υμῖν.

ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.] The reference in διὰ τούτων is to επαγγέλματα (as Dietlein, Wiesinger, Schott, Keil, Kühn, Weiss), not to τα προς ζωην (as de Wette, Hofmann, Spitta), nor to δόξη και αρετη (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 μεχρι περ ἡ του θεου φύσις αυτοις ἐξήρκει . . . φύσεως θείας παραμενουσης παντ αυτοις ηἰξήθη, *Rep.* 366 C θεία φύσει δυσχεραινων το αδικειν, *Legg.* iii. 691 φύσις τις ανθρωπίνη μεμιγμενη θεία τινὶ δυνάμει, *Phaedr.* 230 A θείας και ἀτυφου μοίρας φύσει μετέχον, 253 A ἐφαπτομενοι θεου τη μνημη ἐξ ἐκεινου λαμβάνουσι τα ἔθη καθ' ὅσον δυνατὸν θεου ἀνθρωπω μετασχεῖν, *Rep.* vi. 500C, *Protag.* 322 A ὁ ἄνθρωπος θείας μετεσχε μοίρας. It is found also in Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 2 δοκει ταῦτα οὐκ ἀνθρωπινη μαλλον ἢ θεία φύσει και τυχη 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 θεον ἐξ ἀνθρωπου ἐπιθυμουντα γενεσθαι και . . . περὶ τῆς προς τον 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 ἀθανατιζειν). The same idea occurs in slightly altered form in Heb. 3¹⁴ μετοχοι του Χριστου γεγοναμεν, 6⁴ μετοχους γενηθεντας

πνεύματος ἁγίου, 12¹⁰ εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ, 1 Joh. 1³, ἡ κοινωνία ἢ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰ.Χ., 1 P. 5¹ ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός, 2 Cor. 3¹⁸ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπο δόξης εἰς δόξαν. The phrase or its equivalent also occurs in *Aproc. Petri ap. Method. Symp.* ii. 6 ἡ μακαρία ἐκείνη φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Jos. c. *Ap.* 26 Ἀμενώφει θείας δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέσαι 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 τοσούτον ἀναδραμεῖν ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς ὡς ἀντιλαβέσθαι Θεοῦ φύσεως εἰ μὴ αὐτός ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέσπασεν αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, *ib.* 64⁷ ὅσοι λογικῆς κεκοινήκασιν φύσεως, and in many of the Fathers, e.g. Iren. iv. 20⁵ μετοχὴ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν το γινωσκεῖν Θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, Clem. Al. p. 471 ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα φύσις ἐμπαθῆς οὕσα ἐγκρατείας δεῖται, δι' ἧς συνεγγίζειν πειράται τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, Euseb. c. *Hierocl.* 6 θείαν μὲν φύσιν, εὐεργέτιν οὕσαν καὶ σώτειραν καὶ προνοητικὴν τῶν ὄντων, ἀνθρώποις ποτὲ ἐς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν οὐδεὶς ἀν ἀπειργοὶ λόγος, *ib.* 7 ἡ γὰρ οὐκ ἀτοπώτατον . . . θείαν φύσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπιλαμψασαν (i.e. on Apollonius) σκοτίον πον καὶ μινυθάδιον ἀποτελεῖν, οὐχὶ δὲ ἐς αἰῶνα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδεικνυσθαι; 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 ἐπειδὴν ἡ ψυχὴ πάντα τὰ ποικίλα τῆς φύσεως ἀποσκευασαμένη κινήματα θεοειδῆς γένηται . . . τὴν ὑπερεχούσαν μιμεῖται ζώῃν, τοῖς ιδιώμασι τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐμμορφωθείσα, 228 D ἡ θεία φύσις ἢ 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 ἐσομένω θεῷ.

ἀποφυγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορας.] The negative preparation for the positive glorification, as in James 1²¹ ἀποθέμενοι ρυπαρίαν δεξασθε τὸν λόγον, cf. Plat. *Theaet.* 176A φυγὴ (ἐνθενδε ἐκείσε) ὁμοιωσις θεῷ κατα τὸ δυνατόν. The acc. is commonly used after ἀποφευγῶ, as below 2¹⁸. 20. In fact this is the only recorded instance of the gen. with this verb. Winer (p. 532) mentions other compounds of ἀπό, ἀπαλλοτριῶν (Eph. 2¹². 4¹⁸), ἀφίστασθαι (1 Tim. 4¹), which have the same construction. To these may be added ἀποδιδρασκῶ Philo *Alleg.* p. 90, ἀποκρυπτεσθαι *ib.* p. 88, ἀποτέμνειν, ἀποβαίνειν, ἀπολυεῖν. The gen. whether with or without a preposition serves to intensify the danger which has been escaped, cf. Mt. 3⁷ φυγεῖν ἀπ' ὀργῆς, 1 Cor. 10¹⁴. Sometimes the simple φευγῶ takes the gen., as in Soph. *Phil.* 1034 τῆς νοσοῦ πεφευγεῖν like πεφυγαδευταί του θεοῦ χοροῦ Philo i. p. 88. On the word φθορα see Appendix. It is here defined by ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ, 'the corruption caused by, consisting in, lust'; and then its environment is stated to be the world, on which see James 4⁴ with the notes in my ed. pp. 218 f. Also compare Rom. 8²¹ αὐτὴ ἢ κτισὶς ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπο τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορας εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων του Θεοῦ, Gal. 6⁸ ὁ σπειρῶν εἰς τὴν σάρκα . . . θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπειρῶν εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ζώῃν αἰώνιον.

The author is fond of these compact articular phrases, see 2⁷ below.

5. καὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου δέ.] See for καὶ δέ 2 Tim. 3¹² καὶ πάντες δε οἱ θέλοντες ζῆν, 1 Tim. 3¹⁰ καὶ οὗτοι δε δοκιμαζέσθωσαν, Rom. 11²³ κακεῖνοι δε . . . ἐγκεντρισθήσονται, Mt. 10¹⁸, 16¹⁸, Joh. 6⁵¹, 8^{16.17}, Acts 3²⁴, 22²⁹, Heb. 9²¹, 1 Joh. 1³ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δε with Wescott's n., and Madvig *Gr. Gr.* § 185. 2, 'By annexing a δε to καὶ the new member acquires prominence as a special corroboration and enlargement of the preceding (*and too, and also*).' For classical examples cf. *Prom.* 972 χλιδώντας ὡδε τοὺς ἐμούς ἐγὼ ἐχθροὺς ἰδοίμι καὶ σε δ' ἐν τούτοις λέγω, Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 1. 2 ἀρχόντες μὲν εἰσι καὶ οἱ βουκοῖ τῶν βῶων . . . καὶ πάντες δε οἱ καλούμενοι νομῆες. In all these cases δε has its ordinary connective use: here (if we suppose the construction continued after φθόρας) it would be used *in apodosis*, as in 1 Cor. 1^{22.23}, ἐπειδὴ Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖα αἰτοῦσιν . . . ἡμεῖς δε κηρυσσομεν, 1 Cor. 2^{9.10} α ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν . . . ἡμῖν δε ἀπεκαλύψεν ὁ Θεὸς according to Alford's interpretation, and B in 1 Pet. 4¹⁸ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μολὶς σωζεται, ὁ δε ἀσεβῆς που 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' αὐτοῦ with Blass (*N. T. Gr.* p. 171 n.) for καὶ αὐτοῦ.

For the adverbial use of αὐτοῦ τούτου see Kühner's *Gr. Gr.* vol. ii. p. 267, Plato *Protag.* 310 Ε αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἤκω παρά σε, Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 21 αὐτὸ τούτου οὐπερ ἔνεκα φίλων ὤετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργοὺς ἐχοι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρατο συνεργὸς τοῖς φίλοις εἶναι ὅβ ἰδ' ἑἷςμυτ propter quod opus sibi esse existimabat amicis ut adiutores haberet, ipse amicis adiumento esse conabatur, Euseb. c. *Hierocl.* 5 fin. αὐτό τε τούτου γοῆς ἀντι φιλοσόφου φωραθησεται. 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 ἐπι serve to show the subordinate nature of human effort (along with and in addition to the grace of God) in giving effect to the δωρημα 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 Eriphan. *Haer.* xxvi. 1, and 16, also *Index* 11 μυθολογίας παρεισφέροντες. Cf. παρεισαγω below 2¹.

The phrase εἰσφέρωμαι σπουδὴν is very common in later Greek, see Polyb. xxii. 12. 12, Diod. i. 83 οἱ δ' ὄχλοι πᾶσαν εἰσεφέροντο σπουδὴν, *ib.* 84, xviii. 34, xvi. 3 φιλοτιμίαν εἰσφερόμενοι, Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9. 2 πᾶσαν εἰσηνέγκατο σπουδὴν καὶ προνοιαν, and the Inscription quoted in the Appendix. The prefixing of παρά alters the sense as in παρεργον, παράνυμφος, παραιτιος, παραπράσσω, παραβλαπτω, παραφθέγγομαι, παραψάλλω, παραδράω, παραδυναστευω, etc. The meaning is well

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 1¹¹ πλουσιως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ἡ εισοδος, and thrice by St. Paul in 2 Cor. 9¹⁰ ὁ ἐπιχορηγων σπερμα τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ὄρτον εἰς βρώσιν χορηγήσει, Gal. 3⁵ ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνευμα, Col. 2¹⁹ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα δια τῶν . . . συνδεσμων ἐπιχορηγουμενον. The simple verb means literally to be a χορηγος, 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 οσακίς Ἀντισθενὴς κεχορηγηκε, πασι τοῖς χοροῖς νενικηκε, Plut. *Mor.* 13 E ἐφείσω ποτέ, ἄλλα καὶ χορηγησον ('spend'), Antiph. p. 117 λαμπρως χορηγων; in the passive Xen. *Resp. Ath.* i. 13 χορηγουσι μὲν οἱ πλουσιοι, χορηγεῖται δ' ὁ δῆμος: sometimes it has for direct object the person benefited as in Polyb. iii. 78. 8 (the Celtic population) δαισιλῶς ἐχορήγει τὸ στρατοπεδον τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις, *ib.* 49. 11 σιτω καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιτηδείοις ἀφθόνως ἐχορήγησε τὸ στρατοπεδον; sometimes the assistance given, as in Diod. ii. 35 χορηγοῦσα τὰς τροφὰς ἀφθόνως, and similarly in 2 Cor. 9¹⁰ just quoted, and in 1 P. 4¹¹ ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεος. The compound is found once in the LXX. (Sir. 25²¹) γυνὴ ἔαν ἐπιχορηγή (if she supports) τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς (is a cause of shame); the simple verb is more common, e.g. in 1 K. 4⁷ χορηγεῖν τῷ βασιλεῖ, 1 Macc. 14¹⁰ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐχορήγησε βρωμάτα. It is frequently used by classical writers in the same wide sense, e.g. in Aristotle's definition of the εὐδαιμων (*Eth.* i. 10. 13) τοῖς ἐκτὸς ἀγαθοῖς ἰκανῶς κεχορηγημενος, Dio. Chr. vol. i. p. 52 (Teubner) ἡλιος χορηγεῖ τὸ καλλιστον ὀραμάτων, φῶς. The rarer compound occurs in Dionys. Hal. (*Ep. ad Pomp.* 1) τὰς συντάξεις ἐπιχορηγουντος σοι Ζήνωνος, Strabo xi. 14. 16 ἐξ εὐπορων οἴκων ἐπιχορηγουμεναι, Diog. L. v. 67 πλείστα ἐπεχορήγουν αὐτῷ, Aristid. D. ii. p. 194. 9, i. Clem. R. 38 ὁ πλουσιος ἐπιχορηγεῖτω τῷ πτωχῷ, *ib.* ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιχορηγων 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 ἀρετὴν.] 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. 5³² ἡ θλιψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ κατασχευεῖ, which is itself an expansion of James 1³¹ τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν· ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τελειον ἐχέτω ἵνα ᾗτε τελειοί. 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. 8²⁰ οὓς προεγνώ, καὶ προωρίσεν . . . οὓς δὲ προωρίσεν, τουτούς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τουτούς καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τουτούς καὶ ἐδοξάσεν, *ib.* 10¹⁴, 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. κλίμαξ. Examples are given in the *Ad Herenn.*

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 *πιστις* and ends with *ἀγάπη*, intermediate between which comes *γνώσις* 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. 2⁸ *χαριτι ζῆστε σεσωσμενοι δια πιστεως*), 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 *εν δε* (perhaps derived from the repeated *ἐν δε* 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. 5²²¹. *ὁ δε καρπος του πνευματος εστιν ἀγάπη, χαρα, ειρηνη, μακροθυμια, χρηστοτης, αγαθωσυνη, πιστις, πραυτης, ἐγκρατεια*, 2 Cor. 6⁴. (where S. Paul appeals to his sufferings and the spirit in which they were borne) *εν υπομονη πολλῇ . . . ἐν αγνοτητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμια, ἐν χρηστοτητι, ἐν πνευματι αγίω, εν ἀγάπη ανυποκριτω κ.τ.λ.*, 1 Tim. 6¹¹ *δίωκε δικαιοσυνην, εὐσεβειαν, πιστιν, ἀγάπην, υπομονήν, πραυπαθιαν*, Apoc. 2¹⁹ *οἶδα σου τα εργα, και τὴν ἀγάπην, και τὴν πιστιν, και τὴν διακονίαν, και τὴν υπομονήν 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, *πιστις* in three, *υπομονη* in three. It is just these three which are chosen for mention in 1 Th. 1³ and 2 Th. 1³,⁴, where *υπομονη ἐλπίδος* takes the place of the single *ἐλπις* in 1 Cor. 13¹³. 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) *κρατουνται δε ὑπ' ἀλλήλων αἱ δυνάμεις αυτων και ακολουθουσιν ἀλλήλαις, καθὼς και γεγεννημένοι εισιν. εκ της Πιστεως γενναται Ἐγκρατεια, εκ τῆς Ἐγκρατειας Ἀπλοτης, ἐκ τῆς Ἀπλοτητος Ἀκακια, ἐκ τῆς Ἀκακιας Σεμνοτης, εκ τῆς Σεμνοτητος Ἐπιστημη, ἐκ τῆς Ἐπιστημης Ἀγάπη*, which is perhaps modelled on this passage; Barn. ii. *τῆς ουν πιστεως ἡμων εισιν βοηθοὶ φοβος και υπομονή, τα δε συμμαχουντα ἡμιν μακροθυμία και ἐγκρατεια· τουτων μενοντων τα προς Κυριον ἀγνώς, συνευφραινονται αυτοις σοφία, συνεσις, ἐπιστημη, γνώσις*. In i. Clem. R. 1 *πιστις, ευσεβεια, γνώσις* are found together, and in 62 we have *περὶ γὰρ πιστεως και μετανοίας και γνησίας αγαπης και ἐγκρατείας και σωφροσυνης και υπομονῆς πάντα τυπον ἐψηλαφησαμεν.*

ἀρετήν.] 'Moral energy.' *Strenuus animae tonus et vigor* Bengel, equivalent to 1 Pet. 1¹³ *ἀναζωσαμενοι τας οσφνας τῆς διανοιας υμων*. It is found in this sense in 2 Macc. 6³¹ *τον ἑαυτου θάνατον υποδειγμα γενναιωτητος και μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς κατέλιπεν*, 4 Mc. 9¹⁸, 12¹⁴ 17¹², Plut. *Mor.*

169 C ἀρετῆς ἐλπίς ὁ Θεός ἐστίν, οὐ δειλίᾳ προφασίς. 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. 15¹², 3 Macc. 6¹, Wisd. 4¹, in which case it would answer to the *erga* of James 2²⁶ πιστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστι, cf. 1 Joh. 5^{4, 5}.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν.] This agrees with Joh. 7¹⁷ εἴαν τις θελή το θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνωσεται περὶ τῆς διδασχῆς, 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 γνῶσει 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 γνῶσεως ἢ τοιαυτῆ ἐγκράτεια (Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 874), and again θεμέλιος ἀρετῆς ἢ ἐγκράτεια (*ib.* *Str.* ii. p. 484); cf. also *Str.* iii. p. 538. It closes the list of the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5²⁵, cf. 1 Cor. 9²⁵ πας ὁ ἀγωνίζομενος πάντα ἐγκρατεῦται, *ib.* 7⁹ εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεῦνται, γαμησάτωσαν, Gen 43³¹ (of Joseph restraining his tears) ἐξελθὼν ἐνεκρατευσάτο. It was one of the topics of Paul's address before Felix.

ἐν τῇ ἐγκρατεῖα τὴν ὑπομονήν.] For ὑπομονή see my note on James 1³. It corresponds to the Aristotelian καρτερία, which is distinguished from ἐγκράτεια in *Magn. Mor.* ii. 6. 34 ἡ μὲν ἐγκράτεια ἐστὶ περὶ ἡδονᾶς καὶ ὁ ἐγκρατῆς ὁ κρατῶν τῶν ἡδονῶν, ἡ δὲ καρτερία περὶ λυπᾶς· ὁ γὰρ καρτερῶν καὶ ὑπομενῶν τὰς λυπᾶς, οὗτος καρτερικὸς ἐστίν. The cognate verb is used of Moses (Heb. 11²⁷) τὸν γὰρ ἀορατὸν ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτερήσεν.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσεβειαν.] The martyr in 4 Macc. 5^{23, 33} combines ὑπομονή, εὐσεβεία, and φιλή ἐγκράτεια. No doubt εὐσεβεία 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. 4²⁰ εἴαν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι Ἀγαπῶ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ μισῇ, ψευστῆς ἐστίν and Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2⁹ 'Brethren are those who are united together in Christ to God as their Father' (Joh. 20¹⁷, 21²³, Matt. 12⁵⁰). φιλαδελφία (1 Th. 4⁹, Rom. 12¹⁰, Heb. 13¹, 1 Pet. 1²², where see Hort, 3⁸) leads up to ἀγάπη. Cf. 1 Th. 3¹² ὑμᾶς ὁ κύριος πλεονασαὶ 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.

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 1²) and thus *φιλάδελφος* is found with a wider meaning in 2 Macc. 15¹⁴ (spoken of the prophet Jeremiah) *ὁ φιλάδελφος οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ πολλὰ προσευχομενὸς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ*. The noun *φιλαδελφία* occurs twice in Clem. R. 47 *ἢ περιβόητος φ.* and 48 *ἢ 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 ὡσπερ ἀρχὴ καὶ στοιχεῖον τῆς πρὸς ἀπαντὰς ἀνθρώπων εὐνοίας . . . ἐπεταὶ τῷ φιλαδέλφῳ μὲν ὁ φιλοκίεος, τῷ φιλοκίειω δὲ ὁ φιλόπατρις, τῷ φιλοπατρίδι δὲ ὁ φιλόανθρωπος*. We may compare Plato's famous description of the development of *εἶρος* (*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 adversity¹; (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. 8¹⁵ *ὁ το πολὺν (συλλέξας) οὐκ ἐπλεονασεν, καὶ ὁ το ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλαττονήσεν*, which is a quotation from Exod. 16¹⁸) it is eulogistic, implying increase or abundance of what is good, as in 2 Cor. 4¹⁵ *ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειονῶν 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. 4¹⁷ *ἐπιζητῶ τὸν καρπὸν τοῦ πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν* 'I long for the fruit that increaseth to your credit,' 2 Th. 1³ *ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἐν ἑκάστῳ πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους* 'your faith groweth exceedingly and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth,' Rom. 5²⁰ *νόμος παρεῖσηλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα, οὐ δὲ ἐπλεονασεν ἡ ἀμαρτία ὑπερπερισσεύσεν 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. 3¹²) it has a transitive force *ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι* ('make you to increase') *καὶ περισσεύσαι τὴν ἀγάπην*. 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 *γνώσις*.

between them both in their uses and in their history. The prevailing classical use reminds one of the *μηδὲν ἀγαν*, the Aristotelian *μεσον*, the Greek hatred of the *ἀπειρον*, a trace of which may be found in *Eccles.* 7¹⁶ 'Be not righteous overmuch.' But to the fervent Christianity represented by St. Paul there can be no excess of good. The Greek words expressive of excess fall far short of the intensity of his feelings of love, of hope, of joy, of adoration, and he is driven to invent new phrases to meet the new experience. See Rom. 5²⁰ quoted above. So in 2 Cor. 7⁴ he cries *υπερπερισσευομαι τῇ χαρᾷ*, in 1 Tim. 1¹⁴ *υπερ-επλεονασεν ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, in Eph. 3²⁰ *τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑπερ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτοῦμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν*, cf. 1 Th. 3¹⁰, 5¹³. The very word *υπερβολη* chosen by Aristotle to express the vice of excess (*Eth. N. ii. 8. 1 δυο οὐσῶν κακιῶν τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν*) is employed to express surpassing goodness, as in 1 Cor. 12³¹ *ετι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν οδὸν δείκνυμι*, 2 Cor. 4¹⁷ *το παραυτικα ἐλαφρον τῆς θλιψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰωνιον βαρος δοξης κατεργάζεται ημιν*, Eph. 3¹⁹ *γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνωσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *ib.* 2⁷, 2 Cor. 3¹⁰, *ib.* 9¹⁴.

οὐκ ἀργους οὐδὲ ἀκαρπους 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 'lasst euch nicht trag noch fruchteleer 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 3¹⁸ *αὐξανετε ἐν χαριτι καὶ γνωσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. Just in the same way St. Paul (Col. 1⁶ foll.) after speaking of the growth of the Colossians in faith and love from the day that *ἤκουσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ . . .* goes on to tell them of his prayer *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεληματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πασῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ . . . ἐν παντι ἐργῷ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπίγνωσει τοῦ Θεοῦ*: cf. Phil. 1⁹ *προσευχομαι ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ετι μᾶλλον περισσευση ἐν ἐπίγνωσει καὶ πασῇ αἰσθησει*. So we read in Heb. 12² *ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πιστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν*. Above all, see Joh. 17³ compared with 1 Cor. 13¹² *αρτι γινωσκω ἐκ μέρους*. It is surely a mistake to suppose

that the writer of our epistle regarded the knowledge of God and Christ as merely the first step toward a holy life. We cannot argue from ver. 2 that grace and peace originate in knowledge; but only that they are capable of being multiplied in and through knowledge. Nor does ver. 3 assert that knowledge precedes the faith and virtue of ver. 4: it only asserts that God has given us all that is needed for life and for godliness through the knowledge of Christ. Of course some knowledge of God is needed before we can either fear Him, or trust Him, but each step forward in the Christian life deepens and widens our knowledge and makes that knowledge more effectual in moulding our conduct. *γηράσκω δ' αἰεὶ πολλα διδασκομενος* 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. 5¹⁹ *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 *ακαρπούς* is perhaps borrowed from the *ακαρπα* of Jude v. 12.

9. *ω 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 *μυωπαζουση καὶ ἀποστρεφόμενη* (blinking and turning away).' Suidas gives the following interpretations, *μυωπάζω = τυφλωττω* (corrected from MS. *το φυλάττω*): *μυωπιζομενος = μυωπάζων, παρακαμμυων* (half-closing the eyes), *ἄκροισ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς προσεχω* (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. *υπωπιάζειν*) or *μυωπειν* (cf. *οξυωπειν*). But *οξυωπειν* is not formed from *οξυωψ*, which does not exist, but from the Aristotelian *οξυωπός*. So *ὑπωπιάζειν* comes from *ὑπάπιον*, like *ἀντιάζω* from *αντίος*, *σχετλιαζω* from *σχέτλιος*, *ιδιάζω* from *ἴδιος*. Nouns ending in *-ωψ* or *-οψ* usually give rise to verbs in *-ίζω*, as *Αἰθιοψ αἰθιοπίζω*, *μάλωψ 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 *σαρκαζω* from *σάρξ*, *επηλυγάζω* from *ἡλυξ*), though *μυωπιάζω* would have been perhaps an easier formation, as we find *μυωπία*, *μυωπίας*, *μυωπιάσις*. The form *-ευω* is also found in derivatives from words ending in *-ωψ*, as *θωπεύω*, *κλωπεύω*; see Lobeck's careful investigation of the whole subject in his *Ῥηματικόν*

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 μυωψ; 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 δια τι οι μυωπες συνάγοντες τα βλεφαρα ορώσιν; . . . ινα αθρωτέρα ἢ ὄψις ἐξίῃ δι' ἐλάττονος ἐξιούσα, καὶ μὴ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀναπεπταμένου ἐξιούσα διασπασθῆ, 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': αμφω 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. 2¹²). Cf. Anton. iv. 29 ο καταμυων τῶ νοερῶ ομματι, Greg. Naz. *Anim. et Res.* 186 A οι προς τον κοσμον ὀρώντες προς τον δια τουτου δηλουμενον ἀμβλυωποῦσιν, Clem. Rom. i. 3 ἐν τῇ πίστει ἀμβλυωπήσαι, Clem Al. p. 116 ἀμβλυωποῦντες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Hippol. *Ref.* v. 16 where Isaac's blessing of Jacob is called ἀμβλυωπος ευλογία, Plato *Rep.* vi. 508 C ἀμβλυωπτοῦσί τε καὶ ἐγγυς φαινονται τυφλῶν. The vulg. and boh. translate 'manu tentans.'

λήθην λαβόν.] The phrase occurs in Timocles *Dionysiazusae* (B.C. 340) ὁ γὰρ νους τῶν ἰδίων ληθην λαβων, Jos. *Ant.* ii. 6. 9 ὑμᾶς βούλομαι καὶ αὐτοὺς ληθην ἐκεῖνων λαβόντας ἡδεσθαι, *ib.* iv. 8. 44, Ael. *V.H.* iii. 18; *Hist. An.* iv. 35, cf. Job 7²¹ ἐποιήσω τῆς ἀνομίας μου ληθην, Deut. 8¹⁹, Wisd. 16¹¹: other exx. in Wetstein. Such phrases as ληθην ἔχειν, ποιῆσθαι, ἐμποιεῖν are common in the best authors. For a similar use of λαμβανω see 2 Tim. 1⁵ υπομνησιν λαμβάνων τῆς πιστεως, Heb. 11²⁹ πειραν λαβοντες (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 των πάλαι αὐτοῦ αμαρτιων.]¹ Cf. Heb. 1³ δι' ἑαυτου καθαρισμον ποιησαμενος των αμαρτιῶν ημῶν, Joh. 3²⁵ ἐγενετο ζητησις . . . περὶ καθαρισμοῦ, i.e. as to the meaning and value of John's baptism. It is used elsewhere in the N.T. of the ceremonial washings of the Jews. We may compare 1 P. 3²¹ ο (ω ?) καὶ ημας αντίτυπον νυν σωζει βαπτισμα, ου σαρκος αποθεσις ρυπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδησεως αγαθῆς ἐπερωτημα εἰς Θεόν, 1 Cor. 6¹¹ καὶ ταυτά τινες ητε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελουσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, Eph. 5^{25f}. ο Χριστος ηγάπησεν την εκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρεδωκεν υπὲρ αυτης· ινα αυτην αγιάσῃ καθαρισας τω λουτρῶ του υδατος ἐν ρήματι, Tit. 3⁵ εσωσεν ἡμας δια λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσιαι καὶ ανακαινωσεως πνευματος ἁγίου, Rom. 6³, the words of Peter in Acts 2⁸⁸ μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτισθητω

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 **ΝΑΚ** αμαρτημάτων on account of its comparative rarity and because it might naturally be altered to suit Heb. 1³.

ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, and of the Baptist in Lk. 3^o, also Job 7²¹ διατι οὐκ ἐποιήσω τῆς ἀνομίας μου λήθην καὶ καθαρισμόν τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου; Barn. 11¹¹ καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ρυπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, Herm. *Mand.* 4. 3 ἕτερα μετάνοια οὐκ ἐστὶν εἰ μὴ ἐκείνη ὅτε εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβημεν καὶ ἐλάβομεν ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν τῶν προτέρων . . . εἰδὲ γὰρ τὸν εἰληφότα ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν, *Sim.* 9. 16. Spitta denies the reference to baptism, and would explain it by what follows in 2²⁰⁻²², 1 Joh. 3³ '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 *καθαρισμού* here and of *φωτισθέντας* in Heb. 6⁴⁻⁶ 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. 4³, and see note on *το δευτερον* Jude 5. To the passages quoted there on the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, add Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 41, (The Marcosians) *μετα το βαπτισμα ετερον επαγγέλλονται, ο καλουσιν απολυτρωσιν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναστρέφοντες κακῶς τοὺς αὐτοῖς παραμενοντας ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς ἀπολυτρωσεως, ὡς δυναμειοὺς μετα το ἀπαξ 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 δευτερου ἐν ὀνόματι υψιστου θεου καὶ του υιου αουτου κ.τ.λ.* Callistus Bp. of Rome is accused of doing the same (*ib.* ix. 12). For the use of the article with the adverb in place of attributive adjectives, cf. below 3⁶ *ο ποτε κοσμος*, 3⁷ *οι νυν ουρανοί*, 1 Pet. 2¹⁰ *οι ποτε ου λαος*, Gal. 4²⁶ *η ανω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, Joh. 8²³ *υμεις εκ των κατω ἐστε*, Phil. 3¹⁴ *η ανω κλησις*, James 4¹⁴ *το τῆς αυριου*, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 14 *των παλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν*.

10. *διὸ μαλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε.*] We have *διο σπουδάσατε* again in 3¹⁴, and *διο* in *v.* 12 below and in I P. 1¹³. Here its force is 'Since there is this danger of the coming on of spiritual blindness, be still more on your guard.' He had already bidden them *σπουδῆν πᾶσαν παρεισεγκαι* 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 κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιησθαι.*¹] The only other passages in the N.T. in which *ἐκλογη* occurs are Acts 9¹⁵ (where Saul is described as *σκευος 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 *βεβαιος* occurs several times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, cf. especially 3⁶

¹ Ewald and Hundhausen prefer the reading of NA syrr. sah. boh. (*σπουδάσατε ἵνα διὰ των καλων ὑμῶν ἔργων βεβαίαν . . . ποιήσθε*), which is also thought possible by Hort.

ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, *ib.* v. 14 ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν. βεβ. ποιείσθαι = βεβαιοῦν 'to certify,' 'confirm,' 'attest,' the ordinary periphrastic use of the middle of ποιέω, like σπουδῆν ποιούμενος *Jude* 3. The word βεβ. occurs again in v. 19 below. For κλῆσις cf. n. on καλέσαντος above 1³, *Eph.* 4^{1.2} παρακαλῶ υμᾶς ἀξίως περιπατήσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης κ.τ.λ., *Phil.* 3⁸⁻¹⁴ esp. τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος διώκω εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλησεως.

ταῦτα ποιοῦντες] Repeating the ταῦτα of v. 8, 9 with reference to the preceding list of virtues.

οὐ μὴ πταίσῃτέ ποτε.] As a blind or short-sighted man might do (*Joh.* 11¹⁹). ο' μὴ with subj is very common in the N.T. and is also found in the LXX., cf. *Winer*, pp. 634 foll. πταιω is found in *James* 2¹⁰, 3², and *Rom.* 11¹¹. See n. on ἀπταιστος, *Jude* 24.

11. οὕτως γάρ] = ταῦτα ποιοῦντες, cf. 1 P. 3⁵.

πλουσίως επιχορηγηθήσεται 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.* 3¹⁶ ὁ λογος του Χριστου ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν υμιν πλουσίως ἐν παση σοφια, *Philo Vit. Cont.* M. 2. p. 476 σοφια πλουσίως και ἀφθονως τα δογματα χορηγει, *Heracleon ap. Orig. in Joh. tom.* 13, § 10 τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας του ἄνωθεν επιχορηγουμενου πλουσίως και αυτους εκβλυσαι εἰς τὴν ἕτερων αἰωνιον ζων τα ἐπικεχορηγημενα αυτοις. πλουτος τῆς δοξης and similar phrases are found in St. Paul's epistles, see *Lightfoot's* n. on *Col* 1²¹ γνωρισαι τί το πλουτος τῆς δοξης του μυστηριου τουτου . . . ο ἔστιν Χριστος ἐν ἡμῖν, η ἐλπις τῆς δοξης. For the thought compare *Lk.* 6³⁸ διδοτε και δοθησεται υμῖν μετρον καλὸν πεπεισμένον σεσαλευμενον υπερεκχυννομένον δωσουσιν εἰς τον κολπον υμων. The use of ἐπιχορηγέω here suggests the ordering of a triumphal procession, cf. *Plut. Vit.* 994 ο δῆμος ἐθεατο τας θεας ἀφειδῶς πάνυ χορηγουμενας.

ἡ εἰσοδος 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.* 25²⁴ δευτε οι εὐλογημενοι του πατρος μου κληρονομησατε την ἡτοιμασμένην υμιν βασιλειαν απο καταβολῆς κόσμου, *Joh.* 14² πορευομαι ετοιμασαι τοπον υμιν. In the N.T. εἴσοδος is used not of a place but of an action, cf. *Heb.* 10¹⁹ εχοντες παρρησιαν εἰς την εἴσοδον τῶν αγιων 'boldness to enter into the holy place,' 1 *Th.* 1⁹, 2¹, *Acts* 13²⁴. 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 2² below) and *Clem. Hom.* x. 25 αιωνιας βασιλειας κληρονομοι. From the Index published by the *Lightfoot Trustees* I learn that αἰδιος β. occurs in the same viii. 23, xiii. 20, *Ep. Clem.* 11. In the LXX. we find η βασιλεια σου βασιλεια πάντων τῶν αἰώνων (*Ps.* 144¹³), Κυριος βασιλεύων τον αἰῶνα και ἐπ αἰῶνα και ἔτι (*Exod.* 15¹⁸), ἐξουσια αιωνιος (*Dan.* 4⁸¹ 7¹⁴), cf. *Ps.* 10¹⁶, *Lk.* 1³³, αἰωνιος κληρονομία *Heb.* 9¹⁵, δόξα αἰώνιος 1 *Pet.* 5¹⁰. The usual biblical equivalent is ζων αιωνιος often found

¹ In *Mart. Polyc.* 20, where codd. b p have αἰώνιον β., *Lightfoot* reads ἐπουράνιον βασιλειαν with cod. m.

with κληρονόμος, etc. as in Mt. 19²⁹, Mk. 10¹⁷, Lk. 10²⁶, 18¹⁸, Tit. 3⁷, Heb. 9¹⁵, James 2⁵, 1 Pet. 1⁴. St. John prefers εχειν ζωήν which occurs in his Gospel 3¹⁵, 16. 36, 5-4. 39, 6⁴⁰, 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. 2⁷, 5²¹, 6²², 2 Cor. 4¹⁷, 18, Gal. 6⁸, 1 Tim. 1¹⁶, 2 Tim. 4⁸, Tit. 1²; perhaps as present in 1 Tim. 6¹² επιλαβου τής αιωνιου ζωής, cf. Col. 1¹³, Eph. 2⁶: 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. 3³ απεθάνετε γαρ (in your baptism) και ἡ ζωη ὑμων κεκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· οταν ὁ Χριστος φανερωθη, η ζωη ημων, τοτε και υμεις φανερωσεσθε ἐν οοξῃ, and in 1 Joh. 3² νυν τεκνα Θεου ἐσμεν, και οὐπω ἐφανερωθη τι ἐσομεθα· οιδαμεν δε οτι, ἐαν φανερωθῆ, ομοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσομεθα, οτι οψομεθα αυτον καθως ἐστιν. The same double view is seen in the use of the phrases βασιλεια τοῦ Θεου, τῶν ουρανῶν, etc., which stand sometimes for the Gospel dispensation or the Church on earth, and sometimes (as in 2 Tim. 4¹⁸ ρυσεται με ὁ κυριος ἀπο παντος εργου πονηρου και σωσει εἰς τὴν βασιλειαν αυτου την ἐπουρανιαν) for the glory hereafter. In this passage, as in our text, the kingdom is spoken of as belonging to Christ, compare also Mt. 16²⁸, 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 ἐρχομενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αυτου, so Mt. 28¹⁸, 1 Cor. 15²⁴ Joh. 18³⁶, Eph. 5⁵ κληρονομιαν ἐν τῇ βασιλειᾳ του Χριστου και Θεου, Apoc. 11¹⁵, Lk. 22²⁹, 30, 23⁴², and Messianic prophecies in the O.T. as Ps. 2⁶.

12. διὸ μελλήσω αεί ὑμᾶς ὑπομνησκῆναι περὶ τούτων.] It seems best to explain διὸ 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. 24⁶ where, after prophesying of the false Christs who should appear before his Second Coming, our Lord, continues μελλησετε δε ἀκουειν πολέμους, which some take (like the present μελλω in Mt. 2¹³ μέλλει ζητεῖν) as a periphrasis for the future. But μελλησω 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 3¹. αεί implies a prospect of frequent communication between him and them.

καίπερ εἰδότας.] Cf. for construction Heb. 5⁸, 7⁵, 12¹⁷. In Heb. 4³ we find the unclassical καίτοι τῶν εργων γενηθεντων. The connexion with υπομνησκῆναι 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.

know what he is about to say: here the writer seems to apologize for venturing to remind them of what they already know.

ἔστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείας.] When Jesus warned St. Peter of his approaching fall, he added the word of comfort καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς σου. The same word is used in 1 P. 5¹⁰ ὁ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος . . . αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, and the cognate noun in 2 P. 3¹¹ φυλασσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῶν αθεσμῶν πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ. Cf. Rom. 11¹² ἐπιποθῶ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς . . . εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν συναπακαληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως, ἰδ. 16²⁵ τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι, Jude v. 24, Rom. 14⁴. This metaphorical sense occurs in Sir. 5¹⁰ ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος ἐν συνέσει σου, ἰδ. 6³⁶, αὐτὸς στηριεῖ τὴν καρδίαν σου, and 22¹⁶ καρδία ἐστηριγμένη ἐπὶ διανοήματος βουλήs ἐν καιρῷ οὐ δειλιάσει, Ps. 51¹² πνευματικῶς ἡγεμονικῶς στηριξὼν με, ἰδ. 112⁸, 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 παρουσίᾳ. Editors refer back to παρεστῆναι v. 9, but this would add nothing to what is already expressed in the sentence. If we take παρουσίᾳ in a strict temporal sense, it might suggest, like Phil. 3¹⁶, and κρατεῖ ὁ εἰς in Apoc. 3¹¹, 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 ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει and 2 P. 2²¹ seem to me to favour Spitta's emendation παραδοθείσῃ for παρουσίᾳ, 'stablished in the truth handed down to you.' Such repetitions are not infrequent in 2 P.¹

13. δίκαιον δὲ ἠγοῦμαι.] His first reason for reminding them was the gain to his readers, his second his duty as an Apostle, cf. Phil. 3¹ ταῦτά γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρὸν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές, ἰδ. 1⁷, Eph. 6¹. 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 εἰκοσὶ καὶ ἑκατὸν ἠνυσμένον δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν . . . δίκαιον ἡγήσασθαι μὴν . . . αἰδίων τε υἱὸν πραγματευσασθαι τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσιν, καὶ μὴ μὴν ἐμαυτῷ . . . μητε νομιμῶν τῶν παρόντων ἀλλῆλην προτιμησῆτε διατάξιν, μήτ' εὐσεβείας . . . καταφρονήσαντες εἰς ἄλλον μεταστήσῃσθε τροπὸν. A little below we read ταῦτα δ' οὐκ ονειδίζειν ὑμᾶς προεθέμην, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐξοδοῦ τοῦ ζῆν δυσχεραίνοντας καταλίπειν ἡξίουν, εἰς τὴν ἀναμνησιν φέρων, and at the end ἵνα δὲ μὴ δι' ἀμαθίαν τοῦ κριτότου ἢ φύσιν ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἀπονεύσῃ, συνέθηκα ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους.

¹ Compare however the *Traditions of Matthias* quoted in Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. p. 453 *miti.* θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα, βαθμὴν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπεκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθεμένος.

ἐφ' ὅσον εἶμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.] Cf. Mt. 9¹⁵ ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος, Rom. 11¹³ ἐφ' ὅσον εἶμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀποστολὸς. This seems to be the first instance of the use of σκηνώμα in this sense: it is used in the literal sense of 'tent' in Deut. 33¹⁸. σκῆνος is similarly used in 2 Cor. 5¹ εἰάν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶν καταλυθῆ, οἰκοδομην ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐχομεν, οἰκίαν ἀχειροποιητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, where σκῆνος seems to be so far identified with σωμα, that the original figure of the tent or hut has to be recalled by the use of the synonym οἰκία, *ib.* v. 4, Wisd. 9¹⁵ βρίθει το γέωδες σκηνος νουν' πολυφροντιδα, also in profane Greek, e.g. Plato *Ax.* 365, *Tim. Locr.* 103. We may compare Job. 4¹⁹ τοὺς κατοικούντας οἰκίας πηλίνας, Isa. 38¹² where the body is spoken of under the figure of 'a shepherd's tent.' Later Ecclesiastical writers have followed our author's use of σκηνώμα, e.g. *Ἐρ. ad Diogn.* 6 ἀθανατος ἡ ψυχή ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ, Eus. *H. E.* iii. 31 Παυλοῦ καὶ Πέτροῦ . . . τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βίου τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἀποθέσεως ὁ χώρος δεδηλωται, with Heinichen's n. Weiss thinks the metaphor has reference to the pilgrim life of the Christian, comparing 1 Pet. 2¹¹.

διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει.] The same phrase is repeated in 31. Elsewhere in the N.T. διεγείρω is used literally of waking from sleep, except in Joh. 6¹⁸ 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 ἐκτετελεκοτες, προθυμοτεροὺς αὐτοὺς κατέστησέ· καὶ τοῖς θυμοῖς διεγείρας κ.τ.λ., *ib.* 7²¹; 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 ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου.] ἀποτίθειμαι is frequently used of putting off a garment as in Acts 7⁵⁸ (see my n. on James 1²¹), and ἀποθεσις occurs in Lucian *Hipp.* 5 of the ἀποδυτηριον in the bath. Its combination with σκηνώμα here reminds us of 2 Cor. 5²⁻⁴ where ἐνδυσασθαι and ἐκδυσασθαι are used with reference to the earthly and the heavenly οἰκητηριον. Perhaps it is from this passage that Clement of Alexandria has borrowed the phrase σαρκὸς ἀποθεσις in *Str.* i. p. 374 and ἡ ἀπόθεσις τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν . . . εὐχάριστον τοῦ σκηνῶν ἀπόδοσιν, *ib.* iv. p. 636. ταχινός has the sense of 'speedy' in Isa. 59⁷, where it is used of πόδες, Sir. 11²⁰ ἐν ὥρᾳ ταχινή, also in Theocritus and other post-Aristotelian writers. Some interpret it here 'sudden,' in accordance with the use of ταχὺς in Plato *Rep.* 553 D οὐκ ἐστ' ἄλλη μεταβολὴ οὕτω ταχεῖα 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 20²⁸⁻³², and his final charge to Timothy (2 Tim. 4¹ foll.) διαμαρτυρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μελλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ . . . κηρυξὸν τὸν λόγον· ἐπίστηθι εὐκαιρῶς ἀκαιρῶς . . . ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπενδομαι καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεως μου ἐφῆστηκεν.

καθὼς καὶ ὁ κυριὸς 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 περιεπατεῖς ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ ἄλλος ζῶσει σε καὶ οἰσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποιῶ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν: but a

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.* ἐπεὶ, ὡς ἐδιδάχθην ἀπο Χριστοῦ, αἱ τοῦ θανάτου μου ἡγγικασιν ἡμέραι. Compare similar intimations in the life of St. Paul (Acts 16⁹, 18⁹, 21¹¹, 23¹¹, 27²³).

15. σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε 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 σπουδάω, Plato *Alc. sec.* 141 σπουδασαντες τούτοις παραγενεσθαι, but it is not uncommon with the cognate σπευδω, which shares most of its uses. Thus Blass (*Gr.* p. 223) compares Herm. *Sim.* ix. 3. 2 ελεγον τοῖς ἀνδράσι σπευδειν τον πύργον οἰκοδομεισθαι, so Herod. i. 74 ἔσπευσαν εἰρηνην εἰρηνοισι γενέσθαι, Plato *Crit.* 45 c τοιαῦτα σπευδεις περὶ σαυτὸν γενέσθαι, Arist. *Pax* 672 εσπευδεν ειναι μη μάχας. The infinitive however and even the passive infinitive is not uncommon after σπουδάω, see Plato *Euthyd.* 293 A σπουδ. επιδειξαι, Eur. *Hec.* 337 σπ. μη στερηθῆναι βίου. For ἔχω with *inf.* cf. Mt. 18²⁵ μὴ εχοντος αὐτοῦ αποδουσαι, Eph. 4²⁸ ἵνα ἔχη μεταδιδουσαι τω χρείαν ἔχοντι, Heb. 6¹³. ἐκάστοτε 'on each occasion,' whenever there is need: used here only in N. T. and LXX.

μετα τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον.] 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. 9³¹) ἔλεγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτου ἣν ἐμελλεν πληρουν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ, Wisd. 3² ἐλογίσθη κακωσις ἡ ἐξοδος αὐτων, *ib.* 7⁶ μια πάντων εἴσοδος εἰς τον βίον ἐξοδός τε ἰση, Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 2 ἐπ. ἐξοδου του ζῆν, Iren. iii. 1. 1 (*ap.* Eus. *H.E.* v. 8.) μετα τὴν τούτων (*i.e.* Peter and Paul) ἐξοδον Μαρκος, ὁ μαθητῆς και ἐρμηνευτῆς Πητρον, καὶ αὐτος τα ὑπὸ Πητρον κηρυσσόμενα εγγραφῶς ἡμιν παραδεδωκε.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 ποιεισθαι.] The words μνήμη and μνεια combine the meanings 'memory' 'memorial' 'mention.' The former word is only used here in the N.T. but occurs in Ps. 30⁴, *ib.* 97¹², Prov. 1¹², Eccl. 1¹¹, 2¹⁶. The phrase μνειαν ποιεισθαι is found in Ps. 111⁴, Rom. 1⁹, Eph. 1¹⁶, Philem. 4, etc. in the sense 'to make mention,' see Robinson on the Epistle to the Ephesians pp. 279 f.; μνειαν εχειν has the sense 'to remember' in 1 Th. 3⁶. The same distinction holds good in

¹ See also Eus. *H.E.* vi. 14, ii, 15, and cf. Lat. *exitus*.

classical Gr.; see Aeschin. 23. 5 οὐδαμοῦ μνείαν περὶ συνθηκῶν πεποιηται, Plato *Protag.* 317 A περὶ ὧν μνείαν ἐποιου ἔπος εἰς ἐμὲ (for μνείαν ποιείσθαι); Plat. *Legg.* 798 B (for μνείαν εἶναι). Similarly we find μνήμην ποιείσθαι 'to mention' in Herod. i. 15, Polyb. 2. 7. 12, *ib.* 2. 71. 1 τίνος χάριν ἐποιήσαμεθα τὴν ἐπὶ πλείων ὑπὲρ τοῦ προειρημένου πολέμου μνήμην; while μνήμην εἶναι 'to remember' occurs in Plato *Theaet.* 163 D, *Polit.* 306 D ἡ καὶ μνήμην εἶναι ὅτινα 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 ποιείσθαι in the sense of 'remember' in Thuc. ii. 54 (as to whether λιμός or λοιμός was the right reading in the prophecy) πρὸς α ἐπάσχον τὴν μνήμην ἐποιούνοιο 'accommodated their memory to their experience.' Even μνείαν ποιείσθαι seems to be used in this sense in Job 14¹³ ταξὴ μοι χρόνον ἐν ᾧ μνείαν μου ποιήσῃς, cf. ληθὴν ποιείσθαι, Job 7²¹, Herod. i. 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. σοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες.] In the N.T. ἐξακολουθεῖν occurs only here and below, 2², 2¹⁵. It is found in Amos 2⁴ τα ματαία... οἷς ἐξηκολούθησαν οἱ πατέρες, Isa. 56¹¹ ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν ἐξηκολούθησαν. The phrase μύθοις ἐξακ. occurs, as Wetstein has pointed out, in Jos. *Ant. prooem.* 3 οἱ ἄλλοι νομοθετοῦσι τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τὴν ἀισχυρὴν μετεθεσαν, 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. 3¹⁵, Ps. 18⁷, etc.; and the middle in the sense of 'to be wise,' 'to behave wisely,' in 1 K. 4³¹, Ecc. 2¹⁹. Sometimes the latter is used to express quibbling, as in Sir. 37²⁰ ἐστὶ σοφίζομενος ἐν λόγοις μισητός. Both uses are found in classical writers, as well as the transitive use which we have here, cf. ὅσα προφασεως χάριν σοφίζονται πρὸς τὸν δῆμον Arist. *Pol.* iv. 13. For the passive L. and S. quote Greg. Nyss. i. 171 D σοφισμένη μήτηρ 'supposititious.' The phrase here is not unlike Pind. *Ol.* i. 46 f. δεδαίδαλμενοι ψευδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μύθοι. Apparently the mockers of 3³ spoke of the Christian hope of the glories to come (above *v.* 11) as resting on fictitious prophecies. In denying this charge the writer uses the word μύθοι, which is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful gnostic genealogies: 'our belief is not founded on fables as theirs is.'¹

¹ Dr. Bigg thinks that μύθος 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

ἐγνωρίσαμεν.] We, who were witnesses on the Holy Mount. γνωρίζω in the N.T. is generally used of the preaching of the Gospel.

δυναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν.] The word παρουσία is used of the Second Advent below 3⁴ and 3¹², 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 εως τῆς παρουσίας του Θεου. Equivalents are ἀποκαλυψις, found thrice in 1 Pet., once in 2 Th., once in 1 Cor.; and ἐπιφάνεια found in 2 Th. 2⁸, 1 Tim. 6¹⁴, 2 Tim. 4^{1, 8}, Tit. 2¹³. also the verb φανερωω in Col. 3⁴, 1 Joh. 3². More commonly the verb ἔρχομαι is used, or ημέρα Κυρίου or Χριστου: εισοδος is used in Mal. 3². δύναμις has been already referred to in v. 3. Its connexion with the παρουσία is shown in Mt. 24³⁰ οφονται τὸν υἱὸν του ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν του ουρανου μετα δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς, and in the Transfiguration, which was to the Three a foretaste of the παρουσία, and of which it was said ου μη γενσωνται θανατου εως ἀν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν του Θεου ἐληληθῆσαν ἐν δυναμει (Mk. 9¹).

ἐπόπται γενηθέντες] = εποπτευσαντες in 1 P. 3², see also 1 P. 2¹², and Aesch. Prom. 299 f. καὶ συ δὴ πονων ἐμῶν ηκεις ἐποπτης; The word was used to denote the highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries. It was employed like other mystic terms by Plato and his followers, from whom it was borrowed by the Jews (Wisdom 14²³, Philo i. p. 146 *fin.*) and Christians, see Ch. 3 of my Introduction to Clem. Al. Str. vii. pp. 1. 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. 9⁴³) ἐξεπλησοντο παντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, and of the goddess Artemis in Acts 19²⁷, see Lightfoot on Ign. Rom. *inscr.* p. 189, Jos. Ant. prooem. 4 τὴν μεγαλειότητα του Θεοῦ. The phrase τα μεγαλεία του Θεου 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. 24²⁹⁻³¹ 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. 2¹². 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. 1⁴ μηδὲ προσεχειν μῦθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, *ib.* 4⁷ τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραῶδεις μῦθους παραιτου: in Tit. 1¹⁴ the μῦθοι are defined as Ἰουδαϊκοί and joined with ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων 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.

in Acts 2¹¹. For the emphatic ἐκείνον cf. 2 Tim. 2²⁶. The ordinary pronoun would have been αὐτου 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 εβεβαιωσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, for which he substitutes και εχομεν βεβαιωτερον, 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 και 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. 1⁷, Rom. 2^{7.10}, 1 Tim. 1¹⁷, Heb. 2^{7.9}, and six times in the Apocalypse. Cf. Heb. 1⁸ ὡν απαυγασμα τῆς δόξης.

φωνῆς ενεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαυδε.] 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 φερω 1 Pet. 1¹⁸ τὴν φερομενην ἔμιν χαριν and vv. 18 and 21 below.

ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.] In the Introduction on the Text I have stated why I think απο should be read here for ὑπο. This is the only example of μεγαλοπρεπῆς in the N.T. It occurs in Deut. 33²⁶ ὁ μεγαλοπρεπης του στερεώματος ('who rides in his excellency upon the sky,' A.V.), also in 2 Macc. 15¹³ μεγαλοπρεπεστατην ειναι την περι αυτον υπεροχῆν, ἰδ. 8¹⁵ ἡ ἐπικλησις του σεμνου και μεγαλοπρεπους ὀνόματος αυτου. So η μεγαλοπρεπειά σου is used of God in Ps. 8¹. The above phrase is found in Clem. Rom. i. 9 τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπειᾷ του, with whom the adjective is common, and in Clem. Al. p. 793 τῶν εκλεκτων εκλεκτοτεροι οἱ κατα την τελείαν γνώσιν . . . και τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεστατῇ δόξῃ τιμημένοι; there is a reference to the Transfiguration ἰδ. p. 812. Dr. Bigg calls attention to our author's fondness for these 'reverential paraphrases,' instancing θεια δυναμις v. 3, θεια φυσις v. 4 and gives the following examples, taken from Spitta, of a like fondness in Jewish Apocryphal writers: *Test. Levi ἐν τῷ ανωτέρῳ (οὐρανῷ) πάντων καταλυει η μεγαλη δόξα, Ascens. Is. xi. 32 et vidi quod sedit a dextera illius magnae gloriae* (ed. Charles p. 146 ταῦτα ηκουον τῆς δόξης της μεγαλης λεγουσης τῷ κυρίῳ μου και Χριστῷ), Enoch xiv. 20 η δόξα ἡ μεγάλη εκαθητο ἐπ' αυτω (the throne): το περιβολαιον αυτου ηλιου λαμπρότερον (Charles p. 347), also c. 11. 3. So Heb. 8¹ ἐκαθισεν ἐν δεξια τῆς μεγαλωσυνης ἐν τοις ουρανοις.

It may be well to compare with the above account the synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration.

(1) *The change in the appearance of Jesus.*

Six days (Lk. about eight days) after Peter's confession made at Caesarea Philippi Jesus took with him Peter, James, and John, and went into a high mountain¹ (Luke adds 'to pray, and while he was praying')

¹ Probably not Tabor, but one of the lower slopes of Hermon; see Edersheim *Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 92 foll.

και μεταμορφωθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τα ἱμάτια αὐτου ἐγενετο στιλβοντα λευκα λιαν, οἷα γραφευς ἐπι τῆς γῆς ου δυναται οὕτως λευκαναι Mk. 9² foll.; και ελαμψεν το προσωπον αὐτου ως ὁ ἡλιος, τα δε ἱματια αὐτου ἐγενετο λευκα ὡς το φῶς Mt. 17² foll.; (ἐγενετο) το εἶδος τοῦ προσωπου ἕτερον και ο ἱματισμος αὐτου λευκος ἐξαστραπτων Lk. 9²⁸ foll.

(2) *The appearance of Moses and Elijah.*

και ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας συν Μωϋσει και ἦσαν συνλαλουντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ Mk. and Mt.; και ἰδου ἄνδρες δυο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἱτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς και Ηλίας, οἱ ὀφθεντες ἐν δοξῇ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτου ἣν ἤμελλον πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ Lk.

(3) *The words of Peter.*

και ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λεγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ῥαββει καλον ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὡδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιησωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοι μιαν και Μωϋσεὶ μιαν και Ἡλεια μιαν. ου γαρ ἠδει τι ἀποκριθῆ, ἔκφοβοι γαρ ἐγένοντο Mk. and Mt. (except that Mt. has Κυριε for Ῥαββεί and omits the last sentence). ὁ δε Πέτρος και οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦσαν βεβαρημενοι ὑπνω, διαγρηγορήσαντες δε εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτου και τους δυο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστωτας αὐτῷ. και ἐγενετο ἐν τῷ διαχωριζεσθαι αὐτους ἀπ' αὐτου εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τον Ἰησουν, Ἐπιστατα κ.τ.λ., μὴ εἰδως ο λεγει Lk.

(4) *The overshadowing cloud.*

και ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιαζουσα αὐτοῖς και ἐγενετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης Mk.; ἐτι αὐτου λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτινὴ ἐπεσκιασεν αὐτους, και ἰδου φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα Mt.; ταῦτα δε αὐτου λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη και ἐπεσκιαζεν αὐτους· ἐφοβήθησαν δε ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτους εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. και φωνὴ ἐγενετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λεγουσα Lk.

(5) *The voice from Heaven.*

οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος μου ὁ ἀγαπητος, ἀκουετε αὐτου Mk.; οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος μου ὁ ἀγαπητος, ἐν ᾧ εὐδοκησα· ἀκουετε αὐτου Mt.; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμενος, αὐτοῦ ἀκουετε Lk. (Compare Mt. 12¹⁸.)

(6) *The end of the vision.*

και ἔξαπινα περιβλεψαμενοι ουκετι οὐδενα εἶδον μεθ' ἑαυτων εἰ μη τον Ἰησουν μονον Mk.; και ἀκουσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπεσαν ἐπι προσωπον και ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. και προσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς και ἀψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν Ἐγερθητε και μὴ φοβεισθε. ἐπάραντες δε τοὺς ὀφθαλμους αὐτῶν οὐδενα εἶδον εἰ μη αὐτον Ἰησοῦν μόνον Mt.; και ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὐρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος Lk.¹

The chief points of resemblance between the Gospel narratives and our epistle are δόξαν in v. 17 and Lk. 9³² εἶδαν τὴν δόξαν αὐτου; ἐξοδον in v. 15 and Lk. 9³¹ ἐλεγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτου; φωνῆς εἰχθείσης ἀπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δοξῆς in v. 17 and Mt. 17⁵ νεφέλη φωτινὴ (the Shechinah) ἐπεσκιασεν αὐτους, και ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εὐδοκησα in v. 17 and

¹ Compare the account in *Apoc. Petri* quoted in Appendix.

Mt. 17⁵, 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 (λαβων τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν). If we accept Alford's interpretation of τιμὴ 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 υἱὸς μου, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου, οὗτός ἐστιν.] Cf. the loose quotation from Isa. 42¹ in Mt. 12¹⁸ ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρετίσα, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ 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. 62⁴, Mt. 17⁵, 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 ἐνεχθείσαν.] Heaven here corresponds to the bright cloud of the synoptics. The repetition of ἐνεχθείσαν 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. 3⁵), to Joshua (Jos. 5¹⁵), of Jerusalem the holy city (Isa. 52¹, 63¹⁸, Mt. 4⁵, 27⁵³), and so of the new Jerusalem (Apoc. 21²). Zahn (*Einkl. 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 εσχομεν, to suit the preceding ἤκουσαμεν; 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 βεβαιαν τὴν κλήσιν ποιεισθαι. Field illustrates from Isoc. *ad Dem.* p. 10 τὴν παρ' ἐκείνων εὐνοίαν βεβαιότεραν εχει, Chaeremon *ap. Stob. Flor.* 79, 31 (Mein. vol. iii. p. 83) βεβαιότεραν εχε τὴν φιλίαν. Charit. iii. 9 βεβαιότερον εσχον τὸ θαρρεῖν. Cf. for εχω 1 Pet. 2¹² τὴν ἀναστροφὴν εχοντες καλήν, ἰδ. 4⁸ τὴν ἀγαπὴν ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες. The word προφητικὸς is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek except in Rom. 16²⁶ μυστηρίου χρονοῖς αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, δια τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν πιστεως . . . γνωρισθέντος. It occurs in Philo *de Plantat.* M. i. p. 347 τὸν τέσσαρα ἀριθμὸν . . . ἀποσεμννεῖν εοικεν ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, *Leg. All.* M. i. p. 95 Μωυσης δὲ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος φησιν κ.τ.λ. and is not uncommon in Justin, e.g. *Apol.* i. 54 (after quotations from Deut.) τούτων τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἀκουσαντες οἱ δαίμονες Διόνυσον εφασαν γεγονέναι υἱὸν τοῦ Διός, *Dial.* 39 τοὺς σοφοὺς

. . . ἀπο των προφητικῶν λόγων αποδεικνυμεν ανοητους, 56 (p. 276) Θεον αυτον οντα ο προφητικος λογος σημαίνει, 77 (p. 302) πριν ἡ γνῶναι το παισιον καλειν πατερα η μητερα ο προφητικος λογος εφη, 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. 4², Isa. 60¹, 40⁵, esp. v. 9 ἐπ' ορος ὑψηλον ἀνάβηθι ὁ ευαγγελιζόμενος Σιων . . . εἰπόν ταις πολεσιν Ἰουδα Ἴδου ὁ Θεος υμῶν. Compare St. Peter's remarks on messianic prophecy in Acts 2¹⁷⁻³⁶, 3¹⁸⁻²⁴, and *Praedic. Petri ap. Str.* vi. p. 80⁴ ἀναπτύξαντες τας βίβλους ας ειχομεν τῶν προφητῶν, α μεν δια παραβολῶν, α δὲ δι αἰνιγμάτων, α δε αυθεντικως καὶ αυτολεξεὶ τον Χριστὸν Ἰησουν ονομαζοντων, ευρομεν καὶ την παρουσιαν αὐτου καὶ τον θανατον καὶ τον σταυρον καὶ τας λοιπας κολασεις πασας οσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οι Ἰουδαῖοι, και τὴν εγερσιν και την εἰς ουρανοὺς αναληψιν . . . ταυτα οὖν επιγοντες ἐπιστευσαμεν τῷ Θεῷ δια των γεγραμμενων εἰς αὐτον. 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 βεβαιοτερος, '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.* ημεῖς αυτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς την ἀλήθειαν ἑθεασαμεθα μετ αυτου οντες εν τῷ ορει . . . δια τῆς οψεως βεβαιότερος τῶν προφητων ημιν ὁ λογος ἐγένετο· α γαρ ἐκείνοι ειπον, ταυτα παρων ὁ Χριστος ἐπιστώσατο, and most commentators, Orig. *Princ.* iv. 6 η Ἰησου ἐπιδημια δυναμενους ὑποπτεισθαι τον νομον καὶ τους προφητας, ως ου θεια, εἰς τοῦμφανες ηγαγεν, ὡς ουρανίῳ χαριτι αναγεγραμμενα, Clem. Al. p. 778 πεπιστευκεν δια τε τῆς προφητειας δια τε τῆς παρουσιας τῷ μη ψευδομένῳ Θεῷ, και ο πεπιστευκεν εχει καὶ κρατει τῆς επαγγελιας . . . και το τέλος τῆς επαγγελιας βεβαιως κατειληφεν· ὁ δε την ἐν οἰς εστι καταστασιν βεβαιαν τῶν μελλοντων καταληψιν εἰδως δι' ἀγάπης προαπαντα τῷ μέλλοντι.

ω καλως ποιεῖτε προσεχοντες.] On the phrase καλως ποιεῖτε cf. James 2⁸ with my n.; on προσέχειν Heb. 2¹ περισσοτερωσ προσέχειν τοῖς ακουσθεισι, Acts 8⁶ προσείχον τοῖς λεγομενοις. For both cf. Jos. *Ant.* xi. 6. 12 οἷς (γραμμασιν) ποιησετε καλῶσ μὴ προσέχοντες. The importance of prophecy is also dwelt upon in 1 Pet. 1¹⁰⁻¹², which should be compared with this passage. See too Lk. 16³¹, 24²⁵† Joh. 1⁴⁵, Acts 10⁴³.

ωσ λυχνῷ φαῖνοντι ἐν αυχηρῷ τόπῳ.] So John, the last and greatest of the prophets, is described by our Lord as ὁ λυχνος ὁ καιομενος καὶ φαινων (Joh. 5³⁵). Spitta cites Ps. 119¹⁰⁵ λυχνος τοῖς ποσί μου ο νομος σου, and 4 Esdr. 12⁴² 'tu superasti ex omnibus prophetis, sicut lucerna in loco obscuro,' cf. also Theoph. *ad Aut.* ii. 13 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (sc. Θεου) φαῖνων ὡσπερ λυχνος ἐν οικηματι συνεχομενῷ ἐφωτισεν την νπ' ουρανον, *Mart. Ignat.* 1 λυχνου δικην θεϊκου τὴν ἑκαστου φωτιζων διάνοιαν δια τῆς των γραφῶν ἐξηγησεως ἐπετυχανεν τῶν κατ ευχην. Cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* v. p. 663 *in it.* ἡ μὲν Ἑλληνικη φιλοσοφία τη εκ τῆς

θρυαλλίδος εοικεν λαμπηδονι, ην αναπτουσιν ανθρωποι παρα ηλιου κλεπτοντες εντέχνως το φῶς· κηρυχθεντος δε του λόγου πᾶν εκεινο το αγιον ἐξέλαμψεν φῶς. *αυχηματος* is properly 'dry and parched,' then 'squalid and rough,' found here only in biblical Greek: *αυχμωδης* is the form used in the LXX. as in 1 Sam. 23¹⁵. The apocryphal *Apocalypse of Peter* § 21 has εἶδον καὶ ετερον τοπον καταντικρὺς εκείνου αυχημηροτατον. καὶ ην τοπος κολασεως, καὶ οι κολαζόμενοι . . . σκοτεινον ειχον <τὸ ἔνδυμα> αυτῶν, ενδεδυμένοι κατα τον αέρα του τοπου. Suidas explains it as *στυγγον ἢ σκοτεινον*, 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 το λαμπρον ἢ στιλβον is opposed to το αυχημηρον καὶ ἀλαμπες. It does not seem to imply absolute darkness, but dingy and dusky obscurity as contrasted with 'the brightness of Messiah's rising' Isa. 60³, Rom. 13¹². The *τοπος αυχημηρός* may be illustrated by Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 87 *ει μὴ τον λόγον εγνωμεν καὶ τουτω καθηγασθημεν, οὐδὲν αν τῶν σιτενομενων ορνηθων ελειπομεθα, ἐν σκοτει πιαινόμενοι καὶ θανάτω τρεφομενοι.*

ἕως οὗ ἡμερα διανιάση.] For construction cf. Lk. 15⁸ ζητει ἕως ου εἶρη, *ib.* 22¹⁸ ου μη πιω . . . ἕως οὗ η βασιλεια του Θεου ελθῃ.¹ It seems better to connect *εως οὗ* with *φαινοντι* than with the more remote *προσεχοντες*. The rare *διανιάζω* is used of the first streaks of dawn breaking through the darkness, cf. Polyb. iii. 104. 5 *αμα τω διανυαζειν πρωτο διλυκυλο*; of a flash of lightning, Plut. *Mor.* 893 *τῇ πληγῇ καὶ τῷ σχισμῳ διανιάζει*. The form *διανιέω* is found in Plut. *V. Arati* c. 22 *ημερας ἤδη διανυουσης*.

καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατέλλῃ ἐν ταις καρδιαῖς ἡμῶν.] The word *φωσφόρος* is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, but the synonymous *ἑωσφορος* occurs in Isa. 14. 12 *πῶς ἐξεπεσεν ἐκ του ουρανου ὁ Ἐωσφόρος ο πρωι ανατέλλων*; 1 Sam. 30¹⁷ *απο ἑωσφόρου ἕως δειλης*, Job 3⁹ *μη ιδοι ἑωσφόρον ανατελλοντα*, and in the difficult Ps. 110³ *εκ γαστρος προ ἑωσφορου εγεννησα 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 4² *καὶ ανατελει υμῖν τοις φοβουμενοις το ονομά μου ἡλιος δικαιοσυνης καὶ ιασις ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αυτου*, Lk. 1⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹ *προφήτης υψιστου κληθήση . . . ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδους αυτου, του δουναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας . . . δια σπλαγχνα ελεους Θεου ημῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκεφεται ημας ανατολή ἐξ υψους, επιφαναι τοις εν σκότει καὶ σκία θανάτου καθημενοις*, Apoc. 22¹⁶ *ἐγώ ειμι . . . ὁ αστηρ ο λαμπρος, ὁ πρωινος*, cf. *ib.* 2²⁸, 2 Cor. 4⁴⁻⁶ *ὁ Θεος του αιωνος τουτου ετυφλωσεν τα νοηματα τῶν ἀπιστων εις το μη αυγάσαι τον φωτισμον του ευαγγελίου τῆς δόξης του Χριστου . . . οτι ο Θεος ὁ εἶπων Ἐκ σκοτους φῶς λάμψει, ος ελαμψεν ἐν ταις καρδιαῖς ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμον τῆς γνωσεως τῆς δόξης του Θεου ἐν προσωπω Ἰησου*, 1 Joh. 2⁸ *ἡ σκοτια παράγεται καὶ το φῶς το αληθινον 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 'εως conj.' Of course *οὗ* (*χρόνου*) is the relative governed by *ἕως prep.*

as preceding the appearance of the day-star (say, the planet Venus) thus reversing the order assumed by the poets from Homer downwards, e.g. *Il.* 23. 226 ἤμος δ' ἑωσφόρος εἶσι φώως ἐρέων ἐπὶ γαίαν, ὄντε μετα κροκόπεπλος ὑπεῖρ ἄλα 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. 110³, which is apparently referred to in connexion with our passage by Hippolytus *Ref.* x. 33 τα δε παντα διοικει ο λογος του Θεου, ο πρωτογονος 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 ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστος, ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος, ὁ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου γεννώμενος, ο ζῶν χαρισάμενος ἀκτίσιν ἰδίαις, p. 87 πῶς γὰρ οὐ ποθινὸς ὁ τον εν σκοτει κατορωρυγμενον νουν ἐναργῆ ποιησαμενος και τα φωσφώρα τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποξυνας ομματα ; and p. 89 λαμψάτω ουν ἐν τω ἀποκεκρυμμενω του ανθρωπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ το φως, καὶ της γνωσεως αἱ ακτινες ἀνατειλατωσαν τον εγκεκρυμμενον ενδον εκφαινουσαι καὶ αποστιλβουσαι ανθρωπον. Wetstein compares *Philo de Decal.* ii. p. 188 ἡκριβωται καὶ βεβασάνισται τὰ Θεου λόγια καθαπερ χρυσος πυρι . . . οι μεν τοις χρησμοῖς ἀξιουντες εἶναι καταπειθεις ως εν ἄσκιω φωτὶ τον αι χρονον βιώσονται, τους νομους αυτους ἄστερας ἔχοντες εν ψυχῇ φωσφορουντας. 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 (*ιδιον*, 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 (*λογισμος*) 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, *η δύσις τοῦ λογισμου καὶ το περι αυτον σκοτος εκστασιν και θεοφορητον μανιαν ἐγεννησε*.' Dr. Abbott thinks that the use of *φωσφορει* above implies that the substantive *φωσφορος* (often applied to Helios, Apollo, etc.) may stand for the sun; but *φωσφορεω* simply means 'I give light.' It is true that Wetstein quotes Suidas as interpreting *φωσφορος* 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 *ου λόγον ὡς φωνήν, ἀλλ' ἐνδιάθετον* . . . ἅμα γὰρ τῷ ἐκ του γεννήσαντος προελθεῖν, πρωτότοκος τούτου γενόμενος φωνή, ἔχει ἐν εαυτῷ τας ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ προενοηθείσας ιδέας. Thus *φωσφόρος φωνή* is the light-giving utterance of the Word, which was ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, τὸ φως τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει παντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

those whom he addresses should give heed to the prophetic word shining in obscurity, until the morning breaks and the day-star arises in their hearts? I do not think it is possible to explain this of the Second Advent in connexion with v. 16 and 3⁴. The phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς υμῶν implies an inward coming (Lk. 17²¹) as we see in Rom. 2¹⁶ 5⁵, 8²⁷, 2 Cor. 1²¹ ὁ δε βεβαιων ημας σὺν υμῖν εἰς Χριστον και χρισας ἡμᾶς Θεός, ὁ καὶ σφραγισαμενος ημας και δους τον αρραβῶνα του πνευματος ἐν ταις καρδιαῖς υμων, 4⁶, Eph. 1¹⁸, 3¹⁵, Col. 3¹⁵. The prophets are evidently those of the old dispensation, who spoke amid prevailing darkness (Isa. 8²²) and were themselves ignorant of the full meaning of their prophecies (1 Pet. 1¹⁰). 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. 22¹⁶) 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) ο προφητικος λόγος τοὺς ἐν αγνοια φωταγωγει εως καθαρων υμῖν το φως του εὐαγγελίου διαφανῆ και ὁ νοητος εωσφόρος, τουτεστι Χριστος, ἐν ταις καρδιαῖς υμων ἀνατειλη.

20. τοῦτο πρωτον γινώσκοντες.] Occurs again below (3³) in reference to the coming of mockers in the last times, cf. 1 Tim. 2¹ παρακαλω πρῶτον παντων ποιεισθαι δεησεις and Robinson's Ephesians pp. 278 f. on the epistolary phrase προ παντων. The part. γινώσκοντες, continuing the construction of καλως ποιειτε προσέχοντες, defines the spirit and feeling with which the Scriptures should be read, 'recognizing this truth first of all.'

πασα προφητεια γραφης.] Here we have the Hebraic πασα—ου for ουδεμία, as in 1 Joh. 2²¹ παν ψεῦδος εκ τῆς ἀληθειας ουκ εστιν. The converse ου—πασ is also common as Mt. 24²² ουκ αν εσωθη πασα σάρξ, see Blass tr. p. 178. For προφ. γρ. cf. Apoc. 22⁷ τας προφητειας του βιβλιου τουτου, and Acts 8³² ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ην ανεγινωσκειν, 2 Tim. 3¹⁶ πασα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος και ωφέλιμος 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 ψευδοπροφήται mentioned below.

ιδίας ἐπιλυσεως ου γίνεται.] Aquila has ἐνυπνιων ἐπιλυσις in Gen. 40⁸, where the LXX. has διασάφησις. Cf. Mk. 4³⁴ κατ ἰδίαν ἐπέλυεν πάντα, Herm. Sim. ix. 13 εχεις την ἐπιλυσιν τῶν ἀποβεβλημενων, ἰδ. v. 5. 1. αυθαδης εἰ ἐπερωτῶν τας ἐπιλυσεις των παραβολῶν. ἐπειδὴ δε ουτω παράμονος εἶ, ἐπιλυσω σοι την παραβολην του αγρου, ἰδ. v. 6. 8, 3. 1, 4. 2, 3,

viii. 11. 1 τας επιλυσεις πασῶν τῶν ράβδων, Iren. ii. 28. 3 τῶν εν ταις γραφαις ζητουμενων, ολων τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικων ουσων, ενια μὲν επιλυομεν (= absolvimus) κατα χαριν Θεου, ἔνια δὲ ἀνακεισεται Θεῷ, *ib.* 27. 3 parabolae possunt multas recipere absolutiones (= ἐπιλυσεις), Philo *Vit. Cont.* M. 2. p. 483 ζητει τις τι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γραμμασιν, η καὶ υπ ἄλλου προσταθεν τι ἐπιλυεται, Helioid. i. 18 ονειρατων επιλυσις, *ib.* iv. 9 προς την τῶν αγνοουμένων εὔρεσιν και τῶν χρησθέντων την ἐπίλυσιν, Clem. Al. *Raed.* ii. p. 172 εχοι δ' αν και αλλας επιλυσεις ὁ στατηρ. For the gen. cf. Heb. 12¹¹ πασα παιδεια ου δοκει χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλα λυπης, Acts 20³ ἐγενετο γνωμης του υποστρεφειν, Plato *Apol.* p. 28 ὡς μὲν ἐγω ουκ ἀδικῶ, οὐ πολλῆς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀπολογίας. Alford and others urge that γινομαι 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 γαρ οὐδεν ἴδιον, ἀλλ' αττ αν ὑπηχηση το θεῖον, and again ὁ δε μονωθεῖς ἐξαιφνης θεοφορεται και μηδὲν συνιεις, ωσπερ μετανισταμενου του λογισμοῦ, τα υποβαλλομενα ἐξελάλει, p. 126 ἀπολογία χρώμενος αληθει, ως οὐδεν ἴδιον λεγοι, κατεχομενος δὲ και ενθουσιῶν διερμηνευοι τα ετερου. It was the mark of a false prophet to speak το ιδιον or ἀφ' εαυτου. Compare Jer. 23^{1b} ματαιουσιν εαυτοῖς ορασιν· ἀπο καρδιας ἑαυτῶν λαλουσιν και ουκ ἀπο στοματος Κυριου, Ezek. 13³ οὐαι τοις προφητεύουσιν ἀπο καρδιας αυτων, και το καθολου μὴ βλέπουσιν. Of the true prophet we read (Hippol. *Antichr.* 2) ου γαρ ἐξ ιδίας δυναμεως εφθεγγοντο, οὐδε απερ αυτοι εβουλοντο ταῦτα εκηρυττον, ἀλλα πρωτον μὲν δια τού λογου ἐσοφίζοντο ορθως, επειτα δι οραματων προεδιδάσκοντο τα μελλοντα καλῶς· εἰθ' ουτω πεπεισμενοι ἔλεγον ταυτα ἄπερ αυτοις ἦν μονοις υπο του Θεου αποκεκρυμμενα. This is the view taken in a scholium from Oecumenius quoted by Wetstein λαμβανουσι μὲν απο του Θεοῦ οι προφήται την προφητείαν, ἀλλ' ουκ ὡς εκεινοι βουλονται, ἀλλ' ως το κινουν αὐτους θεῖον ἐνεργει πνευμα. 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 ἐπηλυσεως, Heinsius to ἐπιλευσεως, with the sense 'προφητεια non est res proprii impetus,' while Alford, following Hütther 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 continuation 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—ου μέντοι και την ἐπίλυσιν αυτου ἐποιουντο. So even the holy prophets had very vague ideas as to the meaning and scope of their prophecies, cf. Dan. 12^{8, 9} και ἐγω ἤκουσα και ου συνῆκα, και εἶπα, Κυριε, τι τα ἔσχατα τουτων; και ειπε, Δευρο Δανιήλ, οτι εμπεφραγμενοι και ἐσφραγισμένοι οι λογοι ἔως καιρου περας, Zech. 4⁵, 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,

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 3²¹ (Jesus Christ) *ον δει ουρανον μεν δεξασθαι αχρι χρόνων αποκαταστασεως πάντων ὧν ελαλησεν ὁ Θεος δια στοματος τῶν αγίων ἀπ αἰῶνος αυτου προφητῶν*, Acts 10⁴³ *τουτω παντες οι προφήται μαρτυρουσιν αφεσιν αμαρτιων λαβείν δια του ονοματος αυτου παντα τον πιστευοντα εις αυτον*, Rom. 15^ο *λεγω γαρ Χριστον διακονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπερ αληθειας Θεου εις το βεβαιῶσαι τας επαγγελιας των πατερων*, Iren. iv. 6. 1 *Χριστος δια τυπων και παραβολῶν εσημαίνετο μη δυναμένων νοηθῆναι προ του τῆν ἔκβασιν των προφητευμενων ἔλθειν, ἥτις ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία του Χριστου.*

The different interpretations of this difficult phrase may be classified as follows. Those who agree that *ἐπιλυσις* (*ἐπιλυειν*) 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. 16³). In this way *v.* 20 would mean much the same thing as *v.* 21. Some have endeavoured to find support for this interpretation in the word *γίνεται*, which they would translate 'comes of private interpretation.' This seems to me to be an undue straining of the meaning of the word *γινομαι*, attributing to it a force which it could only bear if followed by the preposition *εκ*. 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 '*ἐπιλυσις* dicitur interpretatio qua ipsi prophetae res antea plane clausas aperuere mortalibus,' Cajetan, Alford, Keil, Kühn, Hundhausen. Spitta proposes an entirely new sense of the word *ἐπιλυσις*, translating 'no prophecy is of such a nature that it can be dissolved,' for which he compares Joh. 10³⁵ *ου δυναται λυθῆναι η γραφη*, Mt. 5¹⁷ *ουκ ἤλθον καταλυσαι αλλα πληρωσαι*, but confesses that he can make nothing of *ιδίας*, for which he proposes to read *αγίας*.

There is similar diversity of opinion as to *ιδίας*. (1) à Lapede, Estius, and the Roman Catholics in general take it as equivalent to *ιδιωτικῆς*,

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. 1¹⁰ f., cf. 4 Esdras 12¹¹ of Daniel's vision. (3) Luther, Erasmus, Wiesinger, Schott, Hofmann, etc. take it of man's own interpretation, contrasting this with the understanding imparted by the Holy Spirit, who is Himself the source of prophecy. (4) Werenfels, Bruckner, Bisping refer *ιδίας* to *προφητεια* 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 ἠρέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.] Cf. Joh. 1¹³ οὐδε ἐκ θελήματος σαρκος οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννηθησαν. We have another example of a final *ποτε* in *v.* 10 above (where, as here, it means 'at any time'). also Rom. 7⁹ ἐγὼ δὲ ζῶν χωρὶς νομοῦ ποτέ, 1 Cor. 9⁷ τις στρατευεται ἰδιοῖς οὐωνίοις ποτέ; so Eph. 2³, Col. 3⁷, Heb. 1¹³. With *ἠνεχθη* we should probably supply in thought ἐξ οὐρανοῦ or its equivalent as in *vv.* 17, 18.

ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι.] Compare the compounds *θεοφορος* Aesch. *Ag.* 1150, *θεοφορητος* *ib.* 1140, *θεοφορία* Strabo, *θεοφορησις* Plut., *θεοφορισθαι* Menander, *πνευματόφορος* and *πνευματοφορουμενος* Eccl., and Philo i. 510 quoted above under *φωσφόρος ανατειλη*, also p. 482, *ἔκστηθι σεαυτης, καθάπερ οἱ κορυβαντιῶντες καὶ κατεχομενοι, βακχενθεισα καὶ θεοφορηθεισα κατα τινα προφητικον ἐπιθειαςμον*, *Mut. Nom.* M. i. p. 609 (of Balaam) *σοφιστεία μαντικῆ τὴν θεοφόρητον προφητειαν παρεχάραξε*, *de Somn.* p. 689 *οταν ἐξ ἔρωτος θειοῦ κατασχεθεις ὁ νους, συντεινας εαυτον ἀχρι των ἀδυτων, ὀρμη καὶ σπουδῆ παση χρωμενος προερχηται, θεοφορουμενος ἐπιλέλησται των ἀλλων*, Justin *Apol.* I. § 33 *ουδενὶ ἄλλω θεοφορουνται οἱ προφητευοντες εἰ μὴ θειῳ λογῳ*, *ib.* § 35 *'Ἡσαΐας θεοφορουμενος τῷ πνευματι τῷ προφητικῳ*, Theoph. *Autol.* ii. 9 *οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι, πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγιοῦ καὶ προφήται γενομενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθεντες . . . ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι*, iii. 12 *τοὺς παντας πνευματοφορους ἐν πνευματι Θεοῦ λελαληκεναι*. For the simple *φερόμενος* cf. Jos. *B.J.* vi. 5. 2 *φερόμενοι τοῖς θυμοῖς οἱ στρατιῶται τὴν στοαν υφάπτουσι*, Plut. *Mor.* 205A *φερομενος ταις ὀρμαῖς*, Acts 2² of the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost *ὡσπερ φερομενης πνοῆς βιαίας*, and such phrases as Mk. 1¹² *τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*, Acts 8⁸⁹ *πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἤρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον*, 2 Cor. 12 *ἀρπαγεντα εως τριτου ουρανοῦ*.

ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι.] Cf. Acts 3²¹ (Times of Restoration of which) ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς δια στόματος των αγίων απ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητων, Justin *Apol.* i. 36 *οταν δε τας λεξεις των προφητων λεγομένας . . . ακουητε, μη απ αυτων των ἐμπεπνευσμένων λεγεσθαι νομίσητε, ἀλλ ἀπὸ τοῦ κινουντος αὐτους θείου λόγου, ib.* 37 *τα διδασκόμενα διὰ των προφητῶν ἀπο του Θεοῦ, ib.* ἀπο προσωπου τοῦ Πατρος ἐλέχθησαν διὰ Ησαίου οἶδε οἱ λόγοι, *ib.* 38 *οταν δε ἀπο προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεγη το προφητικον πνεῦμα, οὕτως φθέγγεται.* The reading ἀπό makes a better contrast to *θειλήματι ἀνθρώπου* than the *αγιοι* of some MSS. The position of *ἀνθρώποι* 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. 27⁸ (LXX. 34⁹) *μὴ ακουετε των ψευδοπροφητῶν ὑμῶν, ib.* 26⁷ (LXX. 33⁷) and in Lk. 6²⁶. We often meet references to these, as in Deut. 13¹⁴, 18²⁰, Jer. 5³¹, Ezek. 13 esp. v. 3 *οὐαὶ τοῖς προφητεουσιν ἀπο καρδιας αυτων (-θειλήματι ἀνθρώπου in 1²¹ above).* Examples of such are Zedekiah (1 Kings 22), Hananiah (Jer. 28). Words compound-d with *ψευδο-* may either mean, falsely named, a 'sham' or 'counterfeit,' as *ψευδόχριστος* Mt. 24²⁴, *ψευδαπόστολος* 2 Cor. 11¹³, *ψευδάδελφος* Gal. 2⁴, *ψευδονερων* 'a sham Nero' (Lucian), *ψευδοκωνων* 'a sham Cynic' (Plut.); or they may mean falsely doing the work implied in the second part of the compound, as in *ψευδοστομῶ* 'to speak falsely' (Soph.), *ψευδουργος* 'one who practises deceitful arts' (Plato), *ψευδορκία* 'perjury' (Philo), *ψευδομάρτυρ* 'a false witness' Mt. 26⁶⁰, *ψευδολόγος* 'speaking falsely' 1 Tim. 4². 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. 28⁷ 'The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink,' Jer. 23¹⁴ 'In the prophets of Jerusalem I have seen an horrible thing; they commit adultery and walk in lies, and they strengthen the hands of evil-doers . . . they are all of them become unto me as Sodom,' *ib.* v. 32, *ib.* 29²¹⁻²³, Ezek. 13³ 'Woe unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing,' *ib.* v. 16 'which see visions of peace for Jerusalem, and there is no peace, saith the Lord

God,' Micah 3¹¹ '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 *ψευδοπροφήται* in the Christian Church, cf. Mt. 24¹¹, 1 Tim. 4¹.

λαός is used of Israel generally in the O.T. esp. in Ex. 19⁵ and Deut. 8 *εσεσθε μοι λαος περιουσιος*, from which is taken the phrase in 1 P. 2⁹ *λαός εις περιποίησιν*. Compare also Lk. 2³² *φῶς εις αποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δοξαν λαου σου Ἰσραηλ*, and Acts 26^{17.23}, where we find the same distinction between the *λαός* and the *εθνη*.

ὡς 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. 13⁹). In the early Church teachers are joined with prophets (Acts 13¹, 1 Cor. 12²⁸ *πρῶτον ἀποστολους, δευτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκαλους*, Eph. 4¹¹ *ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστολους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστας, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκαλους*). We learn from James 3¹ 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 αἵρέσεις ἀπωλειας.] 'Men who will introduce destructive heresies into the Church.' *οστις* seems to have its usual indefinite force, cf. Mt. 7¹⁵ *προσέχετε ἀπο τῶν ψευδοπροφητων, οἵτινες . . . εἰσιν λυκοι αρπαγες*. 'There are some places in the N.T. in which *οστις* cannot be distinguished from *ος*; 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 *παρεισεδησαν* and 2 Pet. 1⁵ *παρεισφερω*, also Lightfoot's n. on *παρεισακτους* Gal. 2⁴, and Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 854 *υπεμνήσθην τῶν περὶ τοῦ μη δεῖν εὔχεσθαι πρὸς τινῶν ἑτεροδοξῶν παρεισαγομένων δογμάτων*. It is frequently used in the Apology of Aristides without any notion of secrecy, which however easily attaches to *παρά*, as in *παρεισακτος*.

αἵρέσεις.] Athanasius quoted by Suicer defines the word *ἀπο τοῦ αἵρεῖσθαι τι ἴδιον καὶ τουτῶ ἐξακολουθεῖν*. Hence it is used for a school or sect whether in philosophy or science, as in Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 887 *καὶ παρα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ παρα τοῖς δοκιμωτατοῖς τῶν παρ Ἑλλήσι φιλοσόφων πάμπολλαι γεγωνασιν αἵρέσεις . . . καὶ οἱ ἰατροί, ἐναντίας δοξας κεκτημένοι κατα τας οἰκείας αἵρέσεις, ἐπ ἰωης ἐργῶ θεραπευουσιν*. 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 5¹⁷ *ἀῤεσις Σαδδουκαίων*, *ib.* 15⁵ *αἱρ. Φαρισαίων*, 24⁵ *πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσεως*. In our text it is used in a dyslogistic sense, as in 1 Cor. 11¹⁹ *δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἵρεσις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα οἱ δοκιμοὶ φανεροὶ γινῶνται*, Gal. 5²⁰, where *διχοστασιαί* and *αἵρεσις* are joined with adultery and idolatry as works of the flesh, Tit. 3¹⁰ *αἱρετικὸν ἀνθρώπον 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

as millenarianism. 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 *προαιρεσις* for 'principle of conduct,' e.g. ii. 56. 9 *το μεν ουν ἀγεννες καὶ γυναικωδες τῆς αἵρεσεως αὐτοῦ*, xviii. 20. 4 *οὐδέποτε ταύτην ἐσχῆκεναι 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. 5²⁰ and 1 Cor. 11¹⁸ where I am glad to see the R.V. has 'heresies') with words signifying division, which seems to make the subjective meaning 'opinionativeness' more appropriate, cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. p. 894 *οἱ ἐν οἴῃσει οἱ κατὰ τὰς αἵρεσεις*. 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 διδαχὴ* 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 *αρνούμενοι*. 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 ζοφου*, *v.* 10 *ἐπιθυμία μiasμου*, see Sir. 16⁷ *ἔθνος ἀπωλείας* and my n. on Jas. 1²⁵ *ακροατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς* and p. ccxiv. The word occurs five times in this ep., once in Acts, where Peter rebukes Simon, and is found in *Αποκ. Πετρὶ* 1 *οδοῦς καὶ δόγματα ποικιλὰ τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν*. It appears as the opposite of *σωτηρία* in Phil. 1²⁸.

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. 10³⁰ *ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες . . . ἡριθμημεναι εἰσίν*, where he translates 'and yet.' For other instances of this use of *καί* cf. Mk. 12⁷, 4²⁵, 1 Cor. 2¹⁰. For *ἀγοράσαντα* see Hort on 1 Pet. 1^{18, 19} (pp. 78-80) *οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε . . . ἀλλὰ τιμῶν ἁματι, ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμωμου 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 λυτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν . . . The nearest

repetition of these words is in 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὁ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. For λυτρομαι St. Paul uses ἀγοράζω 1 Cor. vi. 20 ἠγορασθε γὰρ τιμῆς, vii. 23, Gal. iii. 13 Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγορασεν ἐκ τῆς καταρας του νομου, γενομενος ὑπερ ἡμῶν κατάρρα. So Apoc. v. 9 (of the Lamb) ἠγορασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμας ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου. . . . In the LXX. λυτρομαι is connected with the Exodus . . . in Acts vii. 35 St. Stephen boldly says that God sent Moses as ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτῆν. . . . In some of the passages quoted Christ Himself appears as the ransom: elsewhere it is the Father, as in Acts xx. 28, rightly understood and illustrated by Rom. v. 8 (where note ἑαυτου) 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 δεσποτης would be used here, as elsewhere in the N.T., of the Father; so Acts 4²⁴ δεσποτα, 'συ ο ποιήσας τον ουρανον και την γῆν, Lk. 2²⁹, Apoc. 6¹⁰. See n. on Jude 4, and Wetstein 'semper Deum Patrem significat, nunquam Filium.' If we take it so, with Spitta and v. Soden, we must understand ἀρνούμενοι of the various idolatries, and ἐπάγοντες of the consequent punishments of Israel; but this is rather an awkward construction. Otherwise ὄρν. describes the nature of the threatening heresy, ἐπ. its effect 'so bringing on themselves destruction.' Mr. Feltoe in his ed. of Dionysius of Alexandria p. 242 notes that 'the use of δεσπότης of Christ is said to indicate the end of the fourth century, esp. the Cappadocian divines (Holl on Amphilochius p. 127).' Two examples occur in the doubtful Exegetical Fragments inserted in Feltoe's edition (pp. 248 f.) βαβαὶ τῆς ἀνέξικακίας του δεσποτου, τοῦ και φιλησαντος τον προδοτήν, and in p. 242 we have the phrase το δεσποτικον 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 ἀνθαίρετον αὐτοῖς ἐπαγονται δουλειαν Lys. p. 102. 19 κινδυνεω πολὺ μείζω συμφοραν ἐμαντῷ ἐπαγαγεσθαι. see Blass pp. 183 f., Jannaris *Gr.* §§ 1472, 1478. Another instance of the unclassical active is found in Sir. 1²⁷ μὴ ἐξύψου σεαυτον ινα μη . . . ἐπαγάγῃς τη φυχη σου ατιμίαν. The active is properly used in v. 5 below. For ταχινὴν see n. on 1¹⁴. Spitta finds a difficulty in the doubled participle, on which see Winer p. 433 and Blass p. 250.

2. πολλοὶ ἐξακολούθησουσιν αὐτων ταῖς ἀσελείαις.] αὐτων refers to the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, whose bad example will be largely followed. This verse is parenthetical referring to the deluded followers, while v. 3 returns to the false teachers. The heretics are noted for their licentiousness, see Introduction on Early Heresies, and notes on Jude 4, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, below vv. 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 3^{3, 17}. For pl. ἀσελείαις cf. below v. 15 and εὐσεβείαις 3¹¹, also James 2¹ with my note.

δι οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.] Cf. Rom. 2^{23, 24} (a quotation from Isa. 52^b) ος ἐν νόμῳ καυχασαι, δια τῆς παραβασεως του νομου τον Θεον ατιμάζεις; το γαρ ονομα του Θεου δι' υμας βλασφημεται ἐν τοις ἔθνεσιν, *ib.* 3⁸, Tit. 2^v, James 2⁷ (where see my note), *Apoc. Petri.* 7 οὖ βλασφημουντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσυνης. For ὁδός see also vv. 15 and

21 below, and Mt. 21³², Lk. 17⁹, Rom. 3¹⁷ (ὁδὸν εἰρήνης), Acts 16¹⁷ (ὁδὸν σωτηρίας), Barn. i. 4, v. 4 ὁδ. δικαιοσύνης.¹ The phrase ὁδὸς ἀληθείας comes from Ps. 119³⁰: it is opposed to the 'way of lying' in v. 29.

3. ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορευσονται.] '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. 1²². Contrast with this 1 Th. 2^{5, 6} οὐτε γὰρ ποτε ἐν λογῷ κολακίας ἐγενήθημεν . . οὐτε προφάσει πλεονεξίας . . οὐτε ζητούντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν. For causal ἐν cf. 11, 21³, 21⁸, 22⁰, Jude 10, Blass 130, 131.

ἐμπορευομαι.] Strictly to travel as a merchant (as in James 4¹³), 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 ἐνεπορευετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν 'purchased the forgetfulness of the jurors,' Jos. B.J. i. 26. 1 οὐδὲν ἤγειτο τὴν καθαρὰν δόσιν εἰ μὴ δι αἵματος ἐμπορευσεταὶ τὴν βασιλείαν, Chion *Erist.* xi. ἀρετὴν ἐμπορευομεθα, οὐδένος ἀλλοῦ πλην φύσεως καὶ φιλοπονίας ὠνιον, Prov. 3 κρεῖσσον σοφίαν ἐμπορευεσθαι ἢ χρυσίου θησαυροῦς, Jos. Ant. iv. 6. 8 (of the Midianitish women) οὐδ' ἐμπορευσόμενα τὴν ὄραν τοῦ σώματος προσηκάμεθα τὴν νμετέραν 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 Bart.* μὴ ἐμπορευοῦ τὴν χάριν ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσης τῆς δωρεᾶς, Theodoret τὰς τῶν πενήτων συμφοράς ἐμπορευεσθαι. The idea is the same as that in 2 Cor. 2¹⁷, 1 Tim. 6⁵ 'thinking that godliness is a trade' (πορισμὸν 'a means of gain'). The compound χριστεμπορος occurs in the longer recension of Ignatius *ad Magn.* ix. οἱ χριστέμποροι τὸν λόγον καπηλευόντες 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 ἐπενεικάντες αἰτίαν ἐδίωξαν 'banished him, having brought a charge against him on a false pretext.' Cf. Jos. *Vita* 65 πρᾶττουσι μὲν ὁμοίον τι τοῖς περὶ συμβολαίων πλαστα γράμματα συντεθεικοσι 'they act like those who have forged false documents in a case of contract,' Philo M. i. p. 1 μυθικοῖς πλάσμασι τὴν ἀληθειαν ἐπικρυψάντες. I do not think there is any reference to the σεσοφισμένοι μυθοὶ of 1¹⁶.

οἷς τὸ κριμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.] 'Over whom the judgment (pronounced against false prophets in the O.T.) has long been impending.' The combination of ἀργεῖ and νυσταζει reminds one of ἀργός and μυωπαζων 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 3¹⁵ in biblical Greek, is found in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, etc. The use of compound adverbs, which is comparatively rare in classical Greek (e.g. ἀπαρτι, ἐμπροσθεν, καθάπαξ, ἐξοπισω, παραντικα), received a great extension in post-Aristotelian writers, see Lobeck's *Phrygn.* p. 45 f. Thus we find the unclassical ὑπεράνω, υπερλιαν, ἐφάπαξ, κατέναντι, κατενωπιον in the N.T.

¹ Dr. Bigg quotes Aristid. *Apol.* xvi αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἥτις τοὺς ὀδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, which, as he says, appears to be directly taken from this verse combined with 1¹¹.

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. 25⁵ (of the slumbering virgins) in the N.T. It is found in LXX. Ps. 121⁴ οὐ νυσταξει οὐδε υπνωσει ὁ φυλάσσων τὸν Ἰσραηλ, Isa. 5²⁷ (of the avengers) οὐδε κοπιάσουσιν οὐδε νυσταξουσιν, Prov. 24³³, Nah. 3¹⁸. Compare the scene of the sleeping Eumenides awakened by the shade of Clytemnestra.

4. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο.] The natural apodosis would have been *υμῶν οὐ φείσεται*, but (as above 1¹⁷ 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. 11²¹ εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλαδῶν οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδε σου φείσεται, Mt. 6³⁰.

σειροῖς ἕξοφον ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν.] For *σειροῖς* see Introduction on the text. *σειρος* or *σιρός* is properly a pit for the storage of grain as in Demosth. p. 100 *ad fin.* ἐν τοῖς Θρακικοῖς *σειροῖς*, where the scholiast explains *τοὺς θησαυροὺς καὶ τὰ ὀρυγμὰ ἐν οἷς κατέθεντο τὰ σπέρματα* (different kinds of grain) *σιροὺς ἐκάλουον οἱ Θρακεῖς 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 σειροὺς*. 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 Antigones was thrown and burnt alive (Diod. xix. 44, though *σορον* is read there instead of *σειρον* 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) *ἐμβαλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκοτὸς καὶ ἀνοιξὸν τὴν ἔρημον τὴν οὐσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῃ Δουδαίῃ, καὶ ἐκεῖ πορευθεὶς βάλε αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποθεῖς αὐτῷ λίθους ὄξεις καὶ λίθους τραχεῖς καὶ ἐπικάλυψον αὐτὸν σκοτὸς, καὶ οἰκησάτω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . . . καὶ φῶς μὴ θεωρεῖτω, ib.* 12 (of Shemjaza and his companions) *δῆσον αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ἐβδομήκοντα γενεὰς εἰς τὰς ναπὰς τῆς γῆς . . . ἕως συντελεσθῆ κρίμα τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων, ch.* xviii. 14, xix. 1 'at the bounds of heaven and earth is the prison for the stars of heaven which transgressed the commandment of God, and for the angels who connected themselves with women . . . till the day of the great judgment'; xxi. contains a further description of the prison: 'and the place was cleft as far as the abyss being full of great descending columns of fire,' lxxxviii. 1 'the first star which had fallen from heaven was bound hand and foot and laid in an abyss: now that abyss was narrow and

¹ The Gizeh text has τῷ Δ. omitting τῇ ἐρήμῃ (Charles p. 337).

deep and horrible and dark.' Keil thinks there may be a reference to Isa. 24^{21, 22}. 'It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit (*εις δεσμωτήριον*) and shall be shut up in the prison (*εις ὄχυρωμα*), 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 *σιρος*, 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 *σειραις*, which as the substitution of a more elegant word for the common-place *δεσμος*, 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 *σειρα* to the scribes of **N** and **B**, it might easily happen that the former was unconsciously written in the place of the latter. We also find *σειραις* attested by Didymus, Cyril, Ephrem Syr., Procopius, Damascenus, Eucumenius, and Theophylact, as well as by most cursives and versions. The word occurs in the LXX. in the sense of fetters, Prov. 5²² *παρνομίαι ἀνδρα ἀγρευουσι, σειραις δὲ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν ἑκάστος σφιγγεται. Ἰόφου* occurs below v. 17, twice in Jude, once in Heb. 12¹⁸, not in LXX. *παράδιδωμι* is usually followed by a dative of the person, as Mt. 18³⁴ *παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασιανισταῖς*, and an accusative preceded by *εις* of the thing, as Acts 8³ *παρέδιδου εἰς φυλακὴν*, 2 Cor. 4¹¹ *εἰς θάνατον*. We find *παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ* Eph. 4¹⁹, *παρ. ληθῆ 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. 20¹⁻³ *εἶδον ἀγγελοῦ καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα τὴν κλεῖν τῆς ἀβυσσοῦ καὶ ἀλυσὶν μεγάλην . . . καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸν Δρακοντα . . . καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἐτη καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀβυσσον*. Alford illustrates *σειραῖς ζόφου* by Wisdom 17¹⁶ (of the Egyptian plague of darkness) *μία ἀλυσει σκοτοῦς παντες ἐδέθησαν*: the darkness constituted the chain which prevented them from moving: so in v. 2 of the same chapter we have *δεσμοὶ σκοτοῦς καὶ μακρὰς πεδῆται νυκτοῦς* and in v. 15 *ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν ἀσιδήρον εἰρκτὴν κατακλεισθεῖς*.

ταρταρώσας.] *απ. λεγ.* See for the compound *καταταρταρω* Sext. *P.H.* iii. 24. 210 *ὁ Ζεὺς τὸν Κρόνον καταταρτάρωσεν* with the note of Fabricius. In Enoch 20² 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 40¹⁵ *ἐπελθὼν ἐπ' ὄρος ἀκροτομον, 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.

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 Νωχος δε τοῖς πραττομένοις υπ' αὐτῶν δυσχεραίνων . . . επειθεν επι το κρείττον την διάνοιαν αυτους και τας πραξεις μεταφερειν, *Sib. Orac.* i. 128 Νῶε δεμας θάρσυνον ἐόν λαοισι τε πασι κήρυξον μετάνοιαν, οπως σωθωσιν απαντες, where also his sermon is given extending from l. 150 to 200. So Clem. Rom. i. 7 Νῶε εκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν και οι υπακουσαντες ἐσωθησαν, *ib.* 9 Νῶε πιστος εὔρεθεις . . . παλιγγενεσιαν κοσμω ἐκήρυξεν, *Pauli Apocalypsis* (Tisch. p. 68) εγω ειμι Νῶε . . . και ουκ ἐπανσάμην τοῖς ἀνθρωποις κηρυσσειν, Μετανοειτε, ιδου γαρ κατακλυσμος ἐρχεται, *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 ογδοον. 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.

δικαιοσυνης κήρυκα.] The noun κηρυξ occurs in the N.T. in this sense only here and in 1 Tim. 2⁷, and 2 Tim. 1¹¹ εις ο ἐτέθην εγω κηρυξ και ἀπόστολος, but the verb κηρυσσω is common. Clement of Rome (v.) speaks of St. Paul as κήρυξ γενομενος ἐν τῇ ανατολη και ἐν τῇ δυσει, and so Epict. *Diss.* iii. 21. 13 (quoted by Lightfoot *in loco*) calls his ideal philosopher κήρυξ τῶν θεῶν. In the Book of Enoch 12⁴, 15¹, Enoch is addressed as 'Thou scribe of righteousness.' Here δικ. κ. is contrasted with κοσμω ἀσεβῶν. Noah is called ανθρωπος δίκαιος in Gen 6⁹, like Lot below v. 9.

κατακλυσμόν κοσμφ ἀσεβῶν επαξας.] See below 3⁶ ὁ τοτε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις ἀπωλετο and Mt. 24^{38, 39} Lk. 17²⁷, Gen. 6¹⁷, where the same noun is used. For ἐπάξας cf. n. on ἐπάγοντες v. 1, and for the form of the aor. Lk. 13³⁴, Acts 14²⁷, Winer p. 99, Veitch *s.v.* αγω, 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 ἐφυλαξεν: Noah was kept safe in the flood which came on the world of the ungodly.

6. και πόλεις Σοδόμων και Γομόρρας τεφρώσας.] Winer (pp. 666-668) and Blass (p. 98) take this as a *gen. appositionis*, like Rom. 4¹¹ σημειον 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, Σοδομα και Γομορρα και αἱ περὶ αυτας πολεις. I prefer the former explanation, as the latter strictly taken refers only to αι περὶ αυτας πολεις, omitting the principal cities. Probably our author introduced the pleonastic πολεις here from his recollection of Jude. The very rare τεφρώω, meaning either to cover with, or to convert into, ashes (cf. αἰθαλω), is found in the description of an eruption of Vesuvius (Dio Cass. lxxvi. p. 1094) τῶν ἐν μεσω κραυρουμενων (being parched) και

τεφρουμένων (overwhelmed with ashes), Lyc. Cass. 227 τεφρώσας γυια Λημναίω πυρί. ἐκτεφρώω is also used by Strabo and Plutarch. Philo (M. 2. p. 21) uses the word τεφρα of the overthrow of Sodom, whose abnormal sin was followed by abnormal punishment, ημέρα μιᾶ αἰ μὲν ευανδρουσαι πολεις ταφος τῶν οἰκητορων ἐγεγένητο, αἰ δε εκ λιθων καὶ ξυλων κατασκευαὶ τέφρα καὶ λεπτή κονις.

καταστροφήῃ 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. 8³ κατέκρινε την αμαρτιαν ἐν σαρκι, and 1 Cor. 11³² κρινομενοι δε υὑὸ του κυρίου παιδευομεθα, ἵνα μὴ συν τω κοσμω κατακριθῶμεν. Another possible and, I think, a better interpretation is that the dat. καταστροφή should be here taken as the dative of the instrument. In like manner the Lat. abl. is sometimes used with *damnare*, causing occasional ambiguity, as Munro says *l. c.* The sense would then be 'to condemn, or pass sentence upon, by destroying.' Clem. Al. (*Paed.* iii. p. 280), quoting Jude, dwells on the lesson to be derived from the history of Sodom. In Gen. 19²⁴ we have Κυριος ἐβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σοδομα και Γόμορρα θείον και πῦρ παρα Κυριου ἐξ ουρανου, after which follows in v. 25 καὶ κατέστρεψε τας πολεις ταυτας, 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 τεφρωδης, and says that its appearance bears out the story told by the inhabitants that ὑπὸ σεισμῶν και αναφυσηματων πυρος και θερμῶν υδατων ασφαλτωδων τε καὶ θειωδῶν ἢ λιμνη προπεσοι . . . αἰ τε πολεις καταποθειεν, 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 mixtis que 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 τεφρώω 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 ασεβέσιν τεθεικως.] For the reading and construction see Introd. on Text. Compare Clem. Al. 280 ενος δε υποδειγματος μνησθησο-

μαι . . . τὸ Σοδομιτῶν πάθος, κρίσις μὲν ἀδικησασι, παιδαγωγία δε ακουσασιν. Phryn. (p. 42 Lob.) condemns ὑποδ. as un-Attic.

7. καὶ δίκαιον Δῶτ . . . ἐρυσάτο.] Cf. Abraham's pleading in Gen. 18²³ μὴ συναπολέσης δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσεβοῦς, and Wisdom 10⁶ αὐτῆ (σοφία) δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο, φνυγόντα καταβασίον πυρ Πενταπόλεως. The verb occurs again in v. 9; the form ἐρυσάτο is supported by B, see Lightfoot on Col. 1¹³.

καταπονουμενον.] Cf. Acts 7²⁴ ἰδων τινα ἀδικουμενον ημυνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμενῷ, 3 Macc. 2² Κυριε . . . πρόσχες ἡμῖν καταπονουμενοις ὑπὸ ἀνοσίου καὶ βεβηλου, Theophr. Char. 8 τοὺς ακουοντας καταπονουντες ταῖς ψευδολογίαις.

ὑπὸ τῆς των ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς.] 'By the licentious behaviour of the wicked.' For other exx. of a compact articular phrase see Introd. on Grammar and 1⁴ τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν ἐπιθυμία φθορας, where, as here, an ἐν-clause is incorporated: cf. 1 Pet. 3² τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφήν, ἰδ. v. 16 τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν. For the gen. see n. on James 3⁴ ὑπὸ ἀνεμων ἐλαυνομενα, Philo i. p. 609 κατακεντουμενος ὑπο φρενοβλαβείας. ἄθεσμος occurs again in 3¹⁷, alone in N.T., also in 3 Macc. 5¹² τῆς ἀθεσμου προθέσεως διεσφαλμενος, ἰδ. 6²⁰. Not used by classical writers. The cognate ἀθέμιτος is used in 1 Pet. 4³. Philo has ἐκθεσμος in the same sense, cf. Abrah. 369 οχείας ἐκθεσμοὺς μεταδιωκοντες, ἰδ. ἐκφυλοὺς καὶ ἐκθέσμοὺς συνοδοὺς (of Sodom), Gigant. 288 τὰς ἐκνόμοὺς καὶ ἐκθέσμοὺς ομιλίας τε καὶ μιξείας (of the Watchers). It is a stronger word than ἀνομος, because θεσμός is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law.

8. βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.] For the reading see Introd. on Text. The rare εἰκ. is found in Herod. iv. 204 βασιλευς δε σφι ἔδωκε κωμὴν ἐγκατοικῆσαι, Eur. Antiope fr. 198 ἐξ ὧν κενόισιν ἐγκατοικησεῖς δομοῖς. 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 ἐκτετμημενοὶ γλῶσσαν νευμασι καὶ βλέμμασι καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαῖς τοῦ σωματος σχέσεσι καὶ κινήσειν, οὐχ ἦττον τῆς δια λόγων προφοράς, ἀν' ἑλῶσιν ὑποσημαινουσιν. 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 ἕξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.] Cf. Ps. 96²

¹ Perhaps Clem. Al. Q. Div. Serv. p. 950 εἰ βλέπειεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀτενεὶ 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.

ευαγγελίζεσθε ημέραν ἐξ ἡμερας το σωτήριον αυτου, Jer. 52³⁴ a portion was given to him from the king ἐξ ημερας εις ἡμεραν, Gen. 39¹⁰, Numb. 30¹⁵, 2 Clem. R. 11, in a quotation from what is called a *προφητικος λόγος*, which corresponds closely with 2 P. 3⁴ ταυτα παντα ἡκουσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατερων ημῶν, ἡμεις δε ημεραν ἐξ ἡμερας προσοεχομενοι ουδὲν τουτων ἠωρακαμεν. The same passage is quoted with slight variations in 1 Clem. R. 23, where it is introduced as *η γραφη αυτη*. 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. ημερα)*. It is equivalent to the Hebraic *ἡμερα καὶ ημερα* of 2 Cor. 4¹⁶, and *ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν* of Ps. 68¹⁹.

βασανίζω.] Used of testing, questioning, especially by the use of torture; then for bodily pain in general, as Mk. 5⁷ μή με βασανίσης, Wisdom 11⁹ μετ οργης κρινομενοι ἀσεβεις εβασανιζοντο; of disease, Mt. 8⁶ δεινως βασανιζομενος, 1 Sam. 5³ ἐβαρυνθη χεὶρ Κυριου ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀζωτιοὺς καὶ εβασάνισεν αυτους; then of fatigue, Mk 6⁴⁸ βασανιζομενους εν τω ελαυνειν; lastly of mental suffering, as in Plut. *Vit.* 896c, where Antigonus says to a messenger who had been tardy in bringing good news, ουτως ημας βασανίσας δικην υφεξεις 'you shall pay for keeping me so long on tenterhooks,' Ign. *Eph.* 8 οταν μηδεμία επιθυμία ερήρεισται εν υμῖν η δυναμενη υμας βασανισαι, αρα κατα Θεον ζήτε, Clem. AL *Str.* ii. 55, p. 458 μετανοῶν ἐφ' οἷς εδρασεν ουκετι ποιει η λέγει, βασανίζων δε ἐφ' οἷς ημαρτεν την εαυτου ψυχὴν αγαθοεργει, 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. 11³³ ἐτάραξεν εαυτον might seem to be equivalent to Joh. 13²¹ ἐταραχθη τω πνευματι, like the French reflexive verb. Augustin however (quoted by Westcott) gives it a special force 'turbatus est Christus quia voluit,' cf. the play *Ἐαυτον τιμωρουμενος*. Alford on our text compares our use of the phrase 'distress yourself' (so 'vex yourself,' 'trouble yourself,' 'worry yourself,' 'put yourself out'). For *εαυτόν* the writer substitutes *ψυχὴν δικαίαν*, repeating the idea of justice already embodied in *δικαιος*. In an ordinary writer we should have expected *την δικαίαν αυτου ψυχην*, 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 φιλοσοφῆσεν μέλλων εαυτον βασανισας 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 2²³, 1 Cor. 9²¹; (b) of persons who break the law, malefactors, Lk. 22³⁷; (c) of lawless deeds, as here and in Prov. 1¹⁹ οἱ συντελουντες τα ανομα Job. 34¹⁷ ιδε συ τον μισουντα ανομα.

9. οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμου ρυεσθαι.] Here we have the apo-

dosis to *ει γαρ—ουκ εφεισατο* in *v.* 4, modified to suit the second member of the protasis contained in *vv.* 5 and 7 *ἀλλα ογδοον Νῶε εφυλαξεν . . . και δικαιον Λῶτ ἐρυσατο*. Notice the repetition of *ρυσθαι* from *v.* 7. Compare for the general meaning of the passage Ps. 1⁶ *γινωσκει Κυριος οδον δικαίων, και ὁδος ασεβῶν απολειται*; for infin. with *οἶδα* 1 Tim. 3⁵, James 4¹⁷, Mt. 7¹¹; for the meaning of *πειρασμος* James 1² with my note and comments, Apoc. 3¹⁰ *κἀγω σε τηρησω εκ τῆς ωρας του πειρασμοῦ*. Noah and Lot were exposed to trial, as standing alone amid mockers and unbelievers.

ἀδίκους δὲ εις ἡμεραν κρίσεως κολαζομενους τηρειν.] For *ημ. κρίσ.* see 3⁷ and note on Jude *v.* 6. The phrase *κολ. τηρ.* agrees with the account given in 1 Pet. 3¹⁹ of *τοις ἐν φυλακῇ πνευμασιν* who had been disobedient in the days of Noah, to whom Christ preached, *θανατωθεις μὲν σαρκι, ζωοποιηθεις δε πνευματι*, and also with the account of the fallen angels in the Book of Enoch (see n. on *v.* 4 above).

10. *μαλιστα δὲ τους ὀπίσω σαρκος εν επιθυμια μiasμου πορευομένων.*] 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 *ασέλγεια* in *vv.* 2 and 7. For the compact articular phrase see above on *v.* 5. On *οπισω σαρκος* see Jude *v.* 7. The word *οπισω* is often used of following a teacher or leader, as in Mt. 4¹⁹ *δευτε οπισω μου*; so of following Satan in 1 Tim. 5¹⁵, of the worship of Baal in Deut. 4³, Jer. 2²⁵; then of surrendering ourselves to evil practices or passions, as here and in Isa. 65² *τοις πορευομενοις οὐω ου καλῆ, ἀλλ οπισω των αμαρτιῶν αυτων*. 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 *ετρας* is here omitted, unless we suppose it to be represented by *μiasμου*. Alford translates *ἐπιθυμία μiasμου* 'lust of pollution,' which he explains as 'lust hankering after unlawful and polluting use of the flesh.' I think it is more natural to regard it as another instance of the *gen. qualitatis*, so frequent with this author, see above 2¹ on *αιρεσεις ἀπωλειας*. For *πορευομενοι* see on Jude *v.* 16 and cf. 1 Pet. 4³. *μiasμός* found here only in N.T., occurs in Wisdom 14²⁶ *ψυχῶν μiasμός*, 1 Macc. 4⁴³ 'who cleansed the sanctuary and bare out the defiled stones (*τους λίθους του μiasμου*) into an unclean place,' *Test. Levi.* 17. *μιασμα* occurs below *v.* 20, *μιαίνω* in Jude *v.* 8.

κυριοτητος καταφρονηντας.] See n. on Jude *v.* 8. Here it seems most natural to understand *κυρ.* in an abstract sense. Such a variation from Jude's meaning is very common in our author. The leading reference however may be the same, viz., to the irreverence shown towards the angels by the men of Sodom, as well as to the denial of the Lord on the part of the libertines (see 2¹ above).

τολμηται αυθάδεις.] W.H. and Treg. separate the words by a comma. I have followed Nestle's punctuation, taking *αυθ.* as an epithet of *τολμ.* with Bengel, Spitta, and others. In a somewhat similar phrase in Jude 16 *ουτοι εισιν γογγυσται, μεμψιμοιροι*, I have retained the dividing comma, as it seemed to me that the weighty word *μεμψιμοιροι* was

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 *ουκ ἐτολμησεν* and Jos. *Ant.* i. 11. 4, where speaking of the behaviour of the men of Sodom, he says ο *Θεος ἀγανακτησας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς τολμημασι τοὺς μὲν ημαυρωσεν*. So we find *τολμη* joined with *αναισχυντία* in Arist. *Thesmoph.* 702, Isaeus 60 *fin.*, Antipho 123, Plat. *Apol.* 38 D, *αναιδῆς καὶ τολμηρός* in Antipho 122. *τολμητής* is found in Thuc. i. 70 *οὐ μὲν καὶ παραδυναμὶν τολμηταὶ καὶ παραγνωμὴν κινδυνεύουσι*, Plut. V. 988 F *τολμητὰς ὄντας ἀγαθούς*, Jos. *B.J.* iii. 10. 2 *Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν, εἰ καὶ σφοδρὰ τολμηταὶ καὶ θανάτου καταφρονούντες, ἀλλὰ πολέμων ἄπειροι*. The only other place in the N.T. in which *αυθαδῆς* is found is 1 Tit. 17 'the *ἐπίσκοπος* is to be *μη αυθάδης*.'

δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες.] See on Jude 8. For the complementary participle in place of the infinitive (as in Soph. *Oed. Col.* 128 *αὐτὸν τρέμομεν λεγέειν*) see Winer p. 434 foll., and cf. Lycurg. p. 150. 6 *οὐτε τὴν ἀκροπολιν . . . προδίδουσι 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. 66² *τρέμοντα τοὺς λόγους μου*.

11. *ἔπου.*] 'Whereas,' 'seeing that,' lit. 'in a case in which,' as in 1 Cor. 3³ *οπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ζῆλος καὶ ἐρις, οὐχὶ σαρκικοὶ ἐστε;* 4 Macc. 21⁴ (*ὁ νόμος καὶ τῆς φίλων συνθηκῆς δεσπόζει*) *καὶ μὴ νομισθετε παράδοξον εἶναι, οπου γὰρ καὶ ἐχθρὰς ἐπικρατεῖν ὁ λογισμὸς δυνατὰ δια τὸν νόμον, ἰβ.* 63⁴ *δικαίον ἐστὶν ὁμολογεῖν ἡμᾶς τὸ κράτος εἶναι τοῦ λογισμοῦ, οπου γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐξωθεν ἀλγηδόνων ἐπικρατεῖ*. Common in classical writers, as Antipho p. 112 *οπου δὲ μὴ ἠθέλησεν ἔλεγχον ποιήσασθαι τῶν πεπραγμένων, πῶς περὶ γὰρ ὧν οὐκ ἠθέλησε πυθέσθαι, ἐγχεῖται αὐτῷ περὶ τούτων εἶδέναι;* Andocides p. 12 *οπου τοῖνυν ὑποτακτικῶς τοῖς τριακοντα ὠμνυτε μὴ μνησικακῆσαι, τοῖς μεγίστων κακῶν αἰτιοῖς . . . ἢ που σχολῆ τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων πολιτῶν τινὲς ἡξιοῦτε μνησικακεῖν*, Isocrat. p. 164 *οπου γὰρ Ἀθηνοδωρὸς καὶ Καλλιστρατος, ὁ μὲν ἰδιώτης ὢν, ὁ δὲ φυγάς, οἰκίσαι πόλεις οἷοι τε γενοῦσιν, ἢ που βουλευθέντες ἡμεῖς πολλοὺς ἀντοποὺς τοιοῦτους κατασχεῖν δυνήσμεν*, Thuc. viii. 96, Dem. Herod. etc.

ἄγγελοι ἰσχυρὶ καὶ δυνάμει μέλλοντες 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 *ουτε ποσὶν εἶμι ταχὺς οὔτε χερσὶν ἰσχυρὸς* in contrast with the *πόδας ὠκύς* of Homer, cf. Plato *Rep.* v. 473 B *ὀλίγιστοι τὸν ἀριθμὸν, σμικροτάτοι τὴν δύναμιν*, *Symp.* 190 B *ἦν οὖν ταῦτα τὰ γένη ἰσχυρὰ δεινὰ*. See above v. 8 *βλεμματι δίκαιοι* and Blass pp. 117, 118. We find *ἰσχυς* and *δυναμὶς* combined in the ascription in Apoc. 7¹², Deut. 3²⁴, Cant. 27. The latter is the more general word. Our author gives an indefinite reference both to angels and to *δόξαι*, instead of the very

definite reference (in Jude) to the dispute between Michael and Satan about the body of Moses. This vagueness causes ambiguity. What is the object of the comparison in *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 κρισις*, as the *ψευδοδιδασκαλοι* 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 δοξας*) and what is supposed to be unquestioned (that man is inferior to angels).

[οὐ φερουσιν 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 10⁴), and then delegated by them¹ to Enoch (12⁴), and by him announced to Azazel (13¹). Accordingly Spitta's explanation is 'whereas the angels, though greater in power and might (which he

¹ It is not clear that this is done by the four archangels. The *watchers* (*i.e.* the unfallen Watchers) are here said to summon Enoch and enjoin him to visit the fallen Watchers and announce to them the sentence of judgment.

regards as a periphrasis for ἀρχάγγελοι), decline to carry an announcement of degradation (βλάσφημον κρισιν) from the Lord'; and he illustrates this from *Test. Levi* 15 καὶ λήψεσθε ονειδισμον καὶ αἰσχυνὴν 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 παρα 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 κρισιν cf. κρισιν ἐπενεγκεῖν in Jude, and John 18²⁹ τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ¹ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; Acts 25¹⁸ οἱ κατηγοροὶ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν, Acts 25⁷ πολλὰ καὶ βαρῆα αἰτιώματα καταφέροντες, Aristotle *Rhet. Al.* xxx. 12 διαβολὴν καταφέρειν.

12. οὔτοι δέ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα . . . φθαρήσονται.] The expression in Jude v. 10 is far simpler and more natural.

γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν.] 'Born creatures of instinct for capture and destruction.' Cf. Joh. 18³⁷ ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γενενημαί . . . ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, *Juv.* i. 141 'animal propter convivium 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 αποτελευτῶσαι τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κρινοντος ἀπτόμεναι καὶ τοῦ φρονουντος). One would rather have expected σφαγὴν than φθοραν, 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 ἄλωσιν with such passages as 1 *Tim.* 3⁷ ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμπεσῇ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου, 2 *Tim.* 2²⁶ καὶ ἀνανήψουσιν ἐκ τῆς διαβολοῦ παγίδος ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνου θελημα, 2 *Tim.* 3⁶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικαρῖα σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτιαίς, *Eccles.* 10¹², *Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 4. οὐκ οὐν ὁ οὕτω πεπαιδευμένος ἦττον ἀνδοκεῖ σοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἢ τὰ λοιπὰ ζῶα ἀλίσκεσθαι; . . . γαστρι δελεαζόμενα . . . τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀγόμενα πρὸς τὸ δελεᾶν ἀλίσκεται, 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.* 3²⁹. If we are to expand the relative phrase into ἐν τοῖς α, the frequent confusion between εἰς and ἐν in late

¹ B and WH. om. κατὰ.

Greek may account for the use of ἐν here, compare 1 Esdr. 1⁴⁹ ἐξέμυκτηρίσαν 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. 5¹⁵ ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μὴ ἀγνοεῖ. The point of the phrase is explained by *Test. Aser* 7 μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σοδομα, ἣτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο εἰς αἰῶνος.

ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται.] A very rhetorical phrase to express Jude's ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. We may compare it with ἐμπαιγμονὴ ἐμπαικται 3³ below, and Philo i. p. 693 βουλεται διοικισας ημας τῶν σωματικῶν, ἀπερ ἐν ρυσει καὶ φθορᾷ φθειρομένη καὶ φθειρουση θεωρεται, κλήρον ψυχῆς λαβεῖν μετὰ τῶν ἀφθάρτων καὶ ἀφθαροσίας ἀξίων ἀρετῶν. What is the reference in αὐτῶν? Probably we should explain it of τα ἀλογα, 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 (οσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν 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 καταφθαρησονται for καὶ φθαρ., meaning, I suppose, 'their own corrupt hearts will bring about their destruction' But would not this require αὐτῶν or at any rate a more emphatic position for αὐτῶν? Spitta understands αὐτῶν of the δόξαι, who are referred to as κατ' αὐτῶν in v. 11, and explains ἐν οἷς as ἐν τούτοις οὓς (because δόξαι = ἀγγελοι); this ἐν τούτοις is then replaced by ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, depending on καταφθαρησονται; '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 οὐτε τα τῆς σαρκὸς φρονουσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τα τοῦ πνεύματος. το γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος· το δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη, and 1 Cor. 2¹⁴ ψυχικὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπος οὐ δέχεται τα τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν, καὶ οὐ δυνατὰ γινῶναι, οτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται. See further in the Comment.

13. ἀδικουμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας.] For the reading see Introduction on the Text. The reading κομιουμενοι resembles Col. 3²⁵ ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομίζεται ὁ ἠδίκησεν, Barn. iv. 12 ὁ κυριος κρινει τὸν κοσμον· εἰαστος, καθως ἐποίησεν, κομειται . . εἰαν ἡ πονηρος, ὁ μισθος τῆς πονηριας εμπροσθεν αυτου. 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, σπιλοι και μωμοι in v. 13, and καταρας τεκνα 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 καταφθαρησονται, thinks that the participles stand for finite verbs as in Hebrew. Cf. Blass *G.T.* § 79. 10, Jannaris § 2168. If ἀδικουμενοι 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 ἀδικια' (cf. ἀδικους in v. 9), a thought which may have recalled to his mind Rom. 6²³ τα γαρ οψωνια τῆς ἀμαρτιας θανατος, and perhaps Mt. 6² ἀπέχουσιν τον μισθον αυτων. The corresponding verse in Jude speaks of μισθος in connexion with Balaam, and our author uses the phrase μισθος 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. 24¹¹). 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 μισθον ἀδικίας.' The construction ἀδικεῖν τινά τι 'to wrong a person in any way' is common enough, cf. Acts 35¹⁰, Gal. 4¹². But in classical writers the *acc. rei* does not seem to extend beyond the cognate ἀδικημα: μισθον αποστερουμενος would rather have been used for the sense 'defrauded,' which is here supposed. See however Plut. *Cato Mi.* 17 (p. 766) εὔρων χρέα παλαια τω δημοσιω πολλους οφειλοντας και πολλοις το δημόσιον, αμα την πολιν ἔπαυσεν ἀδικουμένην και ἀδικοῦσαν. The R.V. has 'suffering wrong as the hire of wrongdoing,' which is much the way in which it is taken by Dr. Abbott, who would understand ἀδικίαν after ἀδικουμενοι, 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. 18²⁶ 'With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward.' The difficulty of this is that μισθον 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 φθορα, above, and ἐξ υδατος και δι' υδατος in 3⁵.

ἡδονῆν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν.] Here again we have a very ambiguous sentence. Both ἡδονῆ and τρυφή may be taken either in a

good or a bad sense, while *ἐν ἡμέρα* has been variously interpreted. The word *τρυφή* occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Lk. 7²⁵ where *οἱ ἐν ἡματισμῷ ἐνδόξω καὶ τρυφῇ υπάρχοντες* are contrasted with the Baptist, the reference being to a luxurious life with no special blame attached. In James 5⁵ *ετρυφησατε* is joined with *εσπαταλήσατε* in a bad sense, like *εντρυφαω* here. Exx. of *τρυφή* in the bad sense are found in Herm. *Mand.* vi. 5 (of the works of the Evil Angel) *πολυτελεια μεθυσμάτων καὶ ποικιλων τρυφῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμία γυναικων*, *ib.* viii. 3, xi. 12 *ο δοκων πνευμα εχει υψοι ἑαυτον καὶ ἀναιδής ἐστιν καὶ ἐν τρυφαῖς πολλαῖς ἀναστρεφομενος καὶ ἐν ἑτεραις πολλαῖς ἀπαταις, καὶ μισθους λαμβάνει τῆς προφητειας αὐτου*, *ib.* xii. 2 *πᾶσα τρυφή μωρά ἐστι καὶ κενη τοῖς δουλοις τοῦ Θεου*, Sim. vi. 2 *οὗτος ἀγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ἐστιν*, *ib.* 2 *πορευονται ἀπαταις καὶ τρυφαῖς ματαίαις*, *ib.* iv. 4 *τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ὡρα ἐστὶ μία, τῆς δὲ βασάνου ἡ ὡρα ἡμερῶν δυναμιν εχει*, and so *passim*. On the other hand *τρυφή* is used of the gifts of wisdom in Prov. 4⁹ *ἵνα δῶ τῇ σῆ κεφάλῃ στέφανον χαριτων, στεφανω δὲ τρυφῆς ὑπερασπιση σου*, and of the divine blessing in Ps. 36⁸. 'Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures' (*τὸν χειμάρρον τῆς τρυφῆς σου ποτιεις αὐτους*), moreover the garden of Eden is called *ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς* (Gen. 2¹⁵, 3^{13, 24}, Ezek. 31⁹). In the N.T. *ἡδονή* is used only in a bad sense, see Lk. 8¹⁴, Tit. 3³, James 4^{1, 3}. In one place in the LXX. (Prov. 17¹) it has a good sense, *κρείσσων ψωμος μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ἢ οἶκος πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν μετα 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 *του παροντος καὶ νομισθέντος αγαθου φαντασία διεγείρει τὴν ψυχὴν . . . καλεῖται δὲ τούτο τὸ πάθος ἡδονῆς*, M. 1. p. 39 *σπενδει παν ζων ὡς ἐπὶ ἀναγκαιοτατον καὶ συνεκτικωτατον τελος, ἡδονῆς, καὶ μάλιστα ἀνθρωπος*, or Aristotle's (*Eth. N. x. 4*) *πασαν ενεργειαν τελειοι ἡ ἡδονῆς*. 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 bestimmt ist, mit Schwelgen hinzubringen für Vergnügen achten sie.' For the phrase *ἐν ἡμέρα* cf. 3 Macc. 5¹¹ *ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡμερα*, Rom. 13¹³ *ὡς ἐν ἡμέρα ευσχημόνως περιπατησωμεν, μὴ κωμοῖς καὶ μεθαις, μὴ κοιταις καὶ ἀσελγειαῖς*, 1 Th. 5⁸ *ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νηφωμεν*, also Joh. 9⁴ *εὼς ἡμερα ἐστὶν*, Joh. 11⁹ *εἴαν τις περιπατῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμερα, οὐ προσκοπτει*. The more usual expression in classical Greek would be *ἡμέρας* or *μεθ' ἡμέραν*. For the thought see Isa. 5¹¹, Eccles. 10¹⁷. 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 ἡμέρα 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.

‘Als Lustbarkeit betrachten die Libertiner die tagliche 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. 26⁵⁵, Lk. 11³, (2) that there is nothing wrong in a man’s finding pleasure in his daily bread (Eccles. 5¹⁸), but rather in a morose refusal to enjoy what God has provided for enjoyment (1 Tim. 4⁴). 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 μωμοί.] σπιλος is late Greek for the classical κηλῖς (Phryn. p. 28 Lob.), used of moral defect in Eph. 5²⁷ ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἐάντῳ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσιν σπίλον ἢ ρυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ ἀγία καὶ ἀμωμος; 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 τοὺς δυσεκαθάρτους σπίλους ἀποβλεπόντες οἱ πολλοὶ δυσχεραίνουσι. The adjective ἀσπιλος is used below 3¹⁴, also in 1 Pet. 1¹⁹ τιμῶ ἀἵματι, ὡς ἀμνου ἀμωμον καὶ ἀσπιλου, Χριστοῦ, as well as in 1 Tim. 6¹⁴, James 1²⁷; and the verb σπιλοῦν in Jude 23, James 3⁶. As the word σπιλας in the parallel passage of St. Jude is also found in the sense of σπιλος in one solitary passage, so the σπιλος of 2 P. is also found, though rarely, in the sense of σπιλας, 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 μωμος see note on Jude v. 24, and Lev. 21²¹ πᾶς ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ μωμος . . . οὐκ ἐγγιῆ τοῦ προσευχεῖν τὰς θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ σου, οὐ μωμος ἐν αὐτῷ, where it refers to ritual blemish: in Sir. 11³¹ προσεχε ἀπο κακούργου . . . μῆποτε μωμον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα δῶ σοι, ib. 18¹⁴ ἐν ἀγαθοῖς μὴ δῶς μωμον, ib. 20²³ μῶμος πονηρὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ψευδὸς it is used as in profane Greek, in the sense of ‘blame,’ ‘reproach,’ ‘disgrace.’ With the exclamatory σπίλοι καὶ μωμοί may be compared τολμηταὶ ἀνθαδαί in v. 10, καταρᾶς τέκνα in v. 14, and the denunciatory terms introduced by οὗτοι εἰσὶν in v. 17 and Jude vv. 12, 16.

ἐντροφᾶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. Cf. Isa. 55² ἐντροφήσει ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν (good sense), ‘Let your soul delight itself in fatness’ R.V., 57⁴ ἐν τίνι ἐντροφήσατε; (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 δαλεάζοντες ψυχὰς 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 ραπτᾶ, ἐφ’ ὧν καθίζουσιν οἱ Περσῶν μαλακῶς, ἡσυχυθη ἐντροφήσαι, and Philo M. 1 p. 232 ἐνευφραίνεται καὶ ἐντροφᾶ προ τῶν ἀλλῶν, ἀμιγέσι καὶ ἀκρατοῖς ἔτι δὲ ἀρτίοις καὶ πληρεσι κεχορημενὸς ἀγαθοῖς; in which case ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις might be joined with συννεωχουμένοι to explain how it happened that the libertines were

admitted to the feasts of believers. On the whole however I prefer Hofmann's rendering.

συνευωχουμένοι υμιν.] The participle denotes the circumstances of the preceding action. The phrase ἡ ἐπουράνιος ευωχία 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. 5²⁸ πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἡδὴ ἐμοιχεύσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Plut. *Mor.* 528 Ε ὁ μὲν ρήτωρ τὸν ἀναίσχυντον οὐκ εἶπε κορας ἐν τοῖς ὀμμασιν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ πορνᾶς (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 μεστος see Mt. 23²⁸ ἐσθθεν μεστοί εστε ὑποκρίσεως, Rom. 1²⁹ μεστοὺς φθονοῦ, Prov. 6³⁴, Xen. *Symp.* i. 13. μοιχαλὶς found in Rom. 7³, James 4⁴, Mt. 12³⁹, and late Greek writers (see Phryn. p. 452 Lob.) instead of the classical μοιχευτρία. The reading μοιχαλίας found in N A and some versions is a vox nihili.

ἀκαταπαυστοὺς ἀμαρτίας.] For readings see Introd. on Text. For the construction cf. 1 Pet. 4¹ πέπνυται ἀμαρτίας, and γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας below: see my note on James 1¹³ ἀπειραστος κακῶν. The late word ἀκ. is only found here in biblical Greek. It is used by Polyb. 4. 17. 4, Plut. *Mor.* 114 Ε ἀκαταπαύστῳ συμφορὰ συνεσόμεθα, *ib.* 924 Β, *Vitae* p. 734 C ἡ μοναρχία τὸ ἀκαταπαυστὸν προσλαβουσα, *ib.* 1039 C ἀκαταπαυστος ἀρχῆ. The classical equivalent is ἀπαυστος, used with gen. by Eur. *Suppl.* 82 ἀπαυστος γῶν.

δεδείξαντες ψυχὰς ἀστήρικτους.] For the rare late Greek ἀστήρικτος see below (3¹⁶), and n. on στηρίζω (1¹²): it is used by Longinus ii. 2 (great wits) δίχα ἐπιστημῆς ἀστήρικτα καὶ ἀνερματιστα. For δελ. see below v. 18, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 4 quoted above on v. 12, and my n. on James 1¹⁴.

καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες.] Cf. Heb. 5¹⁴ τῶν διὰ τὴν ἐξίτητα αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν. Wetstein illustrates the construction from Philostratus *Heroic.* iii. p. 688 θαλαττῆς οὐπὼ γεγυμνασμένοι, *ib.* iv. p. 696 πολέμων πολλῶν γεγυμνασμένος, *ib.* xi. p. 708 σοφίας ἡδὴ γεγυμνασμένος, Alford adds Clem. *Hom.* iv. 7 πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐξησκημένος, Hes. *Op.* 649 ναυτιλῆς 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.

κατάρτας τεκνα.] For this Hebraism = κατάρτατοι, cf. τεκνα ὑπακοῆς 1 Pet. 1¹⁴, τεκνα ὀργῆς Eph. 2³, τεκνα φωτός *ib.* 5⁸, τεκνα ἀπωλείας Isa. 57⁴, τεκνα ἀδικίας Hos. 10⁹, and οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας Eph. 2², 5⁶, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας 2 Th. 2³, Joh. 17¹², Winer p. 298 f. Spitta quotes Ps. 95¹⁰ ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ὡς ὠμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου εἰ εἰσελευσονται. For κατάρτας cf. Deut. 11²⁶ ἴδου ἐγὼ διδωμί

ἐνώπιον υμῶν σήμερον τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν, Ps. 109 ἐνεουσατο κατάραν ὡς ἱμάτιον, καὶ εισηγήθηεν ὡσεὶ ὕδωρ εἰς τὰ ἐγκατα αὐτοῦ. It seems better to connect this phrase with what follows rather than with what precedes.

15. καταλείποντες εὐθείαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν.] For the readings see *Introd.* on *Text.* For the metaphorical ὁδός see above on v. 2, 1 Sam. 12²³ δείξω ὑμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ τὴν εὐθείαν, Ezra 8²¹ ζητήσαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδὸν εὐθείαν ἡμῖν, Ps. 107⁷, Isa. 30²¹, Hos. 14⁹ εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δικαιοὶ πορευσονται ἐν αὐταῖς, Acts 13⁹ (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. 2²⁵.

ἐξακολούθησαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βόσorp.] See *Introd.* on *Text.* For ἐξάκ. cf. above 1¹⁶, 2². For Balaam see n. on Jude v. 11. Alford compares Num. 22³² οὐκ ἀστεία ἡ ὁδός σου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ.

ὁς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἤγαπησεν.] See *Introd.* on *Text.* For a similar use of ἀγαπάω cf. Lk. 11⁴³. 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 ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία (3⁴) and πᾶσα ἀδικία ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν (5¹⁷) with Westcott's notes 'Sin is the assertion of a selfish will against a paramount authority,' 'By whatever acts, internal or external, man falls short of God's will, as it is spiritually apprehended, he sins.' So here Balaam is guilty of παρανομία because he consents to ἀδικία.

16. ἔλεγξεν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας.] The only other recorded instances of ἔλεγγις in biblical Greek are in Job 21⁴ μὴ ἀνθρώπου μου ἡ ἔλεγγις; 'is my complaint of man?', *ib.* 23² ἐκ χειρὸς μου ἡ ἐλεγγις ἐστὶ; where R. V. has 'even to-day is my complaint rebellion.' Cf. Philostratus *Vit. Ap.* ii. p. 74 οὐ πικρὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐλεγγεῖς ἦν. Here ἐχω is used with the noun as a sort of periphrastic passive of the cognate verb, as in αἰτιαν ἐχω. For ἰδιος see above on 1³ ἰδία δόξη., Winer p. 191 f., Jannaris *Gr. Gr.* §§ 1416 f. Dr. Bigg after Huther and Hofmann regards it as merely equivalent to αὐτοῦ, comparing Mt. 22⁵ οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἰδίον ἀγρὸν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ. There can be no doubt however that in the great majority of instances in the N. T. ἰδιος retains its emphatic force, and so the R. V. has 'own' both here and in Mt. 22. Weiss translates it 'eine Zurechtweisung der ihm charakteristischen παρανομίας,' Dietlein 'die ihm als Urbilde der Lügenpropheten eigene παρανομία,' Wiesinger 'er der andern ein Prophet war, musste durch eine Eselin sich die eigene παρανομ. vorhalten lassen,' Keil 'ιδίας 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 hatte 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.'

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. 5²² παρανομίαι ἀνδρα ἀγρευουσιν, *ib.* 10²⁶ ὡς περ κάπνος ὀμμασιν, οὕτως παρανομία τοῖς χρωμένοις αὐτῇ.

ὑποζυγίον . . . ἐκάλυπεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.] An example of confirmatory asyndeton, which would have been more usually expressed by the gen. abs. υποζυγίου κωλυσαντος. The indefinite ὑποζυγίον 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. 21⁵, Exod. 4²⁰, 20¹⁷, 23^{4, 5}, Josh. 6²¹, Jud. 1¹⁴, Job 24³. Among the Greeks and Romans the term υποζυγίον 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 υποζυγίον 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 ἀφωνος 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. 14¹⁰ ἀφωνος 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 4¹⁸. The aorist participle is taken by Alford and others as contemporary with the aorist verb following, but ἐκάλυπεν 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 13³ νηστευσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι . . . ἀπέλυσαν and *Introd.* on Grammar.

ἐκάλυπεν 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 φρην is -οσυνη, as παραφροσυνη in Plat. *Soph.* 228 D, from παράφρων 'delirious' (another form is παραφρονησις LXX. Zach. 12⁴); sometimes -ονη as in ευφρόνη, ἀφρονη, 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 ἀδημοσυνη) from ἀδήμων, γειτονία (rarely γειτοσυνη) from γείτων, εὐδαιμονία and κακοδαιμονία (very rarely εὐ- and κακο-δαιμοσυνη) from δαιμων, ἀπημονία as well as ἀπημοσυνη from ἀπήμων. Probably the author was led to select the form παραφρονία from the assonance to

the preceding *παρανομία*. Philo i. p. 609 speaks of Balaam as *κατακεντουμενος υπο φρενοβλαβειας τῆς εαυτου*.

17. οὗτοι εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνδρῳ καὶ ομίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι.] For οὗτοι εἰσιν see n. on J. 16. The author may have thought that, in splitting up the metaphor, he was adding clearness and point to the parallel in Jude v. 12. For the former metaphor cf. Job 6¹⁵, Jer. 14³ foll., for the latter Job 7⁹, 30¹⁵, Hos. 6⁴, 13³. *λαίλαψ* is used of the storm on the Lake of Galilee in Mk. 4³⁷, Lk. 8²³. It seems an unnecessarily strong expression here. Compare however Wisdom 5¹⁴ *ἐλπίς ἀσεβοῦς ὡς φερόμενος χνοῦς ὑπο ἀνεμου, καὶ ὡς παχνη ὑπο λαίλαπος διωχθεῖσα λεπτή*. Philo i. p. 611 uses it metaphorically *λαίλαπι κενῆς δόξης μὴ αναρπασθῆναι*. We should hardly think of a mist as promising rain, indeed Aristotle (*Meteor.* i. 9. 4) asserts the contrary, *ομίχλη σημεῖον μαλλον ἐστὶν εὐδίας ἢ υδατων οἶον γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ομίχλη νεφέλη ἀγονος*, and so in the *De Mundo* i. p. 394a; Plato however defines *ὀμίχλη* as *το ἐξ ἀερος εἰς ὕδωρ ἰον*, and is on this account condemned by Theophrastus (*De Sensu et Sensibili* §§ 90), who makes a mist a sign of fine weather, *ὅταν ομίχλη γένηται, ὕδωρ οὐ γίνεται, ἡ ἐλαττον* (*De Signis* c. 4).¹ Possibly the author may have had in his mind Gen. 2⁶, where a mist is said to have supplied the place of rain in the garden of Eden. For *ἐλαυν.* see n. on James 3⁴.

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετῆρηται.] 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 3⁶ (*ἐπὶ τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου*) *δια τοῦτο νυξ ὑμῖν ἐστὶ ἐξ ὀρασεως καὶ σκοτία ἐστὶ ὑμῖν ἐκ μαντείας καὶ οὐσεταὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφῆτας κ.τ.λ.* contrasting it with Dan. 12³.

18. ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιοτήτος φθεγγόμενοι.] For *υπερογκα* see note on Jude ver. 16. The verb *φθεγγομαι* 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. 4² *ἵνατι ἀγαπατε ματαιότητα*; Ps. 39⁶ *τὰ σύμπαντα ματαιότης*, Eccles. 1² *ματ. ματαιότητων*, Rom. 8²⁰ *τῆ ματαιότητι ἢ κτισὶς ὑπεταγῆ*, where it is used of what is empty, passing, and transient. In Ps. 26⁴ *οὐκ ἐκαθισα μετασυνεδρίου ματαιότητος*, Ps. 119³⁷ *ἀποστρέψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν ματαιότητα*, Ps. 144⁸ *ὡν τὸ στομα ἐλάλησε ματαιότητα*, Eph. 4¹⁷ *μηκετι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοοῦ 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. 4¹⁰ *φυγῶμεν ἀπο πάσης ματαιότητος*, Polyc. *ad Philipp.* 7 *διο 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*.

γαρ 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.

δελιάζουσιν 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 σαρκος*, as in Eph. 2³, 1 Pet. 2¹¹ *ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν*, where Hort says 'this is the only place in the Epistle where St. Peter uses *σαρξ* 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. 5¹⁹ 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. 13¹⁴ *τῆς σαρκος προνοιαν μὴ ποιεισθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας*, Gal. 5¹⁶ *πνευματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμιαν σαρκος οὐ μὴ τελεσητε*, *ib.* *v.* 24 *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταυρωσαν συν τοῖς παθημασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*, 1 Joh. 2¹⁶, above *v.* 10 *τοὺς ὀπισθω σαρκος ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμου πορευομένους*. It might seem also that since *ἐπιθυμία*, though commonly used in a bad sense, is a neutral word to start with, while *ἀσελγεία* is always bad, it was more appropriate to define the former by adding *σαρκος*. 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 *ε* *τις ἀνὴρ ὑπέμεινε τὴν ἀσελγείαν τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἡμετέρων*, where it refers to tyrannical treatment of the allies, *ib.* 398 *β*, where it refers to striking, *ib.* 240 *β* *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), *ἀσελγεία περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας*, to which *σαρκος 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, *ἀσελγεία* the bait itself. Or, perhaps, it is better to take ἐν as expressing generally the way in which they seek to ensnare their victims (through their lusts as distinguished, say, from ambition or curiosity), and the dative *ἀσελγείαις* as the precise means employed to attain this result.¹ Cf. 1 Pet. 4³ *τὸ βουλευμα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, κ.τ.λ.*

τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους.] 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. μiasμου*.

present (with most authorities) or the aorist participle (with K L P etc.)? (2) what is the force of *ολίγως*? If we read *ἀποφευγοντας*, it implies an inferior degree of Christian progress, especially if we give to *ολίγως* 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 *ἀποφυγοντες τα μiasματα του κόσμου* and in 1⁴ *ἀποφυγοντες τῆς ἐπιθυμια φθορας*, we get an exhortation which is suited to the general body of the Church, and which would agree better with other interpretations of *ολίγως* mentioned below. This rare adverb is found in *Anthol.* xii. 205. 1 *παις τις ολιως ἀπαλος του γείτονος ουκ ολιγως* ('in no slight degree') *με κνίζει*, Isa. 10⁷ *ἐξολοθρενσαι ἔθνη ουκ ολιγα* (*Aquila ολίγως*). 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. *Αρῆ.* ii. 7 *τα εν πολλω χρόνω λεπτυνόμενα σώματα νωθρῶς ἐπανατρεφειν δεῖ. τα δε ἐν ολίγω ὀλιγως* 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 *ὀλιγως* the sense of *ὀλιγου*, and read *ἀποφυγόντας*, 'those who had all but escaped.'¹ The other reading *οντως ἀποφυγόντας* is illustrated by Arist. *Vespaer* 997 *οντως ἀπεφυγεν*.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 *δεδεάζουσιν*, and that the clause would then be a rather futile periphrasis for *εαυτους*. Spitta answers this by referring to 1³ where *του καλεσαντος* refers, if not to the preceding *αὐτοῦ*, yet to *Ἰησου* in v. 2. In the similar passages 3¹⁷ *τη τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθεντες*, 2⁷ *τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς*, and 2¹⁴ *δεδεάζοντες ψυχας αστηρικτους*, 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 Δ, where the MSS. have *τῶν πάντων ουκ ὀλίγως ἐνδεεστερως τιμωσιν ἤπερ ημεῖς*, Buttman, reading *ὀλίγω*, 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 *νωθρως lente*.

Weiss, who understands the verse of recent converts 'die sich noch lange nicht ganz von der Gemeinschaft heidnischen Lebens losgesagt haben'; Hundhausen 'οι 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 kodern'; and so Wiesinger, Alford, Schott, Bruckner, 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 ἀποφυγοντας, 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 ἀποφυγοντας τα μiasματα του κοσμου.¹ The word πλάνη would suit either interpretation. It is used of heretics below 3¹⁷ and Jude *v.* 11; of heathens in Rom. 1²⁷, Barn. 14⁵ Ἰησους τας παραδεδομενας τῇ τῆς πλάνης ανομία ψυχας ημῶν λυτρωσάμενος εκ του σκοτους, and generally.

19. ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς επαγγελλόμενοι.] The participle gives a further explanation of the phrase δελεάζουσιν ἀσελγειαῖς, see quotations in n. on Jude *v.* 4.

αὐτοὶ δούλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορας.] The participles επαγγ. and υπ. are contrasted by asyndeton instead of by μεν and δε. For φθορά see Rom. 8²¹ and Appendix below.

ἢ γάρ τις ἠττήται, τουτῶ δεδούλωται.] The act. ηττάω is found in Polyb. and later writers: the pass. is used with the dat. (not of the personal agent, which is expressed by ὑπο with gen. as in 2 Macc. 10²⁴, but of an overmastering feeling) in Ael. *N.A.* xiii. 22 ἐλέφαντες αγρυπνοι και υπνω μὴ ηττωμενοι πιστοτατοι φυλάκων, Plut. *Vit.* 766 ἠττωμενος τοις δικαιοις 'defeated on the merits of the case,' even by Thuc. iii. 38 ἀκοῆς ἠδονῆ ἠσώμενοι, and vii. 25. 9. δουλόω is followed, like δουλευω, by the dat. of the remoter object, cf. Mt. 6²⁴ οὐδεις δυναται δυσιν κυρίοις δουλευειν, 1 Cor. 9¹⁹ πασιν ἐμαυτον ἐδουλωσα, Rom 6¹⁸ ἐδουλωθητε τῇ δικαιοσυνη, Tit. 2³ οἶνω πολλῶ δεδολωμενας, 1 Sam. 17⁹ (the challenge of Goliath) ἐαν εγω πατάξω αὐτον, ἔσεσθε ημιν εις δουλους, Joh. 8³⁴ πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν την αμαρτίαν δούλος εστιν τῆς αμαρτίας, Rom. 6¹⁶, Tit. 3³, Plato *Phaedr.* 238 E, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 8, Julian *Orat.* vi. p. 198 βιον αιδοις και γαστρι δουλευοντα. Estius remarks 'ex jure belli victor victum et captum sibi faciebat mancipium.'

20. εἰ γαρ ἀποφυγοντες τα μiasματα του κόσμου.] We naturally suppose

¹ Spitta's objection to this view is founded on the assumption that the Epistle is addressed to Jewish converts, as to which see Introduction.

the subject to be continued from *επαγγελλόμενοι* and *δεδεμένοι*, as Schott, Keil, Kuhl, 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 *αποφυγοντες* here must refer to *τους ολιγως αποφευγοντας* of v. 18. It would seem however that the persons here spoken of have got beyond the stage of progress implied in *ολιγ. αποφ.* even if we read the aorist there. They have obtained a fuller knowledge of Christ (*εν επιγνωσει του κυριου*) and of the way of salvation (*την οδον της δικαιοσυνης επιγνωουσιν*), see above 1² 3. The force of *γαρ* is seen in the apodosis, 'their last state is worse than the first,' which confirms the preceding statement that they are *δουλοι της φθορας*. No doubt is implied by the hypothetical form (*ει γαρ ηττωνται . . . γέγονεν αυτοις*): it simply expresses a general principle. For *μiasma* 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 1⁴ *αποφυγόντες της εν τω κοσμω εν επιθυμια φθορας* and 1 Pet. 4³.

εν επιγνωσει του κυριου και σωτηρος Ιησου Χριστου. 1 See on 1³ and 3¹⁸.

τουτους δε παλιν εμπλακέντες ηττωνται.] The participles *εμπλακέντες* and *αποφυγοντες* are opposed to one another by *δε*: the emphatic *τουτοις* is used instead of *αυτοις* because of the intervening clause. It is governed by *εμπλακέντες* and must be understood with *ηττωνται*. For *εμπλ.* see 2 Tim. 2⁴, the only other passage in which it occurs in N.T., *ουδεις στρατευόμενος εμπλεκεται ταις του βίου πραγματαις*. It is found once in LXX. *ο σκολιαις οδοις πορευομενος εμπλακησεται* Prov. 28¹. So Eur. *Hipp.* 1236 *ηγίαισιν εμπλακεις*.

γέγονεν αυτοις τα εσχατα χειρονα των πρώτων.] This is the moral of the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (Mt. 12⁴⁵, Lk. 11²⁶). Cf. Heb. 6⁴ 8, 10⁶, n. on Jude v. 5, Herm. *Sim.* ix. 17. 5 *τινες εξ αυτων εμιαναν εαυτους . . . και παλιν εγενοντο οιοι προτερον ησαν, μαλλον δε και χειρονες*, *ib.* 18².

21. *κρείττον γαρ ην αυτοις μη επεγνωκέναι την οδον της δικαιοσύνης.*] For the omission of *αν* 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. 5¹⁰ *ωφειλετε αρα εκ του κοσμου εξελθειν* 'then must ye needs go out of the world,' Heb. 9²⁶ *επει εδει αυτον πολλακις παθειν* 'else must he often have suffered,' Rom. 7⁷ *την επιθυμιαν ουκ ηδειν* ('I had not known sin'), *ει μη ο νόμος ελεγεν Ουκ επιθυμήσεις*, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 4 *αισχρον ην*. More frequently *κρείττον* is used with the present, or the verb is omitted, as in 1 Cor. 7⁹ *κρείττον εστιν γαμειν η πυρουσθαι*, 1 Pet. 3¹⁷ *κρείττον αγαθοποιουντας πασχειν η κακοποιουντας*, Exod. 14¹², Prov. 25²⁴, Xen. *Oecon.* 20. 9 *προκαταλαμβανειν τα επικαιρα κρείττον η μη*. For the phrase cf. above 2² *η οδος της αληθειας*, v. 15 *καταλειποντες την ευθειαν οδον*, Mt. 21³² *ηλθεν Ιωάννης προς υμᾶς εν οδω δικαιοσυνης*, Prov. 21¹⁶, Job. 24¹³.

η επιγνωουσιν υποστρέψαι.] For the dative instead of the acc. with inf. see Acts 15²⁶ *εδοξεν ημῖν . . . εκλεξαμενοις (αλ. -μένους) ανδρας πέμψαι προς υμας*, *ib.* 27³ *επετρεψεν (τω Παυλω) προς τους φιλους πορευθεντι (αλ.*

-θεντα) ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν, Blass pp. 241 f. For υποστρέψαι εκ see Acts 12²⁵.

ἐκ τῆς παραδοθεισῆς αυτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς.] Cf. note and comment on Jude v. 3 ἐπαγωνιζέσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεισῇ τοῖς ἁγίοις πιστεῖ, and the use of ἐντολή below in 3² and 1 Tim. 6¹⁴, 1 Joh. 3²³. 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. 21²¹ τὸ τῆς συκῆς 'the case of the fig-tree,' James 4¹⁴ τὸ τῆς αὐριον, Xen. *Oecon.* 16. 7 ἀνεμνησθῆναι τὸ τῶν ἀλιέων, οὐκ ἀλαττοῦργοι οὐκ ὁμοῦς . . . τὴν μὲν κακὴν γῆν ψεγοῦσι, τὴν δ' ἀγαθὴν ἐπαινοῦσι, Plato *Phaedr.* 230 C πάντων δὲ κομψοτάτον τὸ τῆς πόας οὐκ ἰκανὴ πέφυκε κ.τ.λ. Wetstein quotes Lucian *Dial. Mort.* viii. 1 τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὃ νεβροσ τον λέοντα. For συμβ. cf. 1 Cor. 10¹¹ ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινον ἐκεῖνοις.

κυων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἔξεραμα.] This proverb is found in Prov. 26¹¹ ὡσπερ κυων οὐκ ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐμετον καὶ μισητὸς γένηται, οὕτως ἀφρων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κακίᾳ ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίαν. It is the nature of proverbs, as being familiar to everybody, to suffer abbreviations, like οὐκ ὀνοσ προσ λυραν, 'a stitch in time,' etc. : so here we must supply such a thought as 'the renegade is ὡσ κυων.' For ἐπιστρέψας cf. Gal. 4⁹ πῶσ ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τα πτωχα στοιχεῖα ; The only other recorded exx. of ἔξεραμα 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 ἔξερα τὸ ὕδωρ of emptying the clepsydra, Plut. *Mor.* 904 ἀερα θυραζε ἐξεράω of expelling the air from the lungs, Arist. *Vesp.* 993 φερ' ἐξεράσω τας ψηφους 'let me pour out the voting pebbles from the urn,' *ib.* *Ach.* 341. So κατεξεράω Epict. iii. 13. 23 μὴ κατεξεράω αυτων τὸ σαυτου φλέγμα, *ib.* iii. 21. 6 ἀκουσατε μου σχολια λενοντος. ὑπαγε, ζῆτει τινων κατεξεράσεις, cf. μετεράω, διεράω. Warfield notes that ἐξεράω is used by Aquila in Levit. 18²⁸ '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. 26¹¹ 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 αυτου ακρασιας, ἀλλα βουληθεῖς ὡσ κυων ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον ἐμετον ἐπιστρέφειν, προφάσεις τινας ἐπεινοει, which seems to be taken from this passage with the change of ἔξεραμα into the more common word.

ὅσ 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. 440³⁸ Duncker), speaking of Zephyrinus and Callistus προς μὲν ὄραν αἰδουμενοι και ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγομενοι (? συνεχομενοι) ὠμολόγουν, μετ' οὐ πολυ δε ἐπὶ τὸν αυτον βορβορον ἀνεκυλίοντο. Dr. Bigg however, following Spitta, takes the sense to be 'not

that the creature has washed itself clean in water (as the R. V.), still less that it has been washed clean (as A. V.)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 *τας δ' υας καὶ το λουεσθαι ἐν πηλω (παινει)*. 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 *τα εσχάτα χειρονα των πρωτων*, whereas Dr. Bigg recognizes no distinction of first and last. Moreover *λ. εις κυλισμον* 'bathe into a wallowing' would be an extremely harsh construction; we should have expected *βορβόρω* or *ἐν βορβορω*. It is true we find *ελουετο εις τους κοιρους λουτρῶνας*, 'he used to go to the common baths to bathe' (Ath. 438 E), but *εις κυλισμον* 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 uncleanness 'from the evident signs of enjoyment he manifests when scrubbed and washed: when pigs are served so once a week it helps very considerably to keep them in health.'² *βόρβωρος* is found in biblical Greek only in Jer. 38^b (LXX. 45^b) of the miry dungeon in which the prophet was confined. Both *κυλισμόν* read by most editors, and *κυλισμα*, 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 *κυλιστρα*, which is used by Xen. *de Re Eq.* v. 3 of a rolling place for horses.

Vorst (*de Adag. N.T.* c. 4) adds the following illustrations of the proverb, Lucr. vi. 975 *fol. nobis caenum teterrima cum sit spurcicies, eadem subus haec iucunda videtur, insatiabiliter toti ut volvuntur ibidem*, Clem. Al. *Protr.* p. 75 *οι δε περι τελματα καὶ βορβόρους, τα ηδονης ρευματα, καλινδουμενοι ανονητους εκβόσκονται τροφάς, υωδεις τινες ανθρωποι. υες γαρ, φησιν, ηδονται βορβορω μαλλον η καθαρω υδατι*. Compare Bywater's note on Heracl. *Fr.* liv *βορβορω χαιρειν*, 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, *τον δ' ἐπει οδν δμωαι λουσαν και χρισαν ελαιω*, 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 *αλειπτης* 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.

Err. 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* ἀπελθε καὶ χοίρω διαλέγου ἵν ἐν βορβορῳ μὴ κυλίηται . . . μήτι ἵππος κυλίεται ἐν βορβόρῳ, μήτι κυων γενναίος;

III. 1. Here the writer turns away from the Libertines and their victims to the faithful members of the Church, as Jude does in *v. 17*, both marking the transition by the use of the word 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. 21¹⁴ τοῦτο ἡδη τρίτον ἐφανερῶθη Ἰησοῦς, Hom. Od. ii. 89, Plato Prot. 309 D.* For a discussion as to the earlier letter here alluded to, see Introduction.

ἐν αἰς.] *Constr. ad sensum* ‘in both of which,’ cf. below *v. 6 δι’ ὧν*, which some explain of *υδατος, Acts 15³⁶ κατα πόλιν πασαν ἐν αἰς κατηγορηλαμεν τὸν λόγον, Winer p. 177, Jelf § 819 foll.*

διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.] Repeated from 1¹³. 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 17¹⁷ Ἀβρααμ ἐγέλασεν καὶ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ* ‘said in his heart,’ *Deut. 6⁵ ἀγαπήσεις Κυριον τον Θεον ἐξ ολης τῆς διανοίας σου, Num. 15³⁹ ου διαστραφησεσθε οπισω τῶν διανοιῶν υμων,* and in N.T. *Col. 1²¹ ἐχθρους τη διανοια,* *1 Pet. 1¹³ αναζωσάμενοι τας οσφυας 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 εἰλικρινης τις αν εἴη αδικια η αχαριστια* ‘ingratitude would be the essence of injustice,’ *Plat. Symp. 211 E* *ει τω γενοιτο το καλον ιδειν εἰλικρινές*; and lastly of ethical purity, as in *Phaedo 81 c*, where the *ψυχη εἰλικρινης* is contrasted with the *ψυχη μεμιασμενη καὶ ακαθαρτος*. 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. 1¹⁰ ινα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ απροσκοποι*, and the same is true of the substantive in *1 Cor. 5⁸ ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀζυμοις εἰλικρινιας και ἀληθειας,* *2 Cor. 1¹², 2²⁷*. It is also found in *Wisdom 7²⁰ (σοφία ἐστίν) απορροια της του παντοκρατορος δόξης εἰλικρινής*. Perhaps it should be translated here ‘pure,’ uncontaminated by the poisonous principles of the libertines.

2. *μνησθῆναι των προειρημένων ρημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν.*] For the exegetic infinitive following on *διεγειρω ἐν υπομνήσει* (not, as von Soden, on *γραφω*) cf. *Winer 399 foll., Lk. 1⁵⁴ ἀντελάβετο παιδος αυτου μνησθηναι ἐλέους, ib. v. 72.* The governing phrase here has much the force of *προτρειπω* in *Xen. Mem. i. 7. 1 ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι προετρεπεν*. 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 αυτῆ καθ’ αυτὴν εἰλικρινει τῇ διανοία χρώμενος*, as it is contrasted with the bodily senses, not with any other mental faculty.

articular construction, we might have expected τῶν ὑπο τῶν αγ. προφ. προειρημένων ρημάτων. Probably his reason for preferring the looser construction here was the wish to avoid an uninterrupted succession of genitives. Cf. James 1⁵ αἰτείτω παρα του διδοντος Θεοῦ πασιν απλῶς with my n. As in 1¹³⁻²¹, the writer again combines the evidence from prophecy with the witness of the apostles to the coming of Christ in glory. For the epithet αγιος cf. Lk. 1⁷⁰.

καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτηρος.] ‘Of the Lord’s command delivered by your apostles.’ It is a double possessive genitive, as if we were to say ‘Shakspeare’s speech of Mark Antony,’ meaning ‘the speech put into Mark Antony’s mouth by Shakspeare.’ 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 2²¹, Joh. 12⁵⁰, and Comments on Jude p. 64. By ‘your apostles’ is meant, not necessarily ‘the Twelve,’ but the missionaries from whom they first received the knowledge of the Gospel, of whom the writer claims to have been one in 1¹⁶. We find the same phrase used in Phil. 2²⁵ Ἐπαφροδιτον τον ἀδελφον και συνεργον καὶ συνστρατιωτην μου, ὑμων δε ἀπόστολον, 2 Cor. 8²³ R. V. ‘whether *any* inquire about Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward; or our brethren, they are the messengers of the churches (ἀποστολοι 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. 11¹³ ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀποστολος, and Clem. Rom. 44 οἱ ἀποστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν δια του κυριου ημων . . . οτι εἰς εἶς εἶσται ἐπὶ του ὀνοματος τῆς επισκοπῆς, which Lightfoot calls ‘an exact parallel’ to our text, and explains by a reference to § 5, where the phrase τους αγαθους ἀποστολους is used of Peter and Paul. If our epistle was really addressed to the church in Rome (as to which see note on 3¹⁵ ἐγραψεν ὑμῖν), this would give a special force to the phrase των ἀποστολων ὑμων. See the discussion in the Introduction.

3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.] This phrase was used above (1²⁰) in reference to the right appreciation of prophecy: here it is used of a certain portion of the message of the Apostles, which was now of special importance, viz. the warning against unbelieving mockers. The participle should have been in the accusative agreeing with the subject of μνησθῆναι. For a similar anacoluthon see 1 Pet. 2^{11.12} ἀγαπητοι, παρακαλῶ ως παροικους ἀπεχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικων ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . την ἀναστροφην ὑμων εχοντες 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 των ημερων.] This idea is variously expressed in the N.T. John regularly uses τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, as in 6^{39.40.44.54}, 7³⁷, 11²⁴, 12⁴⁸; ἐν ταις ἐσχάταις ημεραις is found in Acts 2¹⁷, ἐν ἐσχάταις ημεραις in 2 Tim. 3¹, James 5³; ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ in 1 Pet. 1⁵; ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου χρονου (αἰ. του χρονου) in Jude v. 18; ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου των ημερῶν τουτων in

¹ Blass himself is inclined to insert διὰ after τῆς, as in the title of the Διδαχῆ, Δ. Κυρίου διὰ των δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

Heb. 1¹; ἐπ' ἐσχατου των χρονων in 1 Pet. 1²⁰ (where ἐσχατου is substantival); ἐπ' ἐσχατων τῶν ημερῶν here (where ἐσχατων is a predicative adjective, used like *summus mons* 'the top of the mountain'). Blass (p. 156) quotes Barn. 16⁵ λεγει γαρ η γραφη¹ Και ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχατων τῶν ἡμερῶν και παραδωσει Κυριος τα πρόβατα εις καταφθοραν, and Herm. *Sim.* ix. 12. 3 ἐπ' ἐσχατων των ημερῶν 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. 49¹, Deut. 4³⁰ (αλ. ἐπ' ἐσχάτω), Dan. 2²⁸ 10¹⁴ Hos. 3⁵, Mic. 4¹, also Westcott on 1 Joh. 2¹⁸ (p. 69). This, temporal use of ἐπι is a further development of such phrases as we find in classical authors, ἐπὶ Κυρου, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ζῆσης Herod. i. 38, ἐπὶ γῆρας Arist. *Eth.* i. 9. 11, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρονων Arist. *Pol.* iv. 3, ἐπι τῆς νυν ἡλικίας Isocr. p. 75 § 194, ποτερον υμιν ενδοξοτέρα δοκει ἢ πολις ειναι επι τῶν νυν καιρῶν ἢ ἐπι των προγονων 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. 2¹⁸ where the activity of the antichrists denotes οτι ἐσχατη ωρα ἐστίν.

ἐλευσονται . . . εν εμπαυγμόνη ἐμπαϊκται.] Cf. Mt. 24⁵ πολλοι ελευσονται ἐπὶ τω ονοματί μου, λέγοντες 'Εγώ εμι ο Χριστος, and, for εν, 1 Cor. 4²¹ τι θέλετε; ἐν ραβδῳ ελθω προς υμας; 2 Cor. 2¹ ἐν λύπη προς υμας ελθεῖν. The verb εμπαυζω is common both in classical and in biblical Greek, but the latter uses the unclassical formation in ξ (e.g. ἐνέπαιξαν Mk. 15²⁰), from which are derived the unclassical ἐμπαυκτης, found in Isa. 3⁴ as well as in Jude v. 18; ἐμπαυγμος Heb. 11³⁶, Ezek. 22⁴, 2 Macc. 7⁷; ἐμπαυγμα Ps. 37⁷, Isa. 66⁴; ἐμπαυγμονη which only occurs here.³ For the formation of the last see above n. on παραφρονια 2¹⁶; and compare καλλονη, κλαυθμονη, πεισμονη, πλησμονή, φλεγμονή. For the repetition of the cognate word see my n. on James 5¹⁷ προσευχῆ προσηυξάτο, Winer 281 foll.

4. ποῦ εστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτου;] The Second Advent had formed the subject of the Apostles' instructions to their converts (above 1¹⁶) and the writer reverts to it again below, v. 12. Besides the more general intimations of the O. T. on such subjects as the future triumph of the Messiah, the glory and blessedness of His Kingdom, the renewed heaven and earth, of which we read in Isa. 60, 65, etc., the first recorded promise of this Advent in the N. T. is contained in Mt. 10²³ (the directions given to the Twelve before their first mission) οὐ μη τελεσητε τας πολεις Ἰσραηλ, ἕως ελθη ο υιος του ανθρωπου; the next is before the Transfiguration, Mt. 16²⁸ εἰσί τινες τῶν ωδε ἐστηκοτων οιτινες ου μη γευσωνται θανάτου, εως αν ἴδωσιν τον υἱὸν του ανθρωπου ἐρχομενον ἐν τη βασιλεια αυτου (cf. nn. on 1¹⁶ above); the third shortly before the Betrayal, Mt. 24³ (the request of the Apostles) τι το σημειον τῆς σῆς

¹ Hilgenfeld has pointed out that the reference is to Enoch 89^{56, 66, 67}, though the words και ἔσται—ημερῶν are wanting there.

² Blass is, I think, mistaken in identifying the two constructions, by making ἐσχατων gen. of τὰ ἔσχατα.

³ Stephanus gives a reference to Cyr. Alex. v. 21, which I have not been able to find.

παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Mt. 24³⁴ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεα αὐτῆ, ἕως πάντα ταῦτα γένηται, Mt. 24⁴² γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποία ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται; then the announcement of the angel after the Ascension, Acts 1¹¹ 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. 24²⁷⁻³¹, 1 Th. 4^{16,17}, 2 Th. 1⁷⁻⁹. That the Coming was looked for shortly, appears from James 5^{8,9}, Apoc. 2^{5,25}, 3¹¹, and above all from St. Paul's expectation that he would himself live to see it, 1 Cor. 15⁵², 1 Th. 4^{15,17}. There are however signs of disappointment and impatience at the delay of the promised Coming, as in James 5⁷: μακροθυμησατε, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας . . . στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας, Heb. 10³⁶: ὑπομονῆς ἔχετε χρεῖαν ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσθητε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν· ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ χρονίσει, cf. Lk. 12⁴⁵ χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ερχεσθαι: and stress was laid upon the fact that the day and hour were known only to the Father (Mt. 24³⁶), and that the Coming would be unexpected, like that of a thief in the night (below v. 10, Lk. 12³⁹), as former judgments were (Mt. 24³⁷⁻³⁹). For the rhetorical use of ποῦ cf. Lk. 8²⁵ ποῦ ἡ πίστις, 1 Cor. 1²⁰ ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; 1 Pet. 4¹³, Judg. 6¹³ ποῦ ἐστὶ πάντα τα θαυμασία αὐτοῦ ἀδιηγήσαντο ἡμῖν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν; Ps. 42³ ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός σου; Isa. 63¹⁵, Mal. 2¹⁷ ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης; Eur. *Herac.* 510 ποῦ ταδ' ἐν χρηστοῖς πρῆπει; and the similar use of ποῖος in Arist. *Nub.* 367 ποῖος Ζεὺς;

ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.] Cf. Lk. 7⁴⁵ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσηλθὼν οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας, Acts 24¹¹ οὐ πλείους εἰσὶν μοι ἡμέραι δώδεκα ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, Herm. *Sim.* viii. 6. 6 βλέπεις πολλοὺς μετανενοηκότας ἀφ' ἧς ἐλάλησας, above 1¹⁹ ἕως οὐ, Blass p. 140. The elliptical ἀφ' οὐ is used in the same sense Lk. 13²⁵, Apoc. 16¹⁸, and in classical writers. οἱ πατέρες is understood of the first fathers of mankind by some, owing to the phrase which follows, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτισεως: 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. 1⁵⁵, Joh. 7²²; sometimes of Moses and his contemporaries, Joh. 6⁴⁹, Acts 7³⁸; sometimes of the times of the prophets, Lk. 6²³, Acts 7⁵², Rom. 9⁵, 11²⁸, 15⁸, Heb. 1¹. In Judges quoted above, the fathers seem to belong to the preceding generation, and so in Jer. 31²⁹ (the fathers have eaten sour grapes), Acts 15¹⁰ (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. 2¹³ γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, where he says that this term is applied to prophets, priests, and teachers in the O.T., and compares Mt. 23⁹, Acts 7², 1 Cor. 4¹⁵. This however seems to be hardly possible in a letter purporting to be written by an Apostle. Cf. Abbott *Joh. Gram.* p. 410.

Jews they could not say 'All things continue as they were.' Again, neither patriarchs nor prophets had asserted that the Messiah was to come in their own days; on the contrary they eagerly inquired as to the time signified by the Spirit within them (1 Pet. 1¹⁰). 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 ἤκουσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἴδου γεγηρακαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβεβηκεν, which is repeated in ii. Clem. R. 11 in slightly different words, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχομενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἐώρακαμεν. 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—εκοιμήθησαν 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 γαρ, he joins ἀφ' ἧς (παρουσίας) εκοιμήθησαν in the sense 'die Vater 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. 27⁵², Joh. 11¹¹, 1 Cor. 15⁶).

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. 1¹¹ αὐτοὶ ἀπολούνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις, Ps. 119⁹⁰. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως 'From the beginning of the world,' cf. Mt. 24²¹, Mk. 10⁶, *ib.* 13⁹. 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. 1²⁵. 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 26²⁶, v. 8 below, Plato *Parm.* 128 c πρῶτον μὲν σε τοῦτο λανθάνει ὅτι. For θέλοντας cf. Libanius *Prog.* 129 c ἔκων ἀγνοῶν ἃ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ὀφείλεται (quoted by Wetst.), Aesch. *Cho.* 19 γενοῦ δὲ συμμαχος θέλων ἔμοι, Soph. *Phil.* 1343 συγχῶρει θελων, and Col. 2¹⁸

μηδεὶς υμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων, according to some interpreters. I see no ground for supposing (as Schott, Keil, Kühn, Spitta, and v. Soden) that *τοῦτο* is to be taken as the object after *θελοντας*.

οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν—*τω τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ*.] It is a question how we are to take the construction of this sentence. It is evident that we must understand *ην* with *γῆ* from the preceding *ἦσαν*; but are we to understand the predicate of *γῆ* with *ουρανοὶ*? That is, must we complete the first clause by supplying *ἐξ υδ. καὶ δι υδ. συνεστῶτες . . . λόγῳ*? There can be no doubt that *τω . . . λόγῳ* belongs to both clauses, and, if so, the construction would seem to require *συνεστῶτες*, which carries with it the connected words *ἐξ υδ. καὶ δι' υδ.* A further reason for supplying the entire predicate to both clauses, is that the heavens and earth make up the *κοσμος* (*vv.* 6, 7, 12, 13) and that the water by which *ο τότε κόσμος* was destroyed belonged alike to earth and heaven (*Gen.* 7¹¹, 8²). Spitta, it is true, lays stress on *ἔκπαλαι* as used exclusively of heaven, on the ground that the rabbinical school of Shammai, cited *Gen.* 1¹ *εν αρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεος τον ουρανὸν καὶ την 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.* 6³⁸ *Domine locutus es . . . in primo die dicens, Fiat caelum et terra; et tuum verbum opus perfecit.* What *may* be argued is that the *ουρανος* is distinct from the *στερεωμα*, 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* 26¹¹, 2 *Sam.* 22⁸). Below, however, a higher use is assigned to the *στερεωμα*, viz. to support the sun and moon and stars (*Gen.* 1^{14 17}), and in *Ezek.* 1²³⁻²⁵ we read that the throne of God was over the firmament, which is also identified with *ουρανός* in *Gen.* 1⁸. Compare the article on *Cosmogony* in *Hastings' D. of B.* For the plural *ουρανοί* see Robinson's n. on *Eph.* 4¹⁰, Charles' *Slavonic Enoch* pp. xxx–xlvi, and my notes on *Clem. Al. Strom.* vii. §§ 9, 10.

For the irregular construction (caused by the attraction of the nearer subject *γῆ*) *ουρανοὶ ἦσαν . . . συνεστῶσα* instead of *συνεστῶτες*, cf. *Heb.* 9⁹ *δῶρα τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μη δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ.* The reading of *Σ 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.* 2¹⁸ *παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστανω* means 'prove myself a transgressor.' The intransitive uses are *Lk.* 9³² *δὺν ἀνδρας συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ* 'two men standing with him,' *Col.* 1¹⁷ *τα παντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνεστηκεν* 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 αἰέρος καὶ πυρὸς συνέστη οδε ο κοσμος*, *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

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 *εκπαλαι* see n. on 2³.

ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ του 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 *αβυσσος* and *ὕδωρ* are applied in Gen. 1²;¹ (2) to the stages by which the heaven and earth were built up, the *στερέωμα* (here called *ουρανοί*) 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. 1³) εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς, cf. Heb. 11³, Ps. 33⁶ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν. In i. Clem. R. 27. 4 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δυνατὰ αὐτὰ καταστρεφῆναι, 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 ἀνα 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 *δια* to express a state, as δι' ησυχίας εἶναι, δια ἀπεχθείας γίνεσθαι, δια πένθους το γῆρας διαγεῖν Xen. Cyr. iv. 6. 6, τὸν δια περιτομῆς παραβατην Rom. 2²⁷, ὁ δια προσκομματος ἐσθίων ib. 14²⁰, and also in certain adverbial phrases such as δια χειρῶν εχειν, cf. Aesch. Suppl. 193 ἀγάλματα ἔχουσαι δια χειρῶν εὐωνυμῶν 'holding in their left hands,' Soph. Ant. 916, Arist. Pol. v. 8. 8 δια χειρῶν μαλλον εχουσι τὴν πολιτείαν, also in the sing. Plut. Vit. 63 (Nυμα 6) δια χειρὸς εχοντα τὰς ἡνίας 'holding tight in hand,' Av. Vesp. 597, Luc. Demon. 56 δια στοματος τὰς κατηγορίας εχειν 'to have Aristotle's categories between your lips,' Peregryn. 18 τούτο δια στοματος ἦν ἀπασιν, Theocr. 14. 27 χαμῖν τούτο δι' ὠτος ἐγένετο. 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. 24² αὐτὸς ἐπὶ θαλασσῶν ἐθεμελιώσεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐπὶ ποταμῶν ἠτοίμασεν αὐτήν, Ps. 136⁶, Herm. Vis. i. 3. 4 τῷ ἰσχυρῷ ρηγματι πῆξας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ ὕδατων. 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. 148⁴).

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 commentators² generally assign to *δια* its usual force

¹ See also Apoc. 11⁷ and 13¹, 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.'

'by means of,' adducing in support Clem. Hom. xi. 24 τα πάντα το υδωρ ποιει, το δε υδωρ υπο πνευματος κινήσεως την γενεσιν λαμβανει. 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 εκπαλαι, and are content with an explanation confined to the earth, alleging that it was made by means of water, because the transference of part of the water to the clouds and of another part to the sea gave rise to the dry land. Others refer to the erosive effect of water, or to the need of rain or mist (Gen. 2⁶) in fashioning and preserving the earth.¹

6. δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο. I have followed min. 31 in reading *ον* for *ὧν* of the great body of MSS.,² as *ο* and *ω* are frequently confused in MSS., and no satisfactory explanation of δι' ὧν has been given; whereas *ον* refers to the immediately preceding *λογω* and is taken up again in *v.* 7 by *τω αυτω λογω*. We might have had a dative of cause here, as in *vv.* 5 and 7 and in Heb. 11³ *κατηρτισθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ρηματι Θεοῦ*, were it not that the dative was wanted for the instrument *υδατι*. Sometimes indeed the *λόγος* itself is regarded as the instrument, as in Heb. 1² *δι' ου τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*, Joh. 1³ *παντα δι' αυτου ἐγένετο*; but *δια* with acc. is found in Ps. 119¹⁵⁴ *δια τον λόγον σου ζήσον με*, Apoc. 12¹¹ *ἐνίκησαν αυτον δια τον λογον τῆς μαρτυρίας αυτων*, Ps. 16⁴ *δια τοὺς λόγους τῶν χειλεων σου εγω ἐφυλαξα ὁδους σκληράς*, Joh. 6⁵⁷ *ο τρωγων με κακεινος ζήσει δι' ἐμε*. 'It was owing to the divine word that the world of that date was destroyed by a deluge,' cf. below *v.* 12 *δι' ἣν (παρουσιαν) ουρανοὶ πυρουμενοι λυθησονται*, Apoc. 4¹¹ *δια το θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ εκτισθησαν*, Heraclit. xii. (Byw.) *Σιβυλλα . . . χιλιων ἐτέων ἐξικνεεται τῇ φωνῇ δια τον θεον* (paraphrased by Clem. Al. p. 358 *συν Θεῷ*, by Iambli. *Myst.* iii. 8 *τῇ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ενεργεια*), *Petr. Apoc.* (p. 14. 2 Klost.) *ἀνεπιδεῆς (ο Θεὸς) ου τα παντα επιδεεται καὶ δι' ον ἔστιν . . . ἀποιήτος ος τα παντα ἐποίησεν λογω δυναμεως αὐτου*.

The most usual explanation of δι' ὧν regards *ἐξ υδατος 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 *ουρανοὶ* and *γῆ*, since both are spoken of as causing the deluge (Gen. 7¹¹, 8²); but the fact of their remoteness makes this connexion very improbable. We should rather have expected such a phrase as *ομως δε εκ τουτων*. Moreover the heaven and the earth constitute the world which they are said to destroy. Wiesinger thinks the antecedents are *υδατος* and *τω τοῦ Θεοῦ λογω*, but then we have one of the antecedents introduced again as the instrument in *υδατι*; 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.*

ὁ τότε κόσμος.] Cf. n. on 1⁹ τῶν παλαι αμαρτιῶν. By *κοσμος* 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

ἀπόλωτο.] The Mosaic account gives no support to this story of the absolute destruction of the earth, far less of the heaven by the deluge; but Spitta shows that the same language is used in Jewish legends, e.g. Enoch x. 2² πορευου προς τὸν Νῶε . . . και δήλωσον αὐτῷ τέλος ἐπερχόμενον, ὅτι ἡ γῆ ἀπόλλυται πασα, *ιδ.* 83³⁻⁵. '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 προειρηκτος αφανισμὸν Ἀδαμου τῶν ὀλων εσεσθαι, τὸν μὲν κατ' ἰσχὺν πυρός, τὸν ἕτερον δε κατα βίαν καὶ πλήθος υδατος. So the term *παλιγγενεσία* is used of the reappearance of the earth after the flood, 1 Clem. Rom. 9 Νῶε πιστος εὔρεθεις δια τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κοσμοῦ 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 ουρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ.] A more correct expression would have been either καὶ ἡ νυν 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 *θησαυριζω*, which I take to mean 'set apart for,' 'destined for,' cf. 4 Macc. 12¹² (of the judgment on the persecutor) *ταμιευεται σε η θεία δικη αἰωνιῳ πυρί*. Others take *πυρί* with the following *τηρουμενοι*, 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 γαρ εσεσθαι εἰ τηρηθῆεν ἐτέρῳ κατακλυσμῳ*), 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, *ποτε μὲν εκπυρσθῆσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ποτε δε 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 *εκπύρωσις* 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 ελεύσεται παντελῆ . . . διδ ἀνάγκη δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αἰθῆς καὶ τὸν ουρανὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐκφλόγωσιν ἔσεσθαι*.

⁴ See Introduction on Text.

Schatz der unangegriffen bleibt . . . mit aller Sicherheit und Sorgfalt für zukünftigen Zeiten aufbewahrt sind' (Hundhausen). This seems to me very unnatural. We may speak of 'laying up treasures in heaven' or of 'treasuring up to ourselves wrath against the day of wrath' (where the datives ὑμῖν and 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 το ἐμφωλεον τῷ κοσμῷ πυρ ἐκλάμψαν καὶ ἐξαφθὲν καὶ κατεργασάμενον πᾶσαν ὕλην συναλωθήσεται αὐτῇ.

It may be well here to sum up the different features of the συντελεία του αἰῶνος (Mt. 13³⁹, 24³, 28²⁰) as they are presented to us in this epistle, leaving the details for the notes on the different verses. This world, including the earth, the heavens, and the στοιχεῖα, will be destroyed by fire at the Coming of the Son of Man (v. 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 ἀναμειβεται πάντα καὶ πυρ ἀπαντῶν, with the passages quoted in Bywater's notes on xx.—xxv., Plato *Tim.* 22 B. πολλοὶ . . . φθορὰν γεγονασιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔσονται, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ ὕδατι μείγνεται, to which Plato ascribes our ignorance of the past history of mankind. So Censorinus (xviii. 11) 'est praeterca 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 Σιβύλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστασπῆς γενήσεται τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν δια πυρὸς ἔφασαν. οἱ λεγομενοὶ δὲ Στωικοὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν εἰς πυρ ἀναλυσθαι δογματίζουσιν καὶ αὐ πάλιν κατὰ μεταβολὴν τὸν κοσμον 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

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 *κατακλυσμος* and *εκπυρωσις* 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.* 4²⁴ 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 ἀρεσκει τοις Στωικοις τὴν ὀλην οὐσίαν εἰς πῦρ μεταβαλλεῖν οἶον εἰς σπέρμα. For other references see Zeller *Phil. Gr.* iv. p. 133³. For the Sibyl, referred to by Justin above, compare *Sib.* iv. 172 πῦρ ἐστὶ κατὰ γαίαν . . . κοσμος ἀπας μύκημα καὶ ομβριμον ἦχον ἀκουσεῖ. φλεξεί δὲ χθόνα πασαν, ἀπαν δ' ὀλεσει γένος ἀνδρῶν καὶ πασας τε πόλεις, ποταμούς ἀμα ἦδε θαλασσαν, ἐκκαυσει δὲ τε πάντα, κονις δ' ἐσετ' αἰθαλοεσσα. 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, *επειτα μετ' οὐ πολὺ τὴν συντελείαν καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν τοῦ παντός ἐπιστήναι*; and we have seen the same belief expressed in the passage of Joseph. *Ant.* i. 2. 3 quoted above. On the other hand Philo argues for the eternity of the world in his treatise *De Inc. Mundi*, where he distinguishes between two senses of the word *κοσμος*, 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 τεράτα ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκοτος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἔλθειν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, *ib.* 3^{15, 16}, Ps. 50³ ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἤξει . . . πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήσεται καὶ κυκλω αὐτοῦ καταγιγίς σφόδρα, *ib.* 18^{8, 13}, Isa. 29⁶, 30³⁰, 34⁴, 51⁶, 66^{15, 16}, Nahum 1^{5, 6}, Mal. 4¹, Dan. 7^{9, 10} ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ φλόξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλεγόν, ποταμὸς πυρός εἰλκεν ἐμπροσθεν 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' ἀγγελῶν δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ἐν πυρὶ φλογος διδόντος ἐκδικῆσιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδοσιν Θεόν.

τηρουμένοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.] So we read of angels reserved for judgment in 2⁴, of unrighteous men reserved for judgment in 2⁹, of the blackness of darkness reserved for

false teachers in 2¹⁸ · while here it is the heavens and earth which are reserved for the same office of vengeance.

8. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ 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 ἐν τούτῳ cf. v. 3, τούτο πρῶτον, Phil. 3¹⁴ ἐν δέ, Mk. 10²¹ ἐν 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. 90⁴ χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ἐχθὲς ἣτις διήλθε, 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 κρισεως, which scoffers say is now past and gone without injury to any one. Some interpreted this verse to mean that each day of the creation implied a thousand years of the earth’s duration, so Barn. 15⁴ συνετέλεσεν ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις—τούτο λεγεί οτι ἐν εξακισχιλιοῖς ἔτεσιν συντελεσει Κύριος τα συμπαντα. ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ’ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. καὶ κατεπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ—τούτο λεγεί οταν ἔλθων ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τὸν καιρὸν τούτον καὶ κρίνει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλλάξει τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστερας, τότε καλῶς καταπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ, Slavonic Enoch xxxii foll., Justin M. Dial. 81 τὸ εἰρημένον οτι ἡμερα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη κ.τ.λ., Iren. v. 28. 3 ὅσαις ἡμέραις ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος τοσαύταις χιλιοντασι συντελεται . . . 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. 2¹⁷ ἢ δ’ ἀν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανείσθε) by reference to the difference between the human day and the divine day; so Just. M. Dial. 81, p. 308.

9. οὐ βραδυνεὶ Κύριος τῆς επαγγελίας.] The verb βρ. (here used intransitively, as in 1 Tim. 3¹⁵) occurs also in Gen. 43¹⁰, Isa. 46¹³ τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρ’ ἐμοῦ οὐ βραδυνώ. This is the only recorded instance of its being followed by a genitive, which may be compared with that after ὑστερεῖν, υστερίζειν, λειπεσθαι (for which Winer quotes Diod. xiii. 110 υστεροῦν τῆς βοήθειας); or it may be taken as the genitive of the sphere, for which cf. 2¹⁴ 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 βραδυτῆς 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 ἢ βραδυτῆς

ἀφαιρείται τῆς προνοίας, and App. *B.C.* iv. p. 1052 *μηδε βραδυτῆτα τις ἡγείσθω την ἐμπειρίαν.* For *τινες* see n. on Jude v. 4. I understand it of the *ἐμπαικται* of v. 3 above.

ἀλλὰ μακροθυμει εἰς ὑμᾶς.] See Introduction on the Text. Cf. below v. 15, Ps. 86¹⁵, Isa. 30¹⁸, Jonah 4², 1 Pet. 3²⁰ *ἐξεδεχετο ἡ του Θεου μακροθυμια ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε*, Rom. 2⁴ *τοῦ πλουτου . . . τῆς μακροθυμιας καταφρονεις, αγνοῶν οτι το χρηστον του Θεου εἰς μετανοιάν σε αγει;* Wisdom 12^{19, 20}, Herm. *Sim.* viii. 11. 1 *μακροθυμος ὡν ὁ κυριος θέλει τὴν κλῆσιν τὴν γενομένην δια του υἱου αυτου σωζεσθαι;* Clem. *Hom.* xvi. 20 *μακροθυμει, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλει.* The construction with *εἰς* is only found here: *πρός* is used in 1 Th. 5¹⁴; *ἐπι* in Mt. 18^{26, 29}, Lk. 18⁷, James 5⁷.

μη βουλομενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.] Cf. 1 Tim. 2⁴ (God our Saviour) *παντας ἀνθρωπους θελει σωθῆναι και εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθειας ελθεῖν*, Rom. 11³², Ezek. 18²³. Clem. R. i. 7. 5 *ἐν γενεα καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τοπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσποτης τοις βουλομενοις ἐπιστραφῆναι επ αυτον*, *ib.* 8. 5, Justin M. *Apol.* i. 28 *ἡ επιμονη του μηδέπω ταυτα πράξει τον Θεον* (referring to the final judgment) *διὰ το ανθρωπινον γενοσ γεγένηται προγιωσκει γαρ τινας εκ μετανοιας σωθησεσθαι.* Wetstein illustrates *χωρῆσαι* from Plut. *de flum.* 19 *ολιγον δε σωφρονησας, και εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοις πραχθείσι χωρησας*, but I have not been able to find this: cf. Prov. 14¹⁵ *πανουργος ερχεται εἰς μετάνοιαν*, Rom. 2⁴ *ἀγειν εἰς μετάνοιαν.* R. V. translates *τινας* by 'any' giving it the force of *μηδενα*: 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, 37}, and below 3¹⁶.

10. ἦξει δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς.] Cf. 1 Th. 5² *οἰδατε οτι ημερα Κυρίου ὡς κλεπτῃς ἐν νυκτι ουτως ερχεται*, Mt. 24⁴³, Lk. 12³⁹, Apoc. 3^{3, 16}¹⁵.

ἐν ᾗ οἱ ουρανοὶ ροιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται.] For the adverbial termination cf. *κλαγγηδον, κοναβηδον, λυσσηδόν, μολπηδον, ρυμηδόν*, and the cognate *ροιβδηδόν*. 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. 5¹¹, Cantic. 4¹⁵ *φρέαρ υδατος ζῶντος και ροιζούντος απο του Λιβάνου*, other exx. from Homer to Lycophron in Wetstein. It is used of thunder in Luc. *Jur. Trag.* 1 *ὦ μεγαλοσμαράγον στεροπας ροιζημα*, 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 *μηδεῖς*. 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. 2⁴ *παρελεύσεται ὁ βίος ημων ὡς ἴχνη νεφέλης*.

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. 12¹⁸, cf. Enoch 1⁴) as well as from Jer. 25^{30, 31}, Joel. 3¹⁶, Isa. 42¹³ 1 Th. 4¹⁶. The adv. *ροιζηδον* is found in Lycophron *Cass.* 66 (of Oenone hurling herself into the grave of Paris) *πυργων απ ακρων προς νεόδμητον νεκυν ροιζηδὸν ἐκβράσασα κυμβαχον δεμας*, Nicander *Theriaca* 556, and the other form *ροιζηδά* in the *Alexipharmaca* 182, 498.

στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσουμενα λυθήσεται.] For the absence of the article see Introduction on Grammar. The word *στοιχεῖα*¹ 'elements' is used in Heb. 5¹² 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 *του κοσμου*), where its meaning is disputed. In Gal. 4³ *υπο τα στοιχεια του κοσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμενοι*, the patristic commentators generally understand it of the material elements, or of the heavenly bodies: for (1) cf. Philo i. 162 *τα τέσσαρα στοιχεια ἐξ ὧν συνεκραθη ὁ κοσμος*, Wisd. 7¹⁷, 19¹⁸, Hermas *Vis.* iii. 13 *ὁ κόσμος δια τεσσαρων στοιχειων κρατειται*; for (2) Theoph. *ad Autol.* ii. 35 *ὁ θεῖος νόμος οὐ μονον κωλυει το ειδωλοισ προσκυνειν, ἀλλα καὶ τοις στοιχειοις, ἡλιω, σελήνη η τοις λοιποισ αστροις*, 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 χηρευσει στοιχεῖα προπαντα τα κοσμου, αηρ, γαῖα, θαλασσα, φαος, πολος, ηματα, νυκτες*. Clem. *Hom.* x. 9 *οὐδε τα ζῶα προσκυνουσιν, ουδὲ στοιχεια τα υπο Θεου γεγενημενα κολακενουσιν, λεγω δε ἡλιον, σεληνην, αστρα, 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 *ουρανοί* and *γῆ*, but would have either preceded or followed them. He thinks that in Gal. 4 the following verses show that *στοιχεια* is used of objects of worship (vv. 8, 9) *τοτε μὲν ουκ ειδοτες Θεον ἐδουλωσατε τοις φυσει μη ουσιν θεοις . . . νυν δε . . . πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τα ασθενῆ καὶ πτωχα 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 ακοῦειν τινων ὅτι τὰ μὲν πρῶτα οἶονπερὶ στοιχεια, ἐξ ὧν ημεῖς τε συγκεῖμεθα καὶ τᾶλλα, λόγον ουκ ἔχοι*. Later writers distinguished between the *στοιχεῖα* and first principles, cf. Suidas s.v. *διαφερουσι δ' αρχαι καὶ στοιχεῖα τῶν τὰς μὲν εἶναι αγεννήτους καὶ αφθάρτους, τα δε στοιχεια κατὰ τὴν εκπύρωσιν φθειρεσθαι*, Hippol. *Philosoph.* i. 22 (Diels *Doxogr.* p. 571) *Ἐπίκουρος αρχας μὲν τῶν ὄλων ὑπεθετο ἀτόμους καὶ κενόν . . . ἐκ δε των ἀτόμων συνελθουσῶν γενεσθαι καὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὰ στοιχεια καὶ τὰ ἐν αυτοις πάντα*. This distinction was not always observed; see (for Aristotle) Zeller vol. iii. p. 442³, 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*.

the Jews believed the various powers of nature to be under the control of spirits.¹ Similarly Spitta explains Col. 2⁸ *κατα τα στοιχεια του κοσμου και ου κατα Χριστον*, and 2²⁰ *απεθάνετε συν Χριστῷ απο των στοιχειων του κοσμου* by a comparison of 2¹⁶ *μη ουν τις κρινέτω εν βρώσει ἢ εν ποσει ἢ εν μερει εορτῆς ἢ νουμηνιας*. These things belong to the *θηρησκεια των ἀγγέλων* with which St. Paul charges the Colossians (2¹⁸); but such *αρχαὶ και εξουσιαὶ* (2¹⁵) are not to be compared with Him in whom *κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος* (2⁹).² In support of this view Spitta quotes the *Κηρυγμα Πέτρου* (*ap. Clem. Al. Str. vi. p. 760*) *μηδε κατα Ἰουδαιους σέβεσθε, και γαρ εκεινοι, μονοι οιομενοι τον Θεον γινωσκειν, ουκ ἐπιστανται λατρευοντες ἀγγελοις και αρχαγγέλοις, μηνί τε και σελήνη. και εαν μη σελήνη φανῆ σάββατον ουκ ἄγουσιν κ.τ.λ.*, cf. Lightfoot's n. on Col. 2¹⁸. The stars and the angels were closely associated in Jewish thought, see Job 38⁷, Enoch 69^{21 26}, 41⁵⁻⁹, 43² with Charles' note.

To the natural objection that we cannot conceive of spirits being burnt and dissolved (*καυσουμενα λυθήσεται*) Spitta replies by quoting *Test. Levi 4 και του πυρος καταπτήσσοντος και πάσης κτισεως καυσουμενης* (MSS. *κλονουμενης*) *και των ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων*, Enoch 68² '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 *οὐρανοὶ* with Aug. *Civ. Dei. xx. 24*,³ Bede, Estius, and Hundhausen, of the firmament or lower heaven, distinguishing this from the starry heaven in which the *στοιχεια* 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. 34⁴ *καὶ τακῆσονται πασαι αἱ δυνάμεις των ουρανων και ελιγήσεται ο ουρανος ὡς βιβλιον και πάντα τα ἄστρα πεσειται ὡς φυλλα ἐξ ἄμπελου*, a passage which our

See especially En. 50^{12 f} 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. 16⁵. 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 ἐστε; οἱ δε ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἔφησαν . . . ημεῖς ἐσμεν τα λεγόμενα στοιχεια, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες του κόσμου τούτου*, Ep. ad Diogn. 7 God sent to save man, not an angel ἢ ἔρχοντα ἢ τινα των διεποριτων τα ἐπίγεια ἢ τινα των πεπιστευμενων τας ἐν ουρανοῖς διοικήσεις, but Him by whom He had made the world, *οὗ τὰ μυστήρια πιστως πάντα φυλάσσει τα στοιχεια* (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. 4³ and Col. 2⁸, where he argues in favour of the first interpretation given above of *στοιχεια*, 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.

author evidently had in mind, Joel 2^{30, 31}, 3¹⁵, Mt. 24²⁹ ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθησεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει το φεγγος αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσονται ἀπο τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ αἱ δυναμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθησονται, Apoc. 6¹²⁻¹⁴.

καυσόμαι.] 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. 13⁶, Apoc. 16⁸) 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. 2⁴⁴, as well as of dissolving a compound into its elements.

καὶ γη καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρεθήσεται.] 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 *κατακαησεται* is accepted by v. Soden, Hundhausen, Bruckner. I do not think any one is quite satisfied with Hort's suggestion *ρυήσεται* or *διαρνήσεται*. The reading of Sah. (*οὐχ εὐρεθησεται*) makes excellent sense, as may be seen from Gen. 5²⁴ (Enoch) *οὐχ ευρισκετο*, Apoc. 16²⁰ *πασα νησος εφυγε καὶ ορη οὐχ ευρεθησαν* 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 *ευρεθήσεται* interrogative, but this, as Spitta says, is extremely harsh: it should at least have had a *ποῦ* prefixed, as in 1 Pet. 4¹⁸. 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. 28¹⁵ *ευρέθη τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν σοι*. This separates between the earth and the works in it; and would require *φανερωθήσεται*, rather than *ευρεθησεται*. If we are not to accept *οὐχ ευρεθήσεται*, I am rather disposed to suggest *αρθησεται*, cf. Mt. 24³⁹ *ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμος καὶ ἤρην ἅπαντας*, Joh. 15², 17¹⁵, Acts 8³³, 22²², Isa. 16¹⁰ *αρθήσεται εὐφροσυνη*, *ib.* 57¹ *ἄνδρες δικαιοὶ ἀῤῥονται καὶ οὐδεὶς κατανοεῖ*.⁴

¹ Stephanus gives one example of its figurative use (Hesych. *Antirrhet.* p. 315) *ποτίζει νοῦν ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου καυσωθεντα τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ*.

² Dr. Chase in Hastings' *D. of B.* s.v. 'Peter' states that *καυσος* 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.

11. τούτων οὖν παντῶν 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. 21²³ ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει.

ποταπους δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.] The classical ποδαπος (formed like ἀλλοδαπος, παντοδαπος) is equivalent to Lat. *civitas*, as is shown in Plato *Apol.* 20 B τις καὶ ποδαπός; Ἐνηνος, εφη, Παριος. In later writers it is found, generally in the form ποταπος, in the sense of ποιος, as in Mt. 8²⁷ ποταπος ἐστὶν οὗτος ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀνεμοὶ . . . ὑπακούουσιν; Lk. 7³⁹ ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνή, 1 Joh. 3¹ ἰδετε ποταπὴν ἀγαπὴν δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ, *Petri Apoc.* ἵνα ἰδῶμεν ποταποὶ εἰσὶ τὴν μορφὴν, see Lobeck *Phrygichus* 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?*": *υπ-* 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. 4⁷ and (for ὑπάρχειν) Dem. *Olynth.* p. 32. 20 τοῦτ' οὖν δεῖ προσεῖναι τα δ' ἀλλὰ ὑπάρχει, 'this one thing, promptness of action, must be added: quickness of intelligence and all other requisites are your birth-right.'

ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις.] For the abstract plural compare above 2¹⁸ ἀσελγείαις, Jude v. 13, 1 Pet. 2¹, James 2¹, Blass p. 84.¹ For ἀναστροφή see above 2⁷, 1 Pet. 1¹⁵; for εὐσέβεια above 1^{3, 6, 7}. Alford² is perhaps right in connecting these words with the following participles.

12. προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπευδόντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.] For other examples of the transitive force of σπευδω see Isa. 16⁵ ἐκζητῶν κριμα καὶ σπευδὼν δικαιοσύνην, Pind. *Pyth.* iii. 110 μὴ βίον ἀθάνατον σπευδε, Eur. *Suypyl.* 161 εὐψυχίαν γ' ἐσπευσας ἀντ' εὐβουλίας, where the sense is 'to desire,' 'to be eager for'; also Hom. *Od.* xix. 137 οἱ δὲ γαμον σπευδουσιν, Eur. *Med.* 150 τις σοὶ ποτε . . . ἐρος, ὦ ματαία, σπευσει θανάτου τελευτάν; Esther 5⁵ κατασπευσατε Ἀμάν, where the sense is 'to hasten,' 'to accelerate', cf. Sir. 36⁸ (or 33⁸) σπευσον καιρον καὶ μνησθητι ὀρκισμου, i.e. 'hasten the time of the promised vengeance,' Deut. 32³⁵, Baruchi Apoc. 83¹ altissimus accelerans accelerabit tempora sua et adducens adducet horas suas. The latter is the sense preferred here by most editors. 'In Mt. 24¹⁴ 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 3¹⁹. μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς

Legg. 843 E. He observes that πυρῶν is corrupt or corrupted in Prov. 10²⁰, Lam. 4⁷, and other passages where it occurs in the LXX.

¹ Bremi (*exc. vii in Isocr.*) cites ἀλήθειαι *de Pace* § 38, *Evag.* § 5. c. 1, *de Antid.* § 170, § 260, § 283, *ad Nicocl.* § 20; καρτερίαι *Evag.* § 42. c. 19; μετριότητες *Paneg.* § 11; πράβητες *Philipp.* § 116. c. 49, *de Antid.* § 214; σεμνότητες *Archil.* § 98; φιλανθρωπίαι *Philipp.* § 116 c. 49, etc.

² So too Spitta.

ἀμαρτίας ὡς ἀν ἐλθῶσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως (R.V. "that so there may come seasons of refreshing") ἀπο προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀποστείλῃ . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δεξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων' (from Plummer). Compare 4 Esdr. 4³⁵ usque quo spero sic? et respondit archangelus et dixit Quando impletus erit numerus similibus vobis . . . Et respondi et dixi . . . Ne forte propter nos non impleantur justorum areae, propter peccata inhabitantium super terram. For προσδοκῶντας cf. προσδεχομενοι Jude v. 21, 1 Cor. 1⁷ μὴ υστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι, ἀπεκδεχομενους τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν 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 2¹¹, Mt. 4⁵, v. 10 above): we find it however in Jer. 46¹⁰ 'the Day of the Lord God of hosts,' and in Apoc. 16¹⁴.

δι ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρρουμενοι λυθήσονται.] In v. 10 the connexion was only one of time (ἐν ἡ), here it is one of cause. The presence of the Day of God is the cause of the destruction of heaven by fire.

πυρρῶ is used of gold tried in the fire (Apoc. 1¹⁵, 3¹⁸), of fiery darts (Eph. 6¹⁶), of strong feeling (1 Cor. 7⁹, 2 Cor. 11²⁹), of incendiary fire (Herod. vii. 8).

καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα 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. 34⁴ τακῆσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, Micah 1⁴, Nahum 1^{5, 6}.

13. καινους δὲ οὐρανοὺς . . . κατα το ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν.² The reference is to Isa. 65¹⁷⁻¹⁹ and 66²². See also Apoc. 21¹, Isa. 51⁶. Hence we must understand αὐτοῦ of God, not, as Spitta, of Christ. The figure chiasmus (καινους οὐρανοους—γῆν καινήν) is used for the sake of variety, as in Mt. 5¹⁸ ὡτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραια. Here, as in v. 8 above (μία ἡμέρα ὡς χίλια ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμερα 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. 21¹ 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}, 104⁵. 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}, 91¹⁶ '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

Joh. 10¹⁶ γενήσεται μια ποίμνη, εἰς ποιμην, Zech. 14⁹, 2 Cor. 7⁴ πολλη μοι παρρησια προς υμας, πολλη μοι καυχησις υπερ υμων.

ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.] Cf. Isa. 32¹ βασιλευς δικαιος βασιλευσει, *ib.* v. 16 f. και αναπαυσεται ἐν τη ἐρήμῳ κρίμα και δικαιοσύνη ἐν τῷ Καρμῆλῳ κατοικήσει. καὶ εσται τα ἔργα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰρήνη, και κρατήσῃ η δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυσιν . . . καὶ κατοικήσῃ ο 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. 60²¹, Apoc. 21²⁷, 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. 23⁶, 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 ο αρχων Joh. 12³¹.

ἐν οἷς, *i.e.* in the new earth and heaven. For the construction of the relative see above 3¹.

14. διό, αγαπητοί, ταυτα προσδοκωντες.] 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, αγαπητοί introduces the direct appeal to the true members of the Church.

σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι.] Cf. above, notes on 2¹³ σπιλοι και μώμοι. For the complementary construction of εὑρεθῆναι see Phil. 3⁹ (ἵνα) ευρεθω ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔχων ἔμῃν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νομου, Gal. 2¹⁷ εὑρεθημεν ἁμαρτωλοὶ, 2 Cor. 5³ οὐ γυμνοὶ ευρεθησόμεθα, 1 P. 1⁷ with Hort's note. For the dat. see Rom. 7¹⁰ ευρεθη μοι η ἐντολη η εἰς ζωὴν αὐτῇ 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. 20¹¹ τοπος οὐχ ευρέθη αὐτοῖς. In Rom. 10²⁰, ευρεθῆν τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, it approaches more nearly to *υπο* 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.* βουλομενος τῷ βασιλεὶ ἀμεμπτον αὐτὸν διαφυλαττειν.¹ Blass compares Eph. 1⁴ εἶναι ἀμωμοὺς κατενωπιον αὐτου, Col. 1²² παραστήσαι υμας ἀμωμοὺς κατενωπιον αὐτου (*Gr.* pp. 112 f., 185). So Jude v. 24 στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτου ἀμωμοὺς.

ἐν εἰρήνῃ.] Peace and righteousness are joined together in Ps. 85¹⁰, Isa. 32¹⁷, quoted on v. 13 above, and James 3¹⁸, where see my note.

15. τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἠγάπησατε.] 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. 3²⁰ οτε ἀπεξεδέχετο η του Θεου μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμεραις Νῶε.

καθὼς και ὁ αγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος—ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν.] A similar phrase is used by Paul of Tychicus (Eph. 6²¹, Col. 4⁷), of Onesimus (Col. 4⁹, Philem. v. 16). So Epaphras is called ο αγαπητος σὺνδουλος (Col. 1⁷), Philemon αγαπητος και συνεργος (Philem. v. 1), Timothy τεκνον αγαπητον (1 Cor. 4¹⁷, 2 Tim. 1²), while the phrase ὁ αγαπητος μου is

¹ For this quotation I am indebted to Dr. Abbott.

this hypothesis on the fact that we have repeated references to the last time in Heb. 1¹, 9²⁶, 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 (3⁵-3¹³) and thinks that the writer must have had in mind 1 Thess. 4¹³-5¹¹ and 2 Thess. 2¹⁻¹². Lastly Pott, Morus, Spitta, and Zahn (*Einl.* ii. 46) consider that the reference is to a lost epistle. Dr. Bigg is undecided.

κατα τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.] Cf. Paul's own words κατα τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσαν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἐθήκα (1 Cor. 3¹⁰), γνοντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι Ἰακώβος καὶ Κηφᾶς . . . δεξίας ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ (Gal. 2⁹), 1 Cor. 2⁶, Col. 1²⁸, and Polycarp (*ad Phil.* iii. 2) οὐτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὐτε ἄλλος ὁμοίος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου . . . ὅς καὶ ἀπὸν 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 *πασαῖς 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 ἀλλαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς*. In later Greek *λαλῶ* is used, much like *λέγω*, of serious speech (cf. above 1²³) and of writing (here and in Heb. 2⁵, 2 Cor. 11¹⁷). We may translate the phrase 'where he touches on these subjects.' Some commentators seem to me to press too far the meaning of this sentence, using it to weaken the force of the preceding verse, as though the distinct reference to one epistle of St. Paul was destroyed by the addition, that 'the doctrine there taught was in harmony with his other writings,' and as though the *καθὼς* 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

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 τουτων to be the antecedent. For δυσνοητα (not found elsewhere in biblical Greek) cf. Luc. *Alexand.* 54 χρησμοὺς ανοήτους καὶ δυσνοήτους, Diog. L. ix. 13 (a supposititious letter of Darius to Heraclitus) καταβέβλησαι λόγον γραπτον περὶ φύσεως δυσνοητον τε καὶ δυσεξήγητον.

ἀ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλουσιν.] Cf. Clem. Al. *Str.* p. 529 *init.* οἱ διαστρεφοντες τας γραφας προς ιδίας ἡδονάς, και τινων προσωδιων και στιγματων μεταθέσει τα παραγγελθεντα σωφρόνως βιαζομενοι προς ἡδοναθειας τας εαυτῶν, *ib.* pp. 890, 891. I have not found any other example of στρεβλω in the sense of twisting or straining a phrase like the Fr. 'torturer un mot,' but in Ps. 18²⁶ we have μετα στρεβλοῦ διαστρεψεις (Clement's word above), where 2 Sam. 22²⁷ has μετα στρεβλοῦ στρεβλωθηση. I think the figurative sense flows from the notion of twisting or warping, rather than from that of torturing on the rack, cf. Arist. *Rapae* 878 (of ἄνδρες γνωμοτυποι) οταν εις εριν οξυμερίμοις ελθωσι στρεβλοῖσι παλαισμοσιν ἀντιλεγοντες, Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 1. 5 ου δει τον δικαστην διαστρεφειν (we must not warp his judgment) . . . ομοιον γαρ καν εἴ τις, ω μελλει χρῆσθαι κανονι, τουτον 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. 36²⁵ has καρδια στρεβλή = κ. σκολιά. It is strange that so common a word as ἀμαθης should not be found elsewhere in the N.T. or LXX., its place being taken by such words as ιδιωτης Acts 4¹³, 1 Cor. 14^{16, 23}, or ἀγραμματος Acts 4¹³, or ὁ ἀγνοῶν Heb. 5². For ἀστηρικτος see above on 2¹⁴.

What are the δυσνόητα τινα referred to? Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. 3⁵⁻⁸), with his apparent disparagement of the Law in Rom. 3^{20, 28}, 4¹⁵, 5²⁰, 6⁴, 7^{4, 11}; his teaching with regard to the πνευματικοί 1 Cor. 1¹⁵; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council as to εἰδωλοθυτα (Acts 15²⁹, Rom. 14, 1 Cor. 8, 10²⁵); as regards the resurrection in baptism (Rom. 6³⁻¹¹, Col. 3¹, 1 Cor. 15¹²); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. 9¹¹⁻²¹), and the Parousia (2 Th. 2).

ως καὶ τας 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 (5³⁹), four times in the Acts, once in Rom. 15⁴, twice in 1 Cor. 15^{3, 4} (κατα τας γραφάς). We find γραφαί without the article in Rom. 1² ο προηγείλατο δια των προφητῶν αυτου εν γραφαις αγιαις, *ib.* 16²⁶ (μυστηρίου) δια γραφῶν προφητικων . . . γνωρισθεντος. The singular is used in Mk. 12¹⁰ ουδε την γραφην ταυτην ανέγνωτε; Lk. 4²¹ σημερον πεπληρωται ἡ γραφη αυτη, Joh. 2²² ἐπιστευσαν τῇ γραφῃ,

on which Westcott's note is 'the phrase occurs elsewhere ten times in St. John 7^{38, 42}, 10³⁵, 13¹⁸, 17¹², 19^{24, 28, 36, 37}, 20⁹ and in every case except 17¹² and 20⁹ the reference is to a definite passage quoted in the context [similarly Joh. 19³⁷ ἕτερα γραφή λέγει] . . . In 17¹² the reference appears to be to the words quoted in 13¹⁸ . . . According to the Apostle's usage, then, we must suppose that a definite passage is present to his mind in 20⁹ . . . which can hardly be any other than Ps. 16¹⁰.' The singular is similarly used of a definite reference in Acts 1¹⁶, 8³² ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ανεγινωσκεν, 8³⁵; in Rom. 4³, 9¹⁷, 10¹¹, 11², Gal. 3⁸, 3²², 4³⁰, 1 Tim. 5¹⁸, in all of which passages St. Paul seems to personify γραφή, using it without αὐτή. So James 2^{8, 23}, 4⁵. The article is omitted in Joh. 19⁷, Rom. 1², 16²⁶ already quoted, and in 2 Tim. 3¹⁶ πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος καὶ ωφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, 'every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching' (R. V.), 1 Pet. 2⁶ περιεχέει ἐν γραφῇ, where Hort thinks 'the translation "in Scripture" is barely possible without the article; nor again, in the absence of τινι, is the sense "in a passage of Scripture" probable. The most natural rendering is simply "in writing" as Sir. 39³² διενόηθην καὶ ἐν γραφῇ ἀφήκα; 42⁷ δόσεις καὶ λήψεις, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ, 44⁵ διηγούμενοι ἔπη ἐν γραφῇ, 2 Chron. 2¹¹ εἶπε Χιραμ βασιλεὺς Τυροῦ ἐν γραφῇ, 21¹² ἦλθεν αὐτῷ ἐν γραφῇ παρὰ Ἑλίου τοῦ προφήτου, Ps. 86⁶, Ezek. 13⁹, 1 Chron. 28¹⁹. Thus περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ is equivalent to "it stands written": compare St. John's formula of quotation εστὶν 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 *Einvl.* ii. p. 109,¹ we should perhaps attach the same general meaning to γραφή in 2 Tim. 3¹⁶, translating 'every inspired writing,' which gives a better reason for the otherwise otiose epithet. But then what are we to say of 2 Pet. 1²⁰ πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλυσεως 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. 2⁶ 'It is contained in Scripture.' A unique use naturally tends to dispense with the article, as in Θεός, Κύριος, βασιλεὺς, σωτήρ, Χριστός, πνεῦμα, νόμος, λόγος.² When St. Paul can speak of ἡ γραφή λέγει, it is a very short step onwards to say γραφή λέγει, shorter still to say ἐν γραφῇ. I think then that here we must translate γραφᾶς '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 λοιπᾶς. 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. 7⁶⁴ οὗτοι ἐζήτησαν γραφὴν αὐτῶν τῆς συνοδίας, Ezek. 13⁹ ἐν γραφῇ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ οὐ γραφήσονται; sometimes for any particular writing, as in Dan. 5⁷ ὅς ἐν ἀναγνῶ 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 διαλεξομεθα of his own treatise, followed shortly after by κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν 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.

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 *εκτοθεν ἄλλων μνηστήρων*, where Odysseus is distinguished from the others, the suitors; Lk. 23³² *ἕτεροι δύο κακούργοι*; . . . Deut. 8²⁰ (*ἀπωλεία ἀπολείσθε*) *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 *λοιπος*, 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 *τα ἔθνη*. Besides *λοιπός* certainly implies a closer connexion than *ἄλλος*. 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 *λοιπος* in Sir. *prol.* *αὐτός ο νομος 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. 4¹⁶, 1 Th. 5²⁷) 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. 54¹, a quotation from Mk. 2¹⁷ is introduced in the words *καὶ ἕτερα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει οτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς*; (*ib.* 13) Lk. 6^{32, 35} is referred to as *τα 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 γεγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάδ καὶ Μωδατ, τοῖς προφητευσασιν ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ*.] What is considered by some to be the still earlier epistle of Barnabas introduces the words *πολλοὶ κλητοὶ, ὀλιγοὶ δὲ ἐκλεκτοί* (Mat. 22¹⁴) with *ὡς γεγραπται*. Can we then suppose that the books of the N.T. are to be understood here? If we give *λοιπός* 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 *γραφὴ*, 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 *λοιπός*), 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 *ἱερα γράμματα* (from which *γραμματεὺς* is derived)

Supposing, then, that *τας λοιπας 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. 5²¹⁻⁴⁴, 15³⁻⁶, 19³⁻¹⁰, Lk. 9⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶, 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. 9¹³ *αγιαζει προς τὴν τῆς σαρκος καθαροτητα*, Joh. 11⁴ *αυτη η ασθeneia ουκ εστι προς θάνατον*, 2 Cor. 4⁶ *ο Θεος ελαμψεν ἐν ταις καρδιαις ημων προς φωτισμόν*, 2 Th. 3⁸ *εργαζομενοι προς το μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι τινα*, 1 Joh. 5¹⁶ *δωσει ζωην τοις ἀμαρτάνουσιν μη προς θάνατον*. For the combination *ιδίαν αὐτῶν* cf. Acts 24²³ *μηδενα κωλυει τῶν ιδίων αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετειν αὐτῷ*, Tit. 1¹² *εἶπεν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἰδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης*, Dem. 1244. 24 *ισως οὐκ αν ἠδίκησε δια το αὐτου ἴδιον*, Theog. 440 *τὸν αὐτου ἰδιον νουν*, cf. above v. 3. For *ἀπώλειαν* cf. above 2¹.

17. *ἡμεῖς 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 18⁶ *ἐκείνη η νύξ προεγνωσθη πατράσιν ημων*.

φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐκπεσητε.] 'Be on your guard, in order that you may not fall away,' cf. Plut. *Mor.* p. 231 c *ου φυλάξῃ συνεχῶς γελοιάζων, οπως μὴ γελοιος γενῃ*; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 37 *φυλάττου οπως μὴ ελαττους τας βούς ποιησης*, Job 36²¹ *φυλαξαι μη πράξης αποπα*, Sir. 22¹¹ *φυλαξαι απ' αὐτοῦ ἵνα μη κοπον εχης*.

τῆ των ἀθεσμων πλάνη συναπαχθέντες.] For *ἀθεσμων* see n. on 2⁷; for *πλάνη* note on 2¹⁸, Jude v. 11; for *συναπαχθέντες* Gal. 2¹³ (of the weak compliance of Peter and Barnabas) *καὶ Β. συναπηχθη αὐτῶν τῇ υποκρισει*, Rom. 12¹⁶ *τοις ταπεινοῖς συναπαγομενοι* (in a good sense).

ἐκπεσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ.] Cf. Gal. 5⁴ *τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπεσατε*, see n. on James 1¹¹ where it has a different sense. *στηριγμός* here only in N.T., found also in Isa. 3¹, 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 *ἀστηρικτοὶ* 2¹⁴, 3¹⁶, and *στηριζω* 1¹² above.

18. *αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι.*] In early Greek *αὐξάνω* is only transitive, like *αυγεο*, and this use is found in 1 Cor. 3⁶ *Ἀπολλως ἐποτισεν, ἀλλα ο Θεος ἠξάνεν*, 2 Cor. 9¹⁰ (God) *αὐξήσει τα γεννηματα τῆς δικαιοσυνης υμῶν*: the passive is also found in 2 Cor. 10¹⁵ *αὐξανόμενης τῆς πιστεως*, Col. 1¹⁰ *καρποφορουντες και αυξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνωσει του Θεου*, 1 Pet. 2² *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξήθητε εἰς σωτηρίαν*, Mt. 13³², Mk. 4⁸. The more common use in the N.T. is the intransitive, of which we have exx. in Mt. 6²⁸, Lk. 1⁸⁰, 2⁴⁰, Joh. 3³⁰, Acts 6⁷, 7¹⁷, 12²⁴, 19²⁰, Eph. 4¹⁵, and here, besides the form *αὐξω* in Eph. 2²¹, Col. 2¹⁹. So Aristotle combines the passive and the intransitive use in *Anal. Post.* i. 13. p. 78 b 5 *ει γαρ το*

is used of holy scripture in 2 Tim. 3¹⁵, *γράμματα* by itself is often used of writings generally, as in Luke 16^{6,7}, Acts 28²¹, 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.

αυξανομενον ουτω σφαιροειδες, αυξανει δ' η σεληνη κ.τ.λ. For the thought we may compare 1 Pet. 2² το λογικον αδολον γαλα επιποθήσατε, ινα εν αυτώ αυξηθητε εις σωτηριαν and Eph. 4¹⁵ αυξήσωμεν εις αυτον τα παντα ος εστιν η κεφαλη. The writer here repeats the prayer of 1². It seems better to take χάριτι absolutely, rather than to connect it with του κυριου, as in the latter case we should have the awkwardness of giving to the genitive a subjective force as regards χαριτι, and an objective force as regards γνωσις.

καὶ γνώσει τον κυριόν ἡμων καὶ σωτηρος Ἰησου Χριστοῦ.] A repetition of 2²⁰ except that γνωσει here takes the place of ἐπιγνωσει there : cf. also 3². 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 3², we naturally understand τοῦ κυριου of Jesus. For γνώσις see above 1⁶ and Appendix on ἐπιγνωσις.

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα . . . αἰωνος.] See 1 Pet. 5¹¹ and notes on Jude v. 25 ; also Joh. 6⁵¹ ζῆσει εις τον αἰωνα, 12³⁴ ὁ Χριστος μενει εις τον αἰωνα. The rare phrase ημέρα αἰωνος is perhaps borrowed from Sir. 18¹⁰ (where man's life is compared with eternity) ὡς σταγων υδατος ἀπο θαλασσης . . . ουτως ολίγα ετη εν ημέρα αἰωνος. It also agrees well with v. 8 above and with the expressions ημέρα κρισεως and ημέρα Κυρίου in 3^{7.10} ; also with Heb. 1⁵ σήμερον γεγεννηκα σε, where Alf. quotes Philo i. p. 554 σημερον ἐστιν ὁ ἀπεραντος καὶ ἀδιεξιτητος αἰων ; see his whole note.

APPENDIX

TO

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

ἐπιγνωσις.

Lightfoot commenting on Col. 1⁹ (αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πασῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ) says ‘the compound ἐπιγνωσις is an advance upon γνῶσις, denoting a larger and more thorough knowledge. So Chrysostom here, εἰδυότε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπιγνώσκειν, cf. Justin M. Dial. 3, p. 221 ἡ παρεχούσα αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν θείων γνῶσιν, εἰπεὶ τῆς τούτων θειότητος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιγνωσιν. So too St. Paul himself contrasts γινώσκειν, γνῶσις, with ἐπιγινώσκειν, ἐπιγνωσις, as the partial with the complete in two passages, Rom. 1^{21, 28} γινόντες τὸν Θεὸν οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἔδοξασαν . . . οὐκ ἔδοκιμασαν τὸν Θεὸν εἶναι ἐν ἐπιγνωσει, 1 Cor. 13¹² . . . Hence also ἐπιγνωσις 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 πίστεως σου ἐνεργῆς γένηται ἐν ἐπιγνωσει παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ, Lightfoot writes ‘ἐπιγνωσις, 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 ἐπιγνωσις 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 ἐπι 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. 2⁵, Hos. 4^{1, 6}, but γνῶσις Θεοῦ in Wisdom 2^{13, 14}²². In Hos. 4⁶ ὁμοιωθῆ (A.V. ‘are destroyed’) ὁ λαὸς μου ὡς οὐκ ἔχων γνῶσιν ὅτι συ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπώσω καὶ ἄπωσομαι 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. 10²² (οὐδεὶς γινώσκει

τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός) we have οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τον υἱόν in Mt. 11²⁷. 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 ἐπιγνῶσις 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. 1²¹ 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: γινόντες 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 ἔδοκιμασαν τον Θεον εχειν εν επιγνωσει, and (v. 32) το δικαιομα του Θεου επιγνωτες, the latter implying a knowledge of the character and will of God, not merely of his existence and his power. So in 1 Cor. 13¹- ἀρτι γινωσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δε επιγνωσομαι καθως και ἐπεγνωσθην: all that Dr. Robinson will allow is that επιγνωσομαι 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 κατηγεσθαι τον λόγον τῆς εὐσεβειας παιδευέσθω πρό τοῦ βαπτισματος την περί του ἀγεννήτου γνῶσιν, τὴν περί υἱου μονογενους ἐπιγνωσιν, την περι τοῦ αγιου πνεύματος πληροφοριαν. 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 ἐπιγνωσις 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, ἐπιγνωσις, and πληροφορια 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 ἐπι in the compound.

I should draw a similar conclusion from the fact that the phrase κατ' ἐπιγνωσιν is twice opposed to κατα 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 (εὐφυως κειμενον προς τας τῶν προειρημενων

τοπων περιφασεις), and in the Clementine passages referred to. We should infer that the phrase *κατα περιφασιν* must mean 'on a broad general view,' and this seems to suit its use in Clem., though Dindorf reads *κατα περίφρασιν* in each case.¹ The 1st passage is *Str.* i. p. 372, where speaking of Paul's sermon at Athens Clement says *δια του αγνωστου Θεου τιμᾶσθαι κατα περιφασιν προς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τον δημιουργὸν Θεὸν ηἰξάτο, κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν δε δειν δι' υἱου 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 *οἱ οὖν οἱ ανοιγομενοι τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὶ ἢ δι' υἱου ἐπιγνωσίς ἐστι τοῦ πατρός, ἢ τῆς περιφασεως* (MS. *περιφράσεως*) *τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς καταληψις,* 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 *οτι δε ου κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν ἴσασι τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ κατα περιφασιν Ἑλλήνων οἱ δοκιμωτατοι, Πητρος ἐν τῷ Κηρυγματι λεγει . . . τουτον τὸν Θεὸν σεβασθε μη κατα τους Ἑλληνας, ως δηλονοτι τον αυτον ημῖν σεβοντων Θεὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑλλησι δοκιμων, ἀλλ' ου κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν παντελη τὴν δι' υἱου παράδοσιν μεμαθηκοτων.*

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 *επι*, 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 *ἐπαγωνιζεσθαι* (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 *γνώσις*: 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 *γνώσις* 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 *περίφρασιν*.

to claim it as part of the Catholic heritage than to set up against it the special term *ἐπιγνωσις*.

And now to consider what uses of *ἐπι* 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 *ἐπι* 'seems to fix the verb on a definite object'; and further on he says that 'as a rule *γνωσις* 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 *ἐπι* 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 *ἐπι* has this force of onward movement or pressure, as in *ἐπακολουθεῖν*, *ἐπεξελεῖν*, *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 *ἐπαβελτερωσας τον ποτ' οντ' ἀβελτερον* 'to befool even more,' *ἐπαγλαΐζω* 'to grace still more,' *ἐπανορθω*, *ἐπανξανα*, *ἐπεντείνω*, *ἐπεξήγησις*, *ἐπιβιβαιωσις*. 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*, *ἐπιδορπιος*, *ἐπαίτεω*, *ἐπαμπεχω*, *ἐπανερωτάω*, *ἐπαπορέω*, *ἐπιμανθανω*, *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 *ἐπιγνωσις*, 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 δόνατα ἀποτετυφλωμενοι, μὴδ' ἐπιγινώσκοντες τὸν εὐεργετην*, i. 9. 11 *ἐπιγινόντες τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς συγγενειαν*, i. 29. 59 'Bring me Caesar without his trappings, and I am quite at my ease': *ὅταν δε μετὰ τούτων ἔλθῃ . . . τί ἕλλο ἢ ἐπεγνώκα τὸν κύριον ὡς ὁ δραπέτης*; iv. 8. 20 *τί κακόν, ἐν οἷς ἐποιοῦν ἐπιγινώσκεσθαι τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἐν δε τοῖς συμβόλοις μὴ*; 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.'

φθειρω and φθορά.

The characteristic mark of words belonging to the root φθι, of which these, along with φθίω and φθινω, are the most important, as distinguished from such words as κτείνω, καίνω, σφαττω, φονεύω, ολλυμι, θανατω, 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 φθινυθω and φθισις, but φθινω is used also of violent death, as in Aesch. *S. c. Theb.* 970 προς φιλου ξφθισο, και φίλον εκτανες, *Od.* iv. 741 μεμαασιν 'Οδυσσῆος φθισαι γονον, 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 φθειρειν την γῆν, τον σιτον, τα δενδρα; especially of moral injury, as in Xen. *Mem.* i. 5. 3 κακουργοτατον ἐστι μὴ μονον τον οικον αλλα και το σώμα και την ψυχὴν φθειρειν, Plato *Legg.* xii. 958 c πολιν και νομους φθειρων ζημιούσθω; then of bribery, and seduction, of debasing the quality of anything, etc.

φθορα 'rotteness' has a similar range of meaning. Its original force is seen in Philo M. ii. p. 96 εναπεθνησκε τα γενη τῶν ἰχθυων ἀπαντα, ατε τῆς ζωτικῆς δυναμειω εις φθοροποιον μεταβαλουσης, ως δυσωδιασ πάντα αναπεπλήσθαι. Hence it is generally defined as η προς το χειρον μεταβολη, and is frequently found in philosophic writings as the counterpart of γενεσις, 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, φθορευς a seducer, αφθορος 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, συμφωνια μεν ουν αρμόζει προσευχῆ, κοινωνία δε φθορᾶς λυει την εντευξιν, on which Clement comments ου γαρ, ως τινες ἐξηγησαντο, δέσιν γυναικος προς ανδρα τὴν σαρκος προς τὴν φθοραν επιπλοκὴν μηνυεσθαι υποτοπητεον, τῶν γαρ αντικρυς διαβόλω προσαπτουτων την του γάμου ευρεσιν αθειων ἀνθρώπων ἐπίνοιαν κατηγορει· και κινδυνευει βλασφημεισθαι ὁ νομοθετης.

In the LXX. φθείρω occurs in the sense 'to kill' in Wisd. 16^{5, 27} δηγμασι οφειων ἐφθείροντο . . . υπο πυρος φθειρόμενον: in the sense to 'destroy' or 'devastate' in Exod. 10¹⁵ (the swarm of locusts) ἐκάλυψε την οψιν τῆς γῆς και ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ, 2 Sam. 20²⁰ Joab denies that he seeks to destroy a city, 1 Chron. 20¹ εφθειραν την χώραν, Isa. 24⁴ εφθάρη η οικουμενη: to 'injure,' 'mar,' 'spoil' in Lev. 19²⁷ φθ. τὴν ὄψιν του πώγωνος 'to mar the corners of the beard,' Deut. 34⁷ 'natural force abated,' Jer. 13⁹ φθ. τὴν υβριν 'Ιουδα 'mar the pride of Judah.' In Gen. 6¹¹ ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ is used in a moral sense of the corruption of the inhabitants of the earth.

φθορά is used of destruction in Ps. 103⁴ τὸν λυτρουμενον εκ φθορας τὴν ζωὴν σου, Micah 2¹⁰ διεφθάρητε φθορα, Isa. 24³ φθορα φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ; of being worn out by toil Exod. 18¹⁸ φθορᾶ καταφθαρση; of moral corruption in Wisdom 14¹² ευρεσις ειδῶλων φθορα ζωης.

The strengthened forms διαφθειρω 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. 15³³ φθείρουσιν ἡθη χρησθ' ομιλῖαι κακαί, bad company is injurious to character. So 2 Cor. 11³ φοβουμαι μή πως, ως ο οφίς ἐξηπάτησεν Ευαν ἐν τη πανουργία αυτου, φθαρη τα νοήματα υμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστον lest your thoughts should be seduced from the simple faith in Christ, 2 Cor. 7² ουδενα ἠδικήσαμεν, ουδένα ἐφθείραμεν, ουδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν. In the last passage Alford understands it of outward injury 'we ruined no man'; but if we compare Tit. 2⁷ παρεχομενος εν τη διδασκαλία αφθορίαν and 1 Thess. 2³⁸ where the apostle protests that his teaching was not ἐξ ακαθαρσιαις or ἐν δόλω, not ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας οὔτε προφασει 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. 4²² τον παλαιον ανθρωπον, τον φθειρόμενον κατα τας ἐπιθυμιας τῆς ἀπατης, 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. 4¹⁶ εἰ καὶ ὁ ἐξω ημων ἀνθρωπος διαφθειρεται ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσω ημῶν ἀνακαινεται. But, again, it may refer to moral corruption as in 2 Cor. 11³.' 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. 1⁴ below. In Apoc. 19² ἔκρινεν τὴν πορνῆν τὴν μεγάλην ἣτις εφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τη πορνείᾳ αυτῆς, the phrase φθ. τ. γῆν is used of moral corruption, as in Gen. 6¹¹, cf. Apoc. 11¹⁸. In 1 Cor. 3^{16 17} οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστ' καὶ το πνευμα του Θεου ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκει; εἴ τις τον ναὸν του Θεου φθειρει, φθερεῖ τουτον ο Θεος· ὁ γαρ ναὸς του Θεου αγίος ἐστιν, οἱτινες εστε υμεις, 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. 6¹⁹ ἡ οὐκ οἰδατε οτι το σωμα υμων ναος του εν υμιν αγίου πνευματος 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 οσα δε φυσικως ἐπίστανται, ἐν τουτοις φθειρονται and the imitation in 2 Pet. 2¹² ουτοι δε, ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημενα εις αλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημουντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αυτῶν και φθαρήσονται. The former is translated in A.V. 'in those they corrupt themselves,' in R.V. 'in those things are they destroyed' (margin 'corrupted').

Here too I should be inclined to join the two meanings 'these things are their moral and physical ruin.' The latter is translated in A.V. 'made to be taken and destroyed,' 'shall utterly perish in their own corruption,' in R.V. 'born to be taken and destroyed,' 'shall in their destroying (mg. 'corruption') surely be destroyed.' As I have stated in the note, I think it means 'shall share the destruction of the brutes,' *i.e.* 'shall not attain to eternal life.'

φθορά is used of the physical corruption of the dead body in 1. Cor. 15^{42, 50}, σπείρεται ἐν φθορά; cf. Col. 2²² ἃ ἐστὶν εἰς φθοράν 'meats are destined for decomposition'; Gal. 6⁸ 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. 2¹² discussed above, φθορά is primarily physical.

There are two other instances of its use in 2 Pet. viz. 1⁴ ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, which may be compared with Eph. 4²² already discussed, τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπατῆς; and 2 Pet. 2¹⁹ δούλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, which reminds us of Rom. 8²¹ καὶ αὕτη 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. 1²⁰ 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. 1⁴, 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. 1⁴, Rom. 8^{13, 14}). 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, 15}. '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.

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 *φθορα* 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. 12³³ *οπου κλεπτης ουκ εγγίζει ουδε σης διαφθείρει* 'corrupts,' 2 Cor. 4¹⁶ *ει και ο εξω ημων ανθρωπος διαφθείρεται* 'decays,' 'is being wasted away'; Apoc. 8⁹ *το τριτον των πλοίων διεφθάρησαν* 'were destroyed'; Apoc. 11¹⁸ *διαφθείραι τους διαφθείροντας την γην*, 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. 19²). The only case in which the word means simply moral corruption is 1 Tim. 6⁵ *ανθρωπων διεφθαρμενων τον νουν*. *Διαφθορά* occurs several times in Acts 13 in reference to the quotation *ιδειν διαφθοράν*, denoting physical corruption.

Another derivative, *αφθορία* occurs in Tit. 2⁷ *παρεχομενος εν τη διδασκαλια αφθορίαν* of moral incorruptness.

More important are the words *φθαρτος* and *αφθαρτος* which are often used in the N.T. to distinguish the perishable from the imperishable,

αφθαρο
αναγεγεννημένοι ουκ εκ σπορας φθαρτής, αλλά αφθάρτου. In Rom. 1²³ and 1 Th. 1¹⁷ *αφθαρτος* is used of God, in 1 Pet. 1⁴ of the *κληρονομια*. In 1 Pet. 3⁴ the imperishable ornament of a meek and quiet spirit is opposed to the outward adorning of gold.

So *αφθαρσία* is used of the life to come in 1 Cor. 15⁴² *εγειρεται εν αφθαρ-*

σια, Rom. 2⁷ αφθαρσιαν ζητουσιν, 1 Cor. 15⁵⁰ οὐδε η φθορα τὴν αφθαρσίαν κληρονομει, 2 Tim. 1¹⁰ καταργησαντος μεν τὸν θάνατον, φωτισαντος δε ζωὴν κ. αφθαρσιαν δια τοῦ ευαγγελιου. In Eph. 6²⁴ it is questioned how ἡ χάρις μετα παντων τῶν ἀγαπωντων τον κυριον ημών 'Ι.Χ. εν αφθαρσια 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 φθειρω, as in *Eph.* 17 δια τοῦτο μυρον ελαβεν επι τῆς κεφαλῆς ὁ κυριος, ινα πνεη τη ἐκκλησία αφθαρσιαν, where Lightfoot says the idea of *incorruptibility* must be prominent here, as the preceding φθειρη requires, though the idea of *immortality* may not be absent. In § 16 we have the phrase οἱ οἰκοφθοροι βασιλειαν Θεου ου κληρονομησουσιν and εαν πιστιν φθειρη, both alluding to 1 Cor. 3^{16, 17} ουκ οιδατε οτι ναος Θεου ἐστε . . . εἴ τις τον ναον του Θεου φθειρει, φθερει τουτον ὁ Θεος, 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.

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.

Συμεων Πετρος.

The name Πετρος is a translation of the Aramaic Kephas, as Christ of Messiah, Didymus of Thomas, Ζηλωτής of Κανααῖος. The form Σιμων is hellenized from Συμεων, 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, Συμεων 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 Ἀνδρεας.

² Κηφας stands, with its interpretation, in John 1⁴³; it is also found alone four times in 1 Cor. and four times in 2 Cor. The only passage besides this in which Συμεων is used by itself of Peter is St. James' speech in Acts 15¹⁴. Σιμων stands alone in Matt. once; in Mk. ch. i. four times (before the name Peter had been given), and once in 14³⁷, where Jesus λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σιμων καθέδεις; Luke has it ten times; John twice in ch. i., thrice in ch. xxi., where the penitent Apostle is thrice addressed as Σιμων Ἰωάννου; 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. Σιμων Πετρος 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.

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.

ΤΟΙΣ ΙΣΟΤΙΜΟΝ ἡμῖν ΛΑΧΟΥΣΙΝ ΠΙΣΤΙΝ.

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. 7¹⁴) 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 8¹⁴).

Does the statement here made hold good in the present day? Have all Christians *πιστιν ἰσοτιμον*? Was the faith of the doubting father *ισοτιμος* with that of the Syro-phœnician woman? Is that of any ordinary Christian *ισοτιμος* with the faith of an a Kempis, or a Luther, or a Baxter, or a Bishop Wilson? The word is no doubt intended as an encouragement; but perhaps also as a warning. The writer speaks to those of a like faith, not of a different faith. Where the faith is of the same quality, however different in quantity, it contains within it, like the grain of mustard seed, a promise of endless expansion.

ΕΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝῃ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ.

Choice does not mean favouritism. Israel was chosen to be a blessing to others, and at the same time to suffer more than any other people. God wills that all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. This impartiality marked the determinate counsel of the Father no less than the redemptive work of the Son. Salvation is for all, not, as the degenerate Jews supposed, a peculiar privilege for a peculiar people.

SALUTATION (*vv.* 2-4).

Grace and peace be multiplied upon you through the knowledge of [God and of Jesus]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 (*εν δικαιοσύνη*) named as the cause of the gift of faith to all the members of the Church in common, regardless of distinctions of Jew and Gentile. In *v.* 2 we have the knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus (*εν επιγνωσει*) 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 (*δια της επιγνωσεως*) 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 *της θειας δυναμεως αυτου, του καλεσαντος ημας, θειας φυσεως* 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. 1⁷, Ephes. 1¹⁻⁶, in both of which the name Jesus Christ occurs four times in the first three verses, and in Rom. 1⁷.

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 the genitive of possession, and the verb has disappeared.

χαρις υμιν καὶ εἰρηγή πληθυνθειή 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 *γνωσις* and *ἐπίγνωσις* see Appendix.

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.'

in no age of the world have there been so many, and such devoted efforts to resist evil. It is enough to recall the names of Mrs. Fry, Wilberforce, Shaftesbury, Maurice, Father Mathew, Dr. Barnardo, to mention but a few of our own countrymen, who have led the way in this noble crusade. Never before have Englishmen shown so much zeal for the conversion of the heathen at home and abroad. Never before in the history of the world has there been a more earnest effort both in England and abroad to understand and to apply the story of the life and teaching of our Lord. Unhappily even here disunion has sprung up. Community of aim in different bodies has not been found a strong enough bond to overcome the separating influences of diversity of order and method. The generous element of appreciative emulation has too often passed into a depreciative jealousy. Self-will on the part of individuals has too often failed in consideration for others, and hindered the common work of the Church, even where it has not led to actual schism.

Are we then to be satisfied with this? Was it this to which our Master looked forward when he said 'Not peace but a sword'? Far different is His meaning. He spoke of the necessary effect of the new wine in old bottles, the introduction of an unexampled ideal of righteousness into a world peopled by men, good, bad, and indifferent. To some of each of these classes the new teaching would appeal at once as a true divine message, freed from the traditional form which had disguised its meaning and deadened its force before. To others, as to Saul the Pharisee, it seemed to be a denial or reversal of the old revelation, and roused their strongest opposition; the good being often for a while the enemy of the better. Others, who had contrived some sort of *modus vivendi* with the old religion, found the new intolerably exacting, and its preachers men not worthy to live. But the blood of the martyrs is seed: Saul the persecutor became Paul the apostle.

Our Lord's words then are descriptive of a period of transition from a lower to a higher ideal. It would be a total misconception of their spirit, if we used them to make us contented with the world as we see it around us.

But how are we to explain the failure? Why is it that the knowledge of God has not been followed according to promise by universal peace? To this it may be answered in the first place, that the present is an era of transition, if ever there was one since the beginning of the world. Never was change more rapid and multifarious than during the last century. In science, in industry, in politics, in social life, in education, in religion, how different the end of the century from its beginning! One result has been that appeals to tradition and authority have far less effect than they used to have, and that classes or policies or views of life, which base their claims on these appeals, tend to fall into the background. The incredible so rapidly became credible, the impossible possible, the certain either uncertain or actually false, that men ceased to hold firmly to any belief, especially where it placed a restraint on their natural inclinations.

This fact however does not entirely remove the difficulty; for man,

being an imperfect creature on the way to become perfect, must, so far as he acts up to his vocation and destiny, be always in a state of transition, always rising from lower to higher. Thus in all ages the Christian is called upon to be a soldier, though the warfare is hotter at one time than another, and the struggle becomes more difficult and more complicated in proportion to the rapidity of the movement, and the consequent division in the ranks of the well-meaning and public-spirited. At such a time it behoves Christians to bear in mind the warning of Gamaliel 'lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.' May it not be that the present revolt against authority, in almost every sphere of thought and action, is a sign that we need an authority of a different and more penetrating kind; that the time is approaching of which Isaiah prophesied, when 'thy children shall be all taught of God'; a time when the external law written on tables of stone should become a law written on the heart; when, in the words of Christ, men should no longer be called 'father and rabbi, because one is your master and all ye are brethren'? May it not be a sign that 'the good message' consists in expansion rather than repression; that its true bearing is shown not so much in insisting on the restrictions of the past, as in fostering and guiding the aspirations of the future? To put it somewhat differently, should it not be equally our care to stimulate independence of thought and feeling, and to foster the spirit of reverence and humility? May we not hope to do this by the endeavour, on the part of each and all, to realize more our own immediate responsibility to God and to our fellow-men for the use we make both of our reason and our will? There is a danger, no doubt, in encouraging people to think and act for themselves, instead of simply following the traditions of preceding generations; but it is a danger which is inevitable at a certain point in the onward progress of humanity. There are many excellent men who are inclined to despair when they find the world turning with impatience from that which has been the breath of life to themselves. So Samuel was inclined to despair when the rule of the Judges was exchanged for that of the Davidic Kingdom; but 'God fulfils Himself in many ways.' After all it is He who is responsible for the conduct and guiding of the men He has made. After all He is the Great Teacher. If He sees that it is through what seems to us error and heresy, that man must rise to higher purpose and clearer light, who shall gainsay Him? Meanwhile our duty is to be true to the light He vouchsafes to us, and to trust Him absolutely for the future.

So far I have been speaking of Christianity as a theory of life, and have endeavoured to show that, as such, it has a natural tendency, far beyond all other theories, to bring about peace, internal and external. But our text speaks not of an abstract theory, but of intimate acquaintance with a Person (*ἐν ἐπιγνώσει 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

peace with grace, as the immediate consequence of that close communion with God. In his note on 1 Pet. 1² 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

τα προς ζωην και ευσεβειαν (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. 4⁸ *η ευσεβεια προς παντα ωφελιμος εστιν, επαγγελιαν εχουσα ζωης τῆς νυν και τῆς μελλουσης*, 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, *ζωη* 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 *αιωνιος*, as in Joh. 6⁴⁰ 'This is the will of my Father, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth in him should have eternal life'; 6³³ 'The words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life'; 17³ 'This is life eternal that they should know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent'; Joh. 4¹⁴, 7³⁸. Sometimes it is spoken of as 'the real life,' 1 Tim. 6¹⁹ *η οντως ζωη*; sometimes as the 'life of God,' Eph. 4¹⁸ 'being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them'; sometimes as the life of Christ, 2 Cor. 4¹¹ 'that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal body,' Col. 3³ 'Our life is hid with Christ in God,' *ib. v. 4* 'Christ our life'; sometimes it is connected with the Spirit, Gal. 6⁸ 'he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap

¹ It may be noticed that grace and knowledge are again joined in 3¹⁸.

eternal life,' Rom. 8⁶ '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. 18⁸, 19^{17, 29} and again 'to pass from death into life,' 1 Joh. 3¹⁴.

I know of no modern writer who has thrown such light upon the Christian mystery of Life, as Hort in his difficult, but profoundly interesting and instructive lectures on *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*. After speaking of life as seen in the heathen world, in the passage I have quoted above, he proceeds to speak of the higher life known to Israel.

'There is no life, worthy to be called life, entirely separate from joy and gladness. The lower life, when it exists in any strength, has in it at once a gladness of personal energy and a delight in the gladness of all living creatures, as it is displayed in their youth or comeliness. The higher life for Israel could never be wanting in this characteristic . . . "With Thee," says the Psalmist, "is the fountain of life." The perennial spring of water that leaps and flashes as though it were a living thing, breaking ceaselessly forth from a hidden source, is the best image of that higher life bestowed on him to whom God has unveiled his face . . . The spontaneous uncultured joy of spring or of youth is short-lived. It dies out with the mere lapse of time . . . But he whose heart has learned to make answer to the Lord comes to find that the power of life and joy lives on with him, while outward things are taking their course of obstruction or decay. He has a life exempt from being dried up, for it flows not from himself or from any part of the perishable creation, but from an ever-living fountain in the heavens' (pp. 98, 99). 'Whatever life had anywhere been found and lost, whatever life had never been found, was given to man in Christ. It may be that this or that portion of the vast inheritance of life has never as yet been claimed, or has been but doubtfully claimed, because faith in Him has been too petty or wilful in its scope as well as too feeble in its energy. But in Christ life was given in its fulness nevertheless, and in that due subordination which alone secures that nothing be lost. This is the one character of the Gospel which takes precedence of all others : its many partial messages are unfoldings of its primary message of life. Salvation according to Scripture is nothing less than the preservation, restoration, or exaltation of life ; while nothing that partakes or can partake of life is excluded from its scope ; and as is the measure, grade, and perfection of life, such is the measure, grade, and perfection of salvation' (pp. 100, 101). 'The call to the disciples to receive Christ unreservedly as the Life, is a call which surely the Church of later days may well accept as addressed to itself . . . It is the glory of this life to include every life. We do not purify it but impoverish it by detracting from its fulness. It may be that all lower forms of life are rising and will rise yet more in rebellion against the life of Christ, as though it were only a cunningly devised death. Yet the Church will be false to herself and to the universality of the task committed to her, if she seeks to protect the life of Christ by striving to fence it round into a little province of peculiar emotion. There is indeed that in it which is known only to those who have most communed with the living Lord Himself, and been baptized by Him with a holy spirit and with fire. Yet it ceases to be His life when it ceases to go forth and save. It was ordained to purify and control every lower life ; and therefore it must enter freely into them all. If we fear that it may lose itself in the vast and often lawless universe of life beneath, the danger is to be averted not by wilfully contracting it within a narrower field, but by seeking greater intensity of life in deeper and more submissive communion with the Head Himself in the heavens . . . If other lives will not be ruled by His life, they must presently seek to cast it out as an evil thing. Wherever they for a time prevail, they work perdition and destruction for a little hour, and then they perish, while yet proving that life cannot be slighted or repudiated with impunity. Wherever He prevails, He conquers that He may save . . . He destroyed nothing that had life : He lives, that all which once lived may live again in Him.

No ancient form of life can perish for ever, though it be long before mankind are fitted to receive it back at Christ's hands, renewed and transfigured by His resurrection . . . The Saviour Himself stands always nigh to transform by His presence the purifying water without into the wine of gladness within. So He manifests His glory to His disciples. So His disciples believe on Him and live' (pp. 146-149).

τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμας ἰδια δοξῆ 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. 12³² (also 3¹⁴, 8²⁸), where the lifting up of Jesus, that is, the crucifixion, by which, more than by any other single act, He manifested His self-sacrificing love for man, is declared to be the magnet which should draw all men to Him—we love Him because He loved us—as well as the manifestation of His glory: see Joh. 12²⁸ *ἔλθλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and 13³¹, where the departure of Judas to complete the work of betrayal is followed by the saying *νῦν ἐδοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθῃ 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 τα τιμια καὶ μεγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρηται (v. 4).

As our trust in the kindness and goodwill of a friend extends far beyond any definite promise of assistance which he may have made; as it enables us to give the right interpretation of any reported message of his, and even to discriminate between true and false messages ascribed to him; so is it with our trust in God. It is not so much in consequence of this or that particular promise as it is through the manifestation of the Father's love in the person of His Son, that we are emboldened to hope for all future blessings. Therefore it is that in our prayers we encourage ourselves with the thought of what He has already done for man, no less than with the thought of His actual promises for the future. Such is the appeal in the words of the ancient hymn 'Qui Mariam absolvisti et latronem exaudisti, mihi quoque spem dedisti,' and in the suffrages of our Litany, 'By thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, by thine agony and bloody sweat, by

thy cross and passion, by thy glorious resurrection and ascension.' Hence too it was, that St. Paul in preaching to the Corinthians 'determined to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ and him crucified.' Deeds are more than words, and the life of glory and goodness has a wider scope, and penetrates more deeply even than the deeds regarded by themselves.

ἵνα δια 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. 11¹³ '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. 4¹²⁻¹⁶ '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. 17²² '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. 3¹⁸ '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. 2²⁰ '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 ἐπιθυμία φθοράς (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.

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 ρέψῃ ἐπὶ τα τῆς ἀθανασίας τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μισθὸν κομίσῃται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ γενῆται θεός κ.τ.λ.,* and a little above *οὔτε οὖν φύσει θνητὸς ἐγένετο οὔτε ἀθάνατος. εἰ γὰρ ἀθάνατον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πεποιθῆκε, θεὸν αὐτὸν πεποιθῆκε.* This idea may have originated in the language used in 1 Tim. 6¹⁶ *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 *κυριῶς ἀθάνατος ὁ Θεός· οὐσία γὰρ ἀθάνατος, οὐ μετουσία . . . τοῖς δὲ ἀγγέλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς τὴν ἀθανασίαν δεδωρηται.* Compare the opposition in 1 Cor. 15⁵³ *δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδυσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἰδ. v. 42 σπειρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγειρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ,* Wisdom ii. 23 f. *ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτίσεν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ιδιότητος (= θείας κοινωνοῦ φύσεως) ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν· φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἰδ. vi. 19 ἀφθαρσία ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ.* God Himself is called *ἀφθαρτος* in Rom. 1²³, 1 Th. 1¹⁷ and the Christian inheritance *ἀφθαρτος καὶ ἀμικτός* in 1 Pet. 1⁴.

This corruption which pervades the world is the result of *ἐπιθυμία*; compare Gal. 6⁸ 'he that soweth to his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption,' and 1 Joh. 2¹⁷ 'the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' So St. Paul (Rom. 5¹²) attributes 'the reign of death' in the world to the entrance of sin (*i.e.* as St. James says 1¹⁵ of fully developed *ἐπιθυμία*) through one man, see Wisdom 2²³ quoted above; and, again, declares the same truth more generally in the phrase *τὸ φρονήμα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος* (Rom. 8⁶).

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

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. 5²²¹. *χαρά, εἰρηνη, μακροθυμια, χρηστότης, αγαθωσυνη, πραύτης*, as well as *δικαιοσυνη* and *αλήθεια* mentioned in Eph. 5⁹? In 1 Pet. we find in addition to those mentioned in 2 Pet. viz. faith, and love, and *φιλαδελφία* (1²², 2¹⁷, 3⁸), and *υπομονή* (2²⁰), a number of other graces, such as obedience (*ὑπακοη* 1², 2¹⁴, 2²²), joy (*χαρα ανεκκλαλητος και δεδοξασμενη* 1⁸), sobriety (*νηφειν* 1¹⁸, 4¹⁷, 5⁸), holiness (*ἀγιοτης* 1¹⁴, 2⁵, 9), fear (*φόβος* 1¹⁷), meekness (*πραύτης* 3⁴, 1⁵), compassion (*ευσπλαγγία* 3⁸), humility (*ταπεινόφρονες* 3⁸, and especially 5⁵, 6), moderation (*σωφροσυνη* 4¹), hospitality (*φιλόξενοι* 4⁹); while on the other hand 1 Pet. omits four out of the list in 2 Pet., viz. *αρετη, γνωσις, ἐγκρατεια, ευσέβεια*. 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, *σωφροσυνη, ἀνδρεια, δικαιοσυνη*? It may be said perhaps that *αρετή* and *υπομονή* cover the ground of *ανδρεία*, that *ἐγκράτεια* represents *σωφροσυνη*, however imperfectly, and that *αγάπη*, since it fulfils the whole law, is more than *δικαιοσυνη*. 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 *ου τα νυν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτα, ἀλλα ο πεποίηκα, ἐν ω, καταπαυσας τα παντα, αρχην ημερας ὀγδότης ποιησω, ο ἔστιν, ἀλλου κοσμου αρχην. διο και αγομεν την ημέραν την ογδοην εις ευφροσυνην, ἐν ἣ και ὁ Ἰησοῦς ανεστη εκ νεκρων και φανερωθεις ανέβη εις ουρανους*, 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 *οι τοιοῦτοι κατοπαουσουσιν ἐν ορει αγιω θεου . . . οι μη καταμειναντες ἐν εβδομαδι αναπαυσεως, αγαθοεργία δε θείας ἐξομοιωσεως εις ογδοαδικῆς εὐεργεσιας κληρονομιαν υπερκυψαντες, ακορέστου θεωριας εἰλικρινεῖ ἐποπτεια προσαν-εχοντες*, *ib.* vi. pp. 811 f. § 140, *Str.* iv. p. 636, § 158 *τῇ εβδόμῃ ἢ ἀνάπαυσις θρησκευεται, τη δὲ ογδοῃ ἰλασμον προσφερει*,¹ *ib.* § 159 *ειτε ἡ απλανῆς χώρα η πλησιαζουσα τω νοητω κοσμω ὀγδοας λεγοιτο . . . ἐξαναδυναι γενεσεως τε και αμαρτιας χρηναι λέγει τον γνωστικον*, *ib.* p. 637, § 162 *Βασιλειδης δικαιοσυνην τε και εἰρηνην υπολαμβανει ἐν ὀγδοαδι μενειν*. That the writer of 2 Pet. regarded the ogdoad as a mystic number may perhaps be inferred from a comparison between 2⁵, where he speaks of *ογδοον Νῶε*, and Jude v. 14, where Enoch is described as the seventh from Adam.

¹ Ezek. 44²⁶, 27.

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 ταυτα in vv. 8, 9, 10 and ουτως in v. 11. In 3¹⁸ he exhorts his readers to grow (αυξάνετε) in grace (which may be regarded as summing up the list) and knowledge (γνωσει equivalent to ἐπιγνωσει here). Cf. Eph. 4¹², especially v. 15 ἀληθευοντες εν ἀγαπη αυξησωμεν εις αυτον τα πάντα, ος εστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, 1 Pet. 2² ως αρτιγεννητα βρέφη το λογικον αδολον γάλα ἐπιποθησατε, ινα ἐν αυτω αυξήσητε, 2 Th. 1³ υπεραυξάνει ἡ πιστις υμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει η ἀγαπη.

ληθην λαβὼν του καθαρισμου (v. 9).

So Moses warns the Israelites (Deut. 4²³) προσεχετε υμιν, μη ἐπιλάθησθε τὴν διαθηκὴν Κυρίου του Θεου ημων ἣν διεθετο προς υμας: cf. 2 Kings 17³⁸.

βεβαιαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιῆσθαι (v. 10).

So, in other epistles, the elect are urged to make their election sure: as in Eph. 4¹ παρακαλω ουν υμας ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκληθητε, ἰδ. 6¹³ ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλιαν του Θεου ινα δυναθῆτε . . . ἀπαντα ἐργασάμενοι στήναι, 1 Cor. 9²⁷ υπωπιαζω μου το σωμα . . . μηπως αλλοις κηρυξας αὐτος ἀδοκιμος γενωμαι, Col. 3¹² ἐνδυσασθε ουν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ του Θεου σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμῶν, 1 Th. 5¹⁹ το πνεῦμα μη σβέννυτε compared with 1⁴ εἶδοτες τὴν ἐκλογὴν υμῶν, 1 Pet. 1¹⁷ ἐν φόβω τον τῆς παροικιας υμῶν γρονον αναστράφητε compared with 1^{1,2} ἐκλεκτοις . . . κατα προγνωσιν, and 2 Pet. 3¹⁷ φυλάσσεσθε ινα μη ἐκπέσητε του ιδιου στηριγμου. The Vulgate adds 'per bona opera certam . . . faciatis.'

¹ See above on πληθυνθείη in v. 2, and below on αυξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ

THE WRITER'S PROMISE (vv. 12-15).

Therefore, that you may escape the dangers and inherit the blessings named, it will be my care¹ continually to remind you of your duty in this respect (namely that you should make your calling sure in the manner I have pointed out), though I know well that you are familiar with the lesson, and are established in the truth which has been delivered to you [reading παραδοθείση. If we retain παρούση 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 εἰδοτας 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 γαρ. I am inclined to think therefore that the writer here alludes to the Gospel according to St. Mark.

THE GROUNDS OF OUR BELIEF (vv. 16-21).

When we preached to you the coming of the Lord in power, we relied upon no cunning fable, but on the witness of our own eyes, which had beheld His majesty. For He received from the Father honour and glory, when there came to Him from² the excellent Glory such a voice as this: 'Behold My Son, My beloved, in Whom I am well pleased'; and it was this voice we heard proceeding from heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount. We who witnessed the Transfiguration have had thereby confirmed to us the testimony of the prophets, to which you do well to give heed, as to a lamp shining in a dark place until the day break and the day-star arise in your hearts; recognizing this first of all, that no prophecy is a matter of

¹ See Introduction on the Text.

² See Introduction on the Text.

private interpretation, for it was not by the will of man that prophecy came at any time, but men delivered the message of God under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Chase takes the word *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 1⁴, and in the eternal kingdom of 1¹¹: 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 1¹⁶, 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 παρασχών πασιν, 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.'

ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν ἀύχμηρῷ 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 *παιδαγωγος* 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 steadfastness 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

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 *ιδίας επιλυσεως* ; 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 επιλυσεως* ; 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 now¹ . . . 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 prophetic 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 hyperbolic. 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.'

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 fore-tellers 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 ους η ὁδος 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. 1⁶ γινώσκει Κυριος ὁδον δικαίων, 119²⁷ ὁδὸν δικαιομάτων σου συνετίσθη με . . . ὁδὸν ἀδικίας ἀπόστησόν 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.

ὁδὸν ἀληθείας ἡρετισάμην, Isa. 26^{7, 8} οὐδὸς εὐσεβῶν εὐθεία . . . ὁδὸς Κυρίου κρίσις, 35⁸, Jer. 6¹⁶, 10²³ οἶδα, Κύριε, οτι ουχι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ πορεύεται καὶ κατορθώσει πορείαν αὐτοῦ, especially 21⁸ 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' (16¹⁷), the 'way of God' (18²⁶), and 'the way' simply, meaning the Christian life (9², 19^{9, 23}). Above all, Jesus speaks of Himself as the Way in Joh. 14⁶ ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ οὐδεὶς ἐρχεται 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 πορευομαι (Exod. 16⁴, Lev. 26³, Deut. 5³³, Ps. 86¹¹, Isa. 2³, Acts 9³¹), περιπατω (Rom. 13¹², 1. Cor. 7¹⁷, 2. Cor. 5⁷, 12¹⁸, Gal. 5¹⁶, Eph. 5², 1 Joh. 2⁶) are used of the Christian life.

EXAMPLES OF JUDGMENT JOINED WITH MERCY¹ (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.

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 pleasure¹ 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 τρεμουσιν βλασφημουντες (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 ἀγαπαῖς υμῶν σπιλαδες, συννεωχουμενοι αφοβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, on which a Lapidé comments as follows: 'Primitus Christiani in symbolum caritatis, post Eucharistiam celebrabant convivia, communia tam pauperibus quam divitibus, sed frugaliter 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 apostolorum 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, ἀγαπήτοι twice, and ἠγαπημενοι once, in the ordinary sense. He uses the plurals δοξαί (v. 8) and αἰσχυνας (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 ἡ

'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 ἀγαπαι'? The ἀγάπη, it is evident, gives an opportunity of feasting, in a manner which causes scandal (σπιλαδες). 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 κλασις 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 κλασις ἄρτου is as follows. He distinguishes the Pauline source in Acts 2⁴², ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλασει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, from the Judaistic source in 2⁴⁶, καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ομοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντες τε καθ' οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελαμβάνον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλίᾳ 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 διδαχὴ 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 familial du pain à table que par l'acte de foi qui l'accompagne.' Of the latter he asserts 'l'intention judaïsante de son auteur se manifeste : mais l'agape s'évanouit.' On the contrary, I should be much surprised if my readers fail to recognize the agape in both. His examination of the language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. seems to me equally inconclusive.

By the end of the second century the term agape was in regular use for the love-feasts; see quotations from Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinus in Appendix C to my edition of Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. For a more general account see Smith's *D. of Bible* under 'Lord's Supper,' *Dict. of Christian Antiquities* under 'Agape,' and the Encyclopaedias of Herzog and of Welzer and Welte.

ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγγόμενον (v. 16).

The writer takes literally the narrative in Num. 22²¹⁻³⁵, and emphasizes its miraculous character by thus paraphrasing the words in v. 28 ἠνοιξεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ στόμα τῆς οἰκίας. Are we bound to accept his paraphrase? Our reasons for giving credit to the miraculous narratives of the N.T. are (1) because, speaking generally, we believe that we have in the N.T. a revelation of God and of His will towards

men, made through the medium of His Son, who in His perfect goodness, wisdom, and power, represents to men the perfection of His Father's glory. We see signs of His goodness and wisdom shining through all His words and works: we see the same goodness and wisdom, along with some traces of His supernatural power, manifested in what we call His miracles. Though to us now the evidence from miracles may seem of small importance, as compared with the living energy of Christ working in his disciples from the beginning up to the present day, yet we find no difficulty in a supernatural Person acting in what seems to us a supernatural way. As Bishop Butler has pointed out, we can see the value of such action in calling attention to the message of Christ, just as the forces of civilization now strike the chord of wonder in the minds of the uncivilized, and prepare them to receive religious teaching from the mouth of those whose superiority in knowledge has been so unmistakably attested. Moreover, without miracles could Christ have fully manifested what He was to the men of that generation? Above all, could He have brought immortality to light for the men of all time, unless He, the pattern Man, had risen from the dead? (2) This *a priori* probability of miracles in the case of Jesus Christ is met by evidence of their actual occurrence proceeding from contemporary witnesses, who also record instances of miracles wrought by themselves or in their presence; and it is confirmed by the rapid growth of the Christian religion after the death of the Founder. With the miracles of the O.T. the case is very different. The reports are rarely contemporary. The chronicles in which they are imbedded are sometimes inconsistent and erroneous. Some accounts, such as that of the sun and moon standing still at Joshua's command, seem due to a misunderstanding of poetical hyperbole: others have little or no moral significance, as many of the miracles of Elisha, which 'are rather of the nature of Jewish Haggadoth than of sober history.'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 (24³¹) 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.*

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, *καὶ ρ οὐκ υλάοντο, κνυζήθμω δ' ἔερωσε δια σταθμοῖο φοβήθεν*. 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

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, *εις συνάντησιν τοις οἰωνοῖς* (xxiv. i.), to whom an ass speaks.'

Modern criticism distinguishes three main sources of the narrative : the Elohist, according to which Balaam is a selfish, grasping man, coveting the rewards of Balak, and only restrained from taking them by sordid fear of God, yet trying by every means to cajole God into changing his mind ; the Jehovistic, in which Balaam acts up to his light with perfect consistency and is loyal to Jehovah ; the Priestly, in which he is the Midianite soothsayer, the wicked counsellor who persuaded his people to seduce the Israelites by means of immoral rites :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, Sermon 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.

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.'

κατα τας ιδίας επιθυμιας αυτων πορευομενοι (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. 17²⁶⁻³⁰.

ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ; (v. 4).

The writer may have had in his mind such passages as Isa. 5¹⁹ (Woe unto them that say) Let him make speed and hasten his work, that we may see it: and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, that we may know it; Jer. 17¹⁵, Behold they say unto me Where is the word of the Lord? let it come now; Ezek. 12²², What is that proverb ye have in the land of Israel, saying, the days are prolonged, and every vision faileth? *ib.* 12²⁷, Behold they of the house of Israel say The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of times that are far off. St. Jude ascribes the warning against scoffers not to prophets as here, but to the spoken words of the Apostles (v. 18 ελεγον). What is the command of the Saviour here referred to? Perhaps such passages as Mt. 24⁴², Watch therefore, for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh, *ib.* 25¹³, which we find repeated in 1 Th. 5²⁻¹⁰ 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 Word¹ was the cause of their destruction by means of the water which had been used in forming them. As the old world was destroyed by water, so our present heaven and earth are by the same Word treasured up for fire, being reserved for that day when the ungodly shall be finally judged and punished. And there is one thing, my beloved, which I would especially ask you to remember, that measures of time have relation to man and not to God: one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. It is not from indifference that His coming is delayed, but from long-suffering patience, because He desires that all without exception should be brought to repent. Nevertheless, come it will, as a thief, that day of the Lord, in which the heavens shall pass away with a roaring sound and the stars shall be dissolved with glowing heat; and the earth and all the works thereof shall be burnt with fire [or 'nowhere found' or 'taken away'].

It is probably to this passage that the traditional idea of the Judgment Day is mainly due, 'that dreadful day,' as Scott describes it,

'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 δὲ δν for δὲ δν.

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. 119⁹⁰, 'Thou hast established the earth and it abideth' ; Eccl. 1⁴, '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. 7³¹, *παράγει το σχῆμα του κόσμου τουτου* ;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 και ἀνώλεθρον* ; (2a) that of the Epicureans who held it to be *γενητὸν και φθαρτὸν* ; (2b) that of the Stoics who held it to be *φθαρτὸς κατά διακόσμησιν, ἀίδιος δέ* as regards its essence ; (3) that of Plato who held it to be *γενητὸν και*

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 temperatures of interstellar space their constituent elements would be solid and inert ; chemical and molecular movement would be alike impossible.'—Balfour, p. 396.

it seems likely that this hypothesis will have to be considerably modified in consequence of the recognition of the stores of energy in the chemical elements, and of the varieties of radiant energy to which attention has been prominently directed by the discovery of radium.

Moreover the history of scientific research supplies fresh evidence for the possible conflagration of our planet, in the incandescence and subsequent disappearance of what are known as temporary stars, such as the famous star observed by Tycho Brahe in 1572, whether these phenomena are caused by internal disturbance or by collision with other bodies travelling through space. And the possibility of such collision is confirmed by the fact that many of the stars are now known to be moving in different directions with enormous velocity, and that the earth is frequently visited by meteorites, which come from the unknown regions of space, and chance to cross its path.¹

It is remarkable that one of the supposed consequences of the Second Coming, which plays an important part in the Apocalypse and which had the greatest vogue in the first three centuries, *viz.* the Millennium, is not distinctly named by our author, though he quotes (or provides) the text on which the belief is founded by Barnabas, Justin, 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 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 του αἰῶνος*.

In Bishop Westcott's words,² 'The Apostles looked for Christ, and Christ came most truly in the life-time of St. John. He founded His immovable kingdom. He gathered before Him, seated upon the throne of His glory, the nations of the earth, old and new, and passed sentence upon them. He judged in that shaking of earth and heaven most truly and most decisively the living and the dead. He established fresh foundations for society and a fresh standard of individual worth . . . The form of His Coming, His Coming to judgment, at that crisis, is a lesson for all time . . . We see in that Coming the type and promise

¹ I have to thank Professors F. Fuller and G. D. Liveing for kindly revising the above paragraphs, in which I have ventured to touch on questions belonging to natural science.

² *Historic Faith*, pp. 90 foll.

of other Comings through the long ages, till the earthly life of humanity is closed. We see in it the signs of a divine Presence which is laid open in the great crises of social movement. We see in it the assurance that the world is not left unvisited by Him Who died for it; and we take courage at the sight . . . The wider range of our vision enables us now to recognize these manifold Comings of Christ already accomplished, and we may be most thankful for such teachings of experience, but we do not rest in them . . . We believe that Christ has not yet revealed the fulness of His power or uttered the last voice of His judgment . . . This aspect of Christ's Coming, the trustful and reverent recognition of His manifestations in history and in society, is of the highest moment to us now . . . The reality and the meaning of these Comings are clear to faith, but like the Presence of Christ Himself they are hidden from the world. None but believers saw the Risen Christ during the forty days: none but believers see Christ in the great changes of human affairs. But beyond all these preliminary Comings there is a day when *every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him*. In that Coming, that Manifestation, that Presence, the first Coming on earth and the later Comings in history shall be shown in their full import. Then all things, our actions and ourselves, shall be seen as they are, seen by ourselves and seen by others. Then the whole course of life, the life of creation, of humanity, of men, will be laid open, and that vision will be a Judgment beyond controversy and beyond appeal.'

Our author takes a different line. Whether he wrote before, or after, the fall of Jerusalem, it is certain that this event was not marked by the literal fulfilment of Mt. 24²⁹, predicting that the sun and moon should withhold their light and that the stars should fall from heaven. In his view these are signs which prognosticate the Second Coming. Later interpreters have explained these words to mean 'danger to the fabric of human society'; 'the knowledge of God shall be obscured, the truth nigh put out, worldly wisdom darkened, the Church system abolished' (Alf.); but such allegorization was not to the taste of our author. He takes each feature of prophecy in its most literal sense; and for his answer to the objection of the scoffers, he has recourse to the declaration of the Psalmist that God is not bound by limitations of time, one day being with Him as a thousand years. It can hardly be said that this clears up the difficulty. The text was more appropriately used by the Jewish rabbis to explain the non-fulfilment of the threat 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die'; but even there it involved a playing upon words, a sort of paying in one coin of what was promised in another; whereas the essence of good faith is that a promise should be kept in the sense in which it was understood by both parties. There is however a distinction to be made between a threat of evil and a promise of good. To do *more* of good, or *less* of evil, than is promised, is no breach of the covenant, but the prerogative of a merciful and generous ruler; and so we continually find it to be in God's dealings declared to us in the O.T., as especially in the rebuke to the prophet Jonah for his peevish resentment when the threat to

Nineveh was not carried out. This is partly the ground taken up in what follows: it is for the good of man that the Day of Judgment has been deferred by the long-suffering of God, in order to extend to all the opportunity for repentance. It also provided a motive to stimulate the zeal of believers, whose part it was to hasten the day of God by spreading the Good News to all (*v.* 12). But this does not make the reference to the Divine timelessness inappropriate here. It is introduced as a corrective to the impatience and hastiness of men. When we complain, as we naturally do, of the slow pace of improvement, of the delay in the establishment of the reign of righteousness and peace, to which we are taught to look forward as the Kingdom of God, the time when His will shall be done, as in heaven, so in earth,—it may be well to call to mind the deliberateness of His work in bringing the material world to the state in which we now find it, and the long postponement of the discoveries which have so changed the aspect of our modern life. As these have been reserved for the present age in reward for the untiring work of preceding generations, so it may perhaps be with regard to moral and religious discoveries, which may reward the work of those who by diligent use of the talents committed to them, by patient doing of the Father's will, so far as it has already been made known to them, above all by attentive listening to the whispers of the Spirit of Christ within them, may be enabled to hasten the coming of a new Day of God. To such men the Presence within is even now sufficient evidence of that Presence without, which they look forward to beholding 'face to face' when they have 'crossed the bar.' It is to the power of this Presence within that our author testifies, when he says that grace and peace are multiplied by the *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.

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.

σπευδοντας 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

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 περίφρασιν*, pp. 172 f.

In his recent edition of Clement, Dr. Stählin follows Dindorf with some hesitation. He thinks *περίφρασις* may mean *ungenauere Bezeichnung, ungenauere Kenntniss*. "Doch bin ich nicht sicher ob ich richtig entschieden habe. In meine Ausgabung (3. 59. 2) ist 'περίφρασιν L' Druckfehler statt 'περίφρασιν 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 περίφρασιν* (Eus. *Pr.* *Ev.* xiii. 691 *α* *περίφρασιν*) ἀληθῆ. Here the phrase *κατὰ περίφρασιν ἀληθῆ*, meaning 'a correct general view,' is opposed to *ὡς νοεῖσθαι πέφυκεν* instead of *το 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* ἀπεπαυσε τὴν Πυθίαν ὃ θεὸς πυρικῶους μὲν ὀνομάζουσας τοῖς αὐτῆς πολίτας, οφιοβόρους δὲ τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας . . . ἀφελὼν τῶν χρησμῶν ἔπη καὶ γλώσσας καὶ περιφρασεῖς 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 Ἡρακλεΐη* for Heracles. A better example is that from Origen (*Sch. in Psalm.* iv, *Lomn.* 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 περίφρασιν*. If we are to change the latter, it would be better to read *κατ' ἐπίφρασιν* 'on a surface view' as in Polybius *xiv.* 2. 9 *ὃ δὲ Πόπλιος κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐπίφρασιν ἐποίει τὸ παραπλήσιον* (*sc.* *ῥαθύμως διήγει*), *κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα περὶ τὰς παρασκευὰς ἦν*, *xxxix.* 5. 3 (Antiochus showed great courtesy to the Roman ambassadors) *κατὰ τὴν ἐπίφρασιν καίπερ οὐκ ὦν τῇ προαιρεσει τοιούτος*.

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.*

- β. ἀγαλλιασις. J. 24 ἀμωμοὺς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.
 ἀγαπαω: 2 P. 2. 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις (αἰ. ἡγιασμένοις), pp. 17 foll.
 ε. ἀγαπη: 2 P. 1. 7 ἐν τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγαπὴν ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 2. 13 ἀγάπην (MSS. ἡδονήν) ἡγουμένοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, ἐντρύφοντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπαταῖς αὐτῶν (αἰ. ἀγαπαῖς), J. 2 ἀγαπὴ πληθυνθείη, ἰβ. 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, ἰβ. 12 ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαῖς υμῶν σπιλάδες, pp. x, εκενί, 200.
 ἀγαπητός: 2 P. 1. 17 ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, (νομ.) ἀγαπητοὶ 2. P. 3. 1, 8, 14, 17, J. 3, 17, 20.
 ἀγγελος: 2 P. 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησαντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2. 11 ἀγγελοὶ ἰσχυροὶ καὶ δυναμει μείζονες ὄντες, J. 6 ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν.
 ἀγιάζω, see ἀγαπαω.
 ἅγιος: 2 P. 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερομένοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι (αἰ. ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 ὑπο τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν υμᾶς ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, J. 14 ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχομένοι, ἰβ. ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ υμῶν πίστει, 3 (subst.) τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.
 ἀγνοεω: 2 P. 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες.
 ἀγοραζω: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσποτὴν ἀρνούμενοι.
 ἄγριος: J. 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης.
 Ἄδαμ: J. 14 ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἄδαμ Ἐνώχ.
 ἀδελφός: 2 P. 1. 10 διὸ μαλλόν, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε, 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος, J. 1 Ἰουδᾶς ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου.
 ἀδικεω: 2 P. 2. 13 ἀδικούμενοι (αἰ. κομιούμενοι) μισθὸν ἀδικίας, p. Ιxvi.
 ἀδικία: 2 P. 2. 13 and 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας.
 ἄδικος: 2 P. 2. 9 ἀδικοὺς εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.
 ἀεὶ: 2 P. 1. 12 ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς υπομιμνήσκειν.

- b. c.* αθεσμος: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς τῶν αθέσμων αναστροφῆς, 3. 17 τῆ τῶν αθεσμων πλανη.
- b. e.* αθετέω: J. 8 κυριότητα αθετουσι.
- Αιγυπτος: J. 5 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σωσας.
- αἰδιος: J. 8 δεσμοις αἰδιοις ὑπο ζοφον τετήρηκεν.
- αιρεσις: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισαξουσιν αιρεσεις απωλειας.
- αισχυνη: J. 13 κυματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης επαφρίζοντα τας ἐαυτῶν αἰσχυνας.
- αἰων: 2 P. 2. 17 οἷς ο ζοφος τοῦ σκοτους [εἰς αἰῶνα] τετηρηται, 3. 18 εἰς ἡμεραν αιωνος, J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζοφος τοῦ σκοτους εἰς αἰωνα τετήρηται, 25 προ παντος τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νυν καὶ εἰς πάντας τους αἰωνας (αλ. *add.* των αἰωνων).
- αἰωνιος: 2 P. 1. 11 την αἰώνιον βασιλείαν του κυρίου, J. 7 πυρὸς αἰωνιου δικην, 21. εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνιον.
- ακαρπος. 2 P. 1. 8 ουδε ἄκαρπους καθίστησιν εἰς την του κυρίου ημων . . . ἐπιγνωσιν, J. 12 δενδρα φθινοπωρινα ακαρπα.
- b. c. e.* ακαταπαυστος: 2 P. 2. 14 ὄφθαλμοις ακαταπαυστους αμαρτίας (αλ. ακαταπάστους), p. cxvii.
- ακοή: 2 P. 2. 8 βλεμματι καὶ ακοη δικαιος.
- ακουω: 2 P. 1. 18 ταυτην την φωνην ἡμεῖς ηκουσαμεν.
- αλήθεια: 2 P. 1. 12 εν τη παρουση αληθεια ἐστηριγμένους, 2. 2 η οδος τῆς ἀληθειας βλασφημηθήσεται.
- αληθής: 2 P. 2. 22 το τῆς ἀληθους παροιμιας.
- ἀλλά: 2 P. 1. 18 ου σεσοφισμενοι μύθοις ἔξακολουθήσαντες, εγνωρισαμεν, ἀλλ' εποπται γενηθεντες, 21 ου θεληματι ανθρωπου ηνέχθη προφητεία, ἀλλα υπο πνευματος ἁγίου, 2. 4 ουκ εφεισατο, ἀλλὰ παρέδωκεν, 5 αρχαίου κόσμου ουκ εφεισατο, ἀλλα Νωε εφυλαξεν, 3. 9 ου βραδυνει Κυριος, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμει, ἰδ. μη βουλόμενός τινας απολεσθαι, ἀλλα παντας εἰς μετανοιαν χωρήσαι, J. 6 αγγελους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας . . ἀλλα απολιποντας, 9 ουκ ετολμησεν κρίσιν επενεγκεῖν βλασφημιας ἀλλα εἶπεν, pp. li, ci.
- ἄλογος: 2 P. 2. 12 ως ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημενα φυσικα εἰς ἄλωσιν, J. 10 οσα φυσικως ὡς τα ἄλογα ζῶα επιστανται.
- b. c.* ἄλωσις: 2 P. 2. 12 γεγεννημένα εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοραν.
- c. d.* αμαθής: 2 P. 3. 18 οι αμαθεῖς καὶ αστήρικτοι.
- αμαρτάνω: 2 P. 2. 4 αγγελων αμαρτησαντων ουκ εφεισατο.
- αμαρτία: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν του καθαρισμου τῶν πάλαι αντου αμαρτιῶν (αλ. αμαρτημάτων), 2. 14 οφθαλμοις ακαταπαυστους αμαρτίας.
- ἄμαρτωλός: J. 15 αμαρτωλοὶ ἄσεβεις.
- ἄμελεω: 2 P. 1. 12 ουκ αμελήσω αὐεῖ υμας υπομιμνήσκειν (αλ. μελλησω).
- αμην: 2 P. 3. 18 εἰς ἡμεραν αἰωνος, αμὴν (*om.* αλ.), J. 25 εἰς τους αἰῶνας [τῶν αἰωνων], αμην.
- c. d. e.* αμωμητος: 2 P. 3. 14 ἄσπιλοι και ἄμωμητοι.
- c. e.* ἄμωμος: J. 24 αμωμους εν αγαλλιάσει.
- αναγκη: J. 8 ἀνάγκην εσχον γράφαι.
- ἀναστρεφω: 2 P. 2. 18 τους ἐν πλάνη ἀναστρεφομενους.
- ἀναστροφή: 2 P. 2. 7 τῆς των ἀθέσμων εν ασελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δει υπάρχειν υμᾶς εν ἁγiais ἀναστροφαις.

- ἀνατελλω: 2 P. 1. 19 εως ου φωσφόρος ανατειλη ἐν ταις καρδιαις υμων.
 ανεμος: J. 12 νεφέλαι��πὸ ανεμων παραφερομεναι.
- ανθρωπος: 2 P. 1. 21 οὐ γαρ θεληματι ανθρωπου ηνεχθη προφητεια, ἰδ.
 αγιοι (αλ. απο) Θεου ανθρωποι, 2. 16 υποζυγιον αφωνον εν ανθρωπου
 φωνη φθειξαμενον, 3. 7 εις ημεραν απωλειας τῶν ασεβῶν ανθρωπων, J. 4
 παρεισεδυησαν τινες ανθρωποι.
- ανομος: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχην δικαιαν ανομοις εργοις εβασανιζεν.
- αντιλογια: J. 11 τη αντιλογια του Κορε απωλοντο.
- ανυδροσ: 2 P. 2. 17 οὔτοι εισιν πηγαι ανυδροι, J. 12 νεφελαι ανυδροι.
- απαξ: J. 3 τη απαξ παραδοθειση τοις αγιοις πιστει, 5 Κυριος απαξ λαον
 σωσας (readings differ, see pp. clxxxiii f.).
- απατη: 2 P. 2. 13 εντρυφῶντες εν ταις απαιταις αυτων (αλ. αγαπαις, see
 pp. cxcvi f.).
- απερχομαι: J. 7 απελθουσαι οπισω σαρκος ετερας.
- απο: 2 P. 1 17 απο της δόξης (αλ. υπο), 1 21 ελαλησαν απο (αλ. αγιοι) Θεου
 ανθρωποι, 3. 4 αφ' ης γαρ οι πατερες εκοιμηθησαν, ἰδ. απ' αρχης κτισεως,
 p. lxxv, J. 14 εβδομος απο Αδαμ, 23 τον απο της σαρκος εσπιλωμενον
 χιτωνα.
- c. d. αποδιοριζω: J. 19 ουτοι εισιν οι αποδιοριζοντες, p. clxxxvi.
- c. d. e. αποθεσις: 2 P. 1. 14 ταχηνη εστιν η αποθεσις του σκηνωματός
 μου (only found elsewhere in N.T. in 1 P. 3. 21).
- αποθνήσκω: J. 12 δενδρα δις αποθανοντα.
- αποκαλυψις, pp. lxxiv f.
- απολειπω: J. 6 απολιποντας το ιδιον οικητηριον.
- απολλυμι: 2 P. 3. 6 ο κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις απωλετο, 3. 9 μη
 βουλομενος τινας απολεσθαι, J. 5 τους μη πιστευσαντας απωλεσεν, 11 τη
 αντιλογια του Κορε απῶλοντο.
- αποστολος: 2 P. 1. 1 δουλος και αποστολος 'I.X., 3. 2 μνησθῆναι της
 τῶν αποστολων υμων εντολης, J. 17 μνησθητε τῶν ρημάτων τῶν
 προειρημενων υπο τῶν αποστολων του κυριου.
- c. αποφευγω: c. gen. 2 P. 1. 4 αποφυγοντες της εν επιθυμια φθορας, c. acc.
 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν τους ὀλιγως αποφευγοντας τους εν πλάνη αναστρεφο-
 μενους, 2. 20 αποφευγοντες τα μiasματα του κοσμου.
- c. απταιστος: J. 24 φυλαξαι υμας απταιστους.
- απωλεια: 2 P. 2. 1 αιρεσεις απωλειας, ἰδ. ταχηνη απωλειαν, 2. 3 η
 απωλεια αυτων ου νυστάζει, 3. 7 εις ημεραν απωλειας τῶν ασεβῶν
 ανθρωπων, 3. 16 προς την ιδιαν αυτων απωλειαν.
- c. αργεω: 2 P. 2. 3 οἷς το κρίμα εκπαλαι ουκ αργει.
- αργος: 2 P. 1. 8 ουκ αργους ουδε ακαρπους καθίστησιν.
- αρετη: 2 P. 1. 3 του καλεσαντος ημας ιδια δόξη και αρετη (αλ. δια δόξης
 κ. αρετης), 1. 5 επιχορηγησατε εν τη πιστει υμων την αρετην, εν δε τη
 αρετη την γνωσιν.
- αρνεομαι: 2 P. 2. 1 τον αγοράσαντα αυτους δεσποτην αρνουμενοι, J. 4
 τον μονον δεσποτην αρνουμενοι, p. 72.
- αρπαζω: J. 23 ους δε σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες.
- αρχαγγελος: J. 9 Μιχαηλ ο αρχαγγελος.
- αρχαιος: 2 P. 2. 5 αρχαιου κοσμου ουκ εφεισατο.
- αρχη: 2 P. 3. 4 απ' αρχης κτισεως, J. 6 αγγελους τους μη τηρησαντας τη
 εαντων αρχην.

ἀσέβεια: J. 15 ἐλέγξει περι παντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αυτων, 18 κατα.

c. ασεβειω: 2 P. 2. 6 ὑπόδειγμα μελλοντων ἀσεβεῖν (al. ασεβεισιν) τεθεικως, J. 15 των εργαων ἀσεβείας ὧν ησεβησαν.

παρεισεδυησ

αμαρτωλοὶ ασεβεις.

ἀσελγεια: 2 P. 2. 2 πολλοι εξακολουθήσουσιν αυτῶν ταισ ἀσελγείαισ, 2. 7 τῆσ τῶν ἀθεσμων ἐν ἀσελγεια ἀναστροφῆσ, 2. 18 δελεαζουσιν ἀσελγειασ, J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χαριτα μετατιθεντεσ ειασ ἀσελγειαν.

ασπιλοσ: 2 P. 3. 14 ασπιλοι και αμωμητοι.

ἀστηρ: J. 13 ἀστερεσ πλανῆται.

a. c. αστηρικτοσ: 2 P. 2. 14 δελεαζοντεσ ψυχασ αστηρικτουσ, 3. 16 οι αμαθεισ και ἀστήρικτοι.

αυθάδης: 2 P. 2. 10 τολμηται αυθάδεισ.

αυξάνω: *intrans.* 2 P. 3. 18 αυξάνετε ἐν χάριτι.

αυτοσ: (= *is*) 2 P. 1. 17, 18, 2. 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 19 ἐλευθερίαν αυτοισ επαγγελλομενοι, 21 *bis*, 22, 3. 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 *bis*; (emphatic) 18 αυτω ἡ δοξα; (unusual order) 2. 2 εξακολουθησουσιν αυτῶν ταισ ἀσελγειασ; J. 7, 11, 14, 15 *bis*, 16 *bis*, 24. (= *ipse*) 2 P. 1. 5 και αυτο τουτο δε, 2. 19 αυτοι δουλοι υπάρχοντεσ. ὁ αὐτόσ, 2. P. 3. 7, see p. cxcix, τα αυτα τῶν παθηματων, 1 P. 5. 9, p. xciv.

c. d. αυχηροσ: 2 P. 1. 19 λυχνω φαινοντι ἐν αυχηρῶ τοπω, pp. cxciii f.

e. αφόβωσ: J. 12 συνευχουμενοι αφόβωσ (others connect it with what follows ἀφ. εαυτουσ ποιμαίνοντεσ).

ἄφωνοσ: 2 P. 2. 16 υποζυγιον ἄφωνον.

Βαλααμ: 2 P. 2. 15 εξακολουθήσαντεσ τῇ ὁδῶ του Βαλααμ του Βοσορ, J. 11 τη πλάνῃ του Βαλααμ μισθου ἐξεχυθησαν.

βασανίζω: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαιαν ἀνόμοισ εργαοισ εβασανιζεν.

βασιλεια: 2 P. 1. 11 ειασ τὴν αιωνιον βασιλειαν τοῦ κυριου.

βεβαιοσ: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιαν υμων τὴν κλῆσιν ποιεισθαι, 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τον προφητικον λόγον.

Βεώρ: 2 P. 2. 15 (al. Βοσόρ).

βλασφημειω: 2 P. 2. 2 η οδοσ τῆσ ἀληθειασ βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 10 δόξασ οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντεσ, 2. 12 εν οἷσ ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημουντεσ, J. 8 δόξασ δε βλασφημουσιν, 10 ὅσα μεν ουκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν.

βλασφημια: J. 9 ουκ ἐτολμησεν κρισιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημιασ, p. 75.

βλάσφημοσ: 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ φερουσιν κατ αυτῶν βλάσφημον κρισιν.

c. d. βλεμμα: 2 P. 2. 8 βλεμματι και ακοῇ δικαιοσ, p. 1x.

c. βόρβοροσ: 2 P. 2. 22 υσ λουσαμενη ειασ κυλισμον βορβορου.

Βοσορ: 2 P. 2. 15 (al. Βεώρ, see p. cxcviii).

βουλομαι: 2 P. 3. 9 μὴ βουλόμενοσ τινασ ἀπολεσθαι, J. 5 υπομνήσαι υμάσ βουλομαι.

βραδυνω: 2 P. 3. 9 ου βραδυνει Κυριοσ τῆσ επαγγελιασ.

c. a. βραδυτησ: 2 P. 3. 9 ὡσ τινεσ βραδυτήτα ἡγουνται.

γάρ: 2 P. 1. 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21; 2. 4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21; 3. 4, 5; J. 4.

- γεννάω: 2 P. 2. 12 ως ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἀλωσιν.
- 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 Αἰγυπτου σώσας.
- γινομαί: 2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γενησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 1. 16 ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος, 1. 20 προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται, 2. 20 γεγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχάτα χειρονα τῶν πρώτων.
- γινώσκω: 2 P. 1. 20 and 3. 3 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.
- γνωρίζω: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν δύναμιν.
- γνώσις: 2 P. 1. 5, 6 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνώσιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκρατείαν, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
- b. c. γογγυστής: J. 16 γογγυσταὶ μεμψιμοῖροι.
- Γόμορρα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορρας, J. 7 ὡς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα 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 ἐργάσεν ὑμῖν, J. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἰδ. ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν.
- γυμνάζω: 2 P. 2. 14 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας.
- δέ: 2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, ἰδ. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνώσιν (ἐπιχορηγήσατε), 1. 6 *ter*, 1. 7 *bis*; δε καὶ 1. 15, 2. 1; δέ 1. 13, 2. 9, 10, 16, 20, 3. 7, 8, 10 *bis*, 13, 16; οὗτοι δέ 2. 12; J. οὗτοι δέ 10, 12, 16, 19; ὑμεῖς δέ 17, 20, 21; δε καὶ 14; μὲν—δε: 8 σάρκα μὲν . . . κυριότητα δε . . . δοξὰς δε, 10 οσα μὲν . . . οσα δέ, 22 f. οὐς μὲν . . . οὐς δὲ . . . οὐς δέ; δε 1, 5, 10, 24.
- δει: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταποὺς δει ὑπαρχειν ὑμᾶς.
- c. d. δεῖγμα: J. 7 προκεινται δεῖγμα πυρός.
- δελεάζω: 2 P. 2. 14 δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρικτοὺς, 2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκοῦ.
- δένδρον: J. 12 δένδρα φθινοπωρινά.
- δεσμός: J. 6 δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑποζόφον τετηρηκεν.
- δεσποσῖνοι, p. 26.
- δεσποτής: 2 P. 2. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσποτὴν ἀρνούμενοι, J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. ἀρνούμενοι.
- δεύτερος: 2 P. 3. 1 ταυτὴν ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, J. 5 τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστευσάντας ἀπώλεσεν.
- δηλώω: 2 P. 1. 14 ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσεν μοι.
- δια: c. gen. 2 P. 1. 3 δια τῆς ἐπιγνωσεως τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς δια δόξης (*αλ. ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ*), 1. 4 δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδωρηται, ἰδ. 4 ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, 3. 6 δι' ὧν (ον?) ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο, pp. lxxv, lxxxii, J. 25 δια Ἰ.Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
- c. acc. 2 P. 2. 2 δι' οὗς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ δι' ὑμᾶς (*αλ. εἰς ὑμᾶς*), 3. 12 δι' ἧν οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται.
- e. διαβόλος: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος.
- διακρίνω: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος, 22 οὐς μὲν ἐλεγετε διακρινόμενους (*αλ. διακρινόμενοι*).

- διαλέγομαι: J. 9 διελεγето περί του Μωυσεως σωματος.
 διαμενω: 2 P. 3. 4 παντα οὕτως διαμενει απ' ἀρχῆς κτισέως.
 διάνοια: 2 P. 3. 1 την ειλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 145.
b. c. d. διαυγαζω: 2 P. 1. 19 ἕως ου ημέρα διαυγάση.
 δίδωμι: 2 P. 3. 15 κατα την δοθείσαν αυτω σοφίαν.
 διεγειρω: 2 P. 1. 13 διεγειρειν υμᾶς ἐν υπομνήσει, 3. 1 διεγειρω υμων ἐν υπομνησει την ειλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.
 δικαιος: 2 P. 1. 13 δικαιον ἡγουμαι διεγειρειν υμᾶς, 2. 7 δικαιον Λωτ ἐρυσατο, 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ακοη [ο] δικαιος ἐγκατοικων εν αυτοῖς ψυχην δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν.
 δικαιοσυνη: 2 P. 1. 1 εν δικαιοσυνη τ. Θεου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ. X. p. i, 2. 5 Νῶε δικαιοσυνης κηρυκα, 2. 21 τὴν οδον τῆς δικαιοσυνης, 3. 13 καινους ουρανους . . . εν οἰς δικαιοσυνη κατοικει, 181.
 δικη: J. 7 πυρος αιωνιου δίκην υπεχουσαι.
 διο: 2 P. 1. 10 διὸ μᾶλλον, αδελφοι, σπουδασατε, 1. 12 διο μελλησω ἄει υμᾶς υπομνησκειν, 3. 14 διὸ, ἀγυπητοί, σπουδάσατε.
 δις: J. 12 δένδρα δις ἀποθανοντα.
 δοξα: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδια δοξη και ἀρετη, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρα Θεου πατρος δοξαν, ἰδ. φωνῆς ἐνεχθεισης τοιασδε ὑπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, 2. 10 δοξας ου τρέμουσιν βλασφημουντες, 3. 18 αυτῷ ἢ δοξα, J. 8 δοξας δε βλασφημοῦσιν, 24 κατενωπιον τῆς δοξης αυτου, 25 Θεῷ δοξα μεγαλωσυνη κράτος και ἐξουσια.
 δούλος: 2 P. 1. 1 δουλος και ἀποστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, p. 17, 2. 19 δουλοι υπάρχοντες τὴν φθοράς; J. 1 Ἰουδας Ἰησου Χριστου δούλος.
 δουλώω: 2 P. 2. 19 ᾧ γάρ τις ἠττηται τουτω [και] δεδουλωται.
 δυναμαι: J. 24 τω δυναμενω φυλάξει υμᾶς.
 δυναμις: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα ημιν τῆς θειας δυνάμεως αὐτου δεδωρημενης, 1. 18 εγνωρισαμεν υμιν την του κυριου ἡμῶν δυναμιν και παρουσίαν, 2. 11 αγγελοι ἰσχυῖ και δυνάμει μείζονες οντες.
b. c. d. ουσνοητος. 2 P. 3. 16 εν αἷς εστιν δυσνοητά τινα.
 δωρέομαι: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα ἡμιν τῆς θειας δυνάμεως δεδωρημενης, 1. 4 τα τίμια επαγγέλματα δεδωρηται.
 εαυτου: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐπάγοντες εαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπωλειαν, J. 8 μὴ τηρησαντας την ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν, 12 ἀφοβως εαυτους ποιμαινοντες, 18 ἐπαφρίζοντα τας εαυτῶν αισχύνας, 18 κατα τας εαυτῶν ἐπιθυμιας, 19 οἱ αποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτους (*αλ. ομ.* ἑαυτους), 20 εποικοδομοῦντες εαυτους, 21 ἑαυτους εν ἀγάπη Θεου τηρησατε.
 εβδομος: J. 14 ἐβδομος ἀπο Ἀδαμ Ἐνώχ, p. vii.
c. d. εγκατοικεω: (*αλ. ενκατοικεω*) 2 P. 2. 8 εγκατοικων εν αυτοῖς.
 εγκρατεια: 2 P. 1. 6 (επιχορηγήσατε) εν τη γνώσει τὴν εγκράτειαν, εν δε τῇ εγκρατεία τὴν υπομονήν.
 εγω: 2 P. 1. 17 εἰς ὃν εγω ευδοκησα, (μου) 2 P. 1. 14 ἡ ἀπόθεσις του σκηνωματος μου, 1. 17 ο υἱός μου ο ἀγαπητός, (μοι) 2 P. 1. 14 Χριστος εδηλωσεν μοι.
 (ἡμεῖς): 2 P. 1. 18 ταυτην τὴν φωνὴν ημεῖς ἠκουσαμεν, (ἡμᾶς) 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς, 3. 9 μακροθυμει εἰς ἡμᾶς (*αλ. υμᾶς*), (ἡμῶν) 2 P. 1. 1 τοῦ Θεου ἡμῶν, 1. 2, 8, 11, 14, 18, 3. 15, 18 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 2. 20 (*αλ. ομ.* ἡμῶν), 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητος ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, J. 3 τῆς κοινῆς

- ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, 4 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, *ib.* κυριον ἡμων, 17, 21, 25 του κυρίου ἡμῶν, *ib.* σωτήρι ἡμῶν, (ἡμῖν) 2 P. 1. 1 τοις ἰσοτιμον ἡμιν λαχούσιν πίστιν, 1. 3 πάντα ἡμῖν (*αἱ. ὑμῖν*, see p. cxciii) τῆς θείας δυναμεως δεδωρημένης, 1. 4 μέγιστα ἡμῖν δεδωρηται.
- εἰ: 2 P. 2. 4 εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ εφείσατο, 2. 20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγοντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δε πάλιν εμπλακεντες ηττωνται.
- εἰδέναι, see οἶδα.
- εἰλικρινής: 2 P. 3. 1 την εἰλικρινῆ διανοιαν, 145.
- εἰμι: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνωματι, 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλος ἐστι μωπαζων, 1. 14 ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀποθεσις, 1. 17 οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος μου, 3. 4 ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελια; 3. 18 ἐν οἷς ἐστιν δυσνοητά τινα, 2 P. 2. 17 οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἀνυδροι, 3. 7 τεθησαυρισμενοι εἰσίν, J. 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ συνευωχουμενοι, 16 οὗτοι εἰσιν γογγυσταί, 19 οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες—2 P. 1. 18 συν αὐτῷ οντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει, 2. 11 ἄγγελοι δυνάμει μείζονες οντες 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκεναι κ.τ.λ., 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι—2 P. 2. 1 ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, J. 18 ἐσονται ἐμπαικται.
- εἶπον: J. 9 ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κυριος.
- εἰρήνη: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις υμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 3. 14 σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι ευρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ, J. 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγαπη
- εἰς: 2 P. 1. 8 ἀκαρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπιγνωσιν, 1. 11 ἢ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰωνιον βασιλειαν, 1. 17 εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδοκησα, 2. 4 εἰς κρισιν τηρουμενους, 2. 9 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τηρεῖν, 2. 12 γεγεννημένα εἰς ἀλωσιν, 2. 22 εἰς κυλισμον βορβορου, 3. 7 πυρι τηρουμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρισεως, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς υμας, *ib.* εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρησαι, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς ἡμεραν αἰωνος, J. 4 προγεγραμμενοι εἰς τοῦτο, *ib.* τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθεντες εἰς ἀσελγειαν, 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετηρηκεν, 13 εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται, 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ζωην, 25 δοξα . . εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.
- εἰς: 2 P. 3. 8 ἐν δε τοῦτο μὴ λανθανετω υμᾶς, οτι μια ἡμέρα παρα Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμερα μια.
- εἰσοδος: 2 P. 1. 11 ἢ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰωνιον βασιλειαν.
- εκ: 2 P. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐξ ουρανου ἐνεχθεισαν, 2. 8 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχην ἐβασανίζεν, 2. 9 ἐκ πειρασμου ρυεσθαι, 2. 21 υποστρεψαι ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, J. 5 λαον ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου σωσας, 23 ἐκ πυρος ἀρπάζοντες.
- c. d. ἐκάτι τοτε: 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδάσω δε καὶ ἐκαστοτε εχειν υμᾶς τὴν τούτῳ μνημην ποιεισθαι.
- ἐκεῖνος: 2 P. 1. 16 τῆς ἐκεῖνου μεγαλειότητος.
- ἐκλογή: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαίαν υμων τὴν κλησιν καὶ ἐκλογην ποιεισθαι, pp. 19 f.
- b. c. ἐκπαλαι: 2 P. 2. 3 τὸ κριμα ἐκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργει, 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι, p. lii.
- ἐκπίπτω: 2 P. 3. 17 ἵνα μὴ ἐκπεσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμου.
- b. c. ἐκπῶνονεω: J. 7 πολεις ἐκπορευεσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι οπισω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.
- b. ἐκριζοω: J. 12 δένδρα δις ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθεντα.
- ἐκχεω: J. 11 τὴ πλάνη τοῦ Βαλααμ μισθον ἐξεχυθησαν.
- ἐλαυνω: 2 P. 2. 17 ὀμίχλαι ὑπο λαίλαπος ἐλαυνομεναι.

- b. c.* ἐλεγξίς: 2 P. 2. 18 ἔλεγξιν ἔσχεν ιδίας παρανομίας.
 ἐλέγχω: J. 16 ἐλεγξαι παντας τους ἄσεβεις περὶ πάντων, 22 οὐς μὲν ἐλεγετε (*al.* ἐλεᾶτε οὐ ἐλεείτε) διακρινομένους.
 ελεος: J. 2 ελεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 21 προσδεχομένοι το ελεος του κυρίου.
 ελευθερία: 2 P. 2. 19 ελευθερίαν αυτοῖς επαγγελλόμενοι.
 ἐμός: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον.
a. c. d. ἐμπαιγμονη: 2 P. 3. 8 ελευσονται ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαικται.
b. c. ἐμπαικτης. 2 P. 3. 3 ελευσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων των ἡμερῶν ἐμπαικται, J. 18 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαικται.
 ἐμπλεκω: 2 P. 2. 20 τουτοις δε παλιν ἐμπλακεντες.
 ἐμπορευομαι: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξία πλαστοις λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορευονται.
 ἐν: (*place*) 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ φθορᾶς, 1. 13 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 1. 18 ἐν τῷ ὄρει, 1. 19 ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τοπῷ, *ib.* ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, 2. 1 ἐν τῷ λαῷ, *ib.* ἐν ὑμῖν, 2. 8 ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αυτοῖς, 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 τρυφῆν, 3. 10; (*cause or instrument*) 1. 1 ἰσοτιμον λαχων πιστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ Θεου, 1. 13 and 3. 1 διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξία ὑμᾶς ἐμπορευονται, 2. 18 ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον, 2. 18 δελεαζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα ἐν ἐπιγνώσει; (*manner*) 2. 7 τῆς ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 2. 16 ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ πορευόμενοι, 2. 18 τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους, 3. 3 ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαικται, 3. 11 ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς, 3. 14 ἀμωμητοὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ; (*sphere*) 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 3. 18 αὐξανετε ἐν χάριτι; (*subject-matter*) 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες; 2. 13 ἐν τρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπαταῖς; (*addition*) 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν πίστει ἀρετὴν *bis*, 1. 6 *ter*, 1. 7 *bis*. J. (*place*) 12 ἐν ταῖς ἀγαπαῖς σπιλάδες; (*accompaniment*) 14 ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν ἦλθεν; (*cause or instrument*) 10 ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται; (*manner*) 23 ἐν φόβῳ, 24 ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει; (*used of God*) 1 ἐν Θεῷ ἡγαπημένους (?), p. clxxxii, 26 ἐν πνεύματι προσευχομένοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, p. lxxv.
 ἐντολή: 2 P. 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθείσης αυτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 τῆς των ἀποστολων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς του κυρίου, p. 64.
b. c. ἐντρυφάω: 2 P. 2. 13 ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπαταῖς αὐτῶν (*al.* ἀγάπαις).
 ἐνυπνιάζομαι: J. 8 οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, p. 74.
 Ἐνωχ: J. 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν ἐβδομος ἀπο Ἀδαμ Ἐνωχ.
b. c. ἐξακολουθεω: 2 P. 1. 18 μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες, 2. 2 ἐξακολουθησουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, 2. 15 ἐξακολουθησαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.
a. b. c. d. ἐξέραμα: 2 P. 2. 22 κυων ἐπιστρεψας ἐπὶ το ἰδιον ἐξέραμα, p. xii, lxxii.
 ἐξοδος: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον.
 ἐξουσία: J. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
 ἐπαγγελία: 2 P. 3. 4 ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτου; 3. 9 οὐ βραδυνεῖ Κυριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.
 ἐπαγγελλομαι: 2 P. 2. 19 ελευθερίαν αυτοῖς επαγγελλόμενοι.

- c. d.* ἐπάγγελμα : 2 P. 1. 4 τα μέγιστα καὶ τιμια ἐπαγγέλματα, 3. 13
κατα το ἐπάγγελμα αὐτου, pp. xxxiv, cxcii.
επαγω : 2 P. 2. 1 ἐπάγοντες εαυτοῖς ταχυνη ἀπωλειαν, 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν
κοσμῶ ἀσεβῶν ἐπαξας, p. xxvi.
b. c. d. ἐπαγωνίζομαι : J. 3 ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τη ἀπαξ παραδοθειση τοῖς
ἀγίοις πιστει, pp. 22, 23, 70 f.
b. c. d. ἐπαφρίζω : J. 13 κυματα ἐπαφρίζοντα τας εαυτῶν αἰσχυνας.
επι : *c. gen.* 146 f., 2 P. 3. 3 ἐπ εσχάτων τῶν ἡμερων, J. 18 ἐπ εσχάτου
χρόνου.
c. acc. 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' οσον εἰμι ἐν τουτω τῷ σκηνωματι, 2. 22 ἐπιστρέψας
ἐπι το ἴδιον ἔξεραμα. In compounds, pp. 22, 174.
επιγινωσκω : 2 P. 2. 21 κρειττον ἦν μὴ επεγνωκεναι τὴν οδον τῆς
δικαιοσυνης ἢ επιγνοῦσιν υποστρεψαι.
b. ἐπιγνωσις : 2 P. 1. 2 χαρις καὶ εἰρηνη πληθυνθειη ἐν επιγνώσει τοῦ
Θεοῦ, 1. 3 δια τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως του καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς, 1. 8 εἰς τὴν τοῦ
κυρίου ἐπιγνωσιν, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τα μιάσματα του κοσμου ἐν ἐπι-
γνώσει του κυριου.
ἐπιθυμία : 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν επιθυμια
φθορας, 2. 10 τους οπισω σαρκος ἐν επιθυμια μiasμου πορευομενους,
2. 18 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμιαῖς σαρκος ἀσελγειαῖς, 3. 3 κατα τας
ἰδίας επιθυμίας αὐτων πορευομενοι, J. 16 κατα τας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτων
πορευομενοι, 18 κατα τας ἑαυτων επιθυμίας πορευομενοι.
c. d. ἐπιλυσις : 2 P. 1. 20 πασα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας επιλυσεως ου
γίνεται, pp. iv. 196 f.
επισταμαί : J. 10 οσα δε φυσικῶς επιστανται.
επιστολή : 2 P. 3. 1 δευτεραν υμιν γράφω ἐπιστολην, 3. 16 ὡς ἐν πάσαις
ταις ἐπιστολαις.
επιστρεφω : 2 P. 2. 22 κυων επιστρεψας ἐπι το ἴδιον ἔξεραμα.
ἐπιτιμᾶω : J. 9 ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι Κυριος.
επιφερω : J. 9 κρίσιν επενεγκειν βλασφημίας.
b. ἐπιχορηγεω : 2 P. 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τη πίστει ὑμῶν την ἀρετήν,
1. 11 πλουσιως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται υμῖν η εισοδος.
v. ἐποικοδομεω : J. 20 ἐποικοδομοῦντες εαυτοῦς τῇ ἀγιωτατη υμῶν πιστει.
c. ἐποπτης : 2 P. 1. 16 ἐποπται γενηθεντες τῆς ἐκεῖνου μεγα-
λειότητος.
εργον : 2 P. 1. 10 δια των καλῶν ὑμῶν εργαων (*om. al.*) 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίαν
ανομοῖς εργαοῖς ἐβασάνιζεν, 3. 10 γῆ και τα ἐν αὐτῇ εργα, J. 15 περὶ
παντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτων.
ερχομαι : 2 P. 3. 3 ελευσονται ἐμπαικται, J. 14 ἦλθεν Κυριος ἐν ἀγίαις
μυριάσιν αὐτου, *c. in fin.* p. xlv.
εσχάτος : 2 P. 2. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τα εσχάτα χειρονα των πρώτων,
3. 3 ἐπ' εσχάτων των ἡμερῶν, pp. 146 f., J. 18 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρονου,
pp. 77 f.
ετερος : J. 7 ἀπελθουσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.
ἔτος : 2 P. 3. 8 μια ἡμερα παρα Κυριῷ ὡς χιλια ἔτη και χιλια ετη ὡς ἡμερα
μια.
εναγγέλιον, p. 65.
b. εὐδοκεω : 2 P. 1. 17 εἰς ον ἐγὼ εὐδοκησα.
εὐθυς : 2 P. 2. 15 καταλειποντες ευθειαν ὁδον.

- εὐρισκῶ: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρεθήσεται (? see p. cc), 3. 14 ἀμωμητοὶ αὐτῷ εὐρεθῆναι 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.
- εὐσέβης: 2 P. 2. 9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ρυεσθαι.
- ἔχω (1): 2 P. 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιοτερον τον προφητικὸν λογον, 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, ἰβ. καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν ἐσχεν παρανομίας, J. 3 ἀναγκὴν ἔσχον γραψαι, 19 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. (2) = *possuit*. 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδασω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μνήμην ποιησθαι.
- εὐς: 2 P. 1. 19 ὡ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγασῆ.
- α. ζοφος: 2 P. 2. 4 (ἀγγέλους) σειροῖς ζοφου (*αλ.* σειραις and ζοφοῖς) ταρταρωσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν, 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ζοφος τοῦ σκοτους τετηρηται, J. 6 (ἀγγέλους) εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπο ζόφον τετηρηκεν, 13 οἷς ὁ ζοφος του σκοτους εἰς αἰωνα τετηρηται.
- ζωή: 2 P. 1. 3 τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, J. 21 εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνιον.
- ζῶον: 2 P. 2. 12 ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημενα φυσικα εἰς ἀλωσιν, J. 10 οσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπιστάνται ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.
- ἦ: 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκεναι ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρεψαι.
- ἦγεομαι: 2 P. 1. 13 δικαίον δὲ ἠγοῦμαι διεγειρεῖν ὑμᾶς, 2. 13 ἠδονὴν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, 3. 9 ὡς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἠγούνται, 3. 15 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἠγεισθε.
- ἦδη: 2 P. 3. 1 ταυτην ἦδη δευτεραν γραφω ἐπιστολήν.
- ἦδονή: 2 P. 2. 13 ἠδονην (ἀγάπην?) ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφην, p. x.
- ἡμερα: 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 ἡμέρα τρυφην, 3. 3 ἐπ' ἐσχατων τῶν ἡμερών, 3. 8 μια ἡμέρα παρα Κυρίῳ ὡς χιλία ἐτη καὶ χιλία ἐτη ὡς ἡμέρα μια, 3. 10 ἦξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλεπτῆς, 3. 12 τῆς του Θεου ἡμέρας, 3. 18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας.
- ἦττάομαι: 2 P. 2. 19 ὡ γάρ τις ἦττῆται τούτῳ καὶ δεδουλωται, 2. 20 τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακεντες ἠττώνται.
- θάλασσα: J. 13 κυματα ἀγρία θαλάσσης.
- θαυμάζω: J. 16 θαυμάζοντες προσωπα ωφελίας χαριν.
- θεῖος: 2 P. 1. 3 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτου, 1. 4 θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (*elsewhere in N.T. only in Acts 17. 29 το θειον*).
- β. θέλημα: 2 P. 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θεληματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνεχθη προφητεία ποτε.
- θέλω: 2 P. 3. 5 λάνθανει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τούτο θελοντας ὅτι κ.τ.λ.
- θεοσ: 2. P. 1. 1 ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ του Θεου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησου Χριστου, 1. 2 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει του Θεου καὶ Ἰησου του κυριου ἡμῶν, 1. 17 λαβων παρα Θεου πατρος τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, 1. 21 ὑπο πνευματος ἁγίου φερομενοι ἐλαλησαν ἀπο (*αλ.* ἁγιοι) Θεου ἄνθρωποι, 2. 4 ὁ Θεος ἀγγελων ἀμαρτησαντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ του Θεου λόγῳ, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς του Θεου ἡμέρας, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρι ἠγαπημενοις, 4

τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθεντες εἰς ἀσελγειαν, 21 ἑαυτους ἐν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ τηρησατε, 25 μόνω Θεῷ σωτήρι ἡμῶν.
 θησαυρίζω: 2 P. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λογῷ τεθησαυρισμενοὶ εἰσιν.

Ἰακωβος: J. 1 Ἰουδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφος δὲ Ἰακωβου.

ιδιος: 2 P. 1. 3 του καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδία δοξῇ (αἰ. δια δόξης, p. cxcii) καὶ ἀρετῇ, 1. 20 πασα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλυσσεως οὐ γίνεται, 2. 16 ἐλεγξίν ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας, 2. 22 κυῶν ἐπιστρεψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἰδιον ἐξέραμα, 3. 3 κατα τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευομενοι, 3. 16 προς τὴν ἰδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπωλειαν, 3. 17 ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδιοῦ στηριγμου, J. 6 (ἀγγελοῦ) ἀπολιποντας τὸ ἰδιον οικητηριον, pp. xxxii f., xlii.

ιδου: J. 14 ἰδου ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ.

1. 11 του κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1. 14 ο κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐδήλωσεν μοι, 1. 16 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν, 2. 20 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 3. 18 ἐν γνώσει τ. κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, J. 1 Ἰουδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, ἰδ. τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρι ἠγαπημενοὶς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς, 4 τον μονον δεσποτην και κυριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστον ἀρνούμενοι, 5 Ἰησοῦς (αἰ. Κύριος, see pp. cxxxiv f.) λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου σωσας, 17 τῶν ἀποστολῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 21 τὸ ἐλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 25 δια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

ινα: 2 P. 1. 4 ἐπαγγέλματα δειδωρηται ἵνα δια τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 3. 17 φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε.

Ιουδας: J. 1. 1.

ισοτιμος: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῖς ἰσοτιμοῖς ἡμῶν λαχουσιν πιστιν, pp. ii, 181.

ιστημι: J. 24 τῷ δυναμῆν στήσαι κατενωπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.

ισχυς: 2 P. 2. 11 ἄγγελοι ἰσχυῖ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες οντες.

καθαρισμος: 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν.

καθίστημι: 2 P. 1. 8 ἀκαρπούς καθιστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν.

καθως: 2 P. 1. 14 καθως καὶ ο κύριος ἐδήλωσέν μοι, 3. 15 καθως καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφος Παῦλος ἐργαίψεν ὑμῖν.

καί: 'both' 2 P. 3. 18 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 25 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς παντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

'also' 2 P. 1. 14 καθως καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσεν μοι, 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐσονταί, 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται (αἰ. καταφθαρῆσονται), 2. 19 ᾧ τις ἠττηται τούτῳ καὶ (σπ. αἰ.) δεδουλωται, 3. 15 καθως καὶ ο ἀγαπητός ἡμῶν ἀδελφος, 3. 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πασαις ἐπιστολαις, ἰδ. ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς, J. 8 ὁμοίως μενοι καὶ οὗτοι, 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις; 'even' 2 P. 2. 1 καὶ τον αγορασαντα αὐτοὺς ἀρνούμενοι, J. 23 μισουντες και τον ἀπο τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

Καὶν: J. 11 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καιν ἐπορευθησαν.

- καινός: 2 P. 3. 13 καινους οὐρανους και γην καινην προσδοκῶμεν.
 καιπερ: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ ειδότας. *
 καλεω: 2 P. 1. 8 τοῦ καλεσαντος ημας ἰδιά δοξή και ἀρετη.
 καλός: 2 P. 1. 10 δια των καλῶν υμων ἔργων (om. al.).
 καλῶς: 2 P. 1. 19 ω καλῶς ποιειτε προσεχοντες.
 καρδια: 2 P. 1. 19 εως οὔ φωσφορος ανατείλη ἐν ταις καρδίαις υμῶν, 2. 14 καρδιαν γεγυμνασμενην εχοντες.
 κατα: c. gen. 2 P. 2. 11 οὔ φερουσιν κατ' αυτῶν βλασφημον κρίσιν, J. 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατα πάντων, 15 ἐλάλησαν κατ' αυτου.
 c. acc. 2 P. 3. 3 κατα τας ἰδίας ἐπιθυμιας αυτῶν πορευομενοι, 3. 13 γην καινην κατα το επαγγελμα αυτου προσδοκωμεν, 3. 15 κατα τὴν δοθεισαν αυτω σοφίαν εγραψεν, J. 16 κατα τας ἐπιθυμιας αυτῶν πορευόμενοι, 18 κατα τας εαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευομενοι.
 κατακαιω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ και τα εν αυτῇ εργα κατακαησεται (al. ευρεθήσεται).
 c. κατακλυζω: 2 P. 3. 6 ο τοτε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεῖς ἀπωλετο.
 ὀ. κατακλυσμός: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κοσμῳ ἀσεβων επαξας.
 κατακρινω: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις . . καταστροφῇ κατεκρινεν, p. cxcv.
 καταλειπω: 2 P. 2. 15 καταλείποντες (al. καταλιποντες) εὐθειαν οδόν.
 καταπονεω: 2 P. 2. 7 Ἄωτ καταπονουμενον υπὸ τῆς των ἀθέσμων εν ασελγεια ἀναστροφῆς.
 κατάρα: 2 P. 2. 14 κατάρας τεκνα.
 καταστροφη: 2 P. 2. 6 [καταστροφῇ] κατεκρινεν (om. WH.): see p. cxcv.
 ο. καταφθειρω: 2 P. 2. 12 εν τῇ φθορᾷ αυτῶν καταφθαρήσονται (al. και φθαρ-).
 καταφρονεω: 2 P. 2. 10 κυριοτητος καταφρονουντας.
 ὀ. κατενωπιον: J. 24 στῆσαι κατενωπιον τῆς δόξης αυτου.
 κατοικεω: 2 P. 3. 13 εν οἷς δικαιοσυνη κατοικει.
 ὀ. c. a. e. καυσόω: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 2 στοιχεῖα καυσουμενα τηκεται, p. lxx.
 κηρυξ: 2 P. 2. 5 Νῶε δικαιοσυνης κηρυκα.
 κλεπτης: 2 P. 3. 10 ἤξει ἡμερα Κυρίου ως κλεπτης.
 κλησις: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιαν υμων τὴν κλησιν ποιεῖσθαι.
 κλητος: J. 1 τετηρημενοις κλητοις.
 κοιμαω: 2 P. 3. 4 ἀφ' ἧς οι πατερες εκοιμηθησαν.
 κοινος: J. 3 περι τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας.
 κοινωνος: 2 P. 1. 4 θειας κοινωνοι φύσεως.
 κολαζω: 2 P. 2. 4, 9 κολαζομενους τηρειν (in 4 some read τηρουμενους).
 κομιζω: 2 P. 2. 13 κομιούμενοι (al. ἀδικούμενοι) μισθον ἀδικιας.
 Κορέ: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογια του Κορε ἀπώλοντο.
 κοσμος: 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς, 2. 5 αρχαίου κοσμου ουκ ἐφεισατο κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβων επαξας, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τα μιάσματα του κοσμου, 3. 6 ο τοτε κόσμος κατακλυσθεῖς ἀπωλετο.
 κρατος: J. 25 Θεῶ κράτος και ἐξουσια.
 κρείττων: 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττον ἦν αυτοις μη ἐπεγνωκέναι την ὁδὸν ἣ ἐπιγνουσιν κ.τ.λ.

- κ ρ ι μ α : 2 P. 2. 3 οἷς το κριμα εκπαλαι ουκ ἀργεῖ, J. 4 προγεγραμμενοι εις τουτο το κριμα.
- κ ρ ι σ ι ς : 2 P. 2. 4 εις κρισιν τηρουμένους, 2. 9 εις ημέραν κρισεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 2. 11 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αυτων παρα Κυριω βλασφημον κρισιν, 3. 7 τηρουμενοι εις ημέραν κρίσεως, J. 6 εις κρίσιν μεγαλης ἡμέρας τετήρηκεν, 9 κρισιν επενεγκειν βλασφημίας, 15 ποιῆσαι κρισιν κατα παντων.
- κ τ ί σ ι ς : 2 P. 3. 4 ἀπ' αρχῆς κτισεως.
- α. c. δ. κυλισμος : 2 P. 2. 22 εις κυλισμὸν (αἱ. κυλισμα) βορβορου, p. lxii.
- κ υ μ α : J. 13 κυματα αγρια θαλασσης.
- β. δ. κυριοτης : 2 P. 2. 10 κυριοτητος καταφρονοῦντας, J. 8 κυριοτητα αθετουσιν, p. viii.
- λ α γ χ α ν ω : 2 P. 1. 1 τοις ἰσοτιμον ἡμιν λαχουσιν πιστιν.
- λ α ι λ α ψ : 2 P. 2. 17 ὁμίχλαι��πὸ λαιλαπος ελανόμεναι.
- λ α λ ε ω : 2 P. 1. 21 ἐλαλησαν α γ ι ο ι τ ο ὦ (αἱ. απο) Θεου ανθρωποι, 3. 16 λαλῶν ἐν αυταις περι τουτων, J. 15 περι παντων των σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλαλησαν, 16 το στομα αὐτῶν λαλει υπερογκα.
- λ α μ β α ν ω : 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβων του καθαρισμου των πάλαι αυτου αμαρτιων, 1. 17 λαβὼν παρα Θεου πατρος τιμην καὶ δοξαν.
- λ α ν θ α ν ω : 2 P. 3. 5 λανθanei γαρ αυτους οτι, 3. 8 τουτο μη λανθανετω ὑμᾶς οτι.
- λ α ο ς : 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγενοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τω λαῶ, J. 5 λαον ἐκ γῆς Αιγυπτου σωσας.
- λ ε γ ω : 2 P. 3. 4 λεγοντες Ποῦ εστιν ἡ επαγγελια ; J. 14 προεφητευσεν Ἐνωχ λέγων, 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ρημάτων τῶν προειρημενων υπο τῶν αποσταλων οτι ελεγον.
- c. λ ή θ η : 2 P. 1. 9 λήθην λαβων τοῦ καθαρισμου.
- λ ο γ ο ς : 2 P. 1. 19 τον προφητικον λογον, 2. 3 πλαστοῖς λογοις, 3. 5 τω του Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 7 τω αυτω λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν.
- λ ο ι π ό ς : 2 P. 3. 18 ως καὶ τας λοιπας γραφάς.
- λ ο υ ω : 2 P. 2. 22 υς λουσαμενη.
- λ υ χ ν ο ς : 2 P. 1. 19 ως λυχνω φαινοντι.
- λ ύ ω : 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεια καυσουμενα λυθησεται, 3. 11 τουτων παντων λυομενων, 3. 12 ουρανοὶ πυρουμενοι λυθήσονται.
- ω τ : 2 P. 2. 7 δικαιον Λωτ καταπονουμενον.
- β. μακροθυμέω : 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμει εις υμας.
- β. μακροθυμία : 2 P. 3. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυριου μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεισθε.
- μ ά λ ι σ τ α : 2 P. 2. 10 μάλιστα δε τοὺς οπίσω σαρκος πορευομενους.
- μ α λ λ ο ν : 2 P. 1. 10 διο μαλλον σπουδασατε.
- β. ματαιοτης : 2 P. 2. 18 υπερογκα ματαιοτητος φθεγγομενοι.
- β. μεγαλειοτης : 2 P. 1. 16 ἐπαπται τῆς εκεινου μεγαλειοτητος.
- c. μεγαλοπρεπης : 2 P. 1. 17 υπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεπους δόξης.
- β. μεγαλωσυνη : J. 25 Θεῶ . . . δοξα μεγαλωσυνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία.
- μ ε γ α ς : J. 6 εις κρισιν μεγαλης ἡμερας.
- c. μέγιστος : 2 P. 1. 4 δι' ὧν τα μέγιστα καὶ τιμια ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται (reading uncertain), p. xlii.
- μ ε ί ζ ω ν : 2 P. 2. 11 αγγελοι ἰσχυῖ καὶ δυνάμει μειζονες οντες.

- μ ε λ λ ω : 2 P. 1. 12 διὸ μελλήσω (?) υμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, p. lx, 2. 6 υποδειγμα μελλοντων ασεβεισιν τεθεικως, p. cxcv.
- μ ἔ λ ω, see 2 P. 1 12 and p. cxciii.
- β. c. δ. μ ε μ ψ ῖ μ ο ι ρ ο ς : J. 16 γογγυσταὶ μεμψιμοιροί.
- μ ἔ ν : J. 8 σαρκὰ μὲν μαινουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ αθετουσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ ὄδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπιστανται . . . ἐν τούτοις φθειρονται, 22, 23 οὓς μὲν ἐλεγετε διακρινόμενους, οὓς δὲ σωζετε . . . οὓς δὲ ελεατε (readings differ).
- μ ἔ ν τ ο ι : J. 8 ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι σάρκα μαινουσιν.
- μ ε σ τ ὄ ς : 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστὸν μοιχαλίδος.
- μ ε τ ᾶ : c. acc. 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδὸν.
- μ ε τ α ν ο ι α : 2 P. 3. 9 βουλομενος παντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρήσαι.
- μ ε τ α τ ι θ η μ ι : J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσελγειαν.
- μ ῆ : pp. 1, c *with imperat.* 2 P. 3. 8 τούτο μὴ λανθανετω υμας οτι; *with part.* 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμῆ μὴ βουλόμενός τις ἀπολέσθαι, J. 19 οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες; *with part. and article,* J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστευσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, 6 τοὺς μὴ τηρησαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ὑπο ζοφὸν τετηρηκεν.
- c. *infin.* 2 P. 2. 21 κρεῖττον ἢ μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν . . . ἦ.
- c. *rel.* 2 P. 1. 9 ὡ μὴ πάρεστιν ταυτα τυφλος ἐστιν.
- ο υ μ ῆ : 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταισητε ποτε.
- μ ι α ῖ ν ω : J. 8 σάρκα μὲν μαινουσιν.
- c. μ ῖ α σ μ α : 2 P. 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ.
- β. c. μ ι α σ μ ὄ ς : 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπισω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμῖα μiasμου πορευομένους.
- μ ι μ ν ῆ σ κ ο μ α ι : 2 P. 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων, J. 17 μνησθητε τῶν ρημάτων τῶν προειρημένων.
- μ ι σ ἔ ω : J. 23 μισουντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμενον χιτῶνα.
- μ ι σ θ ὄ ς : 2 P. 2. 13 κομιουμενοι (al. ἀδικουμενοι) μισθὸν ἀδικίας 2. 15 μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλααμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχυθησαν.
- c. μ ν η μ η : 2 P. 1. 15 τούτων μνημῆν ποιεῖσθαι, pp. xxxiv, lx.
- β. μ ο ι χ α λ ι ς : 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστὸν μοιχαλίδος.
- μ ὄ ν ο ς : J. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν καὶ κυριὸν Ἰ. X. ἀρνούμενοι, 25 μόνω Θεῷ σωτήρι ἡμῶν.
- μ υ θ ο ς : 2 P. 1. 16 σεσοφισμένοις μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες.
- μ υ ρ ι ᾶ ς : J. 14 ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, p. xxxi.
- c. δ. μ ν ω π ᾶ ζ ω : 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλός ἐστιν μνωπάζων, p. lxi.
- c. μ ω μ ο ς : 2 P. 2. 13 σπιλοὶ καὶ μῶμοι.
- Μ ω υ σ ῆ ς : J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελεγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσεως σωματος.
- ν ε φ ε λ η : 2 P. 2. 17 ὀμιχλαὶ (al. νεφέλαι) ὑπο λαιλαπος ελαυνόμεναι, J. 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν . . . νεφέλαι ἄνδρῶν ὑπὸ ἀνεμῶν παραφερόμεναι.
- ν υ ν : 2 P. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 25 μόνω Θεῷ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντα τοὺς αἰῶνας.
- ν υ σ τ ᾶ ζ ω : 2 P. 2. 3 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυσταζει.
- Ν ὦ ε : 2 P. 2. 5 ὄγδαον Νῶε δικαιοσυνης κήρυκα ἐφυλαξεν.

- ὄγδοος: 2 P. 2. 5 ογδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κηρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, pp. vii, 192
- ε. οδοσ: 2 P. 2. 2 ἡ οδος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 15 καταλιποντες (αλ. καταλειποντες) εὐθειαν οδον, ἰβ. ἐξακολουθήσαντες τη οδῷ του Βαλαάμ, 2. 21 επεγνωκέαι τὴν ὁδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης, J. 11 τῇ οδῷ του Καὶν επορευθησαν.
- οἶδα: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ εἰδοτας και εστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσῃ ἀληθεία, 1. 14 εἰδως οτι ταχινή εστιν ἡ ἀποθεσις του σκηνωματος μου, 2. 9 οιδεν Κυριος ευσεβεις εκ πειρασμου ρυεσθαι, J. 5 υπομῆσαι νμας βουλομαι εἰδοτας ὑμᾶς παντα, 10 οσα μὲν ουκ οἶδασιν βλασφημουσιν.
- οικητηριον: J. 6 ἀπολιποντας το ιδιον οικητηριον.
- ε. δ. ολίγως. 2 P. 2. 18 δελεαζουσιν τους ολιγως ἀποφευγοντας, p. cxcviii.
- ε. ομίχλη: 2 P. 2. 17 ομιχλαι ὑπο λαιλαπος ἐλαννομεναι.
- ομοιος: J. 7 τον ομοιον τρόπον τουτοις ἐκπορνευσασαι.
- ὁμοιος: J. 8 ὁμοιως μεντοι και οὔτοι σάρκα μβαινουσιν.
- ε. οπισω: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς οπίσω σαρκος πορευομένους, 2. 21 εις τα ὀπισω υποστρέψαι (αλ. οπ. εις τα οπισω), J. 7 ἀπελθουσαι ὀπίσω σαρκος ετερας.
- οπου: 2 P. 2. 11 οπου ἄγγελοι οὐ φερουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
- οπωρα, pp. 55 f.
- ὄρος: 2 P. 1. 18 εν τω ορει τω ἀγίῳ (αλ. τω αγιω ορει), ἰν, cxliv.
- ὄς, ἦ, ο: 2 P. 1. 4 δι' ὧν τα μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, 1. 9 ω γαρ μη παρεστιν ταυτα τυφλος εστιν, 1. 17 ο υιος εις ον εγω ευδοκησα, 1. 19 τον λογον ᾧ καλως ποιεῖτε προσεχοντες, εως οὗ ἡμερα διαυγάση, 2. 2 δι' οὗς ἡ ὁδος βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 3 οἷς το κριμα ουκ ἄργει, 2. 12 εν οἷς ἀγνωουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 2. 15 ος μισθὸν ἀδικιας ἠγαπησεν, 2. 17 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τετηρηται, 2. 19 ω τις ἠττηται τουτω και δεδουλωται, 3. 1 δευτεραν νμιν γράφω επιστολην, εν αις διεγειρω, 3. 4 ἀφ ἧς οι πατερες εκοιμηθησαν, 3. 6 δι' ὧν (?ον, see p. cxcix) ὁ τοτε κόσμος απωλετο, 3. 10 εν ἣ οι οὐρανοι παρελευσονται, 3. 12 δι' ἧν ουρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 3. 13 ἐν οἷς δικαιοσυνη κατοικει, 3. 16 εν αἷς εστιν δυσνοητα τινα, α οἱ αμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν, J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζοφος τετήρηται, 15 περι παντων τῶν εργαων ασεβειας ὧν ἠσεβησαν, και περι παντων σκληρων ὧν ἐλάλησαν, 22, 23 οὗς μὲν ελεγχετε, ους δε σωζετε, οὗς δε ελεᾶτε (readings differ).
- οσοσ: 2 P. 1. 13 εφ' οσον εἰμι ἐν τουτω τῷ σκηνώματι, J. 10 οσα μὲν ουκ οιδασιν βλασφημουσιν, οσα δε φυσικως επιστανται εν τουτοις φθειρονται.
- οστις: 2 P. 2. 1 ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι οιτινες παρεισαξουσιν αιρεσεις ἀπωλειας.
- οτε: J. 9 ο δε (αλ. οτε) Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, οτε (αλ. τοτε) τω διαβόλω διακρινομενος διελεγετο.
- οτι: ('that') 2 P. 1. 14 εἰδως οτι, 1. 20, 3. 3 γινωσκοντες οτι, 3. 5 λανθανει οτι, 3. 8 λανθανετω οτι, J. 5 εἰδοτας οτι, 18 μνήσθητε τῶν ρηματων . . . οτι ελεγον ὑμῖν [οτι] . . . εσονται.
('because') J. 11 ουαὶ αυτοις οτι τη ὁδῷ του Καὶν επορευθησαν.
- ου, see μη, pp. 1 f.
- ουαι: J. 11 ουαὶ αυτοῖς οτι.
- ουδε: 2 P. 1. 8 ουκ ἄργους ουδε ἀκαρπους.

- οὖν: 2 P. 3. 11 τούτων οὖν (αλ. οὕτως) πάντων λυομένων, 3. 17 ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, φυλάσσεσθε.
- οὐρανός: 2 P. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἑκπαλαί, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ, 3. 10 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ροιζήσονται παρελευσονται (αλ. οἱ), 3. 12 οὐρανοὶ πυρουμενοὶ λυθήσονται, 3. 13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν προσδοκῶμεν, p. xxxiii.
- οὗτος: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 1. 18 ταυτην την φωνην ημεῖς ηκουσαμεν, 3. 1 ταυτην ἥδη δευτεραν υμιν γραφω επιστολην, 1. 5 καὶ αὐτοῦτο δε (αλ. καὶ αὐτοὶ δε) σπουδην πασαν παρεισενεγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 1. 20, 3. 3 τουτο πρῶτον γινωσκοντες, 3. 5 λανθάνει γαρ αυτους τουτο θελοντας, 3. 8 εν δε τουτο μὴ λανθανετω υμας, 1. 13 εν τουτω τῷ σκηνώματι, 2. 19 ὡ γαρ τις ἠττηται τουτω δεδουλωται, 2. 12 οὔτοι δε ως αλογα ζῶα, 2. 17 οὔτοι εισιν πηγαὶ ανδρῶν, 1. 8 ταυτα υμιν ὑπάρχοντα, 1. 9 ὦ γαρ μη πάρεστι ταυτα, 1. 10 ταῦτα ποιουντες, 3. 14 ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες, 1. 4 ἵνα δια τουτων γένησθε θειας κοινωνοὶ φυσεως, 1. 12 υπομιμνησκειν περι τουτων, 1. 15 τὴν τουτων μνημην ποιεισθαι, 3. 11 τουτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων, 3. 16 λαλων περι τουτων, 2. 20 τουτοις δε παλιν εμπλακεντες, J. 4 οἱ παλαι προγεγραμμένοι εισ τουτο το κριμα, 5 εισοτας υμας τουτο (αλ. παντα), 8 ομοιως μεντοι καὶ οὔτοι ἐνυπνιαζομενοι, 10 οὔτοι δε οσα μὲν ουκ οιδασιν βλασφημουσιν, 12, 16, 19 οὔτοι εισιν, 7 τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις, 10 εν τουτοις φθειρονται, 14 ἐπροφητευσεν δε και τουτοις. Prospective use p. xciii f, 25.
- οὕτως: 2 P. 1. 11 οὕτως γαρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται, 3. 4 παντα οὕτως διαμενει απ' αρχῆς κτίσεως, 3. 11 τούτων οὕτως (αλ. οὖν) πάντων λυομένων.
- ὀφθαλμός: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς εχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλιδος.
- παλαι: 2 P. 1. 9 τῶν παλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιων, J. 4 οἱ παλαι προγεγραμμενοι εισ τουτο το κριμα.
- παλιν: 2 P. 2. 20 τουτοις παλιν εμπλακεντες.
- παρα: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 17 λαβὼν παρα Θεου πατρος τιμην.
(c. aat.) 2 P. 2. 11 ου φέρουσιν κατ αυτων παρα Κυριω (αλ. οἱ π. κ., see p. cxvii) βλασφημον κρίσιν, 3. 8 μια ἡμέρα παρα Κυριω ως χιλια ετη.
- παραγγελία: p. 64.
- παραδιδωμί: 2 P. 2. 4 παρεδωκεν εισ κρισιν τηρουμενους, 2. 21 εκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αυτοις αγίας εντολῆς, J. 3 τῇ απαξ παραδοθειση τοις αγιοις πιστει, pp. 61 f. 1 P. 2 23 παρεδιδου τῷ κρίνοντι, pp. xcvi f.
- παραδοσις: pp. 61 f.
- παραθήκη: p. 62.
- παρακαλέω: J. 3 παρακαλων επαγωνίζεσθαι.
- c. παρανομία: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν δε ἔσχεν ιδίας παρανομιας.
- παραφέρω: J. 12 νεφελαι ανδρῶν ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερομεναι.
- α. παραφρονία: 2 P. 2. 16 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονιαν.
- παραίμι: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμιν πάροντα (αλ. ὑπάρχοντα), 1. 9 ω γαρ μη παρεστιν ταυτα, 1. 12 εστηριγμενους ἐν τη παρουση ἀληθείᾳ (παραδοθειση Sr.).
- c. ἀ. παρεισάγω: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεισάξουσιν αιρέσεις απωλείας.
- c. α. παρεισδύω: J. 4 παρεισδύσαν τινες ανθρωποι.

- c. d.* παρεισφερῶ: 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδὴν πασαν παρεισενεγκαντες, pp. lx, lxi.
 παρέρχομαι: 2 P. 3. 10 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ροιζήδὸν παρελευσονται.
 παροιμία: 2 P. 2. 22 τοῦ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας.
 παρουσία: 2 P. 1. 16 I.X. συναμιν καὶ παρουσιαν, 3. 4 ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτου, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσιαν τῆς τοῦ Θεου ἡμερας, pp. lxxiv f., 195.
 πας: 2 P. 1. 3 παντα τα προς ζωην, 1. 5 σπουδὴν πασαν παρεισενέγκαντες, 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, 3. 4 παντα οὕτως διαμενει, 3. 9 παντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρησαι, 3. 11 τούτων οὖν παντων λυομενων, 3. 16 ἐν πασαις ἐπιστολαις (*al. ταις ἐπ.*), J. 3 πασαν σπουδὴν ποιουμενος, 5 εἰδοτας ὑμας παντα (*readings differ*), 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατα παντων, καὶ ἐλεγεῖαι παντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ παντων τῶν ἐργων . . . καὶ περὶ παντων των σκληρῶν, 25 μὴ Θεῷ δοξα προ παντος τοῦ αἰωνος καὶ νυν καὶ εἰς παντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.
 πατήρ: 2 P. 1. 17 παρα Θεου πατρος, 3. 4 οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμηθησαν, J. 1 τοῖς [ἐν] Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημενοι.
 Παῦλος: 2 P. 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητος ἡμῶν ἀδελφος Παῦλος.
 πειρασμός: 2 P. 2. 9 εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμου ρυεσθαι.
 περί: (*c. gen.*) 2 P. 1. 12 υπομνησκειν περὶ τούτων, 3. 16 λαλῶν περὶ τούτων, J. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας γράψαι, 9 διελεγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσεως σώματος, 15 ἐλεγεῖαι περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργων καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν.
 (*c. acc.*) J. 7 Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτάς πόλεις.
 περιεχει ἐν γραφῇ: 1 P. 2. 6, p. xcviii.
 περισσευω: pp. 93 f.
 περιφασίς) (ἐπίγνωσις: pp. 172 f, 213.
 Πέτρος: 2 P. 1. 1 Συμεῶν Πέτρος δουλός καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰ.Χ.
 πηγῆ: 2 P. 2. 17 οὗτοι εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἀνυδροί.
 πιστευω: J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστευσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.
 πίστις: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῖς ἰσοτιμοῖν ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, J. 3 ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, 20 ἐποικοδομοῦντες εαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτατῇ ὑμῶν πίστει.
 πλανᾶω: 2 P. 2. 15 ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.
 πλάνη: 2 P. 2. 18 ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομενοι, 3. 17 τῇ τῶν ἀθεσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθεντες, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλααμ ἐξεχυθησαν.
c. e. πλανητής: J. 13 ἀστερες πλανῆται (*al. πλάνητες*).
c. d. πλαστός: 2 P. 2. 3 πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορευονται.
 πλεονάζω: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς καθίστησιν.
 πλεονεξία: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ὑμας ἐμπορευονται, 2. 14 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμενὴν πλεονεξίας ἐχοντες.
 πληθυνω: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρηνὴ πληθυνθείη, J. 2 ἐλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρηνὴ καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.
d. πλουσιώσ: 2 P. 1. 11 πλουσιώσ ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν.
 πνευμα: 2 P. 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνευματος ἁγίου φερομενοι ἐλάλησαν, J. 19 ψυχικοί, πνευμα μὴ ἐχοντες, 20 ἐν πνευματι ἁγίῳ προσευχομενοι, p. xxiv.

- ποιέω: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιαν υμων την κλήσιν καὶ εκλογην ποιεισθαι, 1b. ταυτα γαρ ποιουντες, 1. 15 τουτων μνήμην ποιεισθαι, 1. 19 ψ καλῶς ποιειτε προσεχοντες, J. 3 πασαν σπουδὴν ποιουμενος, 15 ποιῆσαι κρισιν κατα πάντων, p. xlix.
- ποιμαίνω: J. 12 εαυτους ποιμαίνοντες.
- πολις: 2 P. 2. 8 πολεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορρας, J. 7 αι περι αυτας πολεις.
- πολυς: 2 P. 2. 2 πολλοι εξακολουθησουσιν αυτών ταις ἀσελγειαίς.
- ε. πορευομαι: 2 P. 2. 10 τους οπίσω σαρκος ἐν επιθυμίᾳ μiasμου πορευομένους, 3. 3 κατα τας ιδίας ἐπιθυμίας αυτων πορευομενοι, J. 11 τῇ οὐῶ του Καὶν ἐπορευθησαν, 16 κατα τας επιθυμίας αυτων πορευομενοι, 18 κατα τας ἐαυτων ἐπιθυμίας πορευομενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.
- β. δ. ποταπος: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταποὺς δει υπάρχειν υμας.
- ποτε: 2 P. 1. 10 ου μη πταίσητε ποτε, 1. 21 ου γαρ θελήματι ανθρωπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ.
- που: 2 P. 3. 4 που ἐστὶν η επαγγελια τῆς παρουσιας αυτου; p. lii.
- πρό: J. 25 μονω Θεω εξουσία προ παντος του αἰῶνος.
- προγινωσκω: 2 P. 3. 17 προγινωσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε.
- προγράφω: J. 4 οι πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τουτο το κρίμα.
- προείρηκα: 2 P. 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημενων ρημάτων ὑπο τῶν αγίων προφητῶν, J. 17 μνήσθητε των ρημάτων τῶν προειρημενων υπο τῶν ἀποστολων.
- προκειμαι: J. 7 αι πόλεις προκεινται δειγμα.
- πρός: c. acc. 2 P. 1. 3 παντα τα προς ζωήν, 3. 16 στρεβλουσιν προς τὴν ἰδιαν αυτων απωλειαν.
- προσδέχομαι: J. 21 προσδεχομενοι το ἔλεος του κυρίου ἡμῶν.
- προσδοκάω: 2 P. 3. 12 προσδοκῶντας την παρουσίαν, 3. 13 καινους δε ουρανοους προσδοκῶμεν, 3. 14 ταῦτα προσδοκωντες.
- προσευχομαι: J. 20 εν πνευματι ἀγιῶ προσευχόμενοι.
- προσεχω: 2 P. 1. 19 ψ καλως ποιειτε προσεχοντες.
- πρόσωπον: J. 16 θαυμάζοντες προσωπα.
- προφητεία: 2 P. 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ιδίας επιλυσεως ου γίνεται, 1. 21 ου γαρ θεληματι ανθρωπου ἠνέχθη προφητεια ποτε.
- προφητεω: J. 14 ἐπροφητευσεν (αλ. προεφήτευσεν) δε και τουτοις
- προφητης: 2 P. 2. 16 τὴν του προφήτου παραφρονίαν, 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων υπο τῶν αγίων προφητῶν.
- β. α. προφητικος: 2 P. 1. 19 και εχομεν βεβαιοτερον τον προφητικον λογον.
- πρωτος: 2 P. 2. 20 γεγονεν αυτοῖς τα ἔσχατα χειρονα των πρωτων, 1. 20, 3. 3 τουτο πῶτον γινωσκοντες.
- πταίω: 2 P. 1. 10 ου μη πταίσητε ποτε.
- πῦρ: 2 P. 3. 7 τεθησαυρισμένοι εισιν πυρι, J. 7 πυρος αιωνιου δικην υπεχουσαι, 23 σωζετε ἐκ πυρος ἀρπαζοντες.
- πυρόω: 2 P. 3. 12 οὐρανοι πυρουμενοι λυθήσονται, 3. 10 γη πυρωθησεται, see p. cc.
- ρημα: 2 P. 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων υπο των αγίων προφητῶν, J. 17 μνήσθητε των ρημάτων τῶν προειρημενων υπο τῶν ἀποστόλων.

- b. c. d.* ροιζηδόν: 2 P. 3. 10 οι ουρανοὶ ροιζηδὸν παρελευσονται.
 ρυομαι: 2 P. 2. 7 δικαίον Δωτ ἔρυσατο (*αλ.* ἔρρυσατο), 2. 9 οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ρυεσθαι.
- e.* σαρξ: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκος ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμου πορευομένους, 2. 18 οελαζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκος ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλιγως ἀποφeyγοντας, J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκος ἑτέρας, 8 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σαρκα μὲν μαιῖνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπο τῆς σαρκος ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
- σειρά, see σειρός and p. cxciv.
- c. d.* σειρος (*αλ.* σιρος): 2 P. 2. 4 σειροῖς (*αλ.* σειραῖς) ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένων.
- e.* σκηνωμα: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 14 ταχινὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, pp. cxx, cxxi.
- σκληρος: J. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν (*αλ.* *add.* λογῶν) ὧν ἐλάλησαν.
- σκοτός: 2 P. 2. 17 and J. 13 οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκοτους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.
- Σόδομα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορρας τεφρωσας κατεκρινεν, J. 7 Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτάς πόλεις προκεινται δειγμα.
- σοφία: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.
- σοφίζω: 2 P. 1. 16 σεσοφισμένοις μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες.
- σοφος: J. 25 μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ (*αλ.* *om.* σοφῷ).
- σπενδω: 2 P. 3. 12 σπενδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας.
- c. d.* σπιλας: J. 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγαπαῖς υμῶν σπιλαδες συνευχόμενοι, p. xi.
- b. d.* σπιλος: 2 P. 2. 13 σπιλοὶ καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (*αλ.* ἀγαπαῖς) αὐτῶν συνευχόμενοι υμῖν.
- b.* σπιλώω: J. 23 τὸν ἀπο τῆς σαρκος ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.
- σπουδαζω: 2 P. 1. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν υμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιῆσθαι, 1. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκαστοτε εχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνημὴν ποιῆσθαι, 3. 14 σπουδασατε ἀσπιλοὶ καὶ ἀμωμητοὶ αὐτῷ εὐρεθῆναι.
- σπουδή: 2 P. 1. 5 σπουδὴν πασαν παρεισενέγκαντες, J. 3 πασαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν υμῖν.
- b. c. d.* στηριγμός: 2 P. 3. 17 φυλασσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπεσητε τοῦ ἰδιοῦ στηριγμοῦ.
- στηρίζω: 2 P. 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείας.
- στοιχεῖον: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καυσουμένα λυθησεται, 3. 12 στοιχεῖα καυσουμένα τήκεται.
- στόμα: J. 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπερογκα.
- c. e.* στρεβλω: 2 P. 3. 16 δυσνόητα τινὰ αἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν.
- σν: J. 9 ἐπιτιμησαι σοι Κύριος; (υ με ἰς) 2 P. 3. 17 υμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοὶ, φυλάσσεσθε, J. 17 ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοὶ, μνησθητε τῶν ρημάτων, 20 υμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, εαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ τηρησατε, 2 P. 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγησατε ἐν τῇ πίστει υμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, 1. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν υμῶν τὴν κλήσιν ποιῆσθαι, 1. 19 εως οὐ ἡμέρα διανγᾶση ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν, 3. 1 διεγειρω υμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, 3. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, J. 12 οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγαπαῖς υμῶν σπιλαδες, 20 τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ υμῶν πίστει, 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν παροντα, 1. 11 ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἰσοδος, 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 2. 1 ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2. 13 συνευχόμενοι ὑμῖν, 3. 1 δευτεραν

- υμιν γράφω επιστολην, J. 2 ελεος υμιν πληθυνθείη, 3 γραφειν υμιν, *ib.*
 γράφαι υμιν ; 2 P. 1. 12 ὑμας υπομιμνήσκειν, 1. 13, 15, 2. 3, 3. 8, 9, 11, J. 24.
 σ υ μ β α ί ν ω : 2 P. 2. 22 συμβεβηκεν αὐτοῖς το τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας.
 Σ υ μ ε ω ν : 2 P. 1. 1 Συμεὼν (*al.* Σίμων) Πέτρος, pp. 180 f, ii.
 σ υ ν : 2 P. 1. 18 συν αὐτῷ ὄντες εν τω ορει τῷ ἁγίω.
 σ υ ν α π ά γ ω : 2 P. 3. 17 τη τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνη συναπαχθεντες.
 c. d. σ υ ν ν ε υ ω χ ε ο μ α ι : 2 P. 2. 13 εντρυφῶντες εν ταις ἀπαταις αὐτῶν
 συννευχουμενοι υμιν, J. 12 οὗτοί εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταις ἀγαπαῖς υμων
 σπιλαδες συννευχουμενοι.
 σ υ ν ί σ τ η μ ι : 2 P. 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ υδατος και δι' υδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ
 Θεοῦ λογῷ.
 σ ὠ ζ ω : J. 5 λαον εκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου σωσας, 23 οὓς μεν ελεατε διακρινομενους
 οὓς δὲ σῶζετε.
 σ ὠ μ α : J. 9 περι τοῦ Μωσeweos σωματος.
 σ ω τ η ρ : 2 P. 1. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν και σωτήρος Ἰ.Χ., 1. 11 την αιωνιον
 βασιλειαν τοῦ κυρίου και σωτήρος Ἰ.Χ. 2. 20 εν επιγνωσει του Θεου και
 σωτηρος Ἰ.Χ., 3. 2 τοῦ κυρίου και σωτηρος, 3. 18 αυξάνετε ἐν γνωσει
 του κυριου και σωτηρος, J. 25 μονῶ Θεῷ σωτηρι ημων οια 1.Α. του
 κυριου ἡμων.
 σ ω τ η ρ ί α : 2 P. 3. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυριου ημων μακροθυμιαν σωτηριαν
 ηγεισθε, J. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδην ποιουμενος γράφειν υμιν περι της κοινης
 ἡμῶν σωτηρίας.
 a. τ α ρ τ α ρ ὴ ω : 2 P. 2. 4 σειροις ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρεδωκεν, pp. vi, lxi.
 b. c τ α χ ι ν ὄ ς : 2 P. 1. 14 ταχινή εστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνωματος μου,
 2. 1 επαγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν.
 τ ε : J. 6 ἀγγελους τε τους μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν εαυτῶν ἀρχην . . . τετηρηκεν.
 τ ε κ ν ο ν : 2 P. 2. 14 κατάρας τεκνα.
 b. c. d. τ ε φ ρ ὴ ω : 2 P. 2. 6 πολεις Σοδομων και Γομορρας τεφρωσας
 κατεκρινεν, p. vii.
 c. τ η κ ω : 2 P. 3. 12 στοιχεια καυσουμενα τήκεται.
 τ η ρ ε ω : 2 P. 2. 4 εις κρίσιν τηρουμενους (*al.* κολαζομενους τηρεῖν), 2. 9
 ἀδικους εις ἡμεραν κρισεως κολαζομενους τηρεῖν, 2. 17 οἱ ὁ ζοφος του
 σκοτους τετήρηται, 3. 7 οἱ δε νῦν ουρανοὶ . . . τεθησαυρισμενοι εισιν
 πυρὶ τηρουμενοι εις ἡμεραν κρισεως, J. 1 τετηρημενοις κλητοις,
 6 ἀγγελους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας την ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν εις κρισιν μεγαλης
 ἡμερας τετήρηκεν, 13 οἷς ὁ ζῶφος του σκοτους εις αἰῶνα τετηρηται,
 21 ἑαυτους εν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.
 τ ι θ η μ ι : 2 P. 2. 6 υπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβειν (*al.* ασεβεῖν) τεθεικως.
 τ ι μ η : 2 P. 1. 17 λαβων παρα Θεοῦ πατρος τιμην και δόξαν.
 τ ί μ ι ο ς : 2 P. 1. 4 τα τιμια και μέγιστα υμιν επαγγελματα (*al.* τα μεγαιστα
 και τιμια ημιν επαγγ.).
 τ ι ς : 2 P. 2. 19 ὧ γάρ τις ἤττηται τουτω και δεδουλωται (*al.* οτι και), 3. 9
 ωσ τινες βραδυτητα ηγούνται . . . μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολεσθαι,
 3. 16 εν αἷς εστιν δυσνοητά τινα, J. 4 παρεισεδυθησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι.
 The interrogative τις does not occur.
 c. a. τ ο ι ὴ σ δ ε : 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθεισης αυτω τοιασδε.
 τ ο λ μ ά ω : J. 9 ουκ ετολμησεν κρίσιν επενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας.
 c. d. τ ο λ μ η τ η ς : 2 P. 2. 10 τολμηται αυθάδεις.

- τόπος: 2 P. 1. 19 ως λυχνω φαίνονται ἐν αυχηρω τοπω.
 τότε: 2 P. 3. 6 ο τότε κοσμος απωλετο, J. 9 οτε Μιχαήλ . . . τότε διακρινο-
 μενος διελεγετο (αλ. ὁ δε Μ. . . , οτε).
 τρεμω: 2 P. 2. 10 δόξας ου τρέμουνσιν.
 τροπος: J. 7 τον ομοιον τροπον τουτοις ἐκπορνευσασαι.
 τρυφή: 2 P. 2. 13 ηδονήν ηγουμενοι την ἐν ἡμερα τρυφήν.
 τυφλός: 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλός εστιν μυωπάζων.
- υδωρ: 2 P. 3. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος και δι' υδατος συνεστῶσα, 3. 6 ο τότε κοσμος
 υδατι κατακλυσθεις ἀπώλετο.
 υιός: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτος εστιν ο υιός μου ὁ αγαπητος (αλ. ὁ υιός μου, ὁ
 ἀγαπητος μου, οὗτος ἐστιν).
 ὑπάρχω: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμιν υπάρχοντα (αλ. παροντα), 2. 19 αυτοὶ δοῦλοι
 ὑπάρχοντες, 3. 11 ποταποὺς δει υπάρχειν υμας.
 c. e. ὑπερογκος: 2 P. 2. 18 υπερογκα ματαιοτητος φθειγγομενοι, p.
 xxxvii, J. 16 το στομα αυτῶν λαλεῖ υπερογκα.
 c. υπέχω: J. 7 πυρος αιωνίου δικην υπεχουσαι.
 υπό: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθεισης αυτῶ υπο (απο?, see p. cxci) τῆς
 μεγαλοπρεποὺς δόξης, 1. 21 υπο πνευματος αγιου φερομενοι, 2. 7 οικαιον
 Λωτ καταπονουμενον υπο τῆς τῶν αθέσμων ἐν ασελγεια αναστροφῆς
 ἐρυσατο, 2. 17 ομιχλαι υπο λαιλαπος ελαινώμεναι, 3. 2 μνησθῆναι τῶν
 προειρημένων ρημάτων υπο τῶν αγίων προφητων, J. 12 νεφελαι ανυροροι
 υπο ανέμων παραφερόμεναι, 17 μνήσθητε τῶν ρηματων των προειρημενων
 υπο τῶν αποστολων.
 (c. acc.) J. 6 ἀγγελους . . . υπο ζόφον τετήρηκεν.
 υπόδειγμα: 2 P. 2. 6 υποδειγμα μελλοντων ασεβειν τεθεικως, p. cxcv.
 ὑποζυγιον: 2 P. 2. 16 υποζυγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ανθρωπου φωνῆ φθειγξα-
 μενον.
 υπομιμνησκω: 2 P. 1. 12 αει υμας υπομιμνησκειν περι τουτων, J. 5
 υπομνήσαι δε υμας βουλομαι.
 ὑπόμνησις: 2 P. 1. 13 διεγειρειν υμας εν υπομνησει, 3. 1 διεγείρω νμῶν
 ἐν υπομνησει την ειλικρινή διανοιαν.
 υπομονή: 2 P. 1. 5 (επιχορηγήσατε) εν τη ἐγκρατεία τὴν υπομονήν, εν δε
 τη υπομονη τὴν εὐσεβειαν.
 υποστρέφω: 2 P. 2. 21 υποστρεψαι εκ τῆς παραδοθεισης αυτοῖς ἀγιας
 εντολῆς.
 c. ὕς: 2 P. 2. 22 ὕς λουσαμενη εις κυλισμον βορβόρου.
- φαινω: 2 P. 1. 19 προσεχοντες ως λυχνω φαίνονται εν αυχηρω τοπω.
 φείδομαι: 2 P. 2. 4 ἀγγελων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ εφεισατο, 2. 5 ἀρχαιου
 κοσμου ουκ ἐφεισατο.
 φέρω: 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθεισης αυτω τοιασδε, 1. 18 ταυτην τὴν φωνην
 ἡμεις ἠκουσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανου ἐνεχθεισαν, 1. 21 ου γαρ θελήματι
 ἀνθρώπου ηνέχθη προφητεια ποτέ, ἰδ. υπο πνευματος αγιου φερομενοι, 2. 11
 οὐ φερουσιν κατ αυτων βλάσφημον κρισιν.
 φθέγγομαι: 2 P. 2. 16 υποζυγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ανθρώπου φωνῆ
 φθειγξαμενον, 2. 18 υπερογκα ματαιότητος φθειγγομενοι.
 φθείρω: 2 P. 2. 12 εν τη φθορᾷ αυτων και φθαρησονται (αλ. καταφθ.),
 J. 10 εν τουτοις φθειρονται.

- c. d.* φθινοπωρινος : J. 12 ουτοι εισιν δενδρα φθινοπωρινα ἄκαρπα, pp. 55–59.
 φ θ ο ρ ᾶ : 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορας, 2. 12 γεγεννημενα φυσικα εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, . . . ἐν τῇ φθора αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται, 2. 19 δουλοι υπαρχοντες τῆς φθορας, pp. 190, 176–9.
- d. e.* φιλαδέλφια : 2 P. 1. 7 (επιχορηγησατε) ἐν τῇ ευσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην.
 φ ο β ο ς : J. 23 ους δε ελεατε ἐν φόβῳ.
 φυλάσσω : 2 P. 2. 5 ογδοον Νῶε δικαιοσυνης κήρυκα ἐφυλαξεν, 3. 17 φυλασσεσθε ἵνα μὴ . . . ἐκπεσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμου, J. 24 τῷ δυναμειῷ φυλάξαι υμας ἀπταίστους.
- d.* φυσικός : 2 P. 2. 12 ζῶα γεγεννημενα φυσικα εἰς ἀλωσιν, p. viii.
c. d. φυσικῶς : J. 10 οσα δε φυσικῶς ὡς τα ἀλογα ζῶα ἐπιστανται.
 φυσις : 2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φυσεως.
 φωνή : 2 P. 1. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιασδε ὑπο (ἀπο ?) τῆς μεγαλοπρεπουσ δοξῆς, 1. 18 ταυτην τὴν φωνην ἡμεῖς ἠκουσαμεν, 2. 16 ὑποζυγιον ἀφωνον ἐν ἀνθρωπου φωνῇ φθηγάμενον, p. lxi.
- c. d.* φωσφόρος : 2 P. 1. 19 ἐως ου φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη ἐν ταισ καρδίαισ υμῶν.
- χάρις : 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθειη, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνῶσει τοῦ κυριου ἡμῶν, J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσελγειαν, p. 26.
 χάριν : J. 16 θαυμαζοντες προσωπα ωφελιασ χάριν.
 χιλιοι : 2 P. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρα Κυρίῳ ὡσ χιλια ἐτη καὶ χιλια ἐτη ὡσ ἡμέρα μια.
 χιτων : J. 23 μισουντες καὶ τον ἀπο τῆς σαρκος ἐσπιλωμενον χιτῶνα.
 Χριστος . 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.
 χωρεω : 2 P. 3. 9 παντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρησαι.
- a. c.* ψευδοδιδασκαλος : 2 P. 2. 1 ὡσ καὶ ἐν υμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι.
b. ψευδοπροφήτης : 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγενοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ.
 ψυχή : 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχην δικαίαν ἀνομοισ ἐργοισ ἐβασάνιζεν, 2. 14 δελεαζοντες ψυχασ ἀστηρικτους.
d. e. ψυχικός : J. 19 οὔτοι εισιν ψυχικοὶ πνευμα μὴ ἐχοντες, pp. cxiv, clxxxvii f.
- ωσ : followed by substantive (α) 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. 3, cf. pp. lii, cii.
 ὡφελία : J. 16 ωφελιασ χάριν.

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., xc v
- 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., xc v 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., xcvi f.; Pres. and Aor. combined *γράφειν, γράψαι*, 22; *τιματε* and *τιμήσατε*, xcvi; Aor. and Perf. Part. combined xcvi
- 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, lxxxii-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^s (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 *ὁμεῖς*, xcii 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 *-οντα* from nouns in *-ων* 137; in *-ονη* from *-ος*, 147
- Divine nature, 87; man's participation in, 190
- Döllinger, xxi f.

- 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, cxcii, 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, xcvi, cv, clxxxiv, cxvii; 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, xcvi, rare in N.T., xl; 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-clii; 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 clxv
- 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, cxxvii foll., clxxxii
- Luther, 51
- Mark, his connexion with Peter, lxviii; his Gospel alluded to in 2 P. 1¹⁵, cxlii foll.
- MSS., 1; errors caused by love of uniformity, 82, *ἡμεῖς* and *υμεῖς* 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., xlv, xlvi f., li, lxxxix
- Munro on *damno c. abl.* = *καταστροφῆ κατακρίνω*, 124
- Negative in J. and 2 P., 1 f.; in 1 P., c, ci
- Nestle, 83, 127, 128, 152, cxci
- Number in J. and 2 P., xxxix, xl; in 1 P. xciii
- Nicolaitan heresy, 38, 39, clxxvi f., clxxx
- Ogdoad, vii, lvii, cxvi, 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, lxviii, xcvi, see aorist
- Paul, his letter cited in 2 P. 3¹⁵, supposed by Zahn to be lost cxxvii, but probably our Ep. to the Romans, 164; his collected Epistles, cxxvii; Lightfoot's account of his stay in Rome, cxxvii foll.

- 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. ovi-cxiv; agree with 1 P. not with 2 P. cxi, cxiv f.; Chase and Zahn on his later life cxi 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, lxxxv
- 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, cxi 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, olxxviii f.
- v. Soden, 94
- 'Sons of God,' how explained, olviii foll.
- Sorites or climax, 90 f.
- Spirits in prison, lxxxiii f.
- Spitta, xxii f., clxxxiv, exciii, exciv, 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, xlv, xcvi
- Superlative joined with positive, 86, cxcii
- Taylor, C., 39
- Tennant, clxi f.
- Tenses, xliii f., xc v 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., xc v 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, xlvi 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.

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