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PREFACE

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

Perhaps it may be well to say a word or two here as to the textual
emendations mentioned in the twelfth chapter of the Introduction. I
have never been able to see why there should be any objection to
applying to the N.T. a process which has been so often found essential
to the restoration of the right text in classical authors. Of course the
abundance of evidence from MSS., versions, and quotations very much
circumscribes the field for emendation in the former case; but where
a full consideration of this evidence fails to supply a natural or even a
possible sense, it seems to me we are bound to fall back upon that which
constitutes the basis of all rational emendation, viz. (1) the careful
investigation of the relevant facts, so as to ascertain exactly what is
wanting in order to put them into proper relation with one another,
and (2) a possible explanation of the corruption of the text. This
proceeding becomes more necessary in proportion to the defective state
of the diplomatic evidence, as in Jude and 2 Peter: see the notes on Jude
1, where Hort proposes to transfer ἐν from Θεῷ to Ἰησοῦ; 2 P. 1 12,
where Field proposes μελῆσω for μελλῆσω and Spitta suggests
παραδοθεῖσα for παρούσῃ; 3 10, where Vansittart and Abbott suggest
πυρωθήσεται for εὑρεθήσεται; besides 2:13, where it is proposed to read ἄγιπήν for ἔδονήν; and 3:6, where δι่ ὑν is proposed for δι’ ὑμ.

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 Catena, 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 ἐπάγωνιζομαι add Clem. Strom. iii. p. 553 ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τοῦ ἀδέω δόξη.

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

P. 24, l. 4.—Add Clem. Strom. v. p. 666 ὁ Κύριος διὰ τῶν παθῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἀρρητοῦ γνώσεως παρεισδιάσκειν.

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 θώοντες ἵνα αὐγάς θελών.

P. 32.—After § 2 add Soph. Ant. 640 γνώμης πατρίδας πάντες ἐπιθέσει ἐκτίνα.

On πρόκειται add Jos. B.J. vi. 2. 1 καθὼς ὑποδειγμάτων πρόκειται βασιλεύς Ἰεροσόλυμα, Demosth. p. 1078 νομίζετε τῶν παθῶν τούτων ἑκκυρίαι υμῖν προκεισθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν τετελευτηκόνων.

P. 33, last l.—For repeated ἐι compare 1 Cor. 114, 124, 1540.


P. 46.—After § 1 add: See Hort on 1 P. 211 Sometimes desires, as such, are implied to be evil, as in 412, 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 ἵνα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος: cf. Jude 16 and 18, 2 Pet. 33 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν παρενομένου. Sometimes a desire is required evil (κακῆ Col. 3, σαρκική 1 Pet. 211, κοσμική 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 χείρι not on ἐν χείρι.


P. 51, l. 3.—For 'πρὸ' read 'πρὸς.'

P. 52.—On ἀπαιτοσ add Epict. Fr. 62 Schw. ἡμετα πταίσεις εἰς ταῖς κρίσεσιν ἐὰν αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ βιῷ ἀπαίτωσ τοῦ σωτῆρος, Antoninus v. 9.

P. 80.—First l. of § 3 add after δύολος 'in 11, though we read of Θεοῦ δύολος in 216.'

P. 81.—Add after § 2 'Col. 112 τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἀγίων with Lightfoot's n.'

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

P. 86.—Add to exx. of the combination of positive and superlative, Clem. Strom. p. 587 τῆς ἐκλευθερίας καὶ κυριωτάτης ἀγάπης.

P. 88, l. 5.—After δόξαν add 4 Macs. 183 δεῖας μερίδας κατηχεῖοθηκαν.

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

P. 90, ll. 14-16.—Transfer 'in the δήμος' to I. 19 after στρατεύων. l. 17, for 'Polyb. iii. 78' read 'Polyb. iii. 68.' l. 1 up, after κλίμαξ add, Cf. the Sorites in Wisdom 615. ἀρχὴ σοφίας ἢ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φρονίς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη δὲ τῆς νόμων αὐτῆς, προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαιώσεις ἀφθαρσία, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ. ἐπιθυμία ἀρα σοφίας ἀνάγκη ἐπὶ Βασιλείαν.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 92, l. 24.—For ' 35' read ' 23.' l. 10 up.—On εἰσέβεβαια see Bonitz, Index to Aristotle s.v., Diog. L. iii. 83, and my note on Cic. N. D. i. 116.


P. 98, last l.—After 5th add Dan. 727 ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰώνος, Isa. 4517 σωτηρία αἰώνος, 1 Macc. 2θ βρόνων βασιλείας εἰς αἰώνα αἰώνος, Wisdom 104 ὕδα αἰώνος.

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

P. 104, § 4.—μεγαλεύτης is found in Jer. 409 (339) and 3 Esr. 14.

P. 105, § 5.—τοιόσον also occurs in Ezra 53. Other exx. of the use of μεγαλοπρέπεια occur in Ps. 209, 1449. The phrase μεγαλοπρεπῆς ὄσα occurs in two of the early Greek liturgies (Swainson, pp. 129, 268).

P. 107, § 3.—The reading in Mt. 129 is doubtful: WH. and Ti. omit εἰς and read ἐν with BN; Treg. reads ἐν ὑμῖν with CiD, vg. etc.: εἰς ὑμῖν is supported by CfL etc., Clem. Hom. iii. 53, Eus. Dem. Ev. p. 452 C. § 5.—Dr. Chase states that the phrase ἄγιον ὅρος is always followed by a possessive genitive in the O.T. but there seem to be some exceptions, e.g. Ps. 871 οἱ θεμελίων αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς δρεμεῖ τοῖς ἄγιοι, Isa. 2712, Dan. 929, 1 Macc. 1137 (of a document) τεθῆναι ἐν τῷ χρεί τῷ ἄγιον ἐν τῷ ἐνσαρκίσμῳ. In Isa. 119 it stands for the Messianic kingdom. § 6.—ἐκομέν βεβαιόσειρον, compare the exx. of βέβαιον παρέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν in the index of Dittenberger's Sylloque 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. 29 λογομαχεῖν . . ἐπὶ καταστροφὴ τῶν ἁκούστων. Gen. 139 ἐξαπεστειλε τὸν Λαότ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς.

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

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

P. 134, l. 3 up.—Comma after ἀράτος.

P. 135, last line.—Read διδώσαμι.


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

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

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

P. 146, § 2.—In 1 P. 112 we have a similar reference to missionaries in the plural, διὰ τῶν εἰςγελασμιμῶν υἱῶν.

P. 148, l. 19.—Read 'Pet. 413.'

P. 151, § 2.—Add R.V. 'compacted out of water and amidst water' and the explanation of Oecumenius ἡ γῆ ἐξ ὤζατος μὲν ὄς ἐξ ὤζικον αἰτίου, δὲ ὦζατος δὲ ὄς διὰ τελικοῦ ὀξωρ γὰρ τὸ σουχέχων τῆς γῆς, σῶν κόλα τις ἵππαρχον αὐτὴν.

P. 160, n. 3.—Read 'Dr. Bigg.'
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I
RELATION OF THE SECOND EPISODE OF PETER TO THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

CHAPTER II
GRAMMAR AND STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

CHAPTER III
FURTHER REMARKS ON THE STYLE OF THE TWO EPISTLES

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. lxvii. 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. lxxxiv; significant differences, p. lxxvi; the language of 1 P. recalls scenes in our Lord’s life or sayings of His, p. lxxx. It shows also a warmth of feeling and depth of spirituality to which 2 P. affords no parallel, p. lxxvii; 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. xcvii, and uses ἐπιτιθέμενος and ἐπιτιθέμενος in a curious way, p. xcviii. Compound sentences, p. xcix; negatives and other particles, p. c. Ellipsis, Anacoluthon, p. cii. 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


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


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

CHAPTER X
STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

Gradual development of this story out of the Hebrew legend referred to in Gen. ch. 6, p. clvii, 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. clxx. 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


TEXT OF JUDE AND 2 PETER, pp. 1-15
NOTES ON ST. JUDE, pp. 17-54
APPENDIX ON φθωνοπωμών, pp. 55-59

JUDE: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

vV. 1, 2. Salutation, p. 60.
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. 17—19. The Faithful are bidden to call to mind the Warnings of the Apostles, p. 77. εἰτ' ἐσχάτον χρόνον, pp. 77 f.
vv. 20—23. Final Charge to the Faithful: εἰν πνεύματι δύνας προσευχόμενοι, pp. 78 f.
vv. 24, 25. Benediction and Ascription, p. 79.

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

APPENDIX ON ἐπίγνωσις, pp. 171—174

APPENDIX ON φθείρω AND φθορά, pp. 175—179

2 PETER: PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

1 Address. Συμεών Πέτρος, pp. 180 f. τοῖς ἰσότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχώσων πίστιν, p. 181. ἐν δυκασύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ, p. 181.


15 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.

18 Remarks on the importance of these virtues, p. 193.

12 The writer’s promise, p. 194.


2 The false teachers of the new dispensation answer to the false prophets of the old, p. 198.

20 Examples of judgment joined with mercy, p. 199.


21 Mischief caused by the Libertines, p. 205.

3 Warning of the spread of unbelief in the last days, p. 206.

3 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.

31 Final exhortation, p. 212. σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν, pp. 212, 213.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON κατὰ περίφημα, p. 213.

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

xvi
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

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

The general resemblance between the two Epistles will be plain to any one who takes the trouble to read them as they stand side by side in my Text (pp. 2-15). The resemblance of 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.

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 ἐλεος into the wider χάρις. J. defines his readers as ‘the called who have been beloved by God the Father and kept safe in Jesus Christ’; P. defers the notion of ‘calling’ to the 3rd and 10th verses, and dwells here on God’s free gift of faith (τοῖς λαχοῦσιν πίστιν) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remarkable phrases, (1) that, through the justice 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 τιτητ γγλατρ in 1 Pet. 4:18, Rom. 2:4(ἀποκάλυψις) δικαιοκρισία-τοῦ θεοῦ, δι’ ἄνοδόνες ἐκάστη κατὰ τὰ ἱγα αὐτῶν, and 2:11 οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν προσώνος λημψία 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), and he emphasizes this equality of Jew and Gentile by the unique use of his own double name, the Hebrew 'Symeon' added to the Greek 'Peter,' suggesting that his sympathies embrace both. We may compare with this the friendly reference to St. Paul in 3:5, and the association of Silvanus with the writer in 1 Pet.

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

1 If the epistle is assigned to the second century, the term ἵστημι may have reference to the pretensions of the Gnostics. Compare what Clement of Alexandria says of the relations between faith, knowledge, and love (Strom. viii. 55), and his condemnation of the heretics who considered that the distinction between the elect and others existed φύσις, and stood in no need of the ἐπικορματικα of which P. speaks in 1:11.

2 The word καπνὴ here may have suggested to P. his phrase ἵστημιν πίστιν.

3 Cf. J. v. 1 καπνοῖ.
through lust.' φθορά here (cf. φθείρονται in J. 10) is opposed to ζωή in v. 3. It is not original evil, but ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον μεταβολή. Here we find the writer freely using expressions borrowed from Greek philosophy, such as τῆς θείας δυνάμεως, θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, the ἀρετή of God; and thus showing his sympathy with the Hellenic spirit, in other words welcoming Hellenism within the pale of Christianity.

After speaking generally of the blessings in store for man through the goodness of God, P. goes on (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-fold 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) ἐπουκοδομοῦντες ἐαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὕμων πιστείᾳ... ἐαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῷ Θεῷ τηροῦμεν. The phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν of P. 1 occurs also in J. 3. The philosophic ἀρετή occurs twice in P. 1. It has been suggested by Dr. Chase that the association of ἐγκράτεια with ἐνσέβεια in the next verse may be pointed at the antinomianism of some of the Gnostics. The mention of ἐνσέβεια in P. 1, 6, 7 may be due to the prevalence of ἀσέβεια so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (18-21) dwell on the importance of the cultivation of these virtues or graces. Their continued growth will tend to make us not unfruitful (cf. J. v. 12) in regard to that knowledge of God out of which they grow. Their absence causes blindness, or at least limits us to narrow earthly views, and makes us forgetful of the baptismal cleansing from the sins of our old life. Remember that it is not enough simply to have been baptized. We have to make sure the calling and election of which baptism was the seal. If you are diligent in doing this, you will never stumble, but will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Here too we find connecting links with the later verses of J. 'Eternal life' is the goal in J. 21, 'the eternal kingdom,' in P. 11. The οὗ μὴ πταίσῃτε and the πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of P. remind us of J.'s summing up in v. 24.

1 The number seven plays an important part in the Apocalypse, where we have 7 churches, 7 lamps, 7 spirits, 7 stars, 7 horns, 7 eyes, 7 seals, 7 angels, 7 thunders, 7 vials, 7 plagues. So there are 7 deacons (Acts 21), and 7 pillars in the house of Wisdom (Prov. 9), cf. also the spirits in Isa. 11, and Clem. Al. p. 813.
'God our Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to set us before his glory without blemish in exceeding joy.'

P. continues (11\textsuperscript{2}-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 16\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{2} Thus was confirmed to us the word of prophecy, to which you rightly give heed as to a lamp shining in darkness until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. And remember, in your study of prophecy, that it is not limited to the prophet's own horizon, or to any one particular interpretation ('God fulfils himself in many ways'), since it is no mere product of man's thought and will, but is the expression of the eternal thought and will of God uttered through men inspired by the Holy Ghost.' Why does the writer here lay stress on the thought that prophecy ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται? Is it because, while he recognized one Coming in the Transfiguration, he in no way regarded this as precluding a greater Coming, but on the contrary as being a sort of preparatory rehearsal, confirming the faith of those who witnessed it? Or could it be because, as

\textsuperscript{1} This phrase is used in Isa. 11\textsuperscript{9} and 65\textsuperscript{25} of the Messiah's kingdom, 'They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain,' saith the Lord. Perhaps P. means that in the Transfiguration the three Apostles were admitted to behold the glories of that kingdom, without alluding to any particular Jewish mountain.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Westcott, Historic Faith, p. 264.
we read below (3:4), doubts were entertained of any Second Coming, some affirming, like Hymenaeus and Philetas, that the Resurrection was past already (2 Tim. 2:17, 18)? In any case, his main object seems to have been to make his readers understand that prophecy, though uttered so long ago and under such different circumstances, cannot lose its significance, but has a message for all times, all characters, and all situations. This deeply interesting and instructive view of prophecy is suggested rather by St. Peter’s words in the Acts (3:21, 10:48) and 1 Pet. (1:10-12) than by anything in the Epistle of Jude, though the latter refers to Enoch’s prophecy of the future Coming to judgment (vv. 14, 15) and speaks of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (v. 20) as aiding our prayers.

The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second chapter of P. In both, this section begins with a short Introduction (J. v. 4, P. 2:1-3), describing in general terms the innovators against whom the readers are warned. They steal into the Church, they deny the Lord, their lives are stained by impurity, the verdict of heaven has long been pronounced against them. To this P. prefixes a clause to connect the new subject with that of the preceding chapter. The gift of prophecy was liable to misuse under the old dispensation (of which he presently quotes Balaam as an example, cf. P. 2:15, 16, and J. v. 11). Corresponding to this in the new dispensation will be the abuse of teaching (cf. James 3:1-12); and these false teachers will introduce destructive heresies and bring on themselves swift destruction. [The word ἀπώλεια does not occur in J., but in the next verse he says that the Lord τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.] P. adds the Pauline epithet ἀγοράσαντα before δεσπότην. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. 119:30) will be evil spoken of (Isa. 52:5). He speaks of their covetousness, cf. J. v. 11 on Balaam [ἐμπορεύσονται in P. 2:9 perhaps contrasted with ἀγοράσαντα in 2:7], and of their glozing words. While J. speaks of οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (where the reference in τοῦτο is obscure), P. has the fine phrase ὅς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἄργα ἐκλά ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νοστάξει. On the other hand we lose J.’s τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, for which perhaps ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοὶς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτῷ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς (P. 2:20) was intended as an

1 Dr. Abbott compares Christ’s warning against those who say, ‘Lo here is the Christ, or there,’ Mt. 24:23.
equivalent, cf. Gal. 5:13 "επ’ ἑλευθερία ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἑλευθερίαν εἰς ἀδομήν τῇ σαρκὶ.

Then follow (J. 5-7) three examples of judgment taken from the O.T.: Israel in the Wilderness, the offending angels, the sin of Sodom, which are repeated in P. 2:20, except that the Deluge takes the place of the punishment of Israel. Why was this change made? Probably because the destruction of the world by water and the destruction of Sodom by fire were recognized types of Divine vengeance (Lk. 17:26-28), and also because P. had already referred to the case of Israel (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) in comparing the false prophets of the O.T. with the false teachers of the N.T. Perhaps, too, he wished to keep the chronological order in his three examples. It has been suggested in the note on τὸ δεύτερον that in speaking of the destruction of Israel after their falling back into unbelief, J. may have had in his mind the question of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. There is perhaps a similar reference in P. 1:9 "λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτίων as well as in P. 2:20. With regard to P.’s triplet, it is to be noticed that it is given in a far more animated form than that of J., being used as a protasis to an apodosis applying the same principles to the persons addressed, εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεός ὥσις ἐφείσατο κ.τ.λ. Of the angels P. says merely that they sinned, J. dwells on their pristine dignity, and follows the book of Enoch in making their sin to consist partly in the fall from their high estate, and partly in their going after σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, as the men of Sodom did afterwards (τὸν ἄμοιον τρόπον τούτοις J. 7). If P. had J. before him, these omissions are natural: if J. wrote after P., he would scarcely have gone out of his way to insert particulars so derogatory to the angelic nature. As to their punishment, they are reserved for judgment under darkness in chains. P. uses the strong phrase ‘chains of darkness’ and the extremely rare word ταρταρῶσας, which may be regarded as another instance of his fondness for Hellenistic phrases.

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

2 I supplement here what is said in the explanatory note on 2:1. The simple verb ταρταρῶσα occurs in Amphiloehus (fl. 370 A.D.) Patrolog. Graecae vol. xxxix, p. 41 A, διὰ παρθενικοῦ τοκετοῦ τεταρτάρωται δαμασών ἀφάτων τὰ τοσαίτα καὶ τηλικάτα συστήματα. The substantive τάρταρος occurs in Clem. Hom. iii. 35 (on the immensity of creation) ἐκεῖ ποιοῦ τοῦ ἀπεραίτου ταρτάρου τὸ δεύτερον βάθος; ἐκεῖ τινι ἐπικρατεί οἱ πάντα περιχένοι ὑφανός; ib. 1. 4 παραδόθησαμεν κατ’ ἐνόπιον φιλοσόφων λόγους Περιφέρεσθαι καὶ Ταρτάρῳ . . . καὶ θαυμάζων ἐν θύσιν τοῦ αἰώνα κολα­ζόνες, ib. xx. 9 ὁ παπρός σκότων χαίρειν κατὰ τὴν κράσιν γεγονός μετὰ τῶν ἰδιοδοὐ­λων ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸ τούτον κατελθὼν ἔδειται, ib. Ep. ad Lac. 14 ταρτα­
The Deluge is described in P. 25, where he uses the words φυλάκσω and ἀσεβής found in J. 4, 15, 18. Besides the reasons mentioned above, P. was naturally led to speak of the Deluge here, as he is about to make use of it below (367) 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 (κείσω τούτο) εἰς ἢν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ’ ἐστιν ὁκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι’ ὕδατος. The ark is here regarded as a symbol of the Church. What was the writer’s motive in adding that it contained only a few, and further that these few, on being reckoned up, were found to amount to 8? Must he not have intended to signify that, while the visible Church consisted of a mere ‘remnant,’ a ‘little flock,’ yet these few represented all who share the Resurrection of Christ, ‘the general assembly and church of the first-born,’ which would be continually recruited not only from the living, but also from the dead by the ever-present, ever-active Spirit of Christ (319)?

In the account of Sodom (P. 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 (τεφρώσας καταστροφὴ κατέκρινεν), while

1 Of. Justin M., Dial. 138, Iren. i. 18. 3.  
2 Of. Clement on this subject in Str. vi. § 44-§ 52, esp. § 47 μίαν ἡ ἔρευς ἡ ἀνδρακάμης ἡ ἐνεργητικὴ (τοῦ Θεοῦ) φθάνει, πάντες δὲ ὕστε χεῖλες τοῦ ἐργαζομένου.  
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 ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσειν is better expressed than J.'s rather confused πρόκειναι δείγμα πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην ὑπέχουσαι. In v. 8 J. turns to the libertines and declares that they are guilty of like sins with these sinners of the old world: they defile the flesh, make light of authority and rail at 'glories' (as the men of Sodom did towards the angels), and this they do because they are still buried in a carnal sleep (cf. Eph. 5:14). These men (v. 10 οὗτοι δὲ) rail at things beyond their ken, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction. P. (2:10) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went ὑπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας (for which he substitutes ὑπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιαμοῦ πορευομένους) with J.'s condemnation of the libertines as despising authority, 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. ετόλμησεν J. v. 9) men that shrink not from railing at glories' (2:10). In 2:12 he goes on, as J. does in v. 10, with a οὗτοι δὲ, 'these are like brute beasts.' Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s ὅσα φυσικῶς ἐπιστάνται, ἐν τούτωι φθείρονται by the periphrasis γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν and ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρῆσουνται. 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 τούτωι φθείρονται to mean 'perish among them,' i.e. among the brutes?

1 For the connexion between the darkened heart which refuses to know God, and the indulgence in the vilest lusts, see Rom. 1:21-25.
2 It will be noticed that, while J. couples κυριότητα and δόξα as belonging to the same category, P. only names the abstract word κυριότητα here, and introduces δόξα later on as a concrete example.
We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. 8 and 10, P. 2:10 and 2:12. In J. it runs ‘Michael, the archangel, when he was disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, did not venture to bring a judgment of railing, but said, “the Lord rebuke thee”’: in P. ‘whereas angels, though greater in power and might, do not venture to bring against them a railing judgment before the Lord.’ The former is a little difficult, but with the help of the Ascensio Mosis we can understand that, if the chief of the archangels abstained from using any contemptuous expression against Satan, and contented himself with making his appeal to God, much more should frail and sinful mortals abstain from slighting language about the powers of the invisible world. What however is to be made of P.? Standing by itself, it is merely a riddle, for which the answer is to be found in J. That is to say, P. wrote with J.’s sentence in his mind, but for some reason or other chose to eliminate the points essential for its intelligibility. What was his reason? The same, I think, which led him to omit the details as to the fall of the angels, which are mainly derived from the Book of Enoch, in 2:4, and the reference to the preaching of Enoch below. He objects, that is, to make use of these apocryphal writings, and generalizes the story by dropping the proper names and by twice changing a singular into a plural (ἄγγελοι, ἀντίων). So too a vague παρὰ Κυρίῳ takes the place of ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, and the vagueness is increased by the use of the indeterminate αὐτῶν and by the omission of the object of the comparative μείζωνες. In fact the sentence is meaningless except to one who was already acquainted with its parallel in J., though it may perhaps be true, as Dr. Bigg suggests, that P. felt himself justified in his generalization by the remembrance of an obscure passage in the Book of Enoch.

I go on to J. v. 11, ‘Woe to them, for they have followed in the steps of Cain, and been carried away in the error of Balaam for gain, and lost themselves in the rebellion of Korah. These are sunken rocks in your love-feasts, where they join your feast without any feeling of religious reverence, caring only for their own enjoyment. They are clouds without water, scudding before the wind; trees without fruit in the fruit-bearing season, twice dead, torn up by the roots; raging waves foaming out their own shame; wandering stars for which the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever.’ This passage corresponds to P. 2:13-17, 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 215,16 '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. clinches 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. 88), 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, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφόντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνενωχοῦμενοι ύμῖν. Here σπίλοι and ἀπάταις are substituted for σπιλάδες and ἀγάπαίς in J. Some editors read ἀγάπαίς with B, but the addition of αὐτῶν suits much better with ἀπάταις. J. speaks of ἀγάπαίς ύμῶν. It was natural of course that the wolves should seek to find their way into the sheep-folds; but can we suppose that the faithful would enter the love-feasts of the libertines? Moreover the change of an original ἀγάπαίς to ἀπάταις by a copyist is hardly conceivable, while the reverse change to suit J. is most natural. But how are we to account for the disappearance of the important—we might almost call it the indispensable word—ἀγάπη? In the chapter on the Readings I have suggested that ἀγάπην was the original reading, instead of ηδονήν, in the earlier part of this verse (ηδονήν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν); where my explanatory note will show how hard it is to make a satisfactory distinction between ηδονήν 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 ηδονήν by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on τρυφήν. The word
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\(\delta\pi\alpha\tau\eta\) is often joined with \(\tau\rhoυφ\iota\), 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 \(\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\delta\varepsilon\varsigma\) should have been changed to \(\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\omega\). The former word is a daring metaphor even among the metaphors which accompany it in \(\mathbf{J.}\), but quite out of place here, and \(\mathbf{P.}\) substitutes for it the similar sounding \(\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\omega\) found in Eph. 5:27, of which the derivatives \(\alpha\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\omega\) and \(\sigma\pi\iota\lambda\omega\) are found elsewhere in \(\mathbf{P.}\) and \(\mathbf{J.}\). Are we to suppose that \(\mathbf{P.}\) intentionally replaced \(\mathbf{J.}\)'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.

\(\mathbf{P.}\) returns to \(\mathbf{J.}\)'s metaphors in 2:17, where he splits up \(\nu\varepsilon\phi\ell\alpha\iota\) \(\alpha\nu\nu\delta\rho\iota\iota\ \iota \iota \alpha\nu\varepsilon\mu\omega\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\varepsilon\varphi\rho\varphi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\) into two, \(\pi\gamma\gamma\iota \alpha\nu\nu\delta\rho\iota\iota\) and \(\iota\mu\iota\chi\lambda\iota \iota \iota \lambda\alpha\iota\pi\alpha\sigma\) \(\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\iota\), perhaps because he regarded \(\mathbf{J.}\)'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 \(\mathbf{J.}\) describes the doom of the wandering stars, \(\alpha\varsigma \delta \xi\omicron\phi\omicron\sigma \tau\omicron\ \sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\varepsilon\tau\iota\rho\omicron\nu\tau\eta\tau\iota\). Of course the gender shows that \(\mathbf{P.}\) intends this clause to apply to the persons whom he has just figuratively described, as it is indeed applied by \(\mathbf{J.}\) himself in v. 6, but it loses the aptness which it has in \(\mathbf{J.}\) v. 13, and thus supplies another convincing proof of the priority of \(\mathbf{J.}\). How could the latter have had the patience to gather the scattered fragments out of \(\mathbf{P.}\) in order to form the splendid cluster of figures in vv. 12, 13? We have still to consider the insertion in \(\mathbf{P.}\) (2:15), \(\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\uomicron\nu\epsilon\nu\iota\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\nu\ \alpha\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma\), which commences the loose series of participles ending in 2:15. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls \(\mathbf{J.}\) 11 \(\tau\gamma\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\nu\ \varepsilon\xi\kappa\uomicron\uomicron\nu\theta\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\) and is repeated again in 2:15; but \(\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\uomicron\nu\epsilon\nu\iota\) is difficult. Apparently \(\mathbf{P.}\) intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to \(\mathbf{J.}\)'s \(\omicron\nu\omicron\alpha\iota\): 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, \(\omicron\phi\beta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron

In vv. 14, 15 J. gives the prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, which simply announces the future judgment on impious deeds and words. To this P. makes no direct reference, but, as I have before suggested, it may have been one reason for speaking of Noah as the eighth. In v. 16 (perhaps taken from the Ascension of Moses) J. goes on to describe the libertines as 'murmuring and discontented, walking after their own lusts, whose mouth λαλεί ὑπέρογκα, and who flatter others for the sake of advantage.' To the same effect P. (218) speaks of them as uttering ὑπέρογκα ματαιώτητος, 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 ἔλευθεριάν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι may be an echo of J. 4 χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἄσέλγειαν. He continues εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶςματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, words which recall what he had said in 14 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, . . . διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, and goes on to give an impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which he borrows from J. 3, ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐνσόλνης, 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 ὁ ἱχώρ καὶ ἡ δυσοδία τῶν κολαζομένων κατέρρεε καὶ ὁσπερ λίμνη ἐγένετο ἐκεῖν· κακεὶ ἐκάθηντο γυναῖκες ἔχουσα τῶν ἱχώρα μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων, and §§ 8, 9, 16, quoted on p. cxxxi.

In the third chapter of P. we return again to J. The readers are addressed as ἀγάπητοι 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) ναυτίωντες . . . ἀπερίωντες (al. ἀπεριώντες) τοιεύτων ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὥσπερ νοσοποίουσι χολᾶς, τὰς ἐκ πικρίας ἀμαρτίας λέγω καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀπάτων σωρευθέντα κακά, ἀτινὰ τῷ ὁμολογήσαι ὥσπερ ἀπεράσαντες (cf. ἐξέρχετο the τῆς νόσου).
against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after
their own lusts. To this P. adds (3:2) 'This is the second letter
I am writing to you, and in both I stir up your sincere mind by
calling on you to remember the command of the Lord and Saviour
spoken by your Apostles.' Since in 1:18 he had used the phrase
ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρουσίαν, it would seem
that P. must himself be included among 'your Apostles. He
further bids them 'remember the words which were spoken before
by the holy prophets,' recurring in this to what he had said in
1:19. What are we to understand by the allusion to a previous
letter? Our first thought is naturally of 1 P. But is there
anything in it which would answer to the description here given?
Many have denied this, because they thought that the contents of
the prophecy, as given in J. 18, were included in P.'s reference to
an earlier epistle. J. there says ὃτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἡτη ἐσχάτους
χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαίκται κ.τ.λ., that is, he asserts that the
words quoted by him were words which were often in the
mouth of the Apostles. On the other hand P. makes a clear
separation between 3:2 and 3:3 by inserting the phrase τοῦτο
πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, which he had previously used in 1:20, not to
introduce a particular prophecy, but to lay down how prophecy was
to be understood. The reference to a former letter is therefore
restricted by P. to 3:2, bidding the readers pay heed to the words
of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. 1:10-12
περὶ ἡς σωτηρίας ἐξεύθετεν ... προφήται οἱ περὶ τῆς
ἐλ五官 χριστος προφητεύσαντες ... οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἔαυτος, ὑμῖν ὁ δὲ διηκόνους αὐτά, ἐν ἀντιγέλη
ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων σαμὲνων ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἀγίῳ (cf. 1 P. 1:16), we shall find an exact correspondence to what
is stated here. The words τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων (J. 17,
P. 3:2) remind us of J. 4: σάλα προεγγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ
κρίμα (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the
prophecy of Enoch) and of P. 2:23 ός τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαί οὐκ ἄργει.
In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic ἐν ἐμπαίκται, which
may be compared with ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρίσανται of 2:12
and with the reiterated ἀσεβείας of J. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας
πορευόμενον of J. 16 and 18.

In 3:4, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure v. 19 οὕτω εἰςων
οἱ ἀποδιώκοντες, ὕψικολ, 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 1\textsuperscript{16}) remained unfulfilled, and that the world was not liable to the catastrophic changes predicted as accompaniments of the final judgment. There is a little awkwardness in P.’s wording, \(\alpha p' \, \alpha r\chi\eta\varepsilon\, \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\) following \(\alpha\phi' \, \dot{\eta}\varepsilon\, \varepsilon\kappa\omega\mu\iota\theta\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\), but it is a very natural blending of two objections. I cannot think that if J. had known this verse, which gives so much point to the preceding prophecy, he would have refrained from inserting it. P. gives a double answer in 3\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{5}.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\textsuperscript{5}.7), in contrast with the severer tone of J. 5–7. In 3\textsuperscript{10} P. bids his readers make a practical use of the knowledge that the Lord is about to come unexpectedly. ‘Do not be blind to the symptoms of the breaking up of the frame of nature (perhaps a reference to volcanic eruptions and earthquakes). Make ready for the coming of the day of God by the practice of holiness and piety. Look forward to the fulfilment of the promise of the reign of righteousness in a new earth and heaven.’

At this point J. and P. again come together in J. 20 and P. 3\textsuperscript{14}, both commencing a new section with \(\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\nu\tau\iota\omicron\). J.’s exhortation to his readers ‘to build themselves up on their most holy faith and keep themselves in love’ has been already used by P., as we have seen, in 1\textsuperscript{5}7. His reference to the Spirit’s help in prayer may be compared with P. 1\textsuperscript{20} on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in v. 21 \(\pi\rho\sigma\delta\varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\mu\nu\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \varepsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\ \dot{\eta}\mu\omicron\WN \iota\eta\sigma\omicron\WN \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\ \varepsilon\iota\ \zeta\omicron\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\ \nu\) is taken up in the \(\pi\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\omicron\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\) of P. 3\textsuperscript{12} and \(\pi\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\omicron\omicron\mu\varepsilon\nu\) of 3\textsuperscript{13}, and again in 3\textsuperscript{14}, while the goal \(\varepsilon\iota\ \zeta\omicron\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\) may be compared with \(\varepsilon\iota\ \tau\iota\ \alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\) in P. 1\textsuperscript{11}. P. inserts \(\dot{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\ \dot{\alpha}\mu\omicron\mu\eta\tau\iota\omicron\) (cf. 1 P. 1\textsuperscript{19}) from J.’s \(\dot{\alpha}\mu\omicron\mu\nu\) in v. 24, and in contrast to his own \(\sigma\pi\tau\iota\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\ \dot{\mu}\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in 2\textsuperscript{12}, and to J.’s \(\dot{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\lambda\omega\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in v. 23. \(\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\) looks back to J. v. 2 and P. 1\textsuperscript{2}. While in vv. 22, 23 we have J.’s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (3\textsuperscript{15}) to the more hopeful

1 Reading \(\delta\iota\ \dot{\delta}\iota\), for which see Chapter on the Text.
view of 3", and claims for it the inspired support of Paul. 'Yet Paul's letters, wise and good as they are, offer some difficulties, which have been misunderstood and perverted, like the rest of the Bible,1 by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction.' The word σωτηρία in 3\(^15\) reminds us that J. had originally intended to write περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (v. 3) and that his purpose is apparently carried out to a certain extent in these last verses from 20 onwards. In v. 24 J. begins an Ascription partly borrowed from St. Paul, addressed 'to Him who is able to keep His people free from stumbling (cf. P. 1\(^{10}\)) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy' (cf. P. 1\(^{11}\) ). P. bids his readers, 'knowing these things beforehand (see above 1\(^{12}, 3\) ) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the error (J. 11, P. 2\(^{18}\)) of the wicked (P. 2\(^{7}\), cf. J. 23 ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ), and so fall from their own stedfastness' (cf. P. 1\(^{12}, 214, 316\) ). J.'s ἐν ἀγαλλίασει soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of 1\(^{11}\). P. continues his exhortation in 3\(^{18}\) αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, for which we may compare χάρις πλοῦτος θείῳ in 1\(^{2}\) and ταῦτα πλεονάξοντα in 1\(^{3}\), also J. 4. The Ascription in P. is much simpler than that in J., being addressed to our Saviour Jesus Christ, while J.'s is addressed μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. P. has δόξα only, while J. has the full liturgical form δόξα, μεγαλοθυμιά, ἐκάστος, καὶ ἐξουσία. P. has καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνος, while J. has πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, concluding with ἀμήν, which is omitted in P. by WH. after Cod. B. Cf. J. of Theol. Stud. vol. viii. 75 on Emphasis in NT.

To sum up: What do we find to be the main points in which the two epistles agree, what the points in which they differ? Both agree in making faith, which is itself the gift of God (P. 1\(^{1}\) λαχοῦσιν πίστιν), the foundation of the Christian life (J. 3, 20, P. 1\(^{11}, 5\) ); both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. 1, P. 1\(^{13}, 10\) ). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. 10\(^{1, 2}\), P. 1\(^{8}\)), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. 1\(^{10}\)), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. 20, P. 1\(^{5, 7}\)), to keep ourselves in the love of God by praying with the help of the Holy Spirit (J. 20), looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (which shall be fully revealed) in the life eternal (J. 21). God our

1 For the justification of this rendering see explanatory notes.
Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to present us before his glory unblemished in joy (J. 24, 25). P. does not expressly mention prayer, and he lays more stress on personal effort than J. in the words 'give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight' 314, 'beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace' 317. So in 158 he bids his readers add all diligence to supply 'in your faith energy, in your energy knowledge,' etc., and goes on in v. 10 to say 'if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied to you the entrance into the eternal kingdom.' At the same time he ascribes to the divine power 'all that pertains to life and godliness through the knowledge of Him who called us by the manifestation of his own goodness.' That manifestation has been to us the guarantee of most blessed promises, through which we are enabled to become partakers of the divine nature (P. 18 4).

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

Taking these points more in order, we will consider:

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

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

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

P. speaks of the Divine power, which has granted to us all that is
needed for life and godliness (1:3), of the Divine nature in which man may share (1:4). He refers to the word of God the Father (styled also ‘the Excellent Glory’), which was uttered at the Transfiguration, ‘This is my son, my Beloved in whom I am well pleased’ (1:17). God is the source of the inspiration of the prophets (1:21). He spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus in chains of darkness; He saved Noah from the flood which swept away the ungodly, and Lot from the overthrow of Sodom. He knows how to save the righteous and punish the wicked (2:9). The angels do not venture to utter a railing judgment in His presence (2:11). By His word He created the heaven and the earth out of water: by the same word He destroyed them through water, and will one day destroy them with fire (3:5-7). In 2:1 it would seem, from the ordinary use of the word δεσπότης in early Christian writers, that we must understand τὸν ἀγωρασκαντά δεσπότην as used, at any rate in the first instance, of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. 7:23), though there is probably also some reference to the Christian use of ἀγωράζω. Measures of time have no relation to Him (3:8). The delay in the day of judgment (the day of God) is due to His long-suffering, because He would have all come to repentance (3:9-11, 15).

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

The Holy Spirit. ‘Men spake from God’ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀγίου φερόμενοι (1:21).

Many have drawn attention to the frequent use in 2 P. of what Dr. Bigg has called ‘reverential periphrases,’ ἡ θεία δύναμις, θεία φύσις, ἡ μεγαλοπρεπής δόξα. I have spoken of the two former as denoting a sympathy with Hellenic feeling, which is not to be found in Jude or 1 Peter. We may compare them with the terms θεότης and τὸ θεῖον used by St. Paul (Col. 2:9, Acts 17:29), with the ‘Word’ of St. John, and with such phrases as ‘the Deity,’ ‘Providence,’ ‘Heaven,’ ‘the Author of Nature,’ ‘the
supreme Being,' which were common with the writers of the 18th century, or with the striking phrase of Matthew Arnold 'A stream of tendency which makes for righteousness.' If they stood alone, such phrases might be regarded as in a way equivalent to the ἄγνωστος θεός of the Athenians: they have an air of coldness and remoteness which cannot but strike one on passing from 1 P. to this epistle; but they all express different aspects of God's revelation of Himself; and our author is only following St. Paul and St. John when he recognizes these different conceptions as all included in the Christian faith.

(2) Man as he is by nature.—J. speaks of man under grace, and man fallen from grace, but hardly at all of man by nature. P. on the other hand, adopting the language of St. Paul and St. John, speaks of the believer's escape from 'the corruption which is in the world through lust' (14), from 'the pollutions of the world' (220), from 'those that live in error' (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. 13.10) and of an answering faith, which is itself a gift from God (1). 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' (312).

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 (11-3). 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
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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 neces-
sary 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 (13.4). 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 persever-
ance in religious exercises (311). At the present time there is a
special danger impending from false teachers who will steal into the
church and assault both your faith and practice by denying the
Master who bought them and indulging their lusts without restraint
(21.2). They seduce the ignorant and unwary by their confident
words (214) promising them liberty, while they are themselves
slaves to corruptness (218.19). They live by sight and not by faith,
they have no reverence for the unseen world, they seek to make
gain of you by encouraging the gratification of your lower nature
(23.10,12), 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' (33.4).

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. 28-30). They are reserved under punishment for the day of judgment, which will be the day of their final destruction (29, 37). Similarly J. speaks of the judgment long ago prepared for these impious men (v. 4), compares them to trees twice dead, to falling stars for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved.

(6) Possibility of repentance after falling away—Both P. and J. speak somewhat doubtfully on this point. P. says that if men, after having escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ, are again entangled in these pollutions and overcome by them, their last state is worse than the first, since men become slaves to that by which they are overcome (219, 20). So he speaks of those who have forgotten the cleansing of baptism (19). On the other hand the delay of punishment is a token of the long-suffering patience of God, who would not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance (39). Hence we are told that we are justified in regarding the long-suffering of God as a token of our own salvation (313). 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 1:16 where he declared that he
had been himself an eye-witness of τὴν τοῦ κυρίου δύναμιν καὶ
παρουσίαν. He might also have answered that the fall of
Jerusalem was itself a συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, another fulfilment
of the prophecy of the παρουσία, which, like all prophecies, was a
matter ὦν ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως. He turns however to the assertion
that the world had remained without change from the creation,
and cites the Deluge as evidence to the contrary. As the world
was then destroyed by water at the word of God, so on the great
day of judgment it will be destroyed by fire in consequence of
the same word, and will be succeeded by new heavens and a
new earth, the dwelling-place of righteousness (3:13). On that great
day the offending angels and ungodly men will meet their doom
(2:9). J. quotes the prophecy of Enoch that the Lord will
come with hosts of angels to execute judgment on impious men
and impious deeds (v. 14). For that judgment the rebel angels
are reserved in chains under darkness, and sinners shall then be
punished in eternal fire (vv. 6, 7), while the righteous enter into
eternal life, being presented before the throne of God in exceeding
joy (vv. 21, 24).

P. speaks of the evidence of prophecy in 1:19–32. It is the word
of God uttered by men under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.
Hence it is of no limited application, but declares the universal
principles of God's government. It appears first as a lamp in
darkness, but to those who attend to it, it is the harbinger of the
full light of the Gospel day and of the day-star of the Spirit in
the heart. Its teaching is confirmed by the eye-witness of those
who beheld the glory of Christ when on earth (1:16–19), and by the
contemplation of his goodness as manifested in the record of his
acts and words (1:18).

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

(2) Jude seems to acknowledge his obligations to Peter in v. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα . . . τῶν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι and in vv. 17, 18 μνήσθητε τῶν ἡμῶν τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἔσπ ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορεύόμενοι, the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.’s 2:3 ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιάσκαλοι . . . τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαι σὺν ἀργεῖ, the latter to P. 3:3 μνημοθύμαι τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες ὅτι ἔλευσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἑδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορεύόμενοι.

(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.
against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts. To this P. adds (3:1–2) ‘This is the second letter I am writing to you, and in both I stir up your sincere mind by calling on you to remember the command of the Lord and Saviour spoken by your Apostles.’ Since in 1:18 he had used the phrase ἐνορίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρουσίαν, it would seem that P. must himself be included among ‘your Apostles. He further bids them ‘remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets,’ recurring in this to what he had said in 1:19. What are we to understand by the allusion to a previous letter? Our first thought is naturally of 1 P. But is there anything in it which would answer to the description here given? Many have denied this, because they thought that the contents of the prophecy, as given in J. 18, were included in P.’s reference to an earlier epistle. J. there says ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν ἑσχάτων ἁγίων ἠσονται ἐμπαικται κ.τ.λ., that is, he asserts that the words quoted by him were words which were often in the mouth of the Apostles. On the other hand P. makes a clear separation between 3:2 and 3:3 by inserting the phrase τοῦτο πρὶν τοὺς γυμνόσκοιτες, which he had previously used in 1:20, not to introduce a particular prophecy, but to lay down how prophecy was to be understood. The reference to a former letter is therefore restricted by P. to 3:2, bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. 1:10–12 περὶ ἡς σωτηρίας ἐξηγήσατο... πρὸ τοῦ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος πρὸ φητεύσαι... οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀνατούς, ὑμῖν δὲ δυνάμενον αὐτά, ἀ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τὸν ἑναγγελίσα μένων ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἀγίῳ (cf. 1 P. 1:16), we shall find an exact correspondence to what is stated here. The words τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων (J. 17, P. 3:2) remind us of J. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the prophecy of Enoch) and of P. 2:3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαι ὕμῳ ἄργει. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic εν ἐμπαικταί, which may be compared with ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται of 2:2 and with the reiterated ἁστέβεις of J. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορενόμηνοι of J. 16 and 18.

In 3:4, P., omitting J.’s somewhat obscure v. 19 οὕτως εἰσήρ οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the ἐμπαικται consisted. They said that
for the mention of Paul in 2 P. is quite distinct from the acknowledge­
ment 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, ἁγίος (= Christian),
πνεῦμα (= indwelling spirit), ψυχικός, which he regards as non­
Petrine; but quotes no examples of ‘Petrine psychology,’ which
would be more to the point, if Jude is really copying 2 P. I will
deal first with the non-Petrine words. It is true that κλητός does
not occur either in 1 P. or 2 P., but κλήσις is found in 2 P. 1
and καλέω of the Divine calling four times in 1 P. as well
as in 2 P. 1. The synonymous ἐκλεκτός is found in 1 P., as ἐκλογή is found in 2 P. 1, both being thoroughly Pauline
words. When it is said that ἁγίος is equivalent to ‘Christian,’
this must mean that it denotes ‘consecration’ rather than the
actual holiness of the persons spoken of; but this is just the
sense which it bears in the phrase ἐθνός ἁγιον used in 1 P. 29.
As to πνεῦμα, it may be true that the distinction between the
human soul and spirit belongs especially to the Pauline phraseology,
but we find it in Joseph. Ant. i. 34, where God is said to have
infused into Adam πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχήν. And what are we to say of
1 P. 4 ζωσιν κατὰ Θεόν πνεύματι and 3 κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας
ἀνθρώπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ἱσοχίου πνεύματος, where καρδία
and πνεῦμα are both preferred to ψυχή? So 315 Χριστὸν
ἀγίαστε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν. The ‘indwelling spirit’ is
surely indicated in 1 P. 11 ἐν ἀυτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. Again
the word ψυχικός is not exclusively Pauline. It occurs in the least
Pauline of the books of the N.T., written by Jude’s own
brother (James 315, where see note). Dr. Bigg denies that it
could have been used in the Pauline sense by Peter, because
to him ‘ψυχή’ means the soul in relation to the religious life,’
but we meet the phrase ψυχάς ἀστηρίκτους in 2 P. 24, and in
1 P. 3 δετῶ ψυχαί stands simply for ‘eight persons’ without
any allusion to the religious life, while on the other hand we
find the phrase ὀλίκος πνευματικός and πνευματικάς 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 con-
siderable 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 ἥ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.’ ψυχή, as Hort
says, ‘answers very nearly to our modern word and conception
“self.”’ See my note on 2 P. 28 ψυχὴν δικαίουν ἐξασάινειν. Other
Pauline words which occur in Peter are ἀγιασμός, ἀἵρεσις,
ἀνομία, γυμνάσια, δικαίωσις, δουλότω, ἐγκράτεια, εἰλικρίνης, ἐλευ-
θερία, ἐπίγνωσις, παραδίδωμι, to name a few from 2 P., and
similarly we find ἀγιασμός, αἷμα Ἰησοῦ, Χριστοῦ παθήματα,
εὐλογεῖο, εὐλογητός, εὐλογία, κληρονομία, προγνώσκο, γάλα,
συνέδρεις, συνκληρονόμος, χάρισμα, σάρξ, σαρκικός in 1 P. On
the other hand I have vainly searched for any specially Petrine
word such as ἀναστροφή (though that is not un-Pauline) in the
epistle of Jude.1

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

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

GRAMMAR AND STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

UNUSUAL INFLEXIONS.

Jude v. 4 παρεισεδύησαν read by WH. after B for παρεισέδυσαν read by Ti. Treg. after Ν Α etc., see explanatory note. 2 Pet. 25 ἐπάξας for the usual ἐπαγαγόω, cf. Blass p. 43. 2 Pet. 116 ἐγενήθην for ἐγενόμην. On the other hand it might seem that hybrid aorist forms such as ἔβαλαν, ἐπεσαν, which are found in other books of the N.T., and the termination -σαν in impf. or 2nd aor. as εἰχοσαν, παρελάβοσαν, and -αν for -ασι in the pf. as εἰσελή-λυθαν, were unknown to the writers of these epistles; but the fact simply is that they have no examples of the 3rd pl. of the imperfect, 2nd aor., and perfect (except οἴδασιν in v. 10), so that we are without the means of judging which form would have been preferred by the writers. For the confusion between the verbal contractions in -άω and -έω see p. 51.

ARTICLE.

The Greek language differs from the English in prefixing the definite article: (1) before proper names, a use which has the advantage of showing the case, where the name is indeclinable, as in Jude 9 ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ, 11 τοῦ Καὶ, τοῦ Βαλαίμ, τοῦ Κορέ, also in 2 Pet. 215 τοῦ Βαλαίμ.

It is omitted in J. v. 14 ἐβδομος ἀπὸ Ἁδᾶμ, Ἐνώχ, v. 1 Ἰακώβου, v. 5 Αλεύπτου, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ passim.3 So in 2 Pet. 25 Νῶε, 27 Δώτ.

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

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

3 Dr. Abbott has discussed the reasons for the presence or absence of the article, Johannine Grammar, pp. 57 f. Cf. J. H. Moulton Gr. of N.T. Prolegomena, p. 83.
(2) Before a name which is applicable only to one as ὁ Θεός, ὁ Κύριος: always so with the nom. and often with other cases in St. James; but found in St. Jude only where the word is defined by a genitive, as in v. 4 τήν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα, v. 17 and v. 25 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. In 2 Pet. 1 we find ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1: ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3: τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 1: τήν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν.

Since the unique use easily passes into a proper name, the former is often found, like the latter, without the article, as in Jude v. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις, v. 21 ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ, v. 5 Κύριος ἀπώλεσεν, v. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος. So 2 Pet. 1: παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, ib. v. 21 ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, 2: οἴδας Κύριος ἀσεβείς ἁσοθαί, 3: οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος, 2: ἡμέρα Κυρίου, 2: ἡμέρα Κυρίου, 2: παρὰ Κυρίῳ. When Κύριος (nom.) is used as a proper name without the article, it must be understood of God; but in oblique cases it is often used of Christ, as in 1 Cor. 7: ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου ἑστῶ, 1 Cor. 10: πατήριον 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. 1: σάρξ, Jude v. 8 σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, 2 Pet. 2: τοὺς ὅπερ σάρκος πορευομένους, 2: σάρκος ἀσεβείας: γραφή, 2 Pet. 2: προφητεία γραπτή. 

Use of Article with a Qualified Noun.

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

(1) Jude v. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, ib. τῇ ἀπαξ παρα-
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2 Pet. supplies many elaborate instances of the compact form, which is used by him, as Dr. Bigg remarks, with exceptional freedom and elegance: so 1 Pet. iv. τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 16 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν, 21 τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην, 27 ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀδέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς, 210 τοὺς ὁπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μαμακοῦ πορευομένους, 213 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφήν, 213 τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονοῦν, 221 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, 32 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, 315 κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.

Where there is a complex qualifying clause, a part of this is sometimes allowed to overflow the inclosure formed by the article and noun, either for euphony, or in order to avoid clumsiness or ambiguity, e.g. the word πίστιν in 2 Pet. 11 τοῖς ἱσότιμον ἠμῶν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν. Such a clause may be called ‘semi-compact.’ Other examples are Jude 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, 7 τῶν ὄμοιον τρόπον τούτους, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευομένους τῶν ἁσβειόνων, 2 Pet. 32 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, ὅτι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου.

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

(3) I proceed to give examples of the uncompact clause: Jude 6 τοῖς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, 11 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν, τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλααίμ, τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ, 17 μηνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, 21 τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. 2 Pet. 13 διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἵδια δόξη (where the desire of compactness would have resulted in the less simple διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἱδία ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος ἐπιγνώσεως), 19 τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν, 111 ἡ εἰσόδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 114 ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, 215 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλααίμ τοῦ Βόσπορ, 218 τοῖς
Greek grammar of Jude and of 2 Peter

Use of Article with Possessive Genitive of Pronoun.

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

2 Pet. 11 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 12 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (also in vv. 8, 11, 14, 16, iii. 15, 18), 13 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτῶν, 15 ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν, 14 τοῦ σκηνομάτος μου, 17 ὑπὸ νίκης μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, 19 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 21 κατὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτῶν, 22 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, 23 ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, 32 τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν, 34 τῆς παρουσίας αὐτῶν, 313 ἐπάγγελμα αὐτῶν.

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 κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, v. 20 τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, 2 Pet. 19 τῶν πάλαι αὐτῶν ἀμαρτίων, 315 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, 316 τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.

Where the possessive genitive follows immediately on the article, as in Jude v. 6 τήν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχήν, v. 13 τάς ἐαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, v. 18 τᾶς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας, the effect is to give special emphasis. Since ἐαυτός is in itself emphatic, it is usually found in this emphatic position, as in Mt. 22 τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς, Lk. 23 ἐκαστὸς εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ πόλιν, 660 θάνατος τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς, 212 φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ αὐλήν, 1426 καὶ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ψυχήν, Rom. 419 τὸ ἐαυτοῦ σώμα ἢδη νεκρωμένου, 33 οἱ Θεοὶ τὸν ἐαυτοῦ υἱὸν σώσας, 104 τῶν ἐαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, 1 Cor. 72 ἐκαστὸς τῆν ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, etc., but there are also cases in which it is found after its noun, as in Mt. 257 ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας ἐαυτῶν, Lk. 1427 ὡς αὐτοὶ ἔτυκαν τὸν σταυρὸν ἐαυτοῦ. An examination of the passages quoted under ἐαυτό in the concordance shows that in general the latter position is less emphatic than the former, and that, in many cases of the latter, αὐτῷ and αὐτῶν occur as various readings. The more emphatic position is naturally assigned to τοῦτοι in 2 Pet. 115 τὴν τοῦτον μινήμην ποιεῖσθαι, and to ἐκεῖνοι in 2 Pet. 116 τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. So Joh. 27 τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν, 2 Cor. 89 τῆς ἐκείνου πτωχείας,
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813 τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα, 814 τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα, 2 Tim. 226 τὸ ἐκείνων θέλημα, Tit. 37 τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι. In 2 Pet. 37 some MSS. have τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, which resembles James 118 τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων, 1 Pet. 13 τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, Tit. 35 τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, 1 Joh. 227 τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα, Rom. 324 τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, 325 τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, 1 Thess. 219 ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, Heb. 24 κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν (quoted by Abbott, Joh. Gr. p. 415); but there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. 37 αὐτῷ is right, see explanatory note. The possessive pronoun in this position has the same emphatic force as the genitive of the personal pronoun, e.g. 2 Pet. 115 μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον contrasted with the preceding ὑμᾶς.

In two passages of 2 Pet. we find the possessive genitive preceding the articular phrase, 22 πολλοὶ ἐξἀκολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἁσσέλγειαις, and 31 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν. Clauses of this form are common in St. John's Gospel, and Dr. Abbott has christened them 'the vernacular possessive.' See Joh. Gr. pp. 414 foll., where many examples are quoted, e.g. Joh. 127 ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἵμαντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος (corresponding to Lk. 316 λύσαι τὸν ἵμαντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ), Joh. 416 φώνησόν σου τὸν ἄνδρα, as well as from other books. In most cases the preceding possessive genitive seems to throw special stress on the following noun, but I do not think that this is so in the examples above quoted from 2 Pet.; and Dr. Abbott allows that in some cases the genitive is itself made emphatic by contrast, as in Joh. 136 σὺ μου νῆπτεις τοὺς πόδας; 1314 εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἐνυψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας... καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀφεῖλετε ἄλληλων νῆπτειν τοὺς πόδας.

Irregular Omission of Article.

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

(1) Where the noun is defined by a dependent genitive, as Jude v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας (R.V. 'the judgment of the great day'). Here the ordinary use in prose would have required εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μεγάλης ἡμέρας κρίσιν: but the phrase μεγάλη ἡμέρα, as well as the word κρίσις, has acquired a technical sense, which
allows of the omission of the article without causing ambiguity, and this omission is further facilitated by the preposition. We may compare the phrase εν ἡμέρας κρίσεως, which occurs four times in Mt., εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως 2 Pet. 2ο, 3ο, ἤξει ἡμέρα Κυρίου 3ο, εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος 3ο, cf. εἰς ἀναστήσονται ἁσβείς εν κρίσει Ps. 1ο, μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως Enoch x. 11 (Gizeh), p. 339 ed. Charles. On the other hand we find the full form τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας 2 Pet. 3ο, εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως 1 Joh. 4ο, εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ (MS. τῆ—λης) τῆς κρίσεως Enoch p. 337. Jude v. 14 εν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτῶν: the parallel in Enoch has σὺν τοῖς (?) μυριάσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτῶν (p. 327 Charles); but the article is omitted in Heb. 12ο προσελήνωσε . . . μυριάσιν ἀγγέλους, Ps. 3ο οὐ φοβηθήσομαι ἀπὸ μυριάδον λαοῦ, and in Deut. 33ο σὺν μυριάσι Κάδης (R.V. 'from the ten thousands of holy ones'). In our passage the R.V. is probably right in translating 'with ten thousands of his holy ones' so as to keep the indefinite force. In the quotation from Enoch, which occurs in Jude v. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἁσβείας αὐτῶν, the Gizeh Greek (followed by Ν and others) omits ἁσβείαις αὐτῶν, and Treg. brackets ἁσβείαις. The omission of the article is awkward but not more so than in Job. 31ο δὲ ἁσβείαν δῶρων δν ἐθέχωσο, and other examples cited in my Introduction to St. James, p. exciii. So Jude v. 7 πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην ὑπέχουσαι (R.V. 'suffering the vengeance of eternal fire'), where we should have expected τὴν τοῦ αἰώνιου πυρὸς δίκην, cf. Heb. 6ο (θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι) βαπτισμῶν διακήρυ, ἐπιθετέος τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰώνιου. Jude v. 21 εν ἁγίᾳ Θεοῦ (R.V. 'keep yourselves in the love of God'). We find similar examples in 2 Pet.

2 Pet. 1ο εν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (R.V. 'in the righteousness of our God'), cf. Rom. 4ο διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως and even the nominative in Rom. 1ο δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ εν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται: so 2 Pet. 1ο εν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ and 2ο, but we meet the full form just below 1ο εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐπίγνωσιν and 1ο διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, as in Rom. 2ο we have τὴν ὅδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης. 2 Pet. 1ο οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπων ἣνεκῆ προφητεία (R.V. 'by the will of man'), cf. Joh. 1ο ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, 1 Pet. 2ο θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι: so the phrase διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ occurs seven times in St. Paul. 2 Pet. 2ο κατακλυσμὸν κόσμω ἁσβεῖν ἐπάξας (R.V. 'the world of the ungodly'): we might translate 'a world of ungodly men,' but
kόσμος is often anarthrous, not only in prepositional phrases such as ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου, ἀμαρτία ἡν ἐν κόσμῳ, but in such cases as Rom. 11:12 τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτοῦ πλούτος κόσμου, and even in the nominative, as Gal. 6:14 δἰ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ. 2 Pet. 2:6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας κατέκρινεν (R.V. ‘the cities’), cf. Lk. 24:27 ἀνέβη ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ. 2 Pet. 2:10 τοὺς ὑπίσθων σαρκός ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισσοῦ πορευομένους (R.V. ‘after the flesh in the lust of defilement’), cf. 2:18 ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἁσελγείας (R.V. ‘in the lusts of the flesh,’ but see explanatory note), Gal. 5:15 ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, 1 Pet. 4:3 ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις... βιῶσαι. 2 Pet. 2:13, 15 μισθοῦ ἀδικίας (R.V. ‘the hire of wrong-doing’), cf. Acts 1:3 ἐκτίσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας. 2 Pet. 3:1 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως (R.V. ‘from the beginning of the creation’), cf. above ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου.

(2) Other examples of omission. Jude v. 21 εἰς ζωῆν αἰώνιον, which is more usual than the full phrase, τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον in 1 Joh. 1:2, 2:25. Jude v. 18 ἐπ' ἐσχάτον χρόνον (R.V. ‘in the last time’), cf. 2 Tit. 3:1, James 5:3 ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, 1 Pet. 1:5 ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ. 1 Joh. 2:18 ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν, 2 Pet. 3:3 ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, where see note. Jude v. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτήρ ἡμῶν δόξα (R.V. ‘to the only God our Saviour,’ Rom. 16:27 μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, 1 Tim. 1:17 μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμή; but in Joh. 5:44 τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε, ἦν. 17:3 ἦν γενόσκοιτιν σε τὸν μόνον ἄλληθρον Θεόν, Jude v. 4 τῶν μόνων δεσπότην. Cf. Thuc. iii. 57. 4 ἠμεῖς τε, ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος, ἡ μόνη ἐκτιστι, δεδεμένη μὴ οὗ βέβαιοι ἦτε, Joh. Gr. p. 10. 2 Pet. 25 ἀρχαίον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφέσοσα (R.V. ‘spared not the ancient world’), cf. Ps. 78:8 μὴ μνησθῇς ἡμῶν ἀνομίαν ἀρχαίον, Job 21:28 ὑπὲρ τὴν φρονήσιν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων. 2 Pet. 2:15 καταλείποντες εὐθείαν ὁδὸν (R.V. ‘the right way’): elsewhere in this epistle ὁδὸς is joined with the article, as in 2:2, 21, and in Jude v. 11; but it is anarthrous in Mt. 21:32 ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Lk. 1:79 εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης, James 5:50 ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ, and in the following quotations from the LXX., Acts 2:28 εγνώρισας μοὶ ὁδοὺς ζωῆς, Rom. 3:17 ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐγνώσας, and constantly in the poetic books of the O.T. e.g. Ps. 1:6 ὁδὸν δικαίων, ὁδὸς ἁσελγείας, Ps. 2:12 ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαιίας, Prov. 21:6 ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ εὐθείας, 2:8 ὁδὸν εὐλαβομένων αὐτοῦ διαφυλάξει. 2 Pet. 2:16 ἐλεγξέν ἐσχέν ἰδίας παρανομίας, 1:8 ἰδία δόξη, cf. Acts 13:36 ἰδία γενεὰ ὑπηρετήσας, 1 Cor. 9:7
We will now consider some nouns apart from their construction. Οὐρανός is anarthrous in 2 Pet. 1:18 φωνῇ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθείσαν, 3:5 οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι, 3:11 οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται, 3:15 καίνοις οὐρανοῖς προσδοκῶμεν. Here 3:5 and 3:13 are indefinite, but 1:18 and 3:12 refer definitely to a known heaven. The article is rightly used in 3:7 οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ as contrasted with the former heavens, but in 3:10 there is no special occasion for it, as it is followed by the anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ and also by οὐρανοὶ in 3:12. The article is often omitted both with the singular and plural in other books of the N.T. where a preposition precedes: we also find δὲ οἱ οὐρανοὶ δέξασθαι Acts 3:21, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς Κύριος Acts 17:24, and the nominative οὐρανοῦ υψηλός, γῆ δὲ βαθεία (R.V. ‘the heaven for height, and the earth for depth’) Prov. 25:2. 2 Pet. 1:19 ἐς οὗ ἡμέρα διανυσία καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη (R.V. ‘the day,’ ‘the day-star’), cf. Job. 38:12 ἐσωφόρος ἐπείδη τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν, Mal. 4:6 ἀνατελεῖ ύμῖν ἠλιός δικαιοσύνης, and the phrases ἡμέρα Κυρίου, ἡμέρα κρίσεως mentioned above. ἄγγελος is used without the article in Jude v. 6 ἄγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας ‘angels, viz. those that kept not,’ and 2 Pet. 2:4 ἄγγελοι πάμετροσάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ‘spared not angels when they sinned.’

2 Pet. 2:11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι 'whereas angels, though greater,' etc. So εὑσεβεῖς and ἀδίκους, in 2 Pet. 2:9 ὅδειν Κύριος εὑσεβεῖς ρύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαξομένους τηρεῖν, where R.V. has 'the godly,' 'the unrighteous,' but it is possible to keep the indefinite force 'godly men,' 'unrighteous men' contrasted with the definite class which follows, μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὁπίσω σαρκός.

It is sometimes a little difficult to see why the article is used, as in 2 P. 1:4 δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ύμιν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδόρηται, where definite reference is made to the promises of Christ. So in 1:5 ἐχεῖν ύμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 'that ye should have it in your power to practise the mention (not simply 'to make mention') of these things.'

The combination of the fully formed articular phrase with what might be thought an illiterate use of the anarthrous noun is very remarkable in this writer. The latter feature is more visible in the prophetic portions (ii. 4–18, iii. 7–12), the first chapter, which is chiefly argumentative, preserving more of a classical character throughout. We may compare the difference between the preface and the poetical portions of the early chapters of St. Luke, the former affording a good specimen of the periodic style, ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, the latter resembling the broken utterances of the Sibyl, τοῦ δοῦναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. So the use of the article in the narrative portion of the book of Job is for the most part in accordance with ordinary rules, e.g. 1:18 ἐτὶ τούτων λαοῦτος ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐρχεται λέγων τῷ Ἰωβ, Τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων σου ἐσθιόντων καὶ πινόντων παρὰ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῶν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ, ἡξαίφησι πνεύμα μέγα ἐπήλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου καὶ ἤψατο τῶν τεσσάρων γωνίων τῆς ὅικας, καὶ ἔπεσεν ή οἰκία ἐπὶ τὰ παιδία σου καὶ ἐτελεύτησαν, while in the drama itself we meet such phrases as συνέκλεισε πύλας γαστρὸς μητρὸς μου 3:10, ἵσχυν ῥημάτων σου τῆς ὑποίσει; 4:2, στόνος λέωντος, φονὴ δὲ λεαίνης, γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη 4:10, ἀφρωνικα ἀναίρει ὅργῃ, πεπλημμένοιν δὲ θανατοὶ ζῆλος 5:2. There is a similar contrast between the style of the narrative portion of Judges, e.g. 4:21 συνεκάλυψεν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ δέρρῃ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔλαβεν . . . τὸν πάσσαλον τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ ἔθηκε τὴν σφόδραν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς . . . καὶ ἐνέκρουσε τὸν πάσσαλον ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ διηλασεν ἐν τῇ γῇ, and the song of Deborah 5:6 ὅρη ἐσαλευ-
If we ask why there should be this difference between the language of prose and that of poetry or prophecy, it may be answered generally that the aim of prose is clearness and exactness, while that of verse is to appeal to the feelings and imagination; that largeness and mystery are proper to the latter, which frets at the minute and definite restrictions of the former. In Greek this natural predilection of verse was assisted by the fact that in Homer the article was not yet separated from the pronoun, and that later poets followed in the footsteps of Homer. The LXX. translators would naturally endeavour to maintain a corresponding distinction between prose and verse in their translation of the O.T., and we know from the Sibylline books that Alexandrian Jews had practised the writing of Greek hexameters, where the article is not more common than in Homer, for more than 150 years before the Christian era.

**Article belonging to more than one Noun.**

2 Pet. 1:11, 2:29, 3:2, 3:18 τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Here the ordinary rule holds good: substantives subordinated to the same article are simply different names for the same subject; but in 2 Pet. 1:1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (σωτήρ belonging to the class of anarthrous nouns) it seems better to understand the substantives as indicating different subjects, since they are plainly distinguished in the next verse τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν; so too in Jude v. 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where see note. In 2 Pet. 1:10 βεβαιῶν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν ποιεῖσθαι, 1:16 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, 2:16 οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρκτοι, the single article is sufficient because the connected nouns belong to one category (see Winer, p. 154).

**Cases.**

**Nominaive.—**There is a tendency in the Hellenistic writings to put the noun or participle into the nominative case, when by the ordinary rules of grammar it should be in an oblique case to suit the preceding construction, see 2 P. 3:13 διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν,
muṣṭhēnai tôn ἰηματων . . . γινόσκοντες, where the participle should have been in the acc. to agree with the understood subject of the infin. μηθῇναι. See below under Anacoluthon, and Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 69; Blass, pp. 81, 242, 243, 284.

Accusative.—Jude (1) Adverbial: v. 5 ποιεσθεν μὴ πιστεύσαντας, v. 7 τῶν ὑμιῶν πρὸ τούτων ἐκπορευόρασαι; (2) with prepositions: 1 eis, v. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμέναι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα; χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν; v. 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετήρηκεν; v. 13 εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται; v. 25 Θεῷ δόξα εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας; v. 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος εἰς ξοφόν αἰώνιον. περὶ c. acc. v. 7 οἱ πρὶν αὐτὰς πόλεις. ὑπό, Jude v. 6 ὑπὸ ξοφὸν τετήρηκεν, cf. Moulton p. 68.


Complementary construction with factitive verb. 2 Pet. 26 τὰς πόλεις ὑπόδειχμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείας τεθεικός, of which we have the passive in Jude v. 7 οἱ πόλεις πρόκεινται δείγμα; 2 Pet. 18 ταῦτα οὐκ ἄργους (ὑμᾶς) καθιστήσων; Jude v. 24 στήσας ὑμᾶς ἀμώμους; 2 Pet. 218 ἔδωκαν ἑγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, 315 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε; Jude v. 24 φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπαίτητος.

Genitive.—The most noteworthy examples in Jude are (after substantive) Possessive: v. 6 κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, v. 15 περὶ τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, v. 18 κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας 1 On the use of the prepositions in later Greek, see J. H. Moulton, pp. 98-107.
* Denotes an unclassical use.
† Denotes an idiomatized expression.
GRAMMAR OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

τῶν ἁσβετῶν. **Qualitative**: v. 9 κρίσιν βλασφημιάς.** Material**: v. 6 πυρὸς αἰώνιον δίκην.** (After verb): v. 17 μνήσθητε ῥημάτων. **Gen. of Price**: Jude v. 11 μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν. **With prepositions**: ἀπὸ twice, ἐκ twice, ἐπὶ once, v. 18 ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου χρόνου, περὶ four times, διὰ once, πρὸ once, v. 25 πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, κατὰ twice, esp. v. 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, * ὑπὸ twice, esp. v. 12 νεφέλαι ὑπὸ ἄνεμων παραφερόμεναι, ὀπίσω* v. 7 ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς, κατενώπιον * v. 24 στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης, χάριν v. 16 ὠφελίας χάριν.

2 Pet. Noteworthy examples of the gen. are (after substantive) the Possessive, 17 ὁ νῖος μου, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου, 10 ἡμέρα Κύριου, 12 ἡμέρα Θεοῦ, 13 ἡμέρα αἰῶνος, 2, 3 ἡμέρα κρίσις, 20 προφητεία γραφῆς, 2 ὡς ὅδος τῆς ἀληθείας. **Objective**: 13 ἐπιγνώσεαν τοῦ καλέσατος, 13 ἡ ἀπόδειξις τοῦ σκηνώματος, 15 τὴν τούτων μνήμην, 16 ἐλευθερία παραφομάς. **Reduplicated genitive**: * 3 μηνήσησαι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, where ὑμῶν depends on ἀποστόλων, ἀποστόλων on τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, and this last on μηνήσησαι. **Gen. of Quality**: 21 αἰρέσεις ἀπολείας,* 210 ἐπιθυμία μισοῦ, * 24 σειροῖς ξόφου,* (reading seirais it is easier to explain it as a Gen. of Material). **Gen. of Apposition**: 21 ἡ πόλις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, (cf. Hes. Sc. Herc. 469 πόλιν Τρηχινος, Aesch. Ag. 29 Ἰλιὸν πόλις, Thuc. iv. 130 ἡ Μένδη πόλις). **Hebraistic**: 21 κατάρας τέκνα. * After neuter article: 222 ἕν τῆς παροίμιας. After neuter adjective: 218 ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος. So Heb. 3 καὶ αγίον, 1 Cor. 5 ἐν ἄξυμοις εἰλικρίνεια. This construction is common with the article, as in Rom. 110 ἁ ὀρατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. 6 τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς ποιημάς, 1 Cor. 4 ἡ κρυπτά τοῦ σκότους. But here it is not a whole class that is spoken of, not the boastings of vanity in general, but occasional swelling words, as in Jude v. 16 λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα and in Dan. 11. So even in Soph. Ant. 1209 τῷ ἀδιάνοια ἂσμα περιβαίνει βοῆς and 1265 ὁμοὶ ὑμῶν ἄνολβα βουλευμάτων. 1 Cf. such Tacitean phrases as vana ranoritis, inania honoris. **With adjective**: of the sphere 2 ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτίας, γεγυμνωσμένος πλεονεξίας; of possession or privation, 2 μεστὸς μοιχαλίδος ὀφθαλμός. **With verb**: 2 κόσμου φελδέωσαι, 3 μηνήσησαι ῥημάτων, 3 ἐκπίπτεων

1 I am indebted to Mr. Herbert Richards for the following additional examples, Eur. Phoen. 1485 προκαλύπτωμα φιλαρχίων ἱερὰ παραδόσεως, Hec. 192 τῶν φθιγγει ἄνεμοι κακῶν; Hor. C. iv. 12. 19 amara curarum, iv. 4. 76 acuta belli, Sat. II. 2. 25 vana rerum, II. 8. 83 ficta rerum, A. P. 49 abdita rerum, Cic. Verr. I. 6. 15 inania nobilitatis, Tac. Hist. iv. 50 ambigua sonitus, iv. 41 tacita suspicionum.
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στηρυγμόν, 14 ἀποθεύγω τῆς φθορᾶς* (but with acc. 220 ἀπ. τὰ μιᾶς ματα and 218); of the sphere 120 προφητεια-ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 37 βραδύνω ἐπαγγελιας.* Genitive absolute 1: 2 Pet. 13 τῆς θελας δυνάμεως τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημενής, 117 φονῆς ἐνεχθείσης, 311 τούτων πάντων λομένων. With prepositions: ἀπό three (or four if we read ἀπό for ἵπτω in 117), esp. 121 ἐκάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ,* 34 ἀφ’ ής (ἡμέρας) ἐκοιμήθησαν.† ἐκ five, esp. 28 ἡμέραν έξ’ ἡμέρας.† ὑπὸ five (or four if we read ἀπό in 117), 121 ὑπὸ πνεύματος φέρομεν, 27 καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέων ἀναστροφῆς (where we should rather have expected διά or the dative, but see my Introd. to St. James, p. cc, and the note on James 34), 217 ὁμόθλαι ὑπὸ λαϊλατος ἑλαυνόμεναι. ὀπίσω* once, 218 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκίς πορευομένους. ἐως once, 119 ἐως οὗ (χρόνου) ἡμέρα διάνυση.† διὰ five times (six if we read διὰ δόξης in 13, four if we read δι’ ὄν in 36), esp. 35 γῃ δι’ ὦδος συνεστώτα,.* where it seems to have the force of the metazύ. ἐπὶ once, 33 ἐπ’ εἰσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. κατά once, 221 οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν.* παρά once, 117 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ τιμήν. περὶ twice.


With Preposition: ἐν eight times, three being unclassical, viz. the dat. of the instrument in v. 10 ἐν τούτῳ φειδορίται, that of association in v. 14 ἐν ἁγίας μυριάσιν ἥλθεν, that of divine influence v. 20 ἐν πνεύματι προσευχήμενοι. See Index.

2 Pet. Dat. of Indirect Object: after δωρεάμαι 13, 14, ἐπιχορηγέω 111, παραδίδωμι 24, 221, δίδωμι 315, δηλῶ 114, γυνορίζῳ 116, ἐπάγω 21, 225, ἐπαγγέλλομαι 219, δουλῶ 229, γράφω 31, cf. 11 τοῖς ἰσότιμοις λαχοῦσίν πίστιν, where καίρεων λέγει is omitted, as at the beginning of 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal., etc. and usually in epistolary

1 Used correctly in 2 P. not, as often in N. T., of the subject or object of the verb, see Blass, pp. 251 f.
correspondence (unless we prefer to say that χαίρεως is changed into χάρις υἷν in v. 2, see note on James 1)  

προσέχουντες λύχνῳ 1 φέρω 17, τίθημι 26 (υπόδειγμα ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς),  

οὐ τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ.  

Dat. with εἰ μὲν, etc.: 1 ὑμῖν ὑπάρχουσα, 10 ὁ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς, 21 κρείττον ἢν αὐτοῖς, 22 συμβεβήκεν αὐτοῖς, 318 αὐτῷ ἡ ὁδὸν (verb understood),  


 Datagram: 314 ἀστιλοι αὐτῷ εὐρέθναι.  

Dat. of Instrument: 13 ἐδίω ὁδήγη καλεῖν, 23 λόγοις υἱᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 26 καταστροφῆς κατέκρινεν, * 218 ἀδιδυχίας δελεάζω, 219 ἢ ἤττηται, 36 κόσμος ὡδατι κατακλυσθεῖς. Dat. of  


With Prepositions: 1 ἐν forty instances, many being unclassical, ὡς the dat. of the instrument, 216 ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθειρόμενον, 23 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ υἱᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 11 λαχῶν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, dat. of manner, 113 διεγερέω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 33 ἐν ἐμπαγμονῇ ἐκείνου. παρὰ Κυρίῳ bis. σὺν once. With prep. in  

compound verb: 213 συνενωθοῦμενοι υἱῶν, 220 τούτως ἐμπλακέντες, 317 πλάνη συναπαχθέντες.  

Number and Gender.  

The rule as to neuter plurals being followed by a singular verb is not strictly adhered to in the N.T. (see Blass Gr. p. 78), but it holds good in 2 Pet. 18 ταῦτα καθίστησιν, 19 πάρεστιν ταῦτα, and 310 στοιχεῖα λυθήσεται (where some MSS. have λυθήσονται). Where  

two or more subjects are joined each may have a separate verb, (1) as in 2 Pet. 10 ἐσόν οὖ ἡμέρα διανυάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, 310 οὐρανοὶ παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ λυθήσεται, 312 οὐρανοὶ λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα τῆκαται. 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. 13) ἐλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις πληθυνθείη. A singular verb is also found where  

the compound subject is made up of a singular and a neuter
plural, as 3\textsuperscript{10} γη καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται (where some MSS. have the plural). Elsewhere, as a rule, (3) the compound subject is followed by a plural verb, as 3\textsuperscript{3} οἱ νῦν ὦφρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν. In 3\textsuperscript{3} a plural relative follows a singular noun δευτέραν γράφω ἑπτασφυλή ἐν αἷς διεγείρω*, because δευτέραν carries with it the thought of a first letter. A collective noun in the singular is followed by a plural participle in Jude v. 5, if we omit the article, λαὸν σώσας [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. Cf. Evangel. Petri § 28 ὁ λαὸς γογγύζει καὶ κόπτεται τὰ στῆθη λέγοντες κ.τ.λ.

Plural of Abstract Nouns to express the various concrete manifestations of the abstract idea: Jude v. 18 τὰς ἑπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν, v. 8 δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν ('glories' for 'glorious beings'): so 2 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{10} δόξας οὗ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦσι, 2\textsuperscript{2} τολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσεβειλαίας, 2\textsuperscript{13} δελεάζουσιν σαρκὸς ἄσεβειλαίας τοὺς ἀποφεύγοντας, 3\textsuperscript{11} ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ ἐν σεβασμαῖς, where there may be an intentional reference to Jude v. 18; see explanatory note. Other examples are James 2\textsuperscript{1} μή ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν, Col. 3\textsuperscript{22} ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις, 1 Pet. 2\textsuperscript{1} ὑποκρίσεις, φθόνους.

Gender.—Exceptional examples are 2 Pet. 3\textsuperscript{6} ὦφρανοὶ ἱσαν ἐκπάλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὑδατος συνεστώσα, where I think we must supply συνεστῶτες with ὦφρανοῖ, the gender of the participle being accommodated to the nearer, though less important, of the nouns in the compound subject. On the other hand in 3\textsuperscript{3} οἱ δὲ νῦν ὦφρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν the gender agrees with that of the more important, though more distant, noun. So in 3\textsuperscript{3} ὦφρανοὺς καὶ γῆν προσδοκῶμεν ἐν οἷς κ.τ.λ. the gender of the relative agrees with ὦφρανοῦς. In Jude v. 12 the reading of the best MSS., οἱ ... σπιλάδες εὐσχοῦμενοι, is very harsh. I have suggested that σπιλάδες may be taken as complementary to the participle; but it gives a much easier construction to omit the article with Κ and some versions. There will then be no difficulty in the fact that the subject οὗτοι differs in gender from the predicate σπιλάδες, the following participle being masculine to suit the subject.

Demonstrative.

οὗτος (a) Substantival (masculine) used as in Demosthenes, of opponents, in Jude 8, καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπναξόμενοι, 10 οὗτοι δὲ
BLÆSΦHMOUSIN, 12 οΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΣΠΙΛΑΔΕΣ, 16 οΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΓΟΥΓΝΥΣΑΙ, 19 οΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΟΙ ἈΠΟΔΙΟΡΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ, 14 ἘΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΟΥΣΕΝ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΤΟΙΟΣ. 2 Pet. 212 οΥΤΟΙ ΔΕ ὩΣ ἌΛΟΓΑ ΞΩΔΑ, 217 οΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΠΗΓΑΙ ΑΝΥΔΡΟΙ. Used of others, Jude v. 7 τὸν ὅμοιον τρότων τούτων (the fallen angels). 2 Pet. 113 οΥΤΟΙ ἔστων ὁ νίος μου (of Christ).

(b) Substantival (neuter) Jude 10 ὅσα ἐπίσταται, ἐν τούτωι φθειρούται. 2 Pet. 120, 33 τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες, 35, 38 τοῦτο λανθάνει, 219 τοῦτο δεδομένως, 18, 9, 10, 314 ταῦτα, 14 διὰ τοῦτον, 112, 316 περὶ τοῦτων, 115 τὴν τούτων μνήμην, 311 τούτων λυμόμενον, 220 τούτωι ἐμπλακέντες.


For αὐτός and ἐαυτοῦ, see Index under these and under ἦδιος, ἐαυτούς is used of the 2nd person in Jude 20 and 21.

τοῦτοις is not found in either epistle, though common in other parts of the N.T. τοιόσοδε, found in 2 Pet. 117 alone in the N.T., retains its classical prospective use, as it does in Ezra 53 τοιῶδε εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, and in Josephus Ant. ii. 2. 1 αἱ δύσεις τοιαίδε ἡσαν, xvii. 13. Αὐχέλαος διὰρ τοιώδε ἐκδηγεῖται, repeated in § 4.

ὅς μὲν ... ὅς δὲ used as demonstratives,† Jude 21, 22.

Relative.

ὅς. Attracted: Jude v. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὅν (= ἄ) ὁσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὃν ἐλάλησαν. 2 Pet. 212 ἐν ὅς (= ὅν τούτοις ἄ) ἁγιοῳσιν βλασφημούντες.

With ambiguous antecedent, 2 P. 14 δι’ ὅν referring to the immediately preceding δόξη καὶ ἀρετῇ but misunderstood by many editors; 36 δι’ ὅν ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπόλλετο, where various antecedents have been suggested, but where I think we should read δι’ ὅν, see note. A similar ambiguity is found in the use of the demonstrative, cf. note on Jude v. 4 τούτῳ τῷ κρίμα, and 2 Pet. 311-12 ἐρωσσόμενοι κατ’ αὐτῶν ... ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν, ἦδ. 13 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτῶν.

Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 2 Pet. 23 ὅς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, cf. 1 Cor. 86 ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτῶν, Winer, p. 186, Jelf § 833.

Elliptical: 2 Pet. 119 ἦνος οὗ (sc. χρόνου) ἡμέρα διανυόμη, 34 ἀφ’ ἦς (sc. ἡμέρας) οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.
For ὃς μὲν... ὃς δὲ see under Demonstratives.

ὅστις: 2 Pet, 21 οὕτωις παρεισάξουσιν,† 'men that will bring in heresies.'

ὅσος: Jude v. 10 ὅσα μὲν... ὅσα δὲ... ἐν τούτοις. 2 Pet. 113 ἐφ' ὅσον† (sc. χρόνον) εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.

Interrogative: τίς, πόσος, ποῖος do not occur in these epistles. ποταπός, 2 Pet. 311.

Indefinite: emphatic Jude v. 4 τινες ἄνθρωποι. 2 Pet. 39 ὅς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἑγοῦνται, ἵθ. μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι.

ADJECTIVES.


Neut. Pl. followed by Gen. 2 Pet. 218 ὑπέρογχα ματαιότητος, see above p. xxxvii.

Comparison of Adjectives. In later Greek the proper force of the comparative and superlative is very much lost. The latter is chiefly found in the 'elative' sense, as ἐλάχιστος in James 34, though it retains its proper superlative force in 1 Cor. 159. Possibly this may explain the combination of μέγιστος with τίμια in 2 Pet. 14. J. H. Moulton goes so far as to say that μέγιστος is 'practically obsolete in Hellenistic,' p. 78. It occurs however in Job 263 τίνι ἐπακολουθήσεις; οὐχ ὁ μεγίστῃ δύναμις; and 3128 ἀνομία ἡ μεγίστῃ. In the same page he gives an example of the comparative μείζων used in the elative sense, which would account for the omission of the gen. after μείζων in 2 Pet. 211.

SPECIAL USES OF SOME COMMON ADJECTIVES.

πᾶς. Qualitative: Jude v. 3 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν πιουμένος, 2 Pet. 15, cf. James 12. πᾶσα... οὐ = οὐδεμία 2 Pet. 120.


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

VERBS.

Moods and Tenses.

Mixture of Tenses in prophetic utterance: Αor. for future, Jude vv. 14, 15 ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἔνωχ λέγων ἰδοὺ ἠλθεν Κύριος ποιήσαι
Varying use of fut. aor. and pres. in 2 Pet. 2:1 έσονται ψευδολιασκαλοί, 2:10 δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν, 2:12 φθαρήσονται, 2:15 επλαινήσανται, 2:17 οὐτοί εἰσιν, 2:18 δελεάζονται, 3:3 ελεύσονται ἐμπαίκται, 3:5 λαυθάνει αὐτοῖς, 3:12 οὐδραυλοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεία τῆς ταυτ. (al. τακτήσεται ορ τῇς ταυτ.)

Imperfect Indicative used without ἄν where condition has failed, 2 Pet. 2:21 κρείττον ἢν † αὕτως μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι, cf. Moulton, pp. 199 f. and, for Latin parallels, references under Indicative in my Index to Cic. N.D.

Future: Doubt as to 2 Pet. 1:12, where most MSS. read μελλήσω ἄεὶ ὡμᾶς ὑπομυνήσκειν, translated in R.V. ‘I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance.’ In the note I have argued in favour of Field’s reading μελήσω, ‘I shall take care.’

Aorist answering to English Perfect: 2 Jude v. 4 παρεισδύσαν ‘there are certain men crept in privily,’ R.V. J. v. 11 τῇ ὀδῷ τοῦ Καίν ἐπερεύθησαν καὶ . . . ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ . . . ἄπόλυντο. This is not prophetic, but a statement of fact as in v. 8. The R.V. translates ‘they went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously . . . and perished,’ but as this verse is interposed between two verses in which the present is used, we cannot, I think, doubt that the writer means the aorists to be understood as equivalent to the completed present. Moreover, the verbs here used are rarely found in the perf. pass. 2 Pet. 1:17 ο ἀγαπητός μου ὄντος ἐστιν εἰς ὅν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, ‘in whom I am well pleased,’ R.V. I believe that no instance of the perf. of this verb has been discovered. The aorist is used of God in Mt. 3:17, 12:18, 17:5, Mk. 1:11, Lk. 3:22, and in every case R.V. has the perfect rendering ‘is well pleased.’ It is a statement not referring to the past, but to the ‘eternal now.’ In Jude v. 15 ἐλέγξαι τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ τῶν ἔργων ὧν ἰσέβησαν καὶ . . . ἐλάλησαν the aorists, as they refer to a time previous to that denoted by ἐλέγξαι, seem to have the force of pluperfects, cf. Joh. Gr. pp. 335 foll.

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

1 Zahn (Einl. vol. II. pp. 85 foll.) explains the differences of tense by the supposition that the dangers against which P. warns his readers, as still future, were already visible in other churches.

2 See Moulton, Proleg. pp. 135-140; Abbott, Joh. Gr. pp. 324 foll. and 581 foll., where he points out that some perfects were avoided owing to their inconvenient form. The fact that Latin has one and the same form for the perf. and aor. was likely to influence the usage of Greek speakers under the Empire.
τῶν ῥημάτων, it is perhaps better to translate 'call to mind,' rather than 'remember' with the R.V. The present imperatives in vv. 21, 22 ἐλέγχετε, σόйтеτε, ἐλεάτε prescribe a course of conduct. So in 2 Pet. 1ε ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 3α σπουδάσατε have the quality of urgency,1 while the present imperatives in 3μ λανθανέτω, 3ηγεῖσθε, 3φυλάσσεσθε, 3αὐξάνετε have a continuous force.

Ἀορ. Συντεταγμένον is correctly used in 2 Pet. 1ι, 3ιν after ἦν (while in other books of the N.T. the indicative is often used after this and other particles, which would be followed by the subj. in classical Greek, see Winer, pp. 360 foll., Joh. Gr. 123); and after οὐ μὴ in 1α (for which the fut. ind. is sometimes used in other books of the N.T., see Blass 209, Joh. Gr. 205); and ἐως οὗ in 1ι οὐ ημέρα διανυσίσῃ 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.

Ἀορ. Ὄπτ.: In the N.T. this mood is comparatively rare except in Lk., see Blass, pp. 37, 219, J. H. Moulton, pp. 194–199. It is used to express a wish in Jude v. 9 ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, and in v. 2 ἔλεος πληθυνθεῖῃ, repeated in 2 Pet. 1ι. Usually the verb is omitted in the salutations of the Epistles, as in Rom. 1χάρις ὑμῖν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρός.

Ἀορ. Ἐνια. is contrasted with Πρεσ. Ἐνια. in Jude v. 3 πᾶσαι σπουδὴν ποιούμενοι γράφειν ... ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι, the present implying continuous action, the aorist a momentary act, so in 3 Joh. 13 πολλὰ εἶχον γράψαι σοι 'I had much that I wanted to say,' ἀλλ’ οὗ θελῶ διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου σοι γράφειν 'but I do not care to be writing to you by pen and ink,' v. 5 ὑπομνήσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι 'I wish to give you a reminder,' v. 24 τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς φυλάξαι ἀπαίτοσθοι καὶ στήσαι ἀμόμους: here στήσαι denotes a momentary act, but the act of guarding might seem to be continuous. The aorist however shows that it is not regarded as such (cf. ἐφύλαξεν in 2 Pet. 2ι), but as an action now to commence, with a particular end in view, viz. στήσαι. In 2 Pet. the present infinitives ποιεῖσθαι 1ι, ὑπομμηνήσκειν 1ι, διεγείρειν 1ι, ἐκάκτοτε ἐχεῖν ... ποιεῖσθαι 1ι5 are all continuous. Similarly προῦσθαι and τηρεῖν in 2ι, and ὑπάρχειν in 3ι. On the other hand ὑποστρέψαι 2ι, μνημόθηναι 'call to mind' 3ι, ἀπολέ-
σθαί, χωρήσαι (‘to arrive at’ not ‘to keep going’), 39 ἀσπιλού ἐὑρεθήσαται 314, all denote a single act.

Unusual constructions of Infinitive: After verbs of motion, as Jude v. 15 ἠλθεν ποιήσαι κρίσιν; so Mt. 22 ἠλθομεν προσκυνήσαι, 118 τί ἔξηλθατε ἰδεῖν; Mk. 217 οὐκ ἠλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, Lk. 312 ἤλθον βαπτισθήσαι, 23 ἐπορεύοντο ἄπογραφεσθαι, Gen. 2532 πορεύομαι τελευτάν. For examples in late Greek see Janaris, Gr. p. 575. It is occasionally found in classical writers, as Soph. Oed. Col. 12 μανθάνει γὰρ ἠκομεν, Eur. Medea 1303 ἐμῶν δὲ παίδων ἠλθον ἐκσώσαι βίον, where some read the more regular ἐκσώσων. After verbs of knowing, 2 Pet. 29 οἴδαν Κύριος εὑσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ τηρεῖν, cf. James 417 εἰδός καλὸν ποιεῖν, Mt. 711 οἴδατε ἀγαθὰ διδόναι, Mt. 163 τὸ μὲν πρόσωπόν τοῦ ὑπαρνοι γνώσκετε διακρίνετε Phil. 412 οἴδα περισσευέον, 1 Th. 44, 1 Tim. 35; also found in classical writings. After ἔχω = δύναμαι, 2 Pet. 115 στονδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μήμην ποιεῖσθαι. Infinitive of Result 2 Pet. 115 στονδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς, 2 Pet. 312 διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν υπομνήσει τὴν διάνοιαν, μνημοθήκην τῶν ρημάτων, cf. Acts 53 διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαι σε; Αποκ. 55 ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ... ἀνοίξαι τὸ βιβλίον, Col. 46 ὁ λόγος ἅλατι ἐρτυμένος, εἰδεναι ὑμᾶς πῶς δεῖ ἀποκρίνεσθαι, also in classical writings, e.g. Thuc. vi. 69. 3 μαχούμενοι ἐχώρουν περὶ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας, αἰκεῖαν σχεῖν.

Infinitive as subject: 221 κρεῖττον ἢ μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι ἢ ἐπιγνοοῦσιν ύποστρέφαι.

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 ὅνα and ὅτι. The following exx. are found in 2 Pet. 115 στονδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 312 διεγείρω ὑμῶν τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν μνησθήναι τῶν ρημάτων, 39 μὴ βουλό-μενος τινας ἀπολέσθαι, 311 ποταποῦ δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς, 315 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν (εἰναι) ἥγεσθε. It is not used at all by Jude.

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

Aor. Part., as contrasted with the Present or Perfect Participle, is to express priority of time, as in Jude v. 5 ἀπαξ σώσας ἀπώλεσεν 'after once saving destroyed,' 'once saved and then destroyed.' 2 Pet. 1.4 ἦν γένησθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς φθορᾶς 'after escaping from,' 'that ye may escape from φθορά and thereby become partakers of a divine nature.' 15 σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε 'contribute all diligence and so add energy to faith.' 116 οὐ μόνος ἔξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐποπταῖ γεννηθέντες 'it was not from any reliance on fables but from eye-witness that we were empowered to declare the second coming.' 117 λαβὼν τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνής ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶσι . . . ἱκουόμεν κ.τ.λ. (the last words standing here by anacoluthon for the logical apodosis ἐβεβαιώσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον) 'when he received honour through the voice that came from heaven, he confirmed the truth of prophecy in us who heard it.' Here the finite verb follows as a consequence on the τιμή, which itself was a consequence of the φωνή. 2 οὐσίας ταρατώσας παρέδωκεν 'he cast them down to Tartarus and then delivered them to chains.' 25 Νῦν ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν ἐπάξας 'when he brought a flood upon the earth, he saved Noah.' 26 τεθρώσας καταστροφὴ κατέκρυνεν, first came the showers of ashes, then the earthquake which overthrew the cities, see explanatory note. 215 καταλείποντες ὅδου ἐπλανήθησαν, where some MSS. have the aorist, which would mean 'they forsook the road and wandered,' the force of the present being 'they strayed from (literally 'leaving') the road.' 216 φθειρίσμων ἐκώλυσεν 'it spoke and so hindered,' lit. 'by speaking it hindered.' 36 ὁ κόσμος κατακλύσθη ἀπώλετο 'the world perished by the flood.' 317 ἦν μὴ τῇ πλανῇ συγκαθίστατε ἐκπέσητε τοῦ στηριγμοῦ 'that ye may not be involved in their error and so fall from your steadfastness.' So when the part. is in agreement with the object, e.g. 2 Pet. 118 φωνὴν ἱκουόμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθέαν 'we heard a voice that came from heaven.' 318 ἄγγελων ἠμαρτησάντων 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. 1530 δραμὼν δὲ τις, γεμίσας σπόργγον, περιθεὶς καλάμφ, ἐπότις.

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 νεὼς τῆς Ὑρας κατεκαθηθεὶς, Χρυσίδος τῆς ἑρείας λύχνου τινὰ θείης ἡμέραν πρὸς τα στέμματα καὶ ἐπικαταδιαρθούσης. Chrysisa did not fall asleep before she set the lamp near the garlands. ‘Here there is no καὶ between ἱαβὼν and ἐνεχθείσης, but this makes no difference.’ Surely Thucydides leaves no doubt as to the sequence: the verb expresses the final result, the preceding participle 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 καταλυτόντες, ‘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 ποιούμενον … ἔγραψα, v. 4 παρεισδύησαν … μετατιθέντες … ἀρνούμενοι, v. 8 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι μιαίνουσιν, v. 9 διακριόμενος διέλεγετο, v. 14 ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγον, v. 21 ἐαυτοὺς τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι. 2 Pet. 121 ὑπὸ πνεύματος φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν 'spake under inspiration,' ‘as inspiration came to them,’ 28 δίκαιος ἐνυκταίων ψυχήν ἐβασανίζει, 315,16 ἔγραψεν … λαλῶν περὶ τούτων ‘he wrote touching this matter,’ 110 ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταισόητε ‘while you do this.’ So too when the part. agrees with the object of the verb, as 27 Δῶτ καταποιούμενον ἐρύσατο ‘saved Lot under his sufferings.’

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

1 Dr. J. H. Moulton in his recent Gr. of the N.T. (Prolegomena, p. 131) supports the view that the aor. part. and the main verb sometimes denote coincident or identical action; for which he quotes (Mt. 222) ἀποκριθεὶς ἔτην, (Acts 1029) καλῶς ἐπιθίμασε παραγινόμενος. He adds that ‘the latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri . . . ἐν τοίχεσθε δοῖς ‘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 ἐπεστῆ ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δοῦλον λαβὼν means ‘He put on the form of a servant and thereby emptied himself.’ κομφύας ἐλαθεὶς 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 ἐγκένωσα, ἐπέπνεσα, τι σῶκ 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 when the moment he had a chance?’ ‘Why has he not answered already?’ Cf. Thuc. iii. 38 ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι τοῖς λέγουσιν μὴ διστηɾοι ἀκολουθήσαι δοκεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ, ἀξίων δὲ τι λέγωντος προεπισήνοι.
themselves over to fornication are set forth as an example; R.V. v. 12 οὕτως εἰσιν ... δεύδρα ... δις ἄποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα 'trees twice dead, plucked up by the roots,' where the relation of the participles to each other is much the same as that in v. 16 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, θαυμάζουστες πρόσωπα, and v. 20 ἐποικοδομοῦντες ... προσευχόμενοι. 2 Pet. 1 τοῖς ἰσότιμοι λαχοῦσιν πίστιν (subaud. γράφει) 'to them that have obtained a like precious faith,' R.V. 215 ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ, 'having followed the way of Balaam,' R.V. 19 τυφλὸς ἔστιν, λήθην λαβῶν 'is blind, having forgotten,' R.V. 230 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μισώματα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακόντες ἠττῶνται 'if, after having escaped the pollutions of the world, they are again entangled in them and overcome by them.'

A remarkable feature in the use of participles in 2 Pet. is the sequence of present participles in 213.14 ἀδικοῦμενοι ... ἡγούμενοι ... ἐντυφώμεντες συνευοχοῦμενοι ... ὑθάλαμος ἐχοῦσες μεστοὺς μυκαλίδος ... διελάβοντες ψυχὰς ... καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην ἐχοῦσες. 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 αὖθις εὐδεμίαν ἐσχηκεν ἄνευν ἡ σὰρξ ήμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, Rom. 122fol. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγνόμενο τὸ ποιηρόν, κολλώμενο τῷ ἄγαθῳ ... προηγοῦμενο ... ξένοιτε ... δονυλέυοντες κ.τ.λ. See 1 Pet. 31 ὁμοίως γνωαίκες ὑποτασσόμεναι, 37.9, Lightfoot on Col. 316 διδάσκοντες, J. H. Moulton, Prolegomena, pp. 180-183, 222-225.

Participle used instead of Infinitive 2 P. 210 οὗ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, where see note.

A participial clause is changed into a finite clause in Jude v. 16 οὕτως εἴσων γνωγματα ... πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεὶ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα.

Voices.

Active for Middle 2 Pet. 15 σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες instead of the usual σπουδὴν εἰσενεγκάμενοι. 21 ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς

1 The aor. mid. of φέρω does not seem to occur in biblical Greek.
āπώλειαν instead of ἐπαγόμενοι. 2 Pet. 115 σπουδάσω for the classical σπουδάσομαι, cf. ἀκούσω Mt. 1219, 1314, ἀμαρτήσω 1821, ἀπαντήσω Mk. 1413, Blass, p. 42. So we find μεταπέμπω for μεταπέμπομαι in Thuc. i. 112. 3, iv. 30, vi. 52, etc., also μεταχειρίζω, ληθώ quoted in Poppo's n. on i. 13. See Blass, pp. 183 f.; Moulton, pp. 154–160.

τοιεῖν act. Jude v. 15 τοιῆσαι κρίσιν 'to execute judgment': 2 Pet. 119 καλῶς τοιείτε προσέχοντες. τοιείσθαι mid. with periphrastic force Jude v. 3 σπουδὴν τοιούμενος 'hasting,' 2 Pet. 110 βεβαιάν τὴν κλῆσιν τοιείσθαι 'to confirm,' 115 μνήμην τοιείσθαι 'to call to mind' or 'to mention.'

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

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

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

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

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


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

ἐκοιμήθησαν pass. with middle force 2 Pet. 34.

τῇκεῖ (al. τακιστεῖ or τῆκε) pass. 2 Pet. 312.

λούσαμαι, 2 Pet. 222 ὑς λουσαμένη, the middle does not exclude the passive sense.

COMPUND SENTENCE.

(1) Substantial Clauses.

(a) Direct Statement subordinated to verb of saying, Jude v. 9 εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σου Κύριος, v. 14 λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἥλθεν Κύριος, v. 18 ἐλεγον... ἐσονται ἐμπαίκται. 2 Pet. 117 φωνής ἐνεχθείσης τοιᾶδε... 'Ο νῦς μου οὐτός ἐστιν; 34 λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστίν ἢ ἐπαγγελία;
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(b) Indirect Statement introduced by ὁτι, Jude v. 5 ὑπομνήσαι ὑμᾶς βουλομαι ὁτι Κύριος ἀπώλεσεν, vv. 17, 18 μνήσθητε ὁτι ἔλεγον. 2 Pet. 114 εἰδὼς ὁτι, 120, 33 γινώσκοντες ὁτι, 35, 38 λανθανέτω ὁτι.


(3) Adverbial Clauses.

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

(a) Jude v. 9 δέτε διελέγετο. 2 Pet. 119 ἐως ὡς ἡμέρα διανύσῃ, 34 ἄφι ἡς ἐκοιμήθησαν, 113 ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμί.

(β) 2 Pet. 221 ἐπον ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρουσιν (tropical force).

(γ) Jude v. 7 ὡς αἱ πόλεις πρόκεινται. 2 Pet. 114 καθὼς ἐδήλωσεν, 21 ὡς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται, 30 ὡς τινες ἡγούνται.

(b) Causal, Jude v. 11 οὐδαὶ αὐτοῖς ὁτι ἐπορεύθησαν.

(c) Final, 2 Pet. 14 δεδώρηται ἵνα γένησθε, 317 φυλάσσοντες ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε.

(d) Conditional, 2 Pet. 24 εἰ ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐφείσατο . . . οἶδεν εὑσεβεῖς ἡμῖν, 220 εἰ ἦττονται . . . γέγονεν αὐτοῖς.

No other form of the conditional clause occurs in either epistle. εάν, ἂν, 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 οὐ in either epistle, except that πᾶς . . . οὐ = οὐδεὶς, 2 P. 120, οὐ . . . ποτέ = οὔποτε ἰδ. 121. It occurs twice only in Jude vv. 9 and 10. It is found after εἰ in 2 P. 245 εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο—καὶ ἀρχαῖον κόσμον οὐκ ἐφείσατο in accordance with the predominant use in the N.T. See Blass, p. 254, and my note on James 123. For μὴ see Index. It is used with the relative where qui would take subjunctive, as in 2 P. 12 ὅ μὴ πάρεστιν, 1 Joh. 43 πάν τινι μὴ ὁμολογεῖ, Tit. 111 διδάσκοντες ἄ μὴ δέι. More commonly the relative is followed by οὐ as in Joh. 422 προσκυνεῖτε οὐκ οἴδατε, Lk. 1427 οὕτως οὐ βαπτίζει. As a rule μὴ is used with the participle, as in Jude v. 19 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, 2 P. 39 μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενος.
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tivnas ἀπολέσθαι. The exceptional cases in which oū is used with the participle are given in Winer, pp. 609 f. and J. H. Moulton, pp. 231 f.

The prohibitive use of oū μή is not found in biblical Greek. The negative use is common in the LXX.; and J. H. Moulton (Prole­
gomena 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. 11ο oū μή ἤπαντε and in classical Greek, with the aor. subj., but is also found with the future indicative, as in Mt. 2685 oū μή σε ἀρνήσομαι, and in Aristoph. Bacae 508 oū μή σ’ ἐγὼ περιόψομαι.

Other Adverbs and Particles.

ἀλλά is used twice in Jude, six times in 2 Pet. always to contrast a positive with a negative conception. In 2 P. 21ο 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 ἀρχαίον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, thus preparing the way for the general apodosis οἶδεν Κύριος εὑσεβεῖς ᾿ὑνεσθαί, ἀδίκους δὲ κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. Here the strict logical sequence would have been εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς παρέδωκεν, καὶ ἀρχαίον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ κατακλυσμὸν ἐπῆξεν, ὅγδου Νῶε σῶσας, with some such apodosis as πῶς τούτων φείεσται?

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

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

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

δὲ occurs 21 times in 2 Pet. twice with καῖ, 11ο σπουδάσω δὲ καῖ, 21 ἐγένοντο δὲ καῖ, which is also found in Jude v. 14. Rarer uses in 2 Pet. are καῖ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ 15, and the repeated ἐν δὲ in 157, where see notes.

ἓν. The idiomatic use of ἓν with the numeral is found in 2 Pet. 31 ταύτην ἓν δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολῆν, where see n. καθὼς.* 2 Pet. 114, 315, once in 1 Pet.

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

καίπερ. 2 Pet. 112 καίπερ εἰδότας.†
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μέντοι used with its proper force ' nevertheless' Jude v. 8.


ποῦ. Rhetorical use.† 2 Pet. 3:4 ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας; cf. Isa. 33:18 ποῦ εἰσίν οἱ γραμματικοὶ; Ps. 42:2,10 ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς σου; Eur. Hercul. 369 ποῦ ταύτα καλῶς ἄν εἰη παρά γ' εὖ φρονοῦσιν; where Paley quotes Elmsley 'Particula interrogativa ποῦ non sine indignatione negat, ut saepe apud tragicos, cf. Alc. 1075, Phoen. 548 ποῦ 'στιν ἡ δίκη; Soph. Aj. 1100 ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε; Oed. T. 390 ποῦ σὺ μάντις εἶ σαφῆς; Sibyl. viii. 75 ποῦ τότε σου τὸ κρύτος;

ὡς with gen. abs., 2 Pet. 1:3 ὡς πάντα τῆς θελας δυνάμεως δεδωρημένης, following χάρις ἦμών πληθυνθείη, where the subjective force almost disappears. If the sentence had run 'I pray that you may be blessed through the knowledge of God, seeing that the Divine Power has granted us all good through the knowledge of Himself,' ὡς would have kept its usual force. Winer (pp. 770 f.) and others prefer to connect the gen. abs. with the imperative ἐπιχορηγῆσατε in v. 5, but this involves us in greater difficulties. See explanatory note. For the other uses of ὡς see Index.

ELLIPSIS.
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tufulos ēstiv, 213 év ois ēgnooušin blasphēmoužntes by attraction for ēν tōútouš ē ēgnooušiν. Noun or pronoun expressed with one verb and understood with another, 2 Pet. 1θ ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς (ὑμᾶς) καθίστησιν. 1 Pet. 28 προσκόπτοντος τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες (τῷ λόγῳ). Verb of subordinate clause understood from the verb of the principal clause, 2 Pet. 316 (Πᾶδος ἔγραψεν) ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει). Participle understood in a later clause from a preceding clause, 2 Pet. 39 μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ (βουλόμενος) πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χαρῆσαι, 222 κῶν ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδιον ἕξεραμα καὶ ὃς λουσαμένη (ἐπιστρέψασα) εἰς κυλισμόν. Also κῶν is without a verb, which may be thus supplied, ὁ πάλιν ἐμπλακεῖς (v. 20) ἦστιν ὡς κῶν.

Pleonasm.

Jude v. 3 ὑμῖν repeated after γράφαι; v. 5 ὑμᾶς repeated emphatically after εἰδότας; v. 4 ἀνθρωποι after τινὲς, after ἀσεβεῖς 2 Pet. 37; redundant pronoun after ἵδιος, 2 Pet. 38 κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 316 πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν; in resumption of preceding noun 2 Pet. 316 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς (γράφει) λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων. Compare the similar redundant use after a relative (Blass, p. 175). The fourfold repetition of πᾶς and of the cognates of ἀσεβῆς 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 ἔξεστη Ἰσαὰκ ἐκστασιν μεγάλην, Lk. 2216 ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, James 517 προσεύχῃ προσηύξατο, where see my note, also Vorst De Hebraismis pp. 610–635. Two remarkable instances are found in 2 Pet. where ἐν is joined to the dative, viz. 212 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται, where αὐτῶν appears to refer to the preceding ἄλογα ζῶα, and ἐν implies that their destruction will be shared by the libertines; and 33 ἐλεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαίγμουῃ ἐμπαίκται, where ἐν ἐμπαίγμουῃ is equivalent to the participle, as in Lam. 12 κλαίουσα ἐκλαυσεν.

Periphrasis.

With ἔχειν, Jude v. 3 ἀνάγκην ἐσχον (= ἡμαγκάσθην) γράφαι ὑμῖν, 2 Pet. 110 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν λόγον = perfect of βεβαιῶ, 216 ἐλευξίν ἐσχεν παρανομίας = ἥλεγχθη περί π., 214 καρδιὰν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες = γεγυμνασμένου πλεονεξίας.
INTRODUCTION

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

2 Pet. 3v. 8 to explain καταπονοῦμενον.

2. Pet. 3v. 8 διεγείρω ύμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, μνημῆμα τῶν ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου, γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαίκται. Here we
should have expected γινώσκοντας to agree with the subject of the infinitive μυσθήναι, but the writer ends his sentence, as if he had begun, as Jude does, with μυσθητε. See explanatory note.

Asyndeton, confirmatory, where we might have expected a genitive absolute, 2 Pet. 2:16 ἔλεγξεν ἐσχέν παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.
A marked feature of the style of St. Jude is his fondness for triplets. Thus in v. 2 we find ἐλεεός καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη. In v. 4 'the men who were designed for this judgment' are described as ἄσεβείς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἄσελγειαν, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνοῦμεν. In vv. 3–7 three examples of punishment are adduced, Israel in the wilderness, the angels who sinned, the overthrow of Sodom. In v. 8 the libertines σάρκα μὲν μιανοῦσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. [In vv. 9, 10 we have two couplets οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν— ἄλλα εἶπεν: οὐα μὲν οὐκ ὁδασίαν—βλασφημοῦσιν, οὐα δὲ— φθειροῦται.] In v. 11 we return to the triplet, Cain, Balaam, Korah. [In vv. 12, 13 we have a quintet of metaphors, hidden rocks, rainless clouds, dead trees, turbid waves, falling stars. In v. 15 again two couplets ποιῆσαι κρίσιν—ἐλέγξαι, περὶ πάντων ὄν ἡσέβησαν—όν ἐλάλησαν.] In v. 16 we return to the triplet πορευόμενοι—αλούντες (disguised in the form καὶ τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα)—θαυμάζοντες. So in v. 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. v. 18 does not admit of subdivision. v. 19 has the triplet ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνευμα μὴ ἔχοντες. vv. 20 and 21 have a double triplet ἐποικισθήσασι—προσευχόμενοι—προσδεχόμενοι and πνεῦμα ἁγιον—Θεὸς—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς. v. 22 has the marked triplet οὓς μὲν—οὐδὲ—οὖς δέ. v. 24 has a couplet φυλάξαι—στήσαι. v. 25 has a quartet δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, ἐξουσία, followed by the triplet πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, thus closing with a septet. Compare the stress laid on the fact that Enoch was seventh from Adam, v. 14.

There are some traces of the triplet in St. James, as in 114.
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There is something analogous to this last in 2 Peter, as in 157 where faith is represented as the root, out of which the seven virtues spring, each growing out of the one before it (ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἁρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἁρετῇ τὴν γνώσιν, 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 παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καὶ σοφία μὲν εὐαγγελία καὶ γνώσις εὐεργετώμενα τούτων ὑμῶν παπράξεως δὲ ἔποιείτο τῆς ἐπιστημής τῶν τελείων ἐκτῶν. See pp. cccxii f. of my edition.

1 Cf. a similar climax in Wisdom vi. 17-21.
desire to give emphasis by the use of ‘line upon line’ or from both. Such repeated words are ἀπώλεια in 21 παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπώλειας . . . ἐπάγωντες έαυτοις ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν, 22 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν ὅπιστάξει, 23 πρὸς τὴν ἠδιαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, and ἀπόλυμι in 24 ὁ κόσμος ἀπώλετο, 25 μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσθαι. So we have the word ἐπίγρωσις four times, γνώσις twice, ἐπιγυνώσκω twice,1 ἐπιθυμία four times, κολαζόμενος τηρεῖν twice, τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες twice, διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει once, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι once, the tropical use of the rare ἐξακολουθεῖν thrice, the rare ἄθεσμος twice, σπουδάζω thrice, βέβαιος thrice, ἐπαγγελία twice, ἐπάγγελμα twice, ἐπάγω twice, πάρειμι twice, κρίας four times, βλασφημεῖν thrice, βλάσφημος once, ἐκπαλαι twice, προσδοκᾶω three times, ὀδός (tropical) four times, κόσμος four times, παρουσία thrice, ἐπιχορηγεῖν thrice, σοτηρίου ἰδίως 12, ἀστήρικτος 16, στηριγμός 17. It is worth noting how frequently the repetition occurs in the same sentence, as in 13 ὅπως πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδορθημένης . . . δι’ δὲν τὰ τίμια ἐπαγγελματα δεδώρηται (where the verb seems to be used first as middle and then as passive), 13,14 ἐφ’ ὅσον εἴμη ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σηκύνωματι . . . ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σεκνώματος μοι, 17,18 λαβῶν δὲ ἡξάν, φωνής ἐνεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς ὀξίας . . . καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνήν ἡκουσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐν εἴσοδον ἐν εἴσοδον ἐν εἴσοδον ἐν εἴσοδον, 27,8 δι’ ἑκατέρου Ἀρτέμιδος τοῦ, βλέπομαι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοὴν δὶ-καίος βολὴν ἐξασάνιζεν, in the next verse comes ἀργοῦ τοῦ, 23 ἀντὶ τῆς ἡγούμενος τῆς ἡμέρας τροφῆς, ἐν τροφῆς ἐ

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. 16,17 οὐ γὰρ σεσοφυσίνς μύθοις ἔξακολουθήσαντες |
STYLE OF JUDE AND OF 2 PETER

The style of Jude and of 2 Peter 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 αὐτὸ τὸ τόπῳ δὲ 19, ἡμέραν ἡ ἡμέρας 28, τὰ πρὸς ζωῆν 13, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας 22, ἐὼς οὐ διανύσῃ 119, ἀφ' ἦς ἐκοιμήθησαν 34, ἐφ' ὤσον εἰμὶ 113, and

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

the subjunctive after ἵνα and οὐ μή. Generally speaking, I think the writer's command of grammar is quite up to the usual level of the N.T. On the other hand, his style suffers from such defects as the non-use of the particle μέν, and of the articular infinitive; but I do not think it deserves the severe censures that have sometimes been passed upon it. Dr. Chase, who is more moderate than others, condemns, as solecisms, P.'s use of βλέμμα, κανοσοῦσθαι, μελλῆσω, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, παρεισφέρω, φωνή. Taking these in order, we must allow that, if we retain the old reading, and the old translation of 28, βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοή ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς... ψυχὴν δικαλὰν ἀνόμως ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν ('For that righteous man dwelling among them vexed his righteous soul, in seeing and hearing, with their unlawful deeds'), βλέμματι will bear a sense for which no precedent can be found; but, if we omit the article before δίκαιος with WH. and B, and translate aspectu et auditu justus with the Vulgate, we get rid of the difficulty. The objection to κανοσοῦσθαι is that it is elsewhere used only of fever, but the same objection might be made to the word καυματίζω, which also is commonly used of fever in profane Greek, but occurs four times in the N.T. (Mt. 13\(^6\), Mk. 4\(^6\), Ac. 16\(^6.9\)) of external heat, as in Epict. i. 6. 26 ἐν Ὁλυμπίᾳ δ' οὐ καυματίζεσθε; οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε; A similar explanation may be given of μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι in 1\(^{15}\). If we translate this with the A.V. 'to have these things in remembrance,' we give an unusual, but (as I have endeavoured to show in my note) not an impossible sense to the phrase. I think however that we may take it in its ordinary sense 'to practise the mention (or 'to make your mention') of these things after my death.' With regard to μελλῆσω (1\(^{12}\)), I agree with Dr. Field in thinking that it makes no sense here, and that it has probably been written by error for the rare μελῆσω 'I will take care to.' Two objections are taken to the phrase σπονδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες (1) that the verb regularly used in periphrasis with σπονδὴν is the middle ἐισφέρεσθαι, and (2) that, in the compound παρεισφέρω, παρά must mean 'secretly,' as in παρεισεδόθησαν Jude v. 4 and παρεισάξουσιν 2 P. 2\(^{21}\). As to the second objection, παρά in composition is not limited to the meaning 'secretly;' cf. Rom. 5\(^{20}\) νόμος παρεισήλθεν 'the law came in beside,' and see Schweighäuser Lex. Polyb. under παρεισώγω. Compare also the compounds παρεισβάλλω, παρεισδέχομαι, παρεισφέρω, παρεισχέω and other compounds quoted in my note on
2 P. 15. As to the voice, in Hellenistic Greek the force of the middle was very much forgotten, as we may see from the forms σπουδάσω and ἐπάγοντες quoted above (pp. xlviii f.) from this epistle; and the parallels there adduced show that even writers of the best period did not shrink from using the active, where later Atticists insisted on the middle. The objection made to φωνὴ 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 φωνὴ however only applies when it is contrasted with λόγος, as in Ignat. Rom. 2: by itself φωνὴ stands not only for the bare sound, but also for the significant utterance, as in the Homeric ὃς ἀρα φώνησεν, and even for the thought apart from the utterance, as in Plato Protag. 341 b τὴν Σιμωνίδου φωνὴν ‘the saying of Simonides,’ Epict. iv. 1. 32 (after a quotation from Diogenes) τοῦτ’ ἐστιν ἐλευθέρον ἀνδρὸς φωνῆ, Plut. Mor. 106 b ἐνταθάντα ἂν τις ἐλκύσει τὴν τοῦ Σωκράτους φωνὴν, εἰ συνεισενέγκαιμεν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τὰς ἀτυχίας ὡςτε διελέσθαι τὸ ἱσὸν ἔκαστον, ἀσμένους ἂν τὸν πλείους τὰς ἐαυτῶν λαβόντας ἀπελθεῖν. So Acts 1327 ἀγνοοῦσαίτες τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πάν τὰν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, Gen. 4516 διεβοήθη ἡ φωνὴ (R.V. ‘the fame thereof) εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φαραώ, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡκασιν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Ἰωσῆφ.

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. 1ν τυφλὸς ἐστιν μυωπάζων, the last word defines or limits the first: he who is without the virtues mentioned in 157 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 2:12.
The same characteristic is noted in Plato Rep. vi. 508 c ἀμβλυνότ-
tουσι καὶ ἑγγὺς φαίνονται τυφλῶν, but μυστάζων gives a more exact expression of a finer thought. A similar criticism has been passed upon what appears to me an even more effective phrase, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος (2:14). In the note I have compared the saying of Timaeus οὐκ ἐφη κόρας ἐν τοῖς δυμασίν ἐχειν, ἀλλὰ πόρνας, which gives the origin of μοιχαλίδος in 2 P.; and the quotation from Aeschylus, 'οculos inlecebrae voluptatisque plenos,' which supplies the remaining words ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστοὺς in the phrase of 2 P. Other words of extreme rarity are παραφρονία, ἐξέραμα, ταρταρόω, κυλισμός on which see explanatory notes. The first is an irregular derivative from παράφρων instead of the ordinary παραφρόνησις. It was probably used in 2 P. 2:18 for the sake of the assonance with παρανομία (ἐλεγξιν ἐσχεν ἱδίας παρανομιάς· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ... ἐκώλυσεν τήν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν). The second takes the place of ἔμετον in the quotation from Prov. 26:11. The verb ἐξεραώ is used by Aquila in translating the same word, and the cognates ἄπεραό, ἐξεραῶ are comparatively common. The simple verb ταρταρόω occurs elsewhere only in Amphilochius (A.D. 370), the compound κατα-
tαρταρόω is found in Sext. Empir. The substantive τάρταρος occurs more than once in the LXX. and in Philo and Josephus, and is not unfrequent in later Christian writings. κυλισμός is found in Theodotion's version of Prov. 2:18.

One reason for the use of these out-of-the-way forms may have been the desire of euphony, as παραφρονία to correspond with παρανομία. So ἐξεραμα gives a better rhythm than ἔμετον, and κυλισμόν than κύλισιν in 2:22, Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἵδιον ἐξέραμα, καὶ Ἶς λονσαμένη ἐις κυλισμὸν βορβώκου. So too the word ταρταρόσας contributes greatly to the fine rhythmical effect of 2:28. What should be our judgment as to this attention to rhythm? If it involves disregard for the thought, if it endangers exactness and clearness of statement, or weakens the expression of emotion, simply in order to gratify the ear, we must allow that, in matters of importance, such a want of seriousness would very much lower our opinion of the writer:

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

εἰς ἴδιον ἐξέραμα ἐπιστρέψας κύων,
λελουμένη ἣ ὡς εἰς κυλίσμα βορβώκου,

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

It may be worth while just to run through the rest of the words which are found in 2 P. and in no other book of the N.T. Some of these are common in ordinary Greek, such as ἀλωσις, ἀμαθης, ἀποφεύγω, ἀργεω, βόρβορος, βραδυτης, ἐκάστοτε, ἐπάγγελμα, ἐπόπτης, κατακλύζω, λίθη, μεγαλοπρεπης, μέγιστος, μίασμα, μνήμη, όμιχλη, παρανομία, πλαστός, σειρά, τοιόδοτε, ὦς, 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 ἐνκατοικεω, τολμητης. Others are fairly common in post-Aristotelian Greek, as ἄθεσμος (Diod. Plut. Macc.), ἀκατάπαυστος (Polyb. Plut.), διανογαζω, ἐκπαλαι, ἐντρυφαω, ἐξακολουθεω, ἐπίλυςις, ἱσότιμος, παρειαγαω, σπιλος, ταχινος, τεφρωο. Some bear an unusual sense, as ἀυχμηρός, 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 ἀμόμητος, 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; στηρομιμος 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 ἀστήρμετος, 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; δυνόητος Luc. and Diog. L.; ἔλεγξις LXX. and Philostr.: ἐμπαγμονη ἀπαγ. ; μιασμός found elsewhere only in Wisdom and 1 Macc., Test. Levi 17, Test. Benj. 8; ὀλίγως occurs only thrice elsewhere; ῥοιξιδον twice, see notes; ψευδοδιάσκελος apparently first used in 2 P.,
found in later writers. If we read θελήσω with Dr. Field in 2 P. 112, we have another extremely rare word to add to our list. We have also to take account of such rare constructions as ἀποφεύγω with the genitive in 14, though it is joined to the ordinary accusative in 218 and 220; βραδύνω followed by ἐπαγγελίας (39) and ἀκατάπαυστος followed by ἀμαρτίας (214), both being classified above under the 'genitive of the sphere.' The combination of positive and superlative in 14 τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα is rare but, as is shown in the note, not unparalleled in classical writings.

Looking back on this list, we must certainly allow that 2 P. has an unusual percentage of out-of-the-way expressions. Of these some appear to me to be justifiable and convenient, such as ἀκατάπαυστος, ἀστήρικτος, δυσνόητος, ἐλεγξις, μοιχαλίς, στηρυμός, ψευδοδιάσκαλος; 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. ῥοῖξηδὸν is a poetical word, which may be compared with the phrase ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος (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 ἀλλοτριοπλήσκος, ἀνάχυσις, ἀνεκλάθης, ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, δεδοξασμένη, ἐγκομβόμαι, ἐμπλοκή, ἐπερότημα, περίθεσις, συνπρεσβύτερος. And the same holds good of St. Paul and of the epistle to the Hebrews. If these latter neologisms cause no difficulty, why should those of 2 Peter? The truth is, each neologism must be tested and judged by itself. It is not the part of wisdom to refuse to listen to a prophet, or indeed to a poet or a philosopher, because he may not confine himself strictly to the language of common life.

What must, I think, be regarded as a fault is the vagueness and ambiguity which run through so much of the epistle, partly in the use of pronouns, of which I have spoken above, partly in particles, e.g. ὁς 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 ἐπιγνώσει in (12, 220), διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως (18), εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν (18) where it may be puzzling to catch the precise shade of meaning. If we read with WH. διὰ δόξης in 13, we have a succession of four phrases introduced by διὰ— διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλεσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, δι’ ὅν τὰ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνία φύσεως, and it is difficult to get a clear conception of this quadruple causal relation. In the next clause ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, the first ἐν has a local, the second a causative sense. Again, the sense varies in 113 δίκαιον ἠγούμεν, ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρεν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 212 ἐν ὅς ἀγνοούσιν βλασφημοῦσας, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται, 218 δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις τοὺς ἐν πλάμην ἀναστρεφομένους, 31 (ἐπιστολάς) ἐν ἂς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τῆς διάνοιας. The force of the repeated ἐν δέ in 157 is not clear. So the meaning of διὰ in 35.6, ὅρανοι ἠσάν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῇ ἔξ ὑδατος καὶ δι’ ὑδατος συνεστώσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ δι’ ὅν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδαιτ κατακλυσθεὶς ἀποκλεῖτο is not easy to make out. I think that in the former verse it is equivalent to μεταξὺ, in the latter the plural ὅν is so ambiguous that it seems necessary to read ὅν, referring to the preceding λόγῳ. In 117 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης we should probably read ἀπό. In 32 Blass thinks it necessary to insert διὰ after τῆς, ‘the Lord’s command given through the apostles.’ In 34 the repeated ἀπό gives two superior limits, the disappearance of the ‘fathers’ (itself a very ambiguous term) and the foundation of the world. The excessive and sometimes not very perspicuous use of prepositions and the predilection for long complicated sentences are not confined to 2 P. Both are marked features of 1 P. and of the Pauline epistles, especially those to the Romans and Ephesians.

There is much dispute as to the meaning of στοιχεῖα in 310.12, of ἄρετῆ in 13 and 15, and as to the force of ταχινῆ in 114 and 21, whether it should be translated ‘sudden’ or ‘speedy,’ also as to the allusion contained in the words καθὼς ὁ κύριος ἐδήλωσεν μοι. In 114 are we to take δεδώρηται as passive or middle? The latter is in accordance with δεδώρημένης in 13, the former makes better sense. In 13 is ὁ καλέσας to be understood of God or of Christ? How are we to understand τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς (316)? In 112, ἐν τῇ
παρουσή ἀληθεία should we read παραδοθείση with Spitta? In 2:18 how is τοῦς ἀλήγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφο-
μένους related to the words which follow (2:20), ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶσμα τοῦ κόσμου?

I must refer to my notes for the questions which have been raised as to the interpretation of 1:1 ἰδότιμον λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 2:1 τὸν ἀγοράσασαν αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, 2:10 δόξαις βλασφημοῦντες, 1:13 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, 1:19 ἐως ὅπερ ἡμέρα διανυσάτης καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη, 3:18 εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

Sometimes the difficulty lies in determining the construction, as in 2:18, δελεάξουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις: does σαρκὸς depend on the preceding or on the following word? In 3:5 λανθάνει αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας is τοῦτο subject to λανθάνει or object to θέλοντας? In 3:1 τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηροῦμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, on which of the participles does πυρὶ depend? The difficulties culminate in 3:10-12, which might seem to be intentionally left obscure. For an attempt to deal with them I must refer to my notes, but I will add a further remark about the remarkable antithetical phrase ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας. This evidently refers on to Balaam in 2:15, who was tempted to do wrong by the rewards offered by Balak, but afterwards missed those rewards on account of his failure to curse Israel. It must however have some connexion with 2:12, which speaks of brute beasts born for capture and destruction, and it would seem that the bait, which brings about their death, is compared to the pleasures of sin by which the libertines are tempted to their own ruin (cf. δελεάξουσιν in 2:14,15). The instinct of animals leads them to be caught and killed by other animals or by man. Man, the rational animal, definitely aiming at pleasure, wealth, or power, by doing what he knows to be wrong, is cheated of the reward of his iniquity, like Ahab or Macbeth, by the inevitable law of retribution: ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἀμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀμαρτία ἀποτελεσθείσα ἀποκεῖται θάνατον. The meaning of the words ἀδικία, ἀδικέω is a little forced for the sake of the antithesis.

I am far from saying that there is nothing to counterbalance the obscurities of our Epistle. Perhaps no part of it has given occasion for more discussion than the passage on prophecy, especially those words of deep meaning which Dr. Arnold has made the foundation of his lectures on the subject, πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς
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 18:4, 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: ‘Scripsit Petrus duas epistolas quae catholicae nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam’; and again in his letter to Hedibia (Epist. cxx. cap. 11): ‘Duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepant structuraque verborum. Ex quo intellegimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum sum usum interpretibus.’ That Peter made use of an interpreter is asserted by Papias, who reports (ap. Eus. H.E. iii. 39) that John the Elder used to say Μάρκος μὲν έρμηνευτής Πέτρου γενόμενος δόσα εμημόνευσε ἀκριβῶς ἐγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ υπὸ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεξικόν ἡ πραξεόντα: οὔτε γάρ ἦκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. So Irenaeus iii. 1 (after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome) Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητής καὶ έρμηνευτής Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ υπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. To the same effect Clement of Alexandria in the Sixth Book of the Hypotyposes (ap. Eus. H.E. ii. 15) says τοσοῦτο δ’ ἐπέλαμψε πρὸς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοαίας εὐσεβείας φέγγως, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσαπαξ ἰκανός ἔχειν ἄρκεισθαι ἀκοῇ μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλία, παρακλῆσες δὲ παντολαῖος Μάρκου, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον δυντα Πέτρου λιπαρήσαι ὡς ἄν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραθεοίμασα αὐτοῖς καταλείψαι (? καταλείψαι) διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερον τε ἀνείναι ἢ κατεγράφασην τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίας γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκου εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς (cf. 2 Pet. 15). 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 χώρις ύμων καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, is found also in 1 P 1². 2 P 1³ τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδιὰ δόξῃ may be compared with 1 P 1⁵ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ἡμᾶς ἀγιόν, ib. 2⁹ τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ βαθμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, ib. 2²¹, 3⁹ εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ib. 5¹⁰ ὁ καλέσας ύμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν. 2 P 1⁰ βεβαιῶν ύμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, cf. 1 P 1¹ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, 2⁴ παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτός, 2⁹ γένος ἐκλεκτών. 2 P 1² οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπων ἣνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ . . . ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀνθρωποί, cf. 1 P 2¹⁵ οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3¹⁷ εἰ θέλει τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 4² θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλουσιν βιῶσαι χρόνον, 4¹⁰ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2 P 2¹⁸ δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείας, ib. 2² πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, cf. 1 P 4³ πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις. 2 P 1¹⁶ ἐποτπᾶ τραγεδήν τοῦ ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος, cf. 1 P 2¹³ ἕνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἐργῶν ἐποτπευόμενον δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεοῦ, 3² ἐποτπευόμενως τὴν ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ύμῶν. 2 P 3¹⁴ ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι, 1 P 1¹⁹ ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος. 2 P 2²⁴ ἀκαταπαύστοις ἀμαρτίας, cf. 1 P 4⁴ πέπαυται ἀμαρτίας.

Other resemblances may be more summarily given.
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destpóntos 2 P (1) of God, 1 P (1) of man. δηλώ 2 P (1), 1 P (1).


diakíni 2 P (4), 1 P (2).

diá 2 P (3), 1 P (1).

δοξα 2 P (5), 1 P (10).

dólos 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

dúnamis 2 P (3), 1 P (2).

diákonos 2 P (3), 1 P (1).


eró 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

σχάτος 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

ἐυρίσκωμαι 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

eîrênia 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

eîdios 2 P (7), 1 P (2).

ίσχυς 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

καθός 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

καλέω 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

κρίτης 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

κοινώνς 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

κομίζωμαι 2 P (1) (?), 1 P (2).

κόσμος 2 P (5), 1 P (3).

κριτίων 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

κρίμα 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

κτίσις 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

λαλέω 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

λαμβάνω 2 P (2), 1 P (2).

λόγος 2 P (4), 1 P (7).

μακροθυμία 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

οίδα 2 P (3), 1 P (2).

ός 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

παραδίδωμι 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

παρέχω 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

πειρασμός 2 P (1), 1 P (2).

πλάτος 2 P (2), 1 P (5).

πλανάμαι 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

πληθύνω 2 P (1), 1 P (1). πνεύμα 2 P (1), 1 P (8).

πορεύομαι 2 P (2), 1 P (3).

ποτέ 2 P (2), 1 P (3).

πού 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

προγνώσκω 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

προφήτης 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

πρώτον 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

πύρ 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

ρήμα 2 P (1), 1 P (2).

σάρξ 2 P (2), 1 P (7).

σκότος 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

στηρίζω 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

συμβαίνω 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

σωτηρία 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

τέκνα 2 P (1), 1 P (2).

τιμή 2 P (1), 1 P (3).

τίμιος 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

ὑδρ 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

νίδος 2 P (1), 1 P (1).

φάινω act. 2 P (1), m. 1 P (1).

φέρομαι 2 P (4), 1 P (1).

φιλαδελφία 2 P (2), 1 P (1).

χάρις 2 P (2), 1 P (10).

TOTAL 100.

Words used in 1 P not in 2 P.\(^1\)

ἀγαθός (7), ἀγαθοτοιεῖν (4), *ἀγαθοτοιεῖα (1), *ἀγαθοτοιοῦσ (1),

ἀγαλλιαίω (3), ἀγαλίζω (1), ἀγαμισός (1), ἀγνίζω (1), ἀγνύς (1), ἀγνοία (1), ἀγνωσία (1), *ἀδελφότης (2), ἀδίκως (1), *ἀδελφός (1), ἀδέμιτος (1), ἀλμα (2), *αισχροκερδός (1), αἰσχύνομαι (1),

αιτέω (1), ἀκρογωνιαῖος (1), ἀλληλων (4), *ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπος

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

άγονεω (1), ἀγοράζω (1), ἀδικέω (1), ἀδικία (2), *ἀδεσμος (2), ἀφεσις (1), ἀκαρπος (1), *ἀκατάπαντος (1), ἀκόη (1), ἀκούω (1), ἀλογος (1), *ἀλωσις (1), *ἀμαθής (1), ἀμάρτημα (1), *ἀμώμητος (1),
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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 16, ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν διάμαχον καὶ παρουσίαν, i.e. it formed the subject of the Apostles' teaching; in 3 it is said that in the last days scoffers shall appear who will make a mock of the promised Advent, asking τὸν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; and in 3 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 57, 8, in 1 Joh. 28, 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 ἀποκάλυψις for the Advent in 17 that the trial of your faith may be found for praise and honour and glory ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; in 418, where it is said that the joy of sharing in the sufferings of Christ leads on to the joy ἐν τῇ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; in 13 ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκάλυψει 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. 18, 'kept through the power of God' εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθήναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 51 τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός. 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, ἀποκάλυψις is the finer and richer phrase, implying, in Hort’s words (on 1 P 16), that ‘Revelation is always in the strictest sense an unveiling of what already exists, not the coming into existence of that which is said to be revealed.’ If 2 P preceded 1 P, we might suppose that the writer subsequently adopted the superior phrase, but, as we shall see, the facts of the case are decidedly in favour of the priority of 1 P.

Another word used for the Second Advent with much the same force as ἀποκάλυπτω is φανερόω in 1 P 54 φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμνου κομιείσθε τῶν ἀμαράντινων τῆς δόξης στέφανον. It is also used of the First Advent in 1 P 120.

It is perhaps worth noting that while ἀγαθός, ἀγαθοτοῖος, ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ἀγαθοποιία, and κακός, κακία, κακῶς, κακοποιός, κακοποιεῖν 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 ἄγιος, δίκαιος δικαιοσύνη, ἀλευθερία, μακροθυμία, γνώσις. Found in 2 P only are εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, ἐγκράτεια, ἐπίγνωσις, μετάνοια, σοφία, στηριγμός. Found only in 1 P are ἄγιος, ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀγαλλιάδωμαι, ἐπιεικής, εὐσπλαγχνος, εὐλογεῖ, ἡσύχιος, καλός, νήφω, ὀμόφων, πιστός, πιστεύω, πνευματικός, πραῖς, πραύτης, προθύμως, στερεός τῇ πίστει, συμπαθής, σωφρονεῖ, συνείδησις ἀγαθή, ταπεινός, ταπεινόφρον, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ὑπακοή, ὑποτάσσομαι, φόβος, χαίρω, χαρά, χάρισμα, χρηστός, Χριστιανός. Words denoting bad qualities found in both are ἀμαρτάω, ἀμαρτία, ἀδικος, ἀσεβής, ἀσέλγεια, βλασφημεῖν, ἐπιθυμία, σάρξ. Found in 2 P only are ἄγνως, ἀδικία, ἀδίκειος, ἀθέσμος, ἀφρεσίς, ἀμαθής, ἀμάρτημα, ἀνόμος, ἀπάτη, ἀπόλεια, ἀργός, ἀστήρικτος, αὐθαίδης, βλάσφημος, ἐμπαιγμόν, ἐμπαίκτης, μυστάξων, παρανομία, παραφρονία, πλεονεξία, τολμητής, τρυφή, ἐντυφώμα, τυφλός, θηράρα. Found in 1 P only are ἅμων, ἅμωμα, ἅματος, ἅματον, ἅμαρτολός, ἅλλοτροσπείσκοπος, αἰχμοκερδός, ἄσωτία, γόγγυρος, εἰδωλολατρία, ἐπηρεάσθω, καταλαλέω, ἅλαλία, κερδαίνω, κῶμος, λοιδορέω, -ρία, λυπέω, οἰνοφλυγία, πότος, πρόσκομμα, προσκόπτω, πτύσσω, ρύπος, σαρκικός, σκάνδαλον, σκολιός, ταράσσω, υπερήφανος, υπόκρισις, φθόνος, φωνεύς. 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 σῦν, such as συμπαθής, συνειδήσις, συνεκλεκτός, συνκληρονόμος, συνοικεῖος, συνοχηματίζομαι, συν-
πρεσβύτερος, συντρέχω, while 2 P has only συμπάγω, συνενωχέομαι and συνιστήμι, 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 ἀθεσμος 2 P for ἀθέμιτος 1 P; ἐξακολουθεῖω 2 P for ἐπικολουθεῖω 1 P; ἐπιχορηγεῖω 2 P for χορηγεῖω 1 P; ἡγεῖμαι 2 P for λογίζομαι 1 P; ἡμέρα 2 P for ἡμέρα, καιρός, and χρόνος 1 P; ἀγοράζω 2 P for λυτρόωμαι 1 P; ἀντ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως 2 P with Mk. for πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου 1 P with Paul; ἐπόπτης 2 P for μάρτυς 1 P; ὑπόδειγμα 2 P for ὑπόγραμμος 1 P;  αἱ πάλαι ἀμαρτίαι 2 P for αἱ πρότερον ἐπιθυμία 1 P; ἄπαστός 2 P for  ποιῶς 1 P; πταῖω 2 P for προσκόπτω 1 P. Words significative of a difference of mind and feeling are ἐλπίς and ἐλπίζω in 1 P, which are inadequately represented by ὑπομονή and προσδοκάω in 2 P; as also words and phrases referring to the pattern set before us in the earthly life of Christ, to His atoning sacrifice, His visit to the spirits in prison, His resurrection and ascension, His throne of glory in heaven. Such phrases are ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος 1 P 12, τίμιον ἁμα ὡς ἁμοῦ ἁμόμον 119, ἐπαθεῖ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν 1 P 21, περὶ ἀμαρτίων ἀπέθανεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἄδικον 318, παθήματα (cf. especially 118, 21-25, 318, 41, 13, 51), ἀνίστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν 13, cf. 121 ὁ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δοῦσ, 321 δι’ ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 332 ὁ ἔστω ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ πορευθεῖς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγήματοι αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἔξωσόν ὑμᾶς.

Sometimes we have particular scenes in our Lord's life, or sayings of His called up before us. Thus the phrase ἀναξιώσα­μενοι τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας (113) reminds us of Lk. 1235 ἐστοσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὁσφύες περεξωσυμέναι, while that most picturesque and remarkable phrase ἐγκομβώσασθε ταπεινοφρο­σύνη (55) reminds us of Christ's girding himself before washing the feet of His disciples (Joh. 135) and of His injunction to them to follow His example (1314). The word ἀρχιπαῖρι, with its accompaniments, ποιμαῖνω, ποιμήν, ποιμνιον, πρόβατα, reminds us of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Good Shepherd, and of the charge to Peter 'ποίμαινε τὰ προβατία μου. Perhaps αὐτὸς στηρίζει in 1 P 510, and the cognate words in 2 P may have a reference to another charge in Lk. 2232, στήμιον τούς ἀδελφοὺς. And the phrase ὅν οὐκ ἰδώντες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς ὅν ἀρτι
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μη ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάτε (1 P 1ρ) naturally recalls the words addressed to Thomas, ὅτι ἐώρακας με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἱδόντες καὶ πιστεύοντες. When we read ὑποτάγητε τάση ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσει διὰ τὸν Κύριον . . . ως Θεοῦ δοῦλοι (1 P 2ρ-3ρ), our thoughts naturally go back to the rule laid down by the Master in Mt. 17 24, as to the payment of the half-shekel, and the words in Mt. 22 21, ‘Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.’ So when we read 1 P 5ρ νήψατε, γρηγορῶσατε, ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος περιπατεῖ, ἐξήτων τινα καταπεί, we naturally think of our Lord’s warnings in Lk. 22 31 and in Mt. 26 41, ‘Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.’

The words κλήρος, κληρονομέω, κληρονομία (1 P 1ρ), συνκληρονόμωσι bring to our minds Mt. 19 29 ζωὴν αἰωνίου κληρονομήσει, along with 5ρ and 25ρ. So ἀναγεννήσας 1 P 1ρ, ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτής, ἀλλὰ ἀφθαρτον 1 P 12ρ, and ὡς ἀρτιγεύνητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε 1 P 2ρ, suggest a reminiscence of the words recorded in Joh. 1 ρ οὐκ ἔσχε οἱ γεγεννημένοι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀμαρτήσαντες σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννηθῆσαν, and 3ρ ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἁνοθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ foll., taken with 1 Joh. 3ρ πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι στέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, and Lk. 18 17 ὡς ἐὰν μὴ δέχηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν. 1 P 4ρ ἐὰν ὀνειδίκεσθε ἐν ὑποματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι reminds us of Mt. 511 μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς . . . ἐνεκεν ἐμοί (cf. 102ρ, 1929); 1 P 16 ὅ ἀγαλλιάζῃ ὅλους λυπηθέντες κ.τ.λ. of Mt. 512 χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθός πολὺς ἐν τοῖς ζωραίοις. 4ρ ὁ πάχυσα ταῦτα τὸ βλέμα τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστὸ κτίσθη παρατίθεσθωσαν τὰς φυσιάς, recalls Lk. 2346 Πάτερ, εἰς χειρῶς σοι παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. So 314 μηδὲ παραχθῆτε recalls Joh. 1ρ 27. 410 ἐκαστός ὅς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, ὅς καλὸς οἰκονόμοι recalls Lk. 124ρ τὰς ἐστιν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, and the Parable of the Talents. When Peter tells his readers that ‘if they are buffeted for doing well, when they take it patiently, this is pleasing to God’ (23ρ), 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. 1466? Again 5ρ μὴ ὡς κατακυριεύσατε τῶν κλήρων recalls Mt. 2025 ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύσῃ αὐτῶν . . . οὐχ οὗτος ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν. So 212 ἵνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἐργῶν ἐποπτεύεσθαι διὸ ἀναζωσι τὸν Θεοῦ seems
to be a reminiscence of Mt. 5\textsuperscript{16} ὁὐτὸς λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἰδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοκάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: 1\textsuperscript{22} ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε, of Joh. 13\textsuperscript{34}, 15\textsuperscript{12}: 1\textsuperscript{10} περὶ ἂς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξιπραύνησαι προφήται, of Mt. 13\textsuperscript{17}.

The quotation from Ps. 118\textsuperscript{22} in 1 P 2\textsuperscript{4-6} was also used by our Lord (Mt. 21\textsuperscript{42}), who specially applied the word ἀποδοκιμάζω to his own treatment by the Jews, after Peter had made his great confession (Mk. 8\textsuperscript{31}); and by Peter himself in Acts 4\textsuperscript{11}. The thought of the living stones which are to be joined to the corner stone and built up into the spiritual temple (1 P 2\textsuperscript{4} foll.) must have been associated in the mind of the Apostle with the commission laid upon him by the Lord in the name Πέτρος (Mt. 16\textsuperscript{18}).

Similarly the quotation from Isa. 8\textsuperscript{14} in 1 P 2\textsuperscript{8} must have been connected in the writer's mind with many sayings of Christ; cf. Mt. 11\textsuperscript{6}, Mk. 14\textsuperscript{27}, Joh. 6\textsuperscript{61}. Also the quotation from Lev. 11\textsuperscript{44} in 1 P 1\textsuperscript{8} as compared with Mt. 5\textsuperscript{48}; that from Isa. 10\textsuperscript{3} in 1 P 2\textsuperscript{12} ἐν ἡμέρα ἔπισκοπῆς compared with Lk. 19\textsuperscript{44}; that from Ps. 110\textsuperscript{5} in 1 P. 3\textsuperscript{22} compared with Mt. 22\textsuperscript{44}, 26\textsuperscript{84} and Acts 2\textsuperscript{34}.

It may be said that we have similar reminiscences in 2 P., such as the account of the Transfiguration, of which the writer was a witness on the holy Mount (1\textsuperscript{16-18}) and the use of the words ἔξοδος and σκέψαμα in the preceding verses (1\textsuperscript{13,15}) reminding us of words then spoken; the warning as to his own approaching death (1\textsuperscript{14}); the stealthy intrusion of false prophets (2\textsuperscript{1}, cf. Mt. 7\textsuperscript{15}, 24\textsuperscript{11}), denying their Lord (2\textsuperscript{1}, cf. Mt. 10\textsuperscript{33}); the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (2\textsuperscript{20}, cf. Mt. 12\textsuperscript{45}); ἦξετ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης (3\textsuperscript{10}, cf. Mt. 24\textsuperscript{43-44}). But these references are few and of a far less intimate nature than those in P. They are chiefly connected (as are the other allusions to our Lord) with His power and majesty (δύναμις and μεγαλειώτης 1\textsuperscript{16}), His judgment of sinners (2\textsuperscript{1,3,12,17}), the terrors of His second coming (3\textsuperscript{7,10-12}), the danger of falling away (2\textsuperscript{20,21}); though their severity is modified, as compared with that of St. Jude, by the announcement of His long-suffering (3\textsuperscript{15}), and of His care for the righteous (2\textsuperscript{9}). How different is the tone in which our Lord is spoken of in 1 P. What a warmth and intensity of feeling is shown throughout the whole epistle, especially in such passages as 1\textsuperscript{8} 'Whom, not having seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory' (χαρᾶ ἀνεκλαλήτω
Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things from your vain manner of life, but with precious blood, as of a lamb slain without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ; 1 Peter 1:18

Love one another from the heart fervently; 1 Peter 2:2

As new-born babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation; if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious; 1 Peter 2:2

Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light; 1 Peter 2:9

Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; 1 Peter 2:11

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; 1 Peter 4:12

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; 1 Peter 4:12

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
2P: thoughtful and interesting as it is, it lacks that intense sympathy, that flame of love, which marks 1P. No doubt these feelings were especially called out by the persecutions under which the readers of 1P were suffering, while 2P 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 2P where it differs from 1P. We find, for instance, such expressions as ὁδὸς ἀληθείας, ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης, εὐθεία ὁδὸς, the Gospel is spoken of as the ἑντολὴ τοῦ κυρίου, ἡ παραδοθεῖσα ἁγία ἑντολή; ἀπώλεια occurs five times, ἀπόλλυμι twice; the warning against forgetfulness is often repeated, as in 19·12·13·16·31 (the last of which, διεγείρω ὕμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν ἐκλεκτὴν διάνοιαν, may be contrasted with 1P 13, ἀναξιωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες τελεῖως ἐλπίσατε), also in 2P 3·8. I have before referred to the "reverential periphrases" to be found in 2P, as θεία φύσις, θεία δύναμις, μεγαλειότης, μεγαλοπρέπης δόξα, κυριότης; and to the frequent recurrence of ἐπιγνώσις, ἐπιγνώσκω used especially of our knowledge of God. These things may be good, but they lack the personal tie that marks the first epistle, the devoted affection which binds the disciple to his Master and the penitent to his Saviour, as well as the tender sympathy shown not merely for his own countrymen, but for churches which lay outside his own special sphere of work. I venture to think that the distinction which Dr. Bigg draws between the "disciplinarian" Peter and the "mystic" Paul would be more appropriate if used to contrast James or 2P with 1P. Another difference between the two epistles is the amount of space given in 1P, as in Eph. 5·22·24·6·8, Rom. 13·18, 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 1P and 2P. 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 2P 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 (145); their tried faith will eventually redound to praise and honour and glory in the revelation of Jesus Christ (17); at the revelation of the glory of Jesus Christ they will rejoice with exceeding joy (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 (45,15).

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 (34,8).

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 310–21, 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 (δ καὶ ύμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει), even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (ἐπερώτημα) of a good conscience toward God.' We will first notice some points of connexion with 2 P. The μακροθυμία of God, which is here
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 39.15. The object of this μακροθυμία is to give oppor-
tunity 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 Noah the 8th in
2 P 25. The former writer takes the deliverance from the flood
by means of the Ark sailing over the waters to be typical of the
deliverance from final condemnation of all who were united with
Christ by the baptism of the Spirit. The same typical character
is ascribed to it in Mt. 2437-39 ὃσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Ναοῦ, οὗτος
ἐσται ἡ παροῦσια τοῦ νῦν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου. See also the comparison
of the cloud and the sea to baptism in 1 Cor. 10 1, 2 ὡς τοῦ Μωταῖον ἐβαπτίζαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ
ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. In this last passage there appears to be a play on
the meaning of the preposition διά, which is used first of the
passage through the Red Sea, and then suggests the use of water
in baptism; so 1 P speaks of the Ark, εἰς ἑν ὁκτὼ ψυχαὶ
dιεσώθησαν δὴ ὕδατος, translated in R.V. mg. 'into which eight
souls were brought safely through water.' This suits the allegorical
reference to the Church, 'into the shelter of which they were
brought by baptism.' The text of the R.V. however has 'wherein
eight souls were saved through water,' taking εἰς in its later sense,
as equivalent to ἐν (see Blass, p. 122). The question then arises,
How are we to understand δὴ ὕδατος in its application to the
Flood? Some take it of 'escaping through the rains and the
flood which had already begun before Noah got to the Ark; but
this contradicts the account in Gen. 74,5,10 where it 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
μεταξὺ, which it seems to bear in 2 P 35, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δὴ ὕδατος
συνεστόσα. 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. 10:1 διὰ is strictly 'in the midst of the sea' which rose up as a wall on one side and on the other. So in 1 P δι' θάραξιν would refer to the ark threatened by waters above (the windows of heaven) and below (the fountains of the great deep), between which it rode secure. Allegory is not particular as to a word being understood in the same sense in the type and in the antitype.

Whence did the writer obtain this remarkable and most significant story of the Gospel being preached not only to those who perished in the Flood (3:20) but also to the dead generally (4:6)? Probably the reference to those who were lost in the Deluge is due to P's allegorical treatment of the story of the Ark. If that is a type of the Church, then those who were not in the Ark are a type of those who are outside of the Church. In Acts 2:27, 31, Peter applies to our Lord the words of Ps. 16, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades.' And we cannot doubt that the subject must have been much in the thoughts of the disciples. It seems to me that the most natural explanation of its appearance here is that it was communicated to Peter by our Lord Himself, perhaps with some injunction as to its being kept secret for the present, such as follows the account of the Transfiguration and the confession of Peter in Mt. 16:20. Other early allusions to the 'Harrowing of Hell' are Test. Levi. 4, where amongst other accompaniments of the Judgment Day—πάσης κτίσεως κλονομομένης καὶ ὁμοίως πνευμάτων πηκομένων—we read τού ἀκόμη σκυλευμένου ῥήτῳ τῷ πάθει τοῦ υψίστου; perhaps Mt. 27:52: πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκομιμένων ἄγιων ἐγήρθησαν, καὶ ἐξελθόντες εκ τῶν μυθεμένων μετὰ τὴν ἐγερσαν αὐτοῦ εἰσήλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοὶ; 1 certainly Ignat. Magn. ix. ὦ (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) οἱ προφῆται μαθηται δότες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτῶν προσεδόκων. καὶ διὰ τούτο, ἐν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρών ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν, where Lightfoot says: 'Here our Lord is assumed to have visited the souls of the patriarchs and prophets in Hades, to have taught them the truths of the Gospel, and to have raised them either to paradise or to heaven. . . . This belief appears in various forms in early Christian writers. Justin Dial.

1 Eusebius connects this with the Descent of Christ in his Demonstr. Evang. x. 8. 64 ὁ μὲν γάρ ἐπὶ σωτηρία τῶν ἐν θάνοι παρῆ, ἐκ μικροῦ αἰῶνος τῆς θρίσκων αὐτοῦ περιενευθέντων, καὶ κατήργη γε θυρας χαλκας συντεθέντων. . . καὶ τῶν πρώτων δειμμάτων ἐδώκαν εἰςθερέους ἀνήσαν. ὡς καὶ γέγονεν, ὅτε πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκομιμένων ἄγιων ἀναστάτα συνεισήλθον αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν ἀληθῶς ἀγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πόλιν.
72 (p. 298) quotes a passage from Jeremiah, ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεός ἀπὸ (αλ. ὁ ἅγιος) Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. He says that the Jews had cut out this passage from their copies; and it does not appear in the extant MSS. of the LXX. ... Irenaeus quotes it several times. Even Marcion accepted the descent of Christ into Hades, though (unless he is misrepresented) he maintained that the righteous men and prophets under the old dispensation, as being subjects of the Demiurge, refused to listen to His preaching, and that only such persons as Cain ... listened and were saved.'

Another allusion is to be found in the Gospel of Peter probably written before A.D. 150. It occurs in § 10, ed. Robinson and James 1892, (The soldiers watching at the tomb) φωνῆς ἤκουον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λεγούσης 'Εκήρυξας τοῖς κοιμημένοις; καὶ ὑπακοὴ ἤκουετο ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅτι Ναζ.

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 2:3 appears also in 2 P 3:18, which may be compared with Eph. 4:15 and Col. 2:19. The reference to angels in 1 P 1:12, where it is said of the mysteries of the Gospel, may be compared with those in 2 P 2:4, áγγελοι ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 211 áγγελοι ἱσχύí καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρονται κατ’ αὐτῶν βλάσφη-μον κρίσιν, in all of which the word áγγελος is anarthrous. In 2 P 2:4 the reference is to fallen angels, who appear to be also referred to under the name δόξαι in 2 P 2:10.

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

where the words spaced are quoted exactly from Isa. 4046.

23 εἰ δὲ γενεῦσαι σοθέν τι χρηστός ὁ Κύριος, from Ps. 348

γενεῦσαθε καὶ Ιδετε ὅτι κ.τ.λ. 24, 6, 7, Λίθων ζοντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀπὸ δεδοκιμασμένου, παρά δὲ Θεό έκλεκτὸν ...

... ἵδον τίθημεν ἐν Σιὼν Λίθων ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογνωμαιον ἐντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὗ μῆ καταίσχυν θῇ. Ὑμὶν οὖν ή τιμή τοὺς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστούσιν δὲ λίθως ὑπὸ ἀπεδοκιμασάν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴ γονίας, from Ps. 11622 Λίθων ὑπὸ ἀπεδοκιμασάν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴ γονίας, and Isa. 2818 ἵδον Βασιλείου ίεράτευμα, ἐθνος ἀγνοει, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς έξαγειλίτη, from Isa. 43, 21 ποτίσαι τὸ γενὸς μου τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν, λαὸς μου ὑπὸ περιποίησιν τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι, Exod. 195, 6 ἔσεσθε μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ... βασιλείου ίεράτευμα καὶ έθνος ἀγνοι, ib. 23, 22 Deut. 7. 210 οὶ ποτε ο ν λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οὶ οὖν ήλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἔλεηθέντες from Hos. 16, 9 κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Οὐκ ἠλεημένη ... κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Οὐ λαὸς μου, ib. 21 εἰπατε τῷ ἄδελφῳ ύμῶν Λαὸς μου, καὶ τῇ ἄδελφῃ ύμῶν Ἡλεημένη, ib. ν. 28. 211 παρακλῶ όσο παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, from Ps. 3912 πάροικος ἐγὼ εἰμί ἐν τῇ ἡγεὶ καὶ παρεπιδήμῳ καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου. 212 εν ἡ μερα επισκοπής, from Isa. 10. 217 τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν Θεὸν καὶ βασιλεία, 222 δς ἀμαρτιαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, quoted exactly from Isa. 539, 249 τὰς ἀμαρτιας ύμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ... οὕτω καὶ θέλω τινὶ ἄθετη, from Isa. 5312 αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν, ib. v. 5 τῷ μόλυπτῳ αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν. 225 ἢτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα τράχων ἐπιλαμβηθησαν, from Prov. 325 σάρμα ὑπέκουν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, κύριον αὐτῶν καλοῦσα, from Gen. 18. 34 ημιφοβοῦμεν αἰ μιδεμιαν περὶ ης ν, from Prov. 325 οὐ φοβηθήσητε πτοίσιν ἐπελθοῦσαν. 3112 ο γὰρ θέλων ἦν ἄγα πάνκαι ἰδεῖν
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η μέρας ἀγαθὸς πανσάτω τὴν γνῶσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ἡμὲν τοῦ μή λαλῆσαι δόλου, ἐκκληνάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἁγαθῶν, ἥμησιάς ἐὰν ἔρημην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν. ὡς ὁ θαλμοὶ Κύριον ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ διὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς δέσιν αὐτῶν, πρὸς ωποῦν δὲ Κύριον ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά, ἀπὸ Ps. 34:12-16 τίς ἐστίν ἄνθρωπος ο θέλων σωθήναι, ἁγαθοὶ ἡμέραι ίδεῖν ἁγαθίας (where the reading ἁγαθῶν should perhaps be restored in 1 P.).

The remainder of the quotation is exact, except that the original has the 2nd instead of the 3rd person. 31-15 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθήσει μὴ δὲ ταραχθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε, from Isa. 8:12-13 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσει οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε. Κύριον αὐτῶν ἀγιάσατε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσται σοὺ φόβος. 32 δὲ ἐστίν ἐν δεξίᾳ Θεοῦ, from Ps. 110:1 εἰπέν ο Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθον ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. 43 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἀμαρτησίων from Prov. 10:12 ‘Love covereth all transgressions’ (R.V.), where LXX. has τοὺς μὴ φιλοεικόνυτας καλύπτει τιλία. 44 εἰ δνειδίξεσθε...μακάριοι, ὡς...τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα εφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀναπηρεταί. Hort reckons this as a quotation from Ps. 89:50, but the connexion is very slight. It seems to me to be a distinct quotation from Mt. 5:31; see above, p. lxxvii. For the latter part of the verse Hort compares Isa. 11:2 ἀναπαύσεται επ’ αὐτὸν πνεύμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 47 καὶ ἐστίν αὐτός ἐκ τοῦ κρίμα αὐτὸς τοῦ ὑμᾶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, from Ezek. 9:7 ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἀφέσατο...καὶ εἰπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μιᾶσε τον ὑμᾶς. 48 εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἁσβῆς καὶ ἀμαρτωλὸς τοῦ φανεῖται; quoted exactly from Prov. 11:31. 55 Θεὸς ὑπὲρφήνανος ἀντιτάσειαν, ταπεινοὶς δὲ ἀδισώσιν χάριν, from Prov. 34 with the change of Κύριος into Θεοῦ. 57 τὴν μερίμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρρήψαντες ἐπὶ αὐτὸν, ὥστι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν, from Ps. 55:22 ἐπιρρήζουν ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μερίμναν σου, καὶ αὐτὸς σε διαθέσει.

Perhaps we may add to these, as probably in the mind of the writer, 12 εἰρήνη πνεῦμα ἡ θυνθεὶς, from Dan. 4:1 (331) and 6:25. 14 ἀφθαρτοὺς καὶ ἀμιαντοὺς καὶ ἀμαραντοὺς: ‘These three words are all absent from the LXX. and are all found in Wisdom (121, 131, 42, 820, 612)’ Hort. 17 ἓνα τὸ δοκὶμον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίον τοῦ ἀπολυμένου, διὰ τοῦ ὑπὸ δὲ δοκιμαζόμενον εὐρέθη εἰς ἕπαυνον, from Zech. 13:9 πυρῶσω αὐτοὺς ὡς πυροῦται τὸ ἀγρύριον, καὶ δοκιμῶ
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autōν ὃς δοκιμάζεται τὸ χρυσὸν. 110-112 περὶ ἦς σωτηρίας ἐξ ἐξ τῆς σα πο...προφήται... ἔρανωντες εἰς τίνα... καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸ μαρτυροῦμεν τὰ ἐίς Ἑρίστον πάντα μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας,... εἰς ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι, from Dan. 813-15, 924-26, 126-2, Isa. 5213-5312, 117 κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστον ἔργον, from Ps. 6212 σύν ἀποδόσεις ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. 118 see above, and add Ps. 408. 119 ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμον, from Lev. 2221 ἄμωμον ἦσσαι εἰσδεκτόν, πᾶς μώμος οὐκ ἦσσαι ἐν αὐτῷ. 319, 20, from Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 417 see above, and add Jer. 25 (32)29 ἐν πόλει ἐν Ἰ ὀνομάζη ἐτὸν ὀνομά μου ἐπὶ αὐτὴν ἐγὼ ἄρχομαι κακόσα. 419 πιστὴ κτίστῃ παρατεθέωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς, from Ps. 315 εἰς χειρὰς σου παραθέσομαι τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐλυτρώσω με Κύριε ὁ Θεός τῆς ἀληθείας. 58 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος... περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπείνων, from Job. 17 ἀποκριθηκεῖ ὁ διάβολος εἰς ἐπειλεθήθων τῆν γῆν καὶ ἐμπεριπτάθησας τὴν ὑπὸ οὐρανὸν πάρεμι, ib. 2a.

In 2 P Hort reckons the following as quotations: 22 δι' ὦς ἢ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημείται ἐν τοῖς ἠθενεῖσι. 222 κύων ἐπιστρέφασι ἐπὶ τὸ διὸ ἐρμα, from Prov. 2611 ὄσπερ κύων ὡστ' ἐπέλθη ἐπὶ τὸν ἐαυτοῦ ἐμετούν καὶ μυστικῶς γένεται, οὕτως ἠφον τῇ ἐαυτοῦ κακία ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἀμαρτιάν. 38 μία ἡ μέρα παρὰ Κύριον ὡς χιλιά δὲ ἡ, καὶ χίλια ἐκτὰ ὡς ἡμέρα μία, from Ps. 904 χίλια ἐκτὰ ἐν ὑφαλλοίς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἕχθες ὑπὸ διήλθε. 312 οὐ ῥανὸν πυροῦμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεία καυσοῦμενα τῇ κετα, from Isa. 34 καὶ ταχιστῶν πᾶσαι αἰ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ἐλυγησομαι ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρα πεσεῖται. 313 καὶ οὐ ὄσ ὡστ' ὦ ῥανὸν οὐ καὶ γ α ᾿Ο οὐ καί ὄσ δε ἐπροδοκέμων, from Isa. 6517 ἦσσαι γὰρ οἶνος καυστὸς καὶ ὡς γῆ καινή, ib. 6622. Perhaps we may add the following: 12 τύφλος ἐστίν μωσπάζων, compared with Isa. 5910 ὡς οὐχ ὑπαρχόντων ὑφαλλοίς ἡμαζέοσαι. 119 τὸ λόγῳ ὑποστείλειν ὁ λόγῳ τρίτῳ ἐν αὐτῷ νομὸν τοῖς σοῦ, 2 Esdras 1242 tu nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis... sicut lucerna in loco obscuro. 2a ἦν ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. Ps. 11990. 2a σειράς ἐκφονοῦσαν παραπόζειν εἰς κρίσιν προσεύμονοι, cf. Wisdom 1716 μιά ἀλλείπει σκότους πάντες ἐδέθησαν. 25 saving of Noah, cf. Gen. chapters 6 and 7. 26 πολείς Σὸδόμων καὶ Γομόρραι τρόπος σα καταστροφῆ ἤ κατέκρυνεν, ὡς...
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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. βιώσαι (4), found also in Aristotle and Plutarch, instead of the classical βιώναι. The fut. pass. κερδηθήσονται is found only in 1 P 3. κερδήσω occurs in James 4, ἐμπροφευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν (where see my note), and the aor. ἐκέρδησα is common in the N.T. The form κερδάνω (WH.) or κερδάναι (Blass) occurs after ἐνα in 1 Cor. 9. 1 P has three examples of the form ἐγενήθην (15, 27, 36). It keeps the classical προσαγαγὴ in 3 as contrasted with ἐπάξας in 2 P 25. In 2 WH. (Introduction § 410, App. p. 166), read φιμοῖν with Σ comparing κατασκευοῖν read by BD in Mt. 13, by B in Mk. 13, and ἀποτεκατοῖν read by BD in Heb. 7, while Ti. Treg. read φιμοῖν 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 articlar phrase, combined with the frequent use of the anarthrous
noun. Of the former we have examples in 1 P 15 toûs ēn dýnàmêî Theôu frourourêmeon, 110 oí peri tís eis ùmâs xârîtos profohtesûscantes, 114 tâís próteron ēn tê ángwoia ùmôn épisthêmiai, 3â tîn ēn fôbôf ãngwîn ánanstrophîn ùmôn, 3â ò ëxwthn èmplokhês triçwv kai periðhêsèsw xwoiôn õi ènðûsewos ìmâtwos kósmos, 3â tîn ãgâðhîn ēn Xristôf ánanstrophîn, 4â òs toû mîkûtî anðrâwton épisthêmiaî álîlêmaitî Thêou tôu ëpîlîopon ēn sârkî ëiðûsai xhôvôn, 5â ó kai tôi thê melloûsîs àpokalûpsethai dözîs koînovos, 5â tôu àmarañtînou tôs dözîs stêfânou, 5â tô tê kôsmôf ùmôn àdêlfothî. Of the latter in 1ç ân ògiasmôf pînèûmatos, eis pántiçmôn àmîmatos, 1ç diî anastásèsws 'Hsou Xristôu ëk nêkrôn, 1ç ēn dûnàmêî Theôu, ìn kairôf èsgâhtî, 17 ân àpokalûpseî 'Hsou, 112 (èvagnelîsâmênoi) ùmâs pînèûmati ãgîfî âpôstalênti âp' ouðarouî, 112 àp katóbâlêî kôsmou, 122 diî lânîn ãwîntos Thêou kai mënovîtos, 3âî oû sârkîs àpôðhesis rîpouî, álîlê sùnvedhîsewos ãgâðhîs èpèròthmâ, 2â períèxeî ēn grâfî (cf. 2 P 150 pása profoh- teîa grâfîs), 41 Xristôu ïpaðîntos sârkî, 4â tô òs mîkûtî anðrâwton épisthêmiaî, álîlê thêlîmaitî Thêou biwssai, 410 oikónmîs pîokîlîs xârîtos Thêou, 414 òn ònûmaitî Xristôu, 5â ò antîdikos ùmôn diâbolos perìpateî, 5âî èpîmârthûrôn tôtîhî eînai àlêthh xhîrôn tôu Thêou, 312 prôsòtpôn Kûrîou èpî pîoûntas kâkâ. We find also in 1 P examples of the looser constructions which we have seen in 2 P, e.g. 1 P 13 ès òsfwos tôs diânîolos, 121 tôu ìnèîratà àntûn ëk nêkrôn, 122 tô ìntakôf tôs àlêthêias, 216 tô thèlîmâ tôu Thêou, 43 tô boûlîmâ tôn ëthwvî, 435 tô tô àpokalûpseî tôs dözîs, 417 àp tô oûkôn tôu Thêou: of the 'appositional' form in 125 tô rîmâ àn èvagnelîsîhen, 110 profohtêi oî peri tôs eîs ùmâs xârîtos profoh- teûscantes : of the 'semi-compact' in 15 tôs ēn dûnàmêî Thêou frourouroûnêvûn dià plîstèsèsw eîs swotîriaèt ètôîmêm àpokalûfûnhîn ēn kairôf èsgâhtî, 117 tôs àpâronosoloîmêntos krôînta kê tô èkástou èrorganî, 113 tôn féromènên ùmîn xhîrîn òn àpokalûfêî 'Hsou Xristôu, 118 tôs matâias ùmôv ànanstrophîs pâtrôpaparàdôtov, 412 tô tô ùmîn puðasipe àpôs peirarasmôn ùmîn giwomênî. 414 tô tôs dözîs kai tô tôu Thêou pînèûma 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 ô sümprosêbînterôs kai màrtus. 1 See for 2 P above, p. xxvi foll.
Cases.

Accusative. We find the Adverbial Accusative in 1 P 38 τὸ τέλος πάντες ὄμορφονες, 39 τοῦναντίον, 18 ὀλόγον; the Acc. of Duration of Time in 117 ἐν φόβῳ τῶν τῆς παροικίας χρόνον ἀναστράφητε, 42 τὸν ἐπίλοιπον βιῶσαι χρόνον; Cognate Acc. in 38 φοβοῦμενοι μηδεμίαν πτόσιν, 314 τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, 41 ὀπλίσασθε ἐννοιαν (some take these as Accusative of the Object). Double Acc. in 316 αἰτεῖ ὑμᾶς λόγον. Of Prepositions which take the Accusative as in 2 P as in 1 P, the former having 42 examples as compared with the 11 of the latter: διὰ 1 P (4), 2 P (4); ἕπι 1 P (5), 2 P (2); κατὰ 1 P (9), 2 P (3); μετὰ 1 P (1), 2 P (1); πρὸς 1 P (3), 2 P (2). Especially noticeable are the following: 1 P 320 εἰς ἧν (κιβωτόν), διεσώθησαν, 121 πιστὸς εἰς Θεοῦ, ὁ. τὴν πίστιν εἶναι εἰς Θεοῦ, 512 εἰς ἥν στήτε; 111 τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα; 115 κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα υμᾶς ἄγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγιοι γενήθητε, and 46 ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, ξῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεόν, which are unlike anything in 2 P with the exception of εἰς in 2 P 117 εἰς δὲ ἐγὼ εὐθυκήσα. So 113 ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν, is copied from the Hebrew use: see Hort's n.
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1 P, never in 2 P; ἄνευ twice in 1 P, not in 2 P; ἀπό occurs five times in 1 P, thrice in 2 P (or four times if we read ἀπό in 117); ἢκ 1 P (8), 2 P (5); διά 1 P (15), the most remarkable being 512 δι' ὄλγον ἔργα, and 320 διεσώθησαν δι' ὦδαστος, 2 P (5), or 6, if we read διά δόξης in 13, the most remarkable being δι' ὦδαστος συνεστώσα.

To occurs five times in 1 P, thrice in 2 P (or four times if we read ἄρα in 17); ἰμα 1 P (8), 2 P (5); ὁμα 1 P (15), the most remarkable being 5 12 ὁμα ἢμαρ κατά 2 P (5), or 6, if we read ὁμα ἢμαρ in 17.

The most noteworthy examples in 1 P are ὁμα 1 P (0), 2 P (1); ἰπίσω 1 P (0), 2 P (1); περί 1 P (5), 2 P (2); πρό 1 P (2), 2 P (0); ὑπέρ 1 P (2), 2 P (0); ὑπό 1 P (1), 2 P (5) (or 4, if we read ἀπό in 17).

DATIVE. Indirect Object 1 P ἅκλητος παρεπιδήμως (λέγει χαίρειν), cf. 2 P 1, 12 χάρεις υμῖν πληθυσμεν, 1 P 12 όσι ἀπεκαλύφθη ὄτι υμῖν διηκόνουν αὐτὰ ἄ νυν ἀνηγγέλη υμῖν, 113 τὴν φερομένην υμῖν χαίρω, 12, 5 after διδόμι, 213, 18, 31, 5, 22, 5 after ὑποτάσσωμαι, 221 υμῖν ὑπολιμπάων ὑπόγραμμον, 221 ἐπακολουθεὶν τοῖς ἰγνεῖ παρευτό, 223 παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι, 32, 147 ἀπεδήπου τῷ λόγῳ, 32 ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, 32 τῷ γυναικί (σκεῦε) ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν, 310 τοῖς πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν, 42 ἀποδώσωσον λόγον τῷ κρίνοντι, 42 νεκροὶς ἐναργείασθη, 42 πιστῷ κίστῃ παρατιθέωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς, 55 ἀκλῆς τὴν ταπεινοφοροῦν ἐγκουμβώσας, 55 ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται, 55 ὁ ἀντίστητη, τά αὐτὰ τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖται, 55 ἦν ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, 25 εὐπρόσδεκτος Θεῷ, 25 πρὸς ἀπολογίαν τῷ αὐτῶντι; with εἰμί, etc., 411 ὃ ἐστίν ἡ δόξα, 112 πρὸς πειραμοῦ ὑμῖν γινομένη ... ἐξένυ ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος, 27 ὑμῖν (ἐστίν) ἡ τιμὴ, 511 αὐτῷ τῷ κράτοι (ἐστώ), 52 αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ἡμῶν. Dat. of Reference 224 ἦν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιώσει ἴσωσμεν, 41 πέπαινα ἀμαρτίαις (al. ἀμαρτίας); with compound verb 228 προσκόπτειν τῷ λόγῳ. 114 συντηρητικῷ μοι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. Dat. of Instrument 112 ἐναργείασάμενοι πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, 119 τιμήρ αἱματι ἐναργείασθη, 224 οὗ τῷ μόλωπτι ἱάθητε; Dat. of Cause 412 μὴ ἐξέγεσθε τῇ πυρόσε. Dat. of Respect 41 παθῶν σαρκι, 46 ὑν κριθωσί μὲν σαρκι, ξοσι δὲ πνεύματι, 38 ἀθανασίοις μὲν σαρκι, ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι μὲν σαρκι, 46 ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι. Dat. of Instrument 114 ἐναργείασάμενοι πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, 119 τιμήρ αἱματι ἐναργείασθη, 224 οὗ τῷ μόλωπτι ἱάθητε; Dat. of Cause 412 μὴ ἐξέγεσθε τῇ πυρόσε. Dat. of Respect 41 παθῶν σαρκι, 46 ὑν κριθωσί μὲν σαρκι, ξοσι δὲ πνεύματι, 38 ἀθανασίοις μὲν σαρκι, ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι μὲν σαρκι, 46 ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι. Dat. of Respect 41 παθῶν σαρκι, 46 ὑν κριθωσί μὲν σαρκι, ξοσι δὲ πνεύματι, 38 ἀθανασίοις μὲν σαρκι, ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι μὲν σαρκι, 46 ξοσοι ἱδεπρεώτι. Dat. of Respect 41 παθῶν σαρκι, 46 ὑν κριθωσί μὲν σαρκι, ξοσι δὲ πνεύματι,
The accumulation of prepositions is even more noticeable in 1 P than in 2 P, hardly less than in Romans, e.g. 1 2 απόστολος κατά πρόγνωσιν ἐν ἀγίασμα, ὑπακοὴν, 1 3 ὥσπερ τὸ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς ἡ ἐλπίδα ὑσάν δὲ ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐστὶν κληρονομιάς τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἡμᾶς τούς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρο-μένους διὰ πίστεως ἐς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἐν καιρῷ ἑσχάτῳ. Cf. 2 P 1st χάρις ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης (al. ἰδία δόξη) καὶ ἀρετῆς, δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἢν διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς. and Rom. 1st. Πάθος ἀφορισμένος ἐς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, ὁ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις περὶ τοῦ οὐροῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δανείδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος οὐροῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἐς ἀνα- στάσεως νεκρῶν, δι' οὗ ἔλαβομεν χάριν ἐς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πάσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἷς ἔστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, πάσιν τούς οὕσων ἐν Ἥρωμα χάρις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.

Number and Gender.

We find an irregularity where nouns, differing in gender, are joined to the same adjective, as in 2 1 ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν καί πάντα δόλου καί ὑπόκρισιν καί φθόνους καί πάσας καταλάλας. Here it would have been easy to make the construction regular by putting πάντα δόλου after ὑπόκρισιν. WH. give ὑπόκρισεις in the margin, which seems to me the better reading, and this is supported by SC etc. The plural would be easily assimilated to the preceding singulars. In 4 10 (ἐκαστὸς καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα) εἰς ἑαυτοὺς διακονοῦντες we have a mixture of singular and plural, depending upon the imperative σωφρονήσατε in v. 7. This would be regular if the phrase in brackets had been placed after διακο- νοῦντες. 2 1 also affords examples of the Plural Abstract in φθόνους and καταλάλας. So we find δόξα 1 11, ἀσέλγεια 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
INTRODUCTION

a pivot for a following explanation, as in 2:10 τοῦτο χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν ὑποφέρει τις λύτας, 3:6 εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ὡς κληρονομήσῃ, 4:6 εἰς τοῦτο εὐθυγέλειαθ, ὡς κριθώσων; and so with οὕτως in 2:15 οὕτως ἐστίν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, followed by the appositional infinitive ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν. The pronoun is retrospective in 2:20-21 τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ Θεοῦ, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, 2:7 ἄλθος ὑπὸ ἀπεδοκίμασαν . . . οὕτως ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γονίας. And so οὕτως in 3:6 οὕτως γὰρ οἱ ἁγιαὶ ἁγναῖκες ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτῶς.

Neither δὲ nor ἐκεῖνος occurs in 1 P.

ἐαυτοῦς is used in 4:8 τήν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, and in 4:10 for ἀλλήλους, as in Col. 3:13 χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς, and elsewhere both in the N.T. and in classical writers. It is curious that it is coupled with ἀλλήλους in 4:9 φιλοξένους εἰς ἀλλήλους, as in Col. 3:13 ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλους. It keeps its usual reflexive sense in 1:12, 3:5.

There is a remarkable use of τὰ αὐτά followed by a genitive in 5:9 εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ύμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελείοντες. 'knowing that the same sufferings are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world' (R.V.).

Dr. Bigg writes about this, much as others have done about unusual constructions in 2 P: 'It is impossible to see why St. Peter did not write τὰ αὐτά παθήματα, if these words would convey his meaning. He was not a scholar, but there are some errors of expression which no man would make.' I must confess, I do not feel quite at ease as to the reception which a Greek of the second century would have given to these sweeping assertions. Was Ovid no scholar when he wrote (F. i. 46), 'Non habet officii lucifer omnis idem'? There was nothing to prevent him from writing the more commonplace 'officium.' Are we sure that no Greek would have written ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ἄναισχυντιᾶς ἐφθασεν τῷ Θερσίτη, or τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν θλίψεων ἀντλήσαντες? I do not mean that the last is exactly equivalent to τὰς αὐτὰς θλίψεις: it is rather 'the same sort of persecutions,' there was an identity in the persecutions they had to endure.

Relative. Sometimes the antecedent is not clearly defined, as in 1:6 ἐν ὧ ἀγαλλιάσθε, where some find it in καιρῷ, some in Θεοῦ, some in the general sense of the preceding clause; 4:4 ἐν ὧ ξενιζονται, where it sums up the preceding clause; 28 εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν, where the antecedent is suggested by the preceding
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προσκόπτουσιν. Replaced by demonstrative in second clause, 22 δὲ ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. ὡστε occurs once, 21 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἐπιθυμίων αὐτίνες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς 'whose nature it is to war against the soul.' A common feature of 1 P is the repetition of relatives, as in 22ı. (Xριστὸς) δὲ ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν... ὃς λοιποδορύμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει... ὃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἦμων αὐτὸς ἀνήγερκεν...

οὐ τῷ μόλωπτι ἱάθητε: 18 ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἁγαπάτε, εἰς δὲ ἄρτι μὴ ὁρώντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθη: 112 οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἐαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλθη ὑμῖν... εἰς ἀπειθημασίαν ἀγγελοῦ παρακύψαι: 319-21 ἐν φ' πνεύμασι εἰκήρυξεν...

κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὁλόγοι διεσώθησαν δι' ὄβασις, ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς σώζει. Attraction, 212 ἦν ἐν φ' (= ἐν τούτῳ φ') καταλαλούσιν ὑμῶν... δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν, 316 ἦν ἐν φ' καταλαλούσιν ὑμῶν... κατασκυθθῶσιν. ὧδε does not occur in 1 P.

Interrogative. τίς and ποιός, 318 τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς; 417 τί τὸ τέλος; 111 ἐρανώντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποίον χρόνον ἐδῆλον. ποταπός, found in 2 P, does not occur in 1 P.

ADJECTIVES.1

Neuter used as a substantive (1) with article 34 τὸ ἀφθαρτὸν τοῦ ἰσχύον πνεύματος, (2) without article 120 ἐπ' ἐσχάτον τῶν χρόνων, 311 ἐκκλησάτω ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἁγαθόν. ἤδος is preceded by the article without αὐτῶν in the two places where it occurs (315,5). The distributive πᾶς is found with the article in the singular, 315 παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦτι.

VERBS.

TENSES. Future Indicative after ὡς, 31 ὡς εἰτίνες ἀπειθοῦσιν...


Aorist Indicative answering to English Perfect. 112 ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη 'these things which have now been announced unto you' (R.V.), 225 ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν ποιμένα 'are now returned' (R.V.), 23 εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος 'if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious' (R.V.), 225 ἢτε ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενα ἀλλ' ἐπεστράψατε νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν ποιμένα 'ye were going astray... but are now returned' (R.V.), 36 ἢς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι

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 1:24 ἐξηράνθη ὁ χώρτος, τὸ ἀνθὸς ἐξέπεσεν.

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

**Subjunctive** is used in final sentences in the N.T. even though the governing verb may refer to past time; cf. 1 P 3:9 εἰς τὸ τοῦτο ἐκλῆθητε ἦνα κληρονομήσοτε, 3:18 Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ἦνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ. After οὐ μὴ 2:6.

**Optative.** The true optative occurs in 1 P. 1:2 εἴρην πληθυνθείῃ, as in 2 P. 1:2. Its use to express a pure hypothesis is rare in the N.T., but is found in 1 P. 3:14 εἰ πάσχοντε ... μακάριοι (ἐστε), 3:17 κρέιττον (ἐστίν) ἄγαθοποιοῦτας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἡ κακοποιοῦτας. The latter parenthetical use may be compared with 1 Cor. 14:10 τοσαῦτα, εἰ τὺχοι, γένη φωνῶν εἰσίν, 15:37 σπείρεις ... γυμνὸν κόκκον, εἰ τύχοι. Luke is more free in the use of the optative than the other writers of the N.T.; cf. Acts 24:19 οὕς ἔδει ... κατηγορεῖν εἰ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ, ib. 17:27, 20:16, 27:12, etc.

**Infinitive after verb**: 1:12 ἐπιθυμοῦσιν παρακύψαι, 2:11 παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι, 5:1 μέλλονα ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι, 5:8 ζητῶν καταπείειν. Accusative with infinitive 5:9 εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπητελεῖσθαι 'knowing that the same things are accomplished.' As the more usual construction of οἶδα in this sense is that which we find in 1:18 εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε, some understand οἶδα in the
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sense in which it is used in 2 P. 2ο οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ῥύεσθαι, but Blass (p. 231) prefers the usual translation which he illustrates from Luke 4:41 ἠδεσαυ τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Another example of acc. with inf. is 1 P. 5:12 ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Infinitive after adjective: 15 ἔτοιμος ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, 4ο ἅρκετός ὁ χρόνος κατευργάσθαι.

Epelexgetic Infinitive. 25 οἰκοδομεῖσθε . . . εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἄγιον ἀνενέχαγαθαν ϑυσίας, 22 οὕτως ἔστω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν. After ὡστε 131.

Infinitive with Article: 4:17 ο θαυμὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι, 3ε εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν, 4ε εἰς τὸ μηκὲτι βιώσαι, 310 παυσάτω τὴν γλώσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλων, where the genitive implies purpose, as in Mt. 13:3 ἐξήλθεν ὁ σπέρμα τοῦ σπέρματι, see Blass, pp. 284 f.

Infinitive as subject without article: 317 κρείττον ἅγιαθοποιοῦντας πάσχειν ἢ κακοτοιοῦντας.

Participle used for Imperative 218 (following imperative τιμᾶτε in v. 17) οἱ οἰκεῖαι ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις, 31 ὡμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἱδίως ἀνδράσιν (no imperative in the preceding eight verses); 37 (following imperative ἔστω in v. 3) οἱ ἁρδεῖς ὡμοίως συνυικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν, 39 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακῶν, 48 (after νήψατε in v. 7) πρὸ πάντων δὲ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦ ἅγιτην ἐκτενὴ ἔχουντες.

The adjective is sometimes used for a participle, as in 315 τῶν Χριστῶν ἅγιότατε ἔτοιμοι (δόντες) πρὸς ἀπολογγαῖν, 47ο νήψατε . . . τὴν ἅγιτην ἐκτενὴ ἔχουντες . . . φιλάξειν (δόντες) εἰς ἀλλήλους, and thus gains an imperative force in 3:8 τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὀρόφρονες συμπαθεῖσι, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχνοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακῶν.

We have a remarkable instance of the combination of the aorist and perfect participle in 2:10 οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, where it might seem, on a first glance, that the perfect, that is, the completed present, should have gone with νῦν; only that νῦν is joined with the aorist in two other passages of 1 P., viz. 1:12, 2:25. The R.V. has 'which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy,' giving a pluperfect force to the perfect participle; and so Hort, 'the contrast of tense is that between the long antecedent state and the single event of conversion which ended it,' and he illustrates it from Rom. 11:30, ὡσπερ γὰρ ὡμεῖς ποτὲ ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε. For
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other instances of the perfect participle used with pluperfect force, see Joh. 29 οἱ διάκονοι ἤθεσαν οἱ ἡπτληκότες, Acts 181 εὕρων Ἰουδαίον . . . προσφάτως ἐξηλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, Heb. 21 τῶν δὲ βραχὺ παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλιαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν . . . ἐστεφανωμένον, quoted by Winer, p. 430.

Voices.

Instead of the classical ἀγάλλω, -ομαι, the N.T. has ἀγαλλιάω, -ομαι, the middle being the form in most common use, as in 1 P. 16, 413. In 18 however WH. read ἀγαλλιάτε χαρᾶ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ, and this form occurs also in Lk. 11, Apoc. 197. Perhaps the distinction which I have drawn between αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖσθαι in James 48 may be applicable here. The subjective middle gives prominence to the feeling, the objective active to the action in which it shows itself. The active ἐπικαλεῖν is used in the N.T. in the sense of 'to call by name,' as in Mt. 1025 εἰ τὸν οἴκοδοστότην Βεθλεβοῦν ἐπεκάλεσαν, the middle in the sense 'invoking,' as in 1 P. 117 εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλείσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα 'if ye invoke as Father,' or, as Dr. Bigg prefers, 'invoke the Father,' πατήρ being frequently anarthrous; cf. 315 Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε. The active λυτρῶν is not found in the N.T., the middle being used in the sense 'to ransom,' Lk. 2421, Tit. 214. The passive λυτρώθητε is used in 1 P. 118 in the sense 'were ransomed.' Similarly the middle εὐαγγελίζομαι (very rarely the active εὐαγγελίζω) is used with the accusative either of the thing or the person, in the sense to 'preach good tidings to,' as in 1 P. 112 οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς, and the passive is used of the word preached in 1 P. 125, 46. Another passive of a deponent verb is ἱάθυτε 1 P. 224. The verb ἐπιστρέφω 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 ὑποτάγγετε and ταπεινώθητε have a middle force in 566.

Two curious uses of the active voice are found in 1 P., one where περιέχω might be thought to have a passive force (26) περιέχει εὖ γραφῇ. The original phrase is περιέχει ή γραφή τοῦτο 'the Scripture contains, has, this,' which is easily changed into the impersonal 'it has in Scripture,' just as 'Scripture saith' is changed into 'it says in Scripture.' The same passive force attaches to ή περιοχή τῆς γραφῆς. In 223 we find the unique παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι,
where we should have expected παρεδίδουέαυτόν. We may compare the use of παρέχω in Plato Gorg. 456 B oùxì ἐθέλοντα ἢ τεμεῖν ἢ καύσαι παρασχεῖν τῷ ιατρῷ, 475 D γενναίος τῷ λόγῳ ὀπέπερ ιατρῷ παρέχων ἀποκρίνου, 480 c, Protag. 348 Λ, Theaet. 191 λ, and the full construction in Apol. 33 B ὀμοίως καὶ πλούσιῳ καὶ πένητι παρέχω ἐμαυτὸν ἐρωτῶν.

COMPOUND SENTENCES.

(1) Substantival Clauses.
   (a) Direct Statement, subordinated to verb of saying. 116 γέγραψαν ὁ γίγαντα Ἔνως ἐσεσθε ὦ ἐγὼ ἄγιος, 20 περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ Ἰδοὺ τίθημι λίθον.
   (b) Indirect Statement. 112 ἀπεκαλύφθη ὦ ἐν οὐχ ἐαυτοῖς διηκόνουν αὐτά, 118 εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἐλυτρώθητε, 23 ἐγεύσασθε ὦ Χριστὲ ὁ Κύριος.
   (c) Indirect Question. 111 ἐραννώντες εἰς τίνα καιρὸν ἐδῆλον τὸ πνεῦμα.

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

(3) Adverbial Clauses.
   (a) Causal Clause, introduced by διότι 116, 24, 20, by ὧν 215, 21, 36, 12, 18, 41, 8, 17, 55, 7.
   (b) Temporal (α), Local (β), Modal (γ).
      (α) 320 ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο, (β) does not occur, (γ) 413 καθὼς κοινονεῖτε χαίρετε, 512 πιστὸς, ἡ λογίζομαι.
      (c) Final Clause. After ὅπως, 20 ὡμεῖς λάδις εἰς περιποίησιν (ἐστε), ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε; after ὧν, 17 ἄλληθέντες ἢν τὸ δοκίμον . . . εὔρεθῇ, 22 γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἢν . . . αὐξηθῇ, 21 ἀναστροφὴν ἔχουσες καλήν, ἢν διδάσκω, 221 Χριστὸς ἐπαθεν . . . ἢν ἐπακολουθήσατε, 224 τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν . . . ἢν ζήσωμεν, 35 εἰς τὸ τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἢν κληρονομήσητε, 318 (ἀγάσατε) . . . ἢν κατασκυθησώσων, 318 ἀπέθανεν . . . ἢν ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ, 46 εἰς τὸ τοῦτο εὐφραίνεσθαι, ἢν κριθῶσι, 411 (διακονεῖτο) ὡς ἐξ ἱσχύος ἢς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός, ἢν δοξάζεται ὁ Θεός, 413 παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἢν καὶ εἰ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει χαρῆτε, 56 ταπεινώθητε . . . ἢν υμᾶς ἴπψοφη. It will be noticed that in all these cases ὧν 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 Apoc. 30 ποιήσω ἵνα ἤξεσαν, and even in Gal. 24 οἴτινες παρεισήλθον... ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν. and Acts 2124 δαπάνησον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἵνα ξυρῆσονται τὴν κεφαλὴν.

(d) Conditional Clause. ei with present ind. both in protasis and apodosis: 210 τοῦτο χάρις (έστιν), ei ὑποσέφει τις λύπας, 414 ei ὄνειδιξασθε μακάριοι (έστε); with pres. ind. in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 417 ei πρῶτον (ἀρχεται) ἀφ' ύμόν τι τὸ τέλος (έσται); 418 ei ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς ποῦ φανεῖται; pres. ind. in protasis and imperative in apodosis 117 ei πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε... ἐν φόβῳ ἀναστράφητε, 416 ei δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ; fut. ind. both in protasis and in apodosis, 230 ποιῶν κλέος (έσται), ei ἀμαρτάνουτε ὑπομενεῖτε; aor. ind. in protasis, imperative in apodosis, 23 ei ἐγεύσασθε, ἐπιστήσατε. With pres. opt. in protasis, pres. ind. (understood) in apodosis, 314 ei καὶ πάσχοιτε μακάριοι (έστε), and where the apodosis is dependent on the principal verb as in 237 κρειττόν (έστιν) ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, ei θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοτοιοῦντας. Here if we liberate the dependent clause, we should have, in the classical construction, ei θέλοι τὸ θέλημα, πάσχοιμεν ἃν, which subordinated to κρειττόν ἐστιν, becomes πασχεῖν. A similar case of dependence is 16 ὁλίγον ἅρτι ei δέον λυπηθέντες, where the conditional sentence, if freed from its surroundings, would be ei δέον ἄστι, λυπηθῆσομαι, but the apodosis is subordinated as a participle to the principal verb ἀγαλλᾶσθε.

eiν with subjunctive in protasis and fut. ind. in apodosis, 313 τοῦ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς (έσται), εἰν τὸν ἀγαθὸν ζηλωταί γένησθε;

Negatives.

μή is used with the imperative in 314 μὴ φοβήθητε, cf. 412, 15, 16; with participle or adverb in imperatival sentence, as 39 μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν, following τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες (έστωσαν), 114 (ἐλπίσατε) ὡς μὴ συνυφαματιζομενοί, 216 ὡς εἰλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχουσε... ἀλλ' ὡς δουλοῦ Θεοῦ παύτας τιμήσατε, 5δ τοιμάσατε ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς... μηδ' ἀἰσχροκερδῶς... μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν; also with participles where there is no imperative, as in 1δ δὲν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς δὲν μὴ ὀρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλᾶσθε, 'whom, not having
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seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice’ (R.V.), where oú denotes a fact, μή a concession; 4

εν ο εκείνουται μη συντρεχόντων υμών, where μη denotes the cause; 36 ὡς εγενήθητε τέκνα . . . μη φοβούμεναι μνημείαν πτόησιν ‘if ye are not put in fear’ [for the double negative compare Mk. 1114 μηκετί εκ σοῦ μηδέις καρπόν φάγοι]; with infinitive 37 εἰς το μη ἐγκόπτεσθαι, 42 εἰς το μηκετί βιῶσαι.

Sometimes we find oú where the principal verb is in the imperative as in 123,23 ἀλλήλοις ἀγαπήσατε ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, 218 οἱ οἰκεταί ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολοίσις, 33 οὐν ἐστο οὐχ ὃ ἐξωθεὶν κόσμος . . . ἀλλ’ ὁ κρυπτὸς ἀνθρωπος. In these cases oú negatives, not the principal verb, but a word or clause dependent upon it. It is also used with a participle in 219 oí οὐκ ἠλεημένου, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, and so with the article or relative, when it simply negatives a fact, as in 210 οί ποτε οὐ λαὸς, and 222 δὲ ἀμαρτίαι οὐκ ἐποίησεν.

οὐ μη is used with the subjunctive in 26 ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μη καταισχύνῃ 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 μη συνσχηματιζόμενοι . . . ἀλλά, 110 οὗ φθαρτοῖς . . . ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἴματι, 123 οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, 216 μη ὡς ἐπικαλύμμα ἔχοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ’ ὡς Θεοῦ δούλοι, 218 οὐκ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ, 34 οὕχ ὃ ἐξωθεὶν κόσμος, ἀλλ’ ὁ κρυπτὸς, 321 οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις . . . ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα, 42 μηκετί ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ βιῶσαι, 412,13 μη ξενίζεσθε . . . ἀλλὰ χαίρετε, 52,3 μη ἀναγκαστός, ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως, ἣν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδός, ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μηδὲ ὡς κατακυριεύοντες . . . ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι. The negative side is less prominent in 220 ποίον κλέος εἰ ἀμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφίζομενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ’ εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦσε ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις, which is equivalent to ‘suffering when guilty is not praiseworthy, but suffering when innocent is praiseworthy.’ In 312,14 τίς ὁ κακόςουν υμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταί γένησθε; ἀλλ’ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι (ἔστε), the opposition is not the simple contradictory ‘not this, but that,’ but the contrast of a higher with a lower stage, not a mere escape from evil (τίς ὁ κακώσων), but positive blessedness (μακάριοι). With the contradictory
oūκ—ἀλλὰ may be compared the contrasting μὲν—δὲ, which is common in the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, and that to the Hebrews, but is not found elsewhere in the N.T. except once in James, thrice in Jude, and in the following passages of 1 P., 120 (ἐλυτρώθητε αἴματι Χριστοῦ) προεγγυσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολής κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτον τῶν χρόνων, 21 λίθων ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένων, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκεκτόν, 210 οἵ τοπε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλειμένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, 318 θεατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ἡσυχαιρθεὶς δὲ πνεύμασι, 46 ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ, ἥσσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι. Sometimes μὲν is omitted, as in 17 χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζόμενου, 214 (πεμπομένους) εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔσται δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν, cf. Jelf § 767. In 1 P. we, not frequently, find δὲ opposed, as a weakened ἀλλὰ, to a preceding negative as in 1 118 εἰς ὑπὸ ἀρτι μὴ ὀρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάτε, 112 οὐχ ἐαυτοῖς, ὡμίν δὲ διηκόνουν, 223 οὐκ ἤπειλε, παρεδίδον δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι, 319 μὴ ἀποδίδοντες λοιδορίαν, τούναντι δὲ εὐλογούντες, 314.15 τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε, 416 μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεόν. Occasional examples may also be found in the Acts 12 118 οὐκ ἤδει . . . ἑδάκει δὲ, 1234 οὐκ ἠνοίξε . . . εἰσδραμοῦσα δὲ, and in some of the Epistles, as Eph. 428, 511 μὴ . . . μᾶλλον δὲ, but not in 2 Pet. or Jude. δὲ καί is not found in 1 P.

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

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

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

Dr. Bigg has called attention (p. 4) to the 'refined accuracy' of the use of ὅς in 1 P. 119 ὁς ἀμωβὸς ἀμώμοι καὶ ἀστιλοὺ Χριστοῦ, 211 παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους ἀπέχεσθαι (ὑμᾶς) τῶν σαρκικῶν ἑπιθυμίων, 37 συνοικοῦντες ὡς ἀθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναίκειῳ (σκεύει), 216 μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχουντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, in all of which the comparison precedes the thing which is compared to it. He illustrates this from Heb. 127 ὃς νίκης ὡμίν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός and Plato Legg. x. 905 B ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις ταῖς πράξεσιν, where Stallbaum quotes Rep. iii. 414 E ὡς περὶ μητρός τῆς χώρας ἐν ἦ εἰσὶ βουλευόσθαι and other examples. The more usual order of words is found in 1 P. 212 καταλαλοῦσιν ὡμίν ὡς κακοποιῶν. In 412 ὡς is used with the gen. abs.
The phrase is properly used with a finite verb, as in 2 Cor. 1:6 εἰς θείαμομέθα. . . . εἰς παρακαλούμεθα, but the verb is more frequently omitted, both in the N.T. (as in 1 Cor. 3:16 πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν, εἰς Παῦλος εἰς Ἀπολλών), and in classical Greek.

ὅστε followed by infinitive 1 P. 1:21, by imperative 4:19 ὁστε οἱ πάσχοντες . . . παρατιθέοντος τῶν ψυχῶν.

**ELLIPSIS.**

**Of verb.** εἰμί: 2:20 ποιον κλέος (ἔστιν), εἰ ὑπομενεῖτε; 3:13 τὸς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς (ἔστιν); 3:14 εἰ καὶ πάσχοντες μακάριοι (ἔστε), 4:17 καιρός (ἔστι) τοῦ ἄφθασθαι, 4:1 εἴναυθενεσθε μακάριοι (ἔστε), 3:12 ὁφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους (εἰσίν), 1:3 εὐλογητὸς (ἔστιν) ο Ἰησοῦς, 29 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτὸν (ἔστε).

**Of other verbs.** Πέτρος ἐκλεκτοῖ (χαϊρειν λέγει), εἰς τις λαλεῖ, ὃς λόγια (λαλεῖτω), εἰς τις διακονεῖ, ὃς εἰ στιχύς ἢς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός (διακονεῖτω), 4:15,16 μὴ γὰρ τὶς πασχέτω ὡς φονεύς . . . εἰ δὲ ὃς Χριστιανὸς (πάσχει), μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, 4:17 ὁ καιρός (ἔστιν) τοῦ ἄρξασθαι . . . εἰ δὲ πρὸτον ἄφθ. ἢμῶν (ἄρχεται) τί τὸ τέλος (ἔσται)

**Of noun (subject of infinitive).** 2:11 παρακαλῶ (ὑμᾶς) ἀπέχεσθαι, (of object) 2:28 παρεδίδου (ἐαυτόν) τῷ κρίνοντι, 3:7 ὃς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ (σκεύει) ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν.

**PLEONASM.**


**ANACOLOUTHON.**

1 P. 2:11,12 ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν υμῶν ἔχουτες καλὴν. Here we should have had ἔχουντες to agree with the (understood) subject of ἀπέχεσθαι; but the periphrastic imperative παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι suggests the simple imperative ἀπέχεσθε, just as in 2 P. 3:13 the periphrastic διεγείρω υμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν μνησθήναι suggests the simple μνησθήτε and is followed by the nominative γινώσκουτες.
Asyndeton, confirmatory, 1 P. 5⁸ γρηγορήσατε ὃ ἀντίδικος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν καταπιεῖν, where some MSS. insert ὅτι.

Reiteration.¹

As in 2 P. so in 1 P. we find a marked liking for iteration Thus ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις occur in 1⁵,⁷,¹₂,¹₃, ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης in 4¹³, cf. ⁵¹; δοκίμων and δοκίμαζομένου in ¹⁷; δόξα in ¹⁷,¹₁, δεδομένη in ¹⁸; σωτηρία in ¹⁵,⁹,¹₀; ἔξεραναί in ¹₀, ἔραναί in ¹¹; ἄγιος four times in ¹₁⁵,¹₆, also in ²⁵,⁹; ἀναστροφή in ¹¹,¹₈, ²¹², ³¹,²⁰, ἐπιτίς (３), ἐπιτίς (２); ἀναγεννάω (２); ἀμαρτία (６); λόγος (７); χάρις (１０); ἀγαθός (７); ἀφθαρτος (３); ἐποπτεύω (２); εὐαγγελίζομαι (３); ἱεράτευμα (２); κακοποιός (３); κρίνω (４); λίθος (５); νήφω (３); νεκρός (４); ὀλγος (４); πᾶσχω (¹²); συνέδοσις (３); τέλος (４); ὑπακοή (３); ὑποτάσσο (６); φόβος (５); φοβερομαι (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 ἐν φίλοις ἀγαλλιάθε | ὁ λόγος ἄρτι | εἰ δὲν ἀναγεννάω, ἢ ἀρπάζων ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως | πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολίμωμου | διὰ πυρός ἢ δοκίμαζομένου | εὐρεθή | εἰς ἐκαίνω καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμήν ἢ ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ | ὃν ὑφίστατο | ἀγαπάτε | εἰς ἃν. τιμὴν ὁράμης | προεύοσπον ἢ ἀγαλλιάτε | χαρὰ ἀνεκλαηθερ καὶ δεδομένη | κομιζόμενον τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως | σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν. The reader will notice here the repetition of l (14), p (12), d (8), and of the syllables in ἀπολλυμένον, δοκιμαζόμενον, ἐν, εἰς ἃν., ἑδόνες, ὀράματε, προεύοσπον, ἀγαπάτε, ἀγαλλιάτε.

What do we gather from this survey of the grammar and style of the two Epistles in respect to identity of authorship? There can be no doubt, I think, that the style of 1 P. is on the whole clearer and simpler than that of 2 P., but there is not that chasm between them which some would try to make out. As to the use of 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. lix f.
² For notation, see note on p. lix.
RELATION BETWEEN 1 PETER AND 2 PETER
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 ὧνα, while 1 P. in one place has the future indicative. 2 P. is also more idiomatic in the use of such elliptical forms as ἐὰν ὅν, ἐὰν ὅσον, ἀφ' ἢς. On the other hand 1 P. shows special elegance in his use of ὃς in comparisons, and emphasizes the contrast between the aorist and the present imperative by coupling τιμήσατε with τιμᾶτε in 27.

Nor is 1 P. quite free from the ambiguities and the difficulties which are objected to in 2 P. Compare what is said above as to the relative and its antecedent, the construction of περιέχω and παραδίδωμι, not to mention phrases such as 22 τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, 28 μὴ φοβοῦμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν, Θ20.21 διεσώθησαν εἰς ὑδάτως· 2 καὶ ὲμᾶς ἀντίτυπον ὑμῶν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις βύσιν, ἄλλα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτησα εἰς Θεόν. In the last I am disposed to agree with Hort that we should read ὧν (or else ὅν) for the MS. ὅ. The latter gives an extraordinarily complicated expression, 'which thing (water), an antitype, now saves you, viz. baptism,' which we may seek to explain as follows, 'which thing, in the form of an antitype, now saves you,' but what we want is 'the antitype to which (sustaining water of the Deluge) now saves you, viz. baptism.' Again the last verses of the Epistle teem with difficulties, arising in part no doubt from our ignorance of the circumstances alluded to. Such are τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὃς λογίζομαι, which seems to suggest that the writer was not quite sure how far Silvanus was to be trusted; ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταῦτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is, I think, rightly explained to mean 'testifying that Paul's teaching, embodied in this letter, is the true grace of God'; but the expression is far from clear. And the phrases that follow, ἧ ἐν Βασιλέων συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μᾶρκος ὁ νῦν μου, are still matters of controversy.

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


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. Above all, as we see from
the discourses in the Acts, Peter was well trained in the history
and literature of his own country, had a mind open to all high
ideas, and was ready at once to act upon them. He had also, as
Dr. Bigg allows, a most tender and affectionate heart. So far from
the dull stoicism which he is supposed to share with the labourer,
he was a man of very quick sensibilities, as we may see from his
behaviour after the miraculous draft of fishes (Lk. 5), his walking
on the water (Mt. 14), his refusal to allow his Master to wash
his feet (Joh. 13), 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 hastyest word was always
the outcome of a noble and generous nature? 2

The remark that Peter was ‘apt on a sudden emergency to say
and do the wrong thing’ is hardly to be reconciled with the fact
that on two of the most critical moments of the life of our Lord,
when many were tempted to go backwards, it was Peter who
answered the appeal to the disciples, ‘Will ye also go away?’
(Joh. 6), ‘Who say ye that I am?’ (Mt. 16), by the prompt word
of loving trust, in the one case, ‘Lord, to whom shall we go?’ Thou
hast the words of eternal life,’ in the other, ‘Thou art the Christ,
the son of the living God,’ the last response drawing from the
Saviour His highest commendation ‘Flesh and blood hath not
revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.’ If I
were called upon to analyse St. Peter’s character I should say that
he was perhaps the most human of all the Apostles, natural, large­
hearted, impulsive, spontaneous, with none of the cramping self­
consciousness of the shy man, and without a particle of guile.
Though capable of pondering over what was said to him, he more
often spoke and acted on the spur of the moment at the prompting
of his own generous heart. He was full of initiative, full of
confidence, easily elated, but really humble, quick to own where

1 See my Introduction to St. James, p. xlii.
2 See my edition of St. James, p. 201.
he had been in the wrong, but never despairing; a reverent and
devoted, yet a thoroughly free-spoken follower of his Master, as
well as a loved and trusted leader of men. Our first introduction
to him (Joh. 1:41) shows him to be one who was looking for the
Messiah. He is quick to lay his doubts and difficulties before
Jesus: 'How oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive
him?' On hearing the words 'Whither I go, ye cannot come,' he
is the one to ask 'Whither goest thou? Why cannot I follow thee
now?' He is not abashed or silent in presence of Moses and
Elijah on the holy mount. He even ventures to rebuke Jesus
when He foretold His approaching death, just after He had
commended Peter's confession 'Thou art the son of God.' His
positiveness, combined with docility and readiness to be corrected
and instructed, is seen in Joh. 13:6, 'Lord, dost thou wash my feet?
Thou shalt never wash my feet'; and then, on hearing the
explanation of Jesus, 'Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands
and my head.' So in Acts 10:13, on hearing the voice 'Rise, Peter,
kill and eat,' he breaks out with 'Not so, Lord; for I have never
eaten anything that is common and unclean.' But his behaviour
to Cornelius shortly afterwards shows how thoroughly he had
imbibed the spirit of the words 'What God has cleansed, make
not thou common.' His self-confidence is seen in such words as,
'I will lay down my life for thee,' 'Though all men should be
offended, yet will not I,' 'Even if I must die with thee, yet will I
not deny thee.' Nor was this mere empty boasting. When the
armed band of the chief priests appeared, he drew his sword and
attacked them. How was it, then, that his courage so soon failed
him? We must remember the circumstances of the case. A few
days before, Jesus had entered Jerusalem in triumph amid the
Hosannas of the multitude. He had spoken mysterious words
about the coming of the kingdom of God: he had warned his
disciples to provide themselves with swords. But now he bids
Peter put up his sword into its sheath: he tells his disciples to
leave him alone with the powers of darkness. And at the word
they all forsook him and fled, two only venturing to follow at a
distance into the Judgment-Hall. Under these circumstances, is it
right to regard the denial as proving timidity in Peter? Is Elijah
to be called timid because he fled from Jezebel, and was for a
brief space inclined to despair of the triumph of right? Both
Elijah and Peter were suffering from reaction: the spirit was
willing, but the flesh was weak. It is as if soldiers whose courage had been strained to the highest pitch at the prospect of leading a forlorn hope were suddenly told that their captain had changed his mind, and that they were now to surrender to the enemy. Despair and bewilderment would succeed to high-wrought courage, and so it was with Peter. But one look of his Master’s was sufficient to recall him to himself. His deep repentance was followed by no false shame on his own part, and by no reproaches on the part of his fellow-disciples. He is the one to whom the Magdalene first brings the news of the empty tomb. He and John are the first of the Apostles to visit the tomb. At the sea of Tiberias we find Peter as usual taking the initiative, and the others as usual following, ‘I go a fishing,’ ‘We also go with thee.’ Impetuous as ever, on hearing that it was ‘the Lord,’ who had foretold the miraculous draft of fishes, Peter leaps into the sea and makes his way to Jesus on the shore. One phrase, in our Lord’s colloquy with him, suggests his energetic, independent character: ‘When thou wast young, thou walkedst whither thou wouldest.’ The question about John, which followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquillity and his thought for his friends.

The beginning of the Acts shows Peter in a position of unquestioned authority, even before the day of Pentecost, in regard to the election of Matthias. When he denounces the Jews for having crucified the Holy and Just one (cf. 1 P. 3:18), the Prince of Life (Acts 2:23, 36, 3:13), his tone is as decided and unflinching as that of the Baptist. At the same time he uses in their behalf the plea uttered on the cross ‘I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers’ (3:17), reminding them (as Joseph reminded his brethren in Gen. 45:5) that God had made use of their evil action to fulfil His eternal purpose declared by the prophets, that Christ should suffer and be raised from the dead and received up into heaven till the time of the restoration of all things. He calls upon them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. He testifies before the Sanhedrin that the miracle done to the impotent man was done in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they, the rulers, had crucified, but whom God had raised from the dead. When the Apostles were charged to keep silence, and when they were brought again before the
Sanhedrin for disobedience, it was Peter who on each occasion answered 'We must obey God rather than men: We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard': 'We are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him' (Acts 4:19, 5:29-32).

I pause here for a moment to consider how far this early teaching of Peter agrees with that which we find in 1 P. It will be seen at once that the main features of both are the same. The Apostles are sent to witness to the fulfilment of prophecy in the sufferings and death of the Messiah, in his Resurrection and Ascension, and in the coming of the Holy Ghost (1 P. 5:1, Acts 1:22, 2:2, 3:15, 10:39-41). The promise is to the Jews, and to all that are far off, as many as the Lord our God shall call. We may notice one or two minute agreements, e.g. 5:41 ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ὅτι κατηξιωθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνοματος ἀτιμασθήναι compared with 1 P. 4:12-16; and the quotation from Ps. 118:22 in Acts 4:11 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. 9:54 f.). But a different light is thrown upon it by 1 Cor. 5:5, where St. Paul speaks of a judgment 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, ye being gathered together and my spirit . . . to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' It is plain how necessary it was to guard the purity of the early Christian community from the idea that God's favour could be purchased by gifts; how necessary it was to instil into them the opposite idea, that the Father must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. In the same way the idea of the perfect holiness of God was taught to Israel of old by the command 'If even a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned.' But the later history of the Church shows plainly that such power could not be safely entrusted to any but Apostles. A similar severity is seen in the story of Simon Magus, where Peter's indignation at the proposal to buy the gifts of God for money breaks out in the words 'Thy silver perish with thee,' 'thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter.' It may have been his recollection of this conduct on the part of one who had just been baptized, which led Peter to distinguish so carefully between the ἀπόθεσις ῥήτου and the ἐπερώτημα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς in baptism (1 P. 3:21). I have
already referred to the story of Cornelius in Acts 10. Particularly deserving of notice are v. 28 ἀθέμιτον ἔστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουναίῳ κολλάσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ, compared with 1 P. 43, the only other passage in the N.T. in which the word ἀθέμιτος occurs; and the succeeding words of the same verse, 'God hath showed to me that I should not call any man common or unclean,' which may be compared with 1 P. 217 'Honour all men.' Again Acts 1034 ἐπ' ἀληθείᾳ καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ Θεός may be compared with 1 P. 117 εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλέσθη τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστοτον ἔργον; and 1042 'This is he which is ordained of God to be judge of quick and dead' with 1 P. 45 ἀποδόσοντων λόγων τῷ ἑτοίμω δὲ ἔχουτε κρίνει ξάνθας καὶ νεκρῶς. The phrase ἰσότιμον πίστιν in 2 P. 1 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 1112, 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 χάρις used by Peter. It was no doubt borrowed by him from Paul, and occurs frequently in 1 P. The view of the Law as a yoke is also Pauline, and agrees with the absence of any mention of law in either epistle, but is hardly reconcilable with the description of Peter as a disciplinarian.

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

To sum up again the main features of St. Peter’s character, as they are presented to us in the rest of the N.T. We have seen that he is distinguished from all the Apostles by his simplicity and naturalness and by the strong and ardent feeling, which shows itself especially in his intense affection for his Master. How does this agree with what we gather from the two Epistles? We should expect that the writing of such a man would be characterized by a natural and simple eloquence, not entering into elaborate arguments, as St. Paul does, but appealing throughout to the hearts of his readers, dwelling upon the salvation wrought by Christ, and holding up before them His life as the example which they should follow. This is exactly what, it seems to me, we find in 1 P. His mind is fixed on the sufferings of Christ: they form the subject of prophecy (1:11); it is through them that the Christians to whom he writes were redeemed from their vain manner of life handed down from their fathers (1:19); servants are to suffer patiently because Christ suffered for them, without reviling or threatening (2:21-24); it is better to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing, because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God (3:17, 18); since Christ suffered in the flesh we should arm ourselves with the same mind (4:1); we should rejoice if we are partakers of His sufferings (4:13); as a fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, as well as a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed, the writer exhorts the elders to make themselves examples to the flock (5:1-3). Turn now to 2 P.: neither style nor matter can be called simple. It is not altogether without eloquence, but the eloquence is elaborate and often artificial, as in the octave of virtues (1:5-8). In many passages the thought is too subtle to be easily followed, as in the introductory verses. Nothing is said of joy, which is so conspicuous in 1 P. (χαρά, χαίρω, ἀγαλλιάω); instead of it we are urged to aim at knowledge and further knowledge of God and Christ (γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις), while in 1 P. γνώσις alone is used, and that only once in
3', where it is equivalent to practical good sense. Again 2 P. shows a preference for the general and abstract above the concrete and particular; and this often leads to ambiguity, as in 2:10-13. Even where he goes into further particulars than 1 P. he does not always gain in impressiveness. Thus 1 P. says nothing in regard to the physical accompaniments of the second Advent; but his allusions to the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled reserved in heaven for you, who are guarded by the power of God through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time (1:3); his reference to the joy unspeakable and full of glory, produced by the consciousness that they were already receiving the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls (1:8); his earnest warning to his readers to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things is at hand (4:7), suggest far stronger motives than the passing away of the heavens, the dissolution of the elements, and the destruction of the earth by fire, on which 2 P. dilates (3:10-12).

It is only when we pass away from the earthquake and the fire to the still small voice in 3:13, 'according to his promise we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' and again in 3:18, 'Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ,' that we recognize an appeal as powerful as that in 1 P.

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

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

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

External Evidence.

Both Epistles were recognized as canonical in the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (Westcott on the Canon, p. 566), with which agree Jerome (Westcott, p. 580) and Augustine (De Doctr. Christiana ii. 12). Jerome however (De vir. ill. iv.) mentions that, owing to the use made of the apocryphal Enoch, the epistle of Jude a plerisque reiectur. So Eusebius H.E. ii. 28, '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 ἐφρασεν ἐπιστολήν, ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐρρωμένων λόγων. In the same treatise (xvii. 30) he quotes Jude 6, adding words which signify that it was not universally received, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδᾶ πρόσοιτο

1 For further details compare Dr. Chase's excellent articles on Peter and Jude in Hastings' D. of B.
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, διδασκαλικῶτα ἐκτίθεται τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν κρινομένων. He quotes him again Strom. iii. 11, and, without naming him, in Strom. vi. 65. Tertullian (De Cult. Fem. 3) says 'Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.' It appears in the Muratorian Canon (c. 170 A.D.), 'Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duae in catholicis habentur.' Theophilus of Antioch (ad Autol. ii. 15) seems to allude to Jude 13 in the words quoted in my note on that verse. Athenagoras (c. 180) speaks (§ 24, p. 130 Otto) of the fallen angels in a manner which suggests acquaintance with Jude v. 6, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχήν. (Of the angels some) ἔμειναν εἴ' οἷς αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν καὶ διέταξεν ὁ Θεός, οἱ δὲ ἐνύβρισαν καὶ τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ὑποστάσει καὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ, and he adds that he asserts this on the authority of the prophets, which may perhaps refer both to Enoch and Jude. The form of salutation used in Jude 2 ἐλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεί 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 ἐλέησες, περὶ δὲ ὑπ' προσεύξῃ, οὕς 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 λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολογητα· ταύτη δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι προσβύτεροι ὅς ἀναμφιλέτω ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηται συγγράμματι. τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφμενε, ὡμοίος δὲ πολλοὶ χρήσιμοι φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἑσπονδάσθη γραφῶν. τὸ γε μὴν τῶν ἐπικεκλημένων αὐτοῦ Πράξεων καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ὀνομασμένον Εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ τε λεγόμενον Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην 'Ἀποκάλυψιν οὐδ' ὡλος ἐν καθολικῷ ἀσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μὴτ ἀρχαίων μῆτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγράφεις ταῖς ξε αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίας . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, δό ν μίαν μόνην γνησίαν ἔγινον ἐπιστολὴν καὶ παρὰ τὸις πάλαι προσβύτεροι ὁμολογημένην, 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) ἵδια δόξη καὶ ἀρετὴ as from the Catholic Epistles; and (14) θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως in

1 In his note Westcott gives examples (a) of 'Differences from the general renderings' of the Vulgate: κοινωνίας ἕκκορσις (14); ἐγκράτεια ἡμοιόησιν (15); ἀρχαίων ἀναγεννησιαὶ (14), (b) 'Differences from renderings in 1 Peter: πληθύνθηκα, adimperiti (15), multiplicari (1 P. 1. 12); ἐπιθυμθα concurrerentia (14, 210, 38), desiderium (1 P. 11, 21, 44) and in 2 P. 21, τηρεῖν réservare (214, 17, 37), conservare (1 P. 4). (γ) Differences from the translation of Jude, ἐλογος ἀναρραφιανής (212), ματίες (J. 10), ἐθνικεῖα περίπτερα (212), corrumpi (J. 10); συνενεχείσθης luxuriae (213), coniunivari (J. 12); δῶδας sectae (210), majestates (J. 8); δ ὄρος τοῖ 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.
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Orat. c. Arian. ii. 1. 133. There is also a catalogue, considered by Tischendorf and Westcott (Canon, p. 578 m.) to be earlier than the fourth century, which is contained in the Codex Claromontanus of the seventh century. It recognizes the seven Catholic Epistles as well as the Shepherd of Hermas, the Acts of Paul, and the Apocalypse of Peter (cf. N.K. pp. 157–172).

Didymus (d. 394) wrote comments on all the Catholic Epistles, fragments of which have come down to us in the Latin translation. The comment on 2 P. ends with the words ‘Non igitur ignorandum praesentem epistolam esse falsatam (= νοθεύτηται), 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. 310, of the total destruction of the earth by fire. In a later treatise (De Trinitate) Didymus quotes repeatedly from 2 P.: cf. Migne Patr. Gr. vol. xxxix, pp. 304 B, 409 B, 415 A, 453 A, 512 C, 644 C, 688 A.


Methodius, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the third century quotes from 2 P. 38 in a fragment of his de Resurrectione cited by Dr. Chase (Hastings’ D. of B. p. 804) χίλια δὲ ἦτη τῆς βασιλείας ὄνομασεν, τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα διὰ τῆς χιλιάδος δηλῶν· γέγραφεν γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος Πέτρος ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἦτη καὶ χίλια ἦτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a friend and pupil of Origen, writing to Cyprian in 256 A.D. (included in Cyprian’s Letters, No. 75) refers to 2 P. in the following words: ‘Stephanus adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos... qui in epistolis suis haereticos exsecrati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerant.’ As 1 P. has no allusion to heretics, this can only be understood of 2 P., Origen speaks doubtfully (In. Joh. v. 3, Lomm. i. p. 165): Πέτρος ἥφ... ὁ ὀἰκοδομεῖται ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία... μίαν ἑπιστολὴν ὑμολογοῦν-μένην καταλέλοιπεν ἕστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. There are several references to 2 P. in the Latin translation of Origen, which are thought doubtful by Dr. Chase and others, because of the license elsewhere taken by the translator, Rufinus. Westcott however notes that some of these passages are very characteristic of Origen, especially the allegorical use made of the fall of Jericho before the blasts of the trumpets (Hom. in Jos.
vii. 1, Lomm, xi. 62): Dominus noster mittit sacerdotes, Apostolos suos, portantes tubas ... Sacerdotali tuba primus in Evangelio suo Matthaeus increpuit ... Petrus etiam duabus epistolarem suarum personat tubis. Jacobus quoque et Judas ... Novissime autem ille veniens, qui dixit “puto autem nos Deus novissimos Apostolos ostendit," et in quatuordccim epistolarem suarum fulminans tubis, muros Jericho et omnes idolatriae machinias 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 τῇ ν ὄδν τῇς ἄληθείας as taken from 2 P. 22; Str. i. p. 374 σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις (cf. ib. iv. 636 τέλειος κα θαρισμὸς ... ἢ δι' ὑπακοῆς πάσης ἀγνείας σὺν καὶ τῇ ἀποθέσει τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν ... εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ σκηνόματος) as taken from 2 P. 114 ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου; Paed. iii. p. 280 ἐνὸς δὲ ὑπὸ δελεατὸς μνησθοῆσομαι ... τὸ Σοδομιτῶν πάθος κρίσις μὲν ἀδικήσαις, παιδαγωγαὶ δὲ ἀκοῦσαιν. As Clement quotes Jude by name in the following §§, it might be supposed that the reference here was to Jude v. 7, Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα ... πρὸκειμένως πυρὸς αἰωνίου, but there is much closer resemblance to 2 P. 26 τολείων Σόδομών καὶ Γομόρρας ... κατέκρινεν, ὑπὸδευνυμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, καὶ δίκαιον λῶς καταπνοοῦμενον ἐρύσατο κ.τ.λ. Ecl. Prophec. 20 ἀ γ ρ ᾣ ἡ ἵς Κύριος τῷ μίῳ αἴματι, δε ῥεσοτῶν πάλαι τῶν πικρῶν ἀπαλλάσσων ἀμαρτίων is like 2 P. 2 τῶν ἀγοράσασιν αὐτούς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι and 1 P. 19 ἐλυτρώθητε ... τιμῶν αἴματι; Str. ii. p. 458 β θ ε θ α νί ζω'ν δὲ ἐφ 'ος ἡμαρτεν τῇ ν ἐναντίον ψ υ χ η ν ἀγαθορρεγεῖ like 2 P. 28 ψυχὴν δικαιαν ἀνόμως ἔργων ἐβασάνιζεν, though the verb seems to me to have a different force in the two passages. In my notes on 2 P. 13.4 I have further called attention to resemblances in such phrases as θεῖα δύναμις, θεῖα φύσις, θεῖα ἀρετὴ 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 πεπιστευκένα δια τε τῇς προφητείας διά τε τῇς παρουσίας τῷ μὴ ψευδομένῳ θεῷ ... καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἑπαγγελίας βέβαιως κατελήθεν ὁ δὲ τῇν ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ κατάστασιν βέβαιως κατάληψιν εἰδὼς δι' ἀγάπης προσαντάτα τῷ
μέλλοντι, where faith is said to rest on prophecy, and on the actual manifestation of Christ, whereby the promises of the Gospel are confirmed, as in 2 Pet. 1:18-19 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν ... καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ. There seems to be an allusion to the same passage in Str. v. 663, ἡ μὲν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ ἐκ τῆς θυραλλίδος ἔοικεν λαμπρῆν, ἢ ἀνάπτουσιν ἀνθρώπου παρὰ ἡλίου κλείστοντες ἐν-τέχνως τὸ φῶς. κηρυχθέντος δὲ τοῦ λόγου πᾶν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἁγιον ἐξελάμψεν, where philosophy is compared (like prophecy in 2 P. 1:19) to the light of a candle which disappears before the sun. The latter part of the verse, ἐς οὖν ἡμέρα διαγνάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀναστῇ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, is illustrated in my note by three quotations from Clement, of which I will only repeat the last here, Prot. p. 89 ἀλαμπάτω ὡν ἐν τῷ ἀποκεκρυμμένῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, τῷ φώς. The words ἐωςφόρος and φωσφόρος occur in the others. It must be allowed however that Clement makes far less use of 2 P. than of 1 P., and that he omits references which might seem appropriate to his purpose, such as 1:7 ἦν γένησθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, which is often referred to by Didymus.

There appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1:13 in Eus. H.E. iii. 31 Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου ... τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλαγὴν τοῦ βίου τῶν σκηνῶν ματων ἀπόθεσεν ὁ χόρος δεδηλωται, and H.E. ii. 25, speaking of the site where τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνῶν ματῶν κατατεθεῖται. In the same writer's c. Hieroclem. c. 4 there seems to be an allusion to 2 P. 1:3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἱδία δύση καὶ ἀρετῆ in the words τῇ ἱδίᾳ θεότητι τε καὶ ἀρετῇ πᾶσαν ἔσωσε τὴν οἰκουμένην; and the same treatise abounds in such phrases as θεία δύναμις, φύσις, ἀρετῆ (see my note on 2 P. 1:4).

Hippolytus (d. 235) Haeres. ix. 7 (We resisted Zephyrinus and Callistus, confuting them and compelling them to confess the truth) οἱ πρὸς μὲν ὄραν αἰδούμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγόμενοι; συνεχόμενοι; ὁμολόγουν, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βόρβορον ἀνεκκυλίοντο, cf. 2 P. 2:2 and Clem. Al. Prot. p. 75 οἱ δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ ὑθείματα, τὰ ἡδονής ρεῦματα, καλυπτόμενοι ἀνοικτοῦσι ἐκβιόσκονται τροφᾶς, ὕδεις τινὲς ἀνθρώπου. ὑπὸ γὰρ, φησίν, ἤδειται ὑβόρβορο μᾶλλον ἢ καθαρὰ ὑδατί. Hippol. x. 34 μὴ προσέχοντες σοφίσμασιν ἐντέχνους λόγους μηδὲ ματαιοὶς ἐπαγγελιαῖς κλέφιλόγοιν
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a i r é s e w n, ἀλλ’ ἀλθείας ἀκόμπον ἀπλότητι σεμνη, δι’ ἂς ἐπιγνώσεως ἐκφεύγεσθε ἐπερχομένη πυρὸς κρίσεως ἀπειληλ καὶ ταρταροῦ σοφεροῦ ὅμμα ἀρώτηστον, cf. 2 P. 116, 24. In Dan. iii. 22, ὃ γὰρ ἄν τες ὑποταγή, τοῦτο δεδομένα ἤτα τοῦτο, cf. 2 P. 210. De Antichristo 2 oὐ γὰρ ἐξ ὑδαί ὡς δεδομένα ἤτα τοῦτον ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἐνέργειαν τοῦτον ἄπτετος ἢν μονίος ὑπό τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκριμένα, cf. 2 P. 120. 21. 1 Clem. ii. 27

Clementine Literature. Recognitiones v. 12 unusquisque illius fit servus cui se ipse subiecerit, cf. 2 P. 219. Homiliae, Epist. Clem. 2 ἐπη, ὃς ἐδιάκρινε ἄπο τοῦ με ἀποστείλαντος κυρίου τε καὶ διδασκάλου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, αἱ τοῦ θανάτου μου ἠγγίκασιν ἡμέρα Κλήμεντα τοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῖν 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 ὅν τῆς ἀλθείας κανόνα παραδώσων, ἐρμηνεύουτε τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας καταστομέμενοι ἄλλους εἰς τὸν ὄμοιον τῆς ἀποκριμένας ἐνέγκασι βοῶνυν, cf. 2 P. 316 ἀ ὁ ἀμαθεῖς στρέβλουσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπόλλειαν.

Apostolicae Pauli 13 ὅσ τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐξ ὅδοις; 15 θεοφρίσον τῆς φύχης τοῦ ἀσεβεῖς τῶς ἐξερχείται ἐκ τοῦ σκηνώματος αὐτῆς, cf. 2 P. 14, 15; 18 παραδοθήτω ἡ φύχη αὕτη ταρταροῦ χρῷ ἀγγέλῳ καὶ φυλαττέσσορα ἐως τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως, cf. 2 P. 29, 31; 4 ἡ μακροθυμία μοῦ πάντων τούτων ἀνέχεται ὅτες μετανοήσουσιν, cf. 2 P. 3.

Irenaeus (fl. 180) iii. 1. 1, ἡμᾶτα τῆς τοῦτων (i.e. Peter and Paul) ἐξ ὅδοις Μάρκος τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε, cf. 2 P. 115; iv. 36 Νοε justae dilinium inducens, cf. 2 P. 24 κατακλυσμοῦ ἐπάξας. Irenaeus has the same adaptation of Ps. 90 ἡθα ἐτήν ὅσον ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθές, as we find in 2 P. 31 μὴ ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χήλα ἐτή, though he applies it with a different reference, viz. to explain the non-fulfilment of the warning against eating the forbidden fruit (v. 23, 2) and as signifying that the millennium would begin after the completion of 6000 years. We have seen that Methodius names 2 P. as the source of this quotation, which occurs also in Justin Martyr Dial. 81 (written about 145 A.D.) συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χήλα ἐτή, which has, with him, the same double application as with Irenaeus. So Barnabas (xv. 4) commenting on
Gen. 2\textsuperscript{2} συντελέσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, explains it as meaning that ἐν ἐξαισθήσεις ἐπεν αὐτὸς σύμπαντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρὰ αὐτῷ χίλια ἐτην αὐτὸς δὲ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων Ἰδοὺ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἐστάι ὡς χίλια ἐτη. And he proceeds to explain the rest of the 7th day to mean that the Son will come to judge the wicked and change the existing universe and put an end to τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, and will afterwards rest on the 7th day.

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

I go back now to Theophilus of Antioch (π. 170). In the treatise ad Autol. ii. 13 there appears to be a reminiscence of 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{9} in the words ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὡσπέρ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν; while ii. 9 οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι, πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἄγιον καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες ἐγένοτο θεοδίκαι, and ii. 33 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἄγιον διασκόμεθα τοῦ λαλήσαντος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις προφηταῖς remind us of 2 P. 2\textsuperscript{11}.

Justin Martyr (Dial. 51) ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ (‘in the interval before His Second Coming’) γενήσεσθαι αἱρέσεις (Μ. ιερεῖς) καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὑψόματι αὐτοῦ προερήμηνος, (ἑβ. 82) δι’ ἐπὶ τρόπον καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῶν παρ’ ὑμῖν γενομένων ἄγιων προφητῶν ἡσαν, καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν νῦν πολλοὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδασκάλου.

Heracleon (c. 130) ἀπ. Οριγ. in Joh. tom. 13, τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τοῦ ἀνωθεν ἐπιχορηγοῦμένου πλουσίως καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκβιλύσαι εἰς τὴν ἔτερων αἰώνιον ξωὴν τὸ ἐπιχορηγοῦμένου αὐτοῖς, cf. 2 P. 1\textsuperscript{11} οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται υἱὸν ἡ εἰσόδως εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος.
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Aristides (c. 130) Apol. xvi. ἡ ὄδος τῆς ἄληθείας ἂν τὸς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείας, cf. 2 P 1,11 22.


Polycarp Ep. ad Phil. 3 κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου ἡ αἰώνιον, cf. 2 P. 216.

2 Clem. Rom. (c. 150) 11 (a quotation from ἡ προφητικὸς λόγος) ταῦτα πάντα ἡ κούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρων ἡ μόνη, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ μέραν ἐξ ἡ μέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἐωράκαμεν, cf. 2 P. 1 19, 2, 8 34; ib. 16 ἔρχεται ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίσιμος καίμενος, καὶ τάκεσται αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀσα ἡ γη ὡς μόλυβδος τη κόμενος, καὶ τότε φανησται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἐργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Cf. 2 P. 37,10,12.

Hermas (c. 140) Vis. iii. 8 ἐκ τῆς πίστεως γεννᾶται ἡ ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἀπλότης, ἐκ τῆς... ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἡ ἀγάπη; a similar climax occurs in Mand. v. 2. 4, cf. 2 P. 1 15 ἐν τῇ πίστει τὴν ἀρετὴν, κ.τ.λ.; Mand. xi. 12 ὁ δοκῶν πνεύμα ἐχειν ὑποδέχεται καὶ ἀναιδῆς ἐστι καὶ ἐν τῷ φαίνεσθαι πολλαῖς ἀναστρέφομεν καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπὸ ταῖς, καὶ μισθοὺς λαμβάνει τῇ προφητείας αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 213.

Clement of Rome 9 τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, cf. 2 P. 217. 1b. 35 ἀγωνισμόμεθα εὐρεθήναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομενόντων αὐτῶν, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γενεαλογικὴν μένων ὅρῳ τούτῳ, ἀναγίνῃτοι; ἐάν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ διάνοια ὤμοι διὰ πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεόν... ἐάν ἐτέλεσωμεν τὰ ἀνήκοντα τῇ ἡ μόνῃ βουλήσῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἁληθείας, cf. 2 P. 37,14 14,12 22. 1b. 27 ἐν τῇ μεγαλοκαθήμενης αὐτοῦ σωματίκης καὶ ἀναστρέφεσαι, cf. 2 P. 35. 71. 1b. 23 πάρρῳ γενέσθω ἣ ἡμῶν ἡ γραφή αὐτῆς ὅπου λέγει Ταλαίπωροι εἰσίν... οἱ λέγοντες, Ταῦτα ἡ κούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἱδοὺ γεγράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῶν τούτων συμβεβηκεν, cf. 2 P. 34 and 2 Clem. Rom. 11 quoted above.
Internal Evidence.

Making allowance for the possibility that many of these resemblances may be accounted for by the general similarity of thought and speech in the early Church, still I think that, if we had nothing else to go upon in deciding the question of the authenticity of 2 P. except external evidence, we should be inclined to think that we had in these quotations ground for considering that Eusebius was justified in his statement that our epistle τολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανείσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιστουδάσθη γραφῶν. Our previous investigations however seem to me to show conclusively that the epistle is later than that of Jude (see Introduction, ch. i.) and that it was not written by the author of 1 P., whom we have every reason to believe to have been the Apostle St. Peter himself (see above chapters iv. and v.). We conclude, therefore, that the second Epistle is not authentic; but was written by some one who made use of the honoured name of Peter, as was done by others in the second century, with a view of commending to the Christian reader views which he regarded as important, and which he believed to be in accordance with St. Peter's teaching. The production of such pseudopigrapha was common both among the Greeks, as in the case of the Platonic Epistles, some of which are ascribed to Plato's immediate disciples, and among the Jews, as Ecclesiastes and the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Esdras, Baruch, Enoch, and the Sibylline Oracles. Their example was naturally followed by Christian writers, as early as the second century, in the form of Gospels or Acts or Epistles or Revelations or didactic treatises. Sometimes these were used for the purpose of putting forth new, perhaps heretical views, as in the Gospel of Peter, which was read in the churches of Cilicia in the second century, but the use of which was forbidden (c. 200) by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, on the ground that it favoured the heretical views of the Docetae. At other times they were of the nature of romances, as the Acts of Paul and Thecla, though this, like many other productions of the time, was written (or revised) in the ascetic interest. The author of 2 P. probably desired to emphasize the warning against

1 None have felt more strongly the difficulty of assigning the two epistles to the same author than Spitta, who in order to support the genuineness of 2 P., found himself driven to deny the genuineness of 1 P.
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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 3⁴ 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 δὲ Ζήμων Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἄγγελός μου λαβόντες τὰ λίνα ἀπήλθομεν εἰς τὴν βάλλεσαν, and the author of the Apocalypse of Peter giving his version of a Transfiguration, says ἥμεις οἱ δακτικα μαθηταὶ ἐδείχθημεν ὡς δεῖξι ἡμῖν ἐν τῶν ἀξιώμαν τῶν ἐθλοῦντω ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα δοθῶντο παταγοῖ εἰς τὴν μορφήν. Similarly the author of the Prudic. Petri speaks of the Apostles in the 1st person. It does not appear that Serapion objected to the Gospel of Peter as spurious, but as heretical; and though Tertullian (De Baptismo xvii.) tells us that the writer of the Acts of Paul and Thecla was condemned quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, 'on the ground that he imputed to Paul an invention of his own,' yet the reason of his condemnation seems to have been that he made Paul guilty of allowing a woman to preach and to baptize. (This is also the view of Lipsius, Acta Apocrypha xcv.) In like manner the vehement warning against apocryphal writings in the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 16) is not directed against them simply qua forgeries,—a charge to which all the books professing to give teachings of the Apostles, independent of what is recorded in the N.T. were themselves liable, as we may see from the curious list of names which stands at the head of the Canones Ecclesiastici—but on the ground of their heretical teaching. When we further call to mind that Eusebius (H.E. i. 3) quotes as genuine an epistle purporting to be written by Christ to Abgarus, which epistle is now universally allowed to be a forgery, it is evident that there were among the early Christians both of 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 Νῶε ἐσωσά σε, he goes on to explain that τὸ μυστήριον τῶν σωζόμενων ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ γέγονεν... those that were saved being eight in number σύμβολον εἶχον τῆς ἀριθμοῦ μὲν ὄψιν ἡμέρας ἐν ἕ ἑφαίνη ὁ Χριστός ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάς... δὲ ὑδατος καὶ πίστεως καὶ ξύλου οἱ μετανοοῦντες ἐφ᾽ ὀσ ἡμαρτον ἐκφέυξινται τὴν μέλλουσαν κρίσιν. And so Irenaeus (i. 18. 3) in his account of the heresy of Marcus says τὴν τῆς κιβωτοῦ οἰκονομίαν ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ ἐν ὑδώ ἀνθρώπω τις καταστροφὴ κατέκρινεν. 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, τεφρώσας καταστροφὴ κατέκρινεν. If so, it must have been written after 80 A.D. In my note on 32 I have assumed that the writer is included in τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν, but the passage would read more naturally, if the writer could be regarded as making a distinction between himself and the Apostles. So far as it goes, this tells against the authenticity of the Epistle. Dr. Bigg considers that the absence of any reference to the Millennium, which was connected with 2 P. 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 ἰδιολογία, i.e. the science of nature, inanimate, animate, and divine. To this he replies that Moses made it his first object Θ ε ο ύ φ υ σ ι ν ι κατανοήσαι. From this point it will be more convenient to quote the Greek, καὶ τῶν ἐργῶν τῶν ἑκείνου θεατὴν τῷ νῷ γενόμενον οὕτως παράδειγμα τὸ πάντων ἀριστῶν μιμεῖσθαι.... οὕτε γὰρ αὐτῷ ποτ' ἂν γενέσθαι νοῦν ἀγαθὸν τὸ νομοθέτη ταύτης ἀπολειπομένῳ τῆς θέας, οὕτε τῶν γραφησμένων εἰς ἀρετής 2 λόγον οὐδὲν ἀποβήσεσθαι τοῖς λαβόσιν, εἰ μὴ πρὸ παντὸς ἄλλου διδάχθειν, ὅτι πάντων πατήρ τε καὶ δὲ σύντομα ὁ πατήρ ὁ καὶ πάντα ἐτιβλέπειν τοὺς μὲν ἐπομένους αὐτῷ διδομένην εὐδαιμονία βίον, τοὺς ἐξω δὲ βαίνοντας ἀρετής μεγάλαις περιβάλλει συμφοραῖς. τούτο δὴ παίδευσαι βουληθεὶς Μωϋσῆς τὸ παίδευμα τοὺς ἐαυτοῦ πολλάτας, τῆς τῶν νόμων θέσεως οὐκ ἀπὸ συμβολαίων καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἄλληλος δικαίων ἡρήσατο τοῖς ἄλλοις παραπλησίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Ἁθέαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευήν τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν ἀναγαγόν καὶ πείσας, ὅτι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ κάλλιστον ἔσμεν ἀνθρωποί, ὅτε πρὸς τὴν ε ὑ σ ε β ε ι α ν 3 ἐσχῆν ὑπακούόντας, μαθιαὶς ἢδη περὶ πάντων ἐτεθειν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλου νομοθέτη φαντάζονται τοῖς μυ θ ό ις 4 ἐξ ἀ κ ο λ ο ο ν ἥ σ α ν τε ἐς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ λόγῳ τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέθεσαν καὶ πολλὰ ὑποτίμησιν τοῖς πανηρίζει ἐδωκαν' ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφήνῃ τῇ ἄρετῇ 5 ἐχ οι ὑτ ἁ τι ροῦ ς ἀποφήμασιν ἀρκετοῦ δεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἑκείνης πειράσατο μεταλαμβάνειν, καὶ τοὺς μὴ ταύτῃ φρονούντας μηδὲ μὴν πιστεύονται ἀπαραντήτως ἐκ ὁ λ α σ ε ι ὑ ο ὑ 6 πρὸς ταύτῃ οὐν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοὺς ἀναγνωσμένους παρακαλῶν φανεῖται γὰρ σκοπομένους οὕτως οὐδὲν οὔτε ἄλογον αὐτοῖς οὕτε πρὸς τῇ μεγαλε ῶ τή ν α τοῦ Θ ε ο ύ 7 καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἀνάμορφον.

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. 16. 5 2 P. 13.
6 2 P. 20. 7 2 P. 110.
8 Notice also the repetition of the words σπουδὴ (twice) and σπουδάζω (thrice) in the preceding sections of Josephus, together with the words δεισποτής, εὔσεβεια, and ψευδὴ πλάσματα.
this unchangeableness by reference to the past destruction of the world by water, and dwells on the features of its future destruction by fire. This has little to do with Josephus’ explanation of the reason why the Law began with an account of the Creation. And again, much has to be omitted from the first chapter of 2 Peter, if we are to limit it to the manner in which we may become sharers of the divine nature. It cannot however be denied that there is a marked resemblance in the vocabulary and in many of the ideas of the two writers, a resemblance which is natural enough in two Jews trained on the old sacred books and familiar with later Jewish writings, such as Philo. This resemblance is found in other passages to which Dr. Abbott refers, e.g. Ant. iv. 8. 2 (Last words of Moses) λέγει τοι ἀδε ἀνδρεῖς . . . τῆς μακρᾶς κόσμου ταλαπωρίας, ἐπεὶ . . . χρόνου ἔτων εἰκοσι καὶ ἐκατον ἡμισμένον δεὶ με τούς ζην ἀπελθεῖν, καὶ . . . οὐ μελα ωσίωσιν ἐσεβαί . . . δι’ ἐκαίνον . . . ἡ γῆ σάμη ν μὴν μὴν μημὲ νῦν ἑγκαταλιπτών τούμων ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐθαμονίας. πρόθυμον, ἂλλ’ ἄδιδον πραγματεύσασθαι . . . μη νη μη ν έμαντι . . . μήτε νομὶ μω ν τῶν παρόντων ἀλλην προτειμήσητε διάταξιν μὴτ’ εὐσέβεις ής νῦν περὶ τούς θεοὺς ἔχετε (al. ἔχουντες), καταφρονήσαντες . . . εἰς ἀλλον μεταστήσησθε τρόπον. ταῦτα δὲ πράπτουσιν ἔσεβθαι . . . μηδὲν τῶν ἕχθρων εὐάλω τοι ἐν . . . διν (so. Eleazar and Joshua) ἀκροάσαθε μὴ χαλέπως, γινώσκοντες ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἀρχεῖ τὰ καλάς εἰδοτε. 11 καὶ ἄρχεν εἰσονται . . . τύν τ’ ἐλευθερίαν ἡ γείσας τέ . . . μὴ τὸ προσαγανάκτοιν οἰς δὲν αὐτοὶ οἱ ἑγεμόνες πράττειν ἐξεύσι . . . ταῦτα δ’ οὐκ ὀνειδίζετε ὑμᾶς προθέμεν, οὐ γᾶρ ἐπὶ δ’ έξοδον τοῦ ζῆν δυσχεραίνεστε καταλαμπαίνων έξουσίων εἰς τὴν ἀναμνήσειν ἑνός . . . βεβαιαῖα γὰρ ἀν οὕτως ὑμῖν ὑπάρξειν ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀφάλεια. ινα δὲ μὴ δι’ αμαθίαν ἡ φύσις ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ χείρον ἀπονευρίζῃ, σὺ νυ ἑτα καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ νόμους, ὑπαγορεύοντος μοι τοῦ θεοῦ. 18 In the same treatise xi. 6. 12 we find the phrase οἰς καλῶς ποιήσετε μὴ προσέχουντες, closely resembling 2 Pet. 1. 14 οἴς καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχουντες.

Similar resemblances might be quoted from Philo (M. 1. 70) on 2 P. 11 ἱσότιμων αὐτῷ ἡγούμενος ψυχῆ, ὥ. M. 1. 165 τῶν σοφῶν ἱσότιμων κόσμω, so ἱσότιμα in M. 1. 160, 2. 86; on ἄρετῇ Θεῷ

---

(2 P. 1), M. 1. 75, 222, 488, 489, 635; on θεία φύσις (2 P. 14),
M. 1. 51, 647, 2, 22, 143, 329, 343; on πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθη-
σται (2 P. 111), M. 2. 476; on τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον (2 P. 119),
M. 1. 95, 347.

Deissman (Bible Studies, pp. 360 f.) compares with 2 Pet. a de-
cree of Stratonicea in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and
Hecate, which begins by stating that τὴν πόλιν ἄνωθεν τῇ τῶν
προστώτων αὐτῆς μεγίστων θεῶν [προνοίᾳ, Διὸς Π]αρή-
με[βίον καὶ Ἐ]κάτης, ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ συνεχῶν κινήματων
σεσώθαι, ὃν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀνυλα καὶ ἱκέται καὶ ἥ ἱερὰ σύνκλητος,
δόγματι Σε[βαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἔπτ] ης τῶν κυρίων ἑα[υτῶν Α]ἰωνίων
ἀ[ἱ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑν ὑ 

[ ]Δρ. Πρωμαίων
αἰωνίων

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.

Apocalypsis Petri.

A much closer relation exists between the lately discovered
Apocalypsis Petri and our Epistle. The resemblances noted below
are taken chiefly from Dr. Montague James' Lecture on the Revelation of Peter', p. 52.

_Apoc._ § 1. πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφήται (2 Pet. 21), ἰδ. δόγματα πουηλία τῆς ἀπωλείας διδαξοῦσιν (2 P. 21), ἰδ. κρινεῖ τοὺς νῦν ἀντί μιᾶς (2 P. 214 κατάρας τέκνα), ἰδ. τὰς ψυχὰς ἐαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας (2 P. 28). _Apoc._ § 2. The twelve Apostles having gone up with the Lord εἰς τὸ ὅρος (2 P. 118) desire to see one of the departed saints in his glorified body, ἐδείξημεν ὅταν ἐδείξῃ ἡμῖν ἕνα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡμῶν τῶν δικαίων [τῶν] ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (2 P. 115), ἵνα ἔδωκεν ποιηταί (2 P. 311) εἰς τὴν μορφήν, καὶ ὑπανάγαντες παραθαρακώομαι καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς ἡμᾶς. § 3 καὶ εὐχομένων ἡμῶν ἄ[φινο φαίνονται δύο ἄνδρες ἐπιστάντες ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς ἐ[ων] ὄντες ἐπινήθημεν ἀντιβίβλεψαν ἐξηρέτω ἱη ἀπὸ τῆς ἡ ἔσσεσαν αὐτῶν ἀκίντι ὡς ἡλίον, καὶ φωτινὸν ἠν αὐ[τῶν δόλον τὸ] ἐνδύμα. This answers to the account of the Transfiguration in so far as it takes place on a mountain, as it exhibits the glorified bodies of two saints, and so inspires the Apostles with a confidence in the life to come, which they are able to infuse into their hearers (2 P. 116 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 119 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον). There are however several points of difference. The time is apparently after the Resurrection (James, p. 54). It is the Twelve and not the Three to whom the vision is manifested. There is no voice from heaven. The two saints are anonymous, so that the whole passage might seem to be rather a working up of the appearance of saints mentioned in Mt. 273 than of the Transfiguration of the Lord. Further resemblances are _Apoc._ § 6 ἐδοκιναὶ καὶ ἔστρωσαν τὸ πον ἐν χθ. η. ῆ. ὁ.ν (2 P. 119) πάνω, καὶ ἤν τὸ ποσ κολάσεως. καὶ οἱ κολαζόων ἐνοι ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ κολάζοντες ἀγγελοί σκοτινόν εἰχόν αὐτῶν τὸ ἐνδύμα κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ ὅρου (2 P. 29), ἰδ. (and § 13) οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τῆς ὁδόν τῆς δικαίας ὁμονήματος, ἐφ. 20 οἱ ἀφέντες τῆς ὁδόν τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 22.15.21). _Apoc._ § 8 λίμνη πεπληρωμένη βόρβολος (also in § 9, bis, § 16), ἰδ. § 15 ἐκπλήσσει κολαζόμενοι (2 P. 22 and Acta Thomae 52 ἐδοκίμασαν ... καὶ ψυχὰς ἐκεῖ κυλίνδοντας). _Apoc._ § 9 τὸ μίας ῆί τις μοιχείας καὶ § 17 μιᾶς τὰ σώματα ἑαυτῶν ὡς γυναίκες ἀναστρέφομεν (2 P. 220, 210). _Apoc._ § 13 (and § 15) πεπληρωμένοι (2 P. 312). _Apoc._ § 15 ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 221, 331). _Fragm._ 1 ἡ γῆ παραστήσει τον ἄνθρωπον. 
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πάντας τῷ Ὁθῷ ἐν ἡ μέρα κρίσεως καὶ αὐτῇ μέλλουσα κρίνεσθαι σὺν καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι οὐρανῷ. Fr. 2 καὶ τακῆσεται πάντα δύναμις οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐλεύθησεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρα πεσεῖται (2 P. 310-12). Fr. 5 παρὰ τὸν θεσμὸν (ἀθεσμός 2 P. 27, 317) τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης φύσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 P. 14). Ib. καταφρονήσαντες τῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ (2 P. 210, 221). Fr. 6 διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐσπράθη ὁ λαός (2 P. 219 ἡ τις ἡττηται, τοῦτο δεδουλωται). The punishment of sins against nature Apoc. § 17, 2 P. 26, 19, 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, *Apostolices etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus*, though it is added, quam (the latter ?) quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolint. 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 Ἁποκαλύψει and refers to it as ἡ γραφή. Methodius (Consviv. 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 σώματα αυτῶν ἦν λευκότερα πάσης χιόνος καὶ ἐρυθρότερα παντὸς ρόδου, συνεκτράτο δὲ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν αὐτῶν τῷ λευκῷ, καὶ ἀπλῶς οὐ δύναμεi ἐξηγήσασθαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν ἢ τε γὰρ κόμη αὐτῶν οὐλή ἢ καὶ ἀνθηρὰ καὶ ἐπιπρέπουσα (ἐπιπρέπουσα το) αὐτῶν τῷ τε προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὄμους, ὡσπερει στέφανοι ἐκ ναρδοστάχνους πεπλεγμένους καὶ ποικίλων ἀνθών, ἢ ὀστερ ἰρις ἐν ἄει, τοιαύτη ἢν αὐτῶν ἢ ἐνπρεπεια. 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 (ἀποστρέφουτες τὴν δικαιοσύ- νην). Comparing this list with that in the Apocalypse of St. John (21) we notice the absence of 'the fearful, the unbelieving, sorcerers, and all liars.' Comparing it with St. Paul's 'works of the flesh,' we miss witchcraft, hatred, emulations, seditions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, etc. (Gal. 5:19). If the author of 2 Pet. had made out such a list, must he not have mentioned the aἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας and ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι of 21, the ἁργία and ἀκαρπία of 18, the πλεονεξία and falsehood of 23, the proud, the presumptuous, and rebellious of 210, the boastful of 218, the back-sliders of 220, the mockers of 38? And there is nothing in our Epistle to suggest that its author would have allowed his fancy to revel in the grotesque ugliness of the tortures depicted in the Apocalypse called by his name. It appears to me therefore very improbable that the author of our Epistle wrote the Apocalypse, and I doubt very much whether he was in any way
indebted to it. On the other hand I think it highly probable
that the writer of the Apocalypse was acquainted with our
Epistle, and that the phrase κυλισμός βορβόρου (2 P. 22,
Ps. 402), along with the undying worm (Isa. 6624), the darkness
(2 P. 24), and the unquenchable fire, formed the substratum of his
idea of hell. Thus the worm appears in §§ 10, 12 and Fr. 6; the
darkness in §§ 6, 12; the fire in §§ 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20; the
quire in §§ 8, 9, 11, 16; rolling or wallowing in § 15 ἐκυλιόντο
ἐπὶ χαλίκων πεπυρωμένων, § 10 (murderers) πλησσομένους ὑπὸ
ἐρπετῶν πονηρῶν καὶ στρεφομένους ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ κολάσει ταύτη,
§ 20 φλεγόμενοι καὶ στρεφόμενοι. On the other hand Dr. Bigg
has pointed out (pp. 207 foll.) that in many respects the descrip-
tion given in the Apocalypse agrees with that in the Aeneid (cf.
vi. 296 Turbidus hic caeno vastaque voragine gurges aequat); also
that it shows signs of being written under stress of perse-
cution: cf. § 12 οὖτοι ἦσαν οἱ διώξαντες τοὺς δίκαιονθ, 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 maies-
tatem suam videre in monte sancto; videns autem luminis splen-
dorem eius cum filiis Zebedei, cecidi tamquam mortuos 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 ἱερότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχοσάων πίστιν, whereas the former is limited to the Christian communities of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, that is, to Churches which had probably received the Gospel either directly or indirectly from Paul and Silas, or, as he is called in 1 P. 5:12, Silvanus. The mention of the latter in that Epistle suggests that Peter may have been induced by him to write to the Christians of a region which, as far as we know, Peter had not personally visited, in addressing whom he might therefore be glad to use the name of Silvanus as an introduction. It is easy to understand why Silvanus should have wished to bring St. Peter’s influence to bear on the Churches of Asia Minor, if these, during the long absence of St. Paul, caused by his imprisonments in Caesarea and in Rome, had been led away by Judaizing teachers, who magnified the authority of St. Peter at his expense.1 These Churches, as we learn from the

1 Cf. 1 Cor. 1:12, 4:15, Gal. 2, 3.
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Acts, were made up of Jews and Gentiles, and the latter are plainly alluded to in 1 P. 1:18, εὐπρόσθετε ἐκ τῆς ματαῖας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροταραδότου. The vague language of 2 P. 1 seems to imply a similar division, with an assumption of higher privileges on the part of the Jewish section, which made it necessary to insist on the ἰσοτιμία of Jew and Gentile; but the most pressing danger seems to have been one which would probably affect the latter more seriously than the former, viz. the antinomianism which professed to rest itself on the authority of Paul (2 P. 3:16). The phrase ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶςματα τοῦ κόσμου in 2:20 seems also more appropriate to Gentile than to Jewish converts.

It has been argued from 1:16, ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, that the writer must himself have preached the Gospel to those whom he is addressing, and that he must therefore be included among 'your apostles' referred to in 3:2. It would seem also from 1:16, ἐπόταται γενηθέντες τῆς έκείνου μεγαλειότητος, that the Apostles referred to must have been those who witnessed the Transfiguration. But is there any hint either in the N.T. or in later Christian literature of any such joint mission undertaken by Peter and the two sons of Zebedee? It seems better therefore to understand the plural as referring here to a single person (cf. Blass, p. 166, where he quotes 1 Joh. 1:4 ταῦτα γράφομεν, Heb. 6:3 ποιήσομεν, 6:9 λαλοῦμεν, etc.), and to suppose the writer to refer simply to his own personal experience, though we may still hold, in accordance with 3:2, that he was not the only apostle concerned in the evangelization of the Church or Churches addressed.

We now come to the consideration of the mention in 2 P. 3:1 of a previous letter addressed to the same readers by the author. The allusion has generally been taken to mean that 2 P. was written to the Churches of Asia Minor designated in the first verse of 1 P. But the result of our comparison of the two Epistles has led us to ascribe them to different authors; and this is confirmed by the remarkable fact that, while the second Epistle implies a long acquaintance between the writer and his readers, who had received the Gospel from him and his fellow-apostles (1:16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν) and whom he felt bound to be continually reminding of the teaching they had received from the holy prophets, and
of the law of Jesus Christ in which they had been instructed by their Apostles (11:13, 31:2), 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. 31 καθὼς καὶ δ άγαπητός ἡμῶν Παύλος ἐγραψεν ήμῖν. I have suggested in my note that the Epistle referred to is that to the Romans, on the ground that ἡμῖν must be explained by the immediately preceding admonition τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἥγεισθε, which is more distinctly stated in Rom. 24, 325-26, 922 than elsewhere, though we find an echo of it in other Epistles, such as 1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 41, 61, Eph. 24-8, 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. An incidental notice in another, probably a later epistle, written also from Rome, reveals the virulence of this opposition still more clearly. Of all the Jewish Christians in Rome, the Apostle can name three only as remaining steadfast in the general desertion: Aristarchus his own companion in travel and captivity, Marcus the cousin of his former missionary colleague Barnabas, and Jesus surnamed the Just. 'In them,' he adds feelingly, 'I found comfort' (pp. 16-18).

Meanwhile among the Gentiles his preaching bore more abundant and healthier fruit. As he encountered in the existing Church of Rome the stubborn resistance of a compact body of Judaic antagonists, so also there were doubtless very many whose more liberal Christian training prepared them to welcome him as their leader and guide. If constant communication was kept up with Jerusalem, the facilities of intercourse with the cities which he himself had evangelized, with Corinth and Ephesus for instance, were even greater.

Thus aided and encouraged the Apostle prosecuted his work among the Gentiles with signal and rapid success. In two quarters especially the results of his labours may be traced. The praetorian soldiers, drafted off successively to guard him, and constrained while on duty to bear him close company, had opportunities of learning his doctrine and observing his manner of life, which were certainly not without fruit. He had not been in Rome very long, before he could boast that his bonds were not merely known, but known in Christ, throughout the praetorian guard. In the palace of the Caesars too his influence

1 Phil. 1:5-18, 2 Col. 4:16, 11.
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was felt. It seems not improbable that when he arrived in Rome he found among the members of the imperial household, whether slaves or freedmen, some who had already embraced the new faith and eagerly welcomed his coming. . . . Writing from Rome to a distant Church, he singles out from the general salutation the members of Caesar's household, as a body both prominent enough to deserve a special salutation and so well known to his correspondents that no explanation was needed (pp. 18, 19). Of the fact that the primitive Church of the metropolis before and after St. Paul's visit was chiefly Greek there is satisfactory evidence. The salutations in the Roman letter contain very few but Greek names, and even the exceptions hardly imply the Roman birth of their possessors. The Greek nationality of this Church in the succeeding ages is still more clearly seen. Her early literature for nearly two centuries is Greek. The first Latin version of the Scriptures was made not for Rome, but for the provinces, especially for Africa (pp. 19, 20).

The points to which I would call attention here are (1) the division of the Christians of Rome into a Jewish and a Gentile section, the former of which was more or less hostile to St. Paul; (2) the comfort St. Paul derived from the presence of Mark at the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians, perhaps in the year 61; (3) Mark's intended visit to Colossae (Col. 4:10); (4) the reference to Mark in 1 P. 5:13 ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἣ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ νιός μου, from which we learn that he was then (that is probably in the following year) with St. Peter in 'Babylon.' What are we to understand by 'Babylon' here? It was a name used by the Jews, as Edom also was, to express their hatred of the great world-power of that time: cp. Apoc. 14:8, 16:19, 17:5, etc. and also Orac. Sib. v. 143, where Nero is described as

τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης βασίλευς μέγας . . .
δότις παμμοῦσι φθόγγοι μεληδέας ὑμνοὺς
θεατροκοτῶν ἀπολεῖ πολλοὺς σὺν μητρὶ ταλαίνη.
φεύξεται ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἀνάξ φοβερὸς καὶ ἀναίδης,

and v. 158,

φλέξει αὐτὴν Βαβυλῶνα
'Ἰταλίης γαῖάν θ', ἣς εἴνεκα πολλοὶ ἤλωντο
'Εβραίων ἁγίοι πιστοὶ καὶ νάδος ἀληθής.

That Rome was the scene of the joint labours of the two Apostles\(^1\) and of their martyrdom under Nero is established by very early

---

\(^1\) See Eus. H.E. ii. 15, and Chase, Art. on Babylon in Hastings' D. of B. i. p. 213.
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 (μαρτυρία) 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. Tune 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 (111 f., 152 f.). The account of St. Paul’s arrival in Rome (Acts 2814 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. 135 f.), and that in Rome he grasped, as even he had never done before, the greatness of the issues involved (Eph. 211–418). If the churches saw the Apostle of the Gentiles and the leader of the Apostles of the Circumcision working together at Rome, they would learn the lesson of the unity of the Church, as they could learn it in no other way. Moreover St. Paul was pledged to distant journeys, so that the Church in Rome would be deprived of his immediate guidance, and as the far-reaching needs of that Church pressed upon him, he might well realize how manifold would be the gain resulting from the presence there of St. Peter. Hence it is probable that St. Peter may have arrived there at St. Paul’s request in the spring of 61. His absence from Rome when St. Paul wrote 2 Tim. we may perhaps explain on the supposition that

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

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

We may compare with this Zahn’s view of the last years of St. Peter and St. Paul (Einleitung in das N.T. ii. 17 foll.). He thinks that the sphere of St. Peter’s activity was limited to Palestine and Syria, until St. Paul’s first Roman captivity, and that it was to these Churches that he wrote 2 P. about the year 60, in order to warn them of the coming heresy. In the year 63, after St. Paul had been released from prison, and had commenced his missionary labours in Spain, St. Peter, probably on the invitation of Mark, went to Rome to supply St. Paul’s place. In Rome (‘Babylon’ 1 P. 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 επιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι τὴν ἀληθὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἡν στήτε). St. Paul’s absence in Spain explains why there is no allusion to him. Zahn thinks that within a year, in the spring of 64, St. Peter was crucified in the gardens of Nero.

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

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

1 Cf. Eus. H.E. iii. 11.
2 This seems very improbable, if we are right in supposing that the Epistle of Jude was written to the same Churches.
3 If he had gone there sooner, he must certainly have been mentioned in the epistles of the imprisonment.
4 Dr. Hort (Introd. to 1 Peter, p. 6) suggests that, as Silvanus was the bearer, St. Peter may well have left all personal matters for him to set forth orally.
5 Not ‘head downwards,’ which is merely a misinterpretation of ἀνωθεν in the phrase which we find in the Acta Pauli cited by Orig. Tom. xx in Joh. ἀνωθεν μᾶλλον σταυροῦσθαι, itself borrowed from Heb. 69 ἀνασταυρώτας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν αἶνον τοῦ Θεοῦ. See Zahn Einl. ii. 25, G.K. ii. 846.
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the other hand if, as we have seen reason to believe, 2 P. is a spurious document written some fifty years after St. Peter's death, it would be very natural for the writer to introduce a reference to the generally recognized tradition that both Apostles had preached and suffered in Rome (cf. ἐγγυρίσαμεν 116, and τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν 32). It may be said that the writer was not one to have overlooked the certainty that, if Peter wrote to the Church at Rome during the captivity of Paul, he must have sent some message of condolence or comfort or congratulation. This difficulty however is obviated, if he was aware that St. Paul was then on a missionary journey in Spain or elsewhere. But such hypotheses are not simply groundless, but altogether unnecessary. There is no reason to suppose that the author of 2 P. any more than the author of the Book of Wisdom desired to deceive his readers. The object of both was the same, to put before them the teaching which they supposed that Solomon in the one case, Peter in the other, would have given under the same circumstances. So far as they introduce historical or biographical allusions beyond what was essential to the actual teaching, these were added only by way of avoiding any startling disillusion.

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

Supposing this Epistle to have been written by St. Peter himself, why might he not have referred to a forthcoming life of Christ, as a treatise which would enable his readers to make mention of the Christian virtues and graces of which he had before spoken? He had already referred (13) to Christ, as having called them
idía dóxa kai ápethí: surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that he should leave behind the picture of this dóxa kai ápethí drawn up from his own recollection by his favourite disciple. And the following words οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθους ἐξακολουθήσαντες, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενθέντες 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 Ἱεροτυροσεις by Eusebius, H.E. ii. 15: 'The hearers of Peter in Rome were not satisfied with simply listening to his preaching' (τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ), para-
klήσει δὲ παντοίας Μάρκου, οὐ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλου-
θονόντα Πέτρου λιπαρῆσαι, ὃς δὲ καὶ διὰ γραφής ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ
λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψει διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερον τε ἀνέιναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τῶν ἀνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι
τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκου εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. εἰνόντα δὲ τὸ
πραχθὲν φασὶ τῶν ἀπόστολον, ἀποκαλύφαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύμα-
τος, ἠθίνηι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρώσαι τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς
ἐντευθεία τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Κλήμης ἐν ἐκτὸς τῶν 'Ὑποτυπώσεων
παρατέθενται τῇ ἱστορίᾳ, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱερα-
τολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὅνομα Παπίας. Much the same account is
given in Eus. H.E. vi. 14, according to the traditions τῶν ἀνέκαθεν
πρεσβυτέρων preserved by Clement, except that Peter is said to
have expressed neither approval nor disapproval of the action of
Mark. Irenaeus (iii. 1) says more briefly that after the martyrdom
of Peter and Paul in Rome Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς
Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖ
παραδέδωκε. Similarly Tertullian (adv. Marc. iv. 5). These
testimonies may all be considered later than 170 A.D., and we have
seen that Clement varies to a certain extent in his account.
Eusebius however (H.E. iii. 39) gives us the exact words of Papias,
reporting the testimony which he had heard with his own ears from
tοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου, an ancient disciple of the Lord: καὶ τούτῳ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. 'Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου
gενόμενος ὅσα ἐρμηνεύσασθαι ἀκριβῶς ἐγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ λεγέντα ἡ πραχέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἥκουσε τοῦ
Κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. ύστερον δέ, ὡς ἐφῆν, Πέτρῳ, ὁς
πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὖν ὡσπερ σύνταξιν
tῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγου· ὡστε οὔδεν ἡμαρτεν Μάρκος, οὗτος
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The statement seems to me to have every mark of simplicity and truth, and from it I think we should certainly infer, as Clement seems to have done, that Mark made notes of Peter's teaching at the time, and probably mentioned to him his intention of publishing his notes at some future time. If this was so, it was very natural for St. Peter to mention it in what he regarded as his last address to his disciples. If it was not so, that is, if Mark never spoke of his intention during Peter's lifetime, it was at any rate most natural that the pseudonymous writer of 2 P. should draw the same inference as Clement did from the words of Papias, or the tradition which they embody.

I take now one or two expressions in the Epistle which seem to be more easily explained on the supposition of a comparatively late date. If 1:15 was written by St. Peter, we naturally suppose the allusion to be to the words of Christ recorded in Joh. 21:18, but it is not easy to see how those words can be construed as implying that Peter, writing some thirty years afterwards, was shortly to die. Yet this must be the sense here, for it is given as a reason for making the most of the short time which remained. If stress is laid on the words ἐν τοῖς ἐξ ἐνεργείας, old age in itself is a sufficient warning of approaching death, so that there seems no reason to recur to the ancient prophecy, the point of which lies not in the nearness or remoteness of death, but in its character, a violent, as opposed to a natural death. It is a far-fetched way of connecting this idea with the nearness of death, to say that a violent death is a sudden death, and a sudden death leaves no time to prepare for death. It is much easier to understand it of a later warning, such as we find alluded to in Clem. Hom. and other apocryphal books. As St. Paul refers to his own approaching death in Acts 20:22,25 and 2 Tim. 4:8, so it seemed natural that a similar intimation should be made to St. Peter.

The phrase τὸ ἀνάγιον ὄρος (2 P. 1:18) seems to imply a later date than the simple εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν (Mk. 9:2, Mt. 17:1) or εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Lk. 9:29), whether we interpret it of a known mountain which had now become consecrated as the scene of the Vision, or whether we take it allegorically of the Mount of God, the New Jerusalem, as I have suggested in p. iv.

If τὸν ἀγωράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην (2 P. 2:1) is to be under-
stood of Christ, as I think it is by most commentators, this is probably the first instance of its being so used. Some scholars deny such a use previous to the fourth century.

In 3\textsuperscript{2} the writer reminds his readers of the command of the Lord, which they had received through their apostles, \textit{i.e.} through those who had preached the Gospel to them. It is evident from 1\textsuperscript{16} that Peter himself is to be counted as one of these, and from 3\textsuperscript{15} Paul would be another, together with the companions who had laboured with him at Rome during his imprisonment.

The most important passage in Jude bearing upon the circumstances of its composition is \textit{v. 17}, where the readers are bidden to call to mind the words formerly spoken to them by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (which would fit in with the suggestion (p. cvi) that it was addressed to the Syrian churches) ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν 'Επ' ἑσχάτου χρόνου ἐσουταὶ ἐμπαίκται, the latter words showing that these communications of the Apostles had now ceased, either by their death or by their removal from Jerusalem. Jude recognizes that ‘the last time,’ of which they had preached, had now arrived. The long retrospect which these words imply agrees with the far-away note of \textit{v. 3}, \textit{παρακαλῶν ἐπαγενίζεσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει}, as contrasted with such passages as Lk. 4\textsuperscript{21} σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, though we must not forget what has been pointed out in the comment (p. 61 below), that the idea of a Christian tradition is familiar to St. Paul, and (p. 23) that ‘there are other examples in the N.T. of the objective use of πίστει.

It has been argued that this epistle must have been written before 70, or it would have contained some reference to the destruction of Jerusalem among the other notable judgments of God. We may grant that this is what we should have expected, if the letter were written shortly afterwards, though even then it is a possible view that a patriotic Jew might shrink from any further allusion to so terrible a subject, beyond the reference to the destruction in the wilderness (\textit{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 (Ἰωύδας) 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 (ὁ Ἰακώβου, Lk. 6:16, Acts 1:13) and Thaddaeus (Mt. 10:3, Mk. 3:18, where some MSS. add Δεσπαιος). Besides these we meet with a Judas among the Brethren of the Lord (Mt. 13:55, Mk. 6:3), Judas of Galilee (Acts 1:22), Judas of Damascus (Acts 9:11). It is therefore not surprising that the writer should have added a note of identification, δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου. The most famous James in the latter half of the first century was the head of the Church at Jerusalem and brother of the Lord, who also begins his epistle by styling himself simply δούλος (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 δὲ in Tit. 1, as giving a reason why his words should be received with respect, since he was brother of James and therefore one of the Brethren of the Lord. In my Introduction to the Epistle of St. James (pp. i–xlvii), I have endeavoured to show that the Brethren of the Lord were sons of Joseph and Mary, that they did not join the Church till after the Crucifixion, and that none of them was included among the Twelve.¹

¹ See ver. 17, where the writer appears to distinguish between the Apostles and himself.
Other facts which we learn from the N.T. are (1) that Jude was probably either the youngest or the youngest but one of the Brethren of the Lord, as he is mentioned last among them in Mt. 13\textsuperscript{35} οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσής καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας, and last but one in Mk. 6\textsuperscript{3} ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; (2) that the Brethren of the Lord (of course exclusive of James, who remained stationary at Jerusalem) were engaged in missionary journeys like St. Paul (1 Cor. 9\textsuperscript{6}), but that they differed from him in the fact that they were married and were accompanied by their wives, and also, as we may suppose from Gal. 2\textsuperscript{9}, Mt. 10\textsuperscript{23}, that their ministrations were mainly directed to the Jews. In my edition of James (p. cxv) I have argued that his epistle was addressed to Jews of the eastern Diaspora and it seems not improbable that Jude, writing many years after his brother’s death, may have wished to supply his place by addressing to the same circle of readers the warnings which he felt bound to utter under the perilous circumstances of the new age. His cousin Symeon, the son of his uncle Clopas, had succeeded to the bishopric of Jerusalem (Eus. H.E. iii. 22, iv. 22, quoted in my edition of James pp. viii foll.), and is said to have been crucified A.D. 107 at the age of 120 (cf. Hesegippus ap. Euseb. H.E. iii. 32 ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν αἱρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσι τινὲς Συμεῶνος… ὥς θυτὸς ἀπὸ Δαβιδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, καὶ οὕτως μαρτυρεῖ ἑτῶν ἰδοὺ εἰκοσιοῦ ἔπει Τραίανος Καῖσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀγαθοῦ).

Eusebius (H.E. iii. 19) quotes again from Hesegippus an interesting story of the grandsons of Judas: τοῦ δ’ αὐτοῦ Δωμετιανοῦ τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους Δαβιδ ἀναφεύρθησαν προστάξαντος, ποιλαῖος κατέχει λόγους τῶν αἱρετικῶν τινὰς\textsuperscript{1} κατηγοροῦσα τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἰουνᾶ (τούτων δὲ εἶναι ἀδελφῶν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος) ὡς ἀπὸ γένους τυχανώτων Δαβιδ καὶ ὁι αὐτοῦ συγγένειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ φερόντων. ταύτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδε ποὺς λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος. (20) ἔτι δὲ περιῆχαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου νῦνοι Ἰουνᾶ, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, οὐς ἐθνικότρευσαν\textsuperscript{2} ὡς ἐκ γένους δυτικὰς Δαβιδ, τούτους δὲ ὁ Ἰουνάκατος\textsuperscript{3} ἤγαγε πρὸς Δωμετιανοῦ Καῖσαρα. ἑφοβεῖτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς εἰ ἐκ Δαβιδ εἶσι καὶ ὕμολογησαν. τότε ἡρώτησεν αὐτοὺς πόσας

\textsuperscript{1} Perhaps provoked by this epistle of their grandfather.
\textsuperscript{2} From delator.
\textsuperscript{3} Evocatus.
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 1:21, 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 3:2).

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

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

(3) For moral strictness and stern severity in rebuking sin, the whole of this short epistle may be compared with such passages as James 2:19, 3:15, 4:1–5:6. For noble and weighty expression we may compare vv. 20, 21, ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτούς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, εἰ πνεύματι ἂγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρῆσατε, προσευχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίου and the final doxology, with the passages which I have selected from St. James in p. ccxxviii. The appealing ἀγαπητοί, which is thrice found in St. James, is also thrice repeated in Jude. The warning against Respect of Persons is found in James 2:9 and in Jude 16: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James 13, 4:5, in Jude 15, 16; that against the misuse of the tongue in James 3:10, in Jude 16: the charge to labour for the salvation of others in James 5:19, 20, in Jude 22, 23. For special details of style see above, ch. ii. pp. xxvi foll.; but I may notice here the forcible antithesis in v. 10, ὡσ ὧν ὃν ὃδεσιν ἐλασθμοῦσιν, ὡσ δὲ φυσικὸς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἔπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

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

B. (1) The differences between the two epistles are hardly less marked: Jude evidently belongs to a much later period of Christian development. James, as I have endeavoured to show in the Introduction to his Epistle, wrote about the year 45 A.D. before any of the other canonical books was in existence, and his theological position is that of the early church described in the opening chapters of the Acts. Jude is familiar with the writings of St. Paul. He is familiar with the terms σωτήρ and σωτηρία (vv. 3 and 25):
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 ἄγιοι (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 (δίψυχος) and 48.9 ἀγνίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι· ταλαιπωρήσατε, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅποι λέγει Ταλαιπωροὶ εἰσὺν οἱ δίψυχοι1 and identified by Lightfoot and Spitta with Eldad and Modad (on which see Herm. Vii. ii. 3), by Hilgenfeld with the Assumption of Moses. The phrase in 414, ἄτμις γὰρ ἐστε πρὸς δίλγον φαινομένη, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 ἔγω δὲ εἰμὶ ἄτμις ἀπὸ κύθρας, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the Assumption of Moses. The phrase κόσμος ἀδίκλειας in James 35 is found in Enoch 487. The Testaments of the Patriarchs, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as Sim. 5 ἐώρακα ἐν χαρακτηρὶ γραφής Ἐνώχ, Levi 10 βιβλίος Ἐνώχ τοῦ δικαίου, ib. 14, ἔγνων ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνώχ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει ἀσεβήσετε, ib. 16, Juda 18,

1 The quotation, as given more fully in Clem. Rom. ii. 11, contains the somewhat rare word ἀκαταστασία, which is also used by James 32.
INTRODUCTION

Benj. 9, Zab. 3, Neph. 4, ἐν γραφῇ ἀγίᾳ Ἐυωκ ὅτι . . . ποιήσετε κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν Σοῦδόμων), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on James 4:7 ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύγεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν. The words which immediately precede (ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν) are not unlike another quotation which occurs in Herm. Ἔισ. ii. 3 ἐγγὺς Θεῶς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὃς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάτ καὶ Ἑλλάτ τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. James has also been credited with a knowledge of the Sibylline writings on the ground of the phrase ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου which occurs in 3:8 and also in Sib. Provem, 71

εἰς ἦς ἡμέραις δηλητόρας <οὕτω> ἀβούλων, τῶν δὲ κὰκ στόματος χεῖται θανατηφόρος ἱὸς.

But if there is borrowing, it is just as likely to be on the other side. The strange expression τροχὸς γενέσεως in 3:6 is regarded as Orphic by some, but it seems to have been used by the Orphic writers in a different sense, viz. that of the endless changes of metempsychosis.

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

1 MS. δολοτοτος. Geffcken reads δόλῳ ἡγητῆραs.
CHAPTER IX

USE OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS BY JUDE

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

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

---

\(^{1}\) On which see Schürer, Hist. of Jewish People, vol. iii. pp. 54–73.
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 judicij Dei, quoniam angeli quidam decidierunt in terram in judiciij' (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 φέρεται ὡς θεία τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία, and In Johannem vi. 25, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἴ τῷ φίλῳ παρεδέχεσθαι ὡς ἀγιον 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 descendentes 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 reiciitur.' 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 φθοροτοι καὶ τῆς ἄληθείας ἐχθροὶ.

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.
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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 1). Thus Jude v. 9 is derived from the Assumption, Jude v. 16 from the Testament (p. lxii). On the latter Charles compares οὕτωι εἰσὶν οὐγγυνται, μεμψύχωροι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέργυρα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὥρελας χάριν with Asc. M. vii. 7 quaerulosi, vii. 9 et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes et os eorum loquentur in gentiæ, v. 5 erunt illis temporibus mirantes personae . . . et accipientes munera (MS. acceptiones munera). He identifies the ἐμπαίκται of Jude v. 18 with the homines pestilentiosi of Ass. M. vii. 3, and calls attention to the frequent recurrence of the word ἀσεβείς in the former (vv. 4, 15, 18) and impii in the latter: see vii. 1 facient facientes impietatem, vii. 3 pestilentiosi et impii, ib. 7, ix. 3, xi. 17.

Again there appears to be a reminiscence of the Testaments of the Patriarchs, where the sin of the Watchers is connected with that of Sodom: cf. Test. Nepht. 3, ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστέρες οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἑθνη πλανητέντα καὶ ἀφέντα κύριον ἡλλοίοσαν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἀξιοκοινοθήσαντες πνεύματι πλάνης. Ὄμεις μή οὕτως . . . ἵνα μη γένησθε ως Ὁδόμα, ἢτις ἐνήλλαξεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὅμοιος καὶ Ἐγγύθορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὐδε κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, Test. Asen. 7 μή γίνεσθε ως Ὁδόμα ἢτις ἠγνώσει τοὺς ἀγγέλους κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἐως ἀδώνος. There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7, and 13, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν εαυτῶν ἀρχήν . . . ως Ὁδόμα . . .

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 διάβαλος ἀντεῖχεν δ λιων ἀπατήσας, λέγων ὅτι Ἠμῶν ἐστίν τὸ σάμα, ὡς τὴν ἔλεης δεσπόζων· καὶ ἤκουσαν τὸ ἑπιτιμήσας σοι Κύριος, τοῦτον δὲ Κύριος ὁ πάντων τῶν πνευμάτων δεσπόζων· ἐλλοι δὲ, ὃτι βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς δειξεῖ ὃτι μετὰ τὴν ἐπιθετικὴν απαλλαγήν, ταῖς ἡμετέραις φυσικῶς ἀνθητάταις ἢν δὲ προσευμέναι τῇ ἐνὶ τὰ ἄνω πορείας, τούτῳ οὖν συνεχόμενω ἀράθεται ἐκ τῆς Μωσιών ταφῆς: ἐβλασφήμη γὰρ καὶ ὁ διάβαλος κατὰ Μωσίους, φοιτὰ τοῦτον καλῶς διὰ τὸ παταξία τῶν Ἀληθείων· τὸ ἡμᾶς ἐρήμων, εἰς ἐνέγκυων τὴν αὐτῶν βλασφημίαν, ἐφηκέν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἑπιτιμήσας σοι Κύριος ὁ θεὸς, διάβολ. Ἐλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὃτι ἐφεύσατο ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀγαγῶν τὴν Μωσιῆν ὕπα παρασσεν αὐτῶν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.
We have seen how this use of apocryphal books was viewed by the early Christian writers. They were at first disposed to think that a book stamped with the approval of St. Jude must be itself inspired. Later on, the feeling changed: the authority of St. Jude was no longer sufficient to save the apocryphal writing: on the contrary the prejudice against the Apocrypha and its ‘blasphemous fables’ (Chrys. Hom. 22 in Gen.) led many to doubt the authority of St. Jude: see above quotation from Jerome, who argues that the approval of the Apostle need not be supposed to extend to the whole of the book of Enoch, but only to the verses quoted by him. So Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 23, 4): ‘Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam negare non possimus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat’ (although the book as a whole has been justly excluded from the Canon).

Some modern writers have endeavoured to avoid the necessity of allowing that an apocryphal writing is quoted as authoritative in the Bible, by the supposition that the words quoted may have come down by tradition and have been made use of by the inspired writer, independently of the book from which he is supposed to quote, or that they were uttered by immediate inspiration without any human assistance, or again, that the book of Enoch may be subsequent to that of Jude, and have borrowed from it. But the careful investigation of many scholars, as summed up by Charles, can leave little doubt in any candid mind as to the proximate dates, both of Enoch and of the Assumption. St. Jude does not put forward his account of the burial of Moses or the preaching of Enoch, as though it were something unheard of before. As regards the libertines described in the latter book, he uses the phrase προγεγραμμένοι, implying that he refers to a written prophecy. None of the early Fathers find a difficulty in supposing him to refer to a book which was not included in the Canon. Jews of that time were accustomed to accept rabbinical explanations or additions to Scripture as having authority. Thus St. Paul accepts the story of the Rock which followed the Israelites in their wanderings (1 Cor. 10:4), gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses before Pharaoh (2 Tim. 3:8), recognizes the instrumentality of angels in the giving of the Law (Gal. 3:19, cf.
Heb. 2:2, Acts 7:53). So, too, Stephen speaks of Moses as learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7:22), the author of the ep. to the Hebrews (11:37) alludes to the tradition as to the death of Isaiah (see Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xlv foll.), and James (5:17) limits the drought predicted by Elijah to 3½ years.
CHAPTER X

THE STORY OF THE FALLEN ANGELS

St. Jude (vv. 5–8) introduces as examples of the divine wrath against those who had sinned after receiving favours from God (1) the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for unbelief after they had been saved from Egypt; (2) the angels who abandoned their original office and habitation, being led away by fleshly lusts, and are now kept in chains under darkness till the day of judgment; (3) the people of Sodom, who inhabited a land like the garden of the Lord (Gen. 13:10) and were rescued from Chedorlaomer by Abraham (Gen. 14:16, 17), and yet sinned after the fashion of the angels, and are now a warning to all, suffering the punishment of eternal fire. A similar account is given in 2 Pet. 2:4–9, 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
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That the version ἄγγελοι gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase 'sons of God' occurs, Job 1:6, 21, 38; Dan. 3:25,28; Ps. 29:1, 89:6. It has been suggested that the phrase μετ' ἐκείνο, ὡς ἀν εἰσεπτερούντο οἱ νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ πασῶν ἄν ἐξελέξαντο ... οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἁμέραις ἐκεῖναις, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνο, ὡς ἀν εἰσεπτερούντο οἱ νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐγέννωσαν ἑαυτοῖς, ἐκείνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αὐώνοι, οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ ὅνομαστοί (LXX.). That the version ἄγγελοι gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase 'sons of God' occurs, Job 1:6, 21, 38; Dan. 3:25,28; Ps. 29:1, 89:6. It has been suggested that the phrase μετ' ἐκείνο may be a marginal note having reference to Num. 13:33, where the Nephilim are mentioned as a gigantic race, 'in whose eyes the spies were as grasshoppers,' inhabiting a part of Canaan at the time of the Exodus. The translation γίγαντες implies not only superhuman size, but also superhuman insolence and impiety. According to Greek mythology they were children of Heaven and Earth, who rose up in insurrection against the Gods and were hurled down to Tartarus or buried beneath the mountains. This resemblance is noted by Josephus in the passage quoted below.

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

The story was variously commented on by later Jewish writers, most of whom supposed that the Nephilim were the offspring of the intercourse between the angels and the daughters of men, and that they were destroyed in the Flood: cf. Sir. 16:7 οὐκ εἴξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γυνώντων οἱ ἀπέστησαν (ὑπὲρπιστευον τῇ ἱσχύι αὐτῶν, Wisdom, 14:8 ἀπολύμενου ὑπερηφάνων γυνώντων, ἡ ἐλπὶς τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ σχέδιας καταφυγόντα ἀπέλεπυ αὐῶν σπέρμα γενέσεως τῇ σῇ κυβερνθείσα χειρί, 3. Macc. 24 οὗ τοὺς ἐμπροσθεν ἀδικίαν ποιήσαντας, ἐν οἷς καὶ γίγαντες ἦσαν ρώμη καὶ θράσει πεποιθότες, διέφθειρας, ἐπαγαγών αὐτοῖς ἀμέτρητον ὕδωρ, Baruch
clx
INTRODUCTION

326-28, Josephus Ant. I. 3. 1, πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοὶ Θεοῦ γυναιξὶ συνιόντες ὑβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παιδας καὶ παντὸς ὑπερόπτας καλοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει πεποίθησιν. ὡμοία τοῖς ὑπὸ γυμνῶν τετολμήσθαι λεγομένοις ὑπ’ Ἑλλήνων καὶ οὕτω δράσαι παραδίδονται. Philo (Vit. Cont. p. 472) ridicules the idea of angels being open to such temptation, ἢν τολμῶσιν οὐκ εὐαγγελιστέως προσφύγειν ταῖς μακαρίαις καὶ θείαις δυνάμεσιν, εἰ γυναιξὶ θηταις ἐπιμανεῖτε ὧμιλήσαν οἱ παντὸς πάθους ἀμέτοχοι. A knowledge of the sin of the angels seems to be implied in Job 418, 'Behold he put no trust in his servants and his angels he charged with folly,' and also in the story of Sarah and Asmodeus (Tobit 614 etc.). Tertullian (De Virg. Vel. 7) explains St. Paul's injunction (1 Cor. 1110) by reference to the same history 'propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob 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, Ἑγρήγοροι 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 ἑτέκνωσαν Ναφθλεῖμ ἡμέρας ἐπὶ ταῦτα ἁρξαίτο οἱ γίγαντες κατεσθείσαι 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 lust 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. 12\(^9\) καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ δόξε ὁ ἄρχαῖος, ὁ καλοῦμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὄλην—ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν; or else was supposed to have made use of the Serpent as his instrument, as in the Assumption of Moses quoted by Orig. De Princip. iii. 2. 1 (Lomm. vol. xxi. p. 303): 'In Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Asc. Mosis, cujus libelli meminit apostolus Judas, Michael Archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam extitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae.'

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

---

1 See his note on pp. 36, 37.
2 Cf. Tennant, The Fall and Original Sin, pp. 245, 246.
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to harmonize the two Fall-stories by making Satan the cause of both, an attempt was made to arrive at the same result by ascribing to Satan or the Serpent the same motive which led to the fall of the angels. In Wisdom 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 ἐλυμίματο μον τὰ ἀγνὰ τῆς παρθενίας λυμείν ἀπάτης ὄφις. Sometimes again his fall is ascribed to the less ignoble motive of pride, as in the pseudepigraphic Life of Adam: ‘When God created Adam, He called upon the angels to adore him as His image ... Satan however refused, and on being threatened with the wrath of God said that he would exalt his throne above the stars of heaven’ (Isa. 1413). In other writings (Life of Adam, Secrets of Enoch) Satan refuses to worship God Himself, ‘entertaining the impossible idea that he should make his throne higher than the clouds over the earth, and should be equal in rank to [God’s] power.’

There can be little doubt that the story of the punishment of the angels took its colouring from two passages of Isaiah, the fine imaginative description of the mighty king of Babylon, under the figure of the morning star, entering the realm of Hades (ch. 14) and what appears to be an account of the punishment of guardian angels for their neglect of the nations committed to their charge (ch. 2421f.), ‘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, 2063.
terms, when contending for the body of Moses. So the continued activity and even the authority of Satan and his angels in this world are asserted both in the O.T., as in Job 1 and Zech. 3 and in the N.T., as in James 4, 1 P. 5, Eph. 6 (we have to stand against the wiles of the devil, ... our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but) ἀρχάς, ἀρχάς ἐξουσίας, ἀρχάς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον, ἀρχάς τὰ πνευματικὰ τὴς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see Lightfoot on Col. 2. In 2 Cor. 4 Satan is spoken of as the god, in John 12 and 16 as the prince of this world. He is the tempter and accuser of the brethren, and did not shrink even from assailing the Son of God Himself (Mt. 4).

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. Nepth. iii. Ἐγρήγορες ἐνῆλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὐς κατηρύσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, and with a rationalistic explanation in Test. Rub. v. where the watchers are said to have been seduced by women, οὖτω γὰρ ἔθελαν τοὺς Ἐγρηγόρους πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ κάκευνοι συνεχῶς ὀρῶντες αὐτὰς ἐγένοντο ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἄλληλον, καὶ συνέλαβον τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν πράξιν καὶ μετευχηματίζοντο εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐν τῇ συνουσίᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν συνεφαίνοντο αὐταῖς, κάκευναι ἐπιθυμοῦσαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῆς φαντασίας αὐτῶν ἐτεκνοῦν γίγαντας. So Justin M. Apol. i. 5, τὸ παλαιὸν δαίμονες φαύλοι ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι καὶ γυναῖκας ἐμοίχευσαν καὶ παῖδας διεθείραν καὶ φόβητρα ἀνθρώπων ἔθεσαν, ὡς καταπλαγῇ τοὺς οἱ, ... μὴ ἐπιστάσαν δαίμονας εἶναι φαύλους, θεοὺς προσωνόμαξον, Apol. ii. 5, ὁ δ ἄγγελος, παραβάντες τὴν τὰξιν, γυμνακῶν μίξεις ἠττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἱ εἰσίν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες, Heracleon ap. Orig. (in Joh. tom. 13, Lomm. vol. ii. p. 125) ἵππεισθαί φημι περὶ τῶν ἄγγελων, εἰ σωθήσονται, τῶν κατελθόντων ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων θυγατέρας, Tert. Apol. 22, De Virg. Vel. 7, De Cultu Fem. 2 (where he defends the authenticity of our Epistle), ib. 10, Iren. iv. 36. 4, Clem. Al. Paed. iii. p. 260, δείγμα σοι τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος ἀπολελυμένος διὰ κάλλος μαριμόμενον, καὶ τοσοῦτον εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀποτελοῦστες χαμαί, ib. p. 280, Strom. iii. p. 538, Str. v. 650, οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐκεῖνοι οἱ τῶν ἀνῶν κλήρου εἰληχότες κατολοθήσαντες εἰς ἱδονάς, ἤξειτον τὰ ἀπόρρητα ταῖς γυναιξίν 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. 6\(^2\) he seems to accept the ordinary view in the words οὐ μόνον δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξεπέσεν ἐκ τελείου ἐπὶ τὸ ἀτέλες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱδώντες οἱ νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἄνθρωπων κ.τ.λ.

His contemporary Julius Africanus is said to be the only one of the ante-Nicene Fathers who enunciated the view which afterwards prevailed, viz. that ‘the sons of God were the descendants of Seth, and the daughters of men descendants of Cain.’ \(^1\) See the quotation in Routh, Rel. Sacr. ii. p. 241, where he also gives the alternative explanation εἴ δὲ ἐπὶ ἀγγέλων νοοῦτο τοῦτο, τῶν περὶ μαργαρίας καὶ γοητείας ... ἐσχολακότας συνιέναι χρὴ τῶν μετεώρων ταῖς γυναιξί τῆς γυναικός δεδωκέναι. Eusebius (Pr. Ev. v. 4. 11, 12) still keeps to the old view and compares the narrative of Gen. 6 to the stories of the Titans and giants of Greek mythology. So Lactantius, Div. Inst. ii. 14: ‘Deus ne fraudibus suis diabolus, cui ab initio terrae dederat potestatem, vel corrumpseret vel disperderet homines, quod in exordio rerum fecerat, misit angelos ad tutelam cultumque generis humani ... Itaque illos cum hominibus commorantes dominator ille terrae fallacissimus consuetudine ipsa paullatim ad vitia pellexit et mulierum congressibus inquinavit ... sic eos diabolus ex angelis Dei suos fecit satellites,’ etc. So Sulpicius Severus (Chron. i. 2): ‘Angeli quibus caelum sedes erat, speciosarum forma virginum capti ... naturae suae originisque degeneres ... matrimoniis se mortalibus miscuerunt.’ Julian, like Celsus, used this belief as a ground for attacking Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply (ix. p. 296) repudiates the belief as altogether unworthy, and injurious to morality, since men plead the angels’ sin as excuse for their own, and adopts the 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 peregrisse concubitum... Dei tamen
angilos sanctos nullo modo sic labi potuisse crediderim, sed potius
de illis qui primum apostatantes a Deo cum diabolo princepe suo
ceciderunt,' unless we are rather to understand this of the chil-
ren of Seth. A little later Philastrius (*Haer*. 107) goes so far as
to condemn the old opinion as a heresy.

The sympathies of Christians in the present day must assuredly
be with those who endeavoured to eliminate from the Scriptures
all that might seem to be dishonouring to God and injurious to
men. But the methods employed with this view were often such
as we could not now accept. For instance, the allegorical method
borrowed from the Stoics by Philo, and adopted from him by many
of the Fathers, is too subjective and arbitrary to be of any value
in getting rid of moral difficulties. We have replaced this now
by the historical method, first enunciated by our Lord, when he
contrasted the spirit of the Gospel with that of the old Dispensa-
tion.1 There is a continuous growth in the ideal of conduct as set
before us in the Bible. Much that was commanded or permitted
in the days of Abraham or Moses or David is forbidden to those
who have received the fuller light of Christianity. So, what it
was found possible for men to believe about God Himself and
about the holy angels, is impossible for us now.2 The words put
into the mouth of God in Gen. 322, and in 116,7, we feel to be
inconsistent with any true idea of the power and wisdom and love
of God, and only suitable to a very low state of human development.

---

1 Cf. Mt. 520-41, 198, Lk. 934-35. In the last passage the reading supported by
the best MSS. is Κύριε θέλεις εἰσεμεν πόρ καταβήναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλώσαι
αὐτούς; σταρεῖς δὲ ἐπιτιθήσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, leaving out all that gives point to the
fuller narrative preserved in other MSS. and versions, which insert the words ἢς
καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν at the end of the Apostles’ question, and the words καὶ εἰπεν
οἶκ οἴδατε οἶον πνεύματος ἔστε ὑμεῖς. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχᾶς ἀνθρώ-
πον ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σώσαι, 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 evid-
cently bearing the mark of the spirit of Christ Himself, and the narrative without
them is so bald and pointless, that I cannot believe that the latter is all that
came from St. Luke’s pen. It seems to me far more probable that a complete
early copy fell into the hands of some Jewish Christian, who was so shocked to
see the authority of the great prophet Elijah thus contumeliously set aside, that
he reduced the pungent life-giving text to the harmless residuum preserved to us
by our present oldest MSS., and unhappily sanctioned by the R. V.

2 See Tennant, *l.c.* p. 4.
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. 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.'

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

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

Jude.

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

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

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

2 Peter.

Here the mischief-makers are characterized as ψευδοπροφήται and 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
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themselves be utterly destroyed, 'defrauded of the hire of fraud.' They count it pleasure \(^1\) to spend the day in carnal gratification; they are spots and blemishes, indulging themselves in your feasts, to which they gain admission through their wiles. Accursed as they are, they have adulterous eyes, unwearied in sin; they entice the unstable, their heart is practised in covetousness; they have gone astray from the right road and followed the way of Balaam, who loved the hire of wrong-doing, but was rebuked by the ass for his transgression. Such men are wells without water, mists driven by the wind, doomed for ever to outer darkness. By their confidant 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 \(\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\nu\) should be read for \(\eta\delta\omega\tau\pi\nu\).
and the Pastoral Epistles; and which under the distinctive name of Gnosticism in its manifold and monstrous developments will disturb the peace of the Church for two centuries to come.' There is much resemblance between the antinomians described in Phil. 3:18-21, of whom Paul warns the Ephesians in Acts 20:29.

The first distinct allusion to these heresies appears in St. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20:29, 'After my departure wolves will enter in, not sparing the flock, and of yourselves will rise up men speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them.' But occasional warnings of a nature not altogether dissimilar may be found even in the earlier epistles: thus we read of ἔργα δαίμονων in Gal. 1:13, of a mystery of iniquity already at work in 2 Th. 2:7, of those that deny the resurrection from the dead in 1 Cor. 15:12, of those who eat the Lord's supper unworthily and cause divisions among the brethren in 1 Cor. 11:17-34, of those who are puffed up with notions of their own superior enlightenment in 1 Cor. 11:17-18, and of those who think they may take part in idolatrous feasts on the ground that all things are lawful unto them (1 Cor. 6:12, 10:23), who defy their teachers and even the Apostle himself (1 Cor. 4:6-13, 5:2, 8:1-13, 9:1-12, 10:14-33), innovators in doctrine, serving their own belly, indulging in carnal lusts (Rom. 16:17, 18, 1 Cor. 6:9-20), deceiving the simple through their plausible speeches (Eph. 4:14, περιφερόμενοι παντί ἀνέμφρ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδίαν τῆς πλάνης, ἢδ. 5:6 μηδεὶς υμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοὶς λόγοις).

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

1 Lightfoot, Phil. p. 45.
hidden wisdom, its exclusive mysteries, its privileged class... St. Paul in this Epistle feels himself challenged to contend for the universality of the Gospel. ‘Only in the light of such an antagonism can we understand the emphatic iteration with which he claims to warn every man and teach every man in every wisdom, that he may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus (128). It will be remembered that wisdom in Gnostic teaching was the exclusive possession of the few... that perfection was the term especially applied to this privileged minority, and thus it will be readily understood why St. Paul... should express his intense anxiety for the Churches of Colossae and the neighbourhood, lest they should be led astray by a spurious wisdom to desert the true knowledge’ (24). ‘This false wisdom is... speculative, vague and dreamy’ (24, 8, 18). [We may compare the phrase ἐνπτυχαζόμενοι in Jude 8.] As regards their cosmogony and theology St. Paul attacks the doctrine of angelic mediators, setting against it the doctrine of the Word Incarnate, in whom the whole Pleroma resides. Angelolatry is a denial of Christ’s twofold personality and His mediatorial office. As regards the practical results of this teaching, we find these to be either immoral, as in the Pastoral Epistles to some extent, ‘and still more plainly in the Catholic Epistles (Jude 8, 2 P. 210f) and the Apocalypse’; or ascetic, as among the Colossians (216, 21, 23) and 1 Tim. 42. St. Paul in his warning against the new heretics does not dwell on the contrast of law and grace, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, but denounces their ascetic practices as concentrating the thoughts on earthly things, while they are found valueless against sensual indulgence, which can only be overcome by the elevation of the inner life in Christ.

I proceed to cite the relevant passages from the Pastoral Epistles. 1 Tim. 167 some have turned aside into ματαιολογίαν, θέλουτες εἶναι νομοδιάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μὴ τέλεγονσιν μὴ τε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιούνται; (v. 19) Some have made shipwreck concerning the faith, of whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander; (36) μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τὐφωθεῖς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου; (41) τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καίροις ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως προσέχοντες πνεῦμασι πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν,
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κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων; (ver. 7) τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μῶθους παραιτοῦ; (65) εἰ τις ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαλούνων λόγοις, ... τευχωταί ... νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, εἰς οὖ γίνεται ... διαπαράτρυβαί δι εἰφθαρμένων αὐθρώπων τῶν νοῶν ... νομιζόντων πορισμῶν εἰλαί τῇ εὐσέβειαν; (ver. 20) τήν παραθήκην φύλαξον ἑκτερομένους τάς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις θῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. 2 Tim. 18 Hold the pattern of sound words, etc.; (214) Of these things put them in remembrance; (v. 16) Shun profane babblings ... Their word will eat as a canker, of whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, men who, concerning the truth, have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already. (225) In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves, if peradventure God may give them repentance ... and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil; 2 Tim. 3 fol. εν ἐσχάταις ἡ μεραίς ἑστησόνται καιροί χαλεποί. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἀνθρωποί φιλάντηροι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονευσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόιοι, ἀστοργοί, ἀσπονδοὶ, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετείς, τευχωταί, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἡ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσέβειας, τῇ δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἀρνοῦμενοι. καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπον. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ εἰσών οἱ ἐνδύοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτιζόντες γυναικάρια σωστρεμένα ἀμαρτίαις ἀγωμένα εἰς θυμίαις ποικίλαις ... δῦν τρόπον Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντεκτησαν Μωσείς, οὕτως καὶ οὕτω ἀνθίσταται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀνθρωποὶ κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ... (v. 13) ποινοὶ δὲ ἀνθρωποί καὶ γόνης προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεὶρον, πλανώντες καὶ πλανῶμενοι. οὐ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἐμαθὲς ... ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς υγιαινούσης διασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωφρύσουσιν διασκάλους, κηθοῦμεν τὴν ἀκοήν.

Titus 110 εἰσίν πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιόλογοι καὶ φρεναπάται μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, οἵτινες ὄλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν διασκόντες οἱ ζητοῦσιν βιοῦ κέρδος καὶ βίου καὶ καὶ τοῖς δὲ ἐργοῖς ἀρνοῦνται, βδηλοὐκτοὶ δολεῖς καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν
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(39) μωράς ξητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ μάχας νομικὰς περιλήφθησο... αἱρετικὸν ἀνθρωπον μετὰ... νοοθεσίαν παραφθή, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἔξετραπται οἱ τοιούτοι καὶ ἀμαρτάνει, ὅν αὐτοκατά-κριτος.

Apocalypse.

22 (Ephesus) ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἕαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς; (ver. 6) μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαίτων ἓ ἐγὼ μισῶ; (ver. 9 Smyrna) those that say they are Jews, but really are the synagogue of Satan; (ver. 13 Pergamum) the seat of Satan; (ver. 14) ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχήν Βαλακαί τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Βαλακαί τῶν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν νῦν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεύσαι;

(39) Nicolaitans; (ver. 18 Thyatira) the harlot Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess and teaches my servants to commit adultery and eat εἰδωλόθυτα; ‘the depths of Satan’ as they say; (39) 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 ὁ ὁρὰ ἐστίν, καὶ καθὼς ἥκουσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γενόμενοι ὁ ἄγιος σειράν ἢ σέκτη ἀρα ἐστίν. ἔξεκλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤσαν ἡμῶν ἢ ἠμῶν... (v. 22) τὸς ἑστιν ὁ ψεύστης εἰ μή ὁ ἀρνοῦμενός ὁτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἕστιν ὁ Χριστός; οὔτος ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν νῦν ὁ ὁρὰ ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν νῦν συνετεὶ τὸν πατέρα ἄξει... (v. 26) ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν πλανῶν των ὑμᾶς; (41) πολλοί ὁ οἴνος ὁ προφήται ἔξεκληθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. (2 Joh. 7) πολλοί πλανοῦντες ἡ θαν εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μῆμοι λόγον ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦν Ἀμαντον ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί. (3 Joh. 9) ὁ φίλος ὁ πρωτεύων Διὸ τρεφής οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. διὰ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἐλθόω, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱσων αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἀ ποιεῖ λόγοις πονηροῖς φλάμων 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. 23-13, 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, 13, 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, 33, 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. 118), are greedy of gain (Jude 11, 16, 2 P. 215, 15, 16), are disputations (Jude 22, 2 P. 36, 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, 16, 18, 2 P. 25, 14, 18), murmuring against God and even going so far as to deny ‘the one Master and the Lord Jesus Christ’ (Jude 4, 16, 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 aipéreis (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 \( \varphi \nu \chi \iota \kappa \iota \) (not merely \( \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \iota \) ); they make invidious distinctions and so cause divisions (vv. 15, 16, 19).

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. 6).

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

Comparing together Jude 11, 2 P. 215,16 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 eitp]olbyvra 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. 1029 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. 21215 it is said that the Church in Pergamum was troubled with those that hold the doctrine of Balaam (who are apparently identified with those that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans), and from v. 6 it would seem that this sect was also known in Ephesus and had rendered itself hated there by its deeds. Clement (Strom. ii. 118, iii. 25) frees not only Nicolaus himself (whom he calls ἀνήρ ἀποστολικός, and who is identified with the deacon of Acts 6 by Irenaeus and Tertullian) but also his sons and daughters, from the charge of immorality, and thinks that the heretics who abused his name misunderstood the phrase employed by him, τὸ δὲν παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολούειν δεῖν ἐδήλου τάς τε ἱδρυνάς τάς τε ἐπιθυμίας...οί δὲ εἰς ἱδρυνὴν τράγουν δίκην ἐκχυθέντες οἶον ἐφυβρίζουτες τῷ σῶματι καθηδυπαθοῦσιν. He tells however a most extraordinary story about Nicolaus being ready to hand over his wife to any one who would take her.1

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

1 See Lightfoot, Gal. pp. 297 n., 309.
horrible mysteries, and says they even used Jude’s denunciations as countenancing their own proceedings, c. 13. He adds that their order of Levites, whom they held in highest esteem, were guilty of the sin of sodomy against which Jude so earnestly warns his readers (vv. 7, 8). The Cainites, who are said to be a branch of the Ophites, held that the Creator was evil (Jude 4), that the Serpent represented the wisdom of God, that Cain and Esau, Korah, and the Sodomites were champions of right (Jude vv. 7, 11): see Epiphan. Haer. xxxviii. 1, Iren. i. 31. 1, Hippol. Ref. v. 16 (on the Peratae). Hippolytus says of the Naassenes or Ophites, that they called themselves Gnostics, φασκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινόσκειν (Ref. Haer. v. 6), which reminds us of the words addressed to the Church in Thyatira (Apoc. 218-25), where we read first of a false prophetess who tempts the believers to commit fornication and eat things offered to idols, which is also the teaching of the followers of Balaam and of the Nicolaitans (vv. 14, 15), and secondly of those who say that they know τὰ βαθεα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, where the addition τοῦ Σατανᾶ pronounces judgment upon the heretics. Of these Nicolaitans Irenaeus says (iii. c. 1) that the evangelist St. John wrote his Gospel to remove the error ‘qui a Cerintho inseminatus erat hominibus et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui sunt vulsio (ἀπόσπασμα) eius quae fals cognominatur scientia, ut suaderet quoniam unus Deus qui omnia fecit per verbum suum; et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem Patrem Domini; et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de superioribus Christum, quem et impassibilem perseverasse, descendentem in Jesum . . . et iterum revolasse in suum Pleroma.’ This account would agree with the statement of St. Jude that the heretics, whom he condemns, denied the Father and the Son (v. 4). We seem to be justified then in saying that the heretical movements of the latter part of the first century, of which we find traces in the later epistles and in the Apocalypse, culminated in the teaching of Cerinthus, the opponent of St. John, for a fuller account of whom I must refer to pp. 106 to 114 of Bishop Lightfoot’s commentary on the Colossians.

There is however an earlier name, which I cannot think we
are at liberty to pass over, like some German commentators, as though it were absolutely unhistorical, denoting an imaginary personage, used by the Ebionites as a pseudonym for the Apostle St. Paul,—and that is Simon Magus. Believing that we have in Acts viii. a true account of an actual historical event, drawn up by a contemporary writer, and seeing no reason to doubt that his followers formed a heretical sect known to Justin Martyr, and holding, more or less, the opinions ascribed to them by Justin, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus, I think we are at any rate bound to compare these opinions with those which we have found to be condemned in the later writings of the N.T. Our first witness, St. Luke, tells us that, before the martyrdom of St. Stephen, Simon had already gained notoriety as a magician and aroused the wonder of the people of Samaria, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐκατόν μέγαν; that the Samaritans of all classes believed his professions and agreed in holding that οὗτος ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. On Philip's visit to Samaria after Stephen's death Simon was much struck with the miracles which he wrought, and received baptism from him. Afterwards, when Simon saw that the gift of the Holy Spirit followed the laying on of the Apostles' hands, he offered Peter money that he might receive the same power, and was met by the stern reproof τὸ ἀργυρίον σου σὺν σοί ἐγὼ εἰς ἀπώλειαν. The story ends with Simon's entreaty that the Apostles would pray for him ὅτως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ὅν εἰρήκατε.

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

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.\footnote{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.}

The law and prophecies of the O.T. were given, he said, by the angels and need not be regarded by those who put their trust in Simon and Helena. Men were saved, as was asserted by the heretics in Jude 4, by grace and not by good works ('secundum ipsius gratiam salvari homines, sed non secundum operas justas' Iren. i. 23. 3, οὐ γὰρ μὴ κρατείσθαι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τίνι νομίζομεν κακῷ λειτουργεῖν γὰρ, Hippol. vi. 19).\footnote{So Irenaeus says of the Valentinians (i. 6. 2) ἀνατείνη μὴ διὰ πρᾶξιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ φύσει πνευματικὸς εἶναι, παντὶ τε καὶ πάντως σωθήσεται δογματίζοντων.}

Indeed the difference between good and evil was only conventional, depending on the arbitrary will of the angels (οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ φύσει κακῶν ἀλλὰ θέσει ἔθεντο γὰρ, φησίν, οἱ ἄγγελοι, Hippol. vi. 19). Simon claimed to have shown himself to the Jews as a Son, to the Samaritans as a Father, to the Gentiles as a Holy Spirit. Origen says the sect had dwindled down to less than thirty in his day (c. Cels. i. 57). Celsus himself professed to have come across Christians who called themselves Simonians or Helenians, but Origen will not allow that they are really Christians, διότι οὐδαμῶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογοῦσιν υἱὸν Θεοῦ Σιμονιανοὶ, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ λέγουσι τὸν 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 ἄλογοστως φάσκοντες δεῖν μὴνυσθαί..., ἀλλὰ καὶ μακαριζούσιν ἐαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ μίξει, ταῦτην εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν τελειὰν 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.\footnote{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 Encyc. Bibl.}

We have seen above that one characteristic of these heretics was that they spoke evil of angels, and we have just had an instance
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 muito 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. 520). What follows is more clearly given in the Greek of Epiphanius, Haer. 38. 2, ἐκαστος ἄρρητα ποιῶν καὶ αἰσχρουργίας ἐπιτελῶν ἐπικαλεῖται ἐκάστον ἀγγέλου ὄνομα καὶ ἐκάστῳ τούτων προσπάττει τι ἔργον ἀθέμιτον . . . ο δεῖνα ἄγγελε καταχρώμαι σου τὸ ἔργον ἡ δεῖνα ἐξουσία πράττω σου τὴν πράξειν. 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).
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. bōdī 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\textsuperscript{p}, though Tregelles cites it correctly as Hcl.\textsuperscript{1} There is a good account of the Egyptian Versions in Hastings’ \textit{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.

\textbf{Jude v. 1.} Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.

Here ἡγαπημένοις is supported by \textit{ABK}, several cursives and versions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. \textit{al.}, while ἡγασμένοις is read by KLP \textit{al.} WH (in \textit{App.} p. 576, and \textit{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\textsuperscript{p}, Sah. Aeth. Orig. (\textit{Mt.}) Lucif. Cassiod.; but I learn from Dr. Gwynn that the true readings of the Syriac versions are as follows:—

\textit{p} is \textit{prima facie} a rendering of the Greek τοῖς ἐθνεῖς \textit{?[tois]} κλητοῖς, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις 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 \textit{p} of the preposition \textit{en} proves nothing. Nor do I think \textit{p} had before him a text with τοῖς κλητοῖς, or with κλητοῖς placed \textit{not} at end of sentence. \textit{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 ἡγαπημένοι, or for Χριστῷ τετηρημένοι, whereas the preposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ as the members of His body. If Bishop Lightfoot is right in saying (on Col. 3:12) that in the New Testament the word ἡγαπημένοι ‘seems to be always used of the object of God’s love,’ it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase ‘Brethren beloved by God in God.’ Omitting the preposition we have the dative of the agent,

\begin{itemize}
  \item Dr. Gwynn adds: ‘It is important to distinguish the readings of the text of \textit{h} from those of the \textit{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 copied from \textit{p}, and therefore add nothing towards the determination of the Greek text.’
\end{itemize}
as in Nehemiah 13:26, ἀγαπώμενοι τῷ Θεῷ ἦν. Nor does it seem a natural expression to speak of 'those who are kept for Christ' (so Alford, Spitta, B. Weiss, v. Soden, al.); rather believers are kept by and in Christ, as in 2 Thes. 2:3, Apoc. 3:10. The easiest way of accounting for the error is to suppose that ἐν was accidentally omitted, and then corrected in the margin and inserted in the wrong place. Possibly the wrong insertion of ἐν may have suggested or facilitated the change from ἡγαπημένοις to ἡγιασμένοις.

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

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

v. 5. ὑπομνήσατε δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδότας ἀπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύ¬

σαντας 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.


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

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

to WH (Sel. Readings, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for pántas (cf. 1 John 2:20) found in SyrP,[1] τοῦτος τ. 31. KL. Sah.


κύριος] Τικ. Συρ. Θεος C 2 Tol. SyrP. Arm. Clem. Lucif. Ἰησοῦς AB. 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Aeth. [In App. to WH. (Sel. Readings, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, ʼapparently ὀτικ (Ὅτι Κύριος), and ὀτικ (Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς) for στι (Ὅτι δ.).']

γῆς om. SyrP.

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

1 ‘This is an error: the two best MSS. of p represent πάντα.’ G.
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ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἔφεισατο, 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. 10:9, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (Dial. 120), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis 49, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἔξι Αἰγύπτου ἔχαγαγώντα, 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, Ἰουνᾶς καθολικῶς γράφει, ἅπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰσραήλ λαῶν ἔξι Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.; Jerome, C. Iov. 1. 12; Lact. Inst. 4. 17, 'Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari'). In the explanatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the article before μὴ did not belong to the original text.

v. 6. ἀγγέλους τε[...] ἅγγ. δὲ Ἀ. boh.1, καὶ ἁγγ. sah. boh.2

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

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

συνενωκόμενοι] C sah. boh. add ὑμῖν.

[v. 18. Syrr. p and h agree with KLP in prefixing ὅτι to ἐν ἑσχάτῳ or ἐπ' ἑσχάτου τῶν χρόνων; but this is only in accordance with the Syriac usage in introducing a quotation, and is no evidence as to the Greek reading. G.]

Mr. Horner sends me the following Greek rendering of a
fragment from a Fayoum papyrus, which is supposed to belong to the fifth or sixth century, containing vv. 17-20, των ῥημάτων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἵππον προεβραμένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὥσπερ εἰπον ὅτι ἐν ἑσάχαρῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐμπαικτεί ἐλεύσονται πορεύόμενοι κατὰ τὰς ἑπταθυμίας ἀσεβείας· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, μὴ ἔχοντες πνεῦμα. Τιμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, ἔστε οἰκοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίστει ὑμῶν [ἀγία τὸ ἔλεος] προσευχόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, which agrees exactly with sah. except that, for the bracketed words, the latter has ἀγιωτάτη omitting τὸ ἔλεος.

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

ἀποδιορίζοντες add. ἑαυτοῖς C vulg. syrr. Oμ. ΝΑΒΚΛ 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in Arist. Pol. iv. 48, ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ ἕφον προπρούμεθα λαβείν εἰδη, πρώτον ἀν ἀποδιορίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν ἔχειν ἕφον (‘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 ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες: ‘welche Unterscheidungen machen, sc. zwischen Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Unterscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten umkehrt.’ This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, οἱ τὰ σχῖσματα ποιοῦντες; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (παρεισδέοντας, v. 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (v. 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word ἀποδιορίζω could bear this sense. ἀφορίζω is used in Luke 6:22 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικὸι 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 άποδιορίζοντες:—

ψυχικος υμας (οι τους πιστους) λεγοντες, δυτε αυτοι
ψυχικο πνευμα μη έχοντες.

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 inquit segregantes fideles a fidelibus secundum propiam infidelitatem redarguti et iterum [non] discernentes sancta a canibus. 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, των δε άγιων μεταδιδοιτα τοις κυσιν άπαγορευται, 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. 1120, ο γαρ έσθοιν και πινον αναξιως κριμα εαντο έσθει και πιει μη δια ακρινων το σωμα. But perhaps we should read sanctos and transpose the clauses as follows:—

Isti segregantes: fideles a fidelibus et iterum sanctos a carnalibus discernentes secundum propiam incredulitatem, redarguti, animales spiritum non habentes, the Greek being something of this sort: ουτοι ειςν οι άποδιορίζοντες. πιστοις των πιστων, έγινος δε αυ των ψυχικων διακρίνοντες κατα την ιδιαν απιστιαν, ελεγχονται ψυχικο πνευμα μη έχοντες.

The opposition of ψυχικο to pneumatiko 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 3:15), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 15:44), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. 2:14): ὕψιστος ἀνθρωπος οὗ δέχεται τά τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μορφα γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν ... ὃ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα. The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (v. 4, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἁσέλγειαν), professing a knowledge of the βαθύ τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. 2:10), though it was really a knowledge only of τὰ βάθη τοῦ Σατάνα (Apol. 2:24), and claiming to be the true δύνατοι 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 ὅσ μὲν ἑλέγχετε διακρινομένους, ὅσ δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, ὅσ δὲ ἑλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστιν ὑπολογέον χιτώνα. (Text of WH. and B. Weiss) καὶ ὅσ μὲν ἑλεάτε διακρινομένους σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, ὅσ δὲ ἑλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστιν ὑπολογέον χιτώνα. In App. to WH. it is added, ‘Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first ἑλεάτε an interpolation’ (Sel. Readings, p. 107).


Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore. Arp. Et quosdam corrigit super peccatis eorum, et quorumdam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos. Arp. Et signate quos-
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dam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) et salvate quosdam territiae, abripite eos ex igne. Aeth. quoniam est quem redarguunt per verbum, quod dictum est (Aeth). propter pecatum eorum, et est qui et servabitur, ex igne et rapient eun, et est qui servabitur timore et poenitentia. Arm. Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et quosdam salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorumdam miseremmini timore judicando (?) indicando). Cassiodor. Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis miserantur errantium et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna executione fugiant. Mr. Horner states that vv. 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows:
ei.(µ,€ν ηεατρευτε ηε ηε και de ignem e}(µ,εν ηε ηε και de. Commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, κακείνους δε, ει μεν ἀποδιδόμεται ὑμῶν—τούτῳ γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνειν—ἐλέγχετε, τούτους υποτεθείσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλεφ προσ-λαμβάνεσθε, σύντονες ἐκ τοῦ ἡπειρημένου αὐτοῦ πυρὸς προσ-λαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἑλεείν αὐνοῦ 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, οὐς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὐς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὐς δὲ ἐλέατε ἐν φόβῳ, and Χ, οὐς μὲν ἐλέατε διακρινομένους, οὐς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ τυφρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὐς δὲ ἐλέατε ἐν φόβῳ. We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in Can. Apost. vi. 4 (οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ) οὐς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὐς δὲ ἐλέεσθε, περὶ δὲ δὲ προσεύξη (οὗς δὲ ἀγαπήεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου), which occurs also, with the omission of the cause οὐς δὲ ἐλέεσθε in the Didache ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syr. Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipserint, miseremmini super eis in timore, representing καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεατε ἐν φοβῳ. Syr. et hos quidem miseremmini resipiscenate, hos autem servate de igne rapienltes in timore, representing καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐλεατε διακρινομενους, ο各种各样ς ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φοβῳ. Clem. Adumbr. quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremmini in timore,1 representing οὐς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὐς δὲ

1 The paraphrase continues, id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doccatis ut semet ipsum liberent. (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be
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ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. Str. vi. 773, καὶ οὐς μὲν ἕκ πυρὸς ἀρπάξετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεείτε, 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 οὐς μὲν ἐλεάτε διακρινομένους σῶζετε ἕκ πυρὸς ἀρπάξοντες, οὐς δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὐς δὲ σῶζετε ἕκ πυρὸς ἀρπάξοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐλεείτε διακρινόμενοι, οὐς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σῶζετε ἕκ πυρὸς ἀρπάξοντες.

St. Jude's predilection for triplets, as seen in vv. 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in vv. 5-7, and of sin in v. 11, is prima facie favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and Ν to represent the original, consisting of three members, a b c, we find B complete in a and c, but confused as to b. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὐς μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεάτε, depending on the principal verb σῶζετε; while οὐς δὲ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεάτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, 'Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear.' It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἐλεάτε was written in error for ἐλέγχετε, and οὐς omitted in error after διακρινομένους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of Syr. and Clem. Str. 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in a and b, but insert a phrase from c in b. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplication of ἐλεάτε in a and c (as in Ν) caused the omission of the second ἐλεάτε, and therefore of the second οὐς δὲ. The reading διακρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἀρπάξοντες, 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 tunicā macula (read maculata) est spiritus concupiscentiis pollūtus carnalibus.
and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühler that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: 'Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur ἔλεγχειν zu üben ist, aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind ’; while the majority take Reiche’s view of a climax: ‘a dubitantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur.’ My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of ἐλέεος, 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 ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτὸν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ο ἐπιστρέψας ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὄδου αὐτοῦ σῶσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, οἰκοπέδοι, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 1:6), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John 16:8; 19, ἔλεγχει περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμὲ). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul’s judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. 5:1), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

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

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

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

ἰδία δόξης Ν ACP 13 vg sah boh syrr Ti Treg WH. m, v. Soden, Weiss, Spitta, Kühl, Keil +, διὰ δόξης BKL 31 'al. longe plur. WH. The recurrence of ἰδία in the sentence πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν . . . δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώ- σεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἁρετῆς· διὰ τὰ μέγιστα . . . ἐπαγγέλματα διδωρηταί, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνία φύσεως, makes it more likely that ἰδία should have been written by mistake for ἰδία than the reverse; δόξης would then be corrected to δόξης. Again διὰ δόξης is too vague to convey a meaning; while ἰδίος is a favourite word with 2 Peter and ἰδία δόξης 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' ὁν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν B syrh (bis) WH. Weiss, δι' ὁν τὰ τίμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα Ν KL+Ti, δι' ὁν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν ACP 13. 31. 68 syrP Treg (sed A 68 syrP ἡμῖν πρὸ ἡμῖν 1). As regards the order of the epithets, ΝBKL agree in placing the positive first, thus avoiding the very unnatural anti-climax. It is true that examples of the anti-climax may be found in other writers, but only when the epithets are not in pari materia, as in Xen. Cyrop. ii. 4. 29 δυνατώτατων καὶ προβούμων, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in Ν is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of τίμια. The order in A seems to have originated in

1 Syrh has ἡμῖν but, as usual, gives the reading of syrP in marg.
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the accidental or intentional omission of τίμια καὶ and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading ὅμων, as we can hardly understand the following γένησθε without it. Confusion between ἡμέις and ήμεις is very common, and the change here is explained by the preceding ήμᾶς in v. 3. Spitta, reading τίμια ἡμῶν, inserts ὅμων after ἐπαγγέλματα.

i. 12. μελλήσω Ν ABPC vg Ti Treg WH, οὔκ ἀμελήσω KL syrr, οὔ μελλήσω tol Cass, μελήσω Field (Otium Nov. ii. p. 151). The insertion of the negative is an attempt to get over the awkwardness of μελλήσω, 'I shall be about to,' the only other example of which in the N.T. is Mt. 24ε μελλήσετε ἀκούειν πολέμους, where the tense seems to point to an event which will be imminent at a time still in the future. This is not the case here. Other instances of the confusion between μέλω and μέλλω are John 12ε, 1 P. 5μ, Mt. 22ε, where many MSS. have the incorrect μέλλω. Field quotes Suidas μελήσω· σπούδασω, φρονίσω. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to μελήσω, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (Cur. Nov. p. 227) 'pro μελήσω necessario reponendum est μελήσω.' Other instances of the personal construction, μέλω for μέλει μοι, are found in Eur. Herc. F. 772 θει τῶν ἄδικων μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὀσίων ἐπαίειν, Plut. Vit. 395.

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

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

i. 19, αὐχμηρῷ] 'χμηρῷ A 26 al. There is the same peculiarity

1 Suidas explains μέλω by ἐν ἐπιμελεῖ σιμλ,
in the ἀκαταπάστους of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. ἀπὸ θεοῦ BP syr<sup>r</sup> + WH Ti, ὑπὸ θελήματος θεοῦ boh, ἀγιος θεοῦ Ν Κ Λ syr<sup>r</sup> + Treg, ἀγιος τοῦ θεοῦ Λ, ἀγιοι sah, ἀγιοι ἀπὸ θεοῦ al. Evidently ἀγιοι is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. σειραῖς Ν Ti (σειραῖς Δ ΑΒ Treg), σειραῖς Κ Λ Π υγ syrr boh+. Sah translates freely, 'For God spared not the angels when they sinned, but cast them down to the abyss in darkmesses infinite, he gave them to be kept for the judgment being punished,' which seems to represent ἀβυσσῷ ἐν ἀπείρῳς (cf. Ἰ. 6 αἰδίων) ξόφοις ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. If σειραῖς were the reading of the archetype, we can hardly conceive its being changed to σειροῖς, since the former is the commoner word and is also supported by διεσμοῖς in Judith 6. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why the author should prefer to write σειροῖς. Why should he not have used a Septuagint equivalent, ἀβυσσός, λάκκος, βόθυνος etc., unless indeed the former was the word employed in Enoch? See further in the explanatory note.

ξόφοι BCKLPΝ Ti Treg WH Weiss, ξόφοις ΝΑ Spitta, Kühl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal -οῖς intended to correct σειραῖς, but wrongly applied to ξόφοι. Spitta would read ξόφοις contracted from ξοφεῖς, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρομένους BCKLP syr<sup>r</sup> + Ti Treg WH, κολαζομένους τηρεῖν Ν A latt syr<sup>r</sup> 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. διεγεῖρεν ἐν υπομνήσει in i. 13 and iii. 1; τοῦτο πρῶτον γιώνοσκοντες in i. 20, iii. 3; ἐξακολουθεῖν in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; φθορά, ii. 12 νίσ; μισθον ἀδίκια, ii. 13, 15; δελεάζω, ii. 14, 18; οὐρανοὶ . . . παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ κανοσούμενα λυθέσται in iii. 10, and οὐρανοὶ . . . λυθόσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα κανοσούμενα τήκεται in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of ΝΑ is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν ΝΑΚΠ Κ Λ vg syrr (ἐν κατ.
where ἐν merely marks the dative) + Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, κατέκρινεν BC WH, κατόστρεψεν P. It seems more likely that καταστροφὴ should have been accidentally omitted than inserted. It was a natural word for the author to use, as καταστρέφω and καταστροφή are used of the destruction of Sodom in Genesis xix. 25, 29, Deuteronomy xxix. 23, Isaiah xiii. 19, Jeremiah xxvii. 40, Amos iv. 11. For constr. cf. Mark x. 33, κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτῶν θανάτῳ, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits θανάτῳ), Marlyr. Andr. prīnos 13 ἄνδρα μηδὲν ἀδικήσαντα κατέκρινεν σταυρῷ, Diod. xiv. 4 τῶν σοφοτάτους κατεδικαζον θανάτῳ, Ael. V.H. xii. 49 κατεγνώσθη θανάτῳ.

ἀσεβείσιν BP syrh (exemplum eorum quae impiis futura sunt ponēns) syrh (exemplum impiis futurorum ponens, al. exemplum impiis futuris ponens) WH, τοῖς ἀσεβείσιν sah boh, ἀσεβείν Ν ACKL vg Treg Ti. The infinitive ἀσεβείν is naturally suggested by μελλόντων, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. ἀσεβείσιν. As a rule, ὑπόδειγμα takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16 Ἐνόχ ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαίς; 2 Macc. vi. 31 τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καταλιπτῶν; 3 Macc. ii. 5 παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγνωμένοις κατα-στήσας. So here it makes much better sense to say ‘an example (or warning) to ungodly persons of things in store for them,’ [cf. Heb. xi. 20 περὶ μελλόντων εὐλογησεν, and v.l. in Heb. ix. 11 τῶν μελλόντων ἄγαθῶν, Col. 217 ἀ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, Petri Apoc. (ap. Clem. Al. Str. vii. § 48) ἀποστόλους δηλούντας τὰ μέλλοντα] than to say ‘an example of persons about to do wrong,’ which would be better expressed by the simple παράδειγμα ἀσεβείας.

ii. 8. ὁ δίκαιος Ν ACKLP syrh Treg Ti, om. ὁ B WH. The latter reading gives an easier construction for the datives βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, ‘righteous in look and in hearing,’ i.e. he discouraged sin by the expression of his countenance and by refusing to listen to evil. Reading ὁ δίκαιος, we should have to govern βλέμματι by ψυχῆν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν, and to give an unprecedented force to βλέμματι, ‘the righteous man tortured his righteous soul in seeing and hearing because of their lawless deeds’ (cf. Field, Ot. Nov. p. 241). VG (not noticed in Ti) seems to agree with B, ‘aspectu enim et auditu justus erat habitans apud eos qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabant.’
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ii. 11. ου γερουσιαν κατ' αυτων παρα κυριω βλασφημου κρισιν

BCKLP syrr Ti, om. παρα κυριω A vg +, παρα κυριου minusc. ct. vers. al. Spitta, [παρα κυριω] Treg WH. Here αυτων refers
to δοξα (=τω διαβολω), and παρα κυριω refers to αλλα ειτευ
επιτυμησαι 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 κυριου. If it is 'from the
Lord,' how can it be a βλασφημος κρισις?

ii. 13. αδικουμενοι Ν BP syrP arm + WH, κομιο&μενοι Νc ACKL
vg sah boh syrP (ementes) + Ti Treg. The future κομιο&μενοι is
out of place here, where we want a present (or even a past)
participle synchronizing with the verb φθαρισσωνται, and can only
be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood αδικο&μενοι,
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.

ηδουνη ηγο&μενοι all MSS. and edd. I have endeavoured to
explain this reading in the note. But I am inclined to think
that ηδουνη, which may have been a marginal gloss on τρυφην,
has taken the place of a half-obliterated αγατην. Cf. Clem. Al.
Str. iii. 10 ου γαρ αγατην επομει αν την συνελευσων αυτων, and
just below μεθ' υμεραν ηδη (= 2 P. εν ημερα) παρ' δων αν εθελη-
sωσι γυναικον απατειν την του Καρποκρατειου νομον υπακοην.
So Paed. ii. 4 (p. 165) την αγατην την ηγιασμενη . . . καθυβρι-
ξωτες, id. τας τοιαυτας εστιασεις α κυριος αγατησ ου κεκληκεν,
id. § 7 αγατη μεν ουν δειπνον ουκ εστιν, η δε εστιασις αγατης
ηρτησθω, and other passages quoted in my App. C on Strom. vii.
If αγατης had thus been lost, it was natural to change απαταις
into αγαταις, but the quotations from Hermas in my note here
show that τρυφη and απαται were often connected.

εν ταις απαταις αυτων Ν A1C1KLP syrP + WH, for απαταις
A2BC2 vg syrP (and mg of syrP) Treg Zahn Nestle Lightfoot (on
Ign. Smyrn.), WH mg. read αγαταις. The gen. αυτων is in favour
of ἀπάταις. It is in consequence of their wiles that they are 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 σπιλάοι and σπιλάδες in the same verse. The reading of B is probably a correction from Jude 12.

ii. 14. ἀκαταπαύστους ΝΚΛΠ 13 31 Ti Treg, ἀκαταπάστους AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek. It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form πάξω, see under ἀμπάξονται in Herwerden, Lex. Gr. Suppletorium, where, after quoting from Hesych. ἀμπ. = ἀναπαύονται, he continues: 'fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάξω = πανευ.' 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 ἀχιμηρφ, the reading may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the ν 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 ἐσχατα at the end of a line. Blass, Gr. T. Gr., p. 44, gives examples of forms in which the ν has been lost, such as ἐπάνυ, Herm. Vis, i. 33, ἐπαναπαύσται Luke x. 6, and ἐκάνυ from καίω. Cf. New Sayings of Jesus, 1 βασιλεύσας ἀνασπάσται. Schaefer in the Index to Bast’s Comment. Palaeogr. (s. av et a confusa) refers to the reading πίφασκον for πίφαντοκον in Hom. Od. 12. 165 with Porson’s note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that ἑστού and τάτο are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for ἑαυτού and ταύτο. He also mentions that Ἀγούστος often stands for Ἀφγουστος in papyri, that two examples of πάω for παύω occur in the C.I.G., viz., 5984 Α 3 ἀναπαύμενος and 6595, 4 ἀναπάσται, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Cröner’s Memoria Hereculanensis, p. 126.1 Hort in his Notes on Orthography (Appendix, p. 170) mentions the form ἀναπαμός = ἀνάπαυναι in a glossary quoted by Ducasge. His own view however is that 'the better sense "insatiable" is provided by an altogether different verb πάσασθαι (from πατέομαι). After pointing out that in Homer it means no more than "to taste," Athenaeus adds in contrast (i. 43, p. 24 λ) οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τιθέασι τὸ πάσασθαι . . . Ἀκατάπαστος is exactly similar to ἀπαστός, ἀπαστία, ἀπαστί.' There is no evidence however that

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

ii. 15. καταλείποντες Ν AB Ti WH, καταλιπόντες B<sup>C</sup>CKLP syrr + Treg WH<sub>m</sub>. If we assume that the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb ἐπλανήθησαν, the aor. would seem to be needed here; but there is no reason why the facts should not be regarded as contemporaneous: or rather we might say that we have here one fact described under two names: leaving the right path is equivalent to going in the wrong path. For the confusion between ει and ει see my note on ἰδε James iii. 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: 'B shows a remarkable inclination to change ει into ειει, of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 ἵστεμιν, 17 τεμην, 20 and iii. 3 γενωσκόντες, 21 γενεται, iii. 1 εἰλικρεινη, 8 χειλια bis.

Βόσορ Ν<sup>C</sup>ACKLP boh syr<sup>h</sup> Ti Treg, Βεωρ B syr<sup>v</sup> sah WH Weiss, Βεωρσορ Ν (arising from a confusion between Βόσορ and the marginal correction εωρ). Prof. Swete informs me, on the authority of Mr. Norman McLean, who is engaged on the forthcoming critical edition of the LXX, that while the name of Balaam's father occurs in seven passages of the Pentateuch, there is no support for the reading Bosor, 'either in our thirty cursives or in the Armenian, Ethiopic, Latin, or Syriac versions.' Prof. Driver considers that it is simply due to textual corruption, (see Hastings' D. of B. i. p. 447, and Zahn's Einl. in d. Ν.Τ. ii. p. 110). The support of the ordinary name by B against the other MSS. may be compared with its support of Σίμων against Συμεών in i. 1. It seems to me far more probable that an original Βόσορ should have been changed to Βέωρ than the reverse.

δς μισθόν ἀδικίας ἡγάπησεν ACKLP Ν<sup>C</sup> syr<sup>r</sup> WH Ti Treg; μισθόν ἀδικίας ἡγάπησαν B arm Treg<sup>m</sup> WH<sub>m</sub>. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (ἐλεγξὼν ἔσχεν) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of δς may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ὀλίγως ΑΒ Ν<sup>C</sup> vg syrr ('propemodum' White, 'paululum' Poc., Gwynn is doubtful), sah boh render 'slightly' Treg Ti WH, ὀντως Ν CKLP, ὀλίγον μινως. al. The reading ὀντως (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 ὀντως, the reading ὀλίγον,
NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JUDE AND 2 PETER

cxcix

"for a short time," would seem to require the aor. ἀποφνυγόντας read by KLP.

iii. 6. δὲ δὲν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὤδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο. Commentators explain δὲ δὲν as referring to the εἴ ὤδατος καὶ δὲ ὤδατος 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 ὤδατι 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 δὲ δὲν with minusc. 31,1 which would refer to the immediately preceding τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγοφ, 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. τὸ αὐτῷ ABP vg sah boh + WH Ti, τῷ αὐτῷ Ν CKL syrr Treg Weiss. The former is the far more ‘effective reading, emphasizing the identity of the creative and the destructive Word. If a genitive were wanted, it would have been more natural to repeat Θεοῦ.

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

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

1 I learn from Nestle’s 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. 1ν, ἡμερημένως ἐπὶ ἑσχάτων τῶν χρόνων δὲ ὧμᾶς, τοὺς δὲ αὐτοῦ πιστῶς εἰς Θεόν, which Hort explains of the Gentiles generally.
INTRODUCTION

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

iii. 10. οἱ οὐρανοί ABC Treg WH Weiss, οὐρανοὶ Ν Κ Λ Ti, add. μέν Ν13. The anarthrous στοιχεία and γῆ which follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In v. 7 the article is required by the following νῦν.

εὐφρεθήσεται Ν BKP syrP, οὐχ εὐφρεθήσεται sah, κατακαθήσεται AL boh syrH Ti, καυθήσεται vel κατακαυθήσονται al., ἀφανισθήσονται C, om. καὶ γῆ—εὐφρεθήσεται vg, om. εὐφρεθήσεται spec, Weiss reads εὐφρεθήσεται with a question, ex ρυήσεταιcorr. putat H (S.R. p. 103). The phrase οὐχ εὐρίσκεται is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36 οὐχ εὐρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ, Job xx. 8 ὁσπερ ἐνύπνου ἐκπετασθέν οὐ μὴ εὐρέθη, Dan. xi, 19 πεσεῖται καὶ οὐχ εὐρεθήσεται, Heb. xi. 5, Aproc. 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 εὐφρεθήσεται: so probably in the case of κατακαθήσεται and the other readings. The required sense would be given by καταρνήσεται or διαρνήσεται, but not, I think, by the simple ρυήσεται. Buttman’s suggestion, ἄ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐφρεθήσεται, does not seem to me very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that διαρνήσεται receives some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to εὐφρεθήσεται than καταρνήσεται. He suggests however that possibly ἱαθήσεται or ἐξιαθήσεται may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, ἱασον τὴν γῆν ἵνα ἰαμάσων οἱ ἐγρήγοροι, and in anticipation of καὶνὴν 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 ἀρθήσεται? There is much to be said for πυρωθήσεται suggested by Dr. Abbott and also by Vansittart in J. of Philol. vol. iii. p. 358. The latter thinks the variants may be explained by the supposition that the archetype had become illegible in places, that the first and fourth letters had disappeared before the first scribe conjectured [ἐ]νθ[θ]ήσεται, and that the letters νο had also disappeared before the second scribe conjectured [ἀφανισ]θήσεται, while θ also had disappeared when the third scribe conjectured [κατακα]θήσεται.

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

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

As a rough test of the character of B in these epistles, I give below the readings in which it differs from all or most of the other uncial MSS. I have put (a) 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 (a) παρεισεδύσαν. 5 (β) ύμᾶς ἀπαξ πάντα (instead of ύμᾶς πάντα). 9 (β) ὁτε Μιχαήλ . . . τότε. 13 (β) πλάνητες οἷς ξόφος σκότους. 14 (α) ἐπροφήτευσεν. 23 (β) om. 1st oνν δέ.

2 PETER.

i. 1 (β) Σιμων. i. 4 (α) τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν. i. 17 (?) ὁ νῖός μου τὸ ἁγιαστής μου οὐς ἑστών. ii. 8 (α) ἀκοὴ δίκαιως. ii. 15 (β) Λέωρ μισθῶν ἀδικίας ἡγαπήσαν. ii. 16 (β) ἀνθρώπους. ii. 18 (β) ματαιώτης Β', ματαιώτης Β². ii. 20 (β) ἐσχα. iii. 5 (β) συνεστώσας. iii. 11 (β) τούτων οὖτως, ib. om. ύμᾶς. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by Ν and the other MSS.

Readings of B supported by one other uncial MS.:

JUDE.

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

2 PETER.

i. 18 (?) τῷ ἄγιῳ δρει BC. i. 21 (α) ἀπὸ θεοῦ BP. ii. 6 (β) om. καταστροφή BC. ii. 13 (β) ἀγάπας BA². ii. 14 (β) ἀκαταπά-
στοὺς ΒΑ. ii. 15 (β) οτι ος Βά. ii. 19 (?) τοῦτο Βά. (omitting καλ). ii. 20 (?) κυρίου (omitting ημῶν) ΒΚ. ii. 22 (?) κυλισμόν
ΒÇ. iii. 10 (α) ήμέρα (omitting η) ΒÇ.

Readings of Β supported by two other uncial MSS.:

2 Peter.

i. 3 (β) διδ δόξης καλ ἀρετῆς ΒΚΛ. ii. 4 (?) σειροῖς ΒΑÇ. ii. 12 (α) ἀδικούμενοι ΒΡΝ. ii. 15 (?) καταλείποντες ΒΑΝ. ii. 21 (α)
υποστρέψαι ΒÇΡ. ii. 22 (α) συμβέβηκεν (omitting δε) ΒΛΑΝ. iii. 7 (α) τῷ αὐτῷ ΒΑΡ. iii. 9 (β) εἰς ὑμᾶς ΒÇΡ. iii. 10 (β) οἱ
οὐρανοί ΒΑÇ. (?) εὑρεθήσεται ΒΚΡ. iii. 16 (β) πάσαις (omitting ταῖς) ΒΑÇ.
EPISTLE OF JUDE

AND

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER
The text given below is founded generally upon that of WH. Where I have departed from this, I have given my reasons for so doing either in the Introduction on the Text or in the Critical Notes. The latter are drawn principally from the last editions of Tregelles and Tischendorf and also from personal inspections of the facsimiles of codd. B and \( \text{S}, \) 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 \( \text{SABCKLP}. \) They are omitted in the Peshitto, but included in the later Syriac versions, the Philoxenian and Harkleian, here distinguished as \( \text{syr}^p \) and \( \text{syr}^h. \) In citing the Egyptian versions I have used the notation \( \text{Boh.} \), now commonly employed, instead of the less distinctive \( \text{Copt.} \), 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 Θεοῖ... καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, 2 Pet. 1\(^{2} \) οτι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ, 1\(^{3} \) οτι αὐτοῦ, 1\(^{4} \) ὑμῖν, 1\(^{5} \) ἀμαρτηματων, 1\(^{12} \) μελήσω, 1\(^{17} \) ἀπό, 2\(^{4} \) σειραῖς, \( \text{ib. κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 3}^{9} \) δι' ὅν, 3\(^{9} \) ἡμᾶς, 3\(^{12} \) τῆς
téλειας.
ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

2 Ρ. 1, 1 1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ δουλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ

2 Ρ. 1, 17 Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦν

2 Ρ. 1, 3, 10 Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις καὶ τοῖς 2 ἔλεος υμῖν καὶ

2 Ρ. 1, 2, 7 εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

1. τοῖς θεφ...,καὶ εν Ιησοῦ ονπ. Η (Sel. Read. p. 106). ἡγαπημένοις ΔΒ Ν, ἡγαπημένοις KλΡ.
ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β

1 Συμμεων Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ οὗτος Ἰ. 2
Χριστοῦ τοῦ τοῖς ισότιμοι ήμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν Ἰ. 3, 2
δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ ήμῶν καὶ σωτηρίος Ἰ. 25
Χριστοῦ· 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληροῦν ἐν Ἰ. 4, 1
ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ήμῶν,
3 ὅσ πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ
πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν διδασκόμενης διὰ τῆς ἐπί-
γνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἵδια δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ,
δι’ ὃν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ήμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα
dεδώρηται, ὡς δὲ τούτων γένεσθαι θείας κοινωνών
φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ Ἰ. 10,
φθοράς. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τούτῳ δὲ σπουδὴ δὴ τις σα ν Ἰ. 10,
pαρείσευγκαντες ἐπιχορηγησάτε ἐν τῇ πίστε 
ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τῆς γνώσεως, ἐν
dὲ τῇ γνώσει τῆς ἐγκράτειας, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ
tῆς ὑπομονῆς, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τῆς εὐσέβειας,
7 ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσέβειᾳ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, ἐν δὲ τῇ
φιλαδελφίᾳ τῆς ἀγάπης. 8 ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρ-
χοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀ κά ῥ πο ν Ἰ. 12
καθότητι ἐς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ήμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

1. Συμμεων Ν AKLP syrr. + Treg. Ti.
WH., Σιμών B vulg. sah. boh. + WH.
eis δικαιοσύνης Κ. τοῦ θεοῦ τ. κυρίου Κ.
2. ημῶν, WH., ημῶν. Treg. Ti.
3. παντα BCKLP + Treg. WH., τα
παντα Ν Δ + Ti. διδοὺ καὶ ἀρετη Ν
ACP 13 vulg. spec. syrr. sah. boh. Ti.
Treg. WH., διδοὺ καὶ ἀρετη BKL
31 WH.
4. τιμια καὶ μεγιστα ημιν B syrh. spec.
WH., τιμια ημιν καὶ μεγιστα Ν KL Ti.
WH., μεγιστα καὶ τιμια ημιν ACP syrr.
(sed Α syrr. μεγιστα ημιν) 13, 31 + Treg. τῆς ἐν τῷ
κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίας την ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπι-
θυμίας Κ. φθορας syrr. WH. Ti. Treg.,
φθορας Weiss.
5. καὶ αὐτὸ τούτῳ δὲ BCKLP, καὶ αὐτοὶ
dὲ Α vulg. +, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τούτῳ Ν C2
syrr., κατ’ ἰσο με καὶ conj. Blass.
6. ὑπαρχοντα παροντα Λ +.
2 P. 3. 1, 8, 14, 17
2 P. 1. 5, 10
2 P. 3. 1, 15
2 P. 2. 21
2 P. 3. 22 P. 1. 1, 5

3 Αγαπητοί, πάσαν σπουδήν ποιούν μενος γράφειν ύμίν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ύμίν παρακαλοῦν ἐπαγωνίζονται τῇ ἀπαξ παράδοσείς τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.
ἐπίγνωσιν. ο φ γάρ μη πάρεστιν ταυτα, τυφλός ἑστιν μυσταξών, λήθην λαβών τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν παλαί. αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν. 10 διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαιῶν μην ἡ τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιείσθαι. 11 οὕτως γάρ πλοοσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ύμιν ἡ ἐἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ησυχιος Χριστός. 12 Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ύμᾶς ὑπὸ μιμησὴς κεῖνες περὶ τούτων, καίπερ εἰ δὸ τα σαὶ καὶ στηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δίκαιον δὲ ἦγοροι, ἐφὶ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνῶματι, διεγείρειν ύμᾶς ἐν ὑπὸ τῇ μνήμῃ ποιεῖσθαι. 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχύνῃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνῶματος μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδίδασκεν μοι. 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ύμᾶς μετὰ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐξουσίας τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. 16 ὁ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μουθός ἐξακολουθήσατε ἐγνωρίσαμεν ύμιν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ δύναμεν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἄλλα ἐποτᾶται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν καὶ δ ὕμας ἐνεχθείσας αὐτῷ τοιαύται ὕπο τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δ ὕμας ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὐτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὅν ἐγὼ εὐδοκησα,—18 καὶ ταῦτα τῆς φωνῆς ἠμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν εἴ συν εἴπαμον ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει καὶ ἐκομμένοις ἀνθρώποις τοῦ προφητικὸν λόγου, ὁ ὁ ἐν Καλως ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἐως ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα διανυσάται καὶ φωσφόρος.
παρεισεδύνσα αν θρωπόσιν, οί ἁλαί προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβείας, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατίθεντες εἰς ἁσέλγειαν καὶ τῶν μονὸν δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. 5 Υπομνηματικά δὲ υμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας υμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος ἀπεξελοὺρεν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον ποταμοῦν ἑως τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολυτικοῦντας τὸ ἱδίον οἰκήτηριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοίς αἰδίως ὕπο τοῦ κρίσιν, 7 ὡς Σῶδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν πόλεις, τῶν ὁμοίων τρόπον τούτους ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσας ὅπισο διαρκέως, πρόκεινται δὲ ἤγαμα πνεῦμα ἀιωνίου δικήν ὑπέχουσαι. 8 Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ ὦτοι ἐνυπνιάζομενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυρίοτητα δὲ θερισμένο, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. 9 Ὅδε ἡ Μιχαήλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῶν διαβόλων διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μουσέως σωμάτου, ὡς τὸλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκείν βλασφημίαν.
προφητεία γραφής] γραφή προφητείας συνθ. επιλυσεως] επιλυσις συνθ. προφητεια ποτε ΒΕΚΡ + ΒΗ. Τρεγ. ποτε προφ. Ν Α Λ Τι. απο θεων ΒΡ συνθ. ΒΟ. ΒΗ. Τι., αγιοι θεων Ν Κ Λ συνθ. + Τρεγ. αγιοι σαλ. αγιοι του θ. Α. αγιοι απο θ. Θ.

ΠΙ 1 ευ το λαοι] om. saih.
2. οδοι] δει α Ν.
4. σειρους ΑΒΣ WH. Τρεγ., σειρους Ν Τι., σειρας ΚΛΠ vulg. συνθ. boh. +.

[Σοφοι] Σοφοι Δ Ν. τρομουμενοι] κολαζο- 
μενοι τηρειν Ν Ν vulg. συνθ. boh. (ex. 
τ. 9 !).

6. καταστροφη κατεκρινει] Ν ΑΣΚΛ 
vulg. συνθ. + Τρεγ. Τι., κατεκρινει BC 
boh. WH., καταστροφη ΒΡ συνθ. WH., 
κατεκρινει Ν ΑΣΚΛ + Τρεγ. Τι.
7. ερωσατο Β WH., ερωσατο Ν ΑΣΚΛ 
Τρεγ. Τι.
8. δικαιος Β φ. WH. δικ. Ν ΑΣΚΛ 
συνθ. boh. Treg. Τι.
µίας, ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.

2 Π. 2. 12

10 Οὖτοι δὲ ὁ σα µὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἀλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. 11 οὐκ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁ ὃς ὁ τῶν Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ µισθοῦ ἔξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορῆ ἀπώλεντο. 12 οὐτοὶ εἰσιν

2 Π. 2. 15

2 Π. 2. 18, 3. 17

2 Π. 3. 6, 9

2 Π. 8. 12

2 Π. 9. 15

2 Π. 1. 8

13 κύματα ἀγρία θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντας τας ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἰς ὁ ζῷος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται. 14 Ἐπρο-

2 Π. 1. 19, 3. 2

2 Π. 2. 4, 16

2 Π. 2. 8

2 Π. 2. 10

3. 3

2 Π. 2. 18

12. οὗτοι εἰσιν] add. (ex v. 16) γογ-

γοῦσται—πορευµένοι Ν C S. οἰς εἰν ταῖς


Chase. ἀγαριαῖς Ν BKL syrP. sah. boh.

+, απαταὶς ΑΕ. νῦν] αὐτῶν Λ vulg.

syrP. +. συνεωχοµενοί, ἀφοβος syrP.

Treg. WH. συνεωχοµενοί, ἀφοβος,Ti. παρα-

φοµένοι B.

13. πλανητες οῖς ζῷος σκότους B.

14. επροφήτευσεν Β, επροφ. Β, προ-

προφλ. Ν, προφετ. ACKL al. αγαιας µυριαιν] µυριαιν ἀγῶν ἀγγελων Ν syrP. sah.

arm. +. 15. παντας τοὺς ασεβεῖς] add. αὐτων

ΚΛ Ti. (incertio ?), πανας ψυχης Ν syrP.

sah. ασεβειας αὐτων] om. Ν sah. +,


λογων Ν C Ti.
12. γεγονημενα ΑΒΟΡ + WH. Treg., γεγονημεν Ν Α2 ΚΛ + Τι. γεγ. φως. Ν ΑΒΟΡ, φως. γεγ. ΚΛ. και φαρηγηται Treg. ΚΑΤΑΦΑΘ. ΚΛ+. 
13. αδικουμενοι Ν ΜΡ syrr. + ΨΗ, κοινωνεμοι ΑΚΛΚ Ν. Β. ohm. spec. syrh. + Τι. Treg. απαταιρ ΑΚΛΚ syrr. (mg. αγαπαις), WH. Τι., αγαπαις Α2Β. ΨΗ, syrr. + Treg. ΨΗ.
15. καταληπτοντες Ν ΑΒ WH. Τι., καταληπτοντες Βσίνορ Treg. ΨΗ, Βοσορος ΑΚΛΚ Ν. vulg. boh. syrh. ae. ΑΒ WH. Βοσορ ΑΚΛΚ Ν. vulg. boh. syrh. ae. ΑΒ WH. - πασος Ν Τι., Beor B syrr. + WH. - βεωσορος Ν. οι ΑΚΛΚ Ν syrr. WH. om. Β WH. ΨΗ, πασος WH. ΨΗ, Πασος WH. 
16. ανθρωπου] ανθρωπως B. 
17. και ομιχλα] νεφελαι (ex Jud. 12) L+., om. και- τηπορημα Κ. σκοτους add. εις αιωνα (ex Jud. 13) ACLP.
17 'Υμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·
18 ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἔπεὶ ἐσχάτος χρόνος ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς εαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβείων. 19 Οὕτως εἰσίν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

18. επ' ἐσχάτος Β, ὀτι επ' ἐσχ. AC, [οτι] επ' ἐσχ. Treg., ὅτι εν ἐσχάτῳ ΚΛ
"Ο ζόφος τού σκότους τετήρηται. 18 ύπερ- J. 13
ο γάρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζονσιν J. 16
ἐν ἔπιθυμίαις σαρκῶς ἁσελγείαις τοὺς οὐλί- J. 7
γως ἀποφέυγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, J. 11
19 ἔλευθεράν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δούλοι
ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς· γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ
dεδούλωται. 20 εἰ γάρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιᾶς ματα J. 8
tοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος J. 25
Τῆς Χριστοῦ, τούτους δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἠττώνται,
γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχάτα χείρων τῶν πρῶτων.
21 κρείττον γάρ ἂν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν
τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐν ἐπιγνώσει ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς
παραδοθεὶς αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐν τολῆς J. 3
22 συμβεβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας παροιμίας, Κύου
ἐπιστρέφας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδίον ἐξέραμα, καὶ Ὄς λουσαμένη J. 6
eis κυλισμόν βορβόρου.

III

1 Ταῦτα γὰρ ηὕθη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ύμῖν J. 8, 17, 20
γράφω ἐπιστολῆν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ύμῶν ἐν ὑπο- J. 8
μενεῖ τὴν εἰλικρίνη διάνοιαν, 2 μεν ιηθεὶς ἀληθεῖς J. 3
τῶν προειρήμενων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων
προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ύμῶν ἐν- J. 14, J. 17
τολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτηρός, 3 τοῦτο J. 25
πρῶτον γνῶσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ ἐσχάρας J. 18
τῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαίγμονη ἐμπαίγμα τι 
κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πολενό-

18. ματαιοθητος] ματαιοθητος B', -ητης B, μαθαητητης Ν*. ασελγειας] ασελ-
γειας Ρ vulg. syrr. boh. + ασελγειας AB Ν* syrr. vulg. sah. boh., -των Ν ΚKL+.
αποφυγοντας Ν ABC, αποφυγοντας KLP +.
19. τουτῳ Ν B sah. boh. + WH. Ti,
toutov και ACKLP Ν* +, toutov [και] Treg.
20. κυριου BK + WH. Treg., add.
ημων Ν ACLP + Ti. ἐσχατα] ἐσχα B
in fine versus.

21. επιγνώσει]. add. εἰς τα σωτηρον Δ
Ν. υποστρέφαι BCP +, επιστρέφαι
KLP +, ανακαμψαι Ν. en BKL, apó
Ν. Ν.
22. συμβεβηκαν Ν AB, add. de KLP
κυρίουν ΒC, κυλισμα Ν ΑKL.
III 2. ημων Ν ABKLP, ημων πειθα.

3. ἐσχατον Ν ABC*, ἐσχατον KLP +,
ἔσχατος C. εν εμπαίγμονα Ν ΒΑΒ, (om.
ἐν ΣΠ), om. ΚL.
μενοι 4 καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἦς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὖνς διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5 λαυθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τούτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δ' ὕδατος συνεστὼσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ. 6 δὲ ὃν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδατὶ κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπόλετο. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν πνεῦμα τῆς ρούμου εἰς Ι. 6, J. 7 ἡ μέρα κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν αὐτῶν βῶν. 8 ἔν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λαυθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπήτεροι, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὅσ χιλίαν J. 8, 17, 20 ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἐτη ὡς ἡμέρα μιᾷ. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὅσ τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενος τινας αἱ πολεῖς θα πάντας εἰς μετανοιαν χωρῆσαι. 10 Ἡδές J. 11 δὲ ἡ μέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, ἐν ἑὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐν ροὶ ὁδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθῆσονται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὐρεθήσονται. 11 Τουτοῖς ὅπερ τοῦ πάντων λυμένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀγίας ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις 12 πρὸ σοφοκῶντας καὶ στεπύδοντος τῆς παρουσίας τῆς J. 21 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μέρας, δὲ ἐν οὐρανοὶ πυροῦμενοι J. 8 λυθῆσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τῆς ἐκκλησίας 13 καὶ μοῦν δεὶ οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆν καὶ καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ πρὸ σοφοκῶμεν, ἐν ὀσὶς δικαστοῦν κατοικεῖ. J. 21

5. συνεστώσα ACLP Ν, συνεστώτης B, -στώσω B, -στώσα Κ, -στώτα Ν WHm.  
6. δ' ἐν δ' ἐν 31.  
7. τῷ αὐτῷ ABP vulg. sah. boh. WH. Ti. τῷ αὐτῷ Ν CKL syr. Treg.  
8. καὶ χίλια ἐτη] om. Ν.  
9. εἰς μᾶς ΒΟΨ vulg. boh. WTh., δι' εἰς μᾶς Ν A vulg. sah. syr. Ti., εἰς τιμας ΚL.  
10. ημέρα BC Ti. Treg. WH., ημέρα Ν ΑΚL, κλέπτης Ν ABP+, κλ. en μυκή CKL (εἰς 1 Th. ν. 2, οἱ οὐρανοὶ ABC WH. Treg., om. Ν CKL Ti., add. μετὰ Ν 13. ροζίδουν BCLL, ροζίδουν Ν ΑΚL, ροζίδουν υἱω ροζίδουν υἱω ροζίδουν al. λυθήσεται Ν BCP, λυθήσονται ΑKL eὐρεθήσεται Ν BKP syr. (Sah. 'non invenien-
20 Ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς

τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ύμων πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσ-

ευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε

προσδέχομενοι τὸ ἐλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν

Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωήν αἰώνιον. 22 Καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐλέγ-

χετε διακρινομένους, 23 οὖς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς

ἀρπάζοντες, οὖς δὲ ἐλέατε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ

tὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλαμένον χιτῶνα.

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ύμᾶς ἀπταίστους

καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώ-

μοὺς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν

diὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δὸξα μεγα-

λωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος

καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμὴν.

21. τηρήσατε] τηρησομένων BC.

22. ἐλέγχετε AC vulg. boh. arm. +, ελεατε Ν BC2, ελεατε KLP +. διακρινομένους Ν ABC, διακρινομενοι KLP.

23. οὐς δὲ (1) ACKLP, om. B. σώζετε Ν ABC, εν φοβῳ σώζετε KLP. οὖς δὲ (2) ελεατε εν φοβῳ Ν AB, om. KLP., εν φοβῳ C.

24. υμᾶς Ν BCL vulg. syrr. boh., ημᾶς Δ syrP*, αὐτοὺς KP. ἀπταίστους] add. καὶ ἀσπιλοὺς C. ἀμωμοὺς Αμεμπτοὺς Δ.

14 Διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκόντες σπουδά- 
σατε ἀπὸ λοιπόν καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθήσαι ἐν τῇ, 
εἰρήνῃ, 15 καὶ τῆς κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σῷ- 
τηρίας ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς 
Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἐγραψεν 
(Clone, 16 ὥς καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν 
αὐταῖς περὶ τοῦτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητα τινα, ὃ 
oὶ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήριτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς 
λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν. 

17 Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγνώσκοντες φῦ- 
λὰ σε σε σε ὑνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλανη 
apαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, 18 αὐξά- 
nυτε δὲ ἐν χαρίτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ ἴ 
sωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν 
καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.
NOTES ON ST. JUDE

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

ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.] Cf. Tit. 1 δοῦλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ 'Ἰ. Χ. See Introduction on the Author.

tοὶς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοι καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένοι κλητοί.] On the readings see Introduction on the Text. For the phrase Θεὸς πατήρ see Hort's note on 1 P. 1. The easier reading of some MSS., ἡγαπημένοι for ἡγαπημένοι, is probably derived from 1 Cor. 1 ἡγαπημένοι ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. There is no precise parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ ἡγ. or for Χριστῷ τετ. The preposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ: they are incorporated in Him as the branches in the vine, as the living stones in the spiritual temple, as the members in the body of which He is the head. Thus we find such phrases as τοὺς ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. Rom. 8, τοὺς ὅντας ἐν Κυρίῳ id. 161, ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ 2 Cor. 12, εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίζων Gal. 327, τοὺς ἁγίους ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. Phil. 1, δικαιώθην εἰς Χριστῷ Gal. 217, ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. 1 Tim. 14, σωτηρίας τῆς ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. 2 Tim. 10. So here 'beloved as members of Christ, reflecting back his glorious image' would be a natural and easy conception. Sometimes the name of the Father is joined with that of the Son in such a phrase, as in 1 Th. 1 Παύλου τῆς ἐκκλησίας Θεσσαλονικείων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ κ. Κυρίῳ 'Ἰ., cf. 1 Joh. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστὶν, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένει καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ. Joh. 1721 ἵνα πάντες ἐν δόσιν, καθὼς σὺ, Πατήρ, ἐν ἑμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν δοσιν, below ver. 25 μόνον Θεῷ σωτηρί ἡμῶν διά 'Ἰ. Χ. There would therefore have been no difficulty in the expression ἐν Θ. Π. καὶ 'Ἰ. Χ. τετηρημένοι, cf. Joh. 1711 πάτερ ἂγιε, τήρησον αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ὁ δεδωκάς μοι..."Οτε ἢμαν..."
But it is different with ἡγαπημένοι. Lightfoot, commenting on Col. 3:12 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. 1:4 εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, and 2 Th. 2:13 ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίων. Cf. 2 Cor. 13:13, Rom. 5:8, 1 Joh. 4:9, 10, 14. B. Weiss takes it in the same way here, but it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase, 'Brethren beloved by God in God.' ἡγαπημένοι is used of the objects of man's love in Clem. Ἡμ., ix. 5 τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡγαπημένων τῶν τάφων ναοὶ τιμῶσιν, and the cognate ἅγαπητοί is constantly used in the same sense (as below ver. 3), as well as in the sense of 'beloved of God' (Rom. 1:7 ἅγαπητοῖς Θεοὶ, κλητοῖς ἅγιοι). 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 φιλαδελφίᾳ 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 τηρεῖν, used of persons, has two significations, that of friendly, or that of punitive keeping,—to keep safe from harm, or to keep in custody. An example of the former use is found in this epistle ver. 21 ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν ἁγίᾳ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, the latter in ver. 6 εἰς κρίσιν δεσμῶν τετήρηκεν. The former is the sense required in this verse, but the force of the dative is not quite clear. Alford, Spitta, Keil, Kühl take it as dat. commodi 'kept for J. C.' (cf. 2 Cor. 11:9 ἐμαυτὸν ὑμῖν ἁγιάσατε, Athanas I. 393 κὰ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τῷ βασιλείῳ τηρεῖν). This might also mean kept safe 'for the sake of' or 'at the request of J. C.': cf. Joh. 17:11 quoted above. The difficulty is that this seems to ignore any active participation by Christ in the work of preserving or defending His Church, as shown in 2 Th. 3:5 πιστός δὲ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος, ὅς στηρίζει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου. Below (ver. 24) it is said of the Father that He is able φυλάξαι υμᾶς ἀπατῶσαυς and so in Rom. 16:26 we read (μονὸς σοφὸς Θεός) τῷ δυναμεῖν ὑμᾶς στηρίζω. In ver. 21 the faithful are called upon to keep themselves in the love of God. It is possible, however, to take the dative as expressing the agent, cf. Nehem. 13:28 ἄγαπημένοι τῷ Θεῷ ἦν, and my note on James 3:2 δαμάζεται καὶ δεδα­μασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ. Others suppose the dat. to be governed by the ἐν which precedes Θεῷ, but the interposed ἡγαπημένοι makes this very harsh.

The above difficulties have led to the suspicion of a 'primitive error' in the text, see WH in Sel. Readings, p. 106, where it is suggested that ἐν should be omitted before Θεῷ and inserted before ἤρσοι, giving the sense 'to those who have been beloved by the Father, and who have been kept safe in Jesus from the temptations to which others have succumbed.' The prominence here given to the love of the Father is in accordance with the general tone of the N.T. and especially of the writings of St. John. Whatever reading we adopt, Jude has in mind the contrast with those who had not been 'kept' but had broken loose from the Christian fold: cf. 1 P. 1:5 τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρονουμενο­μένους 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, 238, 2 Chron. 219, 9°, Is. 434, Hos. 239 (LXX.; cf. Rom. 928), Mal. 1°; comp. Ps. Sol. 916.

Hence [8] ἡγαπημένος becomes a title—or of the nature of a title—for the people: Deut. 3215, 331226, 2 Chron. 207, Ps. 286(?), Is. 51, 442, Bar. 337.

Further, it is used in the singular of certain typical Israelites, Abraham (Dan. 39, Th. and LXX.), Moses (Ecclus. 45°), Samuel (Ecclus. 469°), 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. (631) it is in the plural of three words specially connected with 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 ἡγαπημένος is used I think confirm this view of the word. (a) In 1 Thess. 11 (εἰδότες, ἀδελφοί ἡγ. ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οὗτοι) it is brought into close relation to the divine ἐκκλησία, the latter word being pre-eminent one used to express Israel's relation to Jehovah (see Hort on 1 Pet. 11, 22 [Messianic use9]). (b) 2 Thess. 229 (ἀ. ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κύριου, διὶ ἐκπαντο οὐαίς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κ. τ. ￡.), where WH give the words as a quotation from Deut. 3312. Here also we have the O.T. idea of God's choice—for the word ἐκπαντο in reference to Israel, see Deut. 2618. (c) Col. 312 (ἐνδώσατε ὑμῖν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι), St. Paul had just said οὐκ ἦν ἐλληνικὸς καὶ ιουδαιοῦς: then he uses of the gentile Colossians three words specially connected with Israel—ἐκκλησία (the same idea as in 1 and 2 Thess.), ἅγιοι, ἡγαπημένοι. The use of ἡγαπημένος (and -οι) both in the O.T. and in the N.T. seems to me to afford very strong reasons for regarding the word as one taken over by the Apostles from the vocabulary of the Theocracy. For the thought, see Hort 1 Pet., Introd. Lect., p. 7.

I cannot help thinking that, following on these words, the words τοῖς μητρὶ Πατρός τετεθημένοι naturally express the thought—'who have been kept for Jesus Christ,' the reference being to these Gentiles having been reserved as a λαός εἰς περιποίησιν. Note especially the perfect participle, and compare the whole phrase κληρονομιά...τετεθημένη εν οὐρανοί εἰς ηλικία (1 Pet. 114, 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 καυστὸς 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 ἐπαινεθησόμεθα, 5914 ἐν τῷ Θεῷ παῖσαμεν διάνυσιν. 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 περιφωνικός ἐν θεμάτι τοῦ βασιλέα τό πάντα καὶ ἐστίν—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 ἐν 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 ἐν θελήματι instead of Θεῷ. Then, are we justified in assuming that those addressed are Gentiles? Zahn (Einleitung II. 75, 51) holds that Jude's mission was limited to the circumcision (Gal. 27, 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 κοινὴ σωτηρία 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 Ἀροτ. 1714 (νικήσωσιν) οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ κ. ἐκλεκτοὶ κ. πιστοὶ, in St. Paul's epistles, as in Rom. 16 ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὄνεις, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. 124 κηρύσσομεν Χριστόν ἐσταυρωμένον, 'Ιουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον ... αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς ... Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν. The calling is sometimes specially defined, as in Rom. 1. Ἰαυλός κλητοὶ ἀπόστολος, ἵδ. 17 κλητοὶ ἁγίοις. At other times its nature is further explained, as in Rom. 228 τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς ὑπων, 1 Cor. 125 βλέπετε τὴν κλήσιν ἐμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα ... ἀλλὰ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέγατο ὁ Θεός, Eph. 118 εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τὸς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τής ἐκ πλούτου τής δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 2 Tim. 19 Θεοῦ τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγία, Ἡβ. 31 κλήσεως ἐποιείκα στάσεως καὶ μέτοχοι. In Matt. 2214 a distinction is made between calling and election (πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν κλητοὶ, ὁλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ) 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. 128) and in the parables of the Great Supper and the Labourers in the Vineyard. This idea of calling or election is derived from the O.T. See Hort's n. on 1 Pet. 1 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς: 'Two great forms of election are spoken of in the O.T., the choosing of Israel, and the choosing of single Israelites, or bodies of Israelites to perform certain functions for Israel ... It is singular that ἐκλεκτοῖς never stands at the beginning of St. Paul's Epistles, as it does here: ... his corresponding word is
κλητός and he often uses καλέω with a similar force. The calling and the choosing imply each other, the calling being the outward expression of the antecedent choosing, the act by which it begins to take effect. Both words emphatically mark the present state of the persons addressed as being due to the free agency of God. In Deuteronomy (4:37) the choosing by God is ascribed to His own love of Israel: the ground of it lay in Himself, not in Israel. As is the election of the ruler or priest within Israel for the sake of Israel, such is the election of Israel for the sake of the whole human race. Such also, still more clearly and emphatically is the election of the new Israel. For a similar use of the word 'call' in Isaiah, cf. ch. 48:12, 43:7. The chief distinction between the 'calling' of the old and of the new dispensation is that the former is rather expressive of dignity ('called by the name of God'), the latter of invitation; but the former appears also in the N.T. in such phrases as James 2:7 τὸ καλὸν ἄνωμα τὸ ἐπικληθέν ἔφ' ύμας, and 1 Pet. 2:9 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλεῖον ἐφαράγμα ... λαὸς εἰς παρεσκεύην. The reason for St. Jude's here characterizing the called as beloved and kept, is because he has in his mind others who had been called, but had gone astray and incurred the wrath of God.

2. For the Salutation see my note on χαίρειν James 1:1, and Hort's excellent note on 1 P. 1:2 χαίρεις ... πληθυνθείη. We find ἐλεος and εἰρήνη joined in Gal. 6:26, and with the addition of χαίρεις in 1 Tim. 1:2, 2 Tim. 1:2, 2 Joh. 3. The mercy of God is the ground of peace, which is perfected in the feeling of God's love towards them. The verb πληθυνθείη occurs in the Salutation both of 1 Pet. and 2 Pet. and in Dan. 6:25 (in the letter of Darius) εἰρήνη ύμιν πληθυνθείη, cf. 1 Thess. 3:12 ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ παρεσκεύαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους. Ἀγάπη (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. ὁ χαίρεις τ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in Eph. εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ι. Χ. Cf. 1 Joh. 3:1 ἔστε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δεδωκέν ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ἐνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληρὼμεν, where Westcott's n. is 'The divine love is infused into them, so that it is their own, and becomes in them the source of a divine life (Rom. 13:10). In virtue of this gift they are inspired with a love which is like the love of God, and by this they truly claim the title of children of God as partakers in His nature, 1 Joh. 4:7-19.' The same salutation is used in the letter of the Smyrnaeans (c. 156 A.D.) giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, ἐλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ι. Χ. πληθυνθείη. The thought of ἐλεος and ἀγάπη recurs again in ver. 21.

3. ἀγαπητοί occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 P. 3:1, 8, 14, 17, 1 Pet. 2:11, 4:12, and James. It is common in the Epistles of John and of Paul, sometimes with μον attached, as in 1 Cor. 10:14, Phil. 2:12, and is often joined to ἀδελφοῦ, especially in James. The ἀγαπητοῦ of ver. 2 leads on to the ἀγαπητοῦ here. They are themselves ἀγαπητοὶ because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενον. For πάσαν see my n. on James 1:2, and cf. 2 Pet. 1:5 σπουδὴν πάσαν παρεισενέγκατε, ἵνα σπουδάσω ἐχεῖν ύμᾶς
Also Isocr. *Orat.* v. p. 91 b πᾶσαν τὴν σπουδὴν περὶ τούτου ποιεῖται, Plato, *Euthyd.* 304 ε περὶ οἴδενος ἀξίων ἀναξιάν σπουδὴν ποιεῖται. Other examples in Wetstein. Jude was busy on another subject, when he received the news of a fresh danger to the Church, which, he felt it his duty to meet at once. Whether he lived to carry out his earlier design, and whether it was of the nature of a treatise or of an epistle, we know not. It is noteworthy that there is a similar allusion in 2 P. 3 to an earlier letter now lost. Compare Barn. 

κοινῆς σωτηρίας.] Cf. n. on 2 P. 1 ισότιμου, Tit. 1 κατὰ κοινῆς πίστις, *Ign. Eph.* 1 ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἀνάματος καὶ ἀληθὸς with Lightfoot’s n., *Jos. Ant.* 10. 1. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) ὑπὸ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας. Bede explains as follows: ‘omnia electorum communis est salus, fructes et diletio Christi.’ Jude puts on one side the address he was preparing on the main principles of Christianity (probably we may take vv. 20 and 21 as a sample of what this would have been) and turns to the special evil which was then threatening the church.

ἀνάγκην ἵσχυν γράψαι.] Cf. Luke 14 ἐγὼ ἀνάγκην ἰδεῖν αὐτῶν, *Heb.* 727, al., also Plut. *Cato Mi.* 24 ἀνάγκην ἐτέθη ἐκβαλεῖν ἀδικημόνισαν τὴν γυναῖκα. There is a similar combination of γράφων and γράφων in 3 Joh. 13. The aor. γράφω, contrasted with the preceding pres. γράφω, 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).

ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι τῇ ἄκα θεοδοσίᾳ τοῖς ἀγίωσ πίστει.] ‘to contend for the faith,’ almost equivalent to the ἀγώνισμα περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας in Sir. 428, see 1 Tim. 612 ἄγωνιζον τὸν καλὸν ἄγων τῆς πίστεως, and ἐς ὁ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος Col. 126. We may compare ἐπαμείνειν, ἐπαναπεμφέον νόμῳ Rom. 217. Bengel connects this with the parallel phrase ἐπικοινωνίωντες τῇ πίστει in ver. 20 by the thought borrowed from *Nehem* 416 foll. ‘Officeum duplex, pugnare strenue pro fide contra hostes, et aedificare se ipsum in fide.’ It is possible (as is shown by the following examples) for spiritual blessings, once given, to be lost, unless we use every effort to maintain them. The redemption from Egypt was a fact, as baptism into the name of Christ is a fact, but, unless it is borne in mind and acted upon, the fact loses its efficacy. The word ἐπαγ. is rare in this sense (1): it is found in Plut. *Mor.* 1075 ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι καὶ ἐκκυρώσεις τῇ ἐπικουρώσει. Stephanus quotes Maximus Schol. *in Dion.* *Areop.* p. 54 ταῖς τῇ δόξῃ ἐπαγωγεῖται. Philo (M. 2. 495) uses it in the same sense with the dative understood, ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι (τῷ ἀδίδω ἐνιαίον τῶν κόσμων) ὁ Κριστός ἐκρήγο καὶ θεωποτής λόγῳ, *ib.* p. 228 f. (2) Closely connected with this sense is that which we find in Plut. *V.* 65 c. ἐτέρως ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι τῇ κυρίως ‘lay stress upon other proofs.’ Aristid. *τέτην ἤτοι τηκι* 658 (D. vo. ii. p. 756) κατὰ λείαν γίνεται βραχύτης, ὅταν τις . . . μὴ ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι τῇ λεία . . . ὅταν τις μὴ φιλοτιμήτηται πρὸς τὴν λείαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ
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πράγματα ἀποβλέπη. (3) Libanius (Arg. in Androt. p. 587 δεύτερος ὁ
Διόδωρος ἐπαγωνύζεται τοῦτῳ τῷ λόγῳ) seems to use it in the sense of
'following up the argument of the previous speaker,' λόγῳ being the
instrumental dative. So Philostr. V. Soph. i. 17 ἔσοκε τῷ Πολεμώνι τῷ
Ἡρώδη καὶ τῷ μὴ παρεδείχτω ἐπ’ αὐτῷ εἰς λόγον ἐπίδειξιν μηδὲ ἐπαγωνύζεται
αἱ (ut post eum ad declamandum non veniret, nec post eum dicere
auderet), Sext. Emp. Math. iii. 327 ἤρκει μὲν ἵσως ἐν τούτοις περατοῖς τ. ἀντίρρησιν, ὅρως δὲ ἐπαγωνυζόμενο (ulterior decernentes)
περασόμεθα διδάσκοντεν, Dion. Hal. Ars Rhet. vii. 6 'urge those who have taken few
prizes' ὅσπερ ἀδικήσῃ ἄγαθος ἐπαγωνυζόμενος τῷ Ἀννίβα, ib. 486 Κύμων
ὅσπερ ἀδικήσῃ δεινός δύο καθήκως ἀγανάκτητο... ἐπαγωνύζετο ταῖς
νίκαις by L. and S. but probably to be understood as (3) 'followed up.'

τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖτο τοῖς ἄγιοι πίστει.] The word πίστις here is not
used in its primary sense of a subjective feeling of trust or belief, but
in the secondary sense of the thing believed, the Truth or the Gospel,
as in ver. 20 below, Gal. 123 ὁ δώκιμος ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν
πίστιν ἢν ποτὲ ἐπισφίλει, also Gal. 323, Phil. 127 συναδελφοῦς τῇ πίστει τοῦ
εὐαγγελιῶν, where see Lightfoot, Acts 67. In the same way ἐλπίς is used
in a concrete sense for the object of hope (as in Col. 15 τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν
ἀποκειμένην ὡμί, 1 Tim. 11 ἡ γέννησιν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, Tit. 213
προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and φόβος for the object of fear,
Rom. 132, 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. 925–27, 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 ἐλθάσθην, 1 Th. 218
καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ διὰ ἥσσος ἢμας ἐλθεῖν.

παραδοθείσης.] Cf. Philo M. 1. 387 πιστεύει τοὺς ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖτι, 2 P.
221. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers,
as by Clem. Al. Str. vii. where we read of ἡ ἀληθὴς παραδόσει (p. 845),
ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ π. (p. 890), ἡ θεία π. (p. 896), ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων
π. (p. 900), αἱ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ π. (p. 901), and even in the N. T. as in 1 Cor.
112 καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, 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 ἄγιοις.] 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. παραπεριπήσων γὰρ τινες ἄνθρωπον.] For the form, which is found in
B and adopted by WH, Veitch cites διεξεύθηναι in Hippocr. i. 601, and
compares ἐξέφυγεν, ἐρρύθην. The aor. is here used with the perfect force,
as in v. 11 ἐπορεύθησαν, etc., cf. Blass Gr. p. 199, my ed. of St. James,
p. cxx, and Dr. Weymouth there cited. The contrary view is main-
tained by Winer, but corrected in Moulton's n. p. 345. The verb
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tines ἄνθρωποι.] For the position of the indefinite τις see Acts 32 καὶ τις ἄνειρ χωλός...ἐβαστάτετο, 148, 151, 176, 34, 1 Tim. 524 τίνον ἄνθρωπων αἱ ἀμαρτίαι προδόλα εἰς, and for pleonastic ἄνθρωπος Lk. 154 τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐχων πρόβατα κ.τ.λ. Mt. 70, 1812, Jn. 5. [For τινες, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 1012, Gal. 17. C. Compare also Gal. 212 πρὸ τοῦ ἐθείνε τινας ἀπὸ Ἰκαβάνου, 2 P. 305 ὃς τινες βραδύτητα ἦγουνται.] It has often a contemptuous signification.

- οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.] Cf. 2 P. 28 ὃς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαιλαὶ οὐκ ἀργεῖ. Clem. Al. Adumbr. in ep. Judaee translates 'homenes impii qui olim...praedestinati erant in judicium...non ut fiant impii; sed existenties jam impii in judicium prescripti sunt.' The phrase τινες, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 1012, Gal. 17. C. For the phrase οἱ προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, see Acts 32 καὶ τις ἄνειρ χωλός...ἐβαστάτετο, 148, 151, 176, 34, 1 Tim. 524 τίνον ἄνθρωπων αἱ ἀμαρτίαι προδόλα εἰς, and for pleonastic ἄνθρωπος Lk. 154 τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐχων πρόβατα κ.τ.λ. Mt. 70, 1812, Jn. 5. [For τινες, hinting at a party who are yet well known, compare 2 Cor. 1012, Gal. 17. C. Compare also Gal. 212 πρὸ τοῦ ἐθείνε τινας ἀπὸ Ἰκαβάνου, 2 P. 305 ὃς τινες βραδύτητα ἦγουνται.] It has often a contemptuous signification.

- Cf. 2 P. 28 ὃς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαιλαὶ οὐκ ἀργεῖ. Clem. Al. Adumbr. in ep. Judaee translates 'homenes impii qui olim...praedestinati erant in judicium...non ut fiant impii; sed existenties jam impii in judicium prescripti sunt.' The word πάλαι precludes the proposition that the 2nd ep. of Peter can be referred to. 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 τινες προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, in apposition to τινες ἄνθρωπος, cf. Gal. 17 with Lightfoot's n., Lk. 189 ἐπεν δὲ πρὸς τινας τοὺς πεποιθήσας ἐξ ἐναυοῦ. For τινες, cf. Rom. 154 ὅσα γὰρ προγεγραφή εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδακτικὴν ἔγραφη. Br. Lightfoot in his note on Gal. 31 ὃς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἡ. Χ. προγεγραφή ἐσταισπαρμένος seems to give to the word here the same sense 'placard,' which it bears there, quoting in support Demosth. 1151 τοὺς προσάνεια τινίγραφων αὐτῷ τὴν κρίσιν εἰπ θέλομεν ἡμῖν καὶ Plut. Camill. 9 τὰς δικὰς προγεγραμμένας; 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,' so. by Enoch, or (less probably) 'written before in God's book of judgment,' cf. Exod. 332, Isa. 48 οἱ γραφήτες εἰς ἑωρή, 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 πᾶλα 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 ἐβδομᾶς ἀπὸ Ἀδημί 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. 286 εἰς δὲ καὶ ἐκτίθησαν. By ‘this’ Spitta understands ‘that judgment which I am now about to declare,’ i.e., the condemnation contained in the word ἀσεβείας used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that ὁστός usually refers to what precedes, and he would take τοῦτο here (with Hofmann) as referring to παρεισεδύσαν. I agree that the classical distinction between the prospective use of ὁστός and τοῦσκε, and the retrospective use of ὁστός and τοῦσκε prevails also in the N.T., as in the τάδε λέγει of Ἄρωσ. 21: 8, 12, 18. 31: 7, 14 contrasted with the μετὰ τοῦτο of Ἄρωσ. 41, 71: 9, 155, 181, 191, and the solitary instance of τοῦσκε in 2 P. 117 (where φωνὴς τοῦσκε is explained by the following δὲ υἱὸς μου ὁστός ἐστιν), as contrasted with the common retrospective use of τοῦσκε. ὁστός however may acquire a prospective use when it serves (like the Lat. is) simply as the base of a subsequent explanatory clause, whether introduced by the relative, as in Lk. 6: 3 οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε δ’ ἐποίησεν Δαυίδ; Phil. 25 τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν δ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, or by a conjunction such as ἢνα (Lk. 1: 48) or ἦτο (Lk. 10: 11), or ei’ (1 P. 219 τοῦτο χάρις ei’), or μή (2 Cor. 8: 30 στελλόμενοι τοῦτο μὴ τις), or what approaches more nearly to the use here, by a verb or noun in apposition as Lk. 3: 20 προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο, κατέκλεισεν, ib. 1218 τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, καθελώ, 1 Th. 4: 3 τοῦτο ἐστὶν θέλημα Θεοῦ δ’ ἀγα­­σμός ὑμῶν, Lk. 21: 25 τοῦτο ὑμῖν σημεῖον, εὐρήσετε βρέφος, Rom. 14: 13 τοῦτο κρίνατε, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα, 2 Cor. 21: 3 κρίνα τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ἐλθεῖν. None of these is quite like our text, where every reader naturally looks back for an explanation of τοῦτο. I think however παρεισεδύσαν 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 ἀπακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζονται of ver. 3, which is then further explained by the participles in ver. 4. The sin itself is its own judgment (Joh. 3: 19). Dr. Bigg considers that τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα is meaningless here, and can only be explained by the sup­position that it was hastily borrowed by Jude from 2 P. 28, but why should he have added τοῦτο, which makes the difficulty?

We may compare Enoch 1087 ʻSome 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 ʻblessed is the man who dies in righteousness, concerning whom there is no book of unrighteousness written,’ ch. 10619 ʻafter that there will be still more unrighteousness...for I know the mysteries of the heavenly tables, for the Lord hath showed me...and I have read in the heavenly tables,’ also Charles on 47 Test. Patr. Ασερ. 7 ἀνέγνων ἐν ταῖς πλαξί τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅτι ἀπεθάνετος ἀπεθάνετε αὐτῷ (the Messiah) καὶ ἀσεβθόντες ἀσεβθήσετε εἰς αὐτόν, ib. Levi 14 ἐγών ἀπὸ γράφης Ἐνών ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλος ἀσεβθήσετε, ἐπὶ Κύριον χείρας ἐπιμᾶλλοντες ἐν πάσῃ κακίᾳ, Ἄρωσ. Baruch. 241 ʻaperientur 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.'

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.

With this we may compare 1 P. 2 16, 2 P. 2 19, 2 P. 2 21, 3 16, 1 P. 4 3, and Lightfoot on Gal. 5 19. 'A man may be ἀκάδαρπος and hide his sin: he does not become ἀσέλγης until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word ἀσέλγεια generally signifies insolence or violence towards another... In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality... cp. Polyb. 37. 2 πολλὴ δὲ τις ἀσέλγεια καὶ περὶ τὰς συματικὰς ἑπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξηκολουθεί. Thus it has much the same range of meaning as χάρως.' On the meaning of χάρως see Robinson Ephes. p. 221 f. The form χάρων is used elsewhere in the N.T., except in Acts 24 27.

tὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἦμῶν Ἰσωτῶν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενον] So 2 P. 21 τὸν ἀγοραστήν αὐτοῦς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενον. On the denial of God and Christ see Mt. 10 22 ὅτις ἄν ἀρνήσηται μὲ ἐξουσίωσαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἐξουσίωσαν τῷ πατρός μου, ἴδ. 26 70 (Peter's denial), 1 Joh. 2 22 οὕτως ἦστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν νῦν, Tit. 1 12 θέου ὁμολογούσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἐργοῖς ἀρνοῦνται, βδελυκτοὶ δυντες καὶ ἀπετεθέοι καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἐργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμον, 1 Tim. 5 8 τὴν πίστιν ἄρρητα. 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. 41 2, 45 3, 46 7, 48 16. 'They will fail and not rise again... for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed.'

Two questions have been raised as to the meaning of the text, (1) is τ. μόνον δεσπότην to be understood of the Son, (2) what is the force of ἀρνεῖσθαι? The objection to understanding δεσπότης of our Lord is that in every other passage in the N.T., where δεσπότης occurs, except in 2 P. 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 δεσπότην.1 It seems to me a forced explanation to say that the phrase μόνος δεσπότης has reference only to other earthly masters. No Jew could use it in this connexion without thinking

1 It is true that the use of the word δεσπότης, to denote the kinsfolk of Jesus, by Julius Africanus (lived at Emmaus about 200 A.D.) ap. Euseb. H.E. i. 7, proves that the word δεσπότης must have been used of our Lord at an earlier period, but I am not aware of any example of this use in the Apostolic Fathers.
of the one Master in heaven. Again μόνος is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in Joh. 5:44 τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητείτε, 17 ἵνα γνώσκωσιν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, Rom. 16:27 μόνῳ σωτῆρ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Tim. 1:17 τῷ βασιλεί τῶν αἰωνῶν... μόνῳ Θεῷ τῳ κ. δόξα, ὑ. 615. 16 ο μακάριος κ. μόνος δυνάμεος, ο μόνος ξένον ἄθανασιαν, and by Jude himself, below 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρ ήμῶν διὰ 'I. X., του κυρίου ήμῶν δόξα. Wetst. quotes several passages in which Josephus speaks of God as ο 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 κατὰ, if the article is prefixed to the first noun only, the second noun will then be an attribute of the same subject. In the present case however the second noun (κύριον) belongs to the class of words which may stand without the article, see Winer pp. 147–163. A similar doubtful case is found in Tit. 2:13 προσδεχόμενο τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἑ. Ἡ. ὁ δὲ ἔδωκεν ἐαντόν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν λυτρώσει ἡμᾶς, where also I should take τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ to refer to the Father. Other examples of the same kind are Eph. 5:1 οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομιάν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ (where Αὐτ. notes 'We cannot safely say here that the same Person is intended by X. κ. Θεοῦ merely on account of the omission of the art.; for (1) any introduction of such a predication regarding Christ would here be manifestly out of place, (2) Ἰησοῦς is so frequently anarthrous that it is not safe to ground any such inference on its use here'), 2 Th. 1:12 οπως ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ δομοῖ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 1 Tim. 5:3 (cf. 2 Tim. 4:1) διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγγέλων, which Chrysostom explains μάρτυρα καὶ τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὸν ὑμὸν αὐτόν; 2 P. 1:1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where see n. On this use of the article see Green's Gr. of N.T. pp. 205–219. Rampf compares Eus. H.E. vii. 30 (the charge brought against Paul of Samosata) τοῦ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐαντοῦ καὶ Κύριον ἀρνομένοιν. The denial of the only Master and Our Lord J. C. may be implicit, shown by their conduct, though not asserted in word, as in Tit. 1:16; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 Joh. 2:22, where Westcott notes that a common gnostic theory was that "the Aeon Christ" descended upon the man Jesus at His baptism and left Him before His passion. Those who held such a doctrine denied... the union of the divine and human in one Person... and this denial involves the loss of the Father, not only because the ideas of sonship and fatherhood are correlative, but because... it is only in the Son that we have the [full] revelation of God as Father." The phrase τον μονον δεσποτην might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (Haer. vii. 33, x. 21) οδία ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ τῶν κόσμων γεγονέναι ἔθελησεν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ δυνάμεως τινος ἀγγέληκης, and Irenaeus (Haer. i. 26). See Introduction on Early Heresies.

5. ὑπομνήσας δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα.] 1 Cf. 2 P. 112 διὸ

1 On the readings see Introduction.
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μελλήσω ὑμᾶς ἄλλον παραμυθισμένοι καὶ περι εἰδήςα, ἵνα 113 διεγέρων ὑμᾶς ἐν παραμυθίσει. ἤν ὑπομνήσει, ἵνα 31 διεγέρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν. Ῥωμ. 15:14 τέτειχαμι δι' ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρομένοι πάντες τῆς γνώσεως... τολμηρότερος δὲ ἔγραφα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπάνω-μανησκῶς ὑμᾶς. The word εἰδήςα justifies ὑπομνήσα: 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 ὑμᾶς and οἴνοι (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 τοῦτο. The former finds some support in Enoch 12 'I heard every thing from the angels,' 25 'I should like to know about every thing,' Secrets of En. 40:1-2 'I know all things from the lips of the Lord...I know all things and have written all things in the books,' 61 (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 σώσας, 'ita clamantes ad se de afflictione Aegyptiae primo salvavit humiles, ut secundo murmurantes contra se in eremo prosterneret superbos... Meminerimus illum sic per aquas baptismi salvare credentes, ut etiam post baptismum humilem in nobis requirat vitam.'

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. 12, and he argues that this proves clumsy borrowing on the part of the former; but the provocation in the Wilderness and the destruction of Sodom were among the most familiar lessons of the O.T.
Jerome (Jovin. 1. 12) but explained by him of Joshua. With this we may compare Sir. 46 foll. Ἰησοῦς ἐν πολέμῳ Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ...δός εὔνετο κατὰ τὸ ὀνόμα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ συντρία ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ, Justin Dial. 75, where reference is made to Exod. 23:20, 21. 'Behold I send my angel before thee, to keep thee in the way and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice; for he will not pardon your transgression, for my name is in him.' Justin's comment is τίς ὦν εἰς τὴν γῆν εἰσήγαγε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν; ἣν ποτὲ νοήσατε ότι ὦν τῷ ὁνόματι τουτῷ ἐπονομασθεὶς Ἰησοῦς, πρῶτον Ἀδωνίς καλοῦμενος (see Num. 13:16), i.e. 106, 132, Clem. Al. 134, Lactant. Inst. 4. 17 Christi āguram gerebat ille Jesus; qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praescen­tien sussit eum Jesus vocari; other ref. in Pearson (Art. 2. p. 75, ed. Chevallier). It is difficult however to see how Joshua can be said either to have saved the people from Egypt or to have destroyed the disbelievers. Moses was the divine instrument in the former case, and we are only told of one, Achan, whom Joshua put to death, and that, not for disbelief, but for disobedience. Again Joshua had nothing to do with the punishment of the angels (v. 6). The punishment of murmurers and unbelievers is always ascribed to God, as in Numbers 14:11, 12, Pss. 78, 95, 106, Sir. 16:7-10, Heb. 3:16-19, and 1 Cor. 10:1-10. τὸ δεῦτερον has given rise to much discussion. If we place ἀπαξ before λαῶν with Sin., or before ἐκ γῆς with Clem. Al. p. 280 (ὁ Θεὸς ἀπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αιγύπτου λαῶν σώσας, τὸ δεῦτερον ἀπολέσας), we might then regard it as contrasting the preceding saving with the following destruction. I think Ewald is right in connecting ἀπαξ with this later clause rather than with εἰδότας, 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. 14:27-37). So in 1 Cor. 10 we have the privileges of Israel allowed, and yet all was in vain because of their unbelief. There seems less force in the connexion of ἀπαξ with εἰδότας: ἥν would have been more suitable. For the opposition to τὸ δεῦτερον cf. Heb. 9:28 ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεκείν ἀμαρτίας ἐκ δευτέρου χωρίς ἀμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται, Theoph. Autol. ii. 26 ὅταν τὸ μὲν ἀπαξ ὑ πεπληρωμένον ὅτε ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλη πληροῦσα μετὰ τὴν... κρίσιν, Liban. ap. Wæstæ. ἵμοι δὲ ἀπαξ ἀρκεί γέλωτα ὄφλεων, δευτέρον δὲ ὄνκειτι.

I am inclined to think that the article before μὴ is an intrusion, as it seems to be before ἐν in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take δεῦτερον with μὴ πιστεύσατε, 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 τοῦς as facilitating the plural construction after λαῶν. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. 10:26 ἐκονωθώς

1 Cf. Exod. 2:14, 4:1, 5:21, 6:3, 14:1-12.
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and the belief, apparently based upon it, in the early Church as to sin after baptism, cf. Herm. Mand. iv. 3, Vis. ii. 1, Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 459 τὸν οὖν εἰληφότα τὴν ἁφέσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐκ ἐτὶ ἁμαρτάνειν χρῆ. ἕπι γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ μόνῃ μετανοίᾳ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῆς ἅν εἰ... ἐδωκεν οὖν ἄλλην ἕτι τοὺς κἂν τῇ πίστει περιπετευκόσι τυί πλημμελήματι, πολυελθός ἄν, μετάνων δευτέραν. Hence sprang the custom of post­poning baptism till the approach of death. For the emphatic δευτέρον compare διὸς ἀποθανόντα in ver. 12, also 2 P. 12, 22, 22, Heb. 6:8, Tit. 3:10 αἵρετικον ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοεθείαν παρατοῦ.

Others join τὸ δευτέρον with σῶσας, 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 σῶσας λαὸν metaphorically of the new Israel and reads Ἰησοῦς, maintaining that Jesus may be called the destroyer of Jerusalem, because He prophesied its destruction and spoke of His word as that which should judge men at the last day (Joh. 12:48). He considers that, if the saving and destruction are to be understood of the Exodus of old, it is difficult to account for its being placed before the Fall of the Angels. But why may not Jude have followed the warning derived from O.T. history in 1 Cor. 10, and then have be­thought himself of the warning derived from the story of the Watchers in Enoch? Some again imagine allusion to be made to a second destruction, such as the carrying away captive, or even the fall of Jerusalem under Titus. I do not think we can make τὸ δευτέρον simply equivalent to ἐστερον, as is done by many interpreters. In Nonnus Dionys. 46. 189 καὶ τότε μῖν λίπε λύσα νοσσαφαλέος Διονύσου, καὶ προτέρας φένας ἐγχε τὸ δευτέρον it is nearly ‘again.’ For the combination σῶσας—ἀπολέσειν B. Weiss compares James 4:12 εἰς ἐστιν—δ ἐνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι.

6. ἅγγελους τε τούς μή τηρήσαντας τὴν ξυπνόν ἄρχη... εἰς κρίσιν... τετήρηκεν.] Cf. Clem. Al. Adumbr. ‘Αγγέλους 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 parce superbiëntibus, sed et hos quoque cum sumum principatum non servaverint, quo per gratiam adoptionis filii Dei effecti sunt, sed reliquertin suum domicilium, id est, Ecclesiae unitatem...damnabot.’ On the Fall of the Angels see Introduction and the parallel passages in 2 P. 24, and in Enoch, chapters 6–10.

ἀρχὴν.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. 40:21 of the chief butler: here perhaps of the office of Watcher, though Spitta takes it more generally of the sovereignty belonging to their abode in heaven = τὸν ἄνω κλήρον in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term ἀρχὴ is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. 6:12. Cf. Enoch 12, of the Watchers (angels) who have abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place and defiled themselves with women, ib. 15. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. 1, p. 268) καὶ μὴ λοιποκληθοί μὴν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξεως, ἐν ἡ τούς τεταγμένους πάντας ἁμαρταίειν ἀνάγκη, αὐτομολήσατι.

ἀπολυόντας τὸ ἱδίον οἰκητηρίου.] Cf. 2 Cor. 52 τὸ ὅνικ. τὸ καὶ ὅφον ὑπὲρομφοι, and the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For οἰκητήριον cf. Enoch 155 (the message of Enoch to the Watchers) ‘the spiritual have their dwelling in heaven’...ἠ κατοικίσεις αὐτῶν ἔσται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. C.]

εἰς κράτην μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰώνιοι ὑπὸ τὸ ζῷον τετηρηκεν.] Cf. 2 P. 24 σειροῖς δοξοῦ τοπαρτῆσας, ἵδιον εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, ἱδιὸν 37 τηροῦμεν εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως...τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, Joel 230 ὁ ἱλιος μεταστράφησεν εἰς σκότος...πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφάνην, Apoc. 617 ἠλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, ἱδιὸν 1614 συναγαγείς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Enoch 105 ἐπικαλυφὼν αὐτῷ (Azazel) σκότος, καὶ οἰκήσατω ἐκείνα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἱδιὸν 1012 ἰδίον αὐτοῦ...μεχρὶ ἡμέρας κρίσεως αὐτῶν, ἱδιὸν 2221 (Gr. in Charles’ App. C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως, ἱδιὸν 546, note on xlv. 1. So ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου 1 Cor. 12, 2 P. 310 αὐτ., ἐκείνην ἡ ἡμέρα 2 Th. 110. On δεσμοῖς see En. 544-55 ‘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. δεσμοίς κόστος (Wisd. 172) of the plague of darkness.

For the use of the acc. after ὑπὸ to express ‘rest under,’ instead of the earlier dat. or gen. cf. Joh. 140 ὑπὸ τὸ σχῆν, Jannaris Gr. § 1698, Schmid Attic. iv. p. 467 f.

αἰῶνιοι.] 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 αἰῶνιος in ver. 7. So too in the only other passages in which it occurs in the Bible, Wisdom 726 ἀπάνγασμη ἐπὶ φωτὸς αἰῶνιοι, and Rom. 1320 ὁ αἰῶνιος αὐτοῦ ὀναμάς και θεϊότης. After ἥξιον Clem. Al. p. 280 adds ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων, a variant of which is found also in Lucif. 28 sanctorum angelorum, Speculum, p. 50 (Belsheim, 1889). Cf. Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 363 n.

7. ὁς Ἀδόμα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ Αἰ περὶ αὐτῆς πόλεως.] 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 ἀγγέλων τε...ὁς Ἀδόμα. Cf. 2 P. 26 πόλεις Ἀδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας καταστροφῇ κατεκρινεν. The destruction was not restricted to these two cities, but extended to all the neighbouring country (Gen. 1923, called Πεντάπολις in Wisd. 106), including the towns of Admah and Zeboim (Deut. 2923, Hos. 115). Zoar was spared at the request of Lot.

τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτους ἀκορνίσασαν.] For the adverbial acc., which repeats the preceding ὅς = σικεύς (Clem. Adumbr.), cf. Mt. 2387 διὰ τρόπου ἐπικυρώνησε ὅρνας τὰ νοοτροπία, 2 Macc. 1588 διὰ τρόπον ὅνασ...ἀποτελεῖ, οὕτω καί, Luc. Catapl. 6 τεθνάσι τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον. ‘Like them,’ i.e. the fallen angels. The two judgments are similarly joined in Test. Νεφελ. 3 μή γένητε ὡς Ἀδόμα, ἢτις ἐνήλλαξε τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἐγγέλιοι ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, ὡς κατηράσατο Κύριος, 3 Macc. 245. Others understand τούτως of the libertines who are subsequently referred to as οὕτω (vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19); but the beginning
of ver. 8 (μέντοι καὶ οὖντο) seems to distinguish between them and the preceding. The verb ἐκπ. occurs in Gen. 38:24 of Tamar, Exod. 34:15-16 (μή ποτε) ἐκπορευόμενοι ὑπὸ σοῦ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, Lev. 17:1, Hos. 4:12, Ezek. 16:26, 28, 38.

ἀποθεοῦσα ὑπὸ σαρκός ἐτίμασ.] 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. 12:7), what Philo calls ἀνάνομοι καὶ ἐκθέσμους μίξεις (de Gih. M. 1, p. 267), cf. Exod. 30:9 оὐκ ἀνώσεις θυμίαμα ἔτερον. For the post-classical phrase cf. 2 P. 2:10 τοῦ ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθύμησι μισμοῦ παρευμένου, Deut. 4:3 ὑπερεύθη ὑπὸς Βεβηλεῖν, Jer. 22:3.

πρόκειται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσα.] Cf. Enoch 67:12 ‘this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty,’ 2 P. 2:6 ὕποdeposita μελλάντων ἀσεβῶν τεθεικὸς, 1 Cor. 10:6.11 τύποι έγένοτο, Heb. 4:11 ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ἐποδείξη τῆς ἀπειθείας, 3 Macc. 25 ὑπὸ τούτων ὑπερθερμάνην ἐργαζόμενος Σωδομίτας... πυρὶ θείῳ κατέβλεψας, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγνωμένοις καταστήσας, Clem. Al. p. 260 δεῖγμα σοι τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος ἀπολειπότετος διὰ κάλλος μαρανθομένου, Ael. V.H. vi. 12 ἕν. ἂν δεῖγμα οὐ τὸ τυχόν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς σωφροσύνην ἢ τοῦ Διονυσίου ἐκ τῶν τηλικοῦτων εἰς οὖν ταπεινά μεταβολῆ. The present aspect of the Lacus Asphaltites was a conspicuous image of the lake of fire and brimstone prepared for Satan and his followers, Apoc. 19:20, 20:10, 21:8. It is questioned whether πυρὸς is governed by δέην or δίκην. If by δέην, then the burning of Sodom is itself spoken of as still going on (eternal), and this is in accordance with Jewish belief as recorded in Wisd. 10:7 (πῦρ Πενταπόλεως) ἢ ἔτι μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας κατιομένης καθέστηκε χέρσος, Philo (De Abr. M. 2. 21) μέχρι νῦν καται. τὸ γὰρ κεραυνὸν πῦρ ἦκαστα σβενύμενον ἢ νέμεται ἢ ἐντύφωται. πίστις δὲ ταφεστάτη τὰ δρώμενα, τοῦ γὰρ συμβεβηκότος πάθους οὐκετιόν ἐστιν ὃ τε ἀναδιδόμενος ἐλπ. καὶ κακὰς καὶ ἐμπαλέσωσεν θείοι, ib. V. Mos. M. 2, p. 143. Some disallow this sense of αἰώνιος and think it can only be used of hell-fire, as in 4 Macc. 12:12 (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor) ταμεύεται σὲ ἡ θείᾳ δίκῃ πυκνοτέρῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ, καὶ βάσανοι εἰς ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα οὐκ ἀνήγουσι σὲ. For an examination of the word see Jukes Restitution of All Things, p. 67 n. and cf. Jer. 23:39, 40, Ezek. 16:33, 55 (on the restoration of Sodom), 47:1-12 (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. 10:5 and 12, where the εἰς αἰῶνα of the former verse is equivalent to 70 generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where ἡ ἡμέρα αἰῶνος is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of δείγμα is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with πυρὸς in the sense of ‘an example or type of eternal fire,’ which would escape the difficulty connected with αἰώνιος, but leaves δίκην ὑπέχουσα (for which cf. Xen. Mem. ii. 1, 8, 2, Macc. iv. 48) a somewhat otiose appendage. In the book of Enoch (67 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. "ομοιώς μετ' οι καὶ σοι." Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

[εννυπαντήμονοι σάρκα μαίνονσιν.] Clement's paraphrase in his Adumbrationes is 'qui somniant imaginatione sua libido... bonum esse putantes non illud quod vere bonum est.' He also explains the word in Str. iii. 11, οϋ (so Hort, in the margin of his copy, corrects § of MS.) γὰρ ἵππαρ τὴν ἀλθείαν ἐπιβάλλουσιν. Cf. parallel in 2 P. 210-13, 1 Th. 56, Rom. 1311-12, 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 17(a quotation from Joel 228) οἱ προσβύτεροι ῥώμων εννυπαντήμονοι τοῖς τις σαφεσθέρήσονται τοῖς τις σαφεσθέρησονται 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 ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι 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 ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ εἰδότες (see ver. 10 below), εννυπαντήμονοι κοίτην φιλούντες νυστάξαντα, 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 ἀκούστε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ῥώμων... καὶ τῶν εννυπαντήμονῶν ῥώμων ('nor to your dreamers') καὶ τῶν οἰωνισμάτων ῥώμων, Deut. 133-5 προφήτης ἡ εννυπαντήμονος. 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 δέρα κενεμ. βασείων. This accords with ver. 10: in their delusion and their blindness they take the real for the unreal, and the unreal for the real. The verb is used both in the active and middle by Aristotle, Somn. 1. 1 πότερον συμβαίνει ἢ θεσυκρόν τὸς καθεύδουσιν εννυπαντήμονος, ἀλλ᾿ οὗ μημονεύοντος; Probl. 30. 14. 2 οἱ ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν εννυπαντήμονοι ἀστματίς τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καθ᾿ ὅσον ἤρεμει. ὅνερποτοσιν, cf. Artem. Oecon. 1. 1. Some interpret of polluting dreams (cf. Lev. 15); but the word εννυπαντήμονος is evidently intended to have a larger scope, covering not merely μαίνονσιν but ἀθετοῦσιν and βλασφημοῦσιν. We must also interpret μαίνον here by the ἀσθενείας of v. 4, the ἐκπορευόμενον and σαρκὸς ἐτέρων of v. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. 115 τοῖς μεμασματίσοντος ὅθεν καθαρῶν, ἀλλ᾿ μεμασματίσοντος αὐτῶν καὶ ὅ νοσς καὶ ἡ συνεκτίνησις. The heretics condemned by St. Paul for forbidding marriage (1 Tim. 48) regarded it as μασμός σαρκὸς.

κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δέξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.] On first reading one is
inclined to take the words κυριότης and διά simply as abstractions. The result of indulgence in degrading lusts is the loss of reverence, the inability to recognize true greatness and due degrees of honour. This would agree with the description of the libertines as sharing in the ἀντιλογία of Korah, as κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης, as γογγυσταί uttering hard speeches against God. When we examine however the use of the word κυριότης and the patristic comments, and when we consider the reference to the archangel's behaviour towards Satan, and the further explanation in ver. 10, where the σάρκα of ver. 8 is represented by ὅσα φισικῶς ἐπιστανται and the phrase κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν by ὅσα οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, we seem to require a more pointed and definite meaning, not simply 'majesty,' but 'the divine majesty,' not simply 'dignities,' but 'the angelic orders.' Cf. 2 P. 2:10, Eph. 1:21 (having raised him from the dead and set him on his right hand) ἐπεράων τάς ἄρχης καὶ ἑξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, Col. 1:16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἄρατα, εἰτε θρόνοι εἰτε κυριότητες εἰτε ἄρχαι εἰτε ἑξουσίαι, 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) ὃς κύριον, ὃν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριος ἐστιν, Herm. Sim. v. 6.1 εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κείται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἑξουσίαις μεγάλην κείται καὶ κυριότητα. Hase, on Leo Dicausinus v. 3, p. 449, has the note 'κυριότης vocatur dignitas Servatoris, qua est Dominus et noster et rerum creatarum omnium' and cites among other exx. Chrys. Hom. in Matt. lxxi. p. 696, 'the prophet bears witness to τὴν κυριότητα of Christ and to ὁμότιμον τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,' Greg. Nyss. c. Eunom. vi. p. 180 η κυριότης οὐχὶ οὐσίας ὀνόμα ἀλλ' ἑξουσίαις ἐστί. It was also used as a complimentary address, ἡ στῇ κυριότης 'your lordship.' The verb ἅβετοω has God or Christ for its object in Lk. 10:16, Joh. 12:48, 1 Th. 4:6, etc. We have then to consider how it can be said that the libertines (ὁσιοῦ) 'despise authority' in like manner to the above mentioned offenders. For the former we may refer to ver. 4 κύριον ἣμων ἄρνοιμενοι, for the latter to the contempt shown by the Israelites towards the commandments of God. [This is not inconsistent with the statement in ver. 5 that the unbelieving were destroyed, for the neglect of God proceeded from unbelief.] So the desertion of their appointed station and abode by the angels showed their disregard for the divine ordinance, and the behaviour of the men of Sodom combined with the vilest lusts an impious irreverence towards God's representatives, the angels (Gen. 19:5). Cf. Joseph. Ant. i. 11.2 εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἔστιν
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ὑβρισταὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἄσεβεῖς, and Test. Aser 7, where the sin of Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μη γίνεσθε ως Σόδομα ἤτις ἤγνωσε τοὺς ἄγγελους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο εἰς αἰῶνοι.

δόξας δὲ βλασφήμος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Cf. 2 P. 21ο τολμηται αὐθαδεῖς δόξας οὐ τρέ­
μοναίν βλασφήμουντες. 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 ὁμοίος σοι ἐν θεοίς, Κύριε; τις ὁμοίοι σοι; δεδοξασμένοι ἐν ἄγιοις, θαναματῶν ἐν δόξαις. Clement's interpre­
tation of this and the preceding clause is as follows (Adumbr. 1008) 'dominationem spernunt, hoc est solum dominum qui vere


1 There is much said of the glory of the Angels in Asc. Isaiae, pp. 47, 49 foll. ed. Charles.
an apocryphal book. In Cramer's *Catena* on this passage (p. 163) we read τέλευταί τοις κατά τον Μωσίους, ὁ Μιχαήλ ἀποστείλεται μεταβήσον τὸ σῶμα, ἐτής τοῦ διαβόλου κατὰ τοῦ Μωσίους βλασφημοῦτος καὶ φονεὰ ἀναγορευόντος διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ ἐνεγκώ ἡ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος, Ἠπιτυµήσας οὐ τὸ Θεὸς πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἐφ. Charles in his edition of the *Assumption* thus summarizes the fragments dealing with the funeral of Moses: (1) Michael is commissioned to bury Moses, (2) Satan opposes his burial on two grounds: (a) he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins, 'The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's spirit which created the world and all mankind.' (b) He brings the charge of murder against Moses (the answer to this is wanting). The story is based upon Deut. 34: 6 (R.V.) 'he buried him (mg. he was buried) in the valley...but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.' Compare the vain search for Elijah (2 K. 2: 15-17). Further details in Josephus (Ant. iv. 8. 48) νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ στάντος ἀφανίζεται κατὰ τοὺς φάραγγος. γέγαρφη δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βιβλίοις τεθνεότα, δειοῖς μὴ δὲ ὑπερβαλὴν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρήσῃ τολμήσον εἰπεῖν, Philo I. p. 165, and Clem. Al. (Str. vi. § 132, p. 807) where it is said that Caleb and Joshua witnessed the assumption of Moses to heaven, while his body was buried in the clefts of the mountain.

διακρίνομεν;] Here used in the sense of 'disputing,' as in Jer. 15: 10 ἀνάρα διακρίνομεν πάση τῇ γῇ, Joel 3: 2, Acts 11: 2. See my note on James 1: 6 and below ver. 22.

διελέγεται.] Cf. Mk. 9: 34 πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέγθησαν, τίς μείζων. οὐκ ἐπόλυσαν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκέον βλασφημίας.] Cf. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 856 πρὸς δόσιν αἰτίας ἐπιφέρων, id. 943 τιμωρίαν ἐπιφ. The word occurs elsewhere in N. T. only in Rom. 3: 5. Field (On Translation of N. T. p. 244) compares Acts 25: 18 οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἐξέφερον δὲν ἐγὼ ὑπενόν, Diod. 16. 29 δίκαιον ἐπήνεγκαν κατὰ τῶν Ἐπιφανειῶν, ib. 20. 10 κρίσεις ἄδικους ἐπιφέροντες, 20. 62 φοβηθεῖς τὰς ἐπιφανέστατας κρίσεις, tom. x. p. 171 ed. Bip. ἐπήνεγκαν κρίσιν περὶ ψβρεως, 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 βλασφημίαν to be gen. qualitatis, expressed by the adj. βλάσφημον in 2 P.: see below on ver. 18, James 1: 25 ἀκροασίας ἐπιληψιμόν, 24 κρίσι τα διαλογισμοί πονηροί, 36 ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἄδικας, also 2 P. 21 αἱρέσεις ἀπώλειας, 21 ἐπιτυπωμένα μιμομοῦ.

κρίσις, like κρίνω, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, cf. Lycurg. 31 where οἱ συνοφαντώτες are distinguished from τῶν δικαίων τὰς κρίσεις ἐνστατεῖ. Ἠπιτυµήσας οὐ Κύριος.] These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (3: 10) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words Ἠπιτυµήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοι,
They were no doubt inserted as appropriate by the author of the Asc. Mos. in his account of the controversy at the grave of Moses. We may compare Mt. 17:18 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

10. οὗτοι δὲ δοσὶ μὴν οὐκ ὀδισαν βλασφημοῦν. [The libertines do the contrary of what we are told of the respect shown by the angel even towards Satan: they speak evil of that spiritual world, those spiritual beings, of which they know nothing, cf. 2 P. 2:12. The common verb βλασφ. shows that the δόξα of ver. 8 are identical with θανάτους here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom cf. 1 Cor. 2:16, a passage linked with our epistle by the distinction between the ψυχικοί and πνευματικοί and by the words λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἣν οὐδές τῶν ἀρχώντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον ἐγνωκεν· εἰ γὰρ ἐγνωσαν οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἑπταύρωσαν. See too Joh. 8:19, 1 Tim. 6:6 τετυφώτατοι μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενοι. For the form οἰδαν see my ed. of St. James p. clxxxiii.]

δοσι δὲ φυσικῶς ὥσ τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπιστάμεναι. [This stands for σάρκα in ver. 8 and is explained by αἰσθήμαν in ver. 4, ἐκποιεῖσασα in ver. 7, μαίνοντοι in ver. 8, κατὰ τὸ εἰσθήμα τοῖς αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι in ver. 16.]

φυσικῶς ‘by instinct,’ so Diog. L. x. 137 φυσικῶς καὶ χωρὶς λόγου. Alford cites Xen. Cyrop. ii. 3. 9 μάχην ὅρω πάντας ἄνθρωπους φύσει ἐπισταμένους, ὥσπερ γε καὶ τάλα ζῷα ἐπίστατα τινα μάχην ἕκαστα οὐδὲ παρ’ ἔνος ἄλλου μαθοῦντα ή παρὰ τῆς φύσεως.

ἐν τούτοις φιλορνοτα. [The natural antithesis here would have been ‘these things they admire and delight in.’ For this Jude substitutes by a stern irony ‘these things are their ruin.’ Cf. Phil. 3:10 where speaking of the enemies of the Cross the apostle says διὸ τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, διὸ δὲ καθὼς καὶ εἰ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, Eph. 4:22 ἀποθέσατο . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας.

11. οὐάλ αὐτοῖς, ἐτί τῇ ὅφῳ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν.] For the use of the aorist see n. on ver. 4 παρεισδύοσαν: for the phrase cf. Blass Gr. p. 119, and 2 P. 2:15 ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὅφῳ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ. The phrase οὐάλ, so common in Enoch, esp. in cc. 94 to 100, and in the Gospels and Apocalypse, occurs in the epistles only here and in 1 Cor. 9:16. The woe is grounded on the fate which awaits those who walk in the steps of Cain, Balaam, and Korah. In 2 P. Balaam is the only one referred to of the three leaders of wickedness here named by Jude. Cain, with Philo, is the type of selfishness (M. 1 p. 206) πᾶς φίλαυτος ἐπίκλησις Καὶν εὐρίκευ (quoted by Schneckenb. p. 221); he is named as a type of jealous hate in 1 John 3:11-12 ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἄλληλους· οὐ δόσι παρὰ Καίν ἐκ τοῦ ποινηροῦ ζῷον καὶ έσφαξεν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἐσφαξεν αὐτὸν; διτὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ποιήμα ἢρ, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια, αἱ οὐκ ἠπίστησεν Ὁσίων ᾧς θυσιάν Ἀθελ παρὰ Καὶν προσήγεκεν τῷ Θεῷ. This view of his sin is also taken by the later Jewish writers, cf. Philo De Agric. 1 M. 300 f., and Targ. Jer. on Gen. 4:7 cited by Schneckenburger, in which Cain is represented as saying ‘non est judicium, nec iudex, nec est aliud saeculum, nec dabitur merces bona justis, nec ultio sumetur de improbis, etc. There seems no reason why we should not regard Cain here as symbolizing the absence both of faith and of love, cf. 1 Joh. 3:22. Euthym Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοτότοι
Cain and Korah are said to have been objects of special reverence with a section of the Ophite heresy, which appears to have been a development of the Nicolaitans (Epiphan. Pan. i. 3. 37. 1 oi 'Ophiatai tásς προφάσεις ειλήφασιν ἀπὸ τῆς Νικολάου καὶ Γνωστικῶν καὶ τῶν πρὸ τούτων αἱρέσεων). They held that the Creator was evil, that the Serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epiphan. ib. 38. 1, oi Καυανοὶ φασί τὸν Καῖν ἐκ τῆς ισχυρότερας Δυνάμεως ὑπάρχειν καὶ τῆς ἀνωθὲν αὐθεντικὰ, and boast themselves to be of kin to Cain, καὶ τῶν Σοδομίτων καὶ Ἡσαβ καὶ Κορέ, see too Iren. i. 31, Clem. Str. vii. § 108).

Every word in this clause is open to question. The passive of ἐκχύζω 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 = ἐφύσι sunt, as in Sir. 3729 μὴ ἐκχύζης ἐπ’ ἐδεσμάτων. Test. Eveh. 1 πορνεία ἐν ἦ ἐξεχύθην, Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 491 εἰς ἡδονήν, τράγων δίκην, ἐκχυθέντες καθοδιαιθοῦν, Plut. V. Ant. 21 εἰς τὸν ἡδυταθῆ καὶ ἀκαλαστόν βίον ἐκκεχυμένος. Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with μισθόν, which implies cool self-interest. That covetousness, αἰσχροκόρδια, 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 τῆς, and what is the reference in the word? Should we take πλάνη as equivalent to εἰς πλάνην (Winer p. 268)? This is the interpretation given by Lucifer p. 219 'vae illis quoniam in seductionem B. mercede effusi sunt,' but it is a rare use of the dative, and it seems more natural to explain πλάνη by the preceding ἀδεξ (dat. of the means or manner), which is used in the same collocation in 2 P. 215. What then are we to understand by

1 I do not think the marginal reading in the R.V. 'cast themselves away' is tenable.
'they were hurried along on the line of Balaam's error'?
What was his error? From Numb. 22, 25, and 31, Nehem. 13, Moabitaēs byōsāyto ēp' aoutōn tōn Balaam katarásasba, 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. In rabbinical literature Balaam is a sort of type of false teachers (Pirke Aboth v. 29 with Taylor's n.). Some suppose the name Nicolaitan (Apoc. 2) to be formed from the Greek equivalent to Balaam = 'corrupter of the people;' see however the passages quoted from Clem. Al. in the Introduction on Early Heresies. In Apoc. 2 we read of some in Pergamum that held the teaching of Balaam, δε διδασκεκ τα Βαλαμ βαλαὶν σκάνδαλον ἐνωπίων τῶν ὦν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν ειδωλοθύτα καὶ πορνεύσα. 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. 3 where Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was oúk ἐκ πλάνης οὐδέ ἐς ἀκαθαρσίας ὀδε ἐν δόλῳ . . . οὔτε γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγεννημέν, οὔτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας, οὔτε ἐντοτε ἐς ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, 1 Tim. 3.0 διακόνους μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέγγοντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, ἔχοντας τῷ μυστήριῳ τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθορη συνειδήσει, Tit. 1.11 διδάσκοντες αὐτῷ διε τέρων χάριν, 1 Pet. 5.2. For the gen. μισθοῦ cf. Winer, p. 575 in μισθοῦ ἐπικουροῦσιν, 1 Cor. 7.23 τιμῆς ἡγομένῃ. 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 Κορᾶ ἀπόλοντο.] For Korah's sin see Numb. 16 foll. and compare, for the same rebellious spirit in the Christian Church, 3 Joh. 9, 10 (of Diotrephes), Tit. 11.11, ἐλεὶ πώλη άντιτάκτοι . . . οἳ δὲ ἐπιστομίζεσ, ib. 16; ib. 310.11, 1 Tim. 120 (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenæus and Alexander). οὕς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν, ib. 630, 2 Tim. 1 Zahn understands πλάνη in an active, not a passive sense, as the ruling principle of the πάθος Balaam, not as the error into which others fell through his seductions. I do not think Jude discriminated between these meanings: πλάνη covers both.
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216, 25. ὃς λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἔξει, ὅς ἐστιν 'Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος, οὕτως περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀφετέρους, 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. 122 ἀναλογίασαθε τῶν τοιαύτην ὑπομενεμοντά ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἐαυτοῦ ἀντιλογίαν. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Numb. 2013 al. and (in relation to Korah) in Protev. Jac. 9 μνήσθητι ὅσα ἐπέστη ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς Δαβὰν, Κωρὲ, καὶ Ἀβεράμ, πῶς ἐδιαφόρη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπεσεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν αὐτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these examples. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ἐπορεύθησαν ὅδε, that of Balaam the gentile prophet by ἐξεχύθησαν πλάγια, that of the Levite Korah by ἀπολόγω ἀντιλογίαν.

12. ὃταν, ἀιών [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνυσχούμενοι.] Dr. Chase quotes Zech. 1101, Apoc. 714, Enoch 469, Secrets of Enoch, 73, 183, 193, etc. for the phrase ὃτας, ἀιών, 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 αἰώνας for ἀγάπας and σπίλου for σπιλάδες. There has been much discussion as to the meaning of the latter word. It is agreed that it is generally used of a rock in or by the sea, and many of the lexicographers understand it of a hidden rock, ψαλος πέτρα, see Thomas Mag. σπιλα, Ἀττικῶς ὕψαλος πέτρα, Ἐλληνες, Ἐτυμολ. Μ. σπιλάδες...αἰ ὑπὸ θάλασσαν κεκρυμμέναι πέτραι, ὅθεν καὶ ψαλος ἀνθρώποι λέγεται ὁ κεκρυμμένοι καὶ πανούργοι, ὢδ. κατασπιλάζοντες, κατακρύπτοντες, ἀπὸ μεταφοράς τῶν ψαλος πετρῶν, αἰώνας ὑπὸ ἔδαπτος καλυπτόμεναι τοῖς ἀπορυθμεῖ προσπιλάζοντες κύδων ἐπιφέροντε (both cited by Wetst.).

The same explanation is given by the scholiast on Hom. Od. 5. 401-405 καὶ ὅ δε οὖν ἄκουες ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσι θαλάσσης...ἀλλ' ἀκτα προβλήτες ἑσταὶ σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε. See Plut. Mor. 101 ἴ εἰδία σπιλάδος which Wytt. translates ‟transquitas maris caecam rupem tegentis,' ib. 476 ὁ. Oecumenius on this passage αἱ σπιλάδες τῶν πλέουσιν ὀλέθροι ἀποσοδοκήτως ἐπιγενόμεναι (ὁ-νοις, and ἐξαιρές, ὅστε σπιλάδες, ἐπόγοντες αὐτοὺς τῶν ὀλέθρον τῶν ψυχῶν. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31 θαλάσση προσεκικασάν αἱ τῶν ἀνθρας αἰφνιδίω σπιλάδι κατασωκεῖτας. The compound κατασπιλάζω joined with the parallel case of ὕψαλος 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. 110, and the description of drunkenness.

1 Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. Od. 3. 298 ἀγὰρ νήψῃ γα τοι σπιλάδασσι βάζαν κύματα, where, he says, the σπιλάδες are identical with μισχα ἀπείτε τε εἰς ἀλα πέτρα of 293; and Anthol. xi. 390 φασὶ δὲ καὶ ἔρησιν ἀλπακανέσσι χερέφους τὰς ὑψαλους πέτρας τῶν φαινὼν 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 ὅρας δὲ ταύρῃ παράκειται κατὰ μὲν τὴν κορυφήν πέτρας ἀποτομᾶσα ἤχον καὶ τοῖς ὑψοὶ καταπηλτηκίας, ὥστε δὲ τὰς μίς σπιλάδαις δέσιας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐνθαλάττους.
(perhaps suggested by the text) in Clem. Al. Paed. 183 fn. ἄρατε τοῦ ναυαγίου τον κύδωνον...δοῦν ἐπεριφέρεται τῷ κλώδων...ἐνθαλαττεύον ἐπιγυμνά τῷ ἄχοφῳ τῆς καταγίδος, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀστοχίας λιμένος, ἕως ἀντιπεριτετεον ὡφάλους πέτασε αὐτός αὐτὸν ἐξοξείλας εἰς ἱδροπες διαφθείρει. Scopulus is used in a similar metaphoric sense, see Cic. in Pis. 41 where Piso and Gabinius are called 'geminae voragines scopulique reipublicae.' On the other hand σπιλάς is sometimes used loosely of a rock of any kind, as we find it joined with ὑψηλός in Soph. Laoc. fr.; sometimes of gravel, as in Trach. 678 (= χθονι 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 ἐν σπιλάδεσσον, see also Suidas and Apollon. lexx. Others take σπιλάδες 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 σπιλάς, μεμαμμένον. 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 ὑπερ
υνάυπνοι;? 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 οὖν οἷον αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνίοτεν τοῦ κυρίου ἑστώτες and B's reading παραφερόμενοι below? Or may we take σπιλάδες as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to συνευοχύμενοι? 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.

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

ἀφόβως ἑαυτοῦ ποιμαίνοντες.] If we take σπιλάδες as complementary to συνευοχύμενοι, it is better to take ἀφόβως with ποιμ.: if we omit the article and take σπιλάδες to be the predicate, συνευοχύμενοι 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. 1928 φόβος Κυρίου εἰς ἑωθίν ἄνδρι, ὃ δὲ ἀφόβος κ.τ.λ. ἰδ. 1528 κρίσιον μικρὰ μερίς μετὰ φόβου Κυρίου ἡ ἑρυθραίοι μεγαλύτερα μετὰ ἀφοβίας, Sir. 55 περὶ ἐξελαφόμενον μὴ ἀφόβος γίνον, προσευχάναι ἀμαρτίαν ἐφ’ ἀμαρτίας. The phrase ἑαυτοῦ ποιμ. recalls Ezek. 345 ἐβόσκησαν οἱ ποιμένες ἑαυτοῦ, τὰ δὲ πρόβατά μου οὐκ ἐβόσκησαν,
but there does not seem to be any reference to spiritual pastors in Jude; and ποιμαίνω has probably here the sense 'to fatten, indulge,' as in Prov. 28:7 δε ποιμάνει ἀσωτίαν, ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, ib. 29:3 δε ποιμάνει πόρνας, ἀπολεῖ πλούτον, Plut. Mor. 792 b "Ἀταλον ὑπὶ ἀργίας μακρὰς ἐκλυθέντα κομιδὴ Φιλοσόφυρν ἐποίμανεν ἀτεχνός πιανόμενον. We may compare 1 Cor. 11:27 foll., James 5:5, 1 Tim. 5:6.

The character of the innovators is illustrated by figures drawn from the four elements, air, earth, sea, heaven (αἰθήρ). Spitta points out the resemblance to a passage in Enoch (chapters 2-5), which follows immediately on the words quoted below vv. 14, 15. The regular order of nature is there contrasted with the disorder and lawlessness of sinners. 'I observed everything that took place in the heaven, how the luminaries...do not deviate from their orbits, how they all rise and set in order, each in its season, and transgress not against their appointed order....I observed and saw how in winter all the trees seem as though they were withered and shed all their leaves...And again I observed the days of summer...how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit...And behold how the seas and the rivers accomplish their task. But as for you, ye have not continued steadfast; and the law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled...and have slanderously spoken proud and hard words (below ver. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἄν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτόν) with your impure mouths against his greatness.' For the metaphor cf. Eph. 4:14. Clement's paraphrase in the Ἀδύμβρ. 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, πυρὶ αὐτῷ, ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλανόμεναι. Perhaps the writer may have thought that there was an undue multiplication of causes; if the clouds were waterless, it was needless to add that they were driven past by the wind. It seems however to have been customary with St. Jude to 'mak siker' by the accumulation of causes, as we have below διὰ ἀποθανόντα, ἀκροβαθήνα. We find the same comparison in Prov. 25:14 'As clouds and wind without rain, so is he that boasteth himself of his gifts falsely.' [The LXX. is less like our text, suggesting that Jude was acquainted with the original Hebrew. C.] For the use of ὑπὸ with ἀνέμον see my n. on James 3:4.

Σύντροφος φεύγωτον ἀκαρπα. Clement's paraphrase is 'Arbores autumnales infructuosae [et] infideles videlicet, qui nullum fructum fidelitatis apportant.' See below App. on φεύγωτον.

διὰ ἀποθανόντα ἀκροβαθήνα.] Clement's paraphrase is 'Bis mortuae, semel scilicet quando delinquendo peccarunt; secundo vero quando suppliciis contradentur secundum praedestinata Dei judicia: mors quippe reputanda est etiam quando quisque hereditatem non continuo promeretur' (Clement's favourite doctrine of the divine training and discipline continued after death, as in Str. vii. 835, 879). I prefer Schneckenburger's explanation, 'He who is not born again is dead in his sins (Col. 2:13), he who has apostatized is twice dead,' cf. Apoc. 21:8, Heb. 6:4, 2 P. 2:20, and the n. on τὸ δεύτερον 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. 3:10, 7:31, 15:13 πᾶσα φυτεύα ἡν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατὴρ μου... ἐκρίζωθεται, Joh. 15:6.

13. κύματα ἄγρα θαλάσσης ἐπαφριζόντα τὰς ἰαντὰς αἰσχύνας.] Cf. Cic. Ad Herenn. iv. 55 spumans ex ore seculus. 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 feroois maris: his verbis vitam gentilem significat, quorum ambitionis abominabilis est finis.' The comparison reminds us of Isa. 57:20 'the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.' See my n. on James 16. The phrase ἄγρα κύματα is found in Wisdom 14. 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 overflows of ungodliness (Ps. 174), the ἱππαρία καὶ περιοστεία κακίας condemned by James 1:21, where see my note. The libertines foam out their own shames by their swelling words (ver. 16), while they turn the grace of God into a cloak for their licentiousness (ver. 4). We may compare Phil. 3:10 ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἀιδικνῇ αἰτῶν.

αὐτρές πλανητῶν.] Clement's paraphrase is 'Errantes et apostatas significat: ex hujusmodi stellis sunt qui angelorum eccidere de sedibus.' This is borrowed from Enoch (chapters 43, 44) where it is said that some of the stars become lightnings and cannot part with their new form, ib. 80, 'In the days of the sinners, many chiefs of the stars will err, and will alter their orbits and tasks, ib. 86, where the fall of the angels is described as the falling of stars, ib. 88 'he seized the first star which had fallen from heaven and bound it in an abyss; now that abyss was narrow and deep and horrible and dark... and they took all the great stars and bound them hand and foot, and laid them in an abyss,' ib. 90 'and judgment was held first upon the stars, and they were judged and found guilty and cast into an abyss of fire'; more especially 181:4. (where the Greek has been preserved, see Charles, p. 354) δεσμωτήριον τοῦτο ἐγένετο τοῖς ἀστροῖς καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες οἱ κυλόμενοι ἐν τῷ πυρὶ οὕτω εἴσαν, οἱ παραβὰντες πρόσταγμα Κύριον ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἀνατολῆς αὐτῶν, οἱ οὐκ ἔξηλθον ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀργώθη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῶν μέχρι καιρὸν τελευτάω τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῶν ἐναισχύναν μυρίων, ib. 21:4. ἑώρακα... τόσον ἀκατασκεύαστον καὶ φοβερὸν... καὶ ἑκεῖ τεθάμας ἐπὶ τὰ ἄστέρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δεδεμένους... οὕτω εἶσαν τῶν ἄστερων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἱ παραβάντες τήν ἐπιταγήν τοῦ Κύριου, καὶ ἐδέθησαν δῶς μέχρι τοῦ πληρωσάς μυρία ἑτο. It would seem from these passages, which Jude certainly had before him, that πλανηται cannot here have its usual application, the propriety of which was repudiated by all the ancient astronomers from Plato.
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Charles' translation from the Aethiopic is: "And lo! He comes with ten thousands of his holy ones to execute judgment upon them, and He will destroy the ungodly and will convict all flesh of all that the sinners and ungodly have wrought and ungodly committed against Him." For μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων cf. Heb. 12:22, Ps. 68:17, Deut. 33:2. For the use of ἐν denoting accompanying circumstances see Blass Gr. N.T. tr. p. 118, and Lk. 14:31. For the word ἐν here is the preterite of prophetic vision, as when Micaiah says, "I saw all Israel scattered," cf. Apoc. 10:7, 14:8. Ewald notices that this quotation as to the Coming of the Lord and the subsequent reference in ver. 24 imply the existence of the same doubt as is expressed in 2 P. 3:4.

15. ποιησαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.] Follows exactly the Greek translation of Enoch given above, cf. Ael. V.H. ii. 6 Κρίτων ἐπεθεὶ αὐτῶν ἀποδρανα εἰς τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν κρίσιν διαφθείρα. On the distinction between the active ποιεῖν κρίσιν 'to execute judgment' (as in Joh. 5:27) and the periphrastic middle = κρίνειν (as in Isocr. 48 D) see my nn. on αἰτεῖν and αἰτιώθαι, ἐδεικνύειν (James 4:3, ib. 38).

16. οὖν ἑλθαὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁσβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἁσβείας αὐτῶν ἥρθησαν.] Shortened from the Greek Enoch quoted above.

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

16. οὖν ἑλθαὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἥν ἑλάλησαν.] This is taken from Enoch 27a.}

Charles p. 366 (To Gehenna shall come) πάντες οἴτινες ἐρουσιν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν κατὰ Κυρίων φωνὴν ἀπρεπῇ καὶ περὶ τῆς δοξῆς αὐτοῦ σκληρὰ λαλήσασιν, 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 ἑλάλησεν αὐτῶς σκληρά, 1 Kings 12:23 ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν σκληρά, Mal. 3:13-15.

16. οὖν ἑλθαὶ πάντων σκληρῶν ἥν ἑλάλησαν.] This is found in Epict. and M. A. Aur. but not in classical authors. άσβεις is used in 1 P. 4:9. See further in Phrynicus p. 358 Lob. The verb γγυσαῖν is found in Joh. 7:32 of the whispering of the multitude in favour of Jesus, but is generally used of smouldering discontent which people are afraid to speak out, as in 1 Cor. 10:10 of the murmurings of the Israelites in the wilderness; Mt. 20:11 (where see Wetst.) of the grumbling of the labourers who saw others receiving a day's pay for an hour's labour; Joh. 6:43-48 of the Jews who took offence at the preaching of the Bread of Life. It is found in Epicpt. and M. A. Aur. but not in classical authors. For the word μεμψίμοροι see Lucian Cynic. 17 ὡμίς δὲ διὰ τὴν εἰδαμομοίαν οὐδεὶς τῶν γεγονομένων ἀρέσκεσθαι, καὶ παντὶ μέμψεσθαι, καὶ τὰ μὲν παρόντα φέρειν οὐκ ἔδελθε, τῶν δὲ ἀπόντων ἐφίσεθα, χειμώνος μὲν θέρος εὑρόμενοι, θέρους δὲ χειμώνα . . . καθάπερ οἱ νοσοῦντες, δυσάρεστοι καὶ μεμψίμοροι ὄντες, and Theophr. Char. 17. It is used of the murmuring of the Israelites by Philo Vit. Mos. 1. 109 M. See other exx. in Wetst. The same spirit is condemned in James 1:13.
kata tais epivnalas atovn poroymenon. Cf. 2 P. 33 and 210, below ver. 18, and see my notes on James 412. 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. 2120.'

to stoma auton lalev uperyogka. See Enoch 54 quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch 1013 'ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness,' Ps. 124, Ps. 73, Dan. 78 stoma lalovn megala and ver. 20 of the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James 35 foll. In classical writers uperyogka 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) tivn emvrontsian ek tov biwn kai tov tinov ejheinein kai tas epaxtheis kai uperogkous katolischeis kai megalaichias, id. 7a, where ej theatriki kai paratragodos lexis is styled uperyogkos in contrast with ischnh lexis, Plut. Vitae 506b tivn basileous to frountma tragikon kai uperyogkon ev taiv megalaicis eutychiais egegoni. It is found in 2 P. 218 and in Dan. 1126 o basilevs upovhsetai kai megalyvnhsetai evi pantai theon, kai lalhsei uperyogka.

thauamazontes prosowta afelias charin. The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. 1915 oiv me thuvadnys prosowton, Job 1310, see my n. on James 21 me evn prosowalompwsias exeit tivn pisteiv ton kuriwv hymon I. 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 (to stoma auton lalovn—thauamazontes) compare Col. 22 iva paraklithous aiv kardiai hymon synhysashtes ev efrh where a similar periphrasis (aiv kardiai hymon = hymes) 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 to stoma auton elalhsev uperphvian, or Ps. 1445.11 where a similar phrase occurs.

17. hymes de, agapistos, mnhsete tivn nymatovn tivn proeurhmewn vpi tivn apostolovn. 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. 38, 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 de ilegov hymon, which follow, imply that the warning was spoken, not written, and that it was often repeated. See Introduction on the Early Heresies.

18. evi ischatovn chrwov ergontai empaiktai. The parallel in 2 P. 38 is elivostatai evi ischaton tivn ymivn ev epitaigymen ejmpaikta, where see n. on the use of the article with ischatos, etc. Hort in his note on 1 P. 15 translates evn kairo ischatov '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 evi ischatais ymivais evsthsontai kairov
which would thus become merely tautological. There can be no doubt that in 2 P. 220 τὰ ἐσχάτα compared with τῶν πρῶτων means 'latest in time,' and so in Apoc. 117, 25, 19, 2213, Mt. 1245, 1930, 208, etc. So Joh. 639 τὸν ἄνωτέρον αὐτῷ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 737 ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἐρωτίας, 1124 ἀναστέσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστασίι ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 1 Cor. 1558, 20, 45, 52, Heb. 11 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἁμέρων ἑλάσθησαν ἡμᾶς ἐν νῷ. So I should take Acts 217, 1 P. 120, 1 Joh. 218 where see Westcott, and Isa. 22. For ἐπὶ cf. Arist. Pol. iv. 3 ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων.

The prophecy of this mocking, as a mark of the future trials of the Church, has not come down to us. An example of it in the very beginning of the Church is given in Acts 213 έτερον χλανάζοντες ἔλεγον ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμόνοι εἰσὶ. 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 μικτερίζοντες τοὺς ἀγώνους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουθενύστης τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαίζοντες ἐν τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ, Jer. 208 ἐγενεθῆ λόγος Κυρίου εἰς ἐνεισαγόμενοι ἕμοι καὶ εἰς χλανασμὸν πάσαν ἡμέραν. Cf. also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Mt. 1025 εἰ τῶν αἰκοδεσπότην Βεζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν πόσῳ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ. In 2 P. the purport of this mockery is explained to be the unfulfilled promise of the Parusia. Here we must gather its meaning from the account already given of the libertines. If they turned the grace of God into licentiousness, they would naturally mock at the narrowness and want of enlightenment of those who took a strict and literal view of the divine commandments: if they made light of authority and treated spiritual things with irreverence, if they foamed out their own shame and uttered proud and impious words, if they denied God and Christ, they would naturally laugh at the idea of a judgment to come. On the form ἐμπαίκτης and its cognates see n. on 2 P.

tόν ἀσβεσιάν.] (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 μὴ ἐν προσωπολημφαίᾳ ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῇ δόξῃ, where some connect τῆς δόξης with κυρίου in a qualitative sense. I am rather disposed to take τῶν ἀσβεσιῶν here as a subjective gen. 'lusts belonging to or arising from their impieties,' cf. Rom. 128 καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.

19. οὕτω εἰσὶν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες.] 'These are they that make invidious distinctions.' See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀποδιορίζοντες is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle Pol. iv. 43, ἄστερ οὖν εἰ ἔφυ Πρωηνομεθα λαβεῖν εἰδή πρωτόν ἐν ἀποδιορίζομεν ἐπερ ἀναγκαῖον πάν ἔχειν ζον (‘as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common’) and, I believe, in every other passage in which it is known to occur: see Maximus Confessor, ii. p. 103 D τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν ὄρισεν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ γνωμικόν ἀποδιορίζοντες translated 'naturali in eo (Christo) constituta voluntate, arbitrarium dispunxit,' ib. p. 131 C ὡς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτοῦ μόνον τὸ ἐμπαθεῖς, ἀλλ’ ὡς ὁ φυσικὸν ἀποδιορίσασθαι θέλημα 'quod
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dixerat hoc solum spectare ut libido nosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a Salvatore eliminaret,' Severus de Clyst. 32. 25 οταν ταῦτα τὰ συμπτώματα ὑψη παρόντα, ἀποδιορίζει τὴν ὄργανικήν νόσον ἐκ τῆς ὁμοομφεροῦ. 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 ἀποδιορισμὸς to Hermias in Plat. Phaedr. p. 166 is valueless, as the true reading there is ἀπομερισμὸς (so stated in Couvreur's ed. 1901). The simple διοριζω is found in Lev. 20:24 διώρισεν ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθῶν 'I separated you from the nations,' Job 35:11: so ἀδιοριζω Mt. 25:32 ἀδιορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων, Acts 19: (Paul left the synagogue) καὶ ἀδιορίζετε τοὺς μαθητὰς, 2 Cor. 6:17 ἔξελθατε ἐκ μάζου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀδιορίσθητε, Lk. 6:22 (of excommunication) ὅταν ἀδιορίζωσαν ὑμᾶς, Gal. 2:11 (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀδιορίζεν ἑαυτόν.

[ψυχικό.] Used of worldly wisdom in James 3:15, where see note, distinguished from πνευματικὸς in 1 Cor. 2:13, 15, 1544; cf. the teaching of the Naassenes (ap. Hippol. p. 164) εἰς τὸν ὅφελος θεοῦ οὐκ ἐνελεύσεται ἀκαθάρτος οὐδεὶς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τρέφεται πνευματικὸς.

πνεῦμα μη ἐκοντες.] 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 μη is much more widely extended in late than in classical Greek, cf. such phrases as εἰπὲ μη, οὐ μη. It is simplest to understand πνεῦμα here of the Holy Spirit, cf. Rom. 8:9 ὡς οὐκ ἔστε ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλʼ ἐν πνεύματι, εἰπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν υἱῶν, 1 Cor. 2:13, 7:40, 1 Joh. 3:4, 13, and the contrast in ver. 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιῳ προσευχομένοι. Others, e.g. Plumptre, prefer the explanation that 'the false teachers were so absorbed in their lower sensuous nature that they no longer possessed, in any real sense of the word, that element in man's compound being, which is itself spiritual, and capable therefore of communion with the Divine Spirit.' The connexion of the last clause with what precedes is illustrated by such passages as Eph. 4:3, 4, στονδάθωντες τρεν ἐν τῇ εὐπτη τοῦ πνεύματος... ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα, and 1 Cor. 3:5 ὅπως γὰρ ἐν υἱῶν ζηλοῦ... καὶ διαχοστάσθαι, οὐχὶ σαρκικοὶ ἔστε;

20. ὡς εἰς ἡν, ἄγαντος.] Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17.

ἐποικοδομοῦσες ἑαυτοῦ τῇ ἀγαυμάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.] These words, descriptive of earnest effort to build up the one spiritual temple, are contrasted with the ἐμπαίκται of ver. 18, and οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες in ver. 19. For the construction of verbs compounded with ἐπι see Winer pp. 535, 536. For the spiritual temple, cf. 1 Pet. 2:3-5, Col. 1:28, Eph. 2:20-22 ἐποικοδομήθητες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμέλιῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὅτις ἀκρογυναίον αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. 3:17, a passage which the writer may have had in his mind here and in ver. 23. Dr. Bigg compares Polyc. Phil. 3 'If ye study the epistles of the blessed apostle Paul, δυναθήσεθε οἰκοδομέσθαι εἰς τῇ δοθείσῳ υἱῶν πίστει. Usually Christ is spoken of as the foundation or corner-stone of the Church, and we should probably assign an objective sense to τῇ πίστει here, as in ver. 3 above (ἐπαγωγεύεθαι τῇ πίστε). Otherwise it might be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation
with the spiritual realities (Heb. 11 πίστις ἐλπιδομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἐλεγχοὶ οὐ βλεπομένων), that which is the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see n. on 2 P. 1.5, and which leads to eternal life (1 P. 1, and 9 κοιμώμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν). The faith is here called 'most holy,' because it comes to us from God, and reveals God to us, and because it is by its means that man is made righteous, and enabled to overcome the world (1 Joh. 54.5). Cf. 1 Pet. 59 ὁ ἀντίστητε στήριξε τῇ πίστει.

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

19. ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.] These words, contrasted with πνεύμα μή έχοντες in ver. 19, show how they are to build themselves up upon their faith. I understand them as equivalent to James 5.16 δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργομένη, where see n. Compare also Eph. 6.18 διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς προσευχόμενοι εν παντὶ καιρῷ εν πνεύματι, Rom. 8.26.27.

21. έαυτοῦ εν ἁγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.] In ver. 1 the passive is used: those who are addressed are described as kept and beloved (cf. ver. 24 τῷ δυναμένῳ φιλάξαι): here the active is used and emphasized by the unusual order of words; each is to keep himself in the love of God, cf. James 1.27 άσπιλον έαυτόν τηρεῖν, Phil. 2.13 τὴν έαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. Θεὸς γὰρ ἐστιν δ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν. Again in ver. 2 the writer invokes the divine love and mercy on those to whom he writes: here they are bidden to take steps to secure these. Compare Rom. 55 ἢ ἁγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκένωσα ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν διὰ πνευμάτος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ὑμῖν, ἦδ. 8.28.30 πέπειμαι ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή... οὔτε τὰς κτῖσις έτέρα δυνήσεται ὑμᾶς χωρίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, Joh. 15.9 καθὼς ἡγαπητέναι με διὰ πατήρ κάγω ὑμᾶς ἡγάπησα, μεῖναι ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ τῇ ἡμῖν. ἐὰν τὸς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσῃ, μενεῖ ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ μου. The aor. imperative is expressive of urgency, see n. on έγγίσασθε James 1.23. προσευχόμενοι τῷ θελε.] Cf. Tit. 2.13 προσευχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖν τὰς δόξας τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτηρίας ὑμῶν.'I. X., and 2 P. 3.12.13.14. The same phrase is used of the Jews who were looking for the promised Messiah at the time of his first coming, Mk. 15.43, Lk. 22.58.

εἰς ζωὴν αλλόνων.] Some connect this closely with the imperative τηρήσατε, but it seems to me to follow more naturally on the nearer phrase πρὸ τοῦ έλεος: cf. 1 P. 1.37 εἰληκτικὸς ὁ Θεὸς... ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ έλεος ἀναγεννήσας ὑμᾶς εἰς κληρονομιὰν ἀδίκητην... τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοῖς... φρονουμένους... εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθήσεται εν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.

22. ὁς μὲν έλέγχετε διακρινομένους.] On the reading see the Introduction. For the form ὁς μὲν instead of ὁ μὲν, cf. Mt. 13.22, Lk. 22.38, Acts 27.44, Rom. 14.5, 1 Cor. 7.11, 12, 2 Cor. 2.16, 2 Tim. 2.20, not used in Heb., 1 and 2 P., James or John. The doubled ὁς δέ is found in Mt. 24.8 ὁ μὲν ἔδεικνυν, ὁ δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὁ δὲ ἠλθόντες, ἦδ. 25.15 ὁ μὲν ἐδοκεῖ πνεύτε τάλαντα, ὁ δὲ δύο, ὁ δὲ ἐν. 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 ἐλέγχει (here wrongly translated 'strafen,' in the sense of excommunication, by Rampf), see Const. Apost. vii. 5. 3 ἐλεγμὸ
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 'έλεγχος 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 έλεγχος, there arises a feeling of sin, which is always painful: thus every έλεγχος 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. viii. 4 οὗ μισήσεις πάντα ἀνθρώπων ἄλλος μὲν έλεγχέως, οὗ δὲ έλεγχεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσείξῃς, οὐς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ἀπέρ τὴν ψυχήν σου, which is also found in the Didache ii. 7 with the omission of οὗς δὲ έλεγχεις. Cf. Joh. 16:8 ἐκεῖνος έλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως, 1 Cor. 14:24 έλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων (the effect of the prophets' teaching on an unbeliever), Tit. 1:13 έλέγχει αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως ἵνα οὐκ έγινον ἐν τῇ πίστει, ib. 19 τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας έλέγχειν, 2 Tim. 4:2 (the charge to Timothy) έλέγξον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ, Ἀρω. 3:19 δόγμα τῶν φιλῶν έλέγξον καὶ παύειν, Eph. 5:13 τὰ δὲ πάντα έλέγχωμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανερώταται. There is a tone of greater severity in the ποιήσαι κρίσιν καὶ έλέγξαι 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.

διακρίνομενοι.] We should have expected a nominative here to correspond with ἄρπάζοντες and μισοῦντες in the following clauses, and so the text, rec. has διακρίνομενοι, wrongly translated in A.V., as if it were the active διακρίνομεν, '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 έλέγῃτε (as we find in Plato Theae. 171 ν ἐμε έλέγξας λαμροῦντα, Xen. Mem. 1. 7. 2 έλεγχθησται γελοῦν ὡς, Jelf § 681), or simply as descriptive of the condition of the persons referred to. There is also a question as to the meaning we should assign to SiaKp, Is it to be understood in the same sense as in James 1:6 24? In that case we might translate 'convict them of their want of faith,' taking the participle as complementary to the verb; or 'reprove them because of their doubts.' It seems more probable however that the meaning here is 'convince them when they dispute with you,' which we may compare with 1 P. 3:15 ἔσομοι αἱ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀπολογούντας παντὶ τῶν αἰτοῦντι ψυχὶς λόγον . . . ἄλλα μετὰ πραῦτητος καὶ φόβου (cf. εἰν φόβῳ below). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of διακρίνομενοι being the same as that in ver. 9 τῷ διαβάσει διακρ., and in Socr. E.H. v. 5 ὁ λαὸς εἶχεν ὄμνιον καὶ οὐκέτι πρὸς ἄλλους διεκρίνοντο.

23. σῶτες.] Here again a word which is strictly applicable to God is transferred to him whom God uses as his instrument, cf. 1 Pet. 4:11 and notes on τορήσατε, έλέγχετε above, especially James 5:20 ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ σώτει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.
The expression is borrowed from Amos 4:11, which says, "κατέστρεψαν ἡμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ Θεὸς Σαλμόν καὶ Γόμορρα, καὶ έγένετο ὡς δαλός ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, καὶ οὐδ’ ὃς ἐπεστράφητε πρὸ μέ, λέγει Κύριος, and Zechariah. 3:2 οὐκ ἤδυν ὤντος δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός; Both passages have further connexions with our epistle, the former from the reference to Sodom (see above ver. 7), the latter as following immediately on the words ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος quoted in v. 9, and preceding a reference to filthy garments (see note below). In it the High Priest Joshua is a representative of Israel, saved like a brand from the captivity, which was the punishment of national sin. The image of fire is naturally suggested by the allusion to the punishment of Sodom in the passage of Amos, and of Korah (see above ver. 7) described in Numbers 16:25, Ps. 106:18 ἐξεκαίθη πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλόξ κατέφλεξεν ἄμαρτολοῦ. The writer may also have had in mind St. Paul's description of the building erected on the One Foundation (see above ver. 20), which, he says, will be tried by fire, 1 Cor. 3:15 εἰς τὸ ἐργὸν ὑποίδον ἐστὶν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει . . . εἰ τίνος τὸ ἐργὸν κατακαί­

σεται, ἔριμονθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. Such an one might be spoken of 'as a brand snatched from the fire,' not however as here, saved from the fire of temptation, but as saved through the agency of God's purgatorial fire, whether in this, or in a future life. ἔλατε ἐν φόβῳ.] Luther (quoted by Huther) understands this in the sense 'lasst sie gehen . . . habt nichts mit ihnen zu schaffen,' implying that the case is hopeless, and that there is nothing for bystanders to do but to watch their fate with awe and pity. Huther argues that this is against the use of ἔλεος in the N.T. which expresses no mere passive impression, but active benevolence, cf. James 2:13. The faithful are urged to show all possible tenderness for the fallen, but at the same time to have a fear lest they themselves or others whom thy influence should be led to think too lightly of the sin whose ravages they are endeavouring to repair. Cf. 2 Cor. 7:1 καθάρισμεν ἦν ἄντων ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιτελεύτες ἐγκυωσίνῃ ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ, Phil. 2:12, 1 P. 117, 315. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in -ἐω and -ἀω in late Greek see Janmatis § 850, § 854 foll., Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read ἔλεα in Prov. 21:26, and ἔλεως in Rom. 9:16, but ἔλει in Rom. 9:18.

μισοῦντες καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιλαμβάνον 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 Isaiah 30:22, Lev. 15:17, perhaps too from Zechariah. 3:4 Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἦν ἐνδεχόμενοι ἴματα ῥυπαρά. Cf. Apc. 3:4 οὐκ ἐμολύνω τὰ ἴματα αὐτῶν, and Apcoral. Pauli quoted by Spitta ὁ χιτῶν μου οὐκ ἐρυποῦ. The derivatives of σπλάχνος are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of σπλάχνος in Biblical Greek are James 3:3 ἡ γλῶσσα . . . ἡ σπλάχνα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα and Wisd. 15:4 εἰδος σπλαχνῶν κρύματι διαλλαγμένος. Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. 2:25, 26 ἐν πραύτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατηρεῖμον μήποτε δύναται αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβάλου παγίδος.
24. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαί υμᾶς ἀπαίταιστον. [Apparently a reminiscence1 of Rom. 1625. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ υμᾶς στηρίζει ... μονῷ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ 'Ησίων Χριστοῦ, φη γῆ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. 320 commences τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ. The reading υμᾶς is confirmed by the evidence of Ν and B, which were unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading αὐτῶν, found in KP and some inferior MSS.

ἀπαίταιστον. Occurs in 3 Macc. 639 μεγαλοδόξως ἐπιφάναις τῷ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ὧ τῶν ὁλων δυνάστης ἀπαίταιστον αὐτῶν ἐφόρυσε: 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, οὕτος τέλειος ἀἵμα, 2 P. 110 ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσῃ τοῦτο.

στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλίασε.] Cf. Mt. 2531-33 οὗν δὲ ἰδοὺ ὁ νόος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ ... στήσε τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Acts 66 ὡς ἐστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων, Col. 122 παραστήσας ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους 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 φυλάξα, is spoken of. Lightfoot remarks that ἀμώμους is 'without blemish' rather than 'without blame,' being a sacrificial word like τέλειος and ὀλοκλήρος. Hort gives a fuller account of the word in his interesting note on 1 P. 119 τιμῶ αἴματι ὡς ἀμον αμώμου καὶ ἀσπίδων Χριστοῦ, where he traces the way in which the words μῶμος 'blame,' and ἀμῶμος 'blemless,' come to be used (in 'the Apocrypha the N.T. and other books which presuppose the LXX.') in the entirely unclassical sense of 'blemish' and 'unblemished,' cf. Eph. 14, 527, Heb. 914. In 2 P. 314 ἄμομος 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, ἀμομος κατενώπιον αὑτῶν ἐν ἀγάτη: κατένωσα is found in Hom. Il. xv. 320. For ἀγαλλίασις see Hort's n. on 1 P. 16 ὡς ἀγαλλιάσθη ἐν ἰν ἐν ἰν ἐν ἰ
25. μόνος θεός σωτήρ, ἡμῶν. See above on ver. 4 τον μόνον δεσπότην.

God is called σωτήρ in Is. 45:15 σὺ γὰρ εἶ θεός...ο θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ σωτήρ, ib. ver. 21, Sir. 51 αἰνεῖσθε σε θεον τον σωτήρα μου, Philo Conf. L.Liv. § 20, i. p. 418 fin. τις δ’ οὐκ ἄν...πρὸς τὸν μόνον σωτήρα θεόν ἐκβοήσῃ (лат.; cf. Lk. 1:17 ἡγαλλίσσεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρίῳ μου, elsewhere in N. T. only in Tit. 1, 2, 3, 10, στε ἡ χριστοτήτης...ἐσπεφόν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ...κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν ἔλεος ἐσωθεν ἡμᾶς διὰ...πνεύματος ἀγίου οὗ ἐξέσχεν ἐδ’ ἡμᾶς πλούσιος διὰ Ι. Χ. τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. 1:1 Παύλος ἀπόστολος Ι. Χ. κατ’ ἐπιτάγῃ τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χ. ’. ib. 2, 4, 10. The later writers of the N. T. seem to have felt it needful to insist upon the unity of God, and the saving will of the Father, in opposition to antinomian attacks on the Law.

διὰ Χριστοῦ. It seems best to take διὰ with δόξα and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, cf. 1 Pet. 4:11 ἵνα ἐν πάσιν δοξάζηται ο θεός διὰ ’. Χ. γείτον ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

δόξα.] The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, cf. 2 P. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, Rom. 11:36, 16:17, Gal. 1:5, Lk. 21:16 δόξα ἐν ὑστόσοις θεῷ. In 1 P. 4:11 it is inserted, δ’ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, and, as we find no case in which θεός is inserted, and the indicative is more subject to ellipse than the imperative, it might seem that we should supply ‘is’ here; but the R. V. gives ‘be,’ and there are similar phrases expressive of a wish or prayer, as the very common χάρις ἡμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρός, where we must supply ἐστω or γένοιτο. De Wette maintained that the following words πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, referring to already existing fact, were incompatible with a prayer; but it is sufficient that the prayer has regard mainly to the present and future: the past only comes in to give it a fuller, more joyful tone, reminding us of the eternity of God, as in the psalmist’s words, ‘I said it is my own infirmity, but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High,’ and the close of our own doxology ‘as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.’ I do not see however that we need exclude either interpretation. The writer may exult in that which he believes to be already fact in the eternal world, and yet pray for its more perfect realization in time, as in the Lord’s Prayer γενήθητο τὸ βέλημα σου ὅσ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς. The omission of the verb allows of either or both views in varying proportion. δόξα by itself is the commonest of all ascriptions. It is joined with τιμή in 1 Tim. 1:17 and elsewhere, as here with μεγαλωτών. It is joined with κράτος in 1 Pet. 4:11, 5:11, Ἀποκ. 15. Fuller ascriptions are found in Ἀποκ. 4:11 ἄξιος εἰ, ὁ κύριος...καθαρών τὸν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, 5:12 τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ...ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, 7:12 ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχύς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Just before (ver. 10) we have the remarkable ascription ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Compare with this the ascription of David (1 Chron. 29:11) σοι Κύριε ἡ μεγαλωτών καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ τὸ καύχημα καὶ ἡ νίκη καὶ ἡ ἰσχύς, ὅτι σὺ πάντων τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς δεσπότης. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man
see Rom. 2:10 δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν.\(^1\) An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 65 ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχ' τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δὲ αὐτῷ· δὲ οὖ αὐτῷ δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος καὶ μεγαλοσύνη, θράσος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰώνιος τῶν αἰώνων.

megaloσύνη.] Only found elsewhere in N. T. in Heb. 1:3 ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης ἐν ψυφλοῖς, repeated in 81. Dr. Chase notes that occurs in Enoch 5\(^4\) κατελαλήθητε μεγάλους καὶ σκληροὺς λόγους ἐν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν κατὰ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ, 12\(^3\) τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης, 14\(^{16}\) (a house excelling) ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλοσύνῃ. It is coupled with δόξα, of which it may be regarded as an extension, in the doxology used by Clem. Rom. 20, 61. I am not aware of any other example of εὐσκοια in a doxology: compare however Matt. 28\(^{18}\) ἔδόθη μοι πάσα εὐσκοία ἐν οἴραντι καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος.] Cf. 1 Cor. 27 (τὴν σοφίαν) ἦν προωρισθείν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν, Prov. 822 ἐν τοῖς αἰῶνοι ἑσπερινοῖς με (i.e. σοφίαν), ἐν ἄρχῃ πρὸ τοῦ τῆν γῆν πούταν. An equivalent expression is πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου found in Joh. 1724 ἡγάπησάς με π. κ. κ. also Eph. 1\(^{14}\) ἔξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ π. κ. κ. and 1 Pet. 1\(^{29}\) (Χριστοῦ) προεγνωσμένον μεν π. κ. κ., φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχάτῳ τῶν χρόνων. St. Jude speaks of one past age and of several ages to come. On the other hand St. Paul speaks of many ages in the past (1 Cor. 27), and St. John of only one age in the future.

eis πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.] This precise phrase is unique in the Bible, but εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is common enough, as in Lk. 1\(^{35}\), Rom. 1\(^{25}\), 5\(^{5}\), 11\(^{30}\), 16\(^{27}\), 2 Cor. 11\(^{31}\), etc., so in LXX. Dan. 2\(^{44}\), 4\(^{6}\). The stronger phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs in Gal. 1\(^{5}\), Phil. 4\(^{30}\), 1 Tim. 1\(^{17}\), 2 Tim. 4\(^{18}\), Heb. 13\(^{21}\), 1 P. 4\(^{11}\), 5\(^{11}\), Apoc. 1\(^{6}\), etc. John uses only εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα apparently with the same meaning. Other variations are found in Eph. 3\(^{21}\) αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χ. 'Ἰ. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενέας τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων, 2 P. 3\(^{18}\) αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνος.

\(^1\) For a full account of the early doxologies see Chase on the Lord's Prayer (Texts and Studies, i. 3. p. 68 foll.). He states that the common doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer (σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας 'appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms,' and 'was added to the Prayer in the "Syrian" text of St. Matthew's Gospel.')
APPENDIX TO ST. JUDE

φθινοπωρινός.¹

The force of this word seems to me to have been generally misunderstood by the commentators on Jude, δέινδρα φθινοπωρινά ἀκαρπα δίς ἀποθανόντα ἐκραξωθέντα, 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 '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 ἄφις φθινόκαρπος (Pindar, P. iv. 471) used of a tree which sheds its fruits before they ripen, and φθινοπωρίς ἀνέμων χειμερία καταπνοά (Pindar, P. v. 161), 'the fruit-withering blast of stormy winds,' also by ἔτεια ἄλεσικαρποι (Od. x. 510). There can be no doubt however that φθινοπωρινός is an adjective 2 derived from τὸ φθινόπωρον, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of φθινοῦσα ὀπώρα (cf. φθινόντος μηρός), meaning the concluding portion of the ὀπώρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of ὀπ-, connected with ὀπίσω, ὀπισθαν, and ὀπα = 'the later prime.' We find ὀπα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ὀπα ἄνοι. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of ὀπώρα, of which Ideler says that 'it originally indicated, not a season separate from and following after the summer, but the hottest part of the summer itself, so that Sirius, whose heliacal rising took place (in the age of Homer) about the middle of July, is described as ὀστήρ ὀπωρινός II. 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. Altertumsweiss. 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 -νός (so accented) is almost confined to adjectives of time, as ἅρινός, θερινός, χειμερινός, δειλινός, περισσόν. The two apparent exceptions (πεδινός, ἀληθινός) 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 θέρος or ὀπώρα: compare Arist. *Aves* 709, πρῶτα μὲν ὀφας φαίνομεν ἡμεῖς ἦρος, χειμώνος, ὀπώρας, with *Aesch.* *Prom.* 453, ἢ δὲ οὖν ἀυτοὶ οὖν δέχομαι τέκμαρ οὐτ᾿ ἀνθεμώδους ἦρος οὕτε καρπίμου θέρους βέβαιον. But though ὀπώρα was thus used strictly for the dog-days, when the fruit ripened, it was also vaguely used for the unnamed period which ensued up to the commencement of winter. Thus Hesiod (*Op.* 674) μηδὲ μένειν οὖν τε νέον καὶ ὁπωράν ὁμβρόν καὶ χειμῶν ἐπιότα: and ὀπώρα appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of *Euripides*, quoted by *Plutarch* (*Mor.* 1028 F), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and ὀπώρα 1:

φιλής τ᾿ ὀπώρας διατίχους ἦρος τ᾿ ἱσον

(where the epithet φιλής deserves notice). It is said that the author of the treatise *De Diaeta* (c. 420 n.c.), which goes under the name of Hippocrates, was the first to introduce a definite term (φθινόπωρον or μετήπτωρον 2) for the new season, the word ὀπώρα being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. *II*. v. 5, ὀπώρα ὀρα μετάξει κειμένη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετήπτωρον. And so we find it used by Aristotle (*Meteor.* ii. 5) αἱ χελατεῖ γίνονται ἔφορος μὲν καὶ μετήπτωρον μάλιστα, ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ὀπώρας, χειμῶνος δὲ ὀλγακίς, and by Theophrastus (*peri Σημείων*, 44) εἰὼ τὸ ἔστρο καὶ τὸ θέρος ψυχρὰ γίνεται, ἢ ὀπώρα γίνεται καὶ τὸ μετήπτωρον πνεγραν. 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 μετήπτωρον is found in our present text of Hesiod (*Op.* 415), μετήπτωρον ὁμβρόν τοῖς πρῶτοις έπωράς.
3 Ptolemy, *Appar.* (quoted by Schmidt) gives the limits of the ὀπώρα as follows:
21 July, ὀπώρας άρχή; 15 September, μετήπτωρόν ἀρχή.
4 See Varro, *R.R.* i. 28 (where Keil quotes *Geoponica*, i. 1. 3, μετήπτωρον ἀρχεθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς εἰς ἐνώ τοῦ Ἀναγκαστῶν, ἤλου δυντος ἐν λεύτη); *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) φθινοπώρον ἀπὸ Ἀρχισώφου (i.e. his morning rising about Sept. 15) μέχρι Πλειάδων διήνευσις (the morning setting about Nov. 9), giving less than two months to this season. As the same treatise (Bk. iii. init.) says τὸν ἐνιαυτόν ἐς τέσσαρα μέρας διαίρομεν, ἀπερ μάλιστα γινώσκοισιν οἱ πολλοὶ . . . εἰς ἀπὸ ἵσημεραν (March 21) μέχρι Πλειάδων ἐπιτολῆς (May 10), his summer must have extended over more than four months. Another reckoning was that from the autumnal equinox, φθινοπώριν ἰσημερία (Polyb. iv. 37. 2, Plut. Ant. V. 40), to the solstice Sept. 22 to Dec. 22. This does not seem to have been in such common use: the only Latin authority quoted for it in De Vit’s Forcellini (s.v. ‘Autumnus’) is Ulp. Dig. 43. 20. 1, § 32, ‘aestatem incipere sic peritiores (i.e. the astronomers) ab aequinoctio verno, et finiri aequinoctio autunnali, et ita senis mensibus aetas atque hiemis 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 φθινότωρος, has the following blundering account of its duration, ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Ἀλμυστοῦ μηνὸς ἕως τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης Δεκέμβριον, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκοστῆς δευτέρας Ἀλμυστοῦ ἕως πάλιν εἰκοστῆς δευτέρας Δεκέμβριον. 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 Δεκέμβριον to Ἁντέρμβρια. [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 Δεκέμβριον to Νοέμβριου, 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 φθινότωρον is the late autumn . . . which succeeds the ὄπαρα (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name παρὰ τὸ φθινέσθαι τὴν ὄπαραν, 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 φθινότωρον. 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. Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression, "Trees with out frute at gadringe (gathering) time," i.e. at the season when fruit was looked for. I cannot agree with Archbishop Trench, who maintains that "Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation," and himself explains φθινοπωρινά ἄκαρπα as "mutually completing one another, without leaves, without fruit." Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has "hervest trees without fruyt," and the Rheims version "trees of autumne unfruiteful." The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives "corrupt trees and without frute." The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, "trees withered (φθίνειν) at fruite gathering (δεύτερα) and without fruite," which is explained in the margin, "Trees withered in autumne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth."

The correctness of the interpretation, given by Lightfoot alone among modern commentators, is confirmed by a consideration of the context. The writer has just been comparing the innovators, who have crept into other Churches, to waterless clouds driven past by the wind. Just as these disappoint the hope of the husbandman, so do fruitless trees in the proper season of fruit. If φθινοπωρινά were equivalent to χειμερινά, denoting the season when the trees are necessarily bare both of leaves and fruit, how could a tree be blamed for being ἄκαρπον? It is because it might have been, and ought to have been a fruit-bearing tree, that it is rooted up.

If we follow the Julian calendar, Trench's interpretation is evidently impossible. Even if we suppose St. Jude to have been familiar with the scientific calendar, which makes autumn begin with the equinox; since leaves and fruits would even then not be cleared from the trees till autumn was more than half through; and since the first part of the compound φθινόπωρον has already spent its force in the change from the dog-days (δεύτερα) to the autumn, and cannot act again (as Trench supposes) to change autumn into late-autumn, it follows that φθινοπωρινά would have been a most unsuitable word to express the bareness of winter. How unsuitable it would have been, how little corresponding to the Spätherbst and senescens autumnus of the commentators, will be evident from the way in which autumn is spoken of in the Greek romances. The scene of Longus' Pastoralia is laid in this season: in i. 30 he speaks of the temperature as ἐν τῇ τῆς θάνατος νόσης καιναματάδους, in i. 28 of the ripening of the grapes, μετοπώρον 8' ἀκμαίζοντος καὶ τοῦ βότρυνος. At the beginning of Book ii. the vintage is described, and in the third chapter we are introduced to a shepherd who speaks of the produce of his garden at different seasons, ἄμπελοι καὶ σικαί καὶ βοάι καὶ μιρά καὶ χλωρά. Similarly Philostratus (Heroic. i. 5, 6, p. 663) dwells on the delights of autumn, ὡς ποικιλή σοι

1 This agreement is probably owing to their dependence on the Vulgate 'arbores auctunnales infructuosae.'
We may compare the saying attributed to Euripides (Ael. V.H. xiii. 4), οὐ μόνον τὸ ἐαρ τῶν καλῶν κάλλιστον ἄλλα καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον; Hor. C. iv. 7. 11, pomifer autumnus fruges effuderit, Epod. ii. 17 decorum mitibus pomis caput autumnus agris extulit; Macrobius (Somn. Scip. i. 20. 6) mollities autumnalis aurae.
Jude a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those who have received the divine calling, beloved of the Father, kept safe in Jesus Christ. May mercy, peace, and love be richly poured out upon you!

Mercy and love are spoken of again at the end of the Epistle (v. 21) where the readers are bidden to keep themselves in the love of God, awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ for life eternal. The thought of peace is present to the writer's mind throughout the Epistle, while he utters his warning against the enemies of union who walk according to their own lusts and have not the Spirit (vv. 18, 19). In contrast to these, his readers are urged to keep fast hold of peace and to build themselves up on their most holy faith, praying in the Spirit and using every effort to help and save those who are in danger of falling away (vv. 20–23), always looking to Him who is able to keep them from stumbling and present them before His presence without spot.

Reasons for Writing (vv. 3, 4).

He had been intending to write to them on that which is the common interest of all Christians, salvation through Christ, but was compelled to abandon his intention by news which had reached him of a special danger 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.

πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος.

It was not to have been a mere extemporized effusion, but a well thought out treatise. Such were the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews, and such, as we learn from his preface, was St. Luke’s intention in preparing his Gospel. Nor were his readers to be mere passive recipients of an impression from without. They were to contend for the faith (v. 3), to build themselves up upon it (v. 20), to keep themselves in the love of God (v. 21), to use every effort to save those who were in danger of falling away (vv. 22 f.).

The Faith once for all delivered to the Saints.

One or two references have been given in the explanatory note to illustrate the idea of a Christian tradition. It may be well here to adduce further evidence as to (1) the fact, and (2) the contents of such a tradition.

(1 a) That there was a recognized tradition or traditions (παράδοσις, παράδοσεις) in the Apostolic age, appears from 2 Th. 2:15 κρατεῖτε τὰς παράδοσεις αὕτης εἰς τὸ λόγον αὐτός διὰ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἡμῶν, id. 3:6 κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἦν παρελάβετε παρὰ ἑμῶν, 1 Cor. 11:2 καθὼς παρέδωκα ἡμῖν τὰς παράδοσεις κατέχετε. In contrast with this there was a Jewish παράδοσις of which we read (Mt. 15:6 ἔκφυγατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἡμῶν, Mk. 7:8 ἄφεντες τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ Θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἁρώμων, Gal. 1:14 ἔκτοτε ὑπάρχον τῶν πατρικῶν μου παράδοσεων, and also such oral traditions as those to which the Christianized Essenes of Colossae made their appeal, see Col. 2:23 κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἁρώμων with Lightfoot’s note. The cognate verb was similarly used, as in 1 Cor. 11:2 quoted above, id. v. 23 παρέλαβον ἀπὸ Κυρίου ὁ καὶ παρέδωκα ἡμῖν (viz. the institution of the Eucharist), id. 15:3 παρέδωκα γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐν πρώτῳ καὶ παρέλαβον (viz. the Resurrection of Christ), Lk. 12 καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτότας καὶ ὑπηρέτα γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, 2 P. 2:21 ὑποστρέψας ἐκ τῆς παραδοσεύσεως αὐτοῖς ἅγιας ἐντολῆς.

It is noticeable that, in all the cases in which St. Paul speaks of a Christian tradition, he speaks of it as received by his converts from himself, either by speech or writing (2 Th. 2:16). Sometimes he says that he received a tradition from the Lord, as in 1 Cor. 11:23 (as to the meaning of which see Class. Rev. viii. 149 foll., 267 foll.), with which we may compare Gal. 1:11-12 γνωρίζω ἡμῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ ὑπ’ ὑμῖν τῷ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑπενθέλλεται εἰς τὴν κατὰ ἐπιστολὴν ἡμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν παραδοσιαν αὐτὸς, οὐτε ἐδιάθηκαν, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Some understand in the same way 1 Cor. 15:8, but the details that follow (καὶ ὑπὲρθε Κηφᾶ, ἠτα τοῖς δώδεκα, etc.) make it more probable that the reference here is to information received from older disciples.

1 A remarkable instance of the passive used of a person is given under (1 b).
The converse term to ἐπάθησις is παραδόθησις, of which some examples have already been given (2 Th. 3:6; 1 Cor. 11:24; 15:3, Gal. 1:12); others are Mk. 7:4 (of Jewish tradition) ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, 1 Cor. 15:1 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὁ εὐγγελισμός του ὑμῶν, ἃ καὶ παρελάβητε, ... δὲ οὐ καὶ σώζεσθε, Gal. 1:10 εἰ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ’ ἃ παρελάβητε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, Phil. 4:18 ἃ καὶ ἢμάθητε καὶ παρελάβητε καὶ ἢκουσάτε καὶ ἔδει ἐν ἔμοι, ταῦτα πράσσοτε, Col. 2:6 ὡς παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστόν, ἐν αὐτῷ περιταπείτε, 1 Th. 2:13 παραδόθησις λόγων ἄκος παρ’ ἦμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε ὁ λόγον ἄνθρωπον, ἅλλα, καθὼς ἄλλης ἑστίν, λόγον Θεοῦ, ὑμῖν παραδόθησις ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ’ ἦμῶν τὸ πός δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιταπεῖν ... ἵνα περισσεύῃ μᾶλλον.

(1 b) It is a definite type of teaching, cf. Rom. 6:17 ὑποκύνοντε ἐκ καρδίας εἰς διακήρυξις, Rom. 16:17 παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς σκοτεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοτομίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διακήρυξιν, ἣν ὑμεῖς ἢμάθητε, ποιοῦντας, 1 Cor. 11:18 ὑμεῖς τοιαύτην συνάχθειν οὐκ ἠχοῦν, οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. 1:18 'though we or an angel from heaven should preach to you any other Gospel, let him be anathema', 2 Cor. 11:14, 2 Tim. 1:13 ὑποτύπωσον ἵναι ἐνημερώσων λόγων ἃν παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἢκουσάς ἐν πίστει, 1 Tim. 1:5 ἣν παραγγέλησθε τοῖς μὴ ἐμποδίσασκελι, 1 Tim. 4:6 ἐντερπομένους τοὺς λόγους τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καθῆς διδακτάς ἢ παρακολουθήκας, 2 Tim. 3:14 δὲ μὲν εἰς ὅποις ἢμαθὲς καὶ ἐπιστόμης, εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἢμαθές, Tit. 1:3 (τὸ κήρυγμα) ἢ ἐπιστεύθην ἐν γῇ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἢμῶν Θεοῦ.

(1 c) Sometimes it is spoken of as a deposit (παραθήκη, παρατήθεικι), cf. 1 Tim. 6:20 ἢ τιμώθησθε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτερπαμόν τοὺς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας, 2 Tim. 1:14 τὴν καθὴν παραθήκην φύλαξεν διὰ πνευματός ἄγιον, 1 Tim. 1:18 τοιαύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαι σοι, 2 Tim. 2:2 ἢ ἢκουσάς παρ’ ἐμοῦ ... ταῦτα παράθεσον πιστοῖ ἄνθρώποις οὕτως ἵκαιν ἢμαθὼς καὶ ἐπάραν ἡμᾶς.

(1 d) In the pastoral epistles we also meet such phrases as ἀγία, ἀγιαῖνων, πιστὸς λόγος ὁ διδασκαλία, cf. 1 Tim. 1:10, 11 εἰ τῇ ἡγιασμοῦ διδασκαλία ἀντίκειται κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ... ἢ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ, ὑμῖν. 6:4 ἢ τις ἐμποδίσασκελι καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ἡγιαίνοντος λόγους τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ κατ’ εὐφημείαν διδασκαλίας, τετυφωταί, 2 Tim. 4:3 τῆς ἡγιασμοῦ διδακτάς οὐκ ἀνέχονται ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἴδιας ἐπιθυμίας εἀντοὺς ἐπιστεύοντος διδακτάς, Tit. 1:9 ἀπεγνώμονον τοῦ κατὰ διδακτάς πιστοῦ λόγου, ἵνα ὑμῖν ἢ καὶ παρακάλει ὃς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ἡγιασμοῦ, ὑμῖν. 21 εἰ δὲ λαλεῖ ἐπανέρχεται τῇ ἡγιασμοῦ διδακτάς, ὑμῖν. 20 λόγον ἡγιαία ἀκαθάργωντος τοῦ πράγματος ὁ λόγος ἐμνή ἢ ἐπιθυμεῖ.

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

(2 a) St. Paul gives briefly the contents of the tradition in 1 Cor. 123.
PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS

Elsewhere he speaks of it as 'the ministry of reconciliation (τὸ τῆς καταλλαγῆς) that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself,' 2 Cor. 5:19. So in 1 Tim. 2:5 πιστός ὁ λόγος καὶ πάντας ἀποδοχὴς ἄξιος, ὥστε ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀμαρτωλοῖς σώζει, and still more briefly in Rom. 10:6 ἵνα ἦσθε τὸ ρήμα τῆς πίστεως τῆς κηρύσσομεν ὅτι, ἐὰν ἰδομηνύσημεν τὸ ρήμα ἐν τῷ στόματι σου ὥστε Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πιστεύεσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεός αὐτὸν ἔγερεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ, 1 Cor. 12:3 οὐδεὶς δίναται εἰπεῖν Ἐν Κύριος Ἰησοῦς εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. Much to the same effect St. John says (1 Jo. 4:2) ἔστω δὲ ἰδομηνύσημεν ἑνὶ τοῖς Θεοῖς σοφῶν, of which the converse is given in 2 Jo. 7, πολλοὶ πλανοῦσιν εὐθυμον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ἰδομηυσίντες ἑνὶ σαρκί ἐρχομένον εἰς σαρκί. We may compare Dr. Armitage Robinson on Eph. 5:26 'The confession ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἦσθε ταὐτόν, καὶ σωθήσης σὺ καὶ ὁ σικῶς σου...'). That some confession was required before baptism is seen from the early glosses on the baptism of the eunuch, Acts 8:37, and that this soon took the form of question and answer (ἐπιφώνημα) is suggested by 1 Pet. 3:21, where the context contains phrases which correspond with the baptismal creed of the second century. We may go back to our Lord Himself as sanctioning this tradition in his commendation of Peter's answer (οὐ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωτοῦ). ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακάριοι εἶ, Ζήμων Βαρβωνᾶ, ὅτι σάρξ καὶ αἷμα ὅπως ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· κἀγὼ δὲ σου λέγω ὅτι εἰ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσων μού τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Mt. 16:18). Compare 1 Cor. 3:11 οἱ μετέλεσαν ἄλλους οὐδεὶς δίναται θείναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

(2 b) But the tradition also included rules of action. Thus in 2 Th. 3:5 St. Paul warns his converts στέλλεσθαι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως πεπισταυνόντος καὶ μῆ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἢ παρελάβετε παρ' ἦμον. His own conduct was to be a τύπος to them (ib. ver. 9). See also Rom. 6:17 χάρις τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι ἤτη δουλοὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, υπηκούοντες δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὧν παρεδόθη τύπον δίδαξης, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐξουσίωθη τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. As the nucleus of the tradition in regard to faith was belief in the Father's love manifested in His Son, so the nucleus of the tradition in regard to practice was the love which is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:10), that love, of which St. John says (1 Jo. 3:11) αὕτη ἦταν ἡ ἄγγελία ἢ ἤκουσαν ἢ ἤρχατε, ὅν ἀγαπῶμεν ἄλληλοις, to which he refers again in 3:23 as the command of Jesus Christ. Thus the ethical, as well as the doctrinal tradition is derived from the teaching of Christ Himself, not only from His sanction of the old commandment (Mt. 22:40), but also from the words reported by St. John, (13:34) ἐντολὴν καὶνὶ δίδωμι ὑμῖν ὅν ἀγαπᾶτε ἄλληλοις, καθὼς ἤγαπα καὶ ὑμᾶς, ὅν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄγαπᾶτε ἄλληλοις, to which the Apostle refers in 1 Jo. 2:8.

Sometimes the word παράδοσις is used of less fundamental matters,
as in 1 Cor. 11\(^1\) ἐπαινῶ ὑμᾶς ὅτι... καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παράδοσες κατέχετε: but immediately afterwards St. Paul proceeds to point out that there were exceptions to their obedience. Thus women take part in public worship with uncovered heads (1 Cor. 11\(^5\)) and venture to speak in the congregation (1 Cor. 14\(^24\)). He settles the former question summarily by appeal to the universal practice of the Churches (11\(^16\)), the latter by appeal to a Κυρίου ἐντολή (14\(^37\)).

It may be worth while here to consider some of the terms which are used to express the contents of the παράδοσις, and we will begin with ἐντολή. This is used of the Mosaic law in the synoptists and in the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. In St. John’s writings it is mostly used of the Father’s will as revealed in the Son, e.g. 10\(^1\) the ‘power to lay down His life and take it again’ is spoken of as an ἐντολή from the Father: ib. 12\(^24\), \(50\), My Father has given Me an ἐντολή τι ἐστο καὶ τί λαλήσω: καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολή αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰωνίου ἐστιν: also of a command of our Lord, ib. 13\(^24\) ἐντολή καὶ νόμος δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἅλλοις, 1 Joh. 4\(^21\). The widest significance of the term is found in 1 Joh. 3\(^23\) αὕτη ἐστιν ἡ ἐντολή αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τοῦ ισίου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἅλλοις, on which Westcott comments ‘The things that are pleasing, the many commandments (of the previous verse) are summed up in one commandment, which includes faith and practice, the power of action and the form of action, faith, and love.’ In 1 Cor. 7\(^1\) the τῆρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ is distinguished from the ceremonial law. In 1 Tim. 6\(^14\) τηρησία σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἀσπιλον μὲν οὐ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κυρίου, it is used, as Alford says, ‘not to designate any special command... but as a general compendium of the rule of the Gospel, after which our lives and thoughts must be regulated.’ In 2 Pet. it occurs twice, in 2\(^21\) already quoted under παράδοσις, and 3\(^2\) μνησθήναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτηρος, implying that the Lord spoke through his apostles; and so, apparently, in 1 Cor. 14\(^27\), where St. Paul calls upon the prophets and the spiritual to acknowledge that in his decisions on various points of discipline, he is uttering a Κυρίου ἐντολή. Sometimes it is used of instructions about persons (Col. 4\(^10\)): sometimes of rules laid down by men and condemned by the Apostle (Col. 2\(^2\), τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ δίδασκαλία τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Tit. 1\(^4\) μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαιοὺς μίθους καὶ ἐντολαίς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τῆν ἁλίθειαν).

A similar word is παραγγελία found in 1 Th. 4\(^2\) ὑπάκουστε τῆς παραγγελίας ἡδοκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (warnings against impurity as appears from the context), 1 Tim. 1\(^5\) τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη, ib. 1\(^{18}\) ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαι σοι... ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν, and so παραγγέλλω.

A more important word is εὐαγγέλιον, the good news of the kingdom, as it is called in Mt. 4\(^2\), etc., the good news of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1\(^1\)), of God (Mk. 1\(^1\)) men are called to believe in it (Mk. 1\(^2\)), to sacrifice home and life for it (Mk. 10\(^2\), 8\(^3\)); it is to be preached to all nations (Mk. 13\(^10\), Mt. 24\(^4\)). Paul was especially called to bear witness of the good news of the grace of God to the Gentiles (Acts 20\(^2\), Gal. 2\(^7\)). He speaks of it as my or our Gospel, Rom. 2\(^4\), where it is said to
include the coming of Christ to judge the world, ib. 16²⁵ τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ στηρίζει ὡς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίων μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ι.Χ. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου... εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐνθα γνωρισθέντος, 2 Cor. 4²⁶ τῇ φανερωτικῇ τῆς ἀληθείας συναπτάται εὐαγγέλιον πρὸς πάντα συνειδήσειν ἀνθρώπων ἐνίοτον τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγελίων ἡμῶν, εἰ τοὺς ἀπολλελεμένους ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον, εἰ οὗ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου ἐπώθησεν τὰ νοηματα τῶν ἁπάτων εἰς τῷ μὴ αὐγάστῳ τῶν φωτισμῶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δὲ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἐαντός κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κυρίον, 1 Th. 1⁰ τὸ εὐαγγελίων ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγένετο εἰς ὡς εἰς λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ δυνάμει καὶ εἰ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, 2 Th. 2¹ εἰλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας εἰς ὁ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν, 2 Tim. 2² μημόνευεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγερμένον εἰκόνον, εἰ σπέρματος Δανείδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίων μου. Ίτα nature is further shown by Rom. 10³ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τῷ ρήμα τῆς πίστεως ἐκ κηρύσσομεν. ὅτι εἶναι ἰδέα ἀληθείας τῶν ἱστοματίκων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσεις ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν ἤγερεν εἰκόνα, σωθήσῃ. From this and other passages it appears that, while the distinctive feature of St. Paul’s Gospel was the thought that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, and that he who thoroughly believed this died with Christ to sin and was raised with Him to newness of life (which he sometimes speaks of as an immediate revelation to himself) yet it included the thought of final judgment and the more ordinary topics dwelt upon by the earlier preachers of the Gospel. Nor need we suppose that when he speaks of ‘my gospel’ he is always thinking of a difference of subject or contents: he thinks sometimes of the difference of hearers, as when he says πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγελίον τῆς ἀκροβυσσίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιπομῆς (Gal. 2⁷). It would take too long to go through other terms which are employed to express the new message of salvation, such as ἀληθεία, κήρυγμα, τῷ ρήμα, τὰ ρήματα, ἠω, ἐλπὶς, λόγος, πίστις.

(3) When St. Jude speaks of defending the faith once delivered to the saints, and of his readers building up themselves on their most holy faith (ver. 20), he refers of course, not to any matter of detail, not to rules enacted for a temporary purpose, such as the decisions of the Council of Jerusalem, but to the very foundation of all Christian teaching laid down once for all.

This may be regarded as a definition of Christianity—‘the Christian is he who believes that Christ is Lord’—, or it may be regarded as the minimum required in the way of Christian belief. It is also the seed or starting point, as well as the rule or canon of an endless development. Growth in all ways, in feeling, in understanding, in action, in character,—growth, moral, intellectual, and spiritual is of the essence of the kingdom of Heaven, whether it appear in the individual or in the community. Thus St. Peter says ‘grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour’ (2 P. 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. 3:14). And again, he declares it to be his aim γνῶσις αὐτῶν (not simply ‘know,’ but ‘recognize’ ‘feel’ ‘appropriate’ L.) καὶ τὴν δύναμίν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτῶ (Phil. 3:19). Hence in St. Paul’s epistles and elsewhere we find allusions to a higher teaching, a wisdom not of this world, strong meat suited for those that are mature, as opposed to the milk which is proper for infants (1 Cor. 2:6, 7, 3:1-2, Heb. 5:12-14). Our Lord enjoins that every scribe instructed into the kingdom of heaven should bring forth out of his treasure things new as well as old (Mt. 13:5); and St. Peter, in reminding his readers that they are all stewards of the manifold grace of God, bids those who speak remember that their words should be as it were oracles of God (1 P. 3:11). The whole constitution of the Church, all its offices and all its ministers are εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ νόου τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἀνάρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. 4:12-13). So too our Lord looking forward to the future says ἐν οἱ ἐκκλήσιαι ἡ ἀλήθεια, διδάγασε ὡς εἰς τὴν ἄλλην πάσαν (Joh. 16:12-13), and in his final charge ἓνωσεν ἡ μὲν ἡ μὴ ἡ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς συντέλειας τοῦ αἰῶνος. We must beware therefore of laying too great a stress on the ἀπαξ of Jude, as though it forbade us to look for any further accession to the faith or knowledge of Christians in the future. Jesus Christ has once for all brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel, yet He has still further truth to unfold through His Spirit till He comes again.

On the other hand, if we hold with Plato that, God being the highest ideal (ἡ ἴδε τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ), the perfection of man consists in ὁμοιοίωσις Θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δύναμιν 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.
There are various ways of misusing the Apostolic tradition. It may be openly denied, as it seems to have been by the innovators here condemned (ver. 4). It may be entirely neglected without being specifically denied (as in Tit. 1:16 τοῖς ἔργοις ἀρνούνται). 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 immobilitatem, credendi scilicet in Deum omnipotentem' (then follows a creed ending with the Resurrection of Christ) 'Hac lege fidei manente, cetera ... admitunt novitatem correctionis. Quale est enim, ut diabolo semper operante et adjiciendae 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.' 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, ὁσα ἐστιν ἄλλῃ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὁσα δίκαια, ὁσα ἀγνά, ὁσα προσφάτη, ὁσα εὐφημα· αἱ τις ἀρετῆ, καὶ αἱ τις ἐπανος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθα, 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, 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.'
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the Hebrews, and drew from all quarters material for the building up of the Church.

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

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

To return to the immediate point, perhaps the most dangerous misuse of the Christian tradition, as it is the easiest and the commonest, is that which, whether from indolence and indifference, or ignorant
superstition, or a suicidal theory of religion, transforms it into a mere
death 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.’

I have given expression above—I fear rather confusedly—to some of the
thoughts which arise as one meditates on the words ἐπαγωγής τῆς ἡπαξ παρα-
δοσεὶς πιστεύει. 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) ὑπὸ
δύναμις κακοὶ σφηνήρησιν ἠνδολας. 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 change-
ning 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 con-
tensts 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 Thucy-
dides, 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 utter-
ance of our greatest poets needs to be tested by the comparison of the ‘Faith
once delivered to the saints’ before we can trust it as a voice from heaven.
How are we to contend for the faith? Our natural instinct is to dislike any kind of contradiction. For another to differ in opinion from us is to cast doubt on our intelligence. To the confident and high-spirited it is a βλασφημία, an insult; to the diffident it causes a painful feeling of uncertainty. To recover our sense of security or to punish this insult, we feel tempted to put down dissent by ostracism or violence. We form cliques or parties in which the bond consists in the maintenance of a common opinion; or, it may be, in the participation of a common dislike or prejudice. Where we attach great importance to the opinion or dogma which is questioned, for its own sake, as in the case of religion, intolerance of diversity finds further sanctions. We honestly believe that the acceptance of the dogma would be beneficial to the dissidents themselves. For their own sakes we feel bound to compel them to come in. And the shallower is a man's notion of what constitutes real belief, the readier he is to insist on another's accepting, on peril of persecution, the belief which is pressed upon him. One way then in which men have endeavoured to contend for the faith is by physical force, as was symbolized in Poland and Lithuania by the nobles drawing their swords when the Creed was repeated. St. Paul however has taught us that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal. Another defence was by means of anathemas, such as were attached in former times to some forms of the Creed, and in later days to the decrees of the Council of Trent. The habit of cursing was very common among the Jews, one of the worst examples being Ps. 109 (where vv. 17, 18 might seem to be a protest against what precedes). It is strictly forbidden by St. Paul 'Bless and curse not,' and by our Lord 'Bless them that curse you.' Jude uses the phrase οὐχί in ver. 11, which might be an imprecation, but is perhaps better taken as a simple declaration of fact. Another method of defence is denunciation or invective. This is, I think, permissible, where it is required to arouse the slumbering conscience, or to make the ignorant or obtuse realize what is the nature of the attack, and what the character of the assailants of the truth. Jude has certainly no scruple in using this, and even our Lord has employed it against the Pharisees, but it is not his usual method, and it is not the method recommended by St. Peter (1 P. 3:15) ἠτοιμαί ἂν πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἴτοιντι ἐμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραῦτος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἑκούσεις ἀγαθήν. Jude himself adopts this better method towards the end of his epistle, where he instructs his readers how they should build themselves up upon their most holy faith.

I mentioned ostracism as one means by which people have endeavoured to compel consent to their own views. St. Paul enjoins this in the case of open offenders against the moral law (1 Cor. 5:9), yet our Lord ate with publicans and sinners. He could do this because, though tempted like as we are, He was yet immune from the poison of temptation, carrying about with Him an atmosphere of purity which called out good even
from the most degraded. But in ordinary circumstances there can be no doubt of the wisdom of St. Paul's rule, not merely for safety, or to avoid scandal, but to supply a further motive to the weak, in the fear of forfeiting their Christian fellowship, and to those who have fallen, in the sorrow for its loss and the yearning for its renewal. This discipline is extended to those who taught erroneous doctrine by St. Paul himself in Tit. 3:10 and by St. John in 2 Joh. 10, 11. "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house nor bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." Does this mean that we are to have no dealings with those who do not hold the articles of the faith as embodied in the Creeds? Plainly it has no reference to those who have never heard of Christianity. It is limited to those who are, or have been, professed Christians. Is it true, then, of such, if they can no longer conscientiously repeat the Creed, that they are to be excluded from the society of their fellow Christians on this ground only, apart from other considerations? So far as doubt arises from a high sense of what belief means, from scrupulous fear of saying with our lips more than we believe in our hearts to be true, from a consciousness of our own ignorance, and the incapacity of man to fathom the councils of the Most High, or again from open-mindedness and readiness to welcome light from all quarters, and not prematurely to shut the eyes to what may prove to be a very ray from heaven—to deny admittance to our homes and churches in the case of such a doubter, would be blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. But where disbelief, as in the case referred to by Jude, is confident, loud and boastful, eager to startle and shock the simple-minded, without reverence, or seriousness, or sense of responsibility, above all where it distorts religion in the interest of the baser lusts—there, who can hesitate to say that the sentence of St. John is fully justified?

A special kind of ostracism was excommunication, which was practised by the Jews (cf. the words ἀφορίζω, ἐκβάλλω, ἀποστειλόμενος, Lk. 6:22, Joh. 9:22) and sanctioned by our Lord (Mt. 18:17). St. Paul uses this as a regular instrument of Church discipline in a case of immorality in 1 Cor. 5:5-7 ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἡδη κέρκυρα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὔτως τούτο κατεργασάμενον, ἐν τῷ ἐνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, συναχθέντων ύμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, παραδόναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὀλέθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τῷ πνεύμα σωθῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου, and in a case of misbelief in 1 Tim. 1:20, where he says (speaking of Hymenaeus and Alexander) οἰς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ, ἵνα παύουσιν 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 ὁμολογέω. The N.T. use is illustrated in the Homily 139, on the Adoration of the Cross, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: ὁ ἀρνόμενος ἔτερον οἷον ἡ ἀδελφὴν ἡ φίλον . . . κἂν ματτιζό-

 unquestioningly with the sense of repudiation, i.e. it is equivalent to repudiation. So Peter repudiated our Lord. The sin and its punishment are spoken of in Mt. 1038 ἀστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἑμοί ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἀστις δὲ ἀρνήσεται με ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτόν ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ πατρός μου. In Mk. 838 and Lk. 926 the phrase ἀστις ἀρνήσεται με is replaced by δὲ ἐν ἐπαυσινηθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἑμοὺς λόγους. The martyrlogies the word occurs frequently, as the confessors were called upon either to deny Christ, or to deny that they were Christians, or what comes to the same thing, to affirm Κύριος Καίσαρ, and offer incense to Caesar or swear by his name. In Apoc. 213 it is said of the church at Pergamum οὐκ ἡρνήσω τὴν πίστιν μου, in contrast to the followers of Balaam, who did not scruple to eat things offered to idols; and we read that Basilides justified those who so acted and abjured the faith in time of persecution (Euseb. H.E. iv. 7). It would seem however that what is here condemned is a wrong view of God and Christ, such as a denial of the divine attributes of holiness and justice, wisdom and power, and of the salvation wrought by Christ, the helplessness of man and the need of prayer and watchfulness. See Clem. Al. Str. vi. p. 802 (the heretics, though they profess one God and sing praises to Christ, yet really) ἄλλον θεόν παρευρίσκουσιν καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν οὐχ ὡς αἱ προφητείαι παραδόθαις ἐκδέχονται, and the Introduction on the Early Heresies. Confession being a main element in baptism (cf. Rom. 1010 καρδία πιστεύει εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν), the subsequent denial was an ἀποστασία.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SIN AND JUDGMENT DERIVED FROM HISTORY AND FROM NATURE (vv. 5–13).

The judgment impending over these men is borne witness to by well known facts of the past, and may be illustrated from the phenomena of nature. God showed his mercy in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, but that was no guarantee against their destruction in the wilderness when they again sinned by unbelief. The angels were blessed beyond all other creatures, but when they proved unfaithful to their trust,
they were imprisoned in darkness, awaiting there the judgment of the great day. The men of Sodom (lived in a land of great fertility, they had received some knowledge of God through the presence and 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 infirmarum 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 ἔξωσια τοῦ σκότους
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 with spirits, especially evil spirits,' for which he cites Philo De Gigant. 2, De Somn. I. 22.

\[\text{ένυπνιαξόμενοι.}\]

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. 27·11 χαὶ γὰρ μουσῆροι ἦσαν ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας... καὶ διὰ τούτο πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης εἰς τὸ παιτεύειν αὐτοῖς 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. 137· Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief.' It would seem to be altogether going out of the way to take an archangel for our pattern; but if it was thought worth while to do so, would it not have been more natural to refer to the seraphim who veil their faces in the presence of God, rather than to the apocryphal story of Michael's behaviour towards Satan? Suppose, to allow our thought a freer range, we substitute for this the Miltonic account of the interview between Satan and Gabriel at the end of the fourth book of the P.L. Milton's Satan, we remember, is one whose 'form had not yet lost all her original brightness, nor appeared less than archangel ruined and the excess of glory obscured,' yet there was a certain amount of \[\betaλασφημία,\] not

\[\text{1 In agreement with this, Bengel in his note says 'Angeli qui peccarunt, tamen ut creaturae Dei habent bonitatem... et in sua natura praestantissima, quam a Creatore acceperunt, characterem retinent indebilem majestatia.'}\]
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 βλασφημώ, 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 βλασφημώ bear the sense of χλευάζω or λοιδορέω or ἔπισκόπτω? I think the following quotations tend to show that it may: Clem. Al. Paed. p. 297 πολλάκις βλασφημοίντες εἰς γέλωτα οὐ παύονται, Herodian iv. 12. 1 εἰς τούτον πολλάκις ἀπέσκοπη καὶ μέχρι αἰονίας βλασφημίας. The more common meaning of βλασφημώ 'to speak evil' does not seem appropriate here, for there is hardly a place in the N.T. where the devil is mentioned without some opprobrious addition. He is a sinner from the beginning (1. Joh. 3:8), a murderer from the beginning, a liar and the father of it (Joh. 8:44), a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (1 P. 5:8), the
Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil (1 Joh. 3:8). The force of Jude’s warning seems to be this, ‘Do not make light of the devil, do not belittle the danger of his assaults. Even the archangel invoked the power of God against him.’ In the same sense St. Paul writes (Eph. 6:11-12) “...”

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) “...”

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) εἰς τὴν ὅρασιν τοῦ ἀγίου... ἥν ξειδόν μοι ἄγγελοι καὶ ἰκουσα ταρ’ αὐτῶν πάντα καὶ ἔγνων αὐτὸ θεωρών. καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν νῦν γενέσθαι ἐκ τῆς κατοικίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ άιῶνος ἐπὶ γῆν πατήσει ἐπὶ τὸ Σωλωτρόπιον... καὶ φανέσται ἐν τῇ δυναμείᾳ τῆς ισχύος 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. ἀλεος, 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’ ἐσχάτων χρόνων.

It may be worth while here to quote from Westcott's note on 1 Joh.
2:18. 'The successive partial dawnings of "the age to come" give a
different force to the words "the last days" which usher in the age,
according to the context in which they occur. In one sense "the age
to come" dated from Pentecost; in another from the destruction of
Jerusalem; in another it was still the object of hope. So also "the
last days" are found in each of the seasons of fierce trial which
precede the several comings of Christ. The age in which we live is,
under one aspect, "the last days," and in another it is "the age to
come," which was prepared by the travail pains of the old order. As
we look forward, a season of sore distress separates us from that
which is still to be revealed (2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 3:3; Jude 18; 1 Pet. 1:5,
contrast ver. 20): as we look back we have entered on an inheritance
now through struggles of "a last time."

We find similar references in the O.T.: thus in Gen. 49:1 Israel's
blessing his sons tells them of what should befall ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν
ἡμερῶν, and this blessing, in the case of Judah, is generally thought to
refer to the coming of the Messiah. In Numb. 24:14 Balaam foresees.
ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων 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’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν a time of
restoration should come if they turned to God with all their heart and
with all their soul (Deut. 4:30). In a later chapter (31:29) the phrase
ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν is used to denote the period of the previous falling
away. In Job 19:25 the A.V. has 'I know that my Redeemer liveth
and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth,' but the LXX.
has nothing answering to 'latter day,' and the general sense of the
passage is much disputed. In Isa. 2:2 and Micah 4:1 we read that ἐν
tαῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις 'the mountain of the Lord's house shall be estab-
lished in the top of the mountains and all nations shall flow unto it.'
Jeremiah uses the same phrase of the restoration of Moab (48:7) and
of Elam (49:39), and twice over of the repentance of Israel, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων
tῶν ἡμερῶν νοήσουν αὐτό (23:20, 30:24). It is used by Ezekiel of the,
invasion of Gog and Magog (38\textsuperscript{v}.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 (3\textsuperscript{v}).

**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 ἀγίῳ 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. Ἡμεῖς.] See Introduction on the Text. The writer of the First Epistle calls himself simply Πέτρος. In every other passage of the N. T., where the double name occurs, it is Σίμων Πέτρος. Indeed Συμεών is used of Peter only in one other passage, viz. Acts 15:14, the address of James at the Council of Jerusalem. The hellenized form Σίμων appears for the first time in post-Alexandrine writings, e.g. Sirach 50:1, 1 Macc. 15:24, and seems to be the only one used of Peter in post-Apostolic times.

So far as it goes, this is an argument for the genuineness of our epistle. Our author is at any rate a man of observation and reflexion, and, if he chose to write under another name, would have been careful to copy his model. This applies also to the other points in which this salutation differs from that of the first epistle.

δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] The first epistle omits δούλος; Jude, who is followed so closely in our epistle, omits ἀπόστολος. 'By the addition of the common appellative δούλος 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 ἱσότιμων 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 ἱσότιμῳ below.

tοῖς ἱσότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν.] Field seems to be right in holding that ἱσότιμος and ὁμότιμος 'invariably borrow their meaning from τιμή honour,' and not from τιμή in the sense of price.¹ He quotes Jos. Ant. xii. 3. 1 ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχεία πολιτείας αὐτοὺς ἥξισε καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθέσιν ἱσότιμοι ἀπέδεξε Μακεδονία. 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 ἱσότιμον κόσμῳ ὁ Θεὸς ἡγεῖται quoted in Salmon's Introd. to N. T. p. 502.
privileged; a faith which carries equal privileges, so putting them on an equality with us, whether us the Apostles, or, if addressed to Gentiles, us Jews. The latter would be in accordance with St. Peter's action in the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Gospel. Jewish arrogance and exclusiveness were the cause of much bitter feeling and danger in the early Church, as may be seen from Acts 15, 21 20-28, Rom. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, Ephes. 214-22, esp. ver. 14 αὐτός γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, δ’ ποιότερα τὰ ἄμφοτέρα ἐν, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκί αὐτοῦ, with which our passage may be compared. On the contrary there is no hint that there was any jealousy of the position of the Apostles generally, which could explain the use of such words as ἴσοτιμον and ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. It is true that those here addressed are warned against the τολμητὰ αὐθάδες who speak evil of dignities (210) and that they are hidden 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 (ἡμῶν = τῇ ἡμῶν) see Winer pp. 777 ff.

The use of the word λαγχάνω here is to emphasize the fact that faith itself is the gift of God; so Wisd. 819 ψυχής ἐλαχὸν ἀγαθῆς, Plato Phileb. 55 β ἀνδρὶν ἡ σωφροσύνη...ἡ τὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅς ἂν ἀγαθὰ ἐληξε ψυχή, Polit. 269 σ φράσεων εἰληχώς, cf. Eph. 28-9.

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.] Does this form one phrase with πίστιν? Does it mean 'faith in the righteousness of Christ as our justification'? Cf. Eph. 115 τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Tim. 318. Or should it be connected with all the preceding words 'those who have received a faith no less highly privileged than ours through the justice of God,' who is no respecter of persons? The latter seems to me the more natural way of taking it. For this narrower sense of δίκαιος cf. Heb. 610 οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεός ἐπιλάβησθαι τοῦ ἐργὸν ἡμῶν, 1 Joh. 19 ἢν ὁμολογώμεν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστὸς ἢστιν καὶ δίκαιος ἢν ἄφη ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας, and Clem. Al. p. 116 5τὶ γε μία καθολικὴ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος σωτηρία ἡ πίστες, ἰσοτής δὲ καὶ κοινωνία τοῦ δικαιού καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ αὐτὴ πρὸς πάντας, ὁ ἀπόστολος σαφῶς ἐξηγήσατο, shortly after which follows the quotation from Gal. 320-29.

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] See n. on Jude v. 4 τοῦ μονὸν δεσπότην. If we take Θεοῦ of Christ with Spitta, we may compare 21 below τῶν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην. Joh. 2028 (the words of Thomas) ὁ κύριος μου καὶ 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, 33, 318, but does not occur at all in 1 Pet. Apart from its use as predicate, it occurs without the article in 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit. we have the same salutation with ἀλεος added.

σωτηρ is used of Christ in four other passages of this epistle, 111, 220, 33, 318, but does not occur at all in 1 Pet. Apart from its use as predicate, it occurs without the article in 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit. we have the same salutation with ἀλεος added.

The word ἐπίγνωσις occurs four times in this epistle (here and 13, 18, 220), once in Heb. 1025 is simply ἡ χαρίς μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, as in Eph. 624, Col. 418, 1 Tim. 621, 2 Tim. 421, Tit. 315, to which the words τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν 1 X., μεθ’ ὑμῶν are added in Rom. 1626, 1 Th. 528, 2 Th. 318. In Gal. 618 and Phil. 423 we have the fuller form ἡ χαρίς τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν 1 X., μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. In 2 Cor. 1318 the names of all three Persons are invoked ἡ χαρίς τ. κυρίου 1 X. καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Οὖν χαρίς see Hort’s n. on 1 Pet. 12.

In ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. The word ἐπίγνωσις occurs four times in this epistle (here and 13, 18, 220), once in Heb. 1025, 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 ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ εὑρήσεις, Hos. 41 οὐκ ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἀλλ’ ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὑμ. 71. For its meaning see App. below.

The preposition ἐν denotes that grace and peace are multiplied in and by the fuller knowledge of God, cf. Joh. 173 αὕτη δε’ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ἡμᾶς σου ἀνασκόπησις σε τῶν μόνων ἀληθινῶν Θεῶν καὶ δέν ἀπέστειλας Ἰ. X., and the words of the Blessing, ‘The peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.’

Spitta, followed by Zahn (Einl. ii. 61), prefers the shorter form ἐν ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν, read by B and some of the Lat. verss., to the longer form ἐν ἐπίγνωσις Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου 1 read by BCK, and by Λ 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 εὐφημία ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, of which Lightfoot says it is ‘the only instance in St. Paul’s epistle where the name of the Father stands alone in the opening benediction without the addition of Jesus Christ. The omission was noticed by Origen and by Chrysostom. But transcribers naturally aimed at uniformity, and so in many copies we find the addition καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.’

1 The phrase Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου (without Χριστοῦ) is only found elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. 424 and 1 Cor. 91, though the converse order ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦ is frequent in the epp. to the Thessalonians.
The use of the sing. αὐτοῦ in the 3rd verse is perhaps in favour of the short form here.

3. ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ... δεδομένης.] 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. 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. I and other epistles, unless we are to put up with troublesome anacolutha, and that there is the same irregularity in the beginning of the 3rd and 8th of the pseudo-Platonic epistles. What then is the force of this clause, if taken in connexion with what precedes? It appears to justify the assertion that ‘grace is multiplied in and by the knowledge of God,’ on the ground that ‘His divine power has given us all that tends to life and godliness through the knowledge of Him who called us.’ Compare, for similar instances of the use of the gen. abs. with ὡς, 2 Cor. 5:20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ προσβείομεν ὡς τού Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δε' ἡμῶν, Acts 27:30 τῶν ναυτῶν χαλασάντων τὴν ακάφην ... προφαίρετε ὡς ἐκ προφάρα ἀγκώρας μελλόντων ἔκτεινειν, 1 Cor. 4:15 ὡς ἐρχομένου μον ἐφυνωθησάν τινες, 1 Pet. 4:12 μὴ ἐξενέχθη ὡς ξένον ἡμῖν συμβαίνοντος. In all these cases ὡς has a subjective effect indicating a feeling or point of view, whereas here such a feeling has almost to be forced into the words, ‘may grace be given through the knowledge of God, inasmuch as (we believe that) His divine power has given us all things through the knowledge of Him who called us.’ It is perhaps in favour of continuing the construction into vv. 3 and 4, that αὐτοῦ is used to define δυνάμεως. If the 3rd verse came after a full stop, we should rather have expected δ. Ἰησοῦ.

On the other hand, if we connect this verse with what follows, as is done by Kihl, Keil, Weiss, Hundhausen, the subjective force of ὡς is apparent. ‘Seeing that the divine power has supplied us with all things needed for the attainment of the divine nature, give all diligence for the acquirement of the necessary virtues and graces’ (vv. 3–7). The chief objection to this lies in the form of the apodosis, καὶ αὐτῶ τοῦτο δε', on which see n. below.

Spitta, Weiss, and Nestle read τὰ πάντα with Ν. A Ti., preferring it as the lectio difficilior, and explaining it as meaning ‘die Gesamtheit welche zu Leben und Frommigkeit dient.’ This seems to me very unnatural. I think the reading simply originated in a ditto­

graphia of the 1st syllable of παντα. Spitta further carries out his idea of the opposition between the Apostles and the community by insisting on the contrast between ἡμῖν in v. 2 and ἡμῖν in v. 3. In my opinion there is no opposition, the ἡμεῖς of the former are included in the ἡμεῖς of the latter.

τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.] Cf. 2 Macc. 3:29 (of Heliodorus) δ μὲν διὰ τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν ἁφώνος ἔριπτο, Job 27:3 (and elsewhere) πνεῦμα θείον.

1 I do not understand Nestle’s reading. He puts a full stop at the end of the second and also of the fourth verse.
Besides this verse the adj. only occurs in the N.T. in v. 4 (where see n.) and in Acts 17:29 where it appears in the Carian inscription quoted in the Appendix, which is common in philosophic writings, e.g. Plato Ion 534 c (the poets speak) θεία δυνάμει, Legg. iii. 691 e, Aristotle, Pol. vii. 4 θεία στό τού δυνάμεως ἐργόν, ἃς καὶ τάδε συνέχει τὸ πάν, Justin Apol. 1. 32, Clem. Al. Str. i. p. 376 χαριστείται ἡ Ἑλληνική ἀλήθεια τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μεγέθει γνώσεως καὶ ἀποδείξει κυριώτερα καὶ θεία δυνάμει, ἕδ. vii. p. 853. The addition of the gen. αὐτοῦ does not add to the perspicuity of the sentence, whether we accept the longer or the shorter form of the salutation in v. 2. Without αὐτοῦ we should naturally understand ἡ θεία δυνάμεις as equivalent to ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις, but, as αὐτοῦ stands for τοῦ Θεοῦ, we are obliged to assign to θεία a more general force, such as μεγαλοπρεπής in v. 17. Cf. Eus. c. Hieron. 4 Ἐρείχους πλείους ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας λόγον προντρέψατο, τὸ μύρια πληθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν θείαν ἑαυτοῦ διδασκαλίαν ἐπαγόμενον, ἵνα θεία καὶ ἀρρήτως δυνάμει τοὺς μὲν ἐπανασταμένους αὐτοῦ τῇ θείᾳ διδασκαλίᾳ βαθίων μετών, τὸν δὲ παγέντα καὶ παραδοθέντα θείον λόγον κρατών, οὗτος εἰσέται καὶ νῦν τῆς ἐνθύμιας τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιδείκνυται κ.τ.λ. If two Persons are mentioned in v. 2, it would seem most natural to understand αὐτοῦ of the nearer, but Keil, de Wette, Brückner, Wiesinger, take it of the Father as the leading idea, while Dietlein supposes it to refer to the Deity in general including the Son. There is a similar difficulty as to τοῦ καλέσαντος, see n. below.

τὰ πρὸς ἡμῖν καὶ εὐσέβειαν.] 'All that tends to, or is needed for, life and godliness,' cf. Jud. 17:10 'I will give thee thy victuals' (τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν σου), Acts 28:10 τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, Lk. 19:42 τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου, Jn. Ap. provem. 6 παιδευθήτες τὰ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀσκήσιν ἀρετῆς. Weiss explains 'es handelt sich um alles was dazu gehört um in uns das durch die Wiedergeburt erzeugte wahre geistliche Leben, dessen Hauptcharakterzug die εὐσέβεια ist, zu erzeugen.' εὐσέβειας and the cognate terms are found in the N.T. only in the Acts, in this epistle, and in the pastoral epistles. In 1 Tim. 3:16 Christ, the Incarnate, Risen Lord, is spoken of as τῷ τῆς εὐσέβειας μυστήριον, 'the secret of piety.'

διδασκαλίας.] See n. on δόξῃ Ἰάκω James 1:17. The only other passage, besides this and the following verse, in which the word is found in the N.T. only in the Acts, in this epistle, and in the pastoral epistles. In 1 Tim. 3:16 Christ, the Incarnate, Risen Lord, is spoken of as τῷ τῆς εὐσέβειας μυστήριον, 'the secret of piety.'

διὰ τῆς ἐπίγνωσης τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς.] There is a considerable resemblance between this passage and Col. 1:12 αἰτούμενοι νὰ πληρωθῇ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ ἐν πνεύμα ἐγραφῇ καρποφοροῦντες (see below v. 8 οὐκ ἀκάρπωσις), καὶ ἀναζητῶντες τῇ ἐπίγνωσῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, where we have ἐπίγνωσες repeated as here, and the words underlined correspond to words in our text. For καλέσαντος see below v. 10 σπουδάσατε βεβαιῶν ἡμῶν τὴν κλήσιν ποιοῦμαι, and cf. 2 Tim. 1:6 (Θεοῦ) τοῦ σώσταντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλησεί αγία οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν, 1 Pet. 1:20 κατὰ τὸν
The calling of the Christian seems to be generally ascribed to God in the N. T. Here Spitta, with v. Soden, Beda, Cajetan, Estius, etc., refers it to Christ, citing Mt. 9:13, "οὐκ ἔλθον καλέσαι δικαίως, 2 Clem. Rom. 9 εἰ Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος... ἐγένετο σάρξ καὶ ὄντος ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν. In other passages of this epistle Christ is mentioned as the object of ἐπίγνωσις (18, 229). Cf also Herm. Sim. 14. 5 εἰ οὖν πάσα ἡ κτίσις διὰ τοῦ ἱδίου τοῦ Θεοῦ βαστάζεται, τί δοκεῖς τοῖς κεκλημένοις ὡς ἁπτομένων; In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.

See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἰδίος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:5 ἀπήλθον δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22:1 ἐπὶ τὸν ἵδιον ἐμέτοικεν. In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.

See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἰδίος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:5 ἀπήλθον δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22:1 ἐπὶ τὸν ἵδιον ἐμέτοικεν. In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.

See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἰδίος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:5 ἀπήλθον δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22:1 ἐπὶ τὸν ἵδιον ἐμέτοικεν. In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.

See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἰδίος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:5 ἀπήλθον δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22:1 ἐπὶ τὸν ἵδιον ἐμέτοικεν. In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.

See Introduction on the Text. For the use of ἰδίος as a possessive pronoun, see Blass N.T.Gr. tr. p. 169, and Winer tr. p. 191, cf. Mt. 22:5 ἀπήλθον δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ἄγρων, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ, below 22:1 ἐπὶ τὸν ἵδιον ἐμέτοικεν. In any case the text seems to distinguish between the Possessor of the divine power, and the Caller, through the knowledge of whom that divine power has granted to us all that is necessary for life. The former we naturally identify with the Father, the latter with the Son. See note on κλητοῖς J. 2.
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 ἅρετη has its usual Greek meaning, as in Wisdom 8.4, 4 Macc. 12.4.8.13-18, where the cardinal virtues are recounted, cf. Justin M. Apol. ii. 2 τὸ διδασκάλιον τῆς θείας ἅρετής, Clem. Al. p. 438 παράδειγμα θείας ἅρετης, Eus. c. Hierocl. 4 τῇ ἱδίᾳ θεότητι καὶ ἅρετῇ πάσιν ἐσωτερῇ τῆς οἰκουμένης. It was a debated question whether ἅρετη was to be ascribed to God, see my n. on Clem. Str. vii. § 88. The Stoics affirmed, against the Academics and Peripatetics, the identity of divine and human virtue. For the phrase cf. Jos. Ant. 17. 5. 6 ἐνεπαροίνει τῇ ἅρετῃ τοῦ θείου 'abused the goodness of Providence,' ib. Procem. 4. 11 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι νομοθετά τοὺς μίθους ἔξακολοθύσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀσέχνης μετέθεσαν . . .  ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης, ἀκραυγή τῆς ἅρετης ἐνοχικά τὸν θεού ἀποφήγμα, ψύχῃ δεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκεῖνης περασθαι μεταλαβᾶν, ib. 1. 3. 8 (the words of God to Noah after the Flood) οἷς εξύβριζον εἰς τὴν ἠμὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ ἅρετήν, τούτοις ἐξεβιάσαντο με ταύτην αὐτοῖς ἐπιθαίναι τὴν δίκην. Philo Leg. Alleg. ii. 14 (Μ. 1. p. 75) speaks of τῆς ἅρετής καὶ σοβάς τοῦ Θεοῦ ας τὴν μητέρα τῶν συμπάντων, Q. det. pot. § 44 (Μ. 1. p. 222) τῶν ἅρετῶν, ἢ μὲν θεόν πρὸς ἄλληθιαν ἄστι . . . ἢ δὲ Μαυσωλέως σκηνή, συμβολικός οὕτω ἀνθρώπων ἅρετή . . . μίμημα καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα τῆς θείας ἐκεῖνης, ib. 1. p. 635 init. The meaning of the passage then will be: Χριστὸς 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 ἅρετη and δόξα, e.g. Plut. Mor. 535 (De Vit. Pudore) πῶς οὐ παρίσταται δεινὸν εἶναι τῷ θείῳ δόξῃ καὶ ἅρετῇς ἀφειδεῖν; 4. δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται.] The verb may be taken here in the middle sense, as before, with θεός (understood from τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ) for the subject; but the perf. of deponent verbs frequently bears a passive sense, as in Clem. Al. Protr. p. 73 οὐ μείζον οὐδὲν ἐκ θεοῦ δεδώρηται, Paed. i. p. 133 καὶ ἄλλῳ λαῷ καὶ διαθήκῃ δεδώρηται, Str. iii. 1. 4 οἰς τούτῳ δεδώρηται ἕπαι θεοῦ, and the article suits the subject. For the combination of positive and superlative epithets, see Plato Rep. 450 ε περὶ τῶν μεγίστων τε καὶ φίλων, where H. Richards proposes to read φιλτάτων (C.R. vii. 349). He has supplied me with the following exx. taken from Rehdantz’s n. on Lycurgus 29, δοκεῖ δικαιότατον καὶ δημοτικόν εἶναι, Thuc. i. 1 ἐπὶ ταῖς μέγας τε ἐστιν καὶ ἀξιολογησιτόν τῶν προγεγενημένων, i. 84 ἐλευθέραν καὶ εὐδοξιάταταν πόλειν νεομέθα, Xen. Hell. v. 3. 17 εὐτάκτους καὶ ἐνσπλατάτους, Eur. Cyc. 315 κομψὸς γεννήσει καὶ λαλόστατος, Plato Legg. 808 δ ἐπίβουλον καὶ δριμόν καὶ βύρυσσότατον ὅρμα, Plato Symp. 205 δ ἰ μεγίστος καὶ δολερός ἔρως ποινί, Xen. Cyr. ii. 4. 29 δυνατότατος καὶ προβήσων, Aesch. ii. 11 δὲν δ' ἥγοιμαι σαβεστάτους μοι τοῖς λόγοις ἔστεθαι καὶ γνωρίσωμεν ὑμῖν. In these combinations the difficulty is greatest when the epithets are such as to make it probable that they would vary in the same degree, as here τίμια and μέγιστα, and when the superlative comes first, so as to produce an anti-climax. These considerations are in favour of B.'s reading here. Wetstein quotes two examples of the combination
μέγιστα καὶ τιμώτατα which might suggest reading τιμώτατα here. The forms ἐπαγγελμα and ἐπαγγελία are both classical; the latter alone is found in biblical Gr., excepting this verse and 3:13 below.

Three explanations of δι' ὑμῖν have been given. Spitta would understand them of ὑμῖν in vv. 1 and 3 (i.e. the Apostles, according to his view): he then reads τᾶ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ὑμῖν ἐπαγγελματα <ὑμῖν> δεδορρυται, ‘through whom He has granted to you the promised blessings which are so great and precious to us.’ The 2nd view is that δι' ὑμῖν refers to πάντα τὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐνσέβεσαι: so Keil, Schott, and Hofmann, ‘Wie die Erkenntnis Gottes das Mittel ist, durch welches uns alles zum Leben u. zur Gottseligkeit Diennende geschenkt ist, so ist letzteres das Mittel, wodurch uns kőstliche u. grosse Verheissungen geschenkt werden.’ Against both of these explanations it has to be said that the reference is too distant, and against the second that the promises are not conveyed to us by τὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, but are included in them. The 3rd view (held by Kuhl, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner) is far the simplest, connecting the relative δι' ὑμῖν with the immediately preceding θαύμα δόξη καὶ ἀρετή, ‘through the glory and goodness of Christ God has given to us His most precious promises,’ i.e. what has been revealed to us in the character of the Incarnate Son is the greatest of all promises, cf. 1 Joh. 3:2-3. For the contents of the ἐπαγγέλματα see below 3:13. I should prefer however to read ὑμῖν with 68 syr, instead of ὑμῖν, on account of the following γένοισθε. See Lightfoot (Philemon 6) on the confusion between the 1st and 2nd persons ‘though ὑμῖν has somewhat better support, we seem to be justified in reading ὑμῖν as being much more expressive. In such cases the MSS. are of no great authority.’ So here the preceding ὑμῖν would easily lead to ὑμῖν being written for ὑμῖν.

tau διὰ τούτων γένητε θείας κοινωνία φύσεως.] The reference in διὰ τούτων is to ἐπαγγέλματα (as Dietlein, Wiesinger, Schott, Keil, Kuhl, Weiss), not to τὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς (as de Wette, Hofmann, Spitta), nor to δόξη καὶ ἀρετή (as Bengel). Our nature is changed to divine by the moral power of hope and faith kindled in us by the promises. The phrase θείας φύσεως is Platonic, see Critias 120 D-121 A μέχρι περ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις αὐτοῦ ἐξήρκει ... φύσεως θείας παραμεμονύσθη πάντ' αὐτοῦ ἡ νόησθη, Rep. 366 θεία φυσίς δυσχεραίνω τὸ ἀδικεῖν, Legg. iii. 691 φύσις τις ἀνθρώπινη μεμιμηθεὶς θεία τις δυνάμει, Phaedr. 230 θείας καὶ ἀπόφοι μοῖρας φύσει μετέχον, 253 θεοῦ μετά τοῦμήματος ἐξεικνύσην ἐμαυμάσω τῇ ἐθε καθ' δοσον δυνατον θεοῦ ἀνθρώπω ἐκασταξεῖν, Rep. vi. 500c, Protag. 322 A ὁ ἀνθρώπως θείας μετέχει μοῖρας. It is found also in Xen. Hell. vii. 1. 2 δοκεῖ τούτα οἶκ ἀνθρώπινη μᾶλλον θεία φύσις καὶ τύχη δωρεῶς, so Aristotle Part. Anim. iv. 10, Epicurus ap. Diog. L. x. 97, 113, Seneca Epist. 92. 30 homo Dei pars est, Epict. Dial. ii. 19. 27 θεον εἰς ἀνθρώπω ἐπιθυμητά γενέσθαι καὶ ... περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Διά κοινωνίας βούλευμα. 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 ἔνθεσθαι ἀδιανατίζειν). The same idea occurs in slightly altered form in Heb. 3:1 μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, 6 μετόχους γεγονότας
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πνεύματος ἄγιου, 1210 εἰς τὸ μεταλαβέαν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, 1 Joh. 13, ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰ.Κ., 1 Ρ. 51 ὁ καὶ τῆς μεμλούντος ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινοῦς, 2 Cor. 325 τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτρίζομεν τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοφεύεται ἀπὸ δόξεις εἰς δόξαν. The phrase or its equivalent also occurs in Ἀρκ. Petri ap. Method. Symp. ii. 6 ἡ μακαρία ἐκεῖνη φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ἰο. c. Ἀρ. 26 Ἀμενώθητε θείας δοκούντι μεταχειρεῖται φύσεως, Philo M. 2. p. 329 ἡ ἀμεταβλήτητος καὶ μακάριος καὶ προσευδαίμων θεία φύσις, ἦδ. p. 343 ἡ μακαρία Θεοῦ φύσις, ἦδ. 1. p. 51 οὐ̃ γὰρ ἐν ἐπέτοιμησε τοσοῦτον ἀναδρομέων ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς ὡς ἀντλεῖται Θεοῦ φύσεως εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἦδ. 647 ὁσοὶ λογικὰς κεκοιμήκασιν φύσεως, and in many of the Fathers, e.g. Ἰρεν. iv. 20 ὁ μετοχὴ Θεοῦ ἑστὶν τὸ γνώσεων Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπολαύει τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, Clem. Al. p. 471 ἡ ἡμετέρα φύσις ἐμπαθής οὕτω ἐγκρατεῖα δεῖται, δι ἵνα συνεγείξεν περαιτέρᾳ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, Euseb. c. Hierocl. 6 θείαν μὲν φύσιν, εὐχρήτευσαν οὖσαν καὶ σῶτεραι καὶ προνοητικὴν τῶν ὄντων, ἀνθρώποις ποτὲ ἔστω ὁμιλίας ἐλθέναι οὐδεὶς ἀν ἄρειγος λόγος, ἦδ. 7 οὐκ ὁκ ἀποτύπωσαν . . . θείαν φύσιν ἀνθρώπους ἐπιλάμασαν (i.e. on Apollonius) σκότους του καὶ μυνθιδίον ἀποτελεῖ, οὐχὶ δὲ ἐς αἷσα τὴν ἅρπεν ἐπείδεικνυσθαι; Quotations will be found from Ὀριγεν., Ἑλιαν., Ἀθανασίου, Ἄθωνα, καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ἱερομ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ἱερόμ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ἱερομ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ἰερομ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ἰερομ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ὀριγεν., Ηλιαν., Ἀθανασίου, Ἰερομ., καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Πατρών, Ὀριγεν., Ἑλιαν., Ἀθανασίου, Ἄθωνα, see Westcott on the epistles of St. John p. 319 and my note on Clem. Al. Str. vii. § 3 ἕσομένῳ θεῷ.

ἀποφεύγειν τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς.] The negative preparation for the positive glorification, as in James 121 ἀποθέμενοι ἐν ψυχῇ πάντα τὰ ποικίλα τῆς φύσεως ἀποσκευασμένη κινήματα θεοδεσία γίνεται . . . τὴν ὑπερήφανον ἐμπειρεῖσθαι, 228 δ ἡ θεία φύσις ἡ πυγή πάστρε ἐστὶ τῆς ἁρπαγῆς, Catech. 46 B, 48 B, 51 B, 52 A, 54 D, etc. The same idea receives a stronger and more startling expression in the θεοθοφορίας of Ἀθανασίου and other Fathers, see Westcott on the epistles of St. John p. 319 and my note on Clem. Al. Str. vii. § 3 ἕσομένῳ θεῷ.

The acc. is commonly used after ἄποφευγον, 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 ἄπο, ἀπαλληλον (Eph. 212. 418), ἀφίστασθαι (1 Tim. 41), which have the same construction. To these may be added ἀποδιδράσκω Philo Alleg. p. 90, ἀποκρύπτεσθαι ἦδ. p. 88, ἀποτέμενω, ἀποθανείν, ἀπολύειν. The gen. whether with or without a preposition serves to intensify the danger which has been escaped, cf. Mt. 37 φυγεῖν ἀπ' ὄργης, 1 Cor. 1014. Sometimes the simple φυγεῖ takes the gen., as in Soph. Phil. 1034 τῆς νόσου περιφυγοῦναι like περιφυγάδειν τοῦ θείου χοροῦ Philo i. p. 88. On the word φθορά see Appendix. It is here defined by ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ, 'the corruption caused by, consisting in, lust'; and then its environment is stated to be the world, on which see James 44 with the notes in my ed. pp. 218 f. Also compare Rom. 821 αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθοράς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. 69 ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα . . . θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ζωὴν αἰωνίων.
The author is fond of these compact articular phrases, see 27 below.

5. καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ[.] See for καὶ δὲ 2 Tim. 3:22 καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες ἔρχονται, 1 Tim. 3:10 καὶ οὕτω δὲ δοκιμαζόθησαν, Rom. 11:23 κάκειν δὲ ... ἑγκντριπτότατα, Mt. 10:18, 16:18, Joh. 6:51, 8:16, 17, Acts 2:24, 2:29, Heb. 9:21, 1 Joh. 13 καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ δὲν, and Madvig Gr. Gr. § 185. 2, Ἡβ Ἰν ἄνοιξαν μὲν εἰπτ καὶ οἱ βουκόλοι τῶν βῶν ... καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ καλούμενοι νομεῖς. In all these cases δὲ has its ordinary connective use: here (if we suppose the construction continued after φθορᾶς) it would be used in apodosi, as in 1 Cor. 1:22, 23, ἐπειδὴ Ἰουνάνει σημεῖα αἰτοῦσιν ... ἡμῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν, 1 Cor. 2:9–10 ἀ ὀφθαλμός οὗ τελεῖ ... ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυπτεν ὁ Θεὸς according to Alford’s interpretation, and B in 1 Pet. 4:18 εἰ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ δὲ ἀσεβὴς τοῦ πατρίδος οὐκ εὑρέτεται. I cannot however believe that any writer would have introduced the apodosis by this cumbrous and awkward phrase. If we wish to begin the apodosis with this verse, we must read κατ’ αὐτό with Blass (N. T. Gr. p. 171 n.) for καὶ αὐτό.

For the adversative use of αὐτὸ τοῦτο see Kühner’s Gr. Gr. vol. ii. p. 267, Plato Protag. 310 ε αὐτὰ ταύτα καὶ νῦν ἢκω παρὰ σε, Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21 αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὕτω ἑνεκεν φιλῶν φεῖτο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνέγραφον ἤκυκτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπαιράτο συνεργός τούς φίλους εἶναι οὐτὶ ἢκω propter quod opus sibi esse existimabant amicis ut adiutores haberet, ipse amiciis adiumento esse conabatur, Euseb. c. Hierocl. 5 fin. αὐτὸ τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντὶ φιλοσοφόου φωραθήσεται. What then is the exact reference of the phrase in this place? It has just been said ‘God has given you precious promises in order that through them you may become partakers of the divine nature.’ The writer continues ‘Aye, and for this very reason, viz. because it is God’s will, do you do your part in order that the divine will may be carried out’.

σπουδὴν πάσαν παρεισθείηκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε.] The παρὰ and εἰπτ serve to show the subordinate nature of human effort (along with and in addition to the grace of God) in giving effect to the δώρημα twice mentioned above. The word παρεισθέρειν 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 meaningless phrases καίνούργια ὀνόματα Epiph. Haer. xxvi. 1, and 16, also Index 11 μυθολογιὰς παρεισθέρεντες. Cf. παρεισάγαν below 21.

The phrase εἰσφέρομαι σπουδὴν is very common in later Greek, see Polyb. xxii. 12, 12, Diod. i. 83 οἱ δ’ ὀχλοι πάσαν εἰσφέροντο σπουδήν, ἦν. 84, xviii. 34, xvi. 3 φιλοτιμόν εἰσφέρομεν, Jos. Ant. xx. 9. 2 πάσαν εἰσφεράκατο σπουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν, and the Inscription quoted in the Appendix. The prefixing of παρὰ alters the sense as in πάρεργον, παράνυσσος, παράτιος, παραπάσσο, παραβλάττω, παραβλέγομαι, παραψάλλω, παραδράω, παραδναστεύω, etc. The meaning is well
expressed by Aug. De Pecce Meritis, ii. 5, quoted by Hundhausen

‘nec ideo tantum solis de hac re votis agendum est, ut non subin-

teretur adnimito etiam nostrae efficacia voluntatis.’

επιχορηγήσατε.] (‘supply,’ ‘provide’). Used twice in 2 P., viz. here

and in 111 πλουσίως επιχορηγηθήσεται η εισοδος, and thrice by St. Paul

in 2 Cor. 910 δ επιχορηγών στόμα το στείρου και δρότων εἰς βρώσιν

χορηγήσει, Gal. 30 δ επιχορηγών ύμων το πνεύμα, Col. 210 πών το σώμα διὰ
tῶν ... συνδέσμων επιχορηγούμενον. The simple verb means literally
to be a χορηγός, i.e. (in its first sense) one who leads the chorus, (in its

second sense) one who defrays the cost of the chorus, and then,
generally, one who supplies the costs for any purpose. Hence the
verb is used absolutely, as in Xen. Mem. iii. 4. 3 ὁσάκος Ἀντισθένης
κεχωρηγήκε, πᾶν τοῖς χοροῖς νεικήκε, Plut. Mor. 13 ε ἔφεισον ποτέ, ἀλλὰ
καὶ χορήγησον (‘spend’), Antiph. p. 117 λαμπρῶς χορηγῶν; in the

passive Xen. Resp. Ath. i. 13 χορηγοῦσι μὲν οἱ πλούσιοι, χορηγεῖται δ’
ὁ δήμος: sometimes it has for direct object the person benefited as in
Polyb. iii. 78. 8 (the Celtic population) δαιμόλως έχορηγε το στρατόπεδον
tοῖς επιτρέψεως, ib. 49. 11 σίτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις επιτρέπεις αύλην
εχορηγεί το στρατόπεδον; sometimes the assistance given, as in
Diod. ii. 35 χορηγοῦσα τὰς τροφὰς αὐλήων, and similarly in 2 Cor. 910
just quoted, and in 1 P. 411 ὡς ἐξ ἱσχίου ἦς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεὸς. The com-

pound is found once in the LXX. (Sir. 2521) γυνῇ ἐὰν επιχορηγῇ (if she

supports) τῷ ἄνδρι αὐτῆς (is a cause of shame); the simple verb is more

common, e.g. in 1 K. 47 χορηγεῖ τῷ βασιλεί, 1 Macc. 1410 ταῖς πάλευσι
εχορηγῇς βρῶματα. It is frequently used by classical writers in the

same wide sense, e.g. in Aristotle’s definition of the εὐδαιμῶν (Eth. i.

10. 13) τοῖς ἐκτὸς ἀγαθοῖς ἱκανῶς κεχωρηγημένοις, Dio. Chr. vol. i. p. 52
(Thuebnr) ἡμίος χορηγεῖ τὸ κάλλους ὄραμάτων, φῶς. The rarer compound
occurs in Dionys. Hal. (Ep. ad Pomp. 1) τὰς συντάξεις επιχορηγουντός
σοι Ζήνωνος, Strabo xi. 14. 16 ἐξ εὑρόνοιν ἄκοιν επιχορηγούμεναι, Diog.
L. v. 67 πλείστα επιχορήγουν αὐτῷ, Aristid. D. ii. p. 194. 9, i. Clem. R.
38 ὁ πλουσίως επιχορηγεῖτο τῷ πτωχῷ, ib. ἐτέρῳ ἐστὶν ὁ επιχορηγῶν αὐτῷ
τὴν ἔγκρατεαν, Theoph. Autol. 73 B, where ἐτί 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 pre-

ceding. We have similar lists in Rom. 528, ἡ θλίψει ὑπομονῆν κατεργά-
ζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμη, ἡ δὲ δοκίμη ἔλπις, ἡ δὲ ἔλπις οὗ κατασχίζει,
which is itself an expansion of James 13. ὁ δοκίμιον ὡμός τῆς πίστεως
κατεργάζεται υπομονῆν τὸ ὑπομόνον ἐργον τέλευον ἐκτὸ ὦ ἥτο τέλειον.
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. 822, οὗ προέρχεται καὶ
προφέρεται ... ὡς δὲ προφέρεται, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν καὶ οὗ ἐκάλεσεν,
tούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν ὡς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδῷκασεν, ib. 1014,
Herm. Mem. v. 2. ἐκ τῆς ἀφροσύνης γίνεται πικρία, ἐκ δὲ τῆς πικρίας
θυμὸς, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὀργή, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς μῦνας. 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 πίστις 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. 2:8 χάρις ἐστε σεσώσμενοι διὰ πίστεως), the other virtues may be said to be contained in it. It is not quite so clear that each of the series is in like manner dependent on that which immediately precedes, though this would suit 1, 2, and 7. Possibly the writer may have used ἐν as the connecting link in his climax without considering whether it retained its full force in each case; or he may have intended to mark, not the addition of a distinct virtue, but the infusion of a new quality in the preceding virtue, which would suit 5 and 6; or again he may have had in his mind the poetic use of ἐν δὲ (perhaps derived from the repeated ἐν δὲ used in describing the successive compartments of the Homeric shield in ll. xviii.) to express addition, as in Soph. Oed. C. 55, Trach. 206. Other lists of virtues and graces will be found in Gal. 5:21 φίλως τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρὰ, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, πραύτης, ἐγκράτεια, 2 Cor. 6:6 (where S. Paul appeals to his sufferings and the spirit in which they were borne) ἐν ὑπομονῇ παλλὴ ..., ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι, ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ κ.τ.λ., 1 Tim. 6:11 διακω δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἁγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραΰταθιν, Αρος. 2:18 ὀιδὰ σου τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, καὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν, καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν σου, where the words which occur in our list are in thick type. It will be noticed that ἀγάπη occurs in all the four lists, πίστις in three, ὑπομονή in three. It is just these three which are chosen for mention in 1 Th. 1:3 and 2 Th. 1:4, where ὑπομονὴ ἑλπίδος takes the place of the single ἐπίτις in 1 Cor. 13:13. In none of the longer biblical catalogues, whether of virtues or vices, does the arrangement seem to rest on any more distinct principle than that in our text. We may compare also Hermas Vis. iii. 8 (explaining the vision of the Seven Virgins) κρατοῦνται δὲ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις, καθὼς καὶ γεγεννημέναι εἰσιν. ἐκ τῆς Πίστεως γενάται Ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς Ἐγκρατείας Ἀπλότης, ἐκ τῆς Ἀπλότητος Ἀκακία, ἐκ τῆς Ἀκακίας Σεμνότης, ἐκ τῆς Σεμνότητος Ἐπιστήμη, ἐκ τῆς Ἐπιστήμης Ἀγάπη, which is perhaps modelled on this passage; Barn. ii. τῆς ὡν πίστεως ἡμῶν εἰσὶν βοηθοὶ φόβῳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ, τὰ δὲ συμμαχοῦσάν ἡμῖν μακροθυμία καὶ ἐγκράτεια τούτων μενόντων τὰ πρὸς Κύριον ἀγών, συνεφραίνονται αὐτῶν σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη, γνώσις. In i. Clem. R. 1 πίστις, εὔσεβεία, γνώσις are found together, and in 62 we have περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μετανοίας καὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς πάντα τύποι εὐθλαφήσαμεν.

ἀρετήν.] ‘Moral energy.’ Strenuus animae tonus et vigor Bengel, equivalent to 1 Pet. 1:13 ἀναξιωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφων τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν. It is found in this sense in 2 Macc. 6:31 τὸν ἐαντὸν θάνατον ὕποδειγμα γενναίωτατος καὶ μημόσυνων ἀρετῆς κατέλιπεν, 4 Mc. 9:18, 12:14, 17:12, Plut. Mor.
169 c ἀρετῆς ἐλπίς ὁ θεὸς ἔστιν, οὐ δειλίας πρόφασις. Since it is here simply one in a series of virtues, this seems better than to take it in the more general sense of virtue, as in 2 Macc. 15:12, 3 Macc. 6:1, Wisd. 4:1, in which case it would answer to the ἕργα of James 2:26 πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἔστι, cf. 1 Joh. 5:5.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τῆς γνώσεως.] This agrees with Joh. 7:17 εάν τις θέλη τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, only that the object of γνώσεως 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 γνώσῃ τῆς 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 ἀκολούθα, 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 of ἐγκράτεια (Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 847), and again ἀκρασία ἀρετῆς ἡ ἐγκράτεια (ib. Str. ii. p. 484); cf. also Str. iii. p. 538. It closes the list of the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5:25, cf. 1 Cor. 9:25 πᾶς ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ib. 7:9 εἰ δὲ σοῦ ἐγκρατεύοντα, γαμήσάτωσαν, Gen 43:31 (of Joseph restraining his tears) ἐξελθὼν ἐνεκρατεύσατο. It was one of the topics of Paul's address before Felix.

ἐν τῇ ἐγκράτειᾳ τῆς ὑπομονῆς.] For ὑπομονή see my note on James 1:3. It corresponds to the Aristotelian καρτερία, which is distinguished from ἐγκράτεια in Mag. Mor. ii. 6. 34 ἡ μὲν ἐγκράτεια ἐστὶ περὶ ἡδονῆς καὶ ἡ ἐγκράτεια τὸς χρόνου, ἡ δὲ καρτερία περὶ λύπης· ὁ γὰρ καρτερῶς καὶ ὑπομένων τὰς λύπας, ὡς καρτερικὸς ἐστιν. The cognate verb is used of Moses (Heb. 11:27) τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὅραν ἐκκατέργασεν.

ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τῆς εὐσέβειας.] The martyr in 4 Macc. 5:23, 33 combines ὑπομονή, εὐσέβεια, and φιλὴ ἐγκράτεια. No doubt εὐσέβεια here, as in v. 3, is in tacit opposition to the ἀσέβειας 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 εὐσέβειᾳ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τῆς ἀγάπης.] Cf. 1 Joh. 4:20 εάν τις εἰπῃ ὅτι Ἀγαπᾷ τῶν Θεῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ μοιχή, ψεύτης ἔστιν and Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2:9 'Brethren are those who are united together in Christ to God as their Father.' (Joh. 20:17, 21:23, Matt. 12:50). φιλαδελφία (1 Th. 4:9, Rom. 12:10, Heb. 13:1, 1 Pet. 1:22, where see Hort, 38) leads up to ἀγάπη. Cf. 1 Th. 3:12 ὡς δύσι πλεονάσας καὶ περισσεύεσθαι 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. 15 (spoken of the prophet Jeremiah) ὁ φιλάδελφος σῶτος ἐστιν ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ. The noun φιλαδελφία occurs twice in Clem. R. 47 ἡ περιβάλλον φ. and 48 ἡ σεμνή τῆς φ. ἡμῶν ἄγνη ἄγωγη. 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 ὄσπερ ἀρχὴ καὶ στοιχεῖον τῆς πρὸς ἄπαντας ἀνθρώπους εὐνοίας... ἐπεται τῷ φιλαδελφῷ μὲν ὁ φιλοίκειος, τῷ φιλοίκειῳ δὲ ὁ φιλόστρατος, τῷ φιλοστράτῳ δὲ ὁ φιλανδρός. We may compare Plato’s famous description of the development of ἐρωτ (Symp. 210).

The relation between the seven virtues may be thus stated. Faith is the gift of God already received; to this must be added (1) Moral Strength which enables a man to do what he knows to be right; (2) Spiritual discernment; (3) Self-control by which a man resists temptation; (4) Endurance by which he bears up under persecution or adversity; (5) right feeling and behaviour towards God; (6) towards the brethren, (7) towards all.

8. τάτια γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα.] ‘The possession of these qualities and their continued increase.’ πλεονάζω in classical writers is a term of disparagement, implying excess, to be, or to have, more than enough, to exaggerate. In the N.T. (except in 2 Cor. 8:15 ὁ τὸ πολὺ (συλλέξας) οὐκ ἐπλεύνασε, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλπιττόθησεν, which is a quotation from Exod. 16:18) it is eulogistic, implying increase or abundance of what is good, as in 2 Cor. 4:15 ἢ τὸ χαρίς πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειών τὴν εὐαρεστίαν περισσοτέρη ἐις τὴν ὀδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, grace being multiplied through the more (i.e. through the increase in the number of the disciples) may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the glory of God,’ Phil. 4:17 ἐπίζητο τὸν καρπὸν τὸν πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν ‘I long for the fruit that increaseth to your credit,’ 2 Th. 1:3 ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἐνός ἐκάστος πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους ‘your faith groweth exceedingly and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth,’ Rom. 5:20 νόμος παρεισήλθεν ἢ πλεονάζῃ τὸ παράπτωμα, οὐ δὲ ἐπέλυσεν ἡ ἀμαρτία ὑπερεπερισσούσεν ἡ χαρίς ‘where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.’ In the only other passage of the N.T. in which the verb occurs (1 Th. 3:12) it has a transitive force ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάζαι (‘make you to increase’) καὶ περισσοτέρησαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ. It will have been noticed how often the verb περισσεῖν is joined with πλεονάζω in these passages. There is indeed a remarkable similarity

1 We might have expected that (3) and (4) would be immediately subordinate to (1), preceding γνῶσις.
between them both in their uses and in their history. The prevailing classical use reminds one of the πρέπει αγαπήν, the Aristotelian μέταμορφος, the Greek hatred of the ἀπεραίων, 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 ὑπερπεραίωςμα τῇ χαρᾷ, in 1 Tim. 114 ὑπερ-


tελεόνομον ἢ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, in Eph. 320 τῷ δυναμεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπεραίωσθαι ὡς αἰτούμεθα τῇ νοοῦμεν, cf. 1 Th. 310, 513. The very word ὑπερβολή chosen by Aristotle to express the vice of excess (Eth. N. ii. 8. 1 δῶν οὐσῶν κακῶν τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολῆν, τῆς δὲ κατ' ἴλλευσιν) is employed to express surpassing goodness, as in 1 Cor. 1221 ἐκ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὀδὸν δεικνύμι, 2 Cor. 417 τὸ παραπτώμα ἅμαρτίας τῆς ϑαλάμεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, Eph. 319 γνώμαι τῇ ὑπερβάλλουσιν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, iv. 27, 2 Cor. 310, 311.

οὐκ ἄργος οὐδὲ ἀκάπτων καθύττησιν 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 καθύττησιν 'show.' So Schott 'lässt euch nicht träg noch fröhlicheer 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 αὐξάνετε εἰς χάριν καὶ γνώσει 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 ἡκούσατε καὶ ἐπίγνωσατε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ... goes on to tell them of his prayer ἵνα πληρωθῇ τῷ ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ εἰς πάση σοφία καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ... ἐν παντὶ ἐργῷ ἀγαθῷ καρποφόρουσαν καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ: cf. Phil. 19 προσευχόμασιν ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἡμῶν ἐτί μᾶλλον περισσεύη εἰς ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει. So we read in Heb. 122 διafortūn eis tōn tῆς πίστεως ἄρχεσθαι καὶ τελειώτην. Above all, see Joh. 173 compared with 1 Cor. 1312 ἀρτι γινώσκω 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. γνῶσις δὲ αἰτία πολλὰ διδασκόμενος is an experience which the Christian has no need to learn from others.

καθιστήμεν.] It is curious that there is no other precise example of this use in the N.T., common as it is in classical Greek. The nearest are the passives in Rom. 5:19 ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, κ.τ.λ.

We have still to ascertain the exact force of εἰς after ἄργονις and ἀκάρπους. ‘Not idle for the attainment of knowledge’ is simple enough, but the phrase ‘not fruitless for knowledge’ or ‘fruitful with a view to knowledge’ is perhaps, as Schott says, a less natural expression. Still I think we should find no difficulty in such a phrase as ‘his prolonged and laborious studies were fruitful for the advance (or the attainment) of knowledge’ or ‘bore fruit in knowledge,’ where ‘in’ expressive of result would be equivalent to the Greek εἰς. The use of the word ἀκάρπους is perhaps borrowed from the ἀκάρπα of Jude v. 12.

9. τις γὰρ μη ἑρεστίν τάοτα, τυφλὸς ἑστιν.] 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.

μωστάτων.] 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 μωστάτων καὶ ἀπουστρεφο-μένη (blinking and turning away).’ Suidas gives the following interpretations, μωστάτων = τυφλότωτο (corrected from MS. τὸ φυλάττω): μωστάτων = μωστάτων, παρακαμάτων (half-closing the eyes), ἄκρως τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς προσέχων (observing, as it were, with the edge of his eyes). The same explanation is given under the form μυστάτεσεν.1 Spitta thinks that

1 Dr. Bigg (p. 259) is of opinion that the correct form of the verb is either μυστάτεις (cf. ὅπωτάτεις) or μωστάτεις (cf. ὅμωτάτεις). But ὅμωτάτεις is not formed from ὅμωτα, which does not exist, but from the Aristotelian ὅμωτας. So ὅπωτάτεις comes from ὅπωτα, like ἀντίω from ἀντίω, συκτιάω from συκτίως, ἑξίωσεν from ἑξίωσο. Nouns ending in -ωψ or -ου usually give rise to verbs in -ωμαι, as ἄκρω ἄκρωται, μακάω μακαται, σκοῦσκαλοταίω, and so μυστάτω, ‘gadfly’ or ‘goad,’ μωστάτω. When it was desired to find a verb for the other sense, μωστάτω was chosen (like παρακαλέω from σκέτω, ἀπηλαυçω from ἀλλος), though μωστάτω would have been perhaps an easier formation, as we find μωστάτω, μοστάτω, μοστάτας. The form -ενω is also found in derivatives from words ending in -ωψ, as ὅπως, κλαπταίω; see Lobeck’s careful investigation of the whole subject in his Ρηματικών.
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 μυωσ; if he screws up his eyes, it is in order that he may see, not that he may avoid seeing, cf. Arist. Probl. xxxi. 16 διὰ τὶ οἱ μῦντες συνάγοντες τὰ βλέφαρα ὅρισαν; ... ἵνα ἀλρωτέρα ἡ ὑψὸς ἕξεν δι’ ἐλάττονος ἐξούσια, καὶ μὴ εἰδής ἔξ ἀναστερμένου ἐξούσια διασπασθή, and Cope’s n. on Ῥεθ. iii. 11.13 ‘the involuntary contraction of the half-closed eyes of the short-sighted man is compared to the sputtering of the lamp, when water is poured upon it’: ἄμφω γὰρ συνάγεται ‘because both are contracted.’ The relation between μυων and τυφλός is not that of climax, but of correction or limitation. This is well explained by Beza, Estius, and others, of the near-sightedness which confines the view to earth (Jude v. 10, 2 P. 2 12). Cf. Anton. iv. 29 δ καταμύνω τῷ νοση ὀμματί, Greg. Naz. Antim. et Res. 186 λ οἱ πρὸς τὸν κόσμον ὀρίστες πρὸς τὸν διὰ τούτον δηλομένου ἀμπλωστούν, Clem. Rom. i. 3 εἰ τῇ πίστει ἀμβλυσπήσαται, Clem Al. p. 116 ἀμβλυσπόντες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Hippol. Ref. v. 16 where Isaac’s blessing of Jacob is called ἀμβλυνωτοῦς εὐλογία, Plato 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’: τῷ περὶ τὸ ἄμφω τοὐτῶν τῇ ἀγάθῃ ἐπερτήμα καὶ ἤγια ἀνεστερεί περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ἀντιπ. c. 86 A ὃ τῷ ἀμβλυσπόντι καὶ δὲ ἀγάθος ἀνεστερεί τῇ ἀλήθειαν. Ἡσιόδ. περὶ ποιτίας τῆς πίστεως, Ἡσιόδ. Ισαάκ’s blessing of Jacob is called ἀμβλυνωτοῦς εὐλογία, Plato 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’: τῷ περὶ τὸ ἀμβλυσπόντι καὶ δὲ ἀγάθος ἀνεστερεί περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ἡσιόδ. περὶ ποιτίας τῆς πίστεως, Ἡσιόδ. The vulg. and boh. translate ‘manu tentans.’

λῆθνα λαβῶν.] The phrase occurs in Timocles Dionysiazea (b.c. 340) δ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ὁδῶν ἁλθην λαβῶν, Jos. Ant. ii. 6. 9 ὤμος βούλομαι καὶ αὐτοῖς λῆθην ἐκείνων λαβῶντας ἀδεσθῶ, id. iv. 8. 44, Ael. V.H. iii. 18, Hist. An. iv. 35, cf. Job 721 ὑποκάτω τῇ ἁνομίᾳ μου λήθην, Deut. 819, Wisd. 1111: other exx. in Wetstein. Such phrases as λῆθην ἐχειν, ποιῶσαι, ἐπιοικῶ εἰς the best authors. For a similar use of λαμβάνω see 2 Tim. 15 ύπόμνησιν λαμβάνων τῆς πίστεως, Ἡσιόδ. 11εἰρην λαβῶντες (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. 113 14.

tοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτίων. Cf. Heb. 13 δ' εἰς τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ ποιησάμενος τῶν ἀμαρτίων ἡμῶν, Joh. 325 ἐγένετο ἐξήνοι ... 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 δ ὁ μής ἀντίτυπον νῦν σφένει βάπτισμα, οὗ σαρκός ἀπάθειας ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἡγαθῆς ἐπερτήμα εἰς Θεον, 1 Cor. 611 καὶ ταῦτα πιέσε ἔτε: ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσατε, ἀλλὰ ἠγιάσθητε, Eph. 525 δ' Χριστὸς ἡγάτησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐκ ἄτομον παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγία καθαρισθή τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὦδυσ ἐν ῥήματι, Tit. 35 εἰσελθὼν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακατωνόσεως τευμάτως ἁγίου, Rom. 68 the words of Peter in Acts 238 μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτισθήτω


1 Hundhausen, following Ti. and Treg., prefers the reading of ΝΑΚ ἀμαρτη-ματῶν on account of its comparative rarity and because it might naturally be altered to suit Heb. 11.
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10 Ewald and Hundhausen prefer the reading of ΝΑ syrr. sah. boh. (σπουδάσατε ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἑργῶν βεβαιῶν . . . ποιήσετε), which is also thought possible by Hort.

1 Ewald and Hundhausen prefer the reading of ΝΑ syrr. sah. boh. (σπουδάσατε ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἑργῶν βεβαιῶν . . . ποιήσετε), which is also thought possible by Hort.
As a blind or short-sighted man might do (Joh. 11:19).

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 ν. 5.

The usual biblical equivalent is ξωή αἰώνων 'boldness to enter into the holy place,' 1 Th. 1:9, 21, Acts 13:24.

It is curious that the phrase αἰώνιοι βασιλείαι does not occur elsewhere either in the N.T. or in the Apostolic Fathers. The earliest other examples appear to be Aristides Αρολ. xvi (quoted on 2² below) and Clem. Ημ. x. 25 αἰώνια βασιλείας κληρονόμου. From the Index published by the Lightfoot Trustees I learn that άδιος β. occurs in the same viii. 23, xiii. 20, Ep. Clem. 11. In the LXX. we find ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάνω των αἰώνων (Ps. 144:13), Κύριος βασιλείων τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἐπ’ αἰώνα καὶ ἐτς (Exod. 15:18), ἐξουσία αἰώνως (Dan. 4:31 7:14), cf. Ps. 101:38, αἰώνιος κληρονομία Heb. 9:15, δόξα αἰώνως 1 Pet. 5:10. The usual biblical equivalent is ξωὴ αἰώνων often found

1 In Mart. Polyc. 20, where codd. b p have αἰώνων β., Lightfoot reads ἐπορφάνων βασιλείαν with cod. m.
with κληρονόμος, etc. as in Mt. 19\(^2^\), Mk. 10\(^7\), Lk. 10\(^2^\), 18\(^1\), Tit. 3\(^7\), Heb. 9\(^3\), James 2\(^3\), 1 Pet. 1\(^4\). St. John prefers ἔχειν ζωὴν which occurs in his Gospel 3\(^1\)\(^5\), 16, 36, 5\(^2\)\(^4\), 39, 6\(^4\)\(^0\), 47, 54, 68, and indeed passim. The former expression implies that the life is thought of as future, the latter as already present. St. Paul seems to speak of it as future in Rom. 2\(^7\), 5\(^7\), 6\(^2\), 2 Cor. 4\(^1\)\(^7\), 18, Gal. 6\(^2\), 1 Tim. 1\(^6\), 2 Tim. 4\(^1\), Tit. 1\(^2\); perhaps as present in 1 Tim. 6\(^1\)\(^2\) ἐπίλαβον τῆς αἰωνίας ζωῆς, cf. Col. 1\(^1\)\(^3\), Eph. 2\(^9\) : Jude (v. 21) refers to it as future. We must beware however of supposing that these views are mutually exclusive.\(^1\) The unity of the divine life in man, whether here or there, and its perfection in the life which follows this, are equally declared in Col. 3\(^3\) ἀπεθάνετο γὰρ (in your baptism) καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυμαι σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ: ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερώθη, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς φανερώσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ, and in 1 Joh. 3\(^2\) νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ οὖν εἰς φανερώθη τῇ ἐσόμεθα· οὗτοι δὲ ἐκ νυν, εἰς φανερώθη, ὑμοίοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτε ὑμεθα αὐτῶν καθὼς ἐστίν. The same double view is seen in the use of the phrases βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν, etc., which stand sometimes for the Gospel dispensation or the Church on earth, and sometimes (as in 2 Tim. 4\(^1\)\(^8\) ῥυστεραὶ με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐργόν ποιηρὸν καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουρανίαν) for the glory hereafter. In this passage, as in our text, the kingdom is spoken of as belonging to Christ, compare also Mt. 16\(^2\)\(^8\), 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 ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, so Mt. 28\(^1\)\(^8\), 1 Cor. 15\(^2\)\(^4\), Joh. 18\(^3\)\(^6\), Eph. 5\(^5\) κληρονομιὰν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, Apoc. 11\(^1\)\(^5\), Lk. 22\(^2\)\(^9\), 30, 23\(^2\), and Messianic prophecies in the O.T. as Ps. 2\(^6\).

12. διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομυνήσκειν 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. if the promises referred to in v. 4, and of the way in which their faith was to be built up in virtue and knowledge (vv. 4–8).

μελλήσω.] See Introduction on the Text. The only parallel cited for this use of the future tense is Mt. 24\(^6\) where, after prophesying of the false Christs who should appear before his Second Coming, our Lord, continues μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους, which some take (like the present μέλλειν in Mt. 21\(^3\) μέλλει ζητέων) as a periphrasis for the future. But μελλήσω suggests a further future contemplated from the ground of a nearer future, implying 'you must then be prepared for, you must then expect,' a meaning which is out of the question in our text. I think therefore that Field is right in reading μελλήσω 'I shall take care to remind you.' This thought of the duty of reminding his readers, appears again in vv. 13 and 15, and in 3\(^1\) ἀεὶ implies a prospect of frequent communication between him and them.

καὶ τερίτ έιδώτας.] Cf. for construction Heb. 5\(^5\), 7\(^5\), 12\(^1\). In Heb. 4\(^3\) we find the unclassical καίτοι τῶν ἐργῶν γενηθέντων. The connexion with ὑπομυνήσκειν 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.

When Jesus warned St. Peter of his approaching fall, he added the word of comfort and joy to the knowledge of the Saviour. In Col. 15:6 Paul speaks of the hope which the Colossians had received in a strict temporal sense, it might suggest, like Phil. 3:16 and 5:11 pneuma hagion στηριγμοι, με, ib. 11:23, Clem. R. 35 στηριγμένη διά πίστεως πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; but is not found in classical authors. It is difficult to see the force of παρούση. Editors refer back to πάρεστιν ν. 9, but this would add nothing to what is already expressed in the sentence. If we take παρούση in a strict temporal sense, it might suggest, like Phil. 3:16 and κράτε δ’ έχεις in Apoc. 3:11, that there is a wider, higher truth than they have yet attained, but that they are to make the best of what they have got. If this is so, it seems to take us back to the state of things described before the 5th v. where they are said to have received all that is necessary for salvation through the knowledge of the Saviour. In Col. 15:6 Paul speaks of the hope which the Colossians had received in the truth which has come to you, but it is not a natural expression, and the close resemblance to Jude v. 3 and 5, together with the parallels in Jude 3 τῆς ἀπαθείας τοῦ εἰαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, translated by Lightfoot ‘which reached you.’ So the meaning here might be established in the truth which has come to you,’ but it is not a natural expression, and the close resemblance to Jude v. 3 and 5, together with the parallels in Jude 3 τῆς ἀπαθείας τοῦς ἀγίους πίστει and 2 P. 21 seem to me to favour Spitta’s emendation παραδοθείσα for παρούση, ‘established in the truth handed down to you.’ Such repetitions are not infrequent in 2 P.1

13. δικαίων δὲ ἡγομαι.] His first reason for reminding them was the gain to his readers, the second his duty as an Apostle, cf. Phil. 3:16 τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ ὁμοιόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλέος, ib. 17, Eph. 6:4. This duty was now more urgent from the approach of death. For this particular use, as well as for the general sense, compare the farewell address of Moses in Jos. Ant. iv. 8. 2 ἐπεὶ χρόνον ἤτων ἐκόσι καὶ ἐκατὸν ἤγνωσεν δεὶ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν δὲ ταῖς ἡγέων σαμαριταίων ὑμῖν... αδίκων τε ὑμῖν προγιματισμαθαὶ τὴν τῶν ἁγιαθῶν ἀπόλλονος, καὶ μνήμη μὴ με ἐμαυτῷ... μήτε νομίμων τῷ ἔρωτα πατρὸν τὸν ἄλλην προτιμήσῃς διὰ τὰ τέλη, μὴτ’ εὖ σε ἐβ’ ἐ’ α’... καταφρονήσατες εἰς ἄλλον μεταστήσῃς τρόπον. A little below we read ταῦτα δ’ οὐκ ὁμοίως ὑμῖν προεικόμενον, οὐ γὰρ... εὖ τοῦ ζῆν διὰ τὸν ἡγεμόνα κατατάσσετε κατὰ τοὺς ζησούς, εἰ σ’ τῇ ἔρωτα λαμπάς σιν τὰ σῶμα φέρων, and at the end ἡ δὲ μὴ δι’ ἀμαθίαν τοῦ κράτους καί ἄγιον ἄπονείσθαι, συνέθηκα ἑμῖν καὶ νόμους.

1 Compare however the Traditions f Matthias quoted in Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 453 init. θαῦμα σημαν τὰ πάροντα, βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἑπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθέμενο.
NOTES

I 12–14] 

... έφ' δόσων εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι.] Cf. Mt. 9:15 ἐφ' δόσων μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν οὐ νυμβός, Rom. 11:13 ἐφ' δόσων εἰμι ἡγων ἄποστόλος. This seems to be the first instance of the use of the σκήνωμα in this sense: it is used in the literal sense of ‘tent’ in Deut. 33:14. σκήνως is similarly used in 2 Cor. 5:1 ἐπὶ ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνων καταλύθη, οἰκοδομημένη ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαι ἀληθείας αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, where σκήνως seems to be so far identified with σῶμα, that the original figure of the tent or hut has to be recalled by the use of the synonym οἰκία, ib. v. 4, Wisd. 9:16 βρίσκει τὸ γεώδες σκήνος νοῦν πολυφρόντια, also in profane Greek, e.g. Plato Αξ. 365, Τιμ. Λocr. 103. We may compare Job. 19:13 τοὺς κατοικούντας οἰκίας πτηνάς, Isa. 38:13 where the body is spoken of under the figure of ‘a shepherd’s tent.’ Later Ecclesiastical writers have followed our author’s use of σκήνωμα, e.g. Ep. ad Diogn. 3:16 ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχή ἐν ὠντίῳ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ, Eus. H.E. iii. 31 Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου ... τῆς μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ βίου τῶν σκηνωμάτων ἀπόθεσιας ὁ χώρος δεδήλωται, with Heinichen’s n. Weiss thinks the metaphor has reference to the pilgrim life of the Christian, comparing 1 Pet. 2:11.

... τοιαύτης τοιαύτης] The same phrase is repeated in 3:14. Elsewhere in the N.T. διεγείρω is used literally of waking from sleep, except in Joh. 18:18 of the tossing of the waves. It is used, as here, of the mind in 2 Macc. 15:9 ἐπιστομονήσας αὐτούς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐς ἴσαν ἐκτελεκτές, προθυμοσύνους αὐτοῖς κατέστησας καὶ τοῖς θυροῖς διεγείρας κ.τ.λ., ib. 7:21; Test. Dan. 4 διεγείρει ἐν θυμῷ μεγάλῳ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. For the use of ἐν see Blass G. T. Gr. § 38. 1, § 41.

... ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου.] ἀπόστειμαι is frequently used of putting off a garment as in Acts 7:58 (see my n. on James 12:1), and ἀπόθεσις occurs in Lucian Ηipp. 5 of the ἀπόδοτηρίαν in the bath. Its combination with σκηνώμα τα herein reminds us of 2 Cor. 5:24 where ἐνδύσασθαι and ἐκδύσασθαι are used with reference to the earthly and the heavenly οἰκήμη. Perhaps it is from this passage that Clement of Alexandria has borrowed the phrase σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις in Str. i. p. 374 and ἡ ἀπόθεσις τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰς τὴν ... εἰχάριστον τοῦ σκήνος ἀπόδοσιν, ib. iv. p. 636. τὰ χαίνοντας ἔχει in accordance with the use of ταχύς in Plato Ρεπ. 553 d οἷς εἴπατ’ ἀλλὰ μεταβολή οὗτοι ταχεῖα τε καὶ ἤχωρα, Ευρ. Ηipp. 1047. We may compare St. Paul’s words to the elders of Ephesus when he thought he should see them no more, Acts 20:25-28, and his final charge to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:1 foll.) διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ἠώνες καὶ νεκροὺς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτῶν ... κήρυξον τὸν λόγον ἐπιστεθή ἐκκαίος ἀκαίρως ... ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδωμαι καὶ δ καὶρός τὸς ἀναλύουσιν μοι ἐφέστηκεν.

... καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσεν μοι.] One’s first thought here is of the prophecy of Peter’s death, contained in Joh. 21:18. ὃτε ἦς νεώτερος, ἐξώνυμες σεαυτόν καὶ περιστέασιν ὑπὸν ἠθέλες· ὅταν δὲ γνώρισθης, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖρας σου καὶ ἀλλος ἔσθε σε καὶ ὀδεύς ὅπου οὐθένες. τούτῳ δὲ εἶπεν σημαινον ποίω 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. ἐπεί, ὡς ἐδείχθην ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, αἱ τῶν θάνατον μον ἡγγίκασιν ἡμέραι. Compare similar intimations in the life of St. Paul (Acts 16:9, 18:21, 23:11, 27:23).

15. σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς.] This goes beyond the intention, expressed in vv. 12 and 13, of continually reminding his readers of certain truths. That intention was limited to his own earthly life; here he speaks of making provision for them after his death. The form σπουδάσω is used by Polybius and later writers for the classical σπουδάσομαι. There seems to be only one other recorded example of the acc. c. inf. after σπουδάζω, Plato Alc. sec. 141 σπουδάσαντες τοῦ αὐτοῦ παραγενέσθαι, but it is not uncommon with the cognate σπεύδω, which shares most of its uses. Thus Blass (Gr. p. 223) compares Herm. Sim. ix. 3. 2 ἔλεγον τοῖς ἀνδράσι σπεύδεις τὸν πύργον οἰκοδομεῖον, so Herod. i. 74 ἔστησαν εἰρήνην ἑωτοῦ οἰκεῖον γενέσθαι, Plato Crit. 45 ε τοιαῦτα σπεύδεις περὶ σαυτὸν γενέσθαι, Arist. Pæd. 672 ἐσπευδεῖν εἶναι μὴ μάχας. The infinitive however and even the passive infinitive is not uncommon after σπουδάζω, see Plato Euthyd. 293 ἐ σπουδ. ἐπιδείξαι, Eur. Hec. 337 σπ. μὴ στερηθήσαι βιῶν. For ἔχω with infin. cf. Mt. 18:25 μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι, Eph. 4:28 ἵνα ἐχθρ. μεταδοθᾶν τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι, Heb. 6:13. ἑκάστοτε 'on each occasion,' whenever there is need: used here only in N. T. and LXX.

μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.] The emphatic pronoun contrasts the continued activity of his book with his own decease. The same phrase is used in the account of the Transfiguration (Lk. 9:31) ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἡμὶ ἐμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ, Wisd. 3:2 ἑλογίσθη κάκωσις ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν, ib. 7:6 μία πάντων εἰσόδων εἰς τὸν βίον ἔξοδος τε ἵνα, Ἰοσ. Ant. iv. 8. 2 ἐκ ἔξοδον τοῦ ἐξῆν, Iren. iii. 1. 1 (ἀρ. Eus. H. E. v. 8.) μετὰ τὴν τούτων (i.e. Peter and Paul) ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητής καὶ ἐρμηνεύτης Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτῶς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγραφῶς ἡμὶν παραδίδοικε. Did Irenaeus mean this as an interpretation of our passage? Did he find in it an allusion to the Gospel which St. Mark was believed to have taken down from the lips of St. Peter? 

τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.] The words μνήμη and μνεία combine the meanings 'memory' 'memorial' 'mention.' The former word is only used here in the N.T. but occurs in Ps. 30:4, ib. 97:12, Prov. 1:19, Eccl. 11:1, 210. The phrase μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι is found in Ps. 1114, Rom. 19, Eph. 1:16, Philem. 4, etc. in the sense 'to make mention,' see Robinson on the Epistle to the Ephesians pp. 279 f.; μνείαν ἔχειν has the sense 'to remember' in 1 Th. 3:5. 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 οἶδαμοι μνείαν περὶ συνθηκῶν πεποίητας, Plato Protag. 317 A περὶ δὲν μνείαν ἐποίου πρὸς ἡμί (for μνείαν ποιεσθαι); Plat. Legg. 798 b (for μνείαν ἔχειν). Similarly we find μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι 'to mention' in Herod. i. 15, Polyb. 2. 7. 12, ib. 2. 71. 1 τόνος χάριν ἑπορομέμβαθα τὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὑπὲρ τοῦ προειρημένου πολεμοῦ μνήμην; while μνήμην ἔχειν 'to remember' occurs in Plato Theaet. 163 b, Polit. 306 δ ἢ καὶ μνήμην χρείας ὑπάρχον πρῶτον αὐτῷ δρῶσιν. The distinction however is less rigidly observed in the case of μνήμη. Thus we find τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγου τι πρῶτερον μνήμην ἔχον φάμενοι κ.τ.λ., Herod. iv. 81, ib. 79, in the sense of 'mention,' and μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι in the sense of 'remember' in Thuc. ii. 54 (as to whether λάμος or λαμός was the right reading in the prophecy) πρὸς ἐπαναχων τῆς μνήμης ἐποιεῖν 'accommodated their memory to their experience.' Even μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι seems to be used in this sense in Job 1418 τὰς μοι χρόνον ἐν ὧν μνείαν μον ποιήσῃ, cf. λήπην ποιεῖσθαι, 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. σεσοφισμάνοις μυθοῖς ἐξακολουθήσαντες.] In the N.T. ἐξακολουθεῖν occurs only here and below, 22, 215. It is found in Amos 24 τὰ μάταια ...οὶ ἐξηκολουθησαν οἱ πατέρες, Isa. 5611 ταῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐξηκολουθησαν. The phrase μύθους ἔξεκα. occurs, as Wetstein has pointed out, in Jos. Ant. proem. 3 οἱ ἄλλοι νομιζότα τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων οἱ τῶν θεῶν τὴν αἰεχθὴν μετέθεσαν, which is itself borrowed from Philo M. I. 1 μύθους πλασάμενοι. 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, Eccl. 219. Sometimes the latter is used to express quibbling, as in Sir. 3720 ἐστι σοφιζόμενος ἐν λόγοις μισθίς. Both uses are found in classical writers, as well as the transitive use which we have here, cf. ὅσα προφάσεως χάριν σοφίζων πρὸς τῶν δήμων Arist. Pol. iv. 13. For the passive L. and S. quote Greg. Nyss. i. 171 σεσοφισμένη μήτηρ 'supposititious.' The phrase here is not unlike Pind. Ol. i. 46 f. δεδαιδαλ-μένοι πεφέδει ποικίλοις ἐξαπατώτει μῦθοι. 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 μύθον, which is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful gnostic genealogies: 'our belief is not founded on fables as theirs is.'

1 Dr. Bigg thinks that μῦθος here must bear the sense of 'a fiction which embodies a truth—an allegorism.' 'The False Teachers must have maintained that the Gospel miracles were to be understood in a spiritual sense, and not regarded as facts.' But the first thing we have to ascertainless 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.'
We, who were witnesses on the Holy Mount.

The word *parousia* is used of the Second Advent below 3:4 and 3:12, twice in James, once in John, several times in the Epp. to the Thessalonians, once in 1 Cor., and four times in Matt.; it is found also in Test. Jud. 22 ἐως τῆς *parousiās τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Equivalents are ἀποκάλυψις, found thrice in 1 Pet., once in 2 Th., once in 1 Cor.; and ἐπιφάνεια found in 2 Th. 2:8, 1 Tim. 6:14, 2 Tim. 4:1-8, Tit. 2:13; also the verb φανερώω in Col. 3:14, 1 Joh. 3:2. More commonly the verb ἔρχομαι is used, or ἡμέρα Κυρίου or Χριστοῦ: εἰσόδος is used in Mal. 3:2. *Sύναμις* has been already referred to in v. 3. Its connection with the *parousia* is shown in Mt. 24:30 ἔφυγεν τὸν ὄρον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομεν ἐπὶ τῶν νεφέλων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς, and in the Transfiguration, which was to the Three a foretaste of the *parousia*, and of which it was said οὗ ἡμᾶς ἑρμηνεύω τοὺς βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλπισθήναι ἐν δυνάμει (Mt. 9:2).

Σύναμις Γεννήθησαι] = ἐποτεύσαις in 1 P. 3:2, see also 1 P. 2:12, and Aesch. Prom. 299 ἐκ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὸν ὄρον ἔρχομαι ἑκεῖς ἐπότις; The word was used to denote the highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries. It was employed like other mystic terms by Plato and his followers, from whom it was borrowed by the Jews (Wisdom 14:23, Philo i. p. 146 fin.) and Christians, see Oh. 3 of my Introduction to Clem. Al. Str. vii. pp. 1: to lx. (‘Clement and the Mysteries’).

*Τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειώτητος.*] The word occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in the account of the healing of the demoniac (Lk. 9:48) ἐξηλόσοντο πάντες ἐπὶ τῆς μεγαλειώτητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, and of the goddess Artemis in Acts 19:27, see Lightfoot on Ign. Rom. inscr. p. 189, Jos. Ant. proem. 4 τὴν μεγαλειώτητα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The phrase τὰ μεγαλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is found in the text certainly implies that the belief of the faithful concerning the coming in glory was affirmed by the heretics to rest upon fabulous statements. Perhaps this may refer to such details as are given in Mt. 24:29-33 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 μυθοί followed by the heretics themselves? Dr. Bigg says they were allegorical misinterpretations of the Gospel miracles. But can μυθοί mean this? It is true that we are told of some who declared the resurrection to be already past (2 Tim. 2:17, 18), probably misinterpreting the teaching of St. Paul in such passages as Col. 2:2. But this is not the allegorization of a miracle but the one-sided spiritualization of a doctrine. The meaning of μυθοί 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 μυθοὶ might bear the sense of ‘allegorism.’ Examining these passages we find that two out of the four are joined with words which are certainly not suggestive of spiritual or allegorical interpretation, viz. 1 Tim. 1:4 μὴ δὲ προσέχειν μυθοὺς καὶ γένεαλογίας ἀπεράντων, ib. 4:7 τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γρααδέοις μυθοὺς παρατείνει: in Tit. 1:14 the μυθοὶ are defined as ‘λογικοὶ καὶ joined with ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστρέφων καὶ ἀλλήλων: in the remaining passage there is nothing to mark the character of the μυθοὶ 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 21. For the emphatic ἐκεῖνον cf. 2 Tim. 29. The ordinary pronoun would have been αὐτῷ following μεγ. Bengel says of ἐκεῖνον 'remotum quiddam et admirabile et magnum notat.'

17. λαβὼν—λόγον ν. 19]. The construction is broken off after εἰδοκίσα. I agree with Dietlein, Schott, and Ewald that the writer intended to go on ἐβεβηλώσεν τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, for which he substitutes καὶ ἔγορε βεβαιότερον, after the parenthetic 18th verse. See Blass pp. 283 foll., Winer p. 442 on varieties of Anacoluthon.

εἰς ταρτός. See n. on Jude 1.

τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν.] Alford's n. is 'Honour in the voice which spoke to Him: glory in the light which shone from Him,' and similarly Wordsworth. This, I think, corresponds to the general distinction between the words, τιμὴ being rather extrinsic, δόξα intrinsic. We find them combined in 1 P. 17, Rom. 27.10, 1 Tim. 117, Heb. 27.9, and six times in the Apocalypse. Cf. Heb. 13 ἐν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης.

καὶ καθηκον ἐν μεγαλοπρεπεῖς αὐτῷ τοιῶτα.] The only instance of τοιῶτα in biblical Greek. It is used here prospectively as in classical Greek, 'to the following effect.' Compare for the use of φέρω 1 Pet. 18 τὴν φερομένην ψύχαν χάριν and vv. 18 and 21 below.

ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.] In the Introduction on the Text I have stated why I think ἀπό should be read here for ὑπό. This is the only example of μεγαλοπρεπῆς in the N.T. It occurs in Deut. 3326 ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς τοῦ στερεόματος ('who rides in his excellency upon the sky,' A.V.), also in 2 Macc. 1513 μεγαλοπρεπεστάτην εἶναι τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ υπορέχην, id. 815 ἡ ἐπίκλησις τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς δύναματος αὐτοῦ. So ἡ μεγαλοπρεπεία σου is used of God in Ps. 81. The above phrase is found in Clem. Rom. i. 9 τελείως λειτουργήσαντα τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, with whom the adjective is common, and in Clem. Al. p. 793 τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότερον οἱ κατὰ τὴν τελείαν γνώσιν . . . καὶ τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῃ δόξῃ τετιμημένοι; there is a reference to the Transfiguration id. 812. Dr. Bigg calls attention to our author's fondness for these 'reverential paraphrases,' instancing θεία δύναμις ν. 3, θεία φύσις ν. 4 and gives the following examples, taken from Spitta, of a like fondness in Jewish Apocryphal writers: Test. Levi ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ (οὐρανῷ) πάντων καταλύει ἡ μεγάλη δόξα, Ascens. Is. xi. 32 et vidi quod sedit a dextera illius magnae gloriae (ed. Charles p. 146 τὰ ταῦτα ἡκούον τῆς δόξης τῆς μεγάλης λεγομένης τῷ κυρίῳ μου καὶ Χριστῷ), Enoch xiv. 20 ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη ἐκάθητο ἐπ' αὐτῷ (the throne): τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ ἡλίου λαμπρότερον (Charles p. 347), also c. 11. 3. So Heb. 81 ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ τῆς μεγαλούχονς ἐν τοις οὐρανοῖς.

It may be well to compare with the above account the synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration.

(1) The change in the appearance of Jesus.

Six days (Lk. about eight days) after Peter's confession made at Caesarea Philippi Jesus took with him Peter, James, and John, and went into a high mountain 1 (Luke adds 'to pray, and while he was praying')

1 Probably not Tabor, but one of the lower slopes of Hermon; see Eilersheim Messiah, vol. ii. p. 92 foll.
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(2) The appearance of Moses and Elijah.

(3) The words of Peter.

(4) The overshadowing cloud.

(5) The voice from Heaven.

(6) The end of the vision.

The chief points of resemblance between the Gospel narratives and our epistle are δόξαν in v. 17 and Lk. 9:32 εἶδον in v. 15 and Lk. 9:31 ἑλέγον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνθύεσθης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης in v. 17 and Mt. 17:5 νεφέλη φωτεινή (the Shechinah) ἐπεσκάδασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἵδον ἰδίων ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εἴδοκησα in v. 17 and Lk. 9:32 εἶδον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; ἑλέγον in v. 15 and Lk. 9:31 ἑλέγον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνθύεσθης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης in v. 17 and Mt. 17:5 νεφέλη φωτεινή (the Shechinah) ἐπεσκάδασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἵδον ἰδίων ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εἴδοκησα in v. 17 and Lk. 9:32 εἶδον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; ἑλέγον in v. 15 and Lk. 9:31 ἑλέγον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνθύεσθης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης in v. 17 and Mt. 17:5 νεφέλη φωτεινή (the Shechinah) ἐπεσκάδασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἵδον ἰδίων ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης; εἴδοκησα in v. 17 and Lk. 9:32 εἶδον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; ἑλέγον in v. 15 and Lk. 9:31 ἑλέγον τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ; φωνῆς ἐνθύεσθης ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης
Mt. 17, as in all the accounts of the Baptist. 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. ἐνεχθέσθη, seems to show that the voice preceded, and occasioned the receiving of the glory (λαβὼν τιμήν καὶ δόξαν). If we accept Alford's interpretation of τιμή as referring to the Voice this order would be correct as far as that word is concerned, but I do not see that we are bound to suppose δόξαν to be equally dependent on the Voice.

δὸς μου, δὸς ἀγαπητός μου, οὕτος ἐστιν.] Cf. the loose quotation from Isa. 42:1 in Mt. 12:18 ὁ παῖς μου ἤρεται, δὸς ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς δὲ εὐδοκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου. See note on 'The Beloved,' as a Messianic Title in Dr. Armitage Robinson's edition of the Ephesians, pp. 229–233.

εἰς ὑπὸ εὐδοκίας.] The construction of εὑς. with εἰς is only found here and in Mt. l.c. Elsewhere, as in Isa. 62:4, Mt. 17:5, and in all the synoptic accounts of the Baptism, εὑς. 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. ἐς οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθέσαν.] Heaven here corresponds to the bright cloud of the synoptics. The repetition of ἐνεχθέσαν from v. 17 is characteristic of the writer.

ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὀρέω.] This phrase, translated 'holy mount,' or 'holy hill,' is frequently used in the O.T. for the temple on Mt. Zion, in which it pleased Jehovah to dwell. We also read of holy ground, as where God appeared to Moses in the burning bush (Exod. 3:5), to Joshua (Jos. 5:15), of Jerusalem the holy city (Isa. 52:1, 63:18, Mt. 4:5, 27:53), and so of the new Jerusalem (Apoc. 21:12). Zahn (Einl. in das N.T. ii. p. 59) gives a quotation from the Gnostic Acts of Peter (ed. Lipsius, p. 67) in which the same name is given to the Mount of Transfiguration: Dominus noster volens me maiestatem suam videre in monte sacro etc.

19. ἐχομεν βεβαιότερον τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων.] We should rather have expected ἐχομεν, to suit the preceding ἴκουςαμεν; 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 βεβαιῶν τὴν κλῆσιν τουεῖθαι. Field illustrates from Isoc. ad Dem. p. 10 τὴν παρ' ἐκείνων εὐνοιαν βεβαιότεραν ἔχειν, Chaeremon ap. Stob. Flor. 79, 31 (Mein. vol. iii. p. 83) βεβαιότεραν ἔχε τὴν φιλίαν. Charit. iii. ἂ βεβαιότερον ἔχον τὸ θαρρεῖν. Cf. for ἐχον 1 Pet. 2:12 τὴν ἀναστροφήν ἐχοντες καλῆς, ἑβ. 4:9 τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες. The word προφητικός is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek except in Rom. 16:26 μυστηριῶν χρόνων αἰώνιως σεισμικοῦν, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διὰ τὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως . . . γνωρισθέντος. It occurs in Philo de Plantat. M. i. p. 347 τὸν τέσσαρα ἀριθμὸν . . . ἀποσεμνύνει ἐοικεν ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, Leg. All. M. i. p. 95 Μωσῆς 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 ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες Διόνυσον ἕφασαν γεγονέναι νῦν τὸν Δίος, Dial. 39 τούς σοφοὺς
. . . ὡσ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος ἀποδείκνυμι δόγματος, 56 (p. 276) Θεόν ἀντὶ τοῦ προφητικὸς λόγος σημαίνει, 77 (p. 302) πρὶν ἣ γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐν πατέρα ἣ μητέρα ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος ἐφή, 110, 128, 129, Clem. Rom. ii. 11. What is the prophetic word referred to? No one particular prophecy, but the whole body of declarations of the coming glory of the Messiah, such as Mal. 4, Isa. 60, 405, esp. v. 9 ὅπου ὕψιλον ἀνάβηθι ὁ εἰαγγελιζόμενος Σιών . . . εἰπὼν ταῖς πόλεως Ἰουδαίος Ἰδοῦ δόξα ἦμων. Compare St. Peter's remarks on messianic prophecy in Acts 217-26, 31-24, and Prahedic. Petri ap. Str. vi. p. 804 ἀναπτύσσεται τὰς βίβλους ἃς εἶχεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἡ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἡ δὲ Αἰνεθετικῶς καὶ αἰτολεξι̣ τον Ἰησοῦν ἀνομαζόντων, εὕρομεν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρῶν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πᾶσας ὡς ἐποίησον αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ τὴν ἐξέρχεται καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐράνιον ἀνάληψιν . . . ταῦτα ὡς οὕτως ἐπιτεύχθη τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτὸν. 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 prophecy supported by its fulfilment, and prophecy not so supported. So Cyril of Alexandria ap. Euth. Zig. ἢμεῖς αὐτοὶ ὁδηγοὶ τῶν ἀλλήλων ἐπισκεκράτησα μετ' αὐτοῦ ὠντες ἐν τῷ ὀρεί . . . διὰ τῆς ὄψεως βεβαιότερος τῶν προφητῶν ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο. ἀ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν, ταῦτα παρὼν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπιστάτασα, and most commentators, Orig. Princ. iv. 6 ἡ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιθημία δυναμένους ὑποτευεῖσθαι τὸν νόμον καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ὡς οὖ θεία, εἰς τούμανες ἤγαγεν, ἡς οὖν ὁ παρθένος ἁρπαγμαίην, Clem. Al. p. 778 πεπίστευκεν διὰ τί προφητείας διὰ τῇ παροσμίας τῷ μὴ ἐγνωμονήθη Θεῷ, καὶ δὲ πεπίστευκεν ξεῖα καὶ κρατεῖ τής ἐπαγγελίας . . . καὶ τῷ ἐκλογῇ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας βεβαιώσει κατέληξεν· ὃ δὲ τὴν ἐν ὅς ἐστιν κατάτασμα βεβαιῶν τῶν μελλόντων κατὰλήψιν εἰδὼς δὲ ἀγάπη προςπαντᾶ τῷ μέλλοντι. ὑπὸ κάλους ποιεῖται προσέχοντες.] On the phrase κάλους ποιεῖται cf. James 28 with my n.; on προσέχειν Ἰεβ. 21 περισσοτέρως προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκούον-θείσιν, Acts 89 προσευχήν τοῖς λεγομένονι. For both cf. Jos. Ant. xi. 6. 12 οίς (γράμμασι) ποιεῖτε κάλους 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, 2424 1. Joh. 145, Acts 1043.

ὡς λέγων φαίνοντες ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.] So John, the last and greatest of the prophets, is described by our Lord as ὁ λύχνος ὁ καίμενος καὶ φαίνων (Joh. 528). Spitta cites Ps. 119105 λύχνος τοῦ ποσὶ μον ὁ νόμος σου, and 4 Esdr. 1242 tu superasti ex omnibus prophetis, sicut lucerna in loco obscurum, cf. also Theoph. ad Aut. ii. 13 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ (sc. Θεοῦ) φαίνων διότερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπὸ οὐράνιον, Mart. Ignat. 1 λύχνῳ δύκη βεηκοῦ τῇ ἐκάστῳ φωτίζων διάνοιας διὰ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἐξηγήσεως ἐπετύχατο τῶν κατ’ εὐχήν. Cf. Clem. Al. Str. v. p. 663 ἐπιτ. ὁ μὲν Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τῇ ἑκ τῆς
The rare occurrence of the dawn is represented in biblical Greek as the dawn. The coming of the Messiah is also compared to the dawn breaking through the darkness, cf. Polyb. iii. 104. 5 

It does not seem to imply absolute darkness, but dingy and dusky obscurity as contrasted with 'the brightness of Messiah's rising' Isa. 60, Rom. 13. The τόπος άλοχος may be illustrated by Clem. Al. Protr. p. 87 εἰ μὴ τῶν λόγων ἔγγορεμεν καὶ τοῦτ' άκαθάπαθημεν, οὐδὲν ἃν τῶν συνεμένων δρόμων ἐλεύθερον, ἐν σκότει πιανόμενοι καὶ θανάτῳ προφόμενοι.

[The word ψωφοφόρος is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, but the synonymous ψωφόφωρ occurs in Isa. 14. 12 τῶς ἐξέπεσεν έκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δ’ ἦσος σφόντος δ’ ἄναντι ἑλλόων; 1 Sam. 30 17 ἀπὸ ψωφόφου ἦν δείλης, Ἰοβ 39 μὴ ίδοι ἐν σιφόρον ἄναντι ἑλλόων, and in the difficult Ps. 110 εἶκ γασπρός πρὸ ψωφόφου ἐγέννησά σε, explained by Jennings and Lowe of the birth of the Messiah who comes like a rising sun from the womb of the dawn. The coming of the Messiah is also compared to the dawn in Malachi 4 καὶ ἀνατελεῖ νῦν τοὺς ψωφόβους τὸ ὄνομα μου ἡ λειόν σιδαιμόνιος καὶ ἔσαις εἰς ταῖς πέτρεσιν αὐτοῦ, Lk. 17 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦσος δείλης, Ἰοβ 39 μὴ ίδοι ἐν σιφόρον ἄναντι ἑλλόων, ἐν ὅθεν εἶπεν ἡμῖν ἄνατολη ἡ ἐξ ὑψου, ἐν τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκίᾳ θανάτου καθημένων, Lk. 22 εἰς εἰρήνα . . ὁ ἀστήρ ὁ λαμπρός, ἡ πρωίν, cf. ib. 28, 2 Cor. 45 ὁ Θεός τοῦ αἴωνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἀπιστῶν ἐν τῷ μὴ αὐξάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ὅτε ὁ Θεός ὁ ἐπών 'Εκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὁς ἐλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ἡ μῦν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ προ τῆς θεοσοφίας, 1 Τίτ. 28 ἡ σκοτία παράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄλφαν ἡμᾶς φαίνειν. A difficulty which presents itself here is that the dawn is represented

1 In Geden’s Concordance these and similar examples are given under the head ‘ἕως conj.’ Of course oὐ (χρόνως) is the relative governed by ἐν 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 ἡμὸς δ' ἐωσφόρος ἐστὶ φῶς ἐρέων ἐπὶ γαῖαν, ὡς ἕκατον κροκότεστος ἔστὶ ἂν καθοιμαὶ ἡμὸς, τῆς κ.τ.λ. , Ov. Trist. iii. 5. 55 hune 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 ἐωσφόρον in Ps. 110, which is apparently referred to in connexion with our passage by Hippolytus Ref. x. 33 τὰ δὲ πάντα διοικεὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτόγονος πατρός πάις, ἡ πρὸ ἐωσφόρον φώς ὁ ψάρνης ὁ φίλος οὐκ εἰσέβαλλεν ἐν τῷ ἡμερίῳ τοῦ θεού, ὁ χαθέντων, ... καὶ ἐκπαύσεις σαὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος, ὁ πρὸ ἐωσφόρον γεννώμενος, ὁ ἐκκλησίας ἀκίτιν ἓνδα διαδοχή, p. 87 πῶς γὰρ οὖ ποιεῖται ὁ τὸν ἐκ σκότους κατορθωμένον νου ἀναργὴ παρασκέμηκεν καὶ τὰ φως τοῦ τῆς ἐναξείος ἄτομα ἀτόμα ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτῶν ὡς ἀκίτιν ἀνατείλει ἀτόμων; and p. 89 λαμψε ὁ ἕκτα ἐν τῷ ἀποκρυπτομένῳ ἐρέων ὁ ἄνθροπος τοῦ τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐκφάσοντας καὶ ἀνοιστῆταιν ἀνθρωπον. Wegstein compares Philo de Decal. ii. p. 188 ἦρμίσθησαν καὶ βεβαιάσανται τὰ Θεοῦ λόγια καθάπερ χρυσός πυρὶ ... οἱ μὲν τοὺς χρυσοὺς ἀξίουντες εἶναι καταπεθειός ὡς ἐν ἀκτικό ψωτί τόν ἐκ χρόνων βιωσότας, τοὺς οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς ἀπεργαζόμενος ἔκκομεν τοῖς ὑφαντούσι τοῖς ὑφαντούσι τοὺς ὑφαντούσι. 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 uttereth nothing that is his own or private (Ἰδιαῖος, cf. v. 20), but is merely a lyre in the hand of God. Human reason must be dormant when the Divine Spirit inspires. Now reason (λογισμὸς) is to the mind what the sun is to the universe, for both reason and the sun φωτιστήρι. When the divine light shines, the light of human reason sets; when the former sets, this rises, ἡ δύναμις τοῦ λογισμοῦ καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν σκότος ἐκκαθαίρει καὶ θεοφρόρηται καὶ μαίνει ἐγέννησα.' Dr. Abbott thinks that the use of φωτιστήρι above implies that the substantive φωτιστήρι (often applied to Helios, Apollo, etc.) may stand for the sun; but φωτιστήρι simply means 'I give light.' It is true that Wegstein quotes Suidas as interpreting φωτιστήρι 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 ὁ λόγον ἐν φωτί, ἀλλ` ἐνδιὰθον ... ἀκαὶ γὰρ τῷ τῆς γεννήσεως προελεύν, προστόκος τοῦτον γεννήσεως φωνῆ, ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ προκυπτοθείας ἑνδαιές. Thus φωτιστήρι φωνῆ is the light-giving utterance of the Word, which was ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, τῷ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν δεικνύει πάντα ἐκτός ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.
those whom he addresses should give heed to the prophetic word shining in obscurity, until the morning breaks and the day-star arises in their hearts? I do not think it is possible to explain this of the Second Advent in connexion with v. 16 and 34. The phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν implies an inward coming (Lk. 17:21) as we see in Rom. 2:5, 8:27, 2 Cor. 1:22 δὲ ἐβεβαιών ἡμᾶς σὺν ἑλιᾷ ἥρπον καὶ χρῶσα ἡμᾶς Θεός, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δός τὸν ἀραββώνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, 46 Eph. 1:18, 3:15, Col. 3:1. The prophets are evidently those of the old dispensation, who spoke amid prevailing darkness (Isa. 8:22) and were themselves ignorant of the full meaning of their prophecies (1 Pet. 1:10). Still they were inspired of God to shine as lamps in the darkness, and cannot be superseded until the Gospel-day lights up the sky and the Spirit of Christ is (Apoc. 22:16) manifested in the heart of the individual. The former clause implies 'Search the Scriptures,' the latter, 'Accept the Gospel which has been revealed to you and pray for the first fruits of the Spirit whereby ye are sealed for the day of redemption. Your experience of the latter corresponds to the vision which we saw on the Holy Mount, and will confirm your faith in the former as it did ours.' We have thus the three stages, the prophetic lamp, the Gospel dawn, the inner light of the Spirit. The lower degree of faith in the written word will be followed by divine insight. It is because Christ has come and established His Kingdom upon earth, because He has risen and ascended into heaven, that the spirit of truth has come to abide in the heart of each individual Christian. Compare Euth. Zig. (from Cyril) ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος τοῦ ἐν ἁγνοίᾳ φωταγωγεῖ ἑως καθαρῶν ὑμῖν τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἑναγγελίου διαφανῆ καὶ ὁ νοητὸς ἐσωφόρος, τουτόσι Ἰσραήλ, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ἀνατελής.

20. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.] Occurs again below (33) in reference to the coming of mockers in the last times, cf. 1 Tim. 2:2 παρακαλῶ πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεισίδεις and Robinson's Ephesians pp. 278 f. on the epistolary phrase πρὸ πάντων. The part, 'γινώσκοντες, continuing the construction of καλῶς ποιεῖσθαι προσέχοντες, defines the spirit and feeling with which the Scriptures should be read, 'recognizing this truth first of all.'

πᾶσα προφητεία γραφής.] Here we have the Hebraic πᾶσα—οὐ for οὐδεμία, as in 1 Joh. 2:21 πάν ψεύδος ἐκ τῆς ἄλθειας οὐκ ἐστιν. The converse οὐ—πᾶς is also common as Mt. 24:22 οὐκ ἄν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ, see Blass tr. p. 178. For προφ. γρ. cf. Apoc. 22:7 τὰς προφητείας τοῦ βαβλών τοῦτον, and Acts 8:32 ὡς περιοχῇ τῆς γραφῆς ἦν ἀνεγίνωσκεν, 2 Tim. 3:16 πᾶσα γραφή θεούνευστος καὶ ὁθέλωμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν. Here the addition of γραφής 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 ψευδοφηστῖει mentioned below.

ἰδίας επιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.] Aquila has ἐνυπνῶν ἐπιλύσεις in Gen. 40, where the LXX. has διασάφησις. Cf. Mk. 4:34 κατ' ἵδιαν ἐπέλευσεν πάντα, Herm. Sim. ix. 13 ἔχεις τὴν ἐπιλύσιν τῶν ἀπαθεμάτων, ἦδ. v. 5. 1. αἴθιόδος ἐξ ἐπερωτών τὰς ἐπιλύσεις τῶν παραβολῶν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὕτω παραμονοὶ ἔλ., ἐπιλύσω σοι τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ ἀγροῦ, ἦδ. v. 6. 8, 3. 1, 4. 2, 3,
vi. 11. 1 τὰς ἐπιλύσεις ταῦτα τῶν ῥᾷδων, Iren. ii. 28. 3 τῶν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ἔκτυπαι νέων, ἓνω γὰρ τοῖς τριτον πνευματικοῖς οὖσιν, ἐναὶ μὲν ἐπιλύόμενοι ( = absolventes) κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ, ἕνα δὲ ἀνακείστηκε Θεός, ib. 27. 3 parabolae possunt multas recipere absolusiones (= ἐπιλύσεις), Philo Vit. Cont. M. 2. p. 483 ἄριστοι ταῖς τῶν ἐν τοῖς λεοντος γραμμασιν, ἥττα καὶ ἑνήν ἄλλου προσταθέν τι ἐπιλύεται, Heliod. i. 18 διειράτων ἐπιλύουσιν, ib. iv. 9 πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνυφομενῶν εἰρέσιν καὶ τῶν χρηστήνων τὴν ἐπίλυσιν, Clem. Al. Pasch. ii. p. 172 ζοιοί δ' ἀν καὶ ἄλλας ἐπιλύσεις δ' στατήρ. For the gen. cf. Heb. 1211 πάσα παιδεία οὗ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἄλλα λύπης, Acts 203 εἴγετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν, Plato Apol. p. 28 ὥς μὲν ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀδικοῦ, οὐ πολλῆς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀπολογίας. Alford and others argue that ἀπομακρύνει the translation requires 'prophecy springs not out of human interpretation,' but its force seems to me sufficiently expressed by 'comes under the scope of.'

The statement that prophecy is not a matter of private interpretation has been variously explained. One explanation is founded on Philo's language quoted above on v. 19, with which may be compared Vita Mosis M. ii. p. 125, where Balaam is represented as saying λέγω γὰρ οἴδειν ἔν εἰς νοῦν, ἀλλ' ἀτρέπτων ἐν ψυχῇ τό θείον, and again δ' ὅν μονοθείας ἐξαίφνης θεοφορεῖται καὶ μηδὲν συνείς, ὡσπερ μετανοιαμένου του λογισμοῦ, τά ὑποβαλλόμενα ἐξελάθει, p. 126 ἀπολογίας χρώμενος ἄλλοθε, ὅν οὔδεν ἔδειον λέγοι, κατεχόμενος δ' ἀν και ἐνθυσιῶν διερμηνεύτων ἕτερου. It was the mark of a false prophet to speak τό θεῖον οὕν θείον. Compare Jer. 2316 ματαιωσάν ἂναυτοίς ὅρασιν ἀπὸ καρδίας ἂναυτῶν λαλῶν καὶ οὗ ἀπὸ στόματος Κυρίου, Ezek. 1313 οὗτοι τοῖς προφητεύοντος ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τῷ καθάλου μὴ βλέποντων. Of the true prophet we read (Hippol. Antichr. 2) οὗ γὰρ οὗς χαράς ἐν εἰς γένοις ἐπέκεισθεν, οὗτε ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐξουλοντο ταῦτα ἐκπρομοῦν, ἄλλα πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφολοῦν ὁρῶν, ἑπτατί δ' ὅραμάτων προεδόθακον τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς, εἴθ' οὔτω πεπεισμένοι ἠλέγοιν ταῦτα ἀπὸ αὐτοῦς ἦν μόνοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεκριμένη. Such an interpretation is applicable to the next verse, but is not in harmony with the ordinary force of ἐπιλύεις here. Accordingly Grosier altered the reading to ἐπιλύσεως, Heinsius to ἐπιλύεσσας, with the sense 'propheta non est res proprii impetus,' while Alford, following Hüther and Bengel, seems to understand ἐπιλύεις, 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 ἐπιλύεις—the prophets knew that the word which came to them was prophetic—οὗτοι καὶ τῷ ἐπιλυσαν ἄλλοι ἐποιεῖντο. So even the holy prophets had very vague ideas as to the meaning and scope of their prophecies, cf. Dan. 129 καὶ ἔγνω ἡκούσα καὶ οὗ συνήκα, καὶ εἶπα, Κύριε, τί τα ἐσχάτα τούτα; καὶ εἴπε, Δεύτερο Κανυληίδ, ὅτι ἐμπεθραγμένοι καὶ ἐθαφαγμένοι τοῦ λόγου ἐπος καρποῦ πέρας, Zech. 45, 1 Pet. 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 3:21 (Jesus Christ) δὲ εἰς οὐρανόν μὲν δὲξασθαι ἄξιος ἥρων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων δὲν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰώνων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν, Acts 10:43 τούτω πάντες οἱ προφήται μαρτυροῦσιν ἄφεν εὐαγγελίων ἵπτεών διὰ τοῦ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν παντεύοντα εἰς αὐτὸν, Rom. 15:8 λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενήθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ εἰς τὸ βεβαιώσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, Iren. iv. 6. 1 Χριστός διὰ τῶν καὶ παραβολῶν ἐγερμαίνετο μὴ δυνάμενοι νοσθῆναι πρὸ τοῦ τὴν ἐκβασιν τῶν προφητευμάτων ἀληθῶν, ἡτίς ἀστιν ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The different interpretations of this difficult phrase may be classified as follows. Those who agree that ἐπιλύσις (ἐπιλύων) means solution of a problem or explanation of a difficulty, are divided as to whether this solution should be regarded as preceding or following the prophecy in question. There can be no doubt that according to common, if not universal use, it means the explanation of a given problem or difficulty, e.g. of an oracle (Heliod. iv. 9), of a puzzle (Athen. x. 71, p. 449e), above all of a prophecy. Many commentators however not seeing how to reconcile this explanation with the preceding injunction to give heed to the word of prophecy, have been driven to adopt the far-fetched interpretation of a solution, embodied in the words of the prophet, of some practical problem, 'a discerning of the signs of the times' (Mt. 16:3). In this way v. 20 would mean much the same thing as v. 21. Some have endeavoured to find support for this interpretation in the word γνώμαι, which they would translate 'comes of private interpretation.' This seems to me to be an undue straining of the meaning of the word γνώμαι, attributing to it a force which it could only bear if followed by the preposition ἐκ. It cannot however be denied that this is the view of the passage taken by many commentators, e.g. Bede 'hoc primum intellegere debent, quia nullus prophetarum sanctorum propria sua interpretatione populos dogmata vitae praedicavit, sed quae a Domino didicerant, haec suis auditoribus agenda commendabant.' So Bengel 'ἐπιλύσις dicitur interpretatio quae ipsi prophetae res antea plane clausas aperuere mortalibus,' Cajetan, Alford, Keil, Kuhl, Hundhausen. Spitta proposes an entirely new sense of the word ἐπιλύσις, translating 'no prophecy is of such a nature that it can be dissolved,' for which he compares Joh. 10:35 οὐ δύναται λαθῆναι ἡ γραφή. Mt. 5:17 οὐκ ἠλθὼν καταλύσασι ἀλλὰ πληρώσαται, but confesses that he can make nothing of ἰδίας, for which he proposes to read ἰάγιας.

There is similar diversity of opinion as to ἰδίας. (1) à Lapide, Estius, and the Roman Catholics in general take it as equivalent to ἰδιωτικῆς,
and contrast this with the judgment of the Church. They also extend the rule to Scripture generally: so Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. Nemosueae prudentiae innexus, 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 indicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat. (2) Ecumenius interprets it of the prophet himself in accordance with 1 Pet. 101, cf. 4 Esdras 121 of Daniel's vision. (3) Luther, Erasmus, Wiesinger, Schott, Hofmann, etc. take it of man's own interpretation, contrasting this with the understanding imparted by the Holy Spirit, who is Himself the source of prophecy. (4) Werenfels, Brückner, Bisping refer it to 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 ἡγεῖθη προφητεία ποτέ. [ Cf. Joh. 113 οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ’ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. We have another example of a final ποτέ in v. 10 above (where, as here, it means 'at any time').] also Rom. 79 ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχων χορίς νόμου ποτέ, 1 Cor. 9 τίς στρατεύεται οὕσας ὁμοίως ποτέ; so Eph. 23, Col. 37, Heb. 113. With ἡγεῖθη we should probably supply in thought ἐξ οὐρανοῦ or its equivalent as in vv. 17, 18.

Ὅτῳ πνεύματος ἄγιου φορέμονα. [ Compare the compounds θεοφόρος Aesch. Ag. 1150, θεοφόρητος ib. 1140, θεοφόρων Strabo, θεοφόρησις Plut., θεοφορεῖσθαι Menander, πνευματοφόρος and πνευματοφορόμενος Ecl., and Philo i. 510 quoted below under φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, also p. 482, ἐκσταθή σεαυτὸς, καθάπερ οἱ κυριακιώντες καὶ κατεχομένοι, βασκευθέατα καὶ θεοφορεθέατα κατὰ τινὰ προφητικὸν ἐπιθεωσίμον. Philo, M. i. p. 609 of Ecl. συμφιλεία μαντική τὴν θεοφορήτου προφητείαν παρεξηγῆρα, de Somn. p. 689 ἡν ἐξ ὀρθῶν θείων κατασχέθη ὁ νοῦς, προνείσας ἑαυτὸν ἄχρι τῶν ἁδύτων, ὅρμῃ καὶ σπουδῇ πιάς χρώμενος προφήτητα, θεοφορομένος ἐπιλέκησα τῶν ἄλλων, Justin Apol. i. § 33 ὁδείνι ἀλλ’ θεοφοροῦνται οἱ προφητεύοντες εἰ μὴ θείω λόγῳ, ib. § 35 Ἡσαίας θεοφορομένως τὸ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ Theor. Autol. ii. 9 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρῶποι, πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἄγιον καὶ προφήτη γενόμενοι, ὡς οὗ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες . . . ἐγένετο θεοδικαιούμενον. M. i. p. 5. 2 φερόμενος τοῖς θυμοῖς οἱ στρατεύομεν τὴν στοάν ὑπάρχουσιν, Plut. Mor. 205A φερόμενος ταῖς ὁμαιαῖς, Acts 23 of the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost ἀπὸ πνευματόφορος πνεύματος βιαίας, and such phrases as Mk. 112 τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκβιάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, Acts 839 πνεύμα Κυρίου ἠρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον, 2 Cor. 122 ἀρπαγέντα ἐως τρίτον οὐρανοῦ.
II. 1. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται 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. 348) μὴ ἀκούστε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ώμιν, ἵνα 267 (LXX. 337) and in Lk. 626. We often meet references to these, as in Deut. 1311, 1820, Jer. 524, Ezek. 13 esp. n. 3 αἰαί τῶν προφητευόντων ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν (= θελήματι ἀνθρώπουν in 121 above). Examples of such are Zedekiah (1 Kings 22), Hananiah (1 Jer. 28). Words compound with ψευδο- may either mean, falsely named, a 'sham' or 'counterfeit,' as ψευδόχριστος Mt. 2424, ψευδαστότολος 2 Cor. 1113, ψευδάδελφος Gal. 21, ψευδόνυμον 'a sham Nero' (Lucian), ψευδοκύριον 'a sham Cynic' (Plut.); or they may mean falsely doing the work implied in the second part of the compound, as in ψευδαστομέω 'to speak falsely' (Soph.), ψευδομορφός 'one who practises deceitful arts' (Plato), ψευδομακία 'perjury' (Philo), ψευδομάρτυρ 'a false witness' Mt. 2666, ψευδόλογος '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 dissolve 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 evildoers . . . they are all of them become unto me as Sodom,' ἵνα 32, ἵνα 2921-23, Ezek. 133 'Woe unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing,' ἵνα 16 which see visions of peace for Jerusalem, and there is no peace, saith the Lord
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God,' Micah 3:11 'The prophets divine for money.' It will be seen how closely this description corresponds to the description given below of the false teachers. For warnings against ψευδοπροφηταί in the Christian Church, cf. Mt. 24:11, 1 Tim. 4:1.

λαός is used of Israel generally in the O.T. esp. in Ex. 19:5 and Deut. 8:10 'see the divine λαός περιοϊστος, from which is taken the phrase in 1 P. 2:9 λαός εἰς περιποίησιν. Compare also Lk. 23:2 φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἡμῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, and Acts 26:17.23, where we find the same distinction between the λαός and the ἔθνη.

ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιάσκαλοι.] 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. ἠγαγός corresponds to Rabbi (Joh. 13:9). In the early Church teachers are joined with prophets (Acts 13:1, 1 Cor. 12:28 πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, Eph. 4:11 ἑδυκέν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους). We learn from James 3:1 that the office was much sought after, see my note there. The word ψευδός is rare, ψευδοδιάσκαλις is found in Polyc. ad Phil. 7. For further information see Introduction On the False Teachers.

οὕτως παρεισάξοντος αἵρεσις ἀπωλείας.] 'Men who will introduce destructive heresies into the Church.' ὁστίς seems to have its usual indefinite force, cf. Mt. 7:15 προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οὕτως ... οὕτως λίκοι ἄρπαγες. 'There are some places in the N.T. in which ὁστίς cannot be distinguished from δὲ; 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 παρεισέδωσαν and 2 Pet. 1:5 παρασιφέρω, also Lightfoot's n. on παρεισάκτους Gal. 2:4, and Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 854 ὑπεμισθήσθην τῶν περὶ τοῦ μὴ δέν εὐχεσθαι πρὸς τῶν ἐπεραδύζων παρεισαγωγῶν δομιμάτων. It is frequently used in the Apology of Aristides without any notion of secrecy, which however easily attaches to παρά, as in παρείσακτος.

αἵρεσις.] Athanasius quoted by Suicer defines the word ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵρεσθαι τι ἵδον καὶ τοῦτο ἐξακολουθεῖν. Hence it is used for a school or sect whether in philosophy or science, as in Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 887 καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς δοκιμωτάτοις τῶν παρ' Ἐλληνες φιλοσόφων πάμπολλα γεγόνοις αἵρεσεις ... καὶ οἱ λατρεῖ, ἐναντίας δόξας κεκτημένοι κατὰ τὰς οἰκεῖας αἵρεσεις. ἐπ' ἰδιῆς ἑρῶα θεραπεύοντον. Apparently the first instance of its use in this sense is in Cicero's amusing letter to Cassius (Fam. xv. 16. 3). So in Acts 5:17 αἵρεσις Σαδδουκαίων, ib. 15:5 αἵρ. Φαρισαίων, 24:5 πνευματισμόν τῆς τῶν Ναζαραίων αἵρεσις. In our text it is used in a dyslogistic sense, as in 1 Cor. 11:9 δὲ γὰρ καὶ αἵρεσις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένονται, Gal. 5:20, where δικαστασίαι and αἵρεσεις are joined with adultery and idolatry as works of the flesh, Tit. 3:10 αἵρετικὸν ἀνθρώπων παρατόν. 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 προφαίρεσις for 'principle of conduct,' e.g. ii. 56. 9 τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀγεννής καὶ γνωσκόδες τῆς ἀἵρεσεως αὐτοῦ, xviii. 20. 4 οἴδετοτε ταῦτην ἐσχηκεῖαι τὴν ἄρεσιν, ὅτι δεὶ πολεµεῖν ἀδιαλύτως. In the N.T. there seems to be a general agreement that the objective meaning is to be preferred, except perhaps in this verse of 2 Pet. But it is joined in two passages (Gal. 5:20 and 1 Cor. 11:18 where I am glad to see the R.V. has 'heresies') with words signifying division, which seems to make the subjective meaning 'opinionativeness' more appropriate, cf. Clem. Al. Str. vii. p. 894 οἱ ἐν αἰσχροὶ οἱ κατὰ τὰς ἀἵρεσις. 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 ὑμῶν ὑπεμαχία ἀἵρεσις κατοικεῖ where it seems to be equivalent to κακῇ διδαχῇ in 9. I am disposed to assign the same force to ἀἵρεσις in our text, as more suitable to the word παρασιᾶς and receiving a natural explanation in ἀρνοῦμαι. Spitta, von Soden, and Weiss interpret it in the same way, of opinion, not of schism, but Spitta thinks that ἀἵρεσις in 2 Pet. is still by itself neutral, and gets its bad sense from the following qualitative genitive.

ἀπολέλαιας:] 'Dangerous heresies,' the gen. qualitatis, as below in v. 4 σειρόης ζόφου, v. 10 ἐπιθυμία μισομοῦ, see Sir. 167 ἵθνος ἀπολέλαια and my n. on Jas. 1:25 ἀκρατείας ἐπιθυμεῖναι and p. ccxiv. The word occurs five times in this ep., once in Acts, where Peter rebukes Simon, and is found in Apoc. Petri 1 ἀδειός καὶ δὲ γὰς ματα σοικλα τῆς ἀ πωλα εἰ ας διὶ δ ἔξου σιν. It appears as the opposite of σωτηρία in Phil. 1:35.

καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοῦς δεσπότην ἀρνοῦμαι.] 'Denying even the Lord that bought them.' Alford and others have got into unnecessary trouble about the construction by refusing to recognize that καὶ is used in the sense of 'even' in the N.T. as in other Greek. See his n. on Mt. 10:80 ἣμών δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες ... ἡρατηρεῖται εἰσόν, where he translates 'and yet.' For other instances of this use of καὶ cf. Mk. 13:7, 4:25, 1 Cor. 2:10. For ἀγοράσαντα see Hort on 1 Pet. 1:18, 19 (pp. 78–80) οἱ φθοροῖς ἐλυτρώθητε ... ἀλλὰ τιμῶ ἀιμάτα, ὅς ἀμοῦ ἀμοῦ 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 ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ τολλῶν ... The nearest
repetition of these words is in 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὅ δεῖς ἵνα τῶν ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. For λυτροῦμαι St. Paul uses ἄφορα ἡμῶν 1 Cor. vi. 20 ἵγοραθε γὰρ τιμής, vii. 23, Gal. iii. 13 Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγώρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γεννήσας ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. So Ἀρσ. v. 9 (of the Λάμβν) ἱγοραζας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου... In the I.XX. λυτροῦμαι is connected with the Exodus... in Acts vii. 35 St. Stephen boldly says that God sent Moses as ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν... In some of the passages quoted Christ Himself appears as the ransomer: elsewhere it is the Father, as in Acts xx. 28, rightly understood and illustrated by Ῥωμ. v. 8 (where note ἵνα) and viii. 32. Spitta takes the latter view in our text, comparing such passages as 2 Cor. vii. 20, Gal. iii. 13 ἐξηγώρασεν, ἐκ τοῦ ἱλαρόν. So Ἁπ. v. 9 ἢγοράσας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου... In the LXX. AUTÓV ἐν Ἰωάνną, vii. 23, Gal. iii. 13 ἐξηγώρασεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱλαροῦ. So Ἁπ. v. 9 ἢγοράσας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου... In the nature of the threatening heresy, ἔτι, 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 (POLL on Amphilochnus p. 127). Two examples occur in the doubtful Exegetical Fragments inserted in Feltoe's edition (pp. 218 f.) βαβαι τῆς ἀνεξικαίας τοῦ δεσπότου, τοῦ καὶ φιλόστατου τοῦ προδότην, and in p. 242 we have the phrase το δεσποτικὸν σώμα used of the Lord's body. For ἄρνομεν see n. on Ῥωμ., and Peter's words in Acts 3:13-14. ἔπαγγελε τούτοις ταχυνῷ ἀπόλειον.] The middle is used by classical writers in cases of self-caused evil, e.g. Ἰον. p. 424. 10 ἀθανάτου τουτοίς ἐπάγγελε δωδεκάν Λυς. p. 102. 19 κυνικῶν πολύ μείζων τοιχοφοράν ἐμαυτῶ ἐπαγαγόντα. see Blass pp. 183 f., Jannaris Gr. §§ 1472, 1478. Another instance of the unclassical active is found in Sir. 127 μη ἐξέβουν σεαυτόν ἵνα μη... ἐπαγαγός τῇ φυχῇ σου ἀτύμιαν. The active is properly used in v. 5 below. For ταχυνῷ see n. on 114. Spitta finds a difficulty in the doubled participle, on which see Winer p. 433 and Blass p. 250.

2. πολλοί ἐξεκολοθέθησαν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσέλγειαις.] αὐτῶν refers to the πεινοδοδόσκαλοι, whose bad example will be largely followed. This verse is parenthetic referring to the deluded followers, while v. 3 returns to the false teachers. The heretics are noted for their licentiousness, see Introduction on Early Heresies, and notes on Ῥωμ. 4, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, below vv. 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23-17. For pl. ἀσέλγειαι cf. below v. 15 and εὐσεβείαις 311, also James 2:1 with my note. δ' οὖς ἡ ὁδός τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.] Cf. Ῥωμ. 2:23-24 (a quotation from Ἰσα. 52:2) δι' ἐν νόμῳ καυχάσαται, διά τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀτύματος; τὸ γὰρ ὠνόμα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὐμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν, ἑβ. 39, Tit. 2:2, James 2:7 (where see my note), Ἀπ. Πετρ. 7 οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς δικαιοσύνης. For ὁδὸς see also vv. 15 and
NOTES

21 below, and Mt. 21: 3, Lk. 17: 9, Rom. 3: 17 (ὁδὸν εἰρήνης), Acts 16: 17 (ὁδὸν σωτηρίας), Barn. i. 4, v. 4 ὁδ. ἰδιακοσύνης.1 The phrase ὁδὸς ἀληθείας comes from Ps. 119: 30: it is opposed to the 'way of lying' in v. 29.

3. ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστῶς λόγου ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύοντα.] 'Through covetous ness the false teachers will make gain of you by insincere words,' i.e. by their flatteries, the opposite of φιλαδελφία ἀνυπόκριτος in 1 P. 1: 22. Contrast with this 1 Th. 2: 6. oίτε γάρ τούτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας ἐγενέθημεν . . . οίτε προφάσει πλεονεξίαις . . . οίτε ξητούντες εἰς ἀνθρώπων δόξαν. For causal ἐν cf. 11, 213, 118, 220, Jude 10, Blass 130, 131.

ἐμπορεύομαι.] Strictly to travel as a merchant (as in James 4: 13), then with a transitive force 'to import,' 'purchase,' 'traffic in,' 'exploiter,' cf. ἐμπορευόμεθα, oδιδόν τὸν πληρωμός τῶν φύσεως καὶ φιλοσοφίας ὄνων, Prov. 3: 4 κρίσεων σοφίαν ἐμπορεύεσθαι ἢ χρυσίων θησαυροῖς, Jos. Ant. iv. 6, 8 (of the Midianitish women) οὐδὲ ἐμπορευόμεναι τὴν ἀρά τοῦ σώματος προσθήκαμεν τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀξίωσιν 'we have not lent an ear to your request with a design of making traffic out of our beauty.' Suicer quotes Greg. Nyss. de Hapt. μὴ ἐμπορεύον τὴν χαρὰν ἡμᾶς μὴ ἐκπέμψῃ τῆς δωρεᾶς, Theodoret ἃς τῶν πενήντων συμφοράς ἐμπορεύεσθαι. The idea is the same as that in 2 Cor. 2: 17, 1 Tim. 6: 6 'thinking that godliness is a trade' (πορισμὸν 'a means of gain'). The compound χριστεύμας occurs in the longer recension of Ignatius ad Magn. ix. οἱ χριστεύματοι τὸν λόγον κατηχοῦντες καὶ τὸν Ἡσεὼν πωλοῦντες καὶ ad Trall. vi. where see Lightfoot's note.

πλαστῶς.] 'Made up,' 'fictitious,' not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, cf. Herod. i. 68 ἐκ λόγου πλαστῶν ἐπιπεδόκατε αὐτίναν ἐδώκαν 'banished him, having having brought a charge against him on a false pretext.' Cf. Jos. Vit. 65 πάρτουν μὲν ὅμοιον τι τοῖς περὶ συμβολῶν πλαστά γράφματα συναπεικόνι 'they act like those who have forged false documents in a case of contract,' Philo M. i. p. 1 μιθυκῶς πλάσματι τῇ ἀλήθειαν ἐπικρύψαντες. I do not think there is any reference to the σεποφαρμένοι μίθοι of 110.

ὁς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαὶ οὐκ ἄργετ.] 'Over whom the judgment (pronounced against false prophets in the O.T.) has long been impending.' The combination of ἀργεῖ and νυστάξει reminds one of ἄργος and μυστάξων in 18: 9. The judgment is not idle, but already active in the punishment of other offenders, and gathering up for these false teachers. ἐκπαλαί 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. ἀπαρτί, ἐμπροσθεν, καθάπαξ, ἐποίησεν, παρανίκα), received a great extension in post-Aristotelian writers, see Lobeck's Phryn. p. 45 f. Thus we find the unclassical ὑπεράνω, ὑπερλίαν, ἐφάπαξ, κατανάπι, κατανέφιον in the N.T.

1 Dr. Bigg quotes Aristid. Apol. xvi αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἢτις τῶν ἐδείοντως αὕτην εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγέω βασιλείαν, which, as he says, appears to be directly taken from this verse combined with 111.
The repetition of ἀπώλεια (here personified) for the third time in these three verses is characteristic of the writer. νυστάξω is only used here and in Mt. 255 (of the slumbering virgins) in the N.T. It is found in LXX. Ps. 1214 ὑπνόω (of the avengers) νυστάξει αὐθεν ὑπνόων ὑπνοί τὰς ἀμαρτησάντων νυστάξασθαι, Prov. 2138, Nah. 318. Compare the scene of the sleeping Eumenides awakened by the shade of Clytemnestra.

4. ἐὰν ὁ θεὸς ἁγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων ὁὐκ ἐφείσατο.] The natural apodosis would have been ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐφείσεται, but (as above 117-120) 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 ἐὰν ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδὲ σοι ἐφείσεται, Mt. 630.

σεφοῖς ξύφων ταρπαρῶσας παρεβουκν.] For σεφοῖς see Introduction on the text. σεφοῖς στροφός is properly a pit for the storage of grain as in Demosth. p. 100 στρ. ἐν τοῖς Θρακίων στροφό, where the scholiast explains τοὺς θρακικοὺς καὶ τὰ ὅρυγμα ἐν οἷς κατέθεντο τα στέρματα (different kinds of grain) στροφόν ἐκάλουν οἱ Θράκες καὶ οἱ Διήθεις. 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 σεφοῖς. In Anaxandridas ap. Athen. iv. 131 it seems to mean a large bin for holding edible roots (βολβοῖ). 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 Antigonus was thrown and burnt alive (Diod. xix. 44, though σφόν is read there instead of σεφόν 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) ἐμβάλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος καὶ ἄνοιξεν τὴν ἐρήμον τὴν ὀνταν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Δουδαήλ, καὶ ἐκεῖ πορευθέντες βάλε αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπόθεσεν αὐτῷ λίθους ὀξείς καὶ λίθους τραχεῖς καὶ ἐπικάλυψαν αὐτῷ σκότος, καὶ ἀυθεράτῳ ἐκεὶ εἰς τὸν ἁίώνα . . . καὶ φῶς μὴ θεωρεῖτο, ib. 12 (of Shemjaza and his companions) δόθουν αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ ἐξοσμικοῦνα γενεάς εἰς τὰς νάπας τῆς γῆς . . . ἐς συντελεσθή κρίμα τοῦ ἁίωνος τῶν ἁίωνων, 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,’ lxxxi. 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 ἐρήμῳ (Charles p. 337).
deep and horrible and dark.' Keil thinks there may be a reference to Isa. 24:1-2. ‘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 (eis δεσμωτήριον) and shall be shut up in the prison (eis ὀχυρωμα), 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 σφως, which does not seem to suggest anything awful or terrible. Supposing, as I think we must, that 2 Pet. was partly copied from Jude, the relation of this verse to Jude 6 would be more easily explained, if the original reading of 2 Pet. were σειραί, which as the substitution of a more elegant word for the common-place δσμώς, would be in accordance with our author’s procedure elsewhere. The scholiast to Demosthenes, quoted above, states that the word σφως was in use in Egypt. Supposing it to have been better known than the word σειρά to the scribes of Χ and B, it might easily happen that the former was unconsciously written in the place of the latter. We also find σειραί attested by Didymus, Cyril, Ephrem Syr., Procopius, Damascenus, Òecumenius, and Theophylact, as well as by most cursives and versions. The word occurs in the LXX. in the sense of fetters, Prov. 5:22 παρανομία άνδρα αγρευόμενοι, σειραί δι τῶν έαυτῶν άμαρτίων έκαστος σφύγγεται. Τόφον occurs below v. 17, twice in Jude, once in Heb. 12:18, not in LXX. παραδίδομι is usually followed by a dative of the person, as Mt. 18:34 παρέδωκεν αὐτῶν τοῖς βασανιστοῖς, and an accusative preceded by eis of the thing, as Acts 8:3 παρέδωκον εἰς φυλακήν, 2 Cor. 4:11 εἰς θίανατον. We find παρέδωκαν έαυτοίς τῇ άσελγείᾳ Eph. 4:18, παρ. λύθη 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.’ Ven Soden compares Apoc. 20:13 άγγελον καταβάνοντα εκ τοῦ οίρανον, έξωτα τήν κλείν τής αβύσσου και άλυσαν μεγάλην ... και έκράτησαν τόν Δράκοντα. ... και έδόθην αὐτῶν χίλια έτη και έβαλεν αὐτῶν εἰς τήν άβυσσον. Alford illustrates σειραί ξόφον by Wisdom 17:16 (of the Egyptian plague of darkness) μαί άλυσε σκότους πάντες έδέθησαν: the darkness constituted the chain which prevented them from moving: so in v. 2 of the same chapter we have δέσμιοι σκότοις και μακρᾶς πεδήται νυκτός and in v. 15 έφρωνείτο εἰς τήν άσίδηρον εύρητην κατακλεισθείς.

ταρταρώσας] ἀπ. λέγ. See for the compound καταταρταρώσω Sext. P.H. iii. 24. 210 ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ Κρόνου καταταρτάρωσεν with the note of Fabricius. In Enoch 20:2 Uriel is the ruler of Tartarus. Charles (p. 42) notices the appropriate use of ‘ταρταρώσας in connexion with the fallen angels: Tartarus was originally the place of punishment of the Titans.’ The substantive is found in Job 40:15 ἐτελθὼν ἐπ’ ὀρός άκροτομον, ἐπόσας χαρμοίν 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.
he eateth grass as an ox,' and in 41 \(\text{τῶν \ δὲ τάρταρον τῦς ἄβυσσου \ όσπερ αἰχμάλωτον (\ γηγητα), \ which is again entirely unlike the Hebrew; also in Philo M. 2 p. 433 (the wicked) ὄπουν ὅτι ὑπομένειν ἐναποθαύνω \ \text{τοῦ ἐπιστήμων τῶν ἁθεόν \ ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ \ ὁποῖον \ ὁποῖον \ ἄπειλῃ \ καὶ ταρτάρῳ \ ζωφέρου \ ὁμμα \ ἄψωμον \ ... καὶ ταρταρούχων \ ἀγγέλων \ κολαστῶν \ ὁμμα \ \text{τοῦ \ μένον \ ἐν \ ἄπειλῃ, \ Acta \ Thomasae 32, where the serpent who tempted Eve says \ έγώ \ εἰμι \ ὁ \ τῶν \ ἄβυσσον \ τοῦ \ ταρτάρου \ οἰκών, \ Acta \ Philippī 110. \ For the reasons stated in the Introduction on the Text, I am inclined to prefer the longer reading \ κολασμένων \ πωρείν (on which see below \ ν. 9) to the shorter \ πορομένων. \ The infinitive would be epexegetic after \ παρεδόκησαν.

5. \ἀρχαῖον \ κόσμου \ οὐκ \ ἐφείσατο.] \ The second example of punishment does not appear in Jude. It is however closely connected with the sin of the angels in Gen. 6. The destruction of the ancient world by water is referred to again in 36 in contrast to the present world which is doomed to be destroyed by fire. Compare Sir. 167 \ οὐκ \ ἐξίλασατο \ περὶ \ τῶν \ ἀρχαίων \ γυγάντων. \ The omission of the article is common in 2 Pet. See κόσμῳ \ ἀπεβοῦ, \ πόλεις \ Σαδαμῶν, just below and Introduction on Grammar.

\άλλα \ ὕγον \ Νὼς \ δικαιοσύνης \ κήρυκα \ ἐφώλαξεν.] \ The negative statement \ οὐκ \ ἐφείσατο \ is contrasted with the positive (brought a flood on the world of the ungodly at the time when he saved Noah) by \άλλα, just as the \ οὐκ \ ἐφείσατο \ of the preceding verse is contrasted with \ σειρών \ παρεδόκησαν; but the contrast is blurred from the fact that the writer wishes to combine the evidence of mercy with that of judgment. He even gives more prominence to the former by putting the latter into the participial form; though his limitation of the number of the saved to eight prepares the way for the general statement of judgment on the wicked. For \ ὕγον \ cf. 1 Pet. 320 \ εν \ ήμέραις \ Νὼς \ κατασκευασμένης \ κιβωτοῦ, \ εἰς \ ἄνθισιν, \ τούτ' \ ἐστιν \ οὕτω \ φυλαχθέν \ βε' \ ὑδατος, \ Clem. Al. p. 544, l. 28 foll. \ α' \ ἡ \ οἰνοποιών \ εἰς \ ἑκάστη \ ἐπιστήμων ἐπιστήμων \ τοις \ ναοῖς \ ἄφθασιν, \ δι' \ ἐβδομος \ ἀνακηρυσσόμενος \ τῆς \ φωνῆς \ υἱὸς \ εἶναι \ Θεοῦ. \ The Greeks usually add \ ἀνεύτως \ with this peculiar use of the ordinal, but Winer quotes as examples of the omission of the pronoun, Plato Legg. iii. 695 c λαβέων \ τὴν \ ἀρχήν \ ἐβδομος, Plut. Pelop. 13 εἰς \ οἰκίαις \ διοδήκατος \ κατελθὼν. \ Others compare \ ἐβδομος \ ἀπὸ \ Ἀδάμ in Jude 14 and think that Noah may be similarly described either as 8th from Adam, or the 8th preacher of righteousness. But, if Enoch is 7th, Noah, his great-grandson (Gen. 5) must be 10th (so Jos. Ant. I. 3. 2 \ ἦν \ δ' \ ἀνέφερ \ ἀπὸ \ ᾿ Ἀδάμ \ μον \ διόκατος) not 8th. Hundhausen refers to J. Lightfoot, Heinsius, and others, as maintaining that Noah might be described as the 8th preacher, because Enos, the son of Seth, is said to have been the first to call upon God (Gen. 426). But he rightly replies that we \ οὐκ \ ἔχουμεν \ οὐδὲ \ αὐτὸν \ καὶ \ τὸν \ τῆς \ εὐθύνης \ \text{τοῦ} \ \text{καθηγήσεως}. \ But he rightly replies that we have no knowledge of such a series of preachers, and that Noah is
here called κήρυξ, not simply as one of a line of unknown preachers, but as having actually warned the antediluvians of the approaching judgment. That such was the Jewish tradition is proved by Spitta from Jos. Ant. i. 3.1 Νωὸς δὲ τοῖς παραγγέλοντος υἱὸς αὐτῶν δυσχεραίνων ... ἔπαιθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρείττον τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς πράξεις μεταφέρειν, Sib. Orac. i. 128 Νωὲ δέναις βαρύνον ἐσώ τοι τὰς κήρυκας κοιτάζοντες, ὅπως συνόντας αἵτινες, where also his sermon is given extending from 1. 150 to 200. So Clem. Rom. i. 7 Νωὲ εἰκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν καὶ οἱ ὑπακούοντες ἐπώθησαν, ib. 9 Νωὲ πιστὸς εὐρεθήθη ... παλιγγενεσίας κόσμῳ εἰκήρυξεν, Pauli Apocalypsis (Tisch. p. 68) ἕνω εἰμι Νωὲ ... καὶ οὐκ ἐπανάληκτος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κηρύσσειν, Μεταωθετεί, ἱδον γὰρ κατακλυσμός ἔρχεται, Theoph. ad Autol. iii. 19, also quotations from the Mischna and the Koran in Spitta p. 147. On the other hand it is of great importance to mention the small number of those who were saved in the ark. ‘God spared only eight persons out of the ancient world,’ which explains the prominent position given to οὐγόνον. In his reference to Noah and Lot, the author differs from Jude by calling attention to the exhibition of mercy in the midst of judgment.

The noun κήρυκα occurs in the N.T. in this sense only here and in 1 Tim. 27, and 2 Tim. 111 εἰς ἄντεθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, but the verb κηρύσσω is common. Clement of Rome (v.) speaks of St. Paul as κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, and so Epict. Diss. iii. 21.13 (quoted by Lightfoot in loco) calls his ideal philosopher κήρυξ τῶν θεῶν. In the Book of Enoch 124, 151, Enoch is addressed as ‘Thou scribe of righteousness.’ Here δικ. κ. is contrasted with κόσμῳ ἀνυψών. Noah is called ἀνθρωπος δικαίος in Gen 63, like Lot below v. 9.

κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀνεβάντων ἔπαξας.] See below ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς Ἀτλάντης and Mt. 2428.39 Lk. 1727, Gen. 617, where the same noun is used. For ἔπαξας cf. n. on ἐπαγγέλεις v. 1, and for the form of the aor. Lk. 1334, Acts 1427, Winer p. 99, Veitch s.v. ἅγω, 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 ἐφώλαξεν: Noah was kept safe in the flood which came on the world of the ungodly.

6. καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορράς τετράγων.] Winer (pp. 666-668) and Blass (p. 98) take this as a gen. appositionis, like Rom. 411 σημεῖον ἐλαβε τετραγών, and the Latin urbs Romeae, virtus continentiae. On the contrary A. Butman (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, Σοδόμα καὶ Γομορρά καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις. I prefer the former explanation, as the latter strictly taken refers only to αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, omitting the principal cities. Probably our author introduced the pleonastic πόλεις here from his recollection of Jude. The very rare τετράγων, meaning either to cover with, or to convert into, ashes (cf. αἰθαλω), is found in the description of an eruption of Vesuvius (Dio Cass. lxvi. p. 1094) τῶν ἐν μέσῳ κραυγουμένων (being parched) καὶ
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tεφρομένων (overwhelmed with ashes), Lyc. Cass. 227 τεφρώσας γνώνι
Δημιανοί πυρί. έκτεφρών is also used by Strabo and Plutarch.
Philo (M. 2. p. 21) uses the word τέφρα of the overthrow of Sodom,
whose abnormal sin was followed by abnormal punishment, ἡμέρα
μᾶ αἰ μὲν εἰσάνθρωπα τόλεις τάφοις τῶν οἰκητόρων έγεγένητο, αἰ δὲ έκ
λιθόν καὶ ξύλον κατασκεύαζε τέφρα καὶ λεπτη κόνις.
καταστροφή κατέκρινεν. For the reading and construction see Introd.

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 dammare, 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. 8η κατέκρινε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐν σαρκί, and 1 Cor. 1132 κρυμόμενοι δὲ ύπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παιδεύομεθα, ὥν μὴ
σιὼ τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῆμεν. 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 t. c.
The sense would then be ‘to condemn, or pass sentence upon, by de­
stroying.’ Clem. Al. (Paed. iii. p. 280), quoting Jude, dwells on the
lesson to be derived from the history of Sodom. In Gen. 1924 we have
Κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἑτὶ Σοδόμα καὶ Γόμορρα θείον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ Κύριον ἐξ
οὐρανοῦ, after which follows in v. 25 καὶ κατέστρεψε τὰς πόλεις ταύτας,
the latter seeming to imply an earthquake which followed the rain of
fire and overthrew the cities. So Spitta and Weiss. Cf. Strabo xvi.
2. 44 of the district by the Dead Sea, which he calls γη τεφρώδης, and
says that its appearance bears out the story told by the inhabitants
that ὑπὸ σεισμὸν καὶ ἀναφυγήματοι πυρὸς καὶ θερμῶν ὑδάτων ἀσφαλτωδῶν
τε καὶ θειώδων ἡ λίμνη προσεσθεῖ . . . αἰ τε πόλεις καταποθεῖεν, also Pliny’s
account of the eruption of Vesuvius (Ep. vi. 16. 6) the cloud arising
from the crater was sometimes light, sometimes dark, prout terram
cineremve sustulerat, ib. 11 iam navibus cinis incidebat calidior et
densior, ib. 14 area . . . ita iam cinere mixtixes pumicibus oppleta
surrexerat, ut si longior in cubiculo mora, exitus negaretur . . . 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 erup­
tions in the West Indies.

υπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀπεικών τεθεικώς. For the reading and construction
see Introd. on Text. Compare Clem. Al. 280 εὖς δὲ υποδείγματος μνησθήσο-
μα... τὸ Σωδομίτων πάθος, κρύσις μὲν ἀδικήσασι, παταγωγία δὲ ἀκούσασιν.
Phryn. (p. 42 Loh.) condemns ἕποδ. as un-Attic.

7. καὶ δίκαιοι Δώτ... ἐρώσατο.] Cf. Abraham's pleading in Gen. 1823 μὴ συναπτολέσῃ δίκαιον μετὰ ἄσβεσιν, and Wisdom 105 ἀιτὴ (σοφία) δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένον ἄσβεσιν ἐφύσατο, φυγόνα καταβάσας τῷ Πεντα-πόλεως. The verb occurs again in v. 9; the form ἐρώσατο is supported by B, see Lightfoot on Col. 113.

καταπονούμενον.] Cf. Acts 724 ἰδὼν τινα ἀδικούμενον ἦμύνοι καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονούμενῳ, 3 Macc. 25 Κύριε... πρόσχες ἡμῖν καταπονούμενοι ὑπὸ ἀνόμων καὶ βεβήλου, Theophr. Char. 8 τοὺς ἀκούόντας καταπονοῦστε ταῖς ψευδολογίαις.

υτὸ τῆς τῶν ἄθεσμων ἐν ἁστελγίᾳ 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 κόσμῳ ἐν ἑπιθυμίᾳ φόβοις, where, as here, an ἐν-clause is incorporated: cf. I Pet. 32 τῆς ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆς ἀναστροφῆς. ib. v. 16 τῆν ἀγαθήν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφῆς. For the gen. see n. on James 34 ὑπὸ ἄνεμων ἑλαυνόμενα, Philo i. p. 609 κατα-κεισμένοις ὑπὸ φρονεβλαβεῖς. ἄθεσμος occurs again in 317, alone in N.T., also in 3 Macc. 512 τῆς ἄθεσμος προθεσμῶς διεσφαλέον, ib. 626. Not used by classical writers. The cognate ἄθεσμος is used in 1 Pet. 42. Philo has ἐκθέσμος in the same sense, cf. Abrah. 369 ὡς εἰς ἐκθέσμον μεταδικάστηκα, ἵδι ἐκφύλως καὶ ἐκθέσμον συνόδους (of Sodom), Gémi. 288 τὰς ἑκνόμους καὶ ἐκθέσμους δυμλᾶς τε καὶ μιξιώς (of the Watchers). It is a stronger word than ἄνομος, because θεσμός is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law.

8. βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ἑνακοικίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς.] For the reading see Introd. on Text. The rare ἐν. is found in Herod. iv. 204 βασιλείας δὲ σφί ἐδώκει κόρην ἐγκατσικήσα, Eur. Antiope fr. 198 ἐξ ὑπὲρ κενοῦν ἐγκατοικήσεις δόμοις. Alford with most commentators takes βλέμματι in the objective sense of τῷ βλέπειν, where the eye brings the man into communication with an external object; but the word is generally subjective, where the eye reveals to outsiders the inner feeling of the man: see exx. in Wetstein. I quote one from Philo Conf. Ling. i. p. 406 καὶ γὰρ ἐκτετμημένοι γλώσσαν νεῦσαν καὶ βλέμματι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ σώματος σχέσει καὶ κύνησιν, οὐχ ἤτοι τῆς διὰ λόγων προφορᾶς, ἀν δὲν θεὸν ὑποσημαίνουσιν. Wetstein would interpret it of the look and report of the Sodomites by which Lot was vexed, but the interval between βλέμματι καὶ ἐβασανίζει makes this improbable. I prefer the Vulgate aspectu et auditu iustus 'the righteousness of the man showed itself in his shrinking from the sights and sounds which met him on every side': lit. 'righteous in look and in hearing he tortured himself at their lawless deeds while he lived among them.' Cf. Field Notes on N.T. p. 241, Chase on 2 Pet. in Hastings' D. of B. iii. 867.

ἠμερὰν ἤ ἠμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμους ἐργοὺς ἐβασανίζει.] Cf. Ps. 961

1 Perhaps Clem. Al. Q. Div. Serv. p. 950 εἰ βλέποιες πρὸς τῶν κώμων ἀτενεὶ τῷ βλεμματί, καθάπερ εἰς ἀγαθὸν κυβερνητῆν νεῦμα δεδορκότες, τί βούλεται, τί προστάσει, τί ονείρει, τί διδοίκ τοῖς αὐτῶν νοείσιν τὸ σύνθημα combines the two meanings. It describes a fixed gaze intent on the actions of the pilot.
"A portion was given to him from the king εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ μέρα αὐτοῦ προσέχουμεν. The same passage is quoted with slight variations in 1 Clem. R. 23, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφή αὐτῆς. 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 n.c.) in Mein, Fr. Com. vol. 3, p. 563. See Blass Gr. (Ind. s. ἡμέρα). It is equivalent to the Hebraic ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα of 2 Cor. 4:16, and ἡμέρα καθ᾽ ἡμέραν of Ps. 68:19.

"δανιλευσθε ἡμέραν εἰς ἡμέραν τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, Jer. 52:4 a portion was given to him from the king εἰς ἡμέραν εἰς ἡμέραν, Gen. 39:2, Num. 30:15, 2 Clem. R. 11, in a quotation from what is called αἱ πρὸς ἡ τελείαν εἰς τοὺς ἡμέρας, which corresponds closely with 2 P. 3:4 πᾶν ἡμέρα καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ μέρα αὐτοῦ προσέχουμεν. The same passage is quoted with slight variations in 1 Clem. R. 23, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφή αὐτῆς. 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 n.c.) in Mein, Fr. Com. vol. 3, p. 563. See Blass Gr. (Ind. s. ἡμέρα). It is equivalent to the Hebraic ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα of 2 Cor. 4:16, and ἡμέρα καθ᾽ ἡμέραν of Ps. 68:19.

βασανίζω.] Used of testing, questioning, especially by the use of torture; then for bodily pain in general, as Mk. 5:7 μὴ με βασανίζης, Wisdom 11:5 μετ’ ὀργῆς κρυμμένοι ἄστειες βασανίζοντο; of disease, Mt. 20:28 βασανιζόμενος, 1 Sam. 30:15 ἔβαρινθε χείρ Κυρίων ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀζωτίους καὶ βασανίσανσιν αὐτούς; then of fatigue, Mk 6:48 βασανιζόμενοι εἰς τὸ θλιψεῖν; lastly of mental suffering, as in Plut. Vit. 896C, where Antigonus says to a messenger who had been tardy in bringing good news, οὖν ἴμας βασανίσας δίκην ὕβετεῖς τοῦ σου τί σου χρήσαις νῦν, ἵνα το θερισμόν ἀνάληψις, ἀν προσέξῃς καὶ τὸν ἄντων σου ψυχῆν ἑγαθορύγει, which is perhaps a reminiscence of our text. There is a peculiarity in the expression here: we should rather have expected βασανισθείς, just as in Joh. 11:23 ἐπέμενεν ἐν αὐτῷ might seem to be equivalent to Joh. 13:21 ἐταράξῃ τῷ πνεύματι, like the French reflexive verb. Augustin however (quoted by Westcott) gives it a special force 'turbatus est Christus quia voluit,' cf. the play Εαυτῶ τιμωρούμενος. Alford on our text compares our use of the phrase 'distress yourself' (so 'vex yourself,' 'trouble yourself,' 'worry yourself,' 'put yourself out'). For ἐν αὐτῷ the writer substitutes ψυχῆν ἐκκαίνων, repeating the idea of justice already embodied in ἐφικτή. In an ordinary writer we should have expected τὴν ἐκκαίνων αὐτῷ ψυχῆν, 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 φιλοσοφήσας μέλλων ἐν αὐτῷ βασανίσας ἐπιχείρη, but could it be followed by such a dative?

ἀνάμοι ἔργον.] The adjective is used (a) of persons who are not subject to law, Gentiles, as in Acts 2:23, 1 Cor. 9:21; (b) of persons who break the law, malefactors, Lk. 22:37; (c) of lawless deeds, as here and in Prov. 11:19 οἱ συνελεύστες τὰ ἀνάμα. Job. 34:17 ὁ δὲ σὺ τὸν μισοῦντα ἀνῶμα. 9. οὐδὲν Κυρίος εἰσεβείς ἐὰν περασμοῦ χρῆσθαι.] Here we have the apo-
dosis to έι γαρ—ον τε φειδώς τον Νομαν τε φηλαέν... και δίκαιον διό ερύσατο. Notice the repetition of μῦσσαι from v. 7. Compare for the general meaning of the passage Ps. 16 γινώσκει Κύριος ὅδε δικαίων, καὶ δόδοι ἀσεβῶν ἀπολείται; for infin. with ὅδε 1 Tim. 3, James 4, Mt. 7; for the meaning of πειρασμός James 12 with my note and comments, Apoc. 3 καθα ας σε τηνήσω ἐκ τῆς ὁμα τον περασμοῦ. Noah and Lot were exposed to trial, as standing alone amid mockers and unbelievers.

10. μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας ἐν εὐθυμίᾳ μισθοῦ πορευόμενους.] 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 ἀσταλκα in vv. 2 and 7. For the compact articular phrase see above on v. 5. On ὑπάρχοντας see Jude v. 7. The word ὑπάρχοντας is often used of following a teacher or leader, as in Mt. 4 δεῦτε ὑπάρχοντας μοι; so of following Satan in 1 Tim. 5, of the worship of Baal in Deut. 43, Jer. 25; then of surrendering ourselves to evil practices or passions, as here and in Isa. 65 τοὺς πορευόμενους ὁδῷ ὁ πλεῖον ἀρματών αὐτών. 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 ἠτέρας is here omitted, unless we suppose it to be represented by μισθοῦ. Alford translates ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισθοῦ 'lust of pollution,' which he explains as 'lust handkerking after unlawful and polluting use of the flesh.' I think it is more natural to regard it as another instance of the gen. qualitatis, so frequent with this author, see above 21 on αἰρέσεις ἀπολείπωσι. For πορεύόμενον see on Jude v. 16 and cf. 1 Pet. 43. μισθοῦ found here only in N.T., occurs in Wisdom 14 τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας τοῦ μισθοῦ who cleansed the sanctuary and bare out the defiled stones (τοῖς λίθοις τοῦ μισθοῦ) into an unclean place,' Test. Levi. 17. μισθοῦ occurs below v. 20, μισθῶν in Jude v. 8.

κυρίατης καταφρονοῦντας.] See n. on Jude v. 8. Here it seems most natural to understand κυρίαμ 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).

τολμηταί αἰθάδεας.] W.H. and Treg. separate the words by a comma. I have followed Nestle's punctuation, taking αἰθάδει as an epithet of τολμηταί with Bengel, Spitta, and others. In a somewhat similar phrase in Jude 16 οὐτοὶ ἔσων γογγυσταὶ, μεμψιμωροι, I have retained the dividing comma, as it seemed to me that the weighty word μεμψιμωροι 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 τολμητής, 'headstrong dare-devils' would be too flattering; perhaps 'shameless and headstrong.' The meaning of τολμητής is suggested by Jude 9 οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν and Ἰσ. Αντ. i. 11. 4, where speaking of the behaviour of the men of Sodom, he says ὅ Θεός ἀγανακτήσας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς τολμήσας τοὺς μὲν ἡμᾶς ὡκύτως. So we find τολμή joined with ἀναχυντία in Arist. Theophr. 702, Isaeus 60 θ. A., Antipho 123, Plat. Apol. 38 ν, ἀναδής καὶ τολμηρός in Antipho 122, τολμητής is found in Thuc. i. 70 οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμητής καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδύνευται, Plut. ν. 988 ε τολμήσας ὡστε ἀγαθοῦς, Ἰσ. Β.Ι. iii. 10. 2 Ἰουδαίοι μὲν, εἰ καὶ σφόδρα τολμητής καὶ βανάτον καταφυνοῦντες, ἀλλὰ πολέμου ἀπειροῦ. The only other place in the N. T. in which αἰθαδὴς is found is Ἡτ. i. 17 'the ἐπίσκοπος is to be μὴ αἰθαδὴς.'

δόξας οὖ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. See on Jude 8. For the complementary participle in place of the infinitive (as in Soph. Οἰδ. Κολ. 8., -ρῆμοντοι) see Winer p. 434 foll., and cf. Lycurg. p. 150. 6 οὔτε τὴν ἀκρότητα ... τροφίδιος ἐφοβηθή. This is Nestle's view of the construction, in which I am inclined to concur: if so, we should omit the comma placed after τὴν ἐφοβηθή by WH. According to the other construction οὖτα is governed by τρωμοὺν, for which compare Ἰσ. 66. 2 τρέμονται τοὺς λόγους μου.

11. ὅτιν. 'Whereas,' 'seeing that,' lit. 'in a case in which,' as in 1 Cor. 3. 13 ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξιλος καὶ ἐρις, οὕτω σαρκικοὶ ἐστε; 4 Μακκ. 214 (ὁ νόμος καὶ τῆς φίλων συννήθειας διεσπέρας) καὶ μὴ νομίζете παράδοξον εἶναι, ὅπου γε καὶ ἠχθας ἐπικρατεῖν ὁ λογισμός δύναται διὰ τὸν νόμον, ἢδ. 6. 34 δικαίον ἄστιν ὡμολογεῖν ἡμᾶς τὸ κράτος εἶναι τοῦ λογισμοῦ, ὅπου γε καὶ τῶν εὐθυνῶν ἀληθείαν ἐπικρατεῖ. Common in classical writers, as Antipho p. 112 ὅπου δὲ μὴ ἠθέλησεν ἐλεγχον ποιήσασθαι τῶν πεπραγμένων, τῶς περὶ γ' ὑπὸ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν πυθῆθαι, ἐγχωρεῖ αὕτῳ περὶ τούτων εἰδέναι; Andocides p. 12 ὅπου τοῖς ἥταν ἵπτοι τοῖς τριάκοντα ὤμως μὴ μνησικακήσεως, τοῖς μεγίστων κακῶν αἰτίοις... ἡ ποὺ σχολὴ τῶν γε ἄλλων πολιτῶν τινι ἠέλεστε μνησικακίας, Isocrat. p. 164 ὅπου γὰρ Ἀθηναίωνος καὶ Κάλλιστατος, ὅ μὲν ἰδώτης ὁν, ὁ δὲ φυγάς, οἰκίσαι τῶν οἰω τε γεγοναί, ἡ ποὺ βουληθέντες ἡμεῖς πολλοί ἀν τῶν τοιούτων κατασχείν δυνηθείμεν, Thuc. viii. 96, Dem. Herod. etc.

ἄγγελοι ἵσχυι καὶ δυνάμει μείλισεν 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. Οἰρ. ii. 3. 6 has οὔτε τοσιν εἴμι ταύς οὔτε χεριν ἰσχυρός in contrast with the πόδας ὥκες of Homer, cf. Plato Ρεπ. ν. 473 β ἀλάματοι τῷ ἀρμόνιον, σιμικράτατο τῷ δύναμιν, Συμφ. 190 β ἃν οὖν ταῦτα τὰ γένη ἵσχεν δεινά. See above ν. 8 βλέπωματι δίκαιοι καὶ Blass pp. 117, 118. We find ἰσχύς and δύναμις combined in the ascription in Ἅρων. 712, Deut. 3. 8, Cant. 27. The latter is the more general word. Our author gives an indefinite reference both to angels and to δόξα, 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 δοξα. I think it is better to understand men (with Bengel, Alford, and Keil) i.e. the false teachers who are spoken of as βλασφημοί in v. 10. The angels, though far superior to them, abstain from any such βλασφημος κρίσις, as the ψευδοδιασκαλοι indulge in towards δοξα. 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 βλασφημείν δοξας) and what is supposed to be unquestioned (that man is inferior to angels).

οἱ φέροντες κατ’ αὐτὸν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλασφημον 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 δοξα 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 δοξα. 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 Κυρίῳ, which he strangely interprets in reference to the declaration of judgment from the Lord against the sinful Watchers, a judgment first intrusted to the archangels (Enoch 10:4), and then delegated by them to Enoch (12:4), and by him announced to Azazel (13:1). Accordingly Spitta’s explanation is ‘whereas the angels, though greater in power and might (which he
regards as a periphrasis for ἀφχάγγελοι, decline to carry an announce-
ment of degradation (βλασφημον κρίνων) from the Lord; and he illus-
trates this from Test. Levi 15 καὶ οὐφεσθε ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ αἰσχύνην αὐῶν ἐπὶ τῆς δικαιοκριτίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. I think this explanation impossible for
many reasons, chiefly because it holds up an act of disobedience on the
part of the angels, as a model for men, and because it justifies βλασφημία. There is much more to be said for Dr. Bigg's view. If
our author wished to generalize the special case named by Jude, he
might take advantage of the incident referred to in En. 9. The
archangels did not take it upon themselves to condemn the sinful
Watchers, but made their appeal to God.

I take παρὰ Κυρίῳ to represent the words of Jude ἄλλα ἐπεν 'Επιτιμήσατο σοι Κύριος. The consciousness of the Divine presence keeps
the angels from any injurious word.


12. οὕτω δὲ ὦ ἄλογα ἥρα... φαράγησονται.] The expression in Jude v. 10 is far simpler and more natural.

γεγενημένα φυσικά εἰς ἀλοιπὸν καὶ φθοράν.] 'Born creatures of instinct
for capture and destruction.' Cf. Joh. 18:37 ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγένημα... ἢν μαρτυρήσῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, Juv. i. 141 'animal propter
conivia 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. Μορ. 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
φυσικῶν ἀποτελεστῶσα τῆς ψυχῆς, ἄλλα τοῦ κρίνοντος ἀπτόμεναι καὶ τοῦ
φρονοῦστος). One would rather have expected σφαγήν than φθοράν,
which is not more appropriate for animals than for men. But it seems
to be the intention of the writer to use a word which is applicable to
both, as shown later on, εἰς τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαργήσονται. We must
therefore compare ἄλοιπων with such passages as 1 Tim. 3:7 ἢν μὴ εἰς
ἀνειδισμὸν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου, 2 Tim. 2:26 καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ
tῆς διαβόλου παγίδος ἐξωρημένοι ὑπ’ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἔκειν πάλαιμα, 2 Tim. 3:5
αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια σεσωρωμένα ἀμαρτίαις, Eccles. 10:12, Χεν.
Μεμ. ii. 1. 4. οὐκών δ’ οὕτω παπαῖδεσμόν ἢττον ἄν δοκεῖ σοι ὑπὸ τῶν
ἀντιπάλων ὑὲ τὰ λοιπὰ ζῶα ἀλάκεσθαι... γαστρὶ δελεάζομεν... τῇ
ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀγόρινα πρὸς τὸ δίλαυρ ἀλάσκεται, κ.τ.λ., and v. 18
below.

ἐν οἷς ἄνγυον ἐπεν βλασφημοῦντες.] In the N.T. βλασφημεῖν is usually
followed by the accusative as in v. 10 above: in classical Greek by εἰς,
which also occurs in Mk. 3:29. If we are to expand the relative phrase
into ἐν τούτῳ αὐτοῖς, the frequent confusion between εἰς and ἐν in late

1 B and WH. om. κατά.
Greek may account for the use of \( \epsilon \) here, compare 1 Esdr. 149 \( \epsilon \mu \mu \kappa \tau \mu \rho i \mu \sigma \nu a v \tau \epsilon o i \) \( \alpha \gamma \gamma e l o i a i t o v \). It is better however to give it a wider sense ‘blaspheming in matters of which they know nothing.’ Others expand the clause as follows, \( \tau \alpha i a \) \( \epsilon o i \) \( \alpha \gamma \nu \nu o u \sigma \nu \), for which they compare the totally dissimilar Sir. 515 \( \epsilon \) \( \mu e g a l o \) \( k a i \) \( \epsilon m \nu \kappa \varepsilon \mu i \) \( \alpha \gamma \nu \nu o u \). The point of the phrase is explained by Test. Aser 7 \( m i \) \( \gamma i n e s \theta e \) \( \delta \zeta \delta o \zeta o m a, \) \( \dot{\eta} \tau i s \ \eta \gamma \nu \nu o u s \) \( t o i s \) \( \alpha \gamma \gamma e l o u \) \( K u r i o u \) \( k a i \) \( \alpha \pi o \lambda e t o \) \( \zeta o s \) \( a i n o s \).

\( \epsilon n \) \( \tau \eta \) \( \phi \theta o r a a i t o v \) \( k a i \) \( \phi \theta a i r h \sigma o n t a \). A very rhetorical phrase to express Jude’s \( \epsilon n \) \( t o u t o i s \) \( \phi \theta e i r o n t a \). We may compare it with \( \epsilon n \) \( \epsilon m \tau a g i o m \nu \gamma \) \( \iota m p a \iota t a k a \) 38 below, and Philo i. p. 693 \( b o \iota \iota t a i d \iota u i k \iota i s a ) \) \( \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \) \( t o n \) \( \sigma o m a t i k o n, \) \( \alpha p e r \) \( \epsilon n \) \( \rho \iota s e i \) \( k a i \) \( \phi \theta o r \rho \) \( \phi \theta e i r o m \nu \gamma \) \( \kappa a i \) \( \phi \theta e i r o u s \) \( \theta e w \sigma e i t a i, \) \( k \lambda \rho \iota \nu \) \( \nu i c h \nu \) \( l a b e i n \) \( m e t a \) \( t o n \) \( \alpha \phi \theta a r t o w \) \( k a i \) \( \alpha \phi \theta a r o i a \) \( \alpha \xi o i n \) \( \delta r e t o n \).

What is the reference in \( a i t o n \)? Probably we should explain it of \( \tau \eta \) \( \delta l o g o s, \) of whom \( \phi \theta o r a \) 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 (\( \delta o a \) \( m i n o i \) \( o i d \sigma a r o i \) corresponding to \( \epsilon n \) \( o i \) \( \alpha \gamma \nu \nu o u \sigma \nu \) here), who in both epistles are said to rail at the objects of this knowledge (\( \delta o \xi a i ) : \) 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 (\( a i t o n \) ) plane corrumpentur,’ reading \( \kappa a t a f i l a t h \rho a n s o t a i f o r \) \( k a i \) \( \phi \theta a r, \) meaning, I suppose, ‘their own corrupt hearts will bring about their destruction’ But would not this require \( a i t o n \) or at any rate a more emphatic position for \( a i t o n \)? Spitta understands \( a i t o n \) of the \( \delta o \xi a i, \) who are referred to as \( k a t \) \( a i t o n \) in v. 11, and explains \( \epsilon n \) \( o i s \) \( \epsilon n \) \( t o u t o i s \) \( o i s \) (because \( \delta o \xi a i = \alpha \gamma \gamma e l o i ) ; \) this \( \epsilon n \) \( t o u t o i s \) is then replaced by \( \epsilon n \) \( \tau \eta \) \( \phi \theta o r a a i t o v \), depending on \( k a t a f i l a t h \rho a n s o t a i \); ‘der Untergang der \( \delta o \xi a i \) wird auch der der Libertiner sein (\( v v. \) \( 4, 11, 12 ) . \) He further explains the reference to the \( \alpha \lambda o w i s \) of the brutes by the use of \( \sigma i r o i \) in v. 4. The difficulty of this explanation lies in the fact that it destroys the relation between the second \( \phi \theta o r a \) (that of the angels, according to Spitta) and the first \( \phi \theta o r a \) (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. 85:6 \( o i \) \( k a t a \) \( \sigma \alpha r k a \) \( \hat{o}i \tau e \) \( t \) \( t \) \( \tau \) \( \nu s \) \( s a r k o s \) \( f r o n o u \sigma n, \) \( o i \) \( d i \) \( k a t a \) \( \pi \nu e \iota m a t o s \) \( t a \) \( t o u \) \( \pi \nu e \iota m a t o s \). \( \tau o \) \( \gamma a r \) \( f r o n \nu \iota m a t o s \) \( t t \) \( s a r k o s \) \( \theta a \iota n a t o s \) \( t o \) \( \delta e \) \( f r o n \iota m a m a \) \( t o u \) \( \pi \nu e \iota m a t o s \) \( \dot{\eta} \nu i \) \( k a i \) \( e i r \nu \iota n i, \) \( k a i \) \( 1 C o r. \) 214 \( \nu i c h \nu \iota s \) \( \delta e \) \( \dot{\alpha}n \nu \iota m a t o s o u \) \( \delta e \) \( \dot{\xi}e k t a i \) \( t a \) \( t o u \) \( \pi \nu e \iota m a t o s \) \( t o u \) \( \Theta o u, \) \( m o r i a \) \( \gamma a r \) \( a i t o s \) \( \varepsilon t i n, \) \( k a i \) \( o u \) \( \varepsilon n a t a i \) \( \gamma \nu o n a i, \) \( o t i \) \( \pi \nu e \iota m a t i k o s \) \( a n a k r i n t a i. \) See further in the Comment.
13. ἀδικοῦμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας.] For the reading see Introduction on the Text. The reading κοιμοῦμενοι resembles Col. 3:25 ὁ γὰρ ἄδικον κομίσται ὁ ἁδικησθεν, Barn. iv. 12 ὁ κύριος κρίνει τὸν κόσμον ἐκαστός, καθὼς ἐποίησεν, κομίζεται... ἐὰν ἔπνοησός, ὁ μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας ἐμπροθένθαι αὐτοῦ. But there seems no reason for a future here. The principal verb φθαρίσσονται 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, στίλοι καὶ μῶμοι in v. 13, and κατάφρας τέκνα in v. 14, though the latter is perhaps best taken with the next sentence. The first participle ἀδικ. is closely connected with the preceding verb: the second is connected with the subsequent clauses, which serve to bring out its separate features: the third and fourth are merely appendages to the second. Spitta, putting a full stop after the fine-sounding καταφθαρίσσονται, thinks that the participles stand for finite verbs as in Hebrew. Cf. Blass G.T. § 79. 10, Jannaris § 2168. If ἀδικοῦμενοι is correct, it is another example of the author's love of far-fetched and artificial expressions. The simple thought which underlies the phrase is probably 'being punished for their ἁδίκων' (cf. ἀδίκως in v. 9), a thought which may have recalled to his mind Rom. 6:23 τὰ γὰρ ὄφωνα τῆς ἁμαρτίας βάπτισας, and perhaps Mt. 6:14 ἀπέχουμα τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. The corresponding verse in Jude speaks of μισθός ἐν κοινωνίᾳ with Balaam, and our author uses the phrase μισθὸς ἁδίκας himself in reference to Balaam in v. 15. But, as he would reflect, Balaam never received the promised wages of his iniquity. Balak, who had hired him, never paid his hire (Numb. 24:11). And is it not the same with those libertines, who sacrifice so much for the sake of wealth and popularity, and yet are defrauded of their wage by death? So Tischendorf appears to take it translating 'decepti circa μισθὸν ἁδίκας.' The construction ἄδικως τινὰ τι 'to wrong a person in any way' is common enough, cf. Acts 3:5, Gal. 4:12. But in classical writers the acc. rei does not seem to extend beyond the cognate ἁδίκημα: μισθὸν ἀποστεροῦμενος would rather have been used for the sense 'defrauded,' which is here supposed. See however Plut. Cato Mi. 17 (p. 766) εἰρήν χρήα παλαιά τῷ δημοσίῳ πολλοὶ ἁφελοντας καὶ πολλοὶ τὸ δημόσιον, ἀμα τὴν πάλιν ἐπανεῖν ἁδικομένην καὶ ἁδικωταν. The R.V. has 'suffering wrong as the hire of wrong-doing,' which is much the way in which it is taken by Dr. Abbott, who would understand ἁδίκων after ἀδικοῦμενοι, translating 'they receive from God what they call injustice as the requital of their injustice,' and by Hofmann 'Schlimmes erfahrend als einen Lohn für Schlimmes,' which may be compared with Ps. 18:26 'With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward.' The difficulty of this is that μισθὸν ἁδίκας is used below of the literal reward offered to Balaam. But this playing on the double use of μισθός is not unlike the play on φθορά, above, and εἴ ἐδατος καὶ εἰ ἐδατος in 3:5. ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν.] Here again we have a very ambiguous sentence. Both ἡδονὴ and τρυφή may be taken either in a
good or a bad sense, while ἐν ἡμέρᾳ has been variously interpreted. The word τρυφή occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Lk. 7:25 where οἱ ἐν ἡμετέρῳ και τρυφὴ ὑπάρχοντες are contrasted with the Baptist, the reference being to a luxurious life with no special blame attached. In James 5:5 ἐπροφήσατε is joined with ἐσπαταλάζετε in a bad sense, like ἐστραφαῖος here. Exx. of τρυφή in the bad sense are found in Herm. Mand. vi. 5. (of the works of the Evil Angel) πολυτέλεαι μεθυσμάτων καὶ ποικίλων μυθών καὶ ἐπιθυμία γυναικῶν, i.e. viii. 3, xi. 12 ὁ δοκῶν πνεύμα έξειν υδών καὶ ἀναληθῆς ἐστιν καὶ ἐν τρυφεῖαις ἀναστρεφόμενοι καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις πολλαῖς ἀπαίσισ καὶ μισθοῖς λαμβάνει τῆς τρυφής τείας ἀφό τοῦ, i.e. xii. 2 πάσα τρυφη μιμά ἐστι καὶ κενὴ τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ Θεοῦ, Sim. vi. 2 οὕτως ἄγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ άπατής ής ἐστίν, i.e. 2 πορεύεται ἀπατεῖαι καὶ τρυφαίς μεταίσαι, i.e. iv. 4 τής τρυφῆς καὶ αἰ τής ἁρά ἀρα ἐστί μία, τής δὲ βασιλείας ἡ ἁρά λ' ἡμερῶν δύναμιν ἔχει, καὶ so passim. On the other hand τρυφή is used of the gifts of wisdom in Prov. 4:9 ἐφ' ἀδίκω χείρι καὶ τεσσαράκοντα παραδοτοῦσα σοι, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνοις, καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, ὑπερασπισθείς σοι, and of the divine blessing in Ps. 30:8. Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures' (τοῦ κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ τοῦτον χαρακτήρα τοῦτον, καὶ τοῖς τούτοις, καὶ τοῖς τοὺς, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνοις, καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, ὑπερασπισθείς σοι, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνοις, καὶ τοῖς τοὺς, καὶ τοῖς τούς). 1 On the other hand τρυφή is used only in a bad sense, see Lk. 8:14, Tit. 3:8, James 4:3. In one place in the LXX. (Prov. 17:1) it has a good sense, κρέσσον ποιμὸς μεθ' ἁράνθιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ἡ οὖν πολλῶν ἁγαθῶν μετὰ μάχας. I doubt whether we can find ἁράνθιν in an entirely good sense outside the Epicurean school, but Philo's definition would suit here, see M. 2. p. 164 τοῦ παράγοντος καὶ νομισθέντος ἁγαθοῦ φαντασία διεγείρει τὴν φυσική ... καλείται δὲ τούτο τὸ πάθος ἁράνθιν, M. 1. p. 39 σπεύδει πάν ζων ὡς ἐπί ἀναγκαίαταν καὶ συνεκκυιάσταταν τέλος, ἁράνθιν, καὶ καλίστα ἀνθρωπος, or Aristotle's (Eth. Ν. x. 4) πᾶσιν ἐνεργειαν τελεῖς ἢ ἁράνθιν. 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 schweigen für die höchste Lebensfreude achtet,' n. Soden 'Als Lust betrachtend die Schlemmerei am Tage,' and Keil 'Den Tag, der zur Arbeit bestimmt ist, mit Schwelgen hinzuzubringen für Vergnügen achtet sie.' For the phrase ἐν ἡμέρᾳ οἱ τοῦ καὶ ἡμέρα, Rom. 13:13 ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχήμονοι περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κόμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κολάσις καὶ ἀσελγείας, 1 Th. 5:8 ὡς οἱ ἡμέρας δέντες νιθρίομεν, also Joh. 9:4 ὡς ἡμέρα ἐστίν, Joh. 11:9 ἐὰν τις περιπάτησα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει. The more usual expression in classical Greek would be ἡμέρας οἀ μιθήματι. For the thought see Isa. 5:11, Eccles. 10:17. Dr. Bigg's rendering is 'counting our sober daylight joy (the Agape) mere vulgar pleasure,' which keeps closer to the ordinary meaning of the words in biblical Greek; but the meaning given to τὴν ἡμέρα τρυφῆς is very far-fetched, and it is by no means certain that the Agape was then a daylight meal.1 See my Appendix C to Clem. Al. Strom. vii.
'Als Lustbarkeit betrachten die Libertiner die tägliche Mahlzeit, die doch nur den Zweck hat den Menschen für die Arbeit des Lebens die nöthige Kraft zu geben.' The objections to this are (1) that ἐν ἡμέρα is not equivalent to καθ’ ἡμέραν, cf. Mt. 26:53, Lk. 11:9, (2) that there is nothing wrong in a man’s finding pleasure in his daily bread (Eccles. 5:18), but rather in a morose refusal to enjoy what God has provided for enjoyment (1 Tim. 4:4). Weiss interprets τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρινθήν 'luxury which according to its nature can only last as long as it is day, i.e. during our earthly life.'

σπλάθοι καὶ μάμσει] σπλάθος is late Greek for the classical κηλίς (Phryn. p. 28 Loh.), used of moral defect in Eph. 5:22 ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐνδοξὸν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μη ἡχουσαν σπλαθον ἡ ἁρμίδα ἡ τι τῶν τοιοῦτων, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ ἀγία καὶ ἀρμομος; of a person who discredits the body to which he belongs in Dion. Hal. Ant. iv. 24 (speaking of slaves unammitted in reward for disgraceful services) εἰς τούτους δυσεκκαθάρτους σπλαθον ἀποβλέποντες αἰ τολοι δυσχεραίνουσιν. The adjective ἀσπλάθος is used below 3:14, also in 1 Pet. 11 τιμω ἁμαρτ., ὡς ἁμαρτο ἁμομον καὶ ἀσπλάθον, Χριστον, as well as in 1 Tim. 6:14, James 1:27; and the verb σπλάθω in Jude 23, James 3:6. As the word σπλάθος in the parallel passage of St. Jude is also found in the sense of σπλάθος in one solitary passage, so the σπλάθος of 2 P. is also found, though rarely, in the sense of σπλάθας, 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 μάμσει see note on Jude v. 24, and Lev. 21:21 τὰς ὅ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῶ μάμσει . . . ὅικ ἐγγυιε τοῦ προσευγεκεῖν τὰς ψυχίας τῷ Θεῷ σου. ὅτι μάμσει ἐν αὐτῷ, where it refers to ritual blemish: in Sir. 11 τρόπο πρόσεχε ἀπὸ κακοῦργων . . . μήτρο τοῦ μάμσει εἰς τὸν αἰώνα δῶ σου, ib. 18 ἐν ἁγαθοῖς μη δῶς μάμσαν, ib. 20 μάμσαν πανιρρός ἐν ἄνθρωπο ψεύδος it is used as in profane Greek, in the sense of ‘blame,’ ‘reproach,’ ‘disgrace.’ With the exclamatory σπλάθας καὶ μάμσει may be compared τολμητα αὐθάδεις in v. 10, κατάρας τέκνα in v. 14, and the denunciatory terms introduced by ὅτι τῶν ἐστιν in v. 17 and Jude vv. 12, 16.

ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἄπαθαις αὐτῶν.] For readings see Introduction on the Text. Cf. Isa. 55:2 ἐπειθήσετε ἐν ἀγάθοις ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν (good sense), ‘Let your soul delight itself in fatness’ R.V., 574 ἐν τίνι ἐπειθήσετε; (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 δειλείζοντες ψυγάς in the next verse. Ewald takes it literally, supposed that ἄπαθα is a sort of pun on the ἄπαθη of Jude, ‘Diebsmahle’ for ‘Liebsmahle.’ It might also be taken absolutely, as in Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 30 ἄυστοιδέων δὲ αὐτῶ τῶν θεραπόντων μαστά, ἐφ’ ὃ αὐτῷ καθίζοντι οἱ Πέρσαι μαλακῶς, ἐσχύνθη ἐπειθήσεται, and Philo M. 1 p. 232 ἐνευφαίρεται καὶ ἐντρυφά πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀμυνότι καὶ ἀκράτος ἔτι δὲ ἁρτων καὶ πληρέστες κεφηρεμένοι ἄγαθοίς; in which case τῶν ἄπαθαίς might be joined with συνεφαιρομένου to explain how it happened that the libertines were
admitted to the feasts of believers. On the whole however I prefer Hofmann’s rendering.

14. [Scholia] 

The participle denotes the circumstances of the preceding action. The phrase πάς οἱ βλέπων γυναίκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμήσαι αὐτῆς, ἢ δὲ ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Plut. Mor. 528 κ. ὁ μὲν ἤτρω τὸν ἀνάίσχυντον οὐκ ἐφη κόρας ἐν τοῖς ὀμμασιν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ πόρνας (a saying attributed to Timaeus by Longin. 4, 5), Gell. iii. 5 (Arcesilaus) cum oculos ludibundos atque inlecebrae voluptatissque plenos videret: ‘nihil interest,’ inquit, ‘quibus membris cinaedi sitis, posterioribus an prioribus’ (cited by Wetstein). For the metaphorical use of μετοῦς see Mt. 23:28 ἵππες ἐμοίχευσεν ἑτεροκόρος, ἡ μοναρχία τὸ ἀκατάπαυστον προσλαβοῦσα, id. 1039 π. ἀκατάπαυστος ἄρχης. The classical equivalent is ἀπάυστος, used with gen. by Eur. Suppl. 82 ἀπαυστὸς γῶν.

For readings see Introd. on Text. For the construction cf. 1 Pet. 4:1 τέπαναι ἀμαρτίας, and γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας below: see my note on James 1:13 ἀπείρατος κακῶν. The late word ἀκ. is only found here in biblical Greek. It is used by Polyb. 4. 17. 4, Plut. Mor. 114 ἀκαταπάστη εὐσμφορᾶ συνεσόμεθα, id. 924 ν. ἡ μοναρχία τὸ ἀκατάπαυστον προσλαβοῦσα, id. 1039 c ἀκατάπαυστος ἄρχης. The classical equivalent is ἀπάυστος, used with gen. by Eur. Suppl. 82 ἀπαυστὸς γῶν.

For the rare late Greek ἀστήρικτος see below (316), and n. on στηρίζω (112): it is used by Longinus ii. 2 (great wits) διὰ ἐπιστήμης ἀστήρικτα καὶ ἀνεματίστα. For δελ. see below v. 18, Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 4 quoted above on v. 12, and my n. on James 114.

For πλεονεξία see above v. 3.
14. For the readings see Introd. on Text. For the metaphorical ὅδος see above on v. 2, 1 Sam. 1228 δεῖξο ἡμῖν τὴν ὅδον τὴν ἄγαθην καὶ τὴν ἐθεταν. Ezra 821 ἔτησαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅδον ἐθεταν ἡμῖν. Ps. 1077, Isa. 3021, Hos. 148 εὐθέατα αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δίκαιοι πορεύσωμαι εν αὐτάς, Acts 1310 (of Simon Magus) διαστρέφον τὰς ὅδους Κυρίου τάς εὐθέατα. For the absence of the article see Introd. on Grammar. For πλανάμοι cf. Jas. 51920, 1 Pet. 225.

15. διακολουθήσαντες ἐθεταν ὅδον ἐπανάθησαν.] For the readings see Introd. on Text. For ἐπαναθήσαντες cf. above 1162. For Balaam see n. on Jude v. 11. Alford compares Num. 2232 οἷον ἀστεία ὅδος σου ἐναντίον ἑμοῦ.

8ς μυθὸν ἀδικίας ἁγάτησεν.] See Introd. on Text. For a similar use of ἁγατία, see above 1164. Balak's offer was a bribe, a reward of wrong doing, because Balaam was fully aware that Israel was under the protection and blessing of Jehovah, and yet he consented to go with the messengers of Balak when they came for the second time to ask him to curse Israel. Compare the two equations in the first epistle of St. John ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστίν ἡ ἁμαρτία (34) and τὰσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν (517) with Westcott's notes 'Sin is the assertion of a selfish will against a paramount authority,' 'By whatever acts, internal or external, man falls short of God's will, as it is spiritually apprehended, he sins.' So here Balaam is guilty of παρανομία because he consents to ἀδικία.

16. ἔλεγχον δὲ ἐσχήν ἰδίας παρανομίας.] The only other recorded instances of ἔλεγχος in biblical Greek are in Job 214 μὴ ἀνθρώπου μου ἢ ἔλεγχος; 'is my complaint of man?'; ib. 232 εκ χειρὸς μου ἢ ἔλεγχος ἐστι, where R. V. has 'even to-day is my complaint rebellion.' Cf. Philostratus Vit. Ap. ii. p. 74 ὁ πικρὸς πρὸς τὰς ἔλεγχος ἥν. Here ἔχω is used with a noun in a sort of periphrastic passive of the cognate verb, as in αἰτιαν ἔχω. For ἔχω see above on 13 ἔχω ἀδερφη. Winer p. 191 f., Jannaris Gr. Gr. §§ 1416 f. Dr. Bigg after Huther and Hofmann regards it as merely equivalent to αὐτὸν, comparing Mt. 2225 ὃς δὲ ἀμελήσαντες απῆλθον, δὲ μὲν εἰς τὸν ὅδον ἅγρον, δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτὸν. There can be no doubt however that in the great majority of instances in the N. T. ἔχω 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 παρανομία vorhalten lassen,' Keil 'διδάσκει nicht einfach für αὐτὸν, sondern hebt hervor, dass die παρανομία einen stehenden Zug seines Charakters bildete.' Hundhausen explains it as follows: 'Balaam, der als Prophet den Willen Gottes und das göttliche Gesetz am wenigsten hätte übertreten sollen, selbst dawider handelte, und er der als gottberechteter Prophet andere zurechtzuweisen berufen war, sich ob seiner eigenen Frevelthalt von einer Eselin musste zurecht weisen lassen.'
Perhaps it is simpler to explain as follows: ‘He who was bribed by Balak to curse Israel was rebuked for his own disobedience by the disobedience of the ass and thus hindered from receiving the promised reward.’ The act of receiving, is not so strong an expression as διαρρήσατο. It is not a general defiance of law, but rather a breach of a particular law. It occurs here only in the N.T., but is found in classical Greek and in Prov. 5:22 παρανομεῖαι ἄνδρα ἄγρεύσαν, ἵδι. 10:26 ὅσπερ καπνὸς ὀμμασών, οὕτως παρανομεῖαι τοῖς χρωμένοις αὐτῇ.

ὑποσύνοιο... ἐκάλυψεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονιαν.] An example of confirmatory asyndeton, which would have been more usually expressed by the gen. abs. ὑποσύνοιο καλύπταντος. The indefinite ὑποσύνοιο is sometimes used for the more common δοσις in biblical Greek, as the ass was the familiar beast of burden among the Israelites, see Mt. 21:5, Exod. 4:20, 2017, 23:4-5, Josh. 6:21, Jud. 14, Job 24:3. Among the Greeks and Romans the term ὑποσύνοιο 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 ε we find ὑποσύνοιο distinguished from the horse.

ἄφωνον.] As φωνὴ is used of the sound uttered by any living thing (Arist. de Anim. ii. 8. 9), the epithet ἄφωνος is properly applicable only to creatures which are entirely mute, or to lifeless things, as by Aeschin. 88. 37. A distinctive force is given to the word by the reference to the human voice which follows. In 1 Cor. 14:10 ἄφωνος is used of the gift of tongues in the sense ‘without signification.’

ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνὴ φθειράμμενον.] For exx. of the use of ἐν to express the instrument, see the Index. φθειράμματι is found in N.T. only in this Epistle (here and below v. 18) and in Acts 4:18. The aorist participle is taken by Alford and others as contemporary with the aorist verb following, but ἐκάλυψεν is really consequent upon φθειράμμενον: the present participle might be translated ‘in human speech,’ being simply descriptive of the action; the aorist denotes a logical antecedent to the action, ‘by speaking in man’s voice’; see Acts 13:2 μητενύσαντες καὶ προσευχάμενοι... ἅπελυσαν and Introd. on Grammar.

ἐκάλυψεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονιαν.] ‘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 φωνή is -ονοῦ, as παραφροσύνη in Plat. Soph. 228 b, from παράφρων ‘delirious’ (another form is παραφρόνης in LXX. Zach. 12:2); sometimes -ονη as in εἴφρον, ἀφρόν, δυσφρόνη. Lobeck gives a long list of nouns in -ονη 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 ἄδημονία (rarely ἄδημωσύνη) from ἄδημον, γείτονία (rarely γείτωσύνη) from γείτων, εὐδαιμονία and κακοδαιμονία (very rarely εὐ and κακο-δαιμονίη) from δαίμων, ἀπημονία as well as ἀπημωσύνη from ἀπήμων. Probably the author was led to select the form παραφρονία from the assonance to-
the preceding παρανομία. Philo i. p. 609 speaks of Balaam as κατα-
κεντοῦμενος ὑπὸ φρενοβλαβείας τῆς εαυτοῦ.

17. οὖτος οὖν πηγαὶ ἀνθρώποι καὶ δύσχηι ὑπὸ λαλατος ὀλανόμειναι.] For
ουτό εἶσιν 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. 148
 foll., for the latter Job 79, 3015, Hos. 64, 138. λαλας is used of the
storm on the Lake of Galilee in Mk. 437, Lk. 823. It seems an unnec-
sarily strong expression here. Compare however Wisdom 514 ἀλτις
ἀσεβῶς ὡς φρενόμενοι χροῖς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου, καὶ ὡς πάχη ὑπὸ λαλατος
dωσθέασα λεπτή. Philo i. p. 611 uses it metaphorically λαλατι κενής
δόξης μὴ ἀναρπασθῆναι. We should hardly think of a mist as promis-
ing rain, indeed Aristotle (Meteor. i. 9. 4) asserts the contrary, ὀμίχλη
χιονίων μᾶλλον ἐστιν εἰδίας ἡ ὑδάτων ὁιν γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ ὀμίχλη νεφέλη
ἄγων, and so in the De Mundo i. p. 394a; Plato however defines
ὀμίχλη as τὸ ἐξ ἀνέρω εἰς ἐν ἵν, and is on this account condemned
by Theophrastus (De Sensu et Sensili §§ 90), who makes a mist a sign
of fine weather, ὅταν ὀμίχλη γένεται, ὑδόρ οὐ γίνεται, ἡ ἔλαττον
(De Signis c. 4).1 Possibly the author may have had in his mind Gen.
29, where a mist is said to have supplied the place of rain in the
garden of Eden. For ἔλατω see n. on James 34.

οἰς ὁ ξόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρητα. 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 οἰς is used because the false teachers
are typified by these figures, cf. Winer pp. 176 f. Spitta quotes Micah 38
(ἵπτο τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πλανώντας τὸν λαὸν μου) διὰ τούτο νῦν ὡμίς ἐστι
ἐξ ὀργῆς καὶ σκοτία ἐσται ὡμίς ἐκ μαυτεῖας καὶ δύστη ὁ ἔλιος ἐπὶ
τοὺς προφήτας κ.τ.λ. contrasting it with Dan. 123.

18. ὑπέροχα γάρ ματαιότητος φθεγγώμειν.] For ὑπέροχα see note on
Jude ver. 16. The verb φθέγγομαι is used from the time of Homer
downwards of any kind of utterance or sound of man or animal, or even
of inanimate things. It is repeated here in the author's way from v. 16.
ματαιότητι a biblical word used only by ecclesiastical writers, cf. Ps. 42
ἐνατι ἀγαπάτε ματαιότητα; Ps. 396 τὰ σύμπαντα ματαιότης, Eccles. 12 ματ.
ματαιότητων, Rom. 820 τῇ ματαιότητῃ ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, where it is used of
what is empty, passing, and transient. In Ps. 264 οἷς ἐκάθισα μετὰ
συνεδρίου ματαιότητος, Ps. 11937 ἀπόστρεψον τοὺς ὄφολαμος μου τοῦ μή
ἰδεῖν ματαιότητα, Ps. 1449 ὅτι τὸ στόμα ἐλάχιστα ματαιότης, Eph. 417 μερίτε
ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἐθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν,
it is used of moral instability, of men without principle on whom no
reliance can be placed. Here it seems best to understand it in the
former sense of emptiness. The false teachers use big words, make
high professions, which have no corresponding reality. The word
occurs in Barn. 410 φήγομαι ἀπὸ πάθης ματαιότητος, Polyc. ad Philipp.
7 διὸ ἀπολεπίτεντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν, cf. ib. 2 ἀπολεπίτεντες
τὴν κενῆν ματαιολογίαν. For the genitive see Introd. on Grammar.

1 Quoted in Ideler's note to the Meteorologica.
γάρ here introduces the reason why the false teachers are compared to wells and mists which encourage false hopes of water. Their fine words are equally delusive.

δειλάζοντι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἁσελγεῖαι. 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 καὶ ἁσελγεῖαι, as in Eph. 2, 2 Pet. 2 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, where Hort says ‘this is the only place in the Epistle where St. Peter uses σάρξ or σαρκικός strictly in the Pauline or ethical sense. Two points need attention with respect to it... the flesh includes much more than sensuality, as a glance at Gal. 5 foll. will show, where hatreds and envyings form part of a list which begins with fornication and ends with revellings. On the other hand the term “flesh” is not applied to any part of human nature, absolutely and in itself, but as placed in a wrong relation, that being allowed to rule which was meant to serve’ (shortened). Other examples are Rom. 13, τῆς σαρκός πρόνοιας μὴ ποιείσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, Gal. 5 πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός οὐ μὴ τελείητε, ib. v. 24 οἱ τῶν Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταφύλισαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, 1 Joh. 2, above v. 10 τῶν ὑπό σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισμοῦ πορευομένων. It might seem also that since ἐπιθυμία, though commonly used in a bad sense, is a neutral word to start with, while ἁσελγεία is always bad, it was more appropriate to define the former by adding σαρκός. There are however two kinds of misconduct denoted by ἁσελγεία and the cognate words, (1) petulance, insolence, and (2) lasciviousness. Of (1) we have exx. in Plato Legg. ix. 879 a where ἁσελγαίειν is used of one who wantonly strikes another, Isocr. p. 174 ἐς τῆς ἐπεμείνῃ τὴν ἁσελγείαν τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἡμετέρων, where it refers to tyrannical treatment of the allies, ib. 398 b, where it refers to striking, ib. 240 ἁσελγός κατηγορεῖ τῆς πάλης, 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), ἁσελγεία περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, to which σαρκός ἁσελγεῖαι here corresponds. For the plural of abstract words see on ἁσελγείαι v. 2 above and Blass p. 84. The meaning would then be ‘They ensnare in lusts through fleshly indulgences,’ ἐν denoting the sphere (‘Anknüpfungspunkt’, Kuhl) in which the bait is applied, ἁσελγεία 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 ἁσελγείαι as the precise means employed to attain this result. Cf. 1 Pet. 4 τὸ βούλευμα τῶν θυνῶν κατεργάσθαι πεπορευμένον ἐν ἁσελγείαις, κ.τ.λ.

τοῖς ὀλίγωσ ἀσφείγοντας τοῖς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστραφόμενοι.] 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 ἁσελγείαι, which might be translated ‘lusts of fleshly wantonness,’ cf. above v. 10 ἐπὶθ. μισμοῦ.
present (with most authorities) or the aorist participle (with KLP etc.)? (2) what is the force of ἄλλης? If we read ἀποφεύγοντας, it implies an inferior degree of Christian progress, especially if we give to ἄλλης 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 KühI). On the other hand, if we read the aorist, as in v. 20 ἀποφεύγοντες τὰ μιῶματα τοῦ κόσμου and in 14 ἀποφεύγοντες τῆς ἐπιθυμίας φθορᾶς, we get an exhortation which is suited to the general body of the Church, and which would agree better with other interpretations of ἄλλης mentioned below. This rare adverb is found in Anthol. xii. 205. 1 παῖς τις ἄλως ἀμαλγ. τοῦ γεύσωνος οἶκ ἄλλως (‘in no slight degree’) με κνίζει, Isa. 10' ἔξελοθρεύει θη οἶκ ἄλλως (Aquila ἄλλως). 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. Αrh. ii. 7 τὰ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ λεπτομένα σώματα ναιρῶς ἔπανατρέψαν δε. τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄλλῳ ἄλλως 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 ἄλλης the sense of ἄλλως, and read ἀποφεύγοντας, ‘those who had all but escaped.’ 1 The other reading ὄντως ἀποφεύγοντας is illustrated by Arist. Vesprae 997 ὄντως ἀπέφυγεν. 2

The clause τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους 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 effugiant, 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 δειλάξατεν, and that the clause would then be a rather futile periphrasis for εὐνοίας. Spitta answers this by referring to 13 where τοὺς καλεσθεντος refers, if not to the preceding αὐτοῖ, yet to Ἰησοῦ in v. 2. In the similar passages 317 τὸν ἄθεσμον πλάνῃ συναπαθάντες, 217 τῆς τῶν ἄθεσμων ἐν ἀσέλγεις ἀναστρέφης, and 214 δειλάξατες ψυχαῖς ἀστηρίκτους, there seems little doubt that the reference is to the false teachers. So v. Soden (entice those) ‘welche zu wenig von den in der Irre wandelnden (die Libertiner selbst bezeichnend) sich abkehren. Weil sie nur wenig, nicht ganz, von jenen sich gewendet haben, sind sie ihren Lockungen immer noch erreichbar.’ The second explanation is supported by

1 See however n. on ἀποφεύγοντες v. 20 below.
2 In Plato, Alcib. sec. 149 a, where the MSS. have τὰ ἄνωτα τὰν ἄλλως ἐν ἄστηρος τιμῶν ἦσε ἡμῖν, Buttmann, reading ἄλλως, says in his note, ‘Voci ἄλλως, eius parcissimus est veteribus usus, nullus omnino hic locus est.’ He refers to Hippocr. l.c. where he translates ἄλλως brevi and νωθρῶς lente.
Weiss, who understands the verse of recent converts ‘die sich noch lange nicht ganz von der Gemeinschaft heidnischen Lebens losgesagt haben’; Hundhausen ‘er in πλάνην ἀναπροφέρεται 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 πλάνη fähren. Dem Wandel der Heiden noch nicht ganz entronnen, lassen die Christen sich durch die Schwelgereien der Verführer leicht ködern’; and so Wiesinger, Alford, Schott, Brückner, Hofmann, Kühl, and Dr. Bigg. I agree with the latter explanation, mainly on the ground that, if we understand the clause of the general subject of the sentence, it will not do to translate ‘the false teachers entice, by means of fleshly indulgences, those who are barely escaping from those that live in error’ (viz. the false teachers themselves): we must at least suppose a difference in time, and read ἀποφυγόντας, implying that the false teachers were now making a second attack on those who had to some extent escaped them before. 

But there is nothing here to suggest a previous attack. The author is warning against a new danger now beginning to develop itself. On the other hand, if we suppose the heathen to be meant, this will be the concrete form of the abstract which we find in v. 20 ἀποφυγόντας τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.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. 146 ‘Ἡσυχίος τὰς παραδεδομένας τῇ τῆς πλάνης ἀνομία ψυχάς ἥμων λυτρωθόμενος ἐκ τοῦ σκότους, and generally.

19. ἰαθήριαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγέλλομεν.1] The participle gives a further explanation of the phrase διελέξοντις ἀσελγείας, see quotations in n. on Jude v. 4.

αὐτοὶ δούλου ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς,2 The participles ἐπαγγ. and ὑπ. are contrasted by asyndeton instead of by μὲν and δὲ. For φθορά see Rom. 821 and Appendix below.

17. τίς ἠμμώτατος, ποτ' ἰδοῦλοι, τα. 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 ὑπὸ with gen. as in 2 Macc. 1024, but of an overmastering feeling) in Δελ. Ν.Α. xiii. 22 ἔλεφαντες ἄγρυπνοι καὶ ἕπειρος μή ἠττώμενος πιστῶμαι φυλάκις, Plut. Vit. 766 ἠττώμενος τοῖς δικαίως ‘defeated on the merits of the case,’ even by Thuc. iii. 38 ἀκοῦσα ἠδοὺ ἠττώμενοι, and vii. 25. ἰδοῦλοι, by the dat. of the remoter object, cf. Mt. 624 οὐδεῖς δίναται δυνὴν κυρίως δουλεύειν, 1 Cor. 919 τὰς ἡμῶν ἐνδοξάσθησαι, Rom. 618 ἐκατέρωσεν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Tit. 23 οἴνοι πολλοί δεδουλωμέναι, 1 Sam. 170 (the challenge of Goliath) ἤν ἐγὼ πατάξω αὐτῶν, ἠττήσοι ἡμῖν εἰς δούλους, Joh. 884 πάς οἱ ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν δοῦλος ἐστὶν τῆς ἀμαρτίας, Rom. 616, Tit. 38, Plato Phaedr. 238 ε, Xen. Mem. i. 6. 8, Julian Orat. vi. p. 198 βίων αὐτοὺς καὶ γαστρὶ δουλεύοντα. Estius remarks ‘ex jure belli victum et captum sibi faciebat mancipium.’

20. εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.] We naturally suppose

1 Spitta’s objection to this view is founded on the assumption that the Epistle is addressed to Jewish converts, as to which see Introduction.
the subject to be continued from ἐπαγγελλόμενοι and δεδεμένους, as Schott, Keil, Kühl, Hundhausen, Weiss, v. Soden, Alford, Plummer, and Plumptre; but Estius, Bengel, Dietlein, Hofmann, and Dr. Bigg suppose a change of subject, on the ground that ἀποφηγόντες here must refer to τοὺς ὀλίγους ἀποδείγοντας of v. 18. It would seem however that the persons here spoken of have got beyond the stage of progress implied in ὀλίγος ἀποφ. even if we read the aorist there. They have obtained a fuller knowledge of Christ (ἐν ἐπηγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου) and of the way of salvation (τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐπηγνώσαν), see above 18. The force of γὰρ is seen in the apodosis, ‘their last state is worse than the first,’ which confirms the preceding statement that they are δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς. No doubt is implied by the hypothetical form (εἰ γὰρ ἦττωται ... γέγονεν αὐτοῖς): it simply expresses a general principle. For μίσημα which occurs here only in N.T. see n. on μισέμα in v. 10 above. Both are found in the LXX. Compare for the sense ἀποφηγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς and 1 Pet. 4.

ἐν ἐπηγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] See on 18 and 318.

τοῦτος δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἦττωνται.] The participles ἐμπλακέντες and ἀποφηγόντες are opposed to one another by δὲ: the emphatic τοῦτος is used instead of αὐτοὶς because of the intervening clause. It is governed by ἐμπλακέντες and must be understood with ἦττωνται. For ἐμπλα. see 2 Tim. 24, the only other passage in which it occurs in N.T., οὕτως στρατευόμενος ἐμπλακέται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματίαις. It is found once in LXX. οἰ σκολαίας ὅδοις πορευόμενος ἐμπλακήσεται Prov. 2818. So Eur. Ἡρ. 1236 ἤριασιν ἐμπλακέις.

γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρῶτων.] This is the moral of the parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit (Mt. 1245, Lk. 1126). Cf. Heb. 648, 1026, n. on Jude v. 5, Herm. Σιμ. ix. 17. 'τινὲς εἰ αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν ἑαυτοὺς ... καὶ πάλιν ἐγένοντο οὗτοι πρότερον ἤσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ χείρονες, ib. 182.

21. κρείττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπηγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης.] For the omission of ἄν with imperfect indicative in the apodosis, especially in verbs having something of an auxiliary force, as expressing necessity, propriety, possibility, etc., see Jelf § 858, Blass p. 206. Exx. are 1 Cor. 516 ὀφείλετε ἢπα ἑκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν ‘then must ye needs go out of the world,’ Heb. 928 ἐπεὶ ἐδέι αὐτῶν πολλάκις παθεῖν ‘else must he often have suffered,’ Rom. 7 τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ἤδειν (‘I had not known sin’), εἰ μὴ νόμος ἐλεγεν ὅθεν ἐπιθυμήσεις, Xen. Αναδ. vii. 7. 4 ἀισχροὶ ἦν. More frequently κρείττον is used with the present, or the verb is omitted, as in 1 Cor. 79 κρείττον ἐστὶν γαμεῖν ἣ πυροσβήσα, 1 Pet. 317 κρείττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας πάσχειν ἣ κακοποιοῦντας, Exod. 1412, Prov. 2524, Xen. Oecon. 20. 9 προκαταλαμβάνειν τὰ ἐπίκαιρα κρείττον ἡ. γ. For the phrase cf. above 23 ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἄλθεσιας, v. 15 καταλείπεται τὴν εἰσείαν ὁδὸν, Mt. 2132 ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὕμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Prov. 2116, Job. 2418.

ἡ ἐπηγνώσει ὑποστρέφει.] For the dative instead of the acc. with inf. see Acts 1526 ἠδοκεν ἢμῖν ... ἐκλεξαμένοις (αλ. -μένους) ἀνδρας πέρασαι πρὸς ὕμᾶς, ib. 273 ἐπέτρεψεν (τῷ Παύλῳ) πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευόντα (αλ.
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-θέντα) ἐπιμελείας τυχείν, Blass pp. 241 f. For ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ see Acts 1225.

ἐκ τῆς παραδοθεῖσας αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἑντολής.] Cf. note and comment on Jude v. 3 ἐπαγωγεῖσθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, and the use of ἑντολή 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 παρομίας.] ‘They exemplify the truth of the proverb,’ more literally ‘the (warning) of the true proverb has happened to them,’ cf. Mt. 2121 to τῆς σωκῆς ‘the case of the fig-tree,’ James 414 τὸ τῆς αἵρεως, Xen. Oecorr. 16. 7 ἀνεμιζόμεθα τὸ τῶν ἀλλίων. ὅτι θαλασσοῦργοι ὤτες ὄμα; . . . τὴν μὲν κακὴν γῆν ψέγουσι, τὴν δ’ ἄγαθην ἐπαινοῦσι, Plato Phaedr. 230 c πάντως δὲ κομψότατον τὸ τῆς ποιὰς ὅτι ικανὴ πέφυκε κ.τ.λ. Wetstein quotes Lucian Dial. Mort. viii. 1 ταύτῳ ἐκείνῳ τὸ τῆς παρομίας, δ’ νεβρὸς τὸν λέοντα. For συμβ. cf. 1 Cor. 1011 ταύτῃ δὲ τυπικὸς συνεβαίνειν ἐκείνους.

κών ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ τὸ τινὸς ἐξέραμα.] This proverb is found in Prov. 2611 ὀντα τών ὥστεν ἐπέλεξεν ἐπὶ τῶν έαυτού ἐμεν καὶ μυσην γένηται, οὕτω ἀφρόν τῷ ἐαυτόν κακώς ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐναυτό ἀμαρτίαν. It is the nature of proverbs, as being familiar to everybody, to suffer abbreviations, like ὅνος πρὸς λύραν, ‘a stitch in time,’ etc.: so here we must supply such a thought as ‘the renegade is ὃς κών.’ For ἐπιστρέψεις cf. Gal. 49 τός ἐπιστρέψετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ πτωχὰ σταυρία; The only other recorded exx. of ἐξέραμα are Diosc. vi. 19, Eustath. Opyso. 248. 91, but the verb ἐξεράω is not unfrequently used in a general or figurative sense, as well as in the literal sense of a vomit or purge, cf. Demosth. 963, 993 ἐξέρα τὸ θώρ of emptying the clepsydra, Plut. Mor. 904 ἀφα ὑπραξ ἐξερά of expelling the air from the lungs, Arist. Vesp. 993 φύρ ἐξέρασω τὰς ψήφους ‘let me pour out the voting pebbles from the urn,’ ib. Ach. 341. So κατεξέρασε ἐπικ. iii. 13. 23 μὴ κατεξέρα αὐτῶ τὸ σαυτοῦ φλέγμα, ib. iii. 21. 6 ἀκούσατε μου σεχλα λέγοντος ὑπαγε, ἠτι τῶν κατεξέρασας, 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 ὁλ μὴς ἐς τέλος ἄγγελκε γρατεῖ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκρασίας, ἀλλὰ θυμελθεῖς ὃς κών ἐπὶ τὸν ἰδίον ἐμεν ἐπιστρέφειν, προφαίτες τινὰς ἐπενοεῖ, which seems to be taken from this passage with the change of ἐξέραμα into the more common word.

ὁ μοναζμήν ἐς κυλισμὸν βορβορὸν.] The former proverb contrasted two states, repentance typified by the purging, apostasy by the return to the vomit. And so Hippolytus, apparently referring to this passage, says Ref. ix. 7 (p. 44088 Duncker), speaking of Zephyrinus and Callistus πρὸς μὲν ὄραν αἰδούμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγάμονοι (ὁ συνεχόμενος ἄιμωλόγων, μετ’ οὓς τολμὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βορβορον ἀνεκυκλώστα.) Dr. Bigg however, following Spitta, takes the sense to be ‘not
that the creature has washed itself clean in water (as the R.V.), still less
that it has been washed clean (as A.V.) and then returns to the mud;
but that having once bathed in filth it never ceases to delight in it. and he compares Arist. Hist. An. viii. 6 τὰς δ' οἰκια καὶ τὸ λουσθαι εἰς πηλῷ (παινεί). Other passages are quoted by Wetstein to the same effect, as Ael. H.A. v. 45, Varro R.R. ii. 4 (volutari in luto) est illorum requies, ut lavatio hominis. The objection to this explanation is that the proverb is quoted in illustration of the saying τὰ ἐσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρῶτων, whereas Dr. Bigg recognizes no distinction of first and last. Moreover λ. εἰς κυλισμὸν 'bath into a wallowing' would be an extremely harsh construction; we should have expected βορβόρῳ or εν βορβόρῳ. It is true we find ἐλώτο εἰς τοὺς κοινοὺς λουτρόνας, 'he used to go to the common baths to bathe' (Ath. 438 e), but εἰς κυλισμὸν goes far more naturally with ἐπιτρέψασα. 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 gaudeat quam rivos 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.' βορβόρος is found in biblical Greek only in Jer. 386 (LXX. 456) of the miry dungeon in which the prophet was confined. Both κυλισμὸν read by most editors, and κυλισμα, which is supported by most uncials, are extremely rare, the former occurring elsewhere only in Hippiatria 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 κυλιάτρα, which is used by Xen. de Re Eq. v. 3 of a rolling place for horses.

Vorst (de Adag. N.T. c. 4) adds the following illustrations of the proverb, Lucr. vi. 975 foll. nobis caenum tertetrima cum sit sparcities, eadem subus haec icunda videtur, insatiabiliter toti ut voluntur ibidem, Clem. Al. Protr. p. 75 oi δὲ περὶ τέλματα καὶ βορβόρων, τὰ ἱδρυνόμενα ἔρματα, καλυπτούμενοι ἄνοιγμον ἐκβοσκοῦντα τροφάς, ὡδές τινές ἀνθρωποι. ὅς γάρ, φθοῖν, ἡδονα βορβόρῳ μᾶλλον ἡ καθαρὸ ὕδατι. Compare Bywater's note on Heracl. Fr. liv βορβόρῳ χαίρειν, Hor.

1 The use of the middle does not necessarily imply that there was no assistance in bathing, see Hom. Od. viii where the middle is used in 427 and 449 of the bathing of Odysseus; but in 454 we find the active used of the same bathe, τὸν δ' ἐπεὶ ὁδὸν διαμαίλοντα καὶ χρίονεν ἔλαιον, as to which cf. x. 360-365; and so in later times the use of the middle does not exclude the help of the βαλανεῖς and ἀλείττης 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.
Epp. i. 2. 23 foll. Circae poca,n nosti, quae si cum sociis stultus cupididusque bibisset, vixisset canis immundus vel amica luto sus, Epict. Diss. iv. 11. 29 ἀπελθε καὶ χῶρῳ διαλέγον ἵν' ἐν βορβόρῳ μὴ κυλήται . . . μήτι ἐπος κυλέτας ἐν βορβόρῳ, μήτι κύων γενναῖος;

III. 1. Here the writer turns away from the Libertines and their victims to the faithful members of the Church, as Jude does in v. 17, both marking the transition by the use of the word ἀγαπητοί.

ταύτην ἥδη δειτέραν ψιλύν γράφῳ ἐπιστολήν. [‘This is now the second letter that I write to you.’ For the idiomatic use of ἥδη with the numeral compare Joh. 21:14 τότε ἥδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς, Hom. Od. ii. 89, Plato Prot. 309 d.]

For a discussion as to the earlier letter here alluded to, see Introduction.

ἐν αἷς.] Const. ad sensum ‘in both of which,’ cf. below v. 6 δι' ἐν, which some explain of ἔδασος, Acts 15:38 κατά πόλιν πάσαν ἐν αἷς κατηγ. γειλαμεν τῶν λόγων, Winer p. 177, Jelf § 819 foll.

[diavγραφο ὑμᾶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινή διάνοιαν.] Repeated from 11:13.

The word διάνοια received a technical sense from Plato (Rep. 511 d), corresponding to Coleridge’s ‘Understanding’ (German Verstand), as opposed to νοῖς, Coleridge’s ‘Reason’ (Germ. Vernunft). With earlier writers it means simply ‘thought,’ ‘mind.’ So in the LXX. Gen 17:17 ἀρχηγός ἔγελασεν καὶ ἐπίτε ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ ‘said in his heart,’ Deut. 6:5 ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν εἰς ἀλήθη τῆς διανοίας σου, Num. 15:38 οὗ διαστραφῆσθε ὅποιο τῶν διανοίων υἱῶν, and in N.T. Col. 1:21 ἔχθροις τῇ διανοίᾳ, 1 Pet. 1:13 ἀναξιωσάμενοι τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς 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 in Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 3 εἰλικρινής τις ἐν εἰς ἄδικα ἡ ἀχαριστία ‘ingratitude would be the essence of injustice,’ Plat. Symp. 211 οὕτω ἐν τῷ γένοστο τὸ καλὸν ἰδεῖν εἰλικρινὲς; and lastly of ethical purity, as in Phaedo 81 c, where the ψυχή εἰλικρινῆς is contrasted with the ψυχὴ μεμασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος. This last is the sense in which it is used in the two passages of the N.T. where it occurs, viz. here and in Phil. 1:10 ἵνα ἢτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι, and the same is true of the substantive in 1 Cor. 5:8 ἐν ἀξίμασι εἰλικρινίας καὶ ἀληθείας, 2 Cor. 1:12, 227. It is also found in Wisdom 7:25 (σοφία ἐστιν) ἀπάρροια τῆς τοῦ πνευματικοῦ δόξης εἰλικρινῆς. Perhaps it should be translated here ‘pure,’ uncontaminated by the poisonous principles of the libertines.

2. μην ἐπέστην τῶν προερημένων ρημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν.] For the exegetical infinitive following on διεισέρχομαι ἐν ὑπομνήσει (not, as von Soden, on γράφω) cf. Winer 399 foll., Lk. 1:94 ἀντέλαβεν παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μην ἐπιστήν ἐλέους, ib. v. 72. The governing phrase here has much the force of προτρέπον in Xen. Mem. i. 7. 1 ἀρέτης ἐπιμελείσθαι προτέρετεν. 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 αὐτῷ καθ' αὐτῶν εἰλικρινεὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ χρώμενοι, as it is contrasted with the bodily senses, not with any other mental faculty.
articul construction, we might have expected τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγ. προφ. προεκφέρματον ὑμᾶτον. Probably his reason for preferring the looser construction here was the wish to avoid an uninterrupted succession of genitives. Cf. James 15 αἰτεῖτο παρὰ τού διδόντος Θεοῦ πάσων ἄπλως with my n. As in 13, the writer again combines the evidence from prophecy with the witness of the apostles to the coming of Christ in glory. For the epithet ἄγος cf. Lk. 170.

καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος. Of the Lord’s command delivered by your apostles. It is a double possessive genitive, as if we were to say ‘Shakspere’s speech of Mark Antony,’ meaning ‘the speech put into Mark Antony’s mouth by Shakspere.’ For other instances of the ‘reduplicated genitive’ see Blass p. 99.1

For the use of the word ἐντολὴ to express the teaching of our Lord see above 22, Joh. 120, 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 115. We find the same phrase used in Phil. 225 ‘Ἐπαρφροδίτων τῶν ἅδελφων καὶ συνεργῶν καὶ συνστρατιῶτων μι, ὑμῶν ἐκ ἀποστόλων, 2 Cor. 823 R.V. ‘whether any inquire about Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward; or our brethren, they are the messengers of the churches (ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν), the glory of Christ.’ In both passages the genitive is subjective referring to persons sent by the church. We have however an example of the objective genitive in Rom. 1113 ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, and Clem. Rom. 44 ὁ ἀπόστολος ἡμῶν ἐγνώσας διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . ὅτι ἡμῖν ἐστιν ἐπί τοῦ ὄνοματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, which Lightfoot calls ‘an exact parallel’ to our text, and explains by a reference to § 5, where the phrase τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀπόστολοι is used of Peter and Paul. If our epistle was really addressed to the church in Rome (as to which see note on 315 ἐγραψαίν ἡμῶν), this would give a special force to the phrase τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν. 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. 11.12 ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὃς παρόικος ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἡμῶν ἔχοντες καλήν. In both cases there is an interval between the participle and the verb, and the writer continues his sentence as if he had begun with an imperative, instead of with a phrase equivalent to an imperative.

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. This idea is variously expressed in the N.T. John regularly uses τῇ ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, as in 635, 40, 44, 54, 737, 1124, 1248; ἐν ταῖς ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις is found in Acts 217, ἐν ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις in 2 Tim. 31, James 53; ἐν καιρῷ ἑσχάτῳ in 1 Pet. 15; ἐπ’ ἑσχάτου χρόνου (αἰ. τοῦ χρόνου) in Jude v. 18; ἐπ’ ἑσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων in

1 Blass himself is inclined to insert δια after τῆς, as in the title of the Διδαχή, Δ. Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς Θεοῦσιν.
Heb. 1; ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων in 1 Pet. 1 (where ἐσχάτων is substantival); ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν here (where ἐσχάτων is a predicative adjective, used like summus mons, ‘the top of the mountain’).

Blass (p. 156) quotes Barn. 16.5: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ παραδόσει Κύριος τὰ πρὸβατα ἐπὶ καταφθοράν, and Herm. Sim. ix. 12. 3: ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας. See Lightfoot’s translation of the same phrase in 2 Clem. Rom. xiv, ‘when the days were drawing to a close,’ where he refers to the following instances of its use in the LXX. Gen. 49.1, Deut. 4.30 (al. ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων), Dan. 2.28 10.14, Hos. 3.5, Mic. 4.2, also Westcott on 1 Joh. 2.18 (p. 69). This, temporal use of ἐπὶ is a further development of such phrases as we find in classical authors, ἐπὶ Κύριον, ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμῆς ὡς Herod. i. 38, ἐπὶ γῆς Arist. Eth. i. 9. 11, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων Arist. Pol. iv. 3, ἐπὶ τῆς νῦν ἡλικίας Isocr. p. 75 § 194, πότερον ἕως ἐνδοξέτερα δοκεῖ ἡ πόλις εἶναι ἐπὶ τῶν νῦν καυρῶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων Aesch. Ctes. p. 79 § 178. The existence of these scoffers is a proof of that which they deny. It is one of the appointed signs of the approach of the last day. Cf. 1 Joh. 2.18 where the activity of the antichrists denotes ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἑστίν.

ὅδεσονται...ἐν ἐμπαγμῷ ἐμπάκται.] Cf. Mt. 24.45 πολλοὶ ἔλειβονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μοι, λέγοντες Ἐγὼ ἐμί ὁ Χριστός, and, for ἐν, 1 Cor. 424 τί θέλετε; ἐν βαβδῷ ἔλθων πρὸς ἕμας; 2 Cor. 21 ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ἕμας ἔλθεν. The verb ἐμπάγμω is common both in classical and in biblical Greek, but the latter uses the unclassical formation in ε (e.g. ἐνέπαιναν Mk. 15.20), from which are derived the unclassical ἐμπάκτης, found in Isa. 3 as well as in Jude v. 18; ἐμπαγμός Heb. 11.36, Ezek. 22.4, 2 Macc. 77; ἐμπαγμα Ps. 37.7, Isa. 66.4; ἐμπαγμόνῃ which only occurs here.3 For the formation of the last see above n. on παραφρονία 216; and compare καλλονή, κλαμβρονή, πτιγμονή, πληγμονή, φλεγμονή. For the repetition of the cognate word see my n. on James 5.17 προσευχή προσηνέχετο, Winer 281 foll.

4. ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ.] The Second Advent had formed the subject of the Apostles’ instructions to their converts (above 116) and the writer reverts to it again below, v. 12. Besides the more general intimations of the O. T. on such subjects as the future triumph of the Messiah, the glory and blessedness of His Kingdom, the renewed heaven and earth, of which we read in Isa. 60, 65, etc., the first recorded promise of this Advent in the N. T. is contained in Mt. 10.23 (the directions given to the Twelve before their first mission) οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις Ἰσραήλ, ἐως ἐλθῇ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; the next is before the Transfiguration, Mt. 16.28 εἰσὶ τινες τῶν δὲ ἐστηκότων οὖν μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου, ἐως ἐν ἑώρων τῶν νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ (cf. nn. on 116 above); the third shortly before the Betrayal, Mt. 24.23 (the request of the Apostles) τί τῷ σημείῳ τῆς σῆς

---

1 Hilgenfeld has pointed out that the reference is to Enoch 89.26, 88.67, though the words καὶ ἔσται—ἡμερῶν are wanting there.
2 Blass is, I think, mistaken in identifying the two constructions, by making ἐσχάτων gen. of τὰ ἐσχάτα.
3 Stephanus gives a reference to Cyr. Alex. v. 21, which I have not been able to find.
παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Mt. 24:34 οὗ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς, ἐως πάντα ταῦτα γένηται, Mt. 24:42 γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ ὁδηγᾷ ποιὰ ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἐρχεται; then the announcement of the angel after the Ascension, Acts 1:11 οὗτος ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἀναλαμβανόμενος ἀδικίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὐτῶς ἔλεηται κ.τ.λ. The circumstances of this Coming are described more at length in Mt. 24:27-31, 1 Th. 4:16-17, 2 Th. 2:9-10. That the Coming was looked for shortly, appears from James 5:8-9, Apoc. 25-28, 31, and above all from St. Paul's expectation that he would himself live to see it, 1 Cor. 15:52, 1 Th. 4:15-17. There are however signs of disappointment and impatience at the delay of the promised Coming, as in James 5:7-8, Hebrews 10:36-37, and stress was laid upon the fact that the day and hour were known only to the Father (Mt. 24:36), and that the Coming would be unexpected, like that of a thief in the night (below v. 10, Lk. 12:39), as former judgments were (Mt. 24:37-38). For the rhetorical use of τοῦ, cf. Lk. 8:25, 1 Cor. 10:30, τοῦ σοφὸς; τοῦ γραμματείου; 1 Pet. 4:12, Judg. 6:18 τοῦ ἐστι πάντα τὰ βαθμίατα αὐτοῦ ἀληθινά ἢ μιατέρες ἢμῶν; Ps. 42:2 ποῦ οἶστιν ὁ θεός σου; Isa. 63:15, Mal. 2:17 ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ θεός τῆς δικαιοσύνης; Eur. Herac. 510 ποῦ ταῦθα ἐν χρυσοῖς πρέπει; and the similar use of τοῖς in Arist. Nub. 367 τοῖς Ζεὺς;

αὖρις εἰρήλθων, οὗ διέλευσεν καταφύλαξά μοῦ τοὺς πόδας, Acts 24:11 οὗ πλεῖον εἰσίν μοι ἡμέρα διάδεκα αὖρις ἠρέβαν εἰς ἑρωνυμίαν, Herm. Sim. viii. 6. 6 βλέπτες παλαιῶν μετανοικώντας αὖρις ἠλάθης, above 119 εἰς οὖ, Blass p. 140. The elliptical αὖρις αὖ is used in the same sense Lk. 13:25, Apoc. 16:18, and in classical writers. οἱ πατέρες is understood of the first fathers of mankind by some, owing to the phrase which follows, ἀληθινός κτίσως: the meaning then would be 'there has been no change since the creation, or the death of Adam.' This however is certainly not the prevailing sense in the N.T. It is used sometimes of Abraham and the patriarchs before the time of Moses, as in Lk. 1:35, Joh. 7:22; sometimes of Moses and his contemporaries, Joh. 6:46, Acts 7:36; sometimes of the times of the prophets, Lk. 6:28, Acts 7:52, Rom. 9:5, 11:28, 15:8, Heb. 11. In Judges quoted above, the fathers seem to belong to the preceding generation, and so in Jer. 31:29 (the fathers have eaten sour grapes), Acts 15:10 (neither our fathers nor we were able to bear), and in our text.1 None who claimed to belong to the Christian body, as these libertines did, could deny that the prophecies of the O.T. had to a certain extent received their fulfilment in the first advent of Christ. After the admission of the Gentiles and the rejection of the

1 Another way of explaining πατέρες would be to understand it of those who were held to be authorities in the early Church, see Westcott's n. on 1 Joh. 2:22 γεγραμμένος πατέρες, where he says that this term is applied to prophets, priests, and teachers in the O.T., and compares Mt. 23:9, Acts 7:2, 1 Cor. 4:15. This however seems to be hardly possible in a letter purporting to be written by an Apostle. Cf. Abbott Joh. Gram. p. 410.
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 ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἔδω γεγεράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν, which is repeated in ii. Clem. B. 11 in slightly different words, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν. Lightfoot in his note says 'it seems hardly possible that the two (2 Pet. and the quotation) can be wholly independent.' Whichever was borrowed, we are justified, I think, in interpreting the obscurer language of 2 Pet., by the quotation. The phrase ἀφ’ ἡς—ἐκοιμήθησαν seems to be a loose expression for 'The fathers have fallen asleep, and things are still going on without alteration,' perhaps mixed up in the mind of the speaker with another thought, 'Now that they are gone, we can no longer hope for the Parousia, which was promised in their days.' Spitta's extraordinary explanation, by which, regardless of the intervening γάρ, he joins ἀφ’ ἡς (παρουσίας) ἐκοιμήθησαν in the sense 'die Väter sind entschlafen von der Parusie weg, ihr Tod hat sie entzogen,' has received no support from later commentators. The sleep of death is a common expression in classical (cf. Soph. El. 509) as in biblical Greek (Mt. 27-32, Joh. 111, 1 Cor. 15-6).

πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.] 'All things remain as we see them (in statu quo). In the following verses this statement is shown to be erroneous: heaven and earth have undergone great changes within the memory of man. διαμένει, cf. Heb. 111. αὕτωι ἁπολούνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις, Ps. 11989. ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως 'From the beginning of the world,' cf. Mt. 2421, Mk. 106, ib. 13. 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’ ἡς 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 γάρ αὐτοῖς τούτο θέλουν ἐτί] 'For they shut their eyes to this fact that,' cf. Acts 2626, v. 8 below, Plato Parm. 128 c πρῶτον μὲν σὲ τούτο λανθάνει ἐτί. For θέλουν cf. Libanius Prog. 129 c ἐκὼν ἄγνωστος εἰς τοῖς βασιλεύοντος ὑφείλεται (quoted by Wetst.), Aesch. Cho. 19 γενὸς δὲ σύμμαχος θέλων ἐμοί, Soph. Phil. 1343 συγγρώτε θέλων, and Col. 218
muđdi's úmâz kataβaβaβeνετω ñêλων, according to some interpreters. I see no ground for supposing (as Schott, Keil, Kühl, Spitta, and v. Soden) that τοῦτο is to be taken as the object after ñêλων.

οὐρανοί ἦσαν—τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ.] It is a question how we are to take the construction of this sentence. It is evident that we must understand ἦσαν with γῆ from the preceding ἦσαν; but are we to understand the predicate of γῆ with οὐρανοί? That is, must we complete the first clause by supplying έξ ὀοκ. καὶ δι' ὀοκ. συνεστῶτες ... λόγῳ? There can be no doubt that τῷ ... λόγῳ belongs to both clauses, and, if so, the construction would seem to require συνεστῶτες, which carries with it the connected words έξ ὀοκ., καὶ δι' ὀοκ. A further reason for supplying the entire predicate to both clauses, is that the heavens and earth make up the κόσμος (vv. 6, 7, 12, 13) and that the water by which ὁ τότε κόσμος was destroyed belonged alike to earth and heaven (Gen. 7:11, 8:2). Spitta, it is true, lays stress on ἐκπαλαί as used exclusively of heaven, on the ground that the rabbinical school of Shammai, cited Gen. 1:1 ἐν ἄρχῳ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς, as proving that the heaven existed before the six days' work began, but the same text might be used to prove the pre-existence of the earth. Similarly, we read in 4 Esdr. 6:35 Domine locutus es ... in primo die dicens, Fiat caelum et terra; et tuum verbum opus perfecit. What may be argued is that the οὐρανός is distinct from the στερέωμα, which the Jews believed to have been created as a mere appendage to the earth for the purpose of upholding the clouds, and to be itself supported by the mountains as by pillars (Job 26:11, 2 Sam. 22:9). Below, however, a higher use is assigned to the στερέωμα, viz. to support the sun and moon and stars (Gen. 1:14-17), and in Ezek. 1:23-25 we read that the throne of God was over the firmament, which is also identified with οὐρανός in Gen. 1:8. Compare the article on Cosmogony in Hastings' D. of B. For the plural οὐρανοί see Robinson's n. on Eph. 4:10. 'Charles' Slavonic Ênoch pp. xxx-xlvii, and my notes on Clem. Al. Strom. vii. §§ 9, 10.

For the irregular construction (caused by the attraction of the nearer subject γῆ) οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ... συνεστῶσα instead of συνεστῶτες, cf. Heb. 9:9 ὃς ἐπιφέρει θύσιν μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ. The reading of χ συνεστῶσα (WH. marg.) was probably a correction, the neuter plural applying equally to the two preceding subjects. Lastly we have to investigate the word συνεστῶσα. The transitive tenses are often used in the N.T. in the sense 'to bring together,' 'introduce,' 'commend,' 'put in a favourable light.' In Gal. 2:18 παραβάτην ἐμαυτόν συνιστάω means 'prove myself a transgressor.' The intransitive uses are Lk. 9:32 ὁ άνδρας συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ 'two men standing with him,' Col. 1:17 τὰ πάντα εν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν which Lightfoot translates 'all things hold together in Him.' Sometimes it implies the composition of a whole from its elements, as in Philo i. p. 330 ἐκ γῆς καὶ ἕδατος καὶ ἄρεως καὶ πυρός συνεστήθη ὁ δὲ ὁ κόσμος, Plat. Tim. 32 b: hence it is used more generally (as here) in the sense of being 'framed,' 'formed,' 'brought into being.'

οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἐκπαλαί 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 οὐρανοὶ. For ἔκταλοι see n. on 28.

ἐξ ἔθατος καὶ δι ἔθατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ.] ‘Built up out of water and through water by the word of God.’ This appears to refer (1) to the general evolution out of chaos, to which the names ἄβυσσος and ὄφωρ are applied in Gen. 1:2; (2) to the stages by which the heaven and earth were built up, the στερέωμα (here called οὐρανοὶ) being made on the second day to divide the waters from the waters, and the land being separated from the water on the third day. The cause of these movements was the word of God, as it is written (Gen. 1:2) ἐπεν ὁ Θεὸς, Γενιθῆτω φῶς, καὶ ἔγενετο φῶς, cf. Heb. 11:3, Ps. 33:6 τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ στερεωθέσαν. In i. Clem. R. 27. 4 ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστῆσα τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψα, as in this passage, the word of God appears as the cause alike of creation and destruction. The meaning of εξ ἔθατος is plain, the only question being whether εξ has a local, or a material force, a distinction which was probably not in the mind of the writer; but δι ἔθατος has given rise to much discussion. In reference to the heaven it is explained above, as being equivalent to ἄνα μέγων or μεταξὺ, 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 διᾷ to express a state, as δι᾽ ἡσυχίας ἐνα, διὰ ἄπεξειας γένεσθαι, διὰ πένθους τὸ γῆρας διάγει Χεν. Су. iv. 6, 6, τὸν διὰ περιτομῆς παραβάτην Rom. 2:27, ὁ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐστίν τὸ 14:28, and also in certain adverbial phrases such as διὰ χειρῶν ἔχειν, cf. Aesch. Suppl. 193 ἀγάλματα ἔχουσαι διὰ χειρῶν εἰσοώνων ‘holding in their left hands,’ Soph. Ant. 916, Arist. Pol. v. 8, 8 διὰ χειρῶν μᾶλλον ἔχουσι τὴν πολιτείαν, also in the sing. Plut. Vit. 63 (Numa 6) διὰ χειρὸς ἔχοντα τὰς ἡνίας ‘holding tight in hand,’ Av. Vesp. 597, Luc. Democ. 56 διὰ στόματος τὰς κατηγορίας ἔχειν ‘to have Aristotle’s categories between your lips,’ Peregrin. 18 τοῦτο διὰ στόματος ἢν ἀπασών, Theoc. 14. 27 χάμνεν τοῦτο δι᾽ ὀφές ἐγένετο. If this is an allowable use of διὰ, we may explain it in regard to the earth from the Jewish belief that the earth rested upon water, cf. Ps. 24:4 αὕτος ἐπὶ βαλασσῶν θεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐπὶ τοσαμῶν ἢτούμαςεν αὐτὴν, Ps. 136:6, Herm. V. i. 3. 4 τῷ ἰσχυρῷ βῆματι πῆξας τὸν οὐρανον καὶ θεμελίωσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ ἔθατω. If we suppose an allusion here to the Jewish belief as to the waters on which the earth is founded, the waters above the earth may be explained, as in the case of the στερέωμα, of the waters stored up above the firmament (Ps. 148:4).

There are many difficulties in the interpretation of this passage. The explanation of διὰ given above is that of Grotius, Beza, Hammond, and Mede, but recent commentators generally assign to διὰ its usual force

1 See also Apoc. 11:17 and 13:1, where the abyss from which τὸ θεριὸν ascends is also called βαλασσα.

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 festé Decke zwischen die irdischen und überirdischen Wasser hineingetreten.’
by means of,' adducing in support Clem. Hom. xi. 24 τά πάντα τὸ ὕδωρ τοιεῖ, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ὑπὸ πνεύματος κινήσεως τὴν γένεσιν λαμβάνει. How then are we to interpret it (1) of the heavens, (2) of the earth? How can the firmament be said to be created by means of water? I have not been able to find any satisfactory answer to the question in the commentators. Some, like Keil, put a comma after ἕκταλαμ, and are content with an explanation confined to the earth, alleging that it was made by means of water, because the transference of part of the water to the clouds and of another part to the sea gave rise to the dry land. Others refer to the erosive effect of water, or to the need of rain or mist (Gen. 2:6) in fashioning and preserving the earth.1

6. δὲ δὲν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὑδατι κατακαλύβθης ἀπάλετο. I have followed min. 31 in reading δὲν for δὲν of the great body of MSS.,2 as ω and ω are frequently confused in MSS., and no satisfactory explanation of δὲ δὲν has been given; whereas δὲν refers to the immediately preceding λόγῳ and is taken up again in v. 7 by τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ. We might have had a dative of cause here, as in vv. 5 and 7 and in Heb. 11 κατηργήθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ἰδίατε Ὠσῶν, were it not that the dative was wanted for the instrument ὑδατι. Sometimes indeed the λόγος itself is regarded as the instrument, as in Heb. 12 δὲ οὗ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, Ἰω. 13 πάντα δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγένετο; but διὰ with acc. is found in Ps. 119δὲ διὰ τὸν λόγον σου ξηρὰν με, Ἀρ. 121 εὐκρίνησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν, Ps. 164 διὰ τῶν λόγων τῶν χειλῶν σου ἐγὼ ἐφύλαξα ὦδους σκληρᾶς, Ἰω. 65ο τράγον με κάκινος ξηραὶ δὲ ἐμέ. 'It was owing to the divine word that the world of that date was destroyed by a deluge,' cf. below v. 12 δὲ Ἰη (παροιμίαν) οἴραναι πυροῦμαι λιθήνουταί, Ἀρ. 411 διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίθησαν, Heraclit. xii. (Byw.) Σίβυλλα... χιλιῶν ἔτεων ἐξεκλείσατο τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν (paraphrased by Clem. Al. p. 358 σὺν Ὀσῦ, by Iamb. Myst. iii. 8 τῷ τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐνεργεία), Ἄρ. α. p. 12 Κλ. ἀνεπίδεσ (ὁ θεός) ὅ τὰ πάντα ἐπείδεσαι καὶ δὲν ἐστιν... ἀπονύτος δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτῶν.

The most usual explanation of δὲ δὲν regards ἐξ ὑδατος καὶ δὲν ὑδατος 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 οἴραναι and γῆ, since both are spoken of as causing the deluge (Gen. 711, 83); but the fact of their remoteness makes this connexion very improbable: We should rather have expected such a phrase as ὄμως δὲν ἐκ τοῦτων. Moreover the heaven and the earth constitute the world which they are said to destroy. Wiesinger thinks the antecedents are ὑδατος and τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, but then we have one of the antecedents introduced again as the instrument in ὑδατι; 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 ὑδατος (fishermen) δὲ δὲν ὑδατος (merchants) ἀγοράς 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.
ο τότε κόσμος.] Cf. n. on 1ο τῶν πάλαι ἀμαρτίων. By κόσμος is meant the material world made up of heaven and earth, which are here stated to have perished in the deluge, as we read below of the future destruction of the existing material world by fire. 1

απόλεστο.] 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. 2ο πορεύον πρὸς τὸν Νῶε ... καὶ δῆλωσον αὐτῷ τέλος ἐπερχόμενον, οτι ἡ γῆ ἀπόλλυται πᾶσα, ib. 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 προειρηκότος ἀφανισμὸν Ἀδάμον τῶν ὅλων ἀπεσθαί, τὸν μὲν κατ’ ἱσχύν πυρός, τὸν ἔτερον δὲ κατὰ βίαν καὶ πλῆθος ὀδάτος. So the term πάλιγγενεσία is used of the reappearance of the earth after the flood, 1 Clem. Rom. 9 Νῦν πιστὸς εἰρήσεις διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ πάλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν, where see Lightfoot's note. It is evident from vv. 7, 10, 12 below that the writer looked forward to a fundamental metamorphosis of the existing universe through the final conflagration, and this naturally leads him to take an exaggerated view of the deluge, which he regards as a parallel destruction. Hence the present heavens and earth are distinguished from the antediluvian in the next verse. 3

7. οἱ δὲ τῶν οὕρανοι καὶ ἡ γῆ.] A more correct expression would have been either καὶ ἡ νῦν γῆ or καὶ γῆ. In the latter case γῆ would have shared in the article οἱ.

7. αὐτῷ λόγῳ παλαίσαρσομένης εἰς τοὺς πυρὶ. 4] 'Have been tresured 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 θηραμτῷ, which I take to mean 'set apart for,' 'destined for;' cf. 4 Macc. 1212 (of the judgment on the persecutor) ταμιεύεται σὲ ἡ θεία δίκη αἰωνίων πυρί. Others take τοὺς with the following τηροῦμενος, which is a more usual construction (e.g. Jos. Ant. i. 3. 7, where Noah on coming out of the ark prays that there may be no future deluge, κακοδαιμονεστέρους γὰρ ἐσεσθαι εἰ τηρηθείεν ἔτερῳ κατακλυσμῷ), understanding τεθήσατο 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 εἰς οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις φύσων, and the account of its alternate destruction and renovation by means of water and fire, ποτὲ μὲν ἐκπυρωθεὶς τὸν κόσμον, ποτὲ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς συνισταθεὶς πάλιν (Simplic. ap. Byw. Herac. xx.), a doctrine attributed to the Babylonian Berosus by Seneca N. Q. iii. 29. In the ἐκτίφωσις we are told τὰ στοιχεῖα φθείρεσθαι (Diog. L. vii. 134), and that life retreats back into the fiery seed named Zemz, 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 μὲν εἰς ἀπάλειαν ἐλεύθεραν παντελῷ ... διὸ ἀνάγκη δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὕθις καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐκφλόγασιν ἔσεθαι.

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 γιὰν and σκαυτὸ leave no doubt as to what is intended), but to say that the existing universe is simply ‘treasured up’ is to me unmeaning. Heaven and earth are not stored away, but in constant use; and Hundhausen’s interpretation of θησαυρίζω to ‘keep safe’ is, I think, inadmissible. R.V. has ‘stored up for fire’ in the text, and ‘stored with fire’ in the margin. I do not think θησαυρίζω capable of the latter meaning; otherwise it would suit the passage well: as the old world was stored with the water which eventually caused its destruction, so the new world with fire. Dr. Bigg illustrates this from a passage of Irenaeus (i. 7.1) in which he states the belief of the Valentinians in regard to the final conflagration τὸ ἐμφωλεῖν τῷ κόσμῳ πῦρ ἐκλάμψαν καὶ ἔξαφθεν καὶ κατεργασάμενον πάσαν ὕλην συναναλωθήσεται αὐτῇ.

It may be well here to sum up the different features of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mt. 1329, 243, 2829) as they are presented to us in this epistle, leaving the details for the notes on the different verses. This world, including the earth, the heavens, and the στοιχεῖα, will be destroyed by fire at the Coming of the Son of Man (vv. 4 and 12), otherwise called the ‘day of the Lord’ (v. 10 and v. 6), or the ‘day of Judgment’ (v. 5). The destruction by fire will then be as complete as that by water in the Deluge (v. 6). The overthrow and disappearance of the present world will be followed by the creation of new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (v. 13).

The particular feature brought before us in this verse is the destruction of the existing world by fire. A similar belief prevailed among the Greeks, see Heracl. xxii. πυρὸς ἀνταμείβεται πάντα καὶ πῦρ ἀπάντων, with the passages quoted in Bywater’s notes on xx.—xxv., Plato Tim. 22 B. πολλαί ... φθοραὶ γεγόνασιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐσονται, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ ὅσα μέγιστα, to which Plato ascribes our ignorance of the past history of mankind. So Censorinus (xviii. 11) ‘est præterea 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 summa est cataclysmos, quam nostri diluvionem vocant, aestas autem ecyrosis, quod est mundi incendium. Nam his alternis temporibus mundus tum ignescere, tum exaquescere videtur.’ The chief upholders of this doctrine at the time of the Christian era were the Stoics, whose views are compared with those of the Christians by Justin M. (Apol. i. 20) καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστάτης γεννησθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς ἔσοναι. οἱ λεγόμενοι δὲ Στρωκοὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν εἰς πῦρ ἀνάλυσθαι δογματίζονται καὶ αὐτὶ πάλιν κατὰ μεταβολὴν τῶν κόσμων γενέσθαι λέγοντι, 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 ἐκτύρωσις: they have no conception
of a transfigured heaven and earth to last for ever, but merely of a repetition of the sins and sorrows of the preceding age. So Origen (Cels. iv. 11 f.) answering the charge of Celsus, that the Christian belief in the κατακλυσμός and ἐκτύρωσις was derived from the Greeks, remarks that, according to the latter, these catastrophes occur at fixed periods in necessary alternation, and that the last catastrophe having been that of water, the next must therefore be that of fire; whereas Christians impute both to the wise justice of God. When God is spoken of as a 'consuming fire' (Deut. 4:24 etc.), it is meant that it is His nature to destroy evil and to refine and perfect what is good. Seneca gives a fine description of the periodical conflagration in his Consol. ad Marc. 26. Cf. Cic. N.D. ii. 118 with my notes, and Numen. ap. Eus. Pr. Ec. xv. 18 ἀρέσκει τοῖς Στουκοῖς τὴν ὀλὴν ὀσίαν εἰς πῦρ μεταβάλλειν σον εἰς στέρμα. For other references see Zeller Phil. Gr. iv. p. 133f. For the Sibyl, referred to by Justin above, compare Sib. iv. 172 πῦρ ἔσται κατὰ γαῖαν . . . κόσμος ἄτος μύκημα καὶ ὄμβρωμον ἔχων ἀκοίσε. θέλει δὲ χθόνι πάσαν, ἄπαν δ' ἀλλοιων γένος ἄνδρων καὶ πάσας τε πόλεις, ποταμοὺς ἄμα ἤδε θάλασσαν, ἐκκαύει δὲ τε πάντα, κόνις δ' ἔσερ αἰθαλίσσεσα. As we have evidence in this epistle of familiarity with Stoic phraseology, such as the σύντελειαν καὶ ἐκτύρωσιν τοῦ παντός ἐπιστήμας; and the Sibylline Oracles testify to opinions which were then common among Jews and Jewish Christians. Ἡππολύτουs (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, ἔπεσε μετ’ οὐ πολὺ τὴν συντελειαν καὶ ἐκτύρωσιν τοῦ παντός ἐπιστήμας; and we have seen the same belief expressed in the passage of Joseph. Ant. i. 2. 3 quoted above. On the other hand Philo argues for the eternity of the world in his treatise De Inc. Mundi, where he distinguishes between two senses of the word κόσμος, in one of which it is indestructible quia material, in the other destructible quia 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 2:8, 31 ὅσων τέρατα ἐν ωφρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἰμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀπίδη κατόνοι. ὁ ἡλιος μεταστράφηται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἰμα πρὸν ἡλέουν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, ib. 3:15. 16. Ps. 50:3 ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανίζει . . . πῦρ ἐκατεροῦν αἰτῶν κακιστηθατα καὶ κύκλῳ αἰτῶν καταιγίς σφόδρα, ib. 18:13. Isa. 29:6, 30:9, 34:4, 51:6, 66:15. 16. Nahum 1:5, 6. Mal. 4:1. Dan. 7:9, 10 ὁ θρόνος αἰτῶν φλόγα πυρός, οἱ τροχαὶ αἰτῶν πῦρ φλέγων, ποταμός πυρὸς ἐλκεν ἐμπροσθέν αἰτῶν, and in the promise made to Noah (Gen. 9:11) that the earth should not again be destroyed by water. For the N.T. see 2 Th. 1:7 ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου ἰησοῦ ἀρχαῖον ὑφαντὸν μετ’ ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αἰτῶν, ἐν πυρὶ φλέγων διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδότοις Θεον. τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείᾳ τῶν ἀσιβῶν ἀνθρώπων.] So we read of angels reserved for judgment in 24, of unrighteous men reserved for judgment in 20, 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. έν τούτῳ μὴ λανθανεῖν υμᾶς.] 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 έν τούτῳ cf. v. 3, τούτῳ πρώτον, Phil. 314 έν δὲ, Mk. 1021 έν σοι ὑστερεῖ.

ὅτι μία ήμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ώς 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 ώς η ήμέρα η ἐκδήλως ήτος διήλθη, καὶ φυλακῇ 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 ήμέρα κράτεως, 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 έξ ήμέραις—τούτῳ λέγει ήτοι ἐν ἐξακακυκλοίσι έστειλεν Κύριος τά σύμπαντα. η γὰρ ήμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. καὶ κατέπανσεν τῇ ήμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ—τούτῳ λέγει ἕτοιν ἔλθων ο νυός αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τόν καρόν τούτον καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσβεσίς καὶ ἀλλάξει τόν ήλιον καὶ τίν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας, τότε καλῶς κατα-παύσεται ἐν τῇ ήμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, Slavonic Enoch xxxii foll., Justin M. Dial. 81 το εἰρημένον ὅτι ἠμέρα Κυρίων ὡς χίλια ἔτη κ.τ.λ., Iren. v. 28. 3 ὅσαι ήμέραις ἐγένετο ο κόσμος τοσοῦτος χιλιοτόσι συντελεῖται . . . η γὰρ ήμέρα Κυρίων 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 η δ' ἐν ἠμέρα φάγγε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖνθε) by reference to the difference between the human day and the divine day; so Just. M. Dial. 81, p. 308.

9. οἱ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.] The verb βρ. (here used intransitively, as in 1 Tim. 315) occurs also in Gen. 4310, Isa. 4618 τήν συντηρίαν τήν παρ' ἐμοὶ οἱ βραδύνω. This is the only recorded instance of its being followed by a genitive, which may be compared with that after ὑστερεῖν, ὑστερίειν, λείπεινθαι (for which Winer quotes Diod. xiii. 110 ὑστέρουν τῆς βοηθείας); or it may be taken as the genitive of the sphere, for which cf. 214 πλεονεξίας.

ὡς τίνες βραδύνητα ήγονθαι.] 'According to some men's notion of dilatoriness.' Alford makes βραδύνητα predicate 'account (his conduct) tardiness'; but, if that meaning were intended, it would have been simpler to omit βραδύνητα, translating 'as some men hold': with βραδύνητα the meaning must be 'the Lord is not dilatory in any injurious sense, He is not powerless, or careless, or indifferent.' The word βραδύνης is classical, but not found elsewhere in biblical Greek. Wetstein appositely quotes Plat. De Sera Numinis Vindicta p. 549 B (the delay of punishment has this bad effect) τήν πίστιν ἡ βραδύνης
III 7-10

NOTES

άφασεται τῆς προνοίας, and App. B. C. iv. p. 1052 μηδὲ βραδυττᾶ τις ἑγείροις τὴν ἐμπειρίαν. For την see n. on Jude v. 4. I understand it of the ἐμπαίστα of v. 3 above.

ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς.] See Introduction on the Text. Cf. below v. 15, Ps. 8615, Isa. 3018, Jonah 42, 1 Pet. 320 ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Ἕλει, Rom. 214 τοῦ πλοῦτου... τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοοῦν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετανοίαν σε ἀγεῖ; Wisdom 1215, 20; Herm. Sim. vii. 11. 1 μακροθυμοῦν ὃν κύριος θέλει τὴν κλήσαν τὴν γενομένην διὰ τοῦ νοῦ αὐτοῦ σφηκεθᾶ; Clem. Hom. xvi. 20 μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ. The construction with εἰς is only found here: πρὸς is used in 1 Th. 514; ἐπὶ in Mt. 1820, Lk. 187, James 57.

μὴ βουλώμενός τινας ἀπολέσῃ ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρήσαι.] Cf. 1 Tim. 24 (God our Saviour) πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπέγνωσιν ἀλληλείας ἐλθεῖν, Rom. 1132, Ezek. 1823. Clem. R. i. 7. 5 ἐν γενεῖ καὶ γενεὰ μετανοίας τὸσον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοὺς βουλομένους ἐπιτραβήξας ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν, ib. 8. 5, Justin M. Apol. i. 28 ἡ ἐπιμονή τοῦ μυθῆτα ταῦτα πράξει τῶν Θεόν (referring to the final judgment) διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος γεγένητα προγνώσκει γὰρ τινὰς ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεται. Wetstein illustrates χωρήσαι from Plut. de flum. 19 ἄλλοιν δὲ σῳφρόνησα, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πρακτείοις χωρήσας, but I have not been able to find this: cf. Prov. 1415 πανούργος ἔρχεται εἰς μετάνοιαν, Rom. 24 ἀγεῖ εἰς μετάνοιαν. R. V. translates τινας by 'any' giving it the force of μηδένα: if so, should we have had the plural? The Vulgate has aliquos, and some of the commentators think there is an allusion to the preceding τινες. Perhaps we may give the force of the plural by translating 'not desiring to make exceptions. For ἀπολέσῃ compare ἀπώλεια above 21, 3, and below 46.

10. ἔξις δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης.] Cf. 1 Th. 52 oδιατε ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται, Mt. 2443, Lk. 1229, Apos. 38, 165.

ἔν ἢ οἱ σύρανσι βούλθηλεν παρελεύσονται.] For the adverbial termination cf. κλαγγηδόν, κοναβήδων, λωστήθων, μολεθδόν, μυμλόν, and the cognate βούλβηθων. 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. 51, Cantic. 415 φρέαρ ύπατος ζῶντος καὶ ποιῶντος ἀπὸ τοῦ Δισάνου, other exx. from Homer to Lycophron in Wetstein. It is used of thunder in Luc. Jup. Trag. 1 ὁ μεγαλοσομαράγῳ στερετάς βοίζμα, 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. This explanation would suit the passing away of the heavens, of which we are told in

1 Abbott in his Joh. Gr. § 2586d gives examples of the singular τις following ὁ or μη, 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. magni impetu transcurrent) simply of a sudden disappearance, comparing Wisd. 2 ἀπαλείπονται δί βίος ἡμῶν ὡς ἔχειν 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. 12:18, cf. Enoch 14) as well as from Jer. 25:30, 31, Joel. 3:16, Isa. 42:13, 1 Th. 4:16. The adv. ποιηθήνσις is found in Lycophron Coss. 66 (of Oenone hurling herself into the grave of Paris) πυργων ἀπ᾽ ἄκρων πρὸς νεόδωμον νέκων ποιηθήνσις ἐκβάσασα κύμβαλον δέμας, Nicander Theriacca 556, and the other form ποιηθήνσις in the Alexipharmaca 182, 498.

στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήνεται.] For the absence of the article see Introduction on Grammar. The word στοιχεῖα ‘elements’ is used in Heb. 5:12 of the elementary principles of religion; it occurs twice both in the Ep. to the Galatians and in the Ep. to the Colossians (thrice with the addition τοῦ κόσμου), where its meaning is disputed. In Gal. 4 ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμᾶς δεδουλωμένου, the patristic commentators generally understand it of the material elements, or of the heavenly bodies: for (1) cf. Philo i. 162 τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη ὁ κόσμος, Wisd. 7:17, 19:18, Hermes Ἱσα. iii. 13 ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κατατίθεται; for (2) Theoph. ad Autol. ii. 35 ὁ θεὸς νόμος ὁ μόνον κωλύει τὸ εἰδώλιον προσκυνεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις, ἥλιος, σελήνη ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀστραῖοι, Justin M. Apol. ii. 4, ad Dion. 7. Sometimes these are joined with the seasons defined by them, as in the Sibylline description of the final conflagration (ii. 206) καὶ τότε χρησίμενα στοιχεῖα πρόπαντα τὰ κόσμου, ἁγία, γαϊά, δόλασσα, φάος, πόλος, ἡματα, νύκτες. Clem. Ἱμ. x. 9 οὐδὲ τὰ ζώα προσκυνοῦσαν, οὐδὲ στοιχεῖα τὰ ὑπὸ θεοῦ γεγενημένα κολακεύοντων, λέγω δὲ ἢλιον, σελήνην, ἄστρα, γῆν, δόλασσαν, 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 οὐρανοῦ and γῆ, but would have either preceded or followed them. He thinks that in Gal. 4 the following verses show that στοιχεῖα is used of objects of worship (v. 8, 9) τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεοῦ ἐδούλωσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς ... νῦν δὲ ... τῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀσθένεις καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα; He shows from the book of Jubilees and from Enoch that

1 This word, originally used of the letters of the alphabet or the lines of the dial, is said to have been first used of the material elements by Plato (Favorinus ap. Diog. L. iii. 24), cf. Theaet. p. 201 οἱ εἶδοι καὶ ὑμάς τινῶν ὑπὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα οἰστερεῖ στοιχεῖα, εἴ δὲ ήμείς τῇ συγκεκριμένῃ καὶ τῇ θλίψει, λόγων οὐκ ἤγοι. Later writers distinguished between the στοιχεῖα and first principles, cf. Suidas s.v. διάφοροι δ᾽ ἄρχαι καὶ στοιχεῖα τὰ τὰς μὲν εἶναι ἀγεννητοῖς καὶ ἀθάρτοις, τὰ δὲ στοιχεῖα κατὰ τὴν ἐκτίμησιν φθείρονται, Hippol. Philosoph. i. 22 (Diels Doxogr. p. 571) ἔπικουρος ἄρχας μὲν τῶν ὀλίγων ὑπέθετο ἀτόμους καὶ κενὸν . . . ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀτόμων συνελούσων γενεάθαι καὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῶι πάσα. This distinction was not always observed; see (for Aristotle) Zeller vol. iii. p. 442, and for the Epicureans Lucri. ii. 392, 410, 463, 879, iv. 941, etc., where elementum = 'atom', also Hastings' D. of B. under 'Element,' Diels' Doxographi Graeci (Index) and his excellent history of the word in the treatise entitled Elementum.
the Jews believed the various powers of nature to be under the control of spirits. Similarly Spitta explains Col. 2:8 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν κόσμων καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν, and 2:20 ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τῶν κόσμων by a comparison of 2:15 μὴ οὖν τις κρανιῶν ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέτρῳ ἐφοτισθῇ ή νομομαί. These things belong to the θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων with which St. Paul charges the Colossians (2:18); but such ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξονταί (2:15) are not to be compared with Him in whom κατοικεῖ πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (2:2). In support of this view Spitta quotes the Κηρύγμα Πέτρου (ἀρ. Clem. Al. Str. vi. p. 760) μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίον σέβεσθη, καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνου, μόνον οίκομεν τῶν Θεον γινώσκειν, οὐκ ἐπιστάνται λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους, μην τε καὶ σελήνην. καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σελήνῃ φανῇ σάββατον οὐκ ἄγοουσιν κ.τ.λ., cf. Lightfoot's n. on Col. 2:18. The stars and the angels were closely associated in Jewish thought, see Job 38:7, Enoch 69:6, 41:5, 43:2 with Charles' note.

To the natural objection that we cannot conceive of spirits being burnt and dissolved (κανοσούμενα λυθόμενα) Spitta replies by quoting Test. Levi 4 καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς καταπτῆσαντος καὶ πάγης κτίσεως κανοσούμενης (MSS. κλονοσύμενης) καὶ τῶν δοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων, Enoch 68:2 'who can endure the rigorous judgment passed upon the angels, before which they melt away.' Spitta discovers another argument in the reading λυθόμενα, 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, 24 Bede, Estius, and Hundhausen, of the firmament or lower heaven, distinguishing this from the starry heaven in which the στοιχεῖα are set. That the stars were involved in the destruction of the last day was a part of Jewish belief, as is evident from Isa. 34:4 καὶ τακτήρονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ἐλαχισταὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρά πεσεῖται ὡς φίλλα ἐς ἄμπελον, a passage which our

See especially En. 50:2 where mention is made of the spirits of the moon and stars and lightning, the sea, the hoar-frost, the hail, the dew, the rain, etc., Apost. 16:5. The names of the angels who preside over the seasons are given in En. 82. In the apocryphal Test. Salom. (Fabr. p. 1047) Solomon questions certain spirits which are brought before him τίνες ἦσε τίνας ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμικάτορες τῶν κόσμων τούτων, Ep. ad Diogn. 7 God sent to save man, not an angel ἢ ἄρχοντα ἢ τινά τῶν διεστάνων τὰ ἐπίστεια ἢ τινα τῶν πεπιστευμένων τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς διοικήσεις, but Him by whom He had made the world, οὗ τὰ μυστήρια πιστῶν πάντα φυλάσσει στοιχεῖα (sun, moon, etc.), cf. Eus. H.E. iii. 31 with the notes in Heinichen's ed.

2 Compare with this Lightfoot's notes on Gal. 4:1 and Col. 2:8, where he argues in favour of the first interpretation given above of στοιχεῖα, viz. 'rudimentary instruction belonging to the sphere of material and external things.' I learn from Dr. Bigg's note on this passage that Ritschl and Everling (Paulinische Angelologie, 1888) share Spitta's view as against Lightfoot.

3 Possunt illi caeli intelligi perituri, quos dixit repositos igni reservandos.

4 Aug. l.c. translates the other view, that the stars remain intact, and that only those elements will be burnt 'quae in hac ima mundi parte subistent procedillosa et turbulentia.' 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, Mt. 24:29 ὁ ἡλιος σκοτισθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αἰτής καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πετούνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλαθήσονται, Ἀπο. 6:12-14.

καυσόφαμα.] 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 insitata; and though καῦσος, from which it is derived, is generally used of fever, it also occurs in Proclus of ordinary heat.2 So καυματίζω in classical Greek seems to be confined to the medical sense, but in the N.T. (Mt. 13:16, Ἀπο. 16:19) it is used of the scorching effect of fire. Dr. Bigg suggests, after Veitch p. 309, that it may be an irregular future of καῦω; but there is nothing to justify the use of the future here.

λυθήσεται.] Occurs also in vv. 11 and 12. It is used of breaking up a structure as in Joh. 2:44, as well as of dissolving a compound into its elements.

καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρέθησεν.] 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 κατακαίσαται is accepted by v. Soden, Hundhausen, Brückner. I do not think anyone is quite satisfied with Hort's suggestion νῦνσεται or διαρνήσεται. The reading of Sah. (οὐκ εὑρέθησεται) makes excellent sense, as may be seen from Gen. 5:24 (Enoch) οὐχ εὑρίσκετο, Ἀπο. 16:20 πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγε καὶ ἄρη οὐκ εὑρέθησαν together with the parallels quoted in the Introduction: if the negative were accidentally omitted in the archetype, the other readings would be easy to explain. Weiss and Plummer attempt to get the same sense by making εὑρέθησεται interrogative, but this, as Spitta says, is extremely harsh: it should at least have had a ποῖ prefixed, as in 1 Pet. 4:18. Nor is there much more to be said for the rendering given by Steinfass and Dr. Gwynn 'the works of man shall be discovered and brought to judgement,' for which the latter refers to Ezek. 28:15 εὑρήθη τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν σοὶ. This separates between the earth and the works in it; and would require φανερωθῆσεται, rather than εὑρέθησεται. If we are not to accept οὐκ εὑρέθησεν, I am rather disposed to suggest ἄρθησεν, cf. Mt. 24:30 ἠλθὲν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἤρεν ἀπαντάς, Joh. 15:5, 17:15, Acts 2:22, Isa. 16:10 ἄρθησεν εὐφροσύνη, ἦδ. 57:1 ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἵρονται καὶ οἴδεις κατανοεῖ.4

1 Stephanus gives one example of its figurative use (Hesych. Antirrhet. p. 315) ποιήσει τῶν ἐκ παλαιοῦ χρόνου καυσαθήσετα τῷ ἀσθενείᾳ.
2 Dr. Chase in Hastings' D. of B. s.v. 'Peter' states that καῦσος is used of burnt soil in Athenaeus and Hesychius, referring to Sophocles' Lex., but I have not been able to find the passages there cited.
3 Cf. Melito Ἀπολ., 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 παραθήσεται, as in v. 12, or παρευρήσεται, as in Plat.
11. τοῦτον οὖν πάντων λοιμένων.] For the reading see Introduction on Text. The pres. part. implies ‘since these things are in process of dissolution.’ The seeds of the destruction which will overtake them at the last day are already at work within them. For the tense cf. Joh. 21:23 ὁ μαθητὴς ἔκεινος οὖν ἀποθνῄσκει.

ποταπός δὲ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.] The classical ποταπός (formed like ἀλλοδαπός, παντοδαπός) is equivalent to Lat. euisias, as is shown in Plato Apol. 20 β τίς καὶ ποταπός; Εὐνοος, ἐφή, Πάρμος. In later writers it is found, generally in the form ποταπός, in the sense of ποίος, as in Mt. 8:27 ποταπός ἐστίν οίκος δὲ καὶ οἱ ἁνεμοί . . . ὑπακούοντιν; Lk. 7:39 ἐγίνωσκεν ἀν τίς καὶ ποταπή ἢ γυνή, 1 Joh. 3:1 ἴδετε ποταπήν ἀγάπην ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ, Petρί Αρισ. ἵνα ἰδωμεν ποταποὶ εἰσὶ τήν μορφήν, see Lobeck Phrynichus p. 56. Alford seems to me to give the precise contrary of the meaning of ὑπάρχειν in his note (‘“what manner of men ought ye to be when the event comes?”: ἔπι - seems to imply some fact supervening on the previously existing state’). I understand it to mean ‘what ought ye to be now, beforehand, in readiness for the time when the Lord shall come as a thief in the night?’ cf. 1 Pet. 4:7 and (for ὑπάρχειν) Dem. Olynth. p. 32. 20 τοῦτ' οὖν δὲ προσεῖναι τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὑπάρχει, ‘this one thing, promptness of action, must be added: quickness of intelligence and all other requisites is your birth-right.’

ἐν ἀγίας ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εἰσεθείαις.] For the abstract plural compare above 21:18 ἀσελγείας, Jude v. 13, 1 Pet. 2:1, James 2:1, Blass p. 84.1 For ἀναστροφή see above 27, 1 Pet. 1:15; for εἰσεθέεια above 13.6.7. Alford2 is perhaps right in connecting these words with the following participles.

12. προσδοκώντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παροικίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμᾶς.] For other examples of the transitive force of σπεύδω see Isa. 16:5 ἐκζητῶν κρίμα καὶ σπεύδων δικαιοσύνην, Pind. Pyth. iii. 110 μὴ βλένων ἀθάνατον σπείδει, Eur. Sapph. 161 εἰσφύγαν γ' ἐπεσεις ἀντ' εἴβοιλίας, where the sense is ‘to desire,’ ‘to be eager for’; also Hom. Od. xix. 137 οἱ δὲ γάμον σπεύδουσιν, Eur. Med. 150 τίς σοί ποτε . . . ἔρως, δ' ματαία, σπεύδει θανάτου τελειαν; Esther 5:5 καταστείπατε Ἀμαν, where the sense is ‘to hasten,’ ‘to accelerate’, cf. Sir. 36:8 (or 33:8) σπεύδων καυρόν καὶ μνησθῆναι ὁρκομοί, i.e. ‘hasten the time of the promised vengeance,’ Deut. 32:35, Baruchi Apoc. 83: altissimus accelerans accelerabit tempora sua et adducens adducet horas suas. The latter is the sense preferred here by most editors. ‘In Mt. 24:44 we are told that one condition of the Advent was that the Gospel should be first preached to all nations: it was also to be the subject of prayer “Thy kingdom come”; and we find an even closer parallel to our text in Peter’s speech in Acts 3:19—μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε εἰς τὸ ἐξαλείφθην ὑμῶν τὰς

Legg. 843 ε. He observes that πυρός is corrupt or corrupted in Prov. 10:20, Lam. 4:7, and other passages where it occurs in the LXX.

1 Bremi (exc. vii in Isocr.) cites ἀλήθειαν de Pace § 38, Evag. § 5. c. 1, de Antid. § 170, § 260, § 283, ad Nicocl. § 20; κατεργάζει Evag. § 42. c. 19; μεταβάσεις Panag. § 11; παραβάσεις Philipp. § 116. c. 49, de Antid. § 214; σειμάτωται Archil. § 98; φιλάνθρωπία Philipp. § 116 c. 49, etc.

2 So too Spitta.
That so there may come seasons of refreshing

16. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, persecuted unto death, and rose again from the dead by the glory of the power of the God, according to the gospel:

The word παροντα in biblical Greek is elsewhere used only of a person, not of a day. ‘The Day of God’ is an unusual expression for the Day of the Lord (Joel 2:11, Mt. 4:5, v. 10 above): we find it however in Jer. 46:10 ‘the Day of the Lord God of hosts,’ and in Apoc. 16:14.

= ήν οὐρανὸς περισσοσιμιτοὶ λυθήσονται.] In v. 10 the connexion was only one of time (ἐν γὰρ), here it is one of cause. The presence of the Day of God is the cause of the destruction of heaven by fire.

πυρὸς is used of gold tried in the fire (Apoc. 1:15, 3:18), of fiery darts (Eph. 6:16), of strong feeling (1 Cor. 7:9, 2 Cor. 11:29), of incendiary fire (Herod. vii. 8).

καὶ στοιχεῖα καινούμενα 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 γὰρ... ἐυφράθησαται 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 τῆκεται (which is used in a passive sense by Hippocrates vi. 110). The same word is used of the mountains Isa. 64:1-2, of the heavens Isa. 34:4 ἀκατήροσται Αὐτοί οἱ οὐρανοὶ, Micah 14, Nahum 15:6.

13. καὶ οὐρανοῦς δὲ οὐρανοῖς... κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα οἰκτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν.2] The reference is to Isa. 65:17-19 and 66:22. See also Apoc. 21:11, Isa. 51:6. Hence we must understand αἰτοῦ of God, not, as Spitta, of Christ. The figure chiasmus (καὶ οὐρανοῦς—γῆν καινὴν) is used for the sake of variety, as in Mt. 5:18 ἦλθα ἐν ἣ καὶ κεραία. Here, as in v. 8 above (μία ἡμέρα ὡς χλιόν ἐτη καὶ χιλία ὡς ἡμέρα μία), it has the further effect of improving the rhythm, and giving additional emphasis to the closing καινὴν. On the other hand, in Isaiah and Apoc. 21:1 the epithet is repeated in the same order οὐρανοῦ καὶ οὐρανοῦ—γῆν καινὴν: so

1 Alford explains the text as the ‘present of destiny,’ comparing λοιμένων above; but how then are we to account for the future λυθήσονται?

2 Charles in his book on Eschatology (1899) points out that the opposite view, of the permanence of heaven and earth, is that which prevails in earlier Jewish writings as in Ps. 148:4-6, 104:1. 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 (45:5, 93:16 ‘The first heaven will depart and pass away and a new heaven will appear’) and that the passages quoted from Isaiah are later interpolations and inconsistent with his general teaching. I cannot say that I find his arguments convincing. The doctrine is much more vaguely given in Enoch than in Isaiah, and we do not expect rigid consistency in prophetic visions.
Joh. 10:16 γενήθηται μία τοιμήν, εἷς τοιμήν, Zecl. 14, 2 Cor. 7, πολλή μου παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλὴ μοι καίγοντος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. Cf. Isa. 32, βασιλεὺς δίκαιος βασιλεύσεται, id. v. 16 f. καὶ ἀναπαύεται ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κρίμα, καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐν τῷ Καρμίλῳ κατοικήσει, καὶ ἐσται τὰ ἔργα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰρήνη, καὶ κρατήσει ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυσιν . . . καὶ κατοικήσει ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν παλί ἐρήνῃ. Righteousness is said to have its home in the renewed heaven and earth, because (1) the people shall be all righteous (Isa. 60, Apoc. 21, cf. the picture of the natural effects of virtue in Butler's Analogy Pt. I, ch. 3), and (2) because the Lord, the source of all righteousness, is the light and glory of the new Jerusalem (Jer. 23, Isa. 11, 60 19, 20, Apoc. 21, in contradistinction to this present world, of which Satan is called ὁ ἐρχομένος Joh. 12:31.

ἐν οἷς, i.e. in the new earth and heaven. For the construction of the relative see above 3.

14. διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες] For διό see above 10-12. It is only righteousness that can dwell in the new earth; therefore cleanse yourselves from all unrighteousness. As in Jude v. 20, ἀγαπητοί introduces the direct appeal to the true members of the Church.

σπουδάσατε ἄστιλοι καὶ ἀφόμηνι αὐτῶ ἐφεδρεῖτε. Cf. above, notes on 23 στίλοι καὶ μῦμοι. For the complementary construction of ἐφεδρεῖτε see Phil. 3 1 (i.e. ἐφεσθὼ ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, Gal. 2 ἐφεδρεῖμεν ἄμαρτολοι, 2 Cor. 5 3 oὐ γυμνοὶ ἐφεθερσάμεθα, 1 P. 17 with Hort's note. For the dat. see Rom. 7 10 ἐφέσθη μου ἡ ἐντολή ἢ εἰς ἔργα αὐτῆς εἰς βάπτασην, where it does not express the agent, but the person interested, 'the command, which was for life, turned out in my case to be for death': so in Apoc. 20 τότε ὁ ἐφεσθής αὐτός. In Rom. 10 26, ἐφεσθήν τοὺς ἐμὴν γητοὺσον, it approaches more nearly to ὑπὸ with the gen. Here the dative is ethical, depending on the adjective rather than on the verb, 'to be found without blemish in His sight,' when He appears to judge the world, as in Diod. xvii. 4 μεν. βουλόμενοι τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀμεμπτόν αὐτῶν διαφυλάττειν. Blass compares Eph. 1 ἐκαίνις ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, Col. 1 22 παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ (Gr. pp. 112 f., 185). So Jude v. 24 στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.

ἐν ἐρήνῃ. Peace and righteousness are joined together in Ps. 85, Isa. 32, quoted on v. 13 above, and James 3, where see my note.

15. τῆν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἤγιοσέ. A stronger expression of the statement in v. 9, where the readers are taught to look on βραδυνής as μακροθυμία. Here they are taught to look on μακροθυμία as σωτηρία, i.e. as intended by God to lead to their salvation, if rightly used. Cf. 1 Pet. 3 διε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ του Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νοέ.

καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παύλος—ἐγραψεν ὑμῖν. A similar phrase is used by Paul of Tychicus (Eph. 6, Col. 4), of Onesimus (Col. 4, Philem. v. 16). So Epaphras is called ὁ ἀγαπητὸς σύνδουλος (Col. 1), Philemon ἀγαπητός καὶ συνεργός (Philem. v. 1), Timothy τέκνων ἀγαπητῶν (1 Cor. 4, 2 Tim. 1), while the phrase ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου is.

For this quotation I am indebted to Dr. Abbott.
used of Epaenetus, Ampliatus, Stachys, and Persis in Rom. 16. It would be a very natural phrase for St. Peter to use of St. Paul, especially in a letter written to those who were themselves acquainted with St. Paul and had probably read the severe strictures contained in Gal. 2:11-14. That the warm-hearted, generous Peter bore no grudge against his ‘brother’ for his animadversions, and was (at any rate in later life) in full sympathy with his teaching, is evident from the whole tone of the first Petrine letter. This does not of course prove the genuineness of the present letter; but it shows that there is nothing opposed to it in this kindly mention of St. Paul, joined, as it is, with the gentle caution which follows. For ἡμῶν compare Acts 15:25 σὺν τοῖς ἄγαπητοίς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβας καὶ Παύλῳ, 1 Th. 3:2 Τιμόθεον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, 2 Cor. 1:22, Phil. v. 2 'Αρχίππῳ τῷ συνοπταμάτῳ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ’ οίκον σου ἐκκλησίᾳ. It may be understood either of the Apostles, or, as I should prefer, of Christians generally.

Who are those to whom St. Paul is here said to have written? Can we identify them with the recipients of any of his extant epistles? It seems to me that the phrase καθὼς ἔγραψε can only refer to the preceding injunction, the importance of which injunction is shown by the reiteration in vv. 9 and 15, to the effect that the long-suffering of God was to be regarded as an evidence of His goodwill to men. We find the equivalent to this in Rom. 2:4 καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς ἄγνωστο τὸ χρηστόν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν σε ἀγεί; 3:26. εἰς ἐνδεξαμένης τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ . . . ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ib. 9:22. θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδεξασθαι . . . τὸ δυσαντόν αὐτοῦ ἤργον ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεφθεῖ ὁργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἄπωλεαν, ἵνα γνώρισῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκέψιν ἐλέους, 11:22. Hence Oecumenius, Grotius, Dietlein, Ewald, Plummer argue, as I think, rightly that our epistle is addressed to the Romans, see Introduction on this subject. Others however assuming that those addressed are inhabitants of Asia Minor, as in 1 Pet., are driven to find a different reference in καθὼς ἔγραψε. So Wiesinger, Schott, Hofmann, Keil, Kühler, v. Soden, Weiss think the epistle to the Ephesians intended, because that was certainly known to the author of 1 Pet., and because we find in it admonitions to a godly life, based upon the hope of the inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God (Eph. 4:30-5:5). It is unnecessary to point out the vague generality of such a reference; how little there is in it that is distinctive of one epistle rather than another. Hence Cajetan, Benson, and others have supposed an allusion to the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians along with that to the Ephesians. Corn. à Lapide and Jackmann prefer the first epistle to the Corinthians, the former because of the resemblance of 2 Pet. 3:15 κατὰ τὴν δοθέασιν αἰτεῖ σοφίαν to 1 Cor. 2:1, 128, but this point is too unimportant to justify the reference: the latter on the more plausible ground, that 1 Cor. iii and iv are illustrative of portions of our epistle; but, as these portions do not belong to the section in question, we cannot accept this as a natural explanation. Estius, Bengel, and others, prefer the epistle to the Hebrews, assuming that 2 Pet. was addressed to Jewish Christians, and that the author would have admitted the Hebrews as a writing of Paul. Bengel rests...
this hypothesis on the fact that we have repeated references to the last time in Heb. 11, 926, 1025. De Wette, with whom Plumptre and Alford agree, widens the reference so as to include the whole passage dealing with the Second Coming (35-318) 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.

κατὰ τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν. Cf. Paul’s own words κατὰ τὴν χάριν του θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσαν μοι ὡς σοφός ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον θητηκα (1 Cor. 310), γνώτες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι Ἰδαίῳ και Κηφᾶς . . . δεξιών ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ (Gal. 29), 1 Cor. 28t, Col. 128, and Polycarp (ad Phil. iii. 2) συντέ γὰρ ἐγὼ οὖν ἄλλος ὁμοίας ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθήσατι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου. . . ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐγραπτῶν ἐπιστολᾶς.

16. ὡς καὶ ἐν πᾶσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων.] See Introduction on the Text. We must understand γράφει after ὡς. Of course ‘all his letters’ does not necessarily include all the epistles which have come down to us under the name of Paul; nor on the other hand is it necessarily limited to them: it means simply ‘all the letters known to the writer.’ We may assume that the early Christian teachers would naturally communicate their writings to each other, and that these would be read as containing the teaching of the Spirit for the Church at large. At the same time the phrase πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς would be more naturally understood of a collection of letters made after St. Paul’s death. If he were still living, we should rather have expected ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιστολαῖς. In later Greek λαλῶ is used, much like λέγω, of serious speech (cf. above 128) 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 μακροθημία 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 μακροθημία 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. Nuncquam enim sic locutus fuisse 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.

οι δὲ ἰστὶν δυσνόητα τινὰ. The reading ὁς is probably owing to the copyist's taking τοῦτον to be the antecedent. For δυσνόητα (not found elsewhere in biblical Greek) cf. Luc. Alexand. 54 χρησμοίς ἰσότοις καὶ δυσνόητοις, Diog. L. ix. 13 (a supposititious letter of Darius to Heraclitus) καταβεβλησα λόγον γραπτόν περὶ φύσεως δυσνόητοι τε καὶ δυσεξήγγητον.

ὁ άμαθεὶς καὶ ἀστήρυκτοι στρέβλοσιν.] Cf. Clem. Al. Str. p. 529 init. οἱ διαστρέφοντες τὰς γραφὰς πρὸς ἱδίας ἱδονὰς, καὶ τῶν προσῳδίων καὶ στηγμάτων μεταβέβλητα τὰ παραγεγραμμένα συμφόρους βιαζόμενοι πρὸς ἱδουπαθείας τὰς ἑαυτῶν, ib. pp. 890, 891. I have not found any other example of στρέβλον in the sense of twisting or straining a phrase like the Fr. 'torturer un mot,' but in Ps. 18:26 we have μετὰ στρεβλού διαστρέψεις (Clement's word above), where 2 Sam. 22:27 has μετὰ στρεβλοῦ στρεβλωθῆσαι. I think the figurative sense flows from the notion of twisting or warping, rather than from that of torturing on the rack, cf. Arist. Ἀναλ. 878 (of ἀνδρεῖς γνωμοτυποῖ) ὅταν εἰς ἐρν ἀνεμερμίνους ἠθέθησε στρεβλοῦσι παλαίσομασι ἀντλέγοντες, Aristot. Rhet. i. 1. 5 οὐ δεῖ τὸν δικαιὸν διαστρέφειν (we must not warp his judgment) . . . δρομον γὰρ κἂν εἰ τις, ϕ μέλλει χρησαί κανόνι, τοῦτον ποιήσῃ στρεβλὸν (with Cope's notes); so Plutarch (Mor. 2, p. 968 a) uses the term στρεβλότης to express the windings of the ant's nest; and Sir. 36:25 has καρδία στρέβλη = κ. σκολιά. It is strange that so common a word as ἀμαθής should not be found elsewhere in the N.T. or LXX., its place being taken by such words as ἰδιώτης Acts 4:13, 1 Cor. 14:16, 23, or ἀγάματος Acts 4:13, or ὁ ἄγνων Heb. 5:2. For ἀστήρυκτος see above on 2:14.

What are the δυσνόητα τινὰ referred to? Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. 3:5-8), with his apparent disparagement of the Law in Rom. 3:20, 28, 4:15, 5:20, 6:4, 7:11; his teaching with regard to the πνευματικόν 1 Cor. 11; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council as to εἰδωλοθυτὰ (Acts 15:29, Rom. 14, 1 Cor. 8, 10:25); as regards the resurrection in baptism (Rom. 6:3-11, Col. 3:1, 1 Cor. 15:12); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. 9:11-21), and the Parousia (2 Th. 2).

ὁς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς.] In the N.T. αἱ γραφαί is regularly used of the O.T. Scriptures, especially in the Synoptic Gospels, but also once in the fourth Gospel (5:39), four times in the Acts, once in Rom. 15:4, twice in 1 Cor. 15:5, 4 (κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς). We find γραφαί without the article in Rom. 12 ὁ προαγγελιστά καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις, ib. 16:26 (μυστηρίου) διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . γνωρισθέντως. The singular is used in Mk. 12:10 oüθε τὴν γραφὴν ταυτίνα ἀνέγνωτε; Lk. 4:21 σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὐτή, Joh. 2:22 ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ,
on which Westcott's note is 'the phrase occurs elsewhere ten times in St. John 738, 42, 1045, 1318, 1712, 1924, 28, 35, 37, 209 and in every case except 1712 and 209 the reference is to a definite passage quoted in the context [similarly Joh. 1937 ἐπέρα γραφη 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 περιοχή τῆς γραφῆς ἦν ἀνεγίνωσκεν, 835; in Rom. 43, 917, 1011, 1112, Gal. 38, 328, 430, 1 Tim. 518, in all of which passages St. Paul seems to personify γραφή, using it without αὐτή. So James 226, 23, 45. The article is omitted in Joh. 1917, Rom. 12, 1626 already quoted, and in 2 Tim. 316 πάντα γραφή θεόπνευτος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδάσκαλον, 'every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching' (R.V.), 1 Pet. 226 περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, where Hort thinks 'the translation "in Scripture" is barely possible without the article; nor again, in the absence of τοι, is the sense "in a passage of Scripture" probable. The most natural rendering is simply "in writing" as Sir. 3982 διενοθήναι καὶ ἐν γραφῇ ἄφθονα; 427 δόσις καὶ λήψις, πάντα ἐν γραφῇ, 443 διηγούμενοι ἔτη ἐν γραφῇ, 2 Chron. 211 εἰπε Χύριμ βασιλεὺς Τύρου ἐν γραφῇ, 2112 ἤλθεν αὐτῷ ἐν γραφῇ παρὰ Ἡλεον τοῦ προφήτου, Ps. 86, Ezek. 139, 1 Chron. 2819. Thus περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ is equivalent to "it stands written": compare St. John's formula of quotation ἦτοι γεγραμμένον. That the quotation was authoritative was doubtless implied, in accordance with the familiar Jewish use of the words "said," "written." If we accept this interpretation, which is supported by Blass p. 182, n. 3 and by Zahn Einl. ii. p. 109,1 we should perhaps attach the same general meaning to γραφή in 2 Tim. 318, 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 πάντα προφητεία γραφής ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται? Is this to be translated 'no prophecy of (or "in") writing,' Zahn 'schriftlich'? I confess I prefer the R.V. 'no prophecy of Scripture,' and so in 1 Pet. 226 'It is contained in Scripture.' A unique use naturally tends to dispense with the article, as in θεός, Κύριος, βασιλεὺς, σωτήρ, Χριστός, πνεύμα, νόμος, λόγος.2 When St. Paul can speak of ἐν γραφῇ 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 γραφάς 'Scriptures,' understanding by it the O.T., unless strong reason can be shown on the other side. Such strong reason is thought to be found in the epithet λοιπάς. Can it be supposed that the writer here puts the Pauline epistles on the same shelf as the old sacred books of the Jews?

1 Sometimes γραφή stands for 'register' as in Nehem. 734 οὗτοι ἐγίναγαν γραφὴν αὐτῶν τῆς συνοδίας, Ezek. 139 ἐν γραφῇ οἶκου Ἰσραήλ ὁ γραφότατος; sometimes for any particular writing, as in Dan. 57 δὲ ἐν ἀναγγῇ τῆς γραφῆς ταῦτα. Ireneeus has 'haec scriptura' (αὕτη ἡ γραφή) of his own book (iii. 17. 4); so Clem. Al. Str. vi. 32 περὶ μὲν τῶν προοίμων τῆς γραφῆς διαλεξόμεθα of his own treatise, followed shortly after by κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν used of scripture, and the same diversity is found ἓν. 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, cxxii.
Some commentators escape from this argument by reference to the idiomatic use of "

\[\text{Alla\lambdaos}\] and similar words, as in the passages cited by Dr. Bigg, Hom. Od. i. 132 ἐκθεν ἄλλων μνημήρων, where Ὑδεισσεις is distinguished from the others, the suitors; Lk. 232 ἦτεροι δόου κακοῶργου; ... Deut. 8 (ἀπωλεία ἀπολείποντης) καθά καὶ τὰ λοιπά ἑθή ὅσα καὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπολλαῖει πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν, where the chosen people might seem, according to the usual force of λοιπῶς, to be included in the Gentiles who were destroyed before their face, see Winer, p. 664. The last passage is not of much weight, because Israel is strictly included among τὰ ἑθή. Besides λοιπῶς certainly implies a closer connexion than ἄλλας. If we had ὃς 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 αὐτῶς τὰς γραφάς. We have a parallel use of λοιπὸς in Sir. proil. αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητείαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων. I incline to think that γραφάς is here used to denote any book read in the synagogue or congregation, including the letters of the Apostles (Col. 4:16, 1 Th. 5:27) as well as the lessons from the O.T.

Though γραφάς is generally used of the O.T. in the Apostolic writings, it is also used of the N.T. by the middle of the second century. Thus in 2 Clem. Rom. 2, after a quotation from Isa. 54:1, a quotation from Mk. 2:17 is introduced in the words καὶ ἐτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἄλλα ἀμαρτωλοὺς; (ib. 13) Lk. 6:35 is referred to as τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. Even before the end of the first century, in 1 Clem. Rom. 23 ἡ γραφὴ λέγει introduces a quotation from a book not included in the canon of the O.T. which Lightfoot supposes to be Eldad and Modad. [Hermas alludes to this in Vis. ii. 3. 4 ὃς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μωδάτ, τοὺς προφητεύσαν ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ.] What is considered by some to be the still earlier epistle of Barnabas introduces the words πολλοὶ κλητοὶ, ὄλγου δὲ ἐκλεκτοῖ (Mat. 22:44) with ὃς γέγραπται. Can we then suppose that the books of the N.T. are to be understood here? If we give λοιπὰς its ordinary sense, this seems to me a more difficult explanation than that which would interpret it of the O.T., because it assumes that there was a collection of later writings known to the writer as Scripture, of which St. Paul's epistles formed a part. But such an assumption can hardly be conceived as possible before the middle of the second century. That the word γραφή, Scripture, should be applied to the epistle to the Colossians by one who had heard it read in public worship seems to me perfectly natural; but that this epistle should have been bound up, not only with other epistles, but with a variety of Christian writings by different authors claiming a similar authority (and this is suggested by λοιπὰς), 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 ἰερὰ γράμματα (from which γραμματεύς is derived)
Supposing, then, that τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς is to be understood in the first instance of the O.T., what are the kind of perversions referred to? I think those which rise up first in our minds would be such as are noted by our Lord Himself in Mt. 5:21-44, 15:3-6, 19:3-10, Lk. 9:34-36, etc. If the O.T. was thus liable to perversion, no wonder that the writings of the new prophets should be liable to similar misuse.

πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπάλειαν.] The preposition denotes the end or result of the action στρεβλοῦσθαι, as in Heb. 9:13 ἀγάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, Joh. 11:14 αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἦστι πρὸς θάνατον, 2 Cor. 4:16 οὐκ ἔμαθεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν, 2 Th. 3:3 εργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι τινα, 1 Joh. 5:16 δώσῃ χωρὶς τοῦ ἀμαρτάνοντος μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. For the combination ἱδίαν αὐτῶν cf. Acts 24:23 μηδένα καλῶν τῶν ἱδίων αὐτῶν ὑπηρετεῖν αὐτῷ, Tit. 1:12 εἰπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἱδίος αὐτῶν προφήτης, Dem. 1244. 24 ἵσως οὐκ ἂν ἤδηκεν δίὰ τὸ αὐτῶν ἱδιον, Theog. 440 τὸν αὐτὸν ἱδιὸν νόιν, cf. above v. 3. For ἀπώλειαν cf. above 21.

17. ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγνώσκοντες.] This resumes the exhortation of ver. 14 after the digression on St. Paul’s teaching, replacing the phrase ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες ‘being thus forewarned.’ The word is more often used in the N.T. of the divine foreknowledge. It is used, as here, in Wisdom 18:17 ἐκεῖνη ἡ νῦν προεγνώσθη πατράσιν ἡμῶν.

φυλάσσετε ἵνα μὴ ... ἐκπέσητε.] ‘Be on your guard, in order that you may not fall away,’ cf. Plut. Mor. p. 231 οὐ φυλάξῃ συνεχὸς γελοιαζόν, ὅπως μὴ γελοῖος γένη; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 37 φυλάττον ὅπως μὴ ἠλάττως τὰς βούς ποιήσης, Job 36:31 φυλάξαι μὴ πράξῃς ἀτοπα, Sir. 22:11 φυλάξαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ κόπων ἤχυς.

τῇ τῶν ἀδέσμων πλάνη συναπαχθεῖτε.] For ἄδεσμων see n. on 27; for πλάνη note on 218; Jude v. 11; for συναπαχθεῖτε Gal. 2:13 (of the weak compliance of Peter and Barnabas) καὶ Β. συναπαχθῆ τοῖς ὑπ’ ὑπόκρισιν, Rom. 12:16 τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαχόμενοι (in a good sense).

ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἱδίου στρογγυλοῦ.] Cf. Gal. 5:11 ἡς ἁρμοσ ἐκπέσητε, see n. on James 1:11 where it has a different sense. στρογγυλός here only in N.T., found also in Isa. 3:4, Symm., in the sense of ‘support,’ and in Diod. i. 81, Plut. Mor. 76 d of the apparent ‘stations’ of the planets. See n. on ἀστήρων 214, 316, and στρογγύλων 112 above.

18. αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι.] In early Greek αὐξάνω is only transitive, like αὐξω, and this use is found in 1 Cor. 3:6 Ἀπολλώνι ἐπρώτησε, ἀλλὰ ὁ Θεός ἥξισεν, 2 Cor. 9:10 (God) αὔξησε τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν: the passive is also found in 2 Cor. 10:15 αὔξανομένης τῆς πίστεως, Col. 1:11 καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὔξανομενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. 2:5 ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὔξησητε εἰς σωτηρίαν, Mt. 13:32, Mk. 4:8. The more common use in the N.T. is the intransitive, of which we have exx. in Mt. 6:30, Lk. 1:80, 249, Joh. 3:30, Acts 6:7, 7:17, 12:24, 19:20, Eph. 4:15, and here, besides the form αὔξω in Eph. 3:21, Col. 2:19. So Aristotle combines the passive and the intransitive use in Anal. Post. i. 13. p. 78 b 5 ei γὰρ τὸ is used of holy scripture in 2 Tim. 3:15, γράμματα by itself is often used of writings generally, as in Luke 16:17, Acts 28:1, 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.
For the thought we may compare 1 Pet. 2:2 to λογικόν ἀδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὑράδειτε εἰς σωτηρίαν and Eph. 4:15 αἰσθήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα ὅσ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή. The writer here repeats the prayer of 1:2. It seems better to take χάρις absolutely, rather than to connect it with τοῦ κυρίου, as in the latter case we should have the awkwardness of giving to the genitive a subjective force as regards χάρις, and an objective force as regards γνώσις.

καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] A repetition of 2:20 except that γνώσει here takes the place of ἐπιγνώσει there: cf. also 3:2. In the introductory verses of the Epistle we have seen reason to believe that, in spite of the absence of the article, Jesus our Lord is distinguished from God: here, as in 3:2, we naturally understand τοῦ κυρίου of Jesus. For γνώσις see above 1:6 and Appendix on ἐπιγνώσις.

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ... αἰώνος.] See 1 Pet. 5:11 and notes on Jude v. 25; also Joh. 6:51 ξύνει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 12:4 ὁ Χριστὸς μὲν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The rare phrase ἡμέρα αἰῶνος is perhaps borrowed from Sir. 18:10 (where man's life is compared with eternity) ὡς σταγεένων ὀπόθεν γαλάζεσθι ... αὐτῶς ἠλίγγα ἐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος. It also agrees well with v. 8 above and with the expressions ἡμέρα κρίσεως and ἡμέρα Κυρίου in 3:7, 10; also with Heb. 15: σήμερον γεγένηκά σε, where Alf. quotes Philo i. p. 554 σήμερον ἐστιν ὁ ἀπέραντος καὶ ἀδιεξόρητος αἰῶν; see his whole note.
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ἐπίγνωσις.

Lightfoot commenting on Col. 1\(^9\) (αὐτούμενον ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέτει πνευματικῇ) says the compound ἐπίγνωσις is an advance upon γνώσις, denoting a larger and more thorough knowledge. So Chrysostom here, ἐγνώστε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπιγνώναι, cf. Justin M. Dial. 3, p. 221 ἢ παρέχουσα αὐτῶν τὸν ἀνθρωπόνοι καὶ τῶν θείων γνῶσιν, ἐπειτα τῆς τούτων θείωτος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐπίγνωσιν. So too St. Paul himself contrasts γνώσκεις, γνώσεις, with ἐπιγνώσκεις, ἐπίγνωσις, as the partial with the complete in two passages, Rom. 12\(^{21-28}\) γνώτες τὸν Θεόν ὅς ὁς Θεόν ἐδόξασαν...οὐκ ἔδοξάσαν τὸν Θεόν ἐχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, 1 Cor. 13\(^{12}\)... Hence also ἐπίγνωσις is used especially of the knowledge of God and of Christ, as being the perfection of knowledge.' Again, on Philem. οὕς ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως σου ἐνεργής γένηται ἐν ἐπιγνώσει παντός ἁγαθοῦ, Lightfoot writes ἐπίγνωσις, involving the complete appropriation of all truth and the unreserved acquiescence in God's will, is the goal and crown of the believer's course.' ‘In all the epistles of the Roman captivity St. Paul's prayer for his correspondents culminates in this word.' [Possibly the word came into use to distinguish the living knowledge of the true believer from the spurious γνώσεις which had then begun to ravage the Church.]

Dr. Armitage Robinson has traced the history of the word ἐπίγνωσις with great care in his edition of the Ephesians (pp. 248–254). He shows that in classical writers ἐπιγνώσκειν is chiefly used in the sense of 'recognition' and holds that ἐπὶ here expresses direction rather than addition. ‘There is no indication that it conveys the idea of a fuller and more perfect knowledge.’ It ‘directs attention to some particular point in regard to which knowledge is affirmed.’ In the LXX. ἐπιγνώσκομαι, except where it is used in the sense of recognize, seems not to differ from γνώσκει. The phrase ἐπίγνωσις Ἰσαὰ occurs in Prov. 25, Hos. 4\(^{1-6}\), but γνώσις Ἰσαὰ in Wisdom 2\(^{13-14}\), 14\(^{22}\). In Hos. 4\(^{6}\) ὁμοιώθη (Ἀ.Ν. 'are destroyed') ὁ λαὸς μον ὃς ὁκ ἔχον γνώσιν ὅτι σὺ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπὸ σα κάθῳ ἀπόφοιται σε. ‘In the Gospels and Acts it is found in the sense of “perceiving,” “discerning,” “recognizing” just as in classical authors’: where we have γνώσκει in Lk. 10\(^{22}\) (οὐδεὶς γνώσκει
tis estin o uios) we have oideis epignwosei ton uioin in Mt. 1127. He states the general result of his investigation in the words 'as a rule gnosis is used where knowledge in the abstract is spoken of, but epignosis 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 epignosis is more naturally used of knowledge of a particular point.' I must say, I think L.'s the more natural interpretation: gnosis 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) okei dokimasan ton theon ekein en epignwosi, and (v. 32) to dokaioma touto epignontes, the latter implying a knowledge of the character and will of God, not merely of his existence and his power. So in 1 Cor. 1312 1rmi gnwseis ek merous, tote de epignwosma kathos kai epignwosi : all that Dr. Robinson will allow is that epignwosma 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 gnosis and epignosis 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 0 mellos katheixthai ton logon tis eisbeinai pайдeveth pro tov baptsimatos tin peri tou agennitoi gnwsi, tin peri uioi monogenous epignwoin, tin peri tou agiou pneumatou plerophoriai. 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 epignwos as a word of fuller sound than gnwsi ') 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 gnwsi, epignwos, and plerophoria 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 ep in the compound.

I should draw a similar conclusion from the fact that the phrase kat' epignwosein is twice opposed to kat' perifasien in Clem. Alex. The word perifasien 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 (eidois keimenon pros tas ton proeirnymenon
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τόπων περιφάσεως), and in the Clementine passages referred to. We should infer that the phrase κατὰ περιφάσαυ must mean ‘on a broad general view,’ and this seems to suit its use in Clem., though Dindorf reads κατὰ περίφρασιν in each case.1 The 1st passage is Str. i. p. 372, where speaking of Paul’s sermon at Athens Clement says διὰ τοῦ ἀγνώστου Θεοῦ τιμᾶσθαι καὶ τὰ περὶ φασιν πρὸς τῶν Ἐλλήνων τῶν δημιουργῶν Θεοῦ γῆς, κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν δὲ δεῖν δὲ νῦν παραλαβεῖν καὶ μαθεῖν. A little below, Clement, commenting on Acts 26:17, 18 (‘to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light’), continues όποιοι νῦν οἱ ἀνωγόμενοι τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμαί ή δὲ νῦν ἐπίγνωσις ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρός, ή τῆς περιφάσεως (MS. περιφράσεως) τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς κατάληψις, where the meaning seems to be ‘the opening eyes of the blind are the growing knowledge of the Father through the Son, the clear apprehension of that which was dimly and vaguely seen by the Greeks.’ The MS. reading περιφράσεως would be here unmeaning. The second passage is Str. vi. p. 759 δι’ οὗ καὶ τῇ ἐπὶ γνώσιν ὁ λόγος τῶν Θεῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περὶ φασιν Ἐλλήνων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι, Πέτρος εἰς τὸν Κηρύγματα λέγει . . . τούτων τῶν Θεῶν σέβεσθε μὴ κατὰ τοὺς Ἐλληνας, ὡς ορθοτόν τὸν αὐτόν ἕμεν σεβόντων Θεὸν καὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἑλληνικοί δοκίμως, ἀλλ’ οὗ καὶ τῇ ἐπὶ γνώσιν παντελῆ τῆς δὲ νῦν παράδοσιν μεμαθηκότων.

In considering the force of any compound, we may begin with the assumption that it must have originated in the wish to express some modification in the meaning of the simple word. But the first user of the compound, unless it is introduced as a definitely scientific term (and even that is not always a safeguard; it gets misused by scientific smatterers, and by the large class who like to give their words a scientific flavour), has very little control over its subsequent fortunes. If the prefix is a preposition, such as εἰς, 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 ἐπαγονίζεσθαι (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 περιφάσαυ.
to claim it as part of the Catholic heritage than to set up against it the special term ἐπίγνωσις.

And now to consider what uses of ἐπί may have contributed to the meaning of ἐπίγνωσις. The earliest meaning found in classical Greek is 'to recognize,' 'to discern.' Dr. Robinson says that there is here 'no indication of a fuller, more perfect, more advanced knowledge,' but that ἐπί 'seems to fix the verb on a definite object'; and further on he says that 'as a rule γνώσις is used where knowledge in the abstract is spoken of, but ἐπίγνωσις where the special object of knowledge is expressed'; and he connects these compounds with others in which the preposition has the force of 'direction.' I agree that ἐπί has this defining force and that it frequently expresses direction, but I do not think that this is enough to explain either the classical or the Pauline use. To discern and to recognize imply a closeness and an intimacy of knowledge. I may be acquainted with a man, but I may fail to recognize him. I may know that I am approaching the harbour of Dover, but it is only gradually that I discern the different features of the scene. It seems to me that in many compounds ἐπί has this force of onward movement or pressure, as in ἐπακολουθεῖν, ἐπεξελθεῖν, ἐπιστολεῖν, ἐπεργασία 'encroachment upon,' ἐπιγαμία 'marrying into,' ἐπαλλάσσω 'to interchange,' ἐπιβαίνω 'to be closely associated.' This intensive force seems also to derive support from another use of ἐπί where it connotes addition, repetition, something over and above, as in ἐπιδιωκτεῖν, ἐπιδόρπιος, ἐπαινεῖν, ἐπαμπέχω, ἐπανιστάνω, ἐπιταραχήσαμεν, ἐπιταμπόμος, ἐπισυγγράφω, ἐπιδικτάσσω (Eus. H.E. v. 16. 3), above all perhaps in ἐπιδίδωμι, which beginning with the notion of addition (giving a dowry in addition to a daughter) comes to mean liberality, and then simply growth or increase.

I think therefore that, while Dr. Robinson has rightly insisted on the specializing force of ἐπίγνωσις, Lightfoot is justified in claiming for it an intensive force.¹

¹ Dr. Abbott has supplied me with the following examples from Epictetus. Dis. i. 6. 42 πρὸς τὸν δόντα ἀποστυφλωμένοι, μηδ' ἐπιμυσώκοντες τὸν εὐβείτην, i. 9. 11 ἐπιγνόντες τὴν πρὸς τοὺς βοῶς συνγένειαν, i. 29. 59 'Bring me Caesar without his trappings, and I am quite at my ease': δὴν δὲ μετὰ τούτων ἔλθῃ . . . τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡ ἐπέγνωσκα τοῦ κύριον ὡς ὁ δραπατὴς; iv. 8. 20 τί κακόν, ἐν αἷς ἐπολοῦν ἐπιμυσώκοκεσθαι τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἐν δὲ τοῖς συμβόλοις μῆ; In all these cases the meaning 'recognize' is suitable. In Fragment. Schol. 61 (Schenkl, p. 475) 'If you wish to be a just judge,' μηδὲνα τῶν δικαιομένων καὶ δικαιολογοῦντων ἐπιγνώσκε αλλ' αὐτὴν τὴν δίκην, the sense seems to be 'give heed to,' 'to note.'
The characteristic mark of words belonging to the root φθιω, of which these, along with φθινο and φθίνω, are the most important, as distinguished from such words as κτεινω, καινω, σφάττω, φοινικω, δολυμε, 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 φθινω and φθίσις, but φθινω is used also of violent death, as in Aesch. S. c. Θεό. 970 πρὸς φιλον ἐφθισο, καὶ φιλον ἐκτανεο, Ὀδ. iv. 741 μεμάσαν 'Οδυσσής φθίωα γόνων, and so φθιμενοι and φθιτοι 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. Αφ. 25; then of destruction or injury of any sort, as φθείρειν τὴν γῆν, τῶν σιτῶν, τὰ δέντρα; especially of moral injury, as in Xen. Mem. i. 5. 3 κακουργούτατον ἐστὶ μὴ μόνον τῶν οἴκων ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν φθείρει, Plato Legg. xii. 958 c τῶν καὶ νόμων φθειρῶν ξημούσθω; then of bribery, and seduction, of debasing the quality of anything, etc.

φθορά 'rotteness' has a similar range of meaning. Its original force is seen in Philo M. ii. p. 96 ἐναπέθανε τὰ γένη τῶν ἰχθυῶν ἀπαντά, ἢ τῆς ξωτικῆς δυνάμεως ἐις φθοροποιῶν μεταβαλούσης, διὸ δυσυδίας πάντα ἀναπετληθοῦσα. Hence it is generally defined as ἡ πρὸς τὸ χέριν μεταβολή, and is frequently found in philosophic writings as the counterpart of γένεσις, it being assumed that all that has come into being is necessarily liable to pass out of being by dissolution. It is technically used for the deluges and conflagrations from which the world has suffered (Plato Tim. 22 c). It was especially used in later writers for the 'crime of sense avenged by sense' as combining both the moral and physical senses of the word. So φθορά of seduction, φθορεύς a seducer, ἀφθορος 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, συμφωνεῖ μὲν οὖν ἀρμακεί προσεχθῆ κοινωνίᾳ δὲ φθοράς λιξε τὴν ἐντευξὶ, on which Clement comments οὗ γάρ, διὸ τῶν ἔξοχῶν, δεῖν γυναικὸς πρὸς ἄνδρα τὴν σαρκὸς πρὸς τὴν φθορὰν ἐπιπλοκὴν μηνύσθαι ὑποτετήτων, τῶν γὰρ ἀντικρος διαβόλως προσαπτότων τὴν τῶν γάμου εὕρουν ἀθέων ἀνθρώπων ἐπίσκοπον καθηγορεῖ: καὶ κανονείει βλασφημεῖσθαι ὁ νομοθέτης.

In the LXX, φθειρω occurs in the sense 'to kill' in Wisd. 165-27 δύνασθαι δόφων εὐφηείρων... ὑπὸ πυρὸς φειερμένων: in the sense to 'destroy' or 'devastate' in Exod. 1015 (the swarm of locusts) ἐκάλυψε τὴν δύση τῆς γῆς καὶ εὐφθαρή ἡ γῆ, 2 Sam. 202ο Joab denies that he seeks to destroy a city, 1 Chron. 20 Εὐφθαράν τὴν χώραν, Isa. 244 εὐφθαρή ἡ οἰκουμένη: τὸ ἀτηρος, 'injure,' 'mar,' 'spoil' in Lev. 1937 φθ. τὴν δυν. τοῦ πάγους 'to mar the corners of the beard,' Deut. 347 natural force abated,' Jer. 139 φθ. τὴν ὀβρέων 'Ιουδα 'mar the pride of Judah.' In Gen. 611 εὐφθαρή ἡ γῆ is used in a moral sense of the corruption of the inhabitants of the earth.
φθορά is used of destruction in Ps. 103:4 τῶν λυτρούμενον ἐκ φθορᾶς τὴν ζωὴν σου, Micah 210 διεθμῆτε φθορᾶς, Isa. 243 φθορᾶς φθαρῆσαι ἡ γῆ; of being worn out by toil Exod. 1818 φθορᾶ καταφθαρῆση; of moral corruption in Wisdom 1412 εἴρεσὶ εἰδῶλων φθορᾶ ζωῆς.

The strengthened forms διαφθορᾶ 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. 1538 φθειρόμενον ἢ ἔκαλεθ' ὅμιλα κακάι, bad company is injurious to character. So 2 Cor. 11 φαβοῦμαι μὴ πώς, ὡς ὁ δοφεῖς ἔχουσαν ἔχουσαν ἔφεσάν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῆ τὰ νομίματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν λέσην τους thought should be seduced from the simple faith in Christ, 2 Cor. 72 οὐδένα ἥδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν. In the last passage Alford understands it of outward injury ‘we ruined no man’; but if we compare Tit. 22 παρεχόμενοι ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν and 1 Thess. 23–8, where the apostle protests that his teaching was not εξ ἀκαθαρσίας or ἐν ὀλίγῳ, not ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας οἴτε προφάσει πλεονεξίας, I think we shall prefer the rendering of A.V. and R.V., ‘we corrupted none,’ i.e. we did not seek to gain popularity by lowering the standard of the Gospel. In Eph. 422 τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, Dr. Armitage Robinson’s explanation is (p. 107) ‘you must strip off the old man, a miserable decaying thing, rotted with the old life of error: you must be made new in your spirit,’ and again (p. 109) ‘ἀνθρώπον may simply mean is on the way to perish, as in 2 Cor. 416 εἰ καὶ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπος διαφθείρεται ὅλα’ ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνακαινισθαί. But, again, it may refer to moral corruption as in 2 Cor. 11.3 This ‘second meaning is also in the Apostle’s mind, for he adds the words according to the lusts of deceit and he offers a second contrast in the new man which is created after God.’ ‘The original purity of newly created man was corrupted by means of a deceit which worked through the lusts.’ Cf. 2 Pet. 1 below. In Apoc. 192 έκρεςεν τῆν πόρυν τῆν μεγάλην ἡτοί μεθειρείν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, the phrase φθ. τ. γῆν is used of moral corruption, as in Gen. 611, cf. Apoc. 1118. In 1 Cor. 316–17 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστί καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οίκει; εἰ τίς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρῃ, φθείρει τοῦτον ὁ θεός; ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγίος ἐστιν, εἰς ταῖς ὑμεῖς, the R.V. has ‘if any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy,’ but the sense of φθείρω is not the same in the two cases. The A.V. translates the former ‘defiles,’ and so Alford ‘mars.’ From a comparison with 1 Cor. 619 ἤ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σώμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἠγίον πνεῦματός ἐστίν; we learn that the temple or shrine spoken of is the body, which is defiled but not destroyed by sin. It seems therefore to be another instance of playing upon the double meaning of the Greek word. Last comes the use of φθείρω in Jude v. 10 ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίσταται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται and the imitation in 2 Pet. 212 οὕτω δέ, ὅς ἀλογά γεγεννημένα εἰς ἀλογιν καὶ φθορά, ἐν οἷς ἀναχώρησθεν βλασφημούντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται. 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 εἰς ϕθορά; cf. Col. 2:22 ἡ ἑτήν εἰς ϕθοράν ‘meats are destined for decomposition ’; Gal. 6:8 ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει ϕθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, where Lightfoot says 'the harvest is here made to depend on the nature of the ground into which it is cast. The field of the flesh yields, not full ears of corn, but only putrescent grains. The metaphor suggests that ϕθορά should be taken in its primary physical sense. At the same time, in its recognized secondary meaning as a moral term, it is directly opposed to life eternal.' Similarly in 2 Pet. 2:12 discussed above, ϕθορά is primarily physical.

There are two other instances of its use in 2 Pet. viz. 1:4 ὡς γένησθε θεῖας κοινωνίας φῶσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς εἰς τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ϕθοράς, which may be compared with Eph. 4:22 already discussed, τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρωπῶν τῶν ϕθειρόμενων κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης; and 2 Pet. 2:19 δύο διὰ ὑπάρχοντες τῆς ϕθορᾶς, which reminds us of Rom. 8:21 καί αὐτῇ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερώθησαι ἀπὸ τῆς δούλειας τῆς ϕθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Here we find ϕθορά personified as a world-wide power to which both the material creation and man himself are subject. From Rom. 1:20 it appears that the creation was brought under the yoke of vanity, i.e. of instability and perishableness, not of its own choice, as man was, but owing to the will of another. In man, on the contrary, this bondage to corruption was brought about by his yielding himself up to the motions of his bodily appetites (2 Pet. 1:4, 218, 19. Rom. 8:6, 7, 10, 13), a bondage from which he can only escape by becoming partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4, Rom. 8:13). It is called a bondage, because, unless we make strenuous resistance, we are carried away by a stream of tendency in the direction of evil. We naturally change for the worse, unless we set ourselves with all our might to change for the better. The choice before us is between regeneration and degeneration. We may compare Heb. 2:14: 'that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death . . . and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' This fear of death is included in the notion of ϕθορά, which might be described as our consciousness of the process of death already at work within us and around us. ‘Passing away ’ is written upon all that we see.

Tears from the depth of some divine despair
Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
In looking on the happy autumn-fields,
And thinking of the days that are no more.
We are conscious of decay in ourselves. The quick sensibilities and eager delights of youth are quickly over.

Summer ebbs: each day that follows
Is a reflux from on high,
Tending to the darksome hollows
Where the frosts of winter lie.

And the end is
My days are in the yellow leaf;
The flowers and fruits of love are gone;
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone.

The lines of Tennyson and Wordsworth give a natural and beautiful expression to the Weltschmerz, the sense of the ματαιότης of the surroundings of our earthly life. Byron combines with this the deeper, sadder sense of the intrusion of φθορά into his own inner life and his recognition of the ruin wrought thereby. Yet, as we learn from this very poem, it was out of this sad recognition of failure, that there sprang those few months of the glorious life of sacrifice, which he offered on the altar of Greek freedom.

Contrast now the utterance of one who had long escaped from φθορά and become partaker of the divine nature 'I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day.'

There are still some other offshoots of this family of words which have to be considered. διαφθείρω and διαφθορά have in the N.T. much the same meaning as the corresponding simple words. Thus Lk. 1223 ὅπως κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζῃ οὐδέ σὺς διαφθείρει 'corrupts,' 2 Cor. 415 εἰ καὶ ὃ ἕξω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπως διαφθείρεται 'decays,' 'is being wasted away'; Ἀρσ. 89 τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διεφθάρησαν 'were destroyed'; Ἀρσ. 1118 διαφθείρα τοὺς διαφθειροντας τὴν γῆν, where, I think, we must recognize a play on the double meaning of the word, 'to destroy them that corrupt the earth' (R.V. has 'destroy,' but cf. Ἀρσ. 198). The only case in which the word means simply moral corruption is 1 Tim. 66 ἀνθρώπων διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν. Διαφθορά occurs several times in Acts 13 in reference to the quotation ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν, denoting physical corruption.

Another derivative, ἀφθορία occurs in Tit. 27 παρεχόμενος ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν of moral incorruptness.

More important are the words φθαρτός and ἀφθαρτός which are often used in the N.T. to distinguish the perishable from the imperishable, e.g. Ῥομ. 123 ἤλαξαν τὴν δοξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιωματι εἰκόνοι φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 1 Cor. 925 ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὐκ ἐνα ἀφθάρτοι στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀφθαρτον, ἦν. 1563, 54 δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνούσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, 1 Pet. 118 οὐ φθαρτοί, ἀργυριίς ἡ κρυστάλλη, ἐλατρώθητε, ἤ. 123 ἀναγέννημενοι οὐκ ἐκ στοράς φθαρτής, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτων. In Ῥομ. 123 and 1 Th. 117 ἀφθαρτός is used of God, in 1 Pet. 14 of the κληρονομία. In 1 Pet. 34 the imperishable ornament of a meek and quiet spirit is opposed to the outward adorning of gold.

So ἀφθαρσία is used of the life to come in 1 Cor. 1542 ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρ-
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σί ο, Rom. 27 ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν, 1 Cor. 1529 αἰών ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ, 2 Tim. 110 καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωῆν κ. ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In Eph. 624 it is questioned how ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ should be understood. See Robinson’s n. He explains it to mean ‘in that endless and unbroken life, in which love has triumphed over death and dissolution,’ and shows that this is the only sense found in the Greek O.T. I agree however with the R.V. rendering ‘uncorruptness.’

Dr. Robinson endeavours to show that the writers of the second century use these words exclusively in that which is certainly their ordinary meaning in biblical Greek. He allows however that Ignatius is fond of playing on the two meanings of φθείρω, as in Eph. 17 ἀκαίρ testimony ἐλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ κύριος, ἵνα πνεῦμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀφθαρσίαν, where Lightfoot says the idea of incorruptibility must be prominent here, as the preceding φθείρω requires, though the idea of immortality may not be absent. In § 16 we have the phrase ὁ ὀικουμένων βασιλείαν Θεοῦ ὁ κληρονομήσοναι and ἰν πάσην φθείρῃ, both alluding to 1 Cor. 316.17 οίκ ὀἰδατε ὅτι ναὸς Θεοῦ ἡμέρας... εἰ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρῃ, φθείρῃ τοῦν ὁ Θεὸς, combined with vi. 9, 10, 19. Dr. Robinson himself allows (p. 219) that Origen’s use of the word seems sometimes to combine the idea of the indissolubility of eternal life with the purity which Christians associated with that life.
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PARAPHRASE AND COMMENTS.

ADDRESS (v. 1).

Symeon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those whose lot it has been to enjoy a faith not less privileged than our own, through the equal justice of our God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Συμεὼν Πέτρος.

The name Πέτρος is a translation of the Aramaic Kephas, as Christ of Messiah, Didymus of Thomas, Ζηλοτής of Καναναῖος. The form Σύμων is hellenized from Συμεὼν, like Paulus from Saulus; compare such forms as Disraeli, Brahman, Lias, etc. in the present day. The consistent Hellenic form of the double name, Simon Peter, is frequently found in the N.T.: the consistent Aramaic, Συμεὼν Κηφᾶς, is never found. 1 I give below a table showing how often each name occurs. 2

How are we to account for the unique use in our text? The writer of the epistle, whoever he may have been, was certainly not one who wrote without thinking. We may take it for granted, then, that the combination of the old Hebrew and the new Greek names was intentional; the intention being, as we may suppose, to remind his readers

1 It may be noted that Peter’s brother bore the Greek name Ἀνδρέας.
2 Κηφᾶς stands, with its interpretation, in John 14:33; it is also found alone four times in 1 Cor. and four times in 2 Cor. The only passage besides this in which Συμεὼν is used by itself is St. James’ speech in Acts 15:14. Σύμων stands alone in Matt. once; in Mk. ch. i. four times (before the name Peter had been given), and once in 14:37, where Jesus λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σύμων καθεύδεις; Luke has it ten times; John twice in ch. i., thrice in ch. xxii., where the penitent Apostle is thrice addressed as Σύμων ἰακώβου; 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. Σύμων Πέτρος is found three times in Matt. (twice with δ 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.

tois idóntimov hēmiv laχośivn pístiv.

You have been allotted by divine election (v. 10) a faith which carries with it privileges equal to our own. 'Not of yourselves, it is the gift of God' might be said of all who were born Christians, as opposed to those who belonged to heathen families; and it may (1 Cor. 7:4) be said also of the latter, in so far as they must have been brought by God's providence within the range of Christian influence. From v. 9 we gather that all here addressed had been baptized. Baptism had been granted to the Gentiles in the first instance, because their faith had been attested by the gift of the Holy Ghost: in St. Peter's words 'Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' The view maintained by Spitta, that the Apostles themselves form the other member of the comparison, seems to be excluded by the story of Simon Magus (Acts 8:14).

Does the statement here made hold good in the present day? Have all Christians pístiv idóntimov? Was the faith of the doubting father idóntimos with that of the Syro-Phcenician woman? Is that of any ordinary Christian idóntimos with the faith of an à Kempis, or a Luther, or a Baxter, or a Bishop Wilson? The word is no doubt intended as an encouragement; but perhaps also as a warning. The writer speaks to those of a like faith, not of a different faith. Where the faith is of the same quality, however different in quantity, it contains within it, like the grain of mustard seed, a promise of endless expansion.

ëv dikaiōsúnē tov Θεοῦ.

Choice does not mean favouritism. Israel was chosen to be a blessing to others, and at the same time to suffer more than any other people. God wills that all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. This impartiality marked the determinate counsel of the Father no less than the redemptive work of the Son. Salvation is for all, not, as the degenerate Jews supposed, a peculiar privilege for a peculiar people.
Salutation (vv. 2-4).

Grace and peace be multiplied upon you through the knowledge of [God and of Jesus] our Lord, seeing that it is by means of the knowledge of Him who called us by His own glory and goodness, that His Divine power has granted us all that makes for life and godliness. Through this manifestation of the divine goodness there have been imparted to you [us] promises of highest blessing, in order that through them you may be made partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.

On a first reading this passage might seem to be a mere tangle of words. It is certainly very complicated both as regards persons and instruments, cause within cause, wheel within wheel, difference of names with identity of person and ideas. In the address we have already had the justice of God (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ) named as the cause of the gift of faith to all the members of the Church in common, regardless of distinctions of Jew and Gentile. In v. 2 we have the knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus (ἐν ἑπεξεργασίᾳ) named as the means whereby grace and peace may be increased: a statement which is confirmed in v. 3 from the fact that it is through this knowledge (διὰ τῆς ἑπεξεργασίας) that we have received all that is needed for salvation. Not only are the divine names themselves, as it might seem, unnecessarily repeated, in vv. 1, 2, but we have also the periphrases τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, θείας φύσεως in vv. 3, 4. The general idea of salvation appears as faith in v. 1, as grace and peace in v. 2, as life and godliness in v. 3, as participation in the divine nature in v. 4. The divine calling is said in v. 3 to have been effected by means of the attractive power of the glory and excellency of the Caller, Jesus Christ; and in v. 4 it is stated that this same glory and excellency hold out to the readers the highest hopes for the future, in order that by means of these hopes they may become participants of the divine nature.

Both these characteristics, complexity and the unnecessary repetition, or (as it may be more truly described) the affectionate dwelling upon the divine names, may be found in the salutations of other epistles, especially 1 Pet. 1:7, Ephes. 1:4, in both of which the name Jesus Christ occurs four times in the first three verses, and in Rom. 1:7.

1 See Introduction on the Text.
2 It certainly is so in the Vulgate: 'Gratia vobis et pax adimpleatur in agnitione Dei et Christi Jesu, Domini nostri, quomodo omnia nobis divinae virtutis suae quae ad vitam et pietatem donata est per cognitionem eius qui vocavit nos propria gloria et virtute,' where the gen. abs. seems to have been taken for a genitive of possession, and the verb has disappeared.
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 ἡμῶν and ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ 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, 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 excitements, 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 'thine 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 en-
couraging 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
Davideic 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 ἔκτυπωτοι Θεοί), an acquaintance closer
even than that vouchsafed to Abraham and to Moses, to whom God
is said to have spoken face to face, 'as a man speaketh with a friend';
it speaks of the consciousness of a guiding and inspiring Presence
ever ready to reveal itself in answer to believing prayer; and it connects
peace with grace, as the immediate consequence of that close communion with God. In his note on 1 Pet. 1 Hort has well explained the reason why grace should come first: "standing at the head of the Christian form of blessing, it directs our thoughts to the heavenly source of blessing." Before joy or peace or any other form of well-being, which formed the subject of ordinary good wishes, the Apostles first wished for their converts the smile and the merciful help of the Lord of heaven and earth. Understood in its widest sense, 'grace' would thus mean the influence of the Holy Spirit in the heart. From this flows directly the peace of God which passes all understanding, that of which Isaiah said 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee,' that peace which is independent of outward troubles, and which underlies and rises victorious above all inward agitation.

τὰ πρὸς ζωῆν καὶ εὐσεβείαν (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 ἡ εὐσεβεία πρὸς πάντα ὅφελιμος ἔστιν, ἔπαγγελιάν ζώουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης, godliness is useful both for the life of earth and for the life of heaven. If however we look at the other passages in which ζωή occurs in the N.T., we shall find that, in the great majority of these, ζωή has a deeper and more mystical sense, particularly where it is mentioned in connexion with the sight or knowledge, or the teaching or word of Christ. Often this deeper sense is distinguished by the epithet αἰωνιός, 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'; 638 '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. 640 ἡ δεήσις ζωῆς; 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.
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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, 1917.29; 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
gracefulness 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 salva­
tion' (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 im­
punity. 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).

tοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδία δόξη καὶ ἄρετη (v. 3).

All that is needed for the life of which we have spoken, that life which is always united with submission to the divine will, is given to us in the knowledge of Christ, who is here described as the Caller of Men; and the mode of His calling is said to be the manifestation of His own character and nature. We may compare Joh. 12\(^{22}\) (also 3\(^{14}\), 8\(^{28}\)), where the lifting up of Jesus, that is, the crucifixion, by which, more than by any other single act, He manifested His self-sacrificing love for man, is declared to be the magnet which should draw all men to Him—we love Him because He loved us—as well as the manifestation of His glory: see Joh. 12\(^{23}\) \(λήβηθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,\) and 13\(^{31}\), where the departure of Judas to complete the work of betrayal is followed by the saying \(μὴ ἀναστήσῃ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ.\) The word 'glory' is often misunderstood.

The glory of God is sometimes contrasted with the good of man. ‘In majorem Dei gloriam’ has served as a pretext for much cruelty and excused much superstition. Nothing can really be for the glory of God on earth which is not also for the good of man. The glory of God is the exhibition of His character by His own acts and works, and by the reflexion of His character in the life of His children. Where there is not this reflexion in the heart and life, lip-praise or ceremonial worship, whether gorgeous or slovenly, is of no avail; it is not the \(δυνατά ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται,\) 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.

d'] ὃν τὰ τίμα καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται (v. 4).

As our trust in the kindness and goodwill of a friend extends far beyond any definite promise of assistance which he may have made; as it enables us to give the right interpretation of any reported message of his, and even to discriminate between true and false messages ascribed to him; so is it with our trust in God. It is not so much in consequence of this or that particular promise as it is through the manifestation of the Father's love in the person of His Son, that we are emboldened to hope for all future blessings. Therefore it is that in our prayers we encourage ourselves with the thought of what He has already done for man, no less than with the thought of His actual promises for the future. Such is the appeal in the words of the ancient hymn ‘Qui Mariam absolvisti et latronem exaudisti, mihi quoque spem dedisti,’ and in the suffrages of our Litany, ‘By thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, by thine agony and bloody sweat, by
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.

The purpose and end of the divine action in our behalf is that we may become partakers of the divine nature by making full use of the promises imparted to us. We can see how even the spoken promises of Christ may lead to this result, if we reflect on such a text as Lk. 11:13 'If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give thee Holy Spirit to them that ask Him.' For what else is it to have the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, but to be partakers in the divine nature, a participation promised in answer to prayer? So again, and still more strongly, in 1 Joh. 4:12-16 'If we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us. Herein we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit ... Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and He in God ... God is love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God in him'; Joh. 17:22 'The glory which thou gavest me I have given them that they may be one even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' It may help us to the better understanding of these mysterious intimations, if we call to mind St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. 3:18 'we all, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit,' and Gal. 2:20 'no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.'

We must carefully distinguish this idea of the possibility of our participation in the life and character of God, not only from presumptuous Stoic assertions as to man's equality with God,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.

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.
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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 δεκτικῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἃνα, εἰ ἰέστη ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἀθανασίας τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μουσόν κομίσηται παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁθανασίαν καὶ γένηται θεὸς κ.τ.λ., and a little above οὕτω οἶνος φύσει θυγατίος ἐγένετο οὕτω ἁθανάτος. εἰ γὰρ ἁθανάτον ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς πεποιήκει, Θεὸν ἀυτὸν πεποιήκει. This idea may have originated in the language used in 1 Tim. 6:16 ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, where immortality is spoken of as the peculiar property of God. So Theodoret Dial. iii. p. 145 (quoted by Suicer under ἁθανασία) ἔχων κυρίως ἁθανάτος ὁ Θεός· οὐσία γὰρ ἁθανάτος, οὐ μετουσία . . . τοῖς δὲ ἀγγέλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς τὴν ἁθανασίαν δεδώρηται. Compare the opposition in 1 Cor. 15:28 δέ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνῶσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ib. v. 42 ἑσφεροῦσα ἐν φθορᾷ, ἑγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, Wisdom ii. 23 f. ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτίσε τὸν ἁνθρώπων ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς οἴδας οἴδιότητος (= θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως) ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου βάνατος εἰς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ib. vi. 19 ἀφθαρσία ἑγγός εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ. God Himself is called ἀφθαρσίας in Rom. 1:17, 1 Th. 1:11 and the Christian inheritance ἀφθαρσίας καὶ ἁμάντως in 1 Pet. 1.

This corruption which pervades the world is the result of ἐπιθυμία: compare Gal. 6:8 'he that soweth to his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption,' and 1 Joh. 2:17 'the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' So St. Paul (Rom. 5:12) attributes 'the reign of death' in the world to the entrance of sin (i.e. as St. James says 15 of fully developed ἐπιθυμία) through one man, see Wisdom 2:23 quoted above; and, again, declares the same truth more generally in the phrase τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς βάνατος (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, ἀπίστευτος, 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 ἐπιθυμία as one link in the chain of graces, but this is far from covering all the
ground of the hope which is so prominent a feature in the first epistle
of St. Peter, as well as in the epistles of St. Paul. Why does he leave
out so many of the fruits of the Spirit named in Gal. 5:22-23, faith, love,
and hope, as well as dikaiosynē and ἀληθεία mentioned in Eph. 5:9? In 1 Pet. we find in addition to those
mentioned in 2 Pet. viz. faith, and love, and philadelphia (1:2, 21, 38),
and ὑπομονή (2:20), a number of other graces, such as obedience
(ὑποκομία 12, 21, 15), joy (χάρα ἀνεκλάθης καὶ δεδοξασμένη 18), sobriety (ἵστεν 13,
41, 58), holiness (ἀγίατς 11, 23, 9), fear (φόβος 117), meekness (πραΰτης
34, 15), compassion (εὐσπλαγχνία 35), humility (πατερόφρονες 38, and especi-
ally 5:6), moderation (σωφροσύνη 17), hospitality (φιλοξένοι 49); while on
the other hand 1 Pet. omits four out of the list in 2 Pet., viz. ἀρετή, γνώσις, ἐγκράτεια, εὐφρενία. Again, we have seen evidence of an acquaint-
ance with Greek philosophy in the latter writer: why does he omit three out of the four cardinal virtues, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη? It may
be said perhaps that ἀρετή and ὑπομονή cover the ground of ἀνδρεία, that ἐγκράτεια represents σωφροσύνη, however imperfectly, and that ἀγάπη, since it fulfils the whole law, is more than δικαιοσύνη. Anyhow the list is
peculiar, partly from its arbitrary selections and omissions, partly for
the marked way in which the writer introduces his seven virtues, each
apparently growing out of the preceding, and all rooted in faith. That
seven was a mystical number with the Hebrews, we all know; and its
influence in the mind of the writer of the fourth Gospel has been shown
by Bishop Westcott in his Commentary (pp. 75 foll.) and by Dr. Abbott in his Johannine Grammar, pp. 301, 463, 464.

That the number eight, the ‘Ogdoad’ was also regarded as a mystical number by some of the early Christians, who liked to speak of the Lord’s day as the eighth day, a day of holy activity, the beginning of a new world, surpassing the day of rest which followed on the creation of the old world, is shown by the following passages: Barn. 15. 8 οὐ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἔμοι δεκτά, ἀλλὰ τὰ πειστήρα, ἐν ὑ, καταπαύομε τὰ πάντα, ἀρχήν ἡμέραις ὑπόγεος ποιῶν, ἐς ἑστιν, ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν. διὸ καὶ ἀγομένη τὴν ἡμέρας τὴν ὑπόγεον εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν γὰρ καὶ ὢ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερώθη ἐν ἀνέστη ἐς ὑπάρχον, Justin M. Dial. 24, cf. Clem. Al. Str. v. pp. 712, 713, § 106, where he interprets of the Lord’s day Plato’s description of the vision of Er (Rep. x. p. 616), id. vi. p. 794, § 108 αἱ τοιαύται καταπάυομεν ἐν ὑπάρχῃ ὅσῳ ... αἱ μὴ καταμείναντες ἐν ἐβδομαδί ἀναπαύσεως, ἀγαθοεργίᾳ δὲ θείας ἔξομοισεως εἰς ἐβδομαδικὴς εὐθεργείας κληρονομία ὑπερκύριαν, ἀκροφιστὸν θεωρίας εἰςκωμεὶ ἐποπείᾳ προσανάγοντος, id. vii. pp. 811 f. § 140, Str. iv. p. 636, § 158 η ἐβδομή ἡ ἀνάπαυσις θροποίεται, τῇ δὲ ὑπὸ ἱλασμὸν προσφέρει,1 id. § 159 ἐπεὶ η ἀπαλαίη χώρα η πλησιάζουσα τῷ νοετῷ κόσμῳ ὑπόγεος λέγετο ... ἐξαναδίων γενέσεως τε καὶ ἀμαρτίας χρήμα ῥέγει τν ὑποκομία, id. p. 637, § 162 Βασιλείδης δικαιοσύνην τε καὶ εἴρην ὑπολαμβάνει ἐν ὑγιαῖν κυδεῖν. 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 ὑγιαῖον Νόε, and Jude v. 14, where Enoch is described as the seventh from Adam.

1 Ezek. 44:25, 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, you will be not idle or unfruitful as regards the knowledge of Christ. On the other hand their absence is necessarily attended by spiritual blindness or near-sightedness, and by forgetfulness of the grace received in baptism. Since there is this possibility of falling away, beware of losing the light; be more earnest to ensure and make good the calling and election of which your baptism was the sign. If you steadily practise the virtues I have named, you will walk in the light and be kept from stumbling here, and hereafter you will inherit the glory prepared for you in the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

It is remarkable how the writer recurs to his previous list of virtues with a thrice repeated ταῦτα in vv. 8, 9, 10 and οὕτως in v. 11. In 318 he exhorts his readers to grow (αὔξάνετε) in grace (which may be regarded as summing up the list) and knowledge (γνῶσις equivalent to ἐπιγνώσει here). Cf. Eph. 412, especially v. 15 ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξησόμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅσ ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, 1 Pet. 22 ὃς ἀρτιγενήτα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὔξησητε, 2 Th. 113 ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὦ ἡμῶν καὶ πλευνάζει ἡ ἀγάπη.

λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ (v. 9).

So Moses warns the Israelites (Deut. 423) προσέχετε ὦ ἡμῖν, μὴ ἐπιλάθησθέ τὴν διαθήκην Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἦν διεθέτο πρὸς ὦ ἡμᾶς: cf. 2 Kings 1738.

βεβαιάν ὦ ἡμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν ποιεῖσθαι (v. 10).

So, in other epistles, the elect are urged to make their election sure: as in Eph. 41 parakalῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως περιπατήσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἡς ἐκλήθητε, ὦδ. 613 ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ... ἀπαντά ἐργασάμενοι στήναι, 1 Cor. 927 ὑποπίαξαν τὸ σῶμα ... καὶ πᾶσα ἀλλος κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένομαι, Col. 312 ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ σπλάγχνα αἰκτηρῶν, 1 Th. 510 τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε compared with 14 εἰσόδετε τὴν ἐκλογήν ὦ ἡμῶν, 1 Pet. 117 ἐν φόβῳ τον τῆς παροικίας ὦ ἡμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε compared with 11–2 ἐκλεκτοῖς ... κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, and 2 Pet. 317 φιλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέτυση τοῦ ἵδιον στηρίγματο. The Vulgate adds ‘per bona opera certam ... faciatis.’

1 See above on πληθυνθεὶς in v. 2, and below on αὔξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, 318. 
Therefore, that you may escape the dangers and inherit the blessings named, it will be my care 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 παραδοθεῖσαν]. If we retain παροῦσα the sense will probably be 'in the truth, so far as it has been revealed to you,' but this seems hardly to suit such terms as εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένος (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 γὰρ. I am inclined to think therefore that the writer here alludes to the Gospel according to St. Mark.

The Grounds of our Belief (vv. 16-21).

When we preached to you the coming of the Lord in power, we relied upon no cunning fable, but on the witness of our own eyes, which had beheld His majesty. For He received from the Father honour and glory, when there came to Him from 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 3:17 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 (3:4), 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 13, must surely be of the same nature as the preaching of St. Paul at Athens (Acts 17:30), ‘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, πάσων, 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.’
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 πράγματα 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.

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 ἔστις ἐπιλύσεως; that is to say, what the historian relates of Babylon is to be understood of Babylon only. But what Prophecy says of Babylon is κοινῆς ἐπιλύσεως; it does not relate exclusively, nor even principally, to the Babylon of History; but to certain spiritual evils of which Babylon was at one period the representative, and Rome at another, and of which other cities... may be the representatives 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 prophetical Babylon, the World as opposed to the Church' (pp. 31, 32). 'Most remarkable is it to see in the Prophecies and in the Psalms the confident anticipation of future triumph, which to the human writer individually was never verified. But by this very circumstance their incomplete and typical character is fully manifested: it is by this especially that they in a manner point to Christ; that they stretch out their hands to Him, imploring Him to fulfil what they could but faintly shadow, the whole condition of fallen and redeemed man: sufferings first, but afterwards glory, the serpent bruising man's heel, but man finally crushing the serpent's head' (pp. 40, 41).

'Every prophecy has, according to the very definition of the word, a double source: it has, if I may venture so to speak, two authors, the one human, the other divine.' 'And now we see why the language of the prophets, as applied to those nearer events which occupy the fore-front in their vision, is and must be hyperbolical. Beginning amidst all familiar objects and images, Israel, Jerusalem, the Law, the Temple, Babylon, Egypt, Edom, defeat and victory, captivity and deliverance, famine and plenty, desolation and prosperity, other and higher hopes possess their minds almost immediately, distinct in their greatness, undiscerned in their particular forms. Thus into the human framework there is infused a divine spirit, far too vast for that which contains it.' 'When St. Peter says that "it was revealed to them that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the things now reported unto us" he does not surely mean to deny that they ministered to their own generation also, although not exclusively nor in the highest degree. The prophets never cast themselves as it were into the midst of the ocean of futurity; their view reaches

1 Cf. Baxter's letter to the Lady Ann 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).

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' omission (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 γυνώσκει Κύριος ὁ δῶν δικαίων, 119 ὁ δῶν δικαιωμάτων σου συνέτισον με... ὁ δῶν ἀδικίας ἀπόστησον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ...

1 A valuable book on this subject is Riehm's Messianic Prophecy followed by a complete bibliography, of which an English translation was published in 1900 by Messrs. Clark.
EXAMPLES OF JUDGMENT JOINED WITH MERCY

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

Presumptuous that they are, they shrink not from railing against the unseen powers; yet angels, though so far superior to the libertines in greatness and might, do not venture to bring against these powers a railing accusation. Vengeance however will come upon them in return for their insolent words in matters of which they have no

1 In the parallel passage of St. Jude the moral is rather Mercy does not exclude judgment: here it is Judgment does not exclude mercy.
knowledge: they will share the destruction of senseless animals, that are born creatures of instinct for capture and destruction. Thus they will receive wrong [as they deem it] in requital of their wrong-doing. Their idea of pleasure is to spend the day in wanton living. They are spots and blemishes in the Church [which should be without spot or wrinkle], reveling in their deceits when admitted to your love-feasts. Their eyes betray their adulterous thoughts, insatiable 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 τρέμοντιν βλασφημούντες (v. 10).

See comments on Jude, pp. 74 foll.

Love-Feasts of the Early Christians.

The eminent French theologian, Prof. Batiffol, in a recent study on the Agape (Études d'Histoire, vol. i. pp. 283–325), controverts what has hitherto been the prevalent opinion among Roman Catholic, no less than among Protestant writers on this subject. St. Jude has described the libertines of his time as ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπλάθες, συνεικοσύμμοιν ἄφοβοι ἑαυτοῖς πομαίνοντες, on which a Lapide comments as follows: 'Primitus Christiani in symbolum caritatis, post Eucharistiam celebrabant convivia, communia tam pauperibus quam divitibus, sed frugalia et pia, ideoque eas vocabant Agapes, id est caritates, uti ostendit in 1 Cor. xi. 20. Sic gentiles sua habebant convivia, quae vocabant φιλία'; and Estius on 2 Pet. ii. 13: 'Vox ἀγάπη jam inde a tempore apostolorum usurpata fuit pro convivii 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, ἀγαπτοῖς twice, and ἀγαπημένοι once, in the ordinary sense. He uses the plurals δόξαν (v. 8) and αἰσχύνας (v. 13) for the singulars. We may therefore translate his words in v. 12 as follows: 'Ils sont des écueils dans votre amour... et ici le mot amour signifierait l’ensemble des fidèles, au milieu de qui ces impies sont des pires 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 ἀγάπη for ἡδονή.
'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 χάρις’? The χάρις, it is evident, gives an opportunity of feasting, in a manner which causes scandal (σπαλάθες). Who can help being reminded of the similar scene described in 1 Cor. xi. 18-34, where it is said that those who come together to partake of the Lord’s Supper destroy its character and call down judgment on themselves by drunkenness and greediness? The first Lord’s Supper united the Paschal meal with the participation in the sacramental Bread and Wine; and the allusions in 1 Cor, and in Jude lead us to conclude that the κλάσις ἅρτου in private houses, of which mention is made in the description of the life of the early Christians in Acts ii. 46, was a continuation of this custom, thus furnishing occasion for the possible growth of the abuses of which we read afterwards. Naturally the relative importance attached to either element, the sacrament or the common meal, would vary in different places.

Prof. Batiffol’s explanation of the κλάσις ἅρτου is as follows. He distinguishes the Pauline source in Acts 242, ἵππον δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἅρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, from the Judaistic source in 246, καθ’ ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλωντές τε καὶ ὀίκον ἅρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἁγιαλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας. The former ‘parle de la fraction du pain comme d’un acte purement religieux et la place sur le même rang que la διδαχή et la προσευχή,’ the latter ‘qui voit d’abord le culte du Temple, subordonne la fraction du pain, en la réduisant à une observance privée, en faisant une sorte de rappel intime du Christ, un acte journalier et domestique, qui ne se distingue plus de la fraction familier du pain à table que par l’acte de foi qui l’accompagne.’ Of the latter he asserts ‘l’intention judaïsante de son auteur se manifeste : mais l’agape s’évanouit.’ On the contrary, I should be much surprised if my readers fail to recognize the agape in both. His examination of the language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. seems to me equally inconclusive.

By the end of the second century the term agape was in regular use for the love-feasts; see quotations from Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinus in Appendix 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 ἄνθρωπῳ φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον (v. 16).

The writer takes literally the narrative in Num. 22 21-35, and emphasizes its miraculous character by thus paraphrasing the words in v. 28 ἴπποι εἰς ὅ θεος τὸ στόμα τῆς ὀνο. 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 \textit{a priori} probability of miracles in the case of Jesus Christ is met by evidence of their actual occurrence proceeding from contemporary witnesses, who also record instances of miracles wrought by themselves or in their presence; and it is confirmed by the rapid growth of the Christian religion after the death of the Founder. With the miracles of the O.T. the case is very different. The reports are rarely contemporary. The chronicles in which they are imbedded are sometimes inconsistent and erroneous. Some accounts, such as that of the sun and moon standing still at Joshua's command, seem due to a misunderstanding of poetical hyperbole: others have little or no moral significance, as many of the miracles of Elisha, which are rather of the nature of Jewish Haggadoth than of sober history. That the story of which the text treats belongs to that class of O.T. miracles which are not to be taken literally appears, I think, from the narrative in the Book of Numbers itself.

Is it conceivable that, if a human voice had really proceeded from the mouth of the ass, Balaam could have shown no surprise, but just gone on talking with the ass, as though it had been one of his servants? The true interpretation is, I think, suggested by what we are told as to the idiosyncrasy of Balaam. He describes himself (243) as 'the man whose eye was closed, who hears the words of God, and sees the vision of the Almighty, falling down, and having his eyes open,' i.e. as one blind to outer things but capable of hearing and seeing things which cannot be seen or heard by others. When, therefore, we read that Balaam saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way with his sword drawn, we need not suppose the writer to mean that this was an objective appearance of an angel. Balaam himself did not see it at first. So it was with Saul on the way to Damascus. Those who were with him were conscious of a sudden light, but he alone heard the

\footnote{1 See Dr. J. H. Bernard's article on 'Miracles' in Hastings' \textit{D. of B.}}
voice and saw the vision. Similarly we should naturally infer that the speech of the ass was only audible to the prophet's ears. It is evident that we are meant to conceive of Balaam as one who was wonderfully sensitive to spiritual influences. All nature was full of visions and voices to him. He was setting out on his journey with a conscience ill at ease, knowing that he was tempting God, but trying to quiet his scruples with the resolution that, in any case, he would only speak the words which God should put into his mouth. Nevertheless he is afraid that God may still interfere and prevent him from receiving the rewards on which his heart was set. It is this fear which makes him so irritable when the quiet beast, on which he had so long ridden, suddenly starts aside and leaves the road. It is his own conscience, as we should call it, i.e. it is the still small voice of God within, that speaks to him in the complaints of the ass. His passion answers at first in threats to kill it; but more and more he feels that it cannot be mere natural impulse which makes the animal turn away so obstinately. It is something more, something deeper: it is that awful power from which he is now seeking to escape, but which he was daring to make use of to serve his own avarice and ambition.

There is a strange depth of meaning in the appealing eye of an illtreated animal. It is an appeal, in the first place, to whatever remnant of pity and generosity may still survive in the heart of the man who illtreats it; but it is an appeal, in the second place, to the justice of the God who made them both, a cry of which we may be sure that it has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. When animals are put to unnecessary suffering, either in the shambles or as beasts of burden, or in the interest of science or sport, or for any other reason, cases are sure to arise in which we may justly apply the words of our Epistle, and say of such poor tortured creatures that with their dying gaze, no less clearly than if they had spoken with man's voice, they forbade the madness of their torturers.

The belief in a kind of second sight in animals is widely spread, originating probably in their liability to sudden, unaccountable panics: compare Homer Od. xvi. 160 f., where Athene, invisible to Telemachus, is visible to Odysseus and the dogs, καί ρ’ ὅπο Ἰλάσσω, κυνζήμμω δ᾿ ἵππωσε διὰ σταθμότω φόβηθεν. Other examples are given in Tyler's Primitive Culture, vol. ii. p. 196. There are also famous stories of talking animals, as that of Xanthus, the horse of Achilles, who was made vocal by Hera, and predicted the coming fate of his master (Homer II. xix. 400 f.). See Wetstein’s note on the text.

On the story of Balaam generally, see Dr. Lock's excellent sermon in Journal of Theological Studies for Jan. 1901, where he gives Maurice's view of Balaam's character in the words: 'He is the heathen seer to whom God really speaks, and who yet becomes a false prophet, because he has been ruined by the sense of his own strange power of insight, which he has tried to strengthen by charms and divinations, until the spiritual has become unreal to him, and material things have grown to be of the strongest attraction. So God strives to educate him by permitting him to feel the effects of his own self-will, by lifting him
out of himself by the sight of a righteous nation; yet he falls back, and
his language is the utterance of a melancholy spirit, conscious that he
is not true to himself.' Dr. Lock points to Simon Magus as the New
Testament counterpart of Balaam: 'He too is a soothsayer, he too one
to whom they all gave heed from the least to the greatest, attracted by
a higher religion, with a heart not right with God, but bent on avarice;
if tradition may be trusted, falling back from the highest that he sees,
and becoming a source of danger and corruption to true believers.' He
notes that 'the venal character of the soothsayer and the rewards of
divination offered to him find a parallel in the Greek 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 move­
ments of animals, the animal being supposed to know what He tells to
man . . . It is the prophet who is accustomed to go out to meet the bird­
omens, εἰς συνάγγειλα τοῖς οἴνοισι (xxiv. i.), to whom an ass speaks.'

Modern criticism distinguishes three main sources of the narrative:
the Elohistic, according to which Balaam is a selfish, grasping man,
coveting the rewards of Balak, and only restrained from taking them
by sordid fear of God, yet trying by every means to cajole God into
changing his mind; the Jehovistic, in which Balaam acts up to his
light with perfect consistency and is loyal to Jehovah; the Priestly, in
which he is the Midianite soothsayer, the wicked counsellor who
persuaded his people to seduce the Israelites by means of immoral
rites: and some have been disposed to see in the existing narrative
simply an amalgamation of the doings of three different persons.
Whatever may have been the earlier forms of the story, its inspiration,
that is its ethical and religious significance, is due to the writer who
combined them together and gave them their present shape. The
surpassing grandeur and interest of the story of Balaam consists
just in its combination of these several elements, in its faithful
picture of the downfall of the prophet or man of genius in its
three stages, the first, that in which his only care is 'not to be
disobedient to the heavenly vision,' but simply to deliver the
message entrusted to him; the second, that in which, as recognition
and influence increase, he begins to think of himself as something
apart from, and superior to, his message, and finally feels the message
to be a hindrance in the way of his obtaining the position due to him;
the third, that in which enthusiasm has passed into cynicism, the lost
leader has come to hate the cause he once upheld, and is ready to use
the vilest means to undermine and destroy it. The downfall is most

1 See Maurice, The Old Testament, Serm. XII.
2 See Lock, l.c. p. 163, and the article on 'Balaam' in Hastings' D. of B.; also
J. A. Bewer on the 'Literary Problems of the Balaam Story' in the American
conspicuous in the case of the prophet, but the danger threatens all who are conscious of the dying away of youthful aspirations and enthusiasms under the pressure of the cares of this world; above all it is a warning to those—writers, speakers, politicians, philanthropists, whatever they may be—who claim to lead the way in promoting the onward progress of humanity.

THE MISCHIEF CAUSED BY THE LIBERTINES (vv. 17–22).

Profession without performance, preaching without doing, are like wells with no water or mists dispersed by the wind. For such men the darkest future is reserved. With their empty boasts they allure through their lusts, by fleshly indulgences, those who were just escaping from the life of heathendom. Promising freedom to others, they are themselves slaves of corruption, since each man is enslaved to that by which he is overcome. For if, after having escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overcome by them, their last state has become worse than the first. It would have been better for them never to have been acquainted with the way of righteousness than, after having made acquaintance with it, to turn back from the holy command once delivered to them. In their case has been realized the truth of the proverb, 'A dog returns to its vomit, and a sow, after washing, to its wallowing in the mire.'

WARNINGS OF THE SPREAD OF UNBELIEF IN THE LAST DAYS, AND FINAL EXHORTATION (Ch. III).

PROPHETS AND APOSTLES HAVE WARNED US THAT THE DELAY IN THE LORD'S APPEARANCE WOULD LEAD MEN TO DENY HIS COMING ALTOGETHER (vv. 1–4).

This, my beloved, is my second letter to you. In this, as in the former, I call upon you honestly to reflect on the predictions of the holy prophets and on the command of the Lord and Saviour which was delivered to you by your missionaries, especially bearing in mind their warning that in the last days scoffers would come with their scoffing inquiries, following their own lusts, and saying 'Where is the promise of His coming? The fathers have fallen asleep, and all goes on as it was from the beginning of time.'

κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορεύομενοι (v. 3).

As in the days before the flood and before the destruction of Sodom, in spite of the warnings of Noah and Lot, Lk. 17:26–30.
The 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 ἡ εὐαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; (v. 4).

The Scoffers answered (vv. 5–10).

It is not true that the course of the world is unchanging. There was a time when heaven and earth were not. They were called into being by the Word of God: yet that very Word was the cause of their destruction by means of the water which had been used in forming them. As the old world was destroyed by water, so our present heaven and earth are by the same Word treasured up for fire, being reserved for that day when the ungodly shall be finally judged and punished. And there is one thing, my beloved, which I would especially ask you to remember, that measures of time have relation to man and not to God: one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. It is not from indifference that His coming is delayed, but from long-suffering patience, because He desires that all without exception should be brought to repent. Nevertheless, come it will, as a thief, that day of the Lord, in which the heavens shall pass away with a roaring sound and the stars shall be dissolved with glowing heat; and the earth and all the works thereof shall be burnt with fire [or ‘nowhere found’ or ‘taken away’].

It is probably to this passage that the traditional idea of the Judgment Day is mainly due, ‘that dreadful day,’ as Scott describes it,

‘When shrivelling like a parched scroll
The flaming heavens together roll.’

The experience of partial destructions by means of flood or volcanic eruption naturally led men to look to these as the destined causes of a

1 Reading δι' ἄνω for δι' ἄνω.
universal destruction; and since the repetition of a flood was understood to be precluded by divine decree, it followed that the world must be doomed to perish by fire.

**Answer to the objection that no change is possible in the material universe.**

This objection is directed against the cosmical changes which were supposed to be the necessary accompaniments of the Day of the Lord. The scoffers, on the contrary, maintained the necessary stability of the earth, borne witness to in such scriptures as Ps. 119:90, 'Thou hast established the earth and it abideth'; Eccl. 1:1, 'One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth for ever.' To this the writer replies that history affords a parallel case of the transformation of the earth in the Deluge. Few persons would now admit the fact of a universal deluge, but geology and astronomy afford much stronger proof of the transitory nature of the visible universe, which our Lord asserts in the words 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,' and St. Paul in the words 'The things that we see are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal,' and again, in 1 Cor. 7:31, παράγει τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου;¹ one great aim of Christianity being to enable us to resist the tyranny of the senses, and so to 'endure as seeing Him who is invisible,' looking back to the past and forward to the future.

The association therefore of great cosmical changes with the Coming of Christ is no reason for denying the latter. If He comes to establish on earth a reign of righteousness, peace, and happiness, as the writer seems to suggest, this involves, as St. Paul tells us, 'the deliverance of the Creation itself from the bondage of corruption into the glory of the liberty of the children of God.' We are not bound to take literally all the poetical imaginations with which this idea was embellished by prophets and seers of the Old and New Testaments, though they appear to be taken literally by our author. For instance, we are not bound to believe that the lion shall eat straw like the ox, that there shall be no more sun and no more sea, that the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the earth and all the works that are therein shall be burnt up. It is enough for us to know with St. John that 'though it is not yet manifested what we shall be, yet we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is,' and a fortiori to know that, while we are not informed as to the nature of our future environment, yet it must be such as to satisfy all the longings, and give scope for all the activities, of a perfected humanity. That the

¹ As the authority of Scripture might thus be appealed to on either side of the question of the permanence of the present world-system, so was it with the authority of contemporary science. Philo (M. 2, p. 489) classifies opinions on this subject under three heads: (1) that of Aristotle who held that the universe was ἀγράπτης καὶ ἀνάλεκτος; (2a) that of the Epicureans who held it to be γενητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν; (2b) that of the Stoics who held it to be φθαρτὸς κατὰ διάκόσμησιν, ἀόιδος δὲ as regards its essence; (3) that of Plato who held it to be γενητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν.
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. 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. 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.

1 So Sir Oliver Lodge (Hibbert Journal for Jan. 1906, p. 322) says: ‘Present human bodies bring us into contact with... people in whom perchance we take no interest. Hereafter our acquaintanceship may be limited to those with whom we are linked by ties of affinity or affection, the mode of communication being of a more sympathetic or telepathic character, and less physical, than now.’

2 See Balfour’s Address to the British Association, contained in Essays and Addresses, p. 406, ed. 3. ‘The atom is now no more than the relatively vast theatre of operations in which minute monads perform their orderly evolutions; while the monads themselves are not regarded as units of matter, but as units of electricity, so that matter is not merely explained, but explained away.’

3 ‘Follow out the theory to its obvious conclusion, and it becomes plain that the stars now visibly incandescent are those in mid-journey between the nebulae from which they sprang and the frozen darkness to which they are predestined. At the temperature of interstellar space their constituent elements would be solid and inert; chemical and molecular movement would be alike impossible.’—Balfour, p. 396.
it seems likely that this hypothesis will have to be considerably modified in consequence of the recognition of the stores of energy in the chemical elements, and of the varieties of radiant energy to which attention has been prominently directed by the discovery of radium.

Moreover the history of scientific research supplies fresh evidence for the possible conflagration of our planet, in the incandescence and subsequent disappearance of what are known as temporary stars, such as the famous star observed by Tycho Brahe in 1572, whether these phenomena are caused by internal disturbance or by collision with other bodies travelling through space. And the possibility of such collision is confirmed by the fact that many of the stars are now known to be moving in different directions with enormous velocity, and that the earth is frequently visited by meteorites, which come from the unknown regions of space, and chance to cross its path.¹

It is remarkable that one of the supposed consequences of the Second Coming, which plays an important part in the Apocalypse and which had the greatest vogue in the first three centuries, viz. the Millennium, is not distinctly named by our author, though he quotes (or provides) the text on which the belief is founded by Barnabas, Justin, Irenaeus, and other early writers.

Answer to the objection that, as the promise of the Second Coming has not yet been fulfilled, there is no ground for expecting it in the future.

The promise was made that 'this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled,' or 'till the Son of Man cometh in His Kingdom'; yet that first generation has passed away, and all is not fulfilled. Some have answered this objection by a reference to the secondary fulfilments of prophecy. Our Lord's discourse, related in Matt. 24, was elicited by the double question, 'When shall these things be' (viz. the destruction of the temple, of which he had just spoken), 'and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world.' A portion, no doubt, of the prophecy was fulfilled in the siege and capture of Jerusalem by Titus, which was in a very true sense the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος.

In Bishop Westcott's words,² 'The Apostles looked for Christ, and Christ came most truly in the life-time of St. John. He founded His immovable kingdom. He gathered before Him, seated upon the throne of His glory, the nations of the earth, old and new, and passed sentence upon them. He judged in that shaking of earth and heaven most truly and most decisively the living and the dead. He established fresh foundations for society and a fresh standard of individual worth . . . The form of His Coming, His Coming to judgment, at that crisis, is a lesson for all time . . . We see in that Coming the type and promise

¹ I have to thank Professors F. Fuller and G. D. Liveing for kindly revising the above paragraphs, in which I have ventured to touch on questions belonging to natural science.
² Historic Faith, pp. 90 foll.
of other Comings through the long ages, till the earthly life of humanity is closed. We see in it the signs of a divine Presence which is laid open in the great crises of social movement. We see in it the assurance that the world is not left unvisited by Him Who died for it; and we take courage at the sight... The wider range of our vision enables us now to recognize these manifold Comings of Christ already accomplished, and we may be most thankful for such teachings of experience, but we do not rest in them... We believe that Christ has not yet revealed the fulness of His power or uttered the last voice of His judgment... This aspect of Christ's Coming, the trustful and reverent recognition of His manifestations in history and in society, is of the highest moment to us now... The reality and the meaning of these Comings are clear to faith, but like the Presence of Christ Himself they are hidden from the world. None but believers saw the Risen Christ during the forty days: none but believers see Christ in the great changes of human affairs. But beyond all these preliminary Comings there is a day when every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him. In that Coming, that Manifestation, that Presence, the first Coming on earth and the later Comings in history shall be shown in their full import. Then all things, our actions and ourselves, shall be seen as they are, seen by ourselves and seen by others. Then the whole course of life, the life of creation, of humanity, of men, will be laid open, and that vision will be a Judgment beyond controversy and beyond appeal.'

Our author takes a different line. Whether he wrote before, or after, the fall of Jerusalem, it is certain that this event was not marked by the literal fulfilment of Mt. 24:29, predicting that the sun and moon should withhold their light and that the stars should fall from heaven. In his view these are signs which prognosticate the Second Coming. Later interpreters have explained these words to mean 'danger to the fabric of human society'; 'the knowledge of God shall be obscured, the truth nigh put out, worldly wisdom darkened, the Church system abolished' (Alf.); but such allegorization was not to the taste of our author. He takes each feature of prophecy in its most literal sense; and for his answer to the objection of the scoffers, he has recourse to the declaration of the Psalmist that God is not bound by limitations of time, one day being with Him as a thousand years. It can hardly be said that this clears up the difficulty. The text was more appropriately used by the Jewish rabbis to explain the non-fulfilment of the threat 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die'; but even there it involved a playing upon words, a sort of paying in one coin of what was promised in another; whereas the essence of good faith is that a promise should be kept in the sense in which it was understood by both parties. There is however a distinction to be made between a threat of evil and a promise of good. To do more of good, or less of evil, than is promised, is no breach of the covenant, but the prerogative of a merciful and generous ruler; and so we continually find it to be in God's dealings declared to us in the O.T., as especially in the rebuke to the prophet Jonah for his peevish resentment when the threat to
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 εἰρήνη of the Lord, and of which Christ Himself affirms that 'this is life eternal, to know thee and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'

Another point which enters into the consideration of this question of the Second Coming is the fact that, in many respects, the day of death is, for each individual, equivalent to the day of God. It removes him out of the sphere of illusion into the sphere of reality. Judgment is passed upon the whole of the earthly life. The environment of the soul is altogether new. For the sensualist, the covetous, the overbearing, the selfish, the worldling, as well as for the believer, there is a new heaven and a new earth, perhaps the very opposite of what he had pictured to himself before. Thus each man is made to stand before the Judgment-seat of God, not because Christ has shown Himself in glory upon earth, but because we are one by one called to behold Him as our judge in the unseen world.

1 'How this last Coming of Christ to judgment shall be accomplished, which reveals the world to itself, we know not, and it is idle to speculate. But for each one of us death is its symbol. For each one of us that solemn coming, which seals our earthly work, is in a most real sense the vision of God, instantaneous and age-long, the vision, in His light, of ourselves.'—Westcott, p. 97.
Final Exhortation (vv. 11-18).

How Christians should be affected by the thought of the approaching judgment (vv. 11-18).

Since, then, all that we see around us is thus in process of dissolution, what sort of persons should you show yourselves to be, as you look forward to and hasten the coming of the Day of God, in all holy and pious living—that great day which will bring about the dissolution of the heavens by fire, and the melting of the stars with glowing heat. But we, according to His promise, look forward to new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, my beloved, as you look forward to these things, do your best that you may be found by Him spotless and unblemished in peace, and count that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation, as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you, according to the wisdom given to him, as in all his epistles, where he touches on these matters. [I say this to you, for] I do not mean that his instructions are always suited to the unlearned and unstable, seeing that there are some things in them hard to be understood, which such men distort, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction. Having been thus forewarned, do you, my beloved, stand on your guard, that you may not fall away from your own steadfastness through the evil example of the rebellious; but grow in grace and in knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both in this earthly life and in the day of eternity.

σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν (v. 12).

In the explanatory notes special mention was made of two ways of hastening the coming of the Day of God (1) by prayer, (2) by working for the fulfilment of one of its conditions, viz. the preaching of the Gospel through all the world. I think the last has sometimes been interpreted too narrowly by missionaries, who have been dispirited by apparent want of success and have endeavoured to console themselves with the thought that, independently of any practical result of their labours in the conversion of the heathen, the mere fact that the Gospel had been preached for the first time in a new country sufficed to bring nearer the fulfilment of prophecy. Ought we not however to understand the text in a wider and more spiritual sense? The coming of the Day of God in its fullest sense means the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven, first, like the leaven in the heart, and secondly, like the
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 ungenaue Bezeichnung, ungenaue Kenntniss. "Doch bin ich nicht sicher ob ich richtig entschieden habe. In meine Ausgabe (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) τὸ ἄκυδολα τοιοῦτος, εἰ μὴ κατηχηθεῖν πρὸς ἥμιν, οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐδ' αὐτόν, ὅπως νοείσθαι πέφυκεν, τὸν θεόν, μόνον δὲ, ὡς ἦν πολλάκις εἰρήκαμεν, κατὰ περίφρασιν (Εἰσ. Pr. Εὖν, xiii. 691 λ περίφρασιν ἀληθῆ. Here the phrase κατὰ περίφρασιν ἀληθῆ, meaning 'a correct general view,' is opposed to ὥσ νοείσθαι πέφυκεν instead of τὸ 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 ν ἀπέπαυσε τὴν Πυθίαν ὁ θεὸς πορικάδως μὲν ὄνομάζοντα τοῖς αὐτής πολίταις, ὀφισθώς δὲ τοῖς Σπαρτιάταις... ἀφελῶν τῶν χρησμῶν ἦπῃ καὶ γλάσας καὶ περίφρασες καὶ ἀσάφειας, and again, ib. 408 D, where the obscurities of the oracles are condemned, πλάττειν περίφρασει καὶ γλάσας ἐπάγειν. Here the word means simply a round-about, indirect way of speaking, such as Βίπ Ήραικλέη για Ηρακλῆς for Heracles. A better example is that from Origen (Sch. in Psalm. iv, Lomm. xi. 431) ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ περῖφρασιν λάβῃ τις τὸν ὑδόν ἄνθρωπων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον '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' ἐπίγνωσιν 'on a surface view' as in Polybius xiv. 2. 9 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ἐποίη τὸ παρακήπησιν (ὁς μὲν ἀιδώμα δι' ὑμᾶς), κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα περὶ τὰς παρακήπησις ἦν, xxxi. 5. 3 (Antiochus showed great courtesy to the Roman ambassadors) κατὰ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν καίτερ οὐκ ἦν τῷ προαιρέσει τοιούτος.
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a. First example of its use.
b. Post-Aristotelian.
c. No other example in the N.T.
d. Not used in the LXX.
e. Special signification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. First. example of its use.</td>
<td>15 and 15 µισθὸν ἄδικιας ἡγάπησεν, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις (al. ἡγαπημένοις), pp. 17 foll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Post-Aristotelian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No other example in the N.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Not used in the LXX.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Special signification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Notes:**

- The entries are sorted alphabetically.
- Greek words are listed with their page references.
- The page references indicate the specific sections where the words appear.
- The entries include a variety of morphological forms of the words.
- The index includes both vocabulary and terms specific to the study of Greek literature and culture.
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ά ν α τέλων: 2 P. 1. 19 έως οὗ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.
άν εμοῦ: J. 12 νεφέλαι άπό άνέμων παραφερόμεναι.
άνθρωπος: 2 P. 1. 21 οὗ γαρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἤνέξονθε προφητεία, ἰδ.
άγεων (αἵ. άπό) Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπω, 2. 16 ὑποζύγουν ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ
φωνῇ θεογόνου. 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, J. 4
παρεισδημνῶν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπω.
άνομος: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχῆι δικαίαν ἀνόμως ἐξοργία βεβασάνειν.
ἀντιλογία: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἀπαλλότο.
ἀνυδρο: 2 P. 2. 17 οὕτω άισων πηγαί ἀνδριῶ, J. 12 νεφέλαι ἀνάδρο.
ἀπαξ: J. 8 τῇ άπαξ παραδοθείᾳ τοῦ ἀγγέων πίστει, 5 Κύριος ἀπαξ λαὸν
σώσας (readings differ, see pp. clxxxvii f.).
ἀπάτη: 2 P. 2. 13 ἐντυφώντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (αἵ. ἀγάπαις, see
pp. ecxix f.).
ἀπερχόμαι: J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσα ὑπὸσ παρὼν ἐξέρας.
ἀπό: 2 P. 1. 17 ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης (αἵ. ἀπό), 1. 21 ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ (αἵ. ἀγων) Θεοῦ
ἀνθρώπω, 3. 4 ἀφ' ἃς γαρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, ἰδ. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως,
p. lxvi, J. 14 ἐξοδομός ἀπὸ 'Αδάμ, 23 τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐςειλομένων
χιτώνα.
c. d. ἀ ποδιορίζω: J. 19 οὕτω ἐισών οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, p. clxxxvi.

c. d. e. ἀπόθεσις: 2 P. 1. 14 ταχύν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνωμάτος
(only found elsewhere in N.T. in 1 P. 3. 21).
ἀποθνῄσκω: J. 12 δεδομα δὲ ἀποθανόντα.
ἀποκάλυψις: pp. lxix f.
ἀπολέως: J. 6 ἀπολούσα τό ἴδιον οἰκογείρων. ἐπείρων ἐπείρων τῶν ἀποκάλυψι
(2 P. 3. 6) στήριξι κατακλυσθείς ἀπώλετο, 3. 9 μή
βουλόμενος τῶν ἀπολέσαντας ἀπώλεσαν, 11 τῇ
ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἀπάλλοτο.
ἀπόστολος: 2 P. 1. 1 δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰ.Χ., 3. 2 μηνοθύμαι τῇ
τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, J. 17 μνήμης τῶν μηνῶν τῶν
προερχόμενον ἕπό τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου.
c. d. αποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, c. acc.
2. 18 δελεάζουσαν τοὺς ὄλγοις ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀνεφερο-
μένους, 20 ἀποφεύγοντες τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.

c. d. ἀπαίσωτος: J. 24 φυλάξαντι άμα ἀπαίσωτος.
ἀπώλεια: J. 2 P. 2. 1 αἰρέσεις ἀπώλειαι, ἰδ. ταχύν ἀπώλειαι, 2. 3 ή
ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νοστάξας, 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπώλειαι τῶν ἀσεβῶν
ἀνθρώπων, 3. 16 πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαι.

c. d. ἀργως: 2 P. 2. 3 οἷς τὸ κόμῳ ἐκπαίλει οὐκ ἀργεῖ.
ἀργος: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἄργους οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθιστήσαν.
ἀρετή: 2 P. 1. 3 τοῦ καλεστάντος άμα ίδια δόξα καὶ ἀρετή (αἵ. διὰ δόξης
κ. ἀρετής), 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε εἰς τῇ πιστεί ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, εἴς ἐς
ἀρετὴν τὴν γνώσιν.
ἀρνομαί: 2 P. 2. 1 τοῖς ἀγοράσαντα αὐτῶν δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, J. 4
tοὺς μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, p. 72.
ἀπάξω: J. 23 οὕτω ὑπὸ κυρίου καὶ ἀρτέων.
ἀρχέλος: J. 9 Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος.
ἀρχαιος: 2 P. 2. 5 ἀρχαῖον κόσμου οὐκ ἔφεσατο.
ἀρχή: 2 P. 3. 4 αἵ. ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, J. 6 ἀγγέλος τοὺς μή τηρήσαντας τὴν
εὐαντὸν ἀρχήν.
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α σ' ε β εια: J. 13 έλεγχαι περί πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβείων.
c. α σ ε β' εω: 2 P. 2. 6 ἔρωτειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείων (αλ. ἀσεβείων) τεθεικός, J. 15 τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείων δὲν ἠσέβθησαν.
ad σ' ε β' η' σ: 2 P. 2. 5 κατακλυσμῶν κόσμω ἀσεβείων ἐπάξας, 2. 6 ἀσεβείων (αλ. ἀσεβείων), 3. 7 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, J. 4 παρασεβείσας τινες ἀνθρώπου, ἀσεβείς, 15 ἐλέγχαι τοὺς ἀσεβείς, ἦδ. ἀρματωλοὶ ἀσεβείς.
ad σ' ἐ λγε ια: 2 P. 2. 2 πολλοί ἐξαικολουθήσωσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, 2. 7 τῆς τῶν ἁθεσμῶν ἐν ἀσελγεία ἀναπτυσσόμενος, 2. 18 δειλαίσωσιν ἀσελγείαις, J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χαρίτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.
ad σ' τ ῥ ο: 2 P. 3. 14 ἀπιλος καὶ ἀμώμητοι.
ad σ' τ ρ ι κ ξασ: 2 P. 2. 14 δειλαίοντες ψυχᾶς ἀστηρίκτους, 3. 16 οἱ ἁρμαθείς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι.
αυθαί: 2 P. 2. 10 τολμηταί αἰθάδεις.
αυξ' αυω: 2 P. 2. 3. 18 ἀδένατεν εἰς χαρίτι.
αυτός: (=is) 2 P. 1. 17, 18, 2. 3. 8, 11, 12, 13, 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελ-λόμενοι, 21 bis, 22. 3. 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 bis.; (emphatic) 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δοξά; (unusual order) 1. 2 ἐξαικολουθήσωσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις; J. 7, 11, 14, 15 bis, 16 bis, 24. (=is) 2 P. 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, 2. 19 αὐτοῖς δοῦλοι ὑπάρχουσεν. αυτός, 2 P. 3. 7, 2 P. 3. 7, see p. excix, τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων, 1 P. 5, 9, p. xcv.
c. αν χιμη ρος: 2 P. 1. 19 λύχνῳ φαίνοντι εἰς ἀρχὴν τότε, pp. excii f.
σ. αφ' βως: J. 12 συνενωχοῦμενοι ἀφαβοσ (others connect it with what follows αφ. ἐαυτοῖς τομαίνοντες).
αφωνο: 2 P. 2. 10 ὑπόξυγον ἄφωνον.
Βαλαμαί: 2 P. 2. 15 ἐξαικολουθήσατε τῇ ὅδῇ τοῦ Βαλαίμα τοῦ Βοσόρ, J. 11 τῇ πλαιᾳ τοῦ Βαλαίμα μαθιν έξεχυθέρασαν.
βασανίζω: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίων ἄνωμοι ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν.
βασιλεία: 2 P. 2. 11 εἰς τὴν αἰώνων βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου.
βεβαιαν: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιαν ὅμων τῆς κλήσης ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιάτερον τοῦ προφητικῶν λόγον.
Βεωρ: 2 P. 2. 15 (al. Βοσόρ).
βλασφημηθέστατα: 2 P. 2. 2 ή δόδος τῆς ἄλθειας βλασφημηθέστατα, 2. 10 δόξας οὐ τρόμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, 2. 18 ἐν ὧν άγνοοοῦσι βλασφημοῦσιν, J. 8 δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 ὡσα μὲν οὐκ οἰδασιν βλασφη-μοῦν.
βλασφημία: J. 9 οὐκ ἔτολμηκεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, p. 75.
βλάσφημος: 2 P. 2. 11 οὐ βέβαιον κατ' αὐτῶν βλασφημὸν κρίσιν.
c. α. βλασφειμα: 2 P. 2. 8 βλέμματι καὶ ἄκοψ δικαίος, p. ix.
σ. βρόβος: 2 P. 2. 22 ής λουτσιμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.
Βόσφορος: 2 P. 2. 15 (al. Βοσόρ, see p. excviii).
βουλαλομαί: 2 P. 3. 9 μὴ βουλομένοις τινας ἀπολέσσαι, J. 5 ὑπομνήσαι ἕμας βουλόμαι.
βραδύνως: 2 P. 3. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.
c. α. βραδύντες: 2 P. 3. 9 οὐς τινος βραδύντα ἤγοντα.
γαρ: 2 P. 1. 8, 9, 19, 11, 16, 17, 21; 2. 4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21; 3. 4. 5; J. 4.
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διαλέγωμαι: J. 9 διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσείου σώματος.
διαμένω: 2 P. 3. 4 πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.
διάνοια: 2 P. 3. 1 τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, 145.

διανυά: 2 P. 1. 12 δίκαιον Ἡγούμενος διεγείρει ἡμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λον ἐρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέπομεν καὶ άκοῦ [δ] δίκαιον ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ψυχήν δικαίαν ἐβασάνεις.

dικαίοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον Ἡγούμενος διεγείρει ἡμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λον ἐρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέπομεν καὶ άκοῦ [δ] δίκαιον ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ψυχήν δικαίαν ἐβασάνεις.

δικαίοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον Ἡγούμενος διεγείρει ἡμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λον ἐρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέπομεν καὶ άκοῦ [δ] δίκαιον ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ψυχήν δικαίαν ἐβασάνεις.

δικαίωσις: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον Ἡγούμενος διεγείρει ἡμᾶς, 2. 7 δίκαιον Λον ἐρύσατο, 2. 8 βλέπομεν καὶ άκοῦ [δ] δίκαιον ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ψυχήν δικαίαν ἐβασάνεις.
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ήμων σωτηρίας, 4 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἰδ. κυρίον ἡμῶν, 17, 21, 26 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἰδ. σωτῆρι ἡμῶν, (ἡμῖν) 2 Ρ. 1. 1 τοῖς ἱσότιμοι ἡμῖν λαγοῦσιν πιστων, 1. 8 πάντα ἡμῖν (αὐτοῖς, see ῥ. ἀγ. ἢσι) τῆς θείας δυνάμεως δεδουλιμένης, 1. 4 μέγιστα ἡμῖν δεδόρηται.

eι: 2 Ρ. 2. 4 εἰ γὰρ δ' Θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὕκ ἐφείσατο, 2. 20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μάσταμα τοῦ κόσμου, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἤττώται.

eιδέναι, see ἐδα.

ἐλικρίνης: 2 Ρ. 3. 1 τὴν ἐλλικρίνη διάνοιαν, 145.

ἐλιμ: 2 Ρ. 1. 13 εἵφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνωματί, 2 Ρ. 1. 9 τυφλὸς ἔστιν μωυσάζων, 1. 14 ταχύνῇ ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις, 1. 17 οὖτος ἔστιν ὁ νίος μου, 3. 4 τοῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία; 3. 16 ἐν οἷς ἐστιν διανοητὰ τινα, 2 Ρ. 2. 17 οὖτοι εἰσίν πιγια ἀνυόν, 3. 7 τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσίν, Ἰ. 12 οὐτοὶ εἰσίν οἱ συνενωχούμενοι, 18 οὔτως εἰσίν γογγυστα, 19 οὔτως εἰσίν οἱ ἀποδοξίζοντες—2 Ρ. 1. 18 σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει, 2. 11 ἀγγελοὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες—2 Ρ. 2. 21 κρείστον ἡν αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπεγενοκέναι κ.τ.λ., 3. 5 οὐφαντι ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι—2 Ρ. 2. 1 ἐν ὧμιν ἦσαν ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, Ἰ. 18 ἦσαν ἐμπαϊκτα.

ἐπον: Ὡ. 3 ἀλλά ἐπέν Ὑπημηθαίσαν οἱ Κύριοι.

ἐρήνη: 2 Ρ. 1. 2 χαῖρε ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖη, 3. 14 σπουδάσατε ἀστιλοῦ εὑρέθηνεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, Ἰ. 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

ἐις: 2 Ρ. 1. 8 ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπέγνωσιν, 1. 11 ἢ ἐκόσδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, 1. 17 εἰς ὅν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, 2. 4 εἰς κρίσιν τηροῦμενοι, 2. 9 εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως τοιεῦν, 2. 12 γεγενημενα εἰς ἀλωσιν, 2. 22 εἰς κυλισμον βοββρῶν, 3. 7 πιρί τηροῦμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως, 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἰδ. εἰς μετάοιον χωρήσαι, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα εἰς ἡμέραν αἰώνοις, Ἰ. 4 προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτῳ, ἰδ. τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κάρωτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, 6 εἰς κρίσιν τετήρηκαν, 13 εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται, 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ζωήν, 26 δόξα... εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἴωνας.

ἐις: 2 Ρ. 3. 8 ὡς τούτῳ μὴ λαχανάντω ὑμᾶς, ὅτι μιὰ ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χέλλα ἢτη καὶ χελλὰ ἢτη ὡς ἡμέρα μιὰ.

ἐσοδός: 2 Ρ. 1. 11 ἢ ἐσοδός εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν.

ἐκ: 2 Ρ. 1. 18 φωνῇ εἰς οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαι, 2. 8 ἢμέραν εἰς ἡμέρας ψυχὴν ἐβασανίζει, 2. 9 ἢ πειρασμοῦ ὑφεθοῦ, 2. 21 ὑποστρέψας ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἐστολῆς, 3. 5 γῆς ἢ ἡθοῦς καὶ δὲ ἡθοῦς συνεστώσα, Ἰ. 5 λαῦν ἢ γῆς Ἀνθύποτον σώσας, 23 ἢ τυπός ἀρπαξάτον.

c. d. ἐκάστοτε: 2 Ρ. 1. 15 σπουδασῶ δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἢχειν ὕμας τὴν τούτων μην ἐξεισάχθαι.

ἐκείνοις: 2 Ρ. 1. 16 τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειώττος.

ἐκλογὴ: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 βεβαιῶν ὑμῶν τὴν κλησιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, pp. 19 f.

b. c. ἐκπαλαι: 2 Ρ. 2. 3 τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαι ὡσ ἀργεί, Ἰ. 5 οὐφαντ ήσαν ἐκπαλαί, p. lii.

ἐκπίπτω: 2 Ρ. 3. 17 ἢ μὴ ἐκτέσατε τοῦ ἵδου στηρείμοι.

b. c. ἐκπορνευόμαι: Ἰ. 7 πόλεις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὁπώς σαρκος ἐπέρας.

b. ἐκριζώμενος: Ἰ. 12 δεύδρα δὲ ἀποβάνοντα ἐκριζώθηντα.

ἐκχεω: Ἰ. 11 τῇ πλάγῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.

ἐλαύνω: 2 Ρ. 2. 17 ὁμήλαι ὑπὸ λαλαπώτες ἐλαυνόμεναι.
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b. c. έλεγχειν: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξειν ἐσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας.

έλέγξαι πάντας τούς ἀσέβεις περὶ πάντων, 22 οὐς μὲν ἔλεγχετε (αλ. ἐλεάτε ἢ ἐλείτε) διακρινόμενοι.

έλεος ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 21 προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἐλεος τοῦ κυρίου.

έλευθερία: 2 P. 2. 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὑτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.

έμοι: 2 P. 1. 6 μετὰ τὴν ἐμῆν ἔξοδον.

a. c. έδοξάσάς: 2 P. 3. 3 ἐδείκτηται ἐν ἐμπαιγμῷ ἐμπαικτα.

b. c. εἴτε: 2 P. 3. 3 ἐδείκτηται ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἥμερων ἐμπαικτα, J. 13 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων χρόνων ἐστοντα ἐμπαικτα.

έμπλακάντες: 2 P. 2. 19 τοῦτοι δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακάντες.

έμπορεύονται: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται.

έν: (place) 2 P. 1. 4 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ φθορᾶς, 1. 18 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 1. 18 ἐν τῷ δραπε, 1. 19 ἐν αἰχμήρῳ τόπῳ, ὑπὸ εἰς ταῖς καρδίαις, 2. 1 εἰς τῷ λαῷ, ἃς ἐν ἰδίᾳ, 2. 8 ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὑτοῖς, 3. 10 τα ἐν γῇ ξέρα, 3. 13 ἐν ὄσι δικαιοσύνης κατοικεῖ, 3. 1, 3. 16 εἰς ἐπιστολῶς λαλῶν δίπλα; (time) 2. 24 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, 2. 10; (cause or instrument) 1. 1 ἐν ἐν αὐτοῖς λατρίων πίστιν ἐν δικαίωσιν Θεοῦ, 1. 25 and 3. 1 διεγείρας ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 2. 3 εἰς πλεονεξίᾳ ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, 2. 16 εἰς ἀνθρώπου φωνὴ θρογμάτος, 2. 18 διελεύσοντο ἐν ἐπιθυμίας, 2. 19 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μισήματα ἐν ἐπιγνώσει; (manner) 2. 7 τῆς ἐν ἀσέβεια ἀναστροφῆς, 2. 10 εἰς ἐπιθυμία πορεύομενοι, 2. 18 τούς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενοι, 3. 3 εἰς ἐμπαιγμῷ ἐμπαικτα, 3. 11 εἰς ἀγίας ἀναστροφαῖς, 3. 14 ἀμώμητοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ; (sphere) 1. 12 ἐπιπεργόμενος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 3. 18 αὐξάνειν ἐν χάριτι; (subject-matter) 2. 12 ἐν ὄσι ἄγονους μαθησεῖμεν; 2. 13 ἐνπροθέμενεν ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις; (addition) 1. 1 ἐπιπεργόμενος ἐν πίστει ἀρετῆς διακρίνει, 1. 6 τοι, 1. 7 διὰ, 1. 22 ἐν τοῖς ἂγαθαις σταθῆς; (accompaniment) 14 ἐν ἀγίαις μερίσαις ἑλθεν; (cause or instrument) 10 ἐν τοῦτοι φθείρονται; (manner) 22 ἐν φόβῳ, 24 ἐν ἀγαλλίασε; (used of God) 11 ἐν ἐπὶ ἡγημονεὺς (!), p. clxxii, 20 εἰς πνεύματι προσευχόμενοι, 21 ἐν τούτου ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, p. lxv.

έντολή: 2 P. 2. 21 τῆς παραδοθεώτης αὑτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, 3. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἰδίων ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, p. 64.

b. c. ἐντροφά: 2 P. 2. 13 ἐντροφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν (al. ἄγαπαίς).

έννια: 8 οἴκου ἐννυπαξάγομεν, p. 74.

Τ' ἐνωχ: ἡ ἐπιφάνειας ἐβδομος ἀπὸ Ἄδαμ ἐνωχ.

b. c. έίακολον θέω: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐκθέοις ἐξακουσθήσαντες, 2. 3 ἐξακολούθησαν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελεγείαις, 2. 15 ἐξακολούθησαν τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαίμα.

a. b. c. d. έκεραμα: 2 P. 2. 22 κὼν ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδον ἐξέφαιμα, p. xii, lxii.

c. έκδος: 2 P. 1. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἐμῆν ἔξοδον.

εὐνοοῦ: 2 P. 3. 4 σα ἐντί ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ;

εἰς βοηθεῖν Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

εἰς παιγνελλομένου: 2 P. 2. 19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι.
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c. d. ἐπάγγελμα: 2 P. 1. 4 τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα, 3. 13 κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ, pp. xxxiv, cxxii.

eπάγγος: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐπαγγούντες ἐαυτοῖς ταχύν ἀπώλειαν, 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κάσων ἄσβεσθον ἐπάξιος, p. xxvi.

b. c. d. ἐπί ὠνίς χιλιομ. I. 3 ἐπαγγοῦσθαι τῇ ἄπαξ παραδοθεῖσθαι ταῖς ἀγίοις πίστει, pp. 22, 23, 70 f.

b. c. d. ἐπὶ τρίς: 2 P. 1. 4 ἐπὶ τοῖς ξύλοις ἀρατίων τὰς ἐαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.

eπι: c. gen. 146 f., 2 P. 3. 3 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἥμερῶν, I. 18 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων χρόνον.

c. acc. 2 P. 1. 13 ὑδ᾽ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 2. 22 ἐπιστρέφας ἐπί τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα. In compounds, pp. 22, 174.

ἐπίγνωσις: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεὶς ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1. 3 ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλοστάστος ἡμᾶς, 1. 8 εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐπίγνωσιν, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μάσταμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου.

ἐπιθυμία: 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς, 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μασχοῦ πορευομένους, 2. 18 διελαύσοντες ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ σαρκὸς ἀσέλγειας, 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτῶν πορευομένους, I. 16 κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενους, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενους.

c. d. ἐπίλυσις: 2 P. 1. 28 πάσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, pp. iv. 196 f.

ἐπίστολή: 2 P. 3. 1 διητέραν ὑμᾶν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, 3. 18 ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς.

ἐπιστρεφόμενος: 2 P. 2. 22 κύων ἐπιστρέφας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα. 

ἐπιτρυμα: J. 9 ἐπιτυμῆσαι σοι Κύριος.

ἐποφθήρω: J. 9 κραίνει ἐπενεγκεῖ θλασμοῦ. 

ἔποκομεν: J. 20 ἐποκοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἄγιωτάτῃ ἡμῶν πίστει.

ἐπόπτης: 2 P. 1. 16 ἐπότα ἕγνηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.

ἐργον: 2 P. 1. 10 διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων (om. al.) 2. 8 ψυχὴν δικαίων ἀνάμοιρας ἔργων ἐξασθάνειν, 3. 10 γῇ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα, J. 15 περὶ πάσας τῶν ἔργων ἀσβεσθῶς αὐτῶν.

ἐρχόμενος: 2 P. 3. 3 ἔλευθον ἐμπαίρηται, J. 14 ἤλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἀγάμσις μιριάσις αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ, ἐπὶ, p. xlv.

ἐσχάτος: 2 P. 2. 28 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχάτα χείρων τῶν πρῶτων, 3. 3 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἥμερῶν, pp. 146 f., J. 18 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων χρόνου, pp. 77 f.

ἐπισκοπός: J. 7 ἀπελθοῦσα ὁπίως σαρκὸς ἐτέρας.

ἐπος: 2 P. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἐτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.

ἐπαγγέλματος: 2 P. 1. 17 εἰς ἐν ἔγω εὐδόκησα.

ἐπίθετος: 2 P. 2. 15 καταλείποντες εὐθείαν ὅδον.
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εὐρίσκω: 2 P. 3. 10 γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται (ἐπ. see p. cc).

εὐσεβεία: 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 ἀγίαις ἀναστοράφαις καὶ εὐσέβειαις.

εὖσεβείας: 2 P. 2. 9 οἷς Κύριος εὐσέβεις ἐκ πεισμοῦ μύσθαι.

εὐχος: 2 P. 1. 19 ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου, 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μουχαλίδος, ἃδ. καρδίαις γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεχίας ἔχοντες, 2. 16 ἔλεγεν ἢ ἄχον παρανομάσας, 3. 3 ἀνάγκης ἢ ἄχον γράφας, 19 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. (2) = ροσσιτ. 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδάσῳ ἢ ἁγίας μνημήν ποιεῖσθαι.

εῶς: 2 P. 1. 19 ὅς καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ἐως ὅπου ἡμέρα διανυάγη.

d. ξύφος: 2 P. 2. 4 (ἀγγέλους) σειρῶς ξύφου (ἀλ. σειραὶ and ξύφοις) ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν, 2. 11 σι ὁ ξύφος τοῦ σκότους τετηρηται, 3. 6 (ἀγγέλους) εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοίς άδιδός ὑπὸ ζύφων τετηρητηκέν, 13 ὁς ὁ ξύφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνα τετηρηται.

εῷς: 2 P. 1. 8 τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαι, 21 εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

εὐνοον: 2 P. 2. 12 ὡς ἀλογα ἔξω γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ ἢ ἁλωσιν, 19 ὅσα ὑπὸ φυσικὸς δέ τὰ ἀλογα ἔξω ἔπιστανται εἰς τούτοις φθείρανται.

η: 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττων ἢν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγυωκέναι ἢ ἐπηγυοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι.

ηγερμι: 2 P. 1. 13 δίκαιον δέ ἢγοωμα διεγείραι ὑμᾶς, 2. 13 ἢδονὴν ἢγοομενοτ τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, 3. 9 ὡς τινες βραδυτήτα ἢγοοῦται, 3. 15 τὴν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἢγοοσθή.

ηδη: 2 P. 3. 1 ταύτην ἢδη δευτέραν γράφω ἢπιστολήν.

ηδονή: 2 P. 2. 13 ἢδονὴν (ἀγαπητήν ἢ ἢγοομενοτ τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, p. c).

ημέρα: 2 P. 1. 19 ἢς ὅς δὲ ἢμερα διανυάγησθαι, 8 ἢμέραν ἢ ἢμέραν γεγυμνασών, 2. 9 and 3. 7 ἢς ἢμεραν κρισεως, 2. 13 τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τρυφῆν, 3. 3 ἢς ἢχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν, 3. 8 μία ἢμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία, 3. 10 ἢς ἢμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλήτης, 3. 12 τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢμερας, 18 εἰς ἢμεραν αἰώνων, 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἢμερας.

ητάμα: 2 P. 2. 19 φι γάρ τις ἢττηται τοῦτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται, 2. 20 τοίοις δὲ πάλιν ἀμπλακέωτες ἢττώνται.

θάλασσα: J. 13 θάλασσα ἢγιρα θαλάσσας.

θαυμάζουσα: J. 16 θαυμάζουσα πρόσωπο ὀφελίας χάριν.

θειοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 3 τῆς θείας δινάμεως αὐτοῦ, 1. 4 θείας κοινωνοι φύσεως (elsewhere in N.T. only in Acts 17. 29 το θείον).

θελήματι: 2 P. 1. 21 οὐ γάρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ήμέραν προφητεία ποτέ.

θελω: 2 P. 3. 5 λάνθανε γάρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλονται ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

Θεοσύνη: 2 P. 1. 1 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήριτ 'Ισιου Χριστοῦ, 2. 2 εἰς ἐπιγνωσεὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰσιου τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1. 17 λάβων παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός τιμῆν καὶ δόξαν, 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ (ἀλ. ἁγίου) Θεοῦ ἀνθρωποι, 2. 4 ὁ Θεὸς ἡγελών ἀμαρτησάντων ὅν ἐρείσατο, 3. 5 γῇ ἢ ἡδατος συνεστώτα τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, 1. 10 ὅς ἐν Θεο πατρι ἡγαθημένου, 4
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τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, 21 ἐαυτοῖς ἐν ἁγάπῃ Ἰησοῦς θυρήσατε, 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν.

θ η σ α υ ρ υ ω : 2 Π. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὗραντι καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησάμενοι εἰσίν.

'I ἀ κ ω β ο s : J. 1 'Ἰουδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλους, ἐδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.

i δ ι o s : 2 Π. 1. 3 τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἔδει δόξη (ἀλ. διὰ δόξην, p. cxci) καὶ αφετήρ, 1. 20 πάσα προφητεία γραφής ἔδει ἐπιλύσεως ὑπὸ γίνεται, 2. 16 ἐλεγξίην ἐσχεν ἔδει παρανομίας, 2. 22 κών ἐπιστρέψας ἔπι τὸ ἰδίον ἔξωμα, 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἑδεις ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 3. 16 πρὸς τὴν ἑδείαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, 3. 17 οὐ μὴ ἐκπέμψε ὑπὸ τὸ ἰδίον στηργμοῦ, J. 6 (ἀγγέλου) ἀπολαπαντά τοῦ ἰδίου οἰκήμου, pp. xxxii f., xliii.

i δ ού : J. 14 ἵθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυρίασιν αὐτοῦ.

'Ἰ ῶ σ σ ο ὑ s : 2 Π. 1. 1 ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἱδ. ἐν δικαίωσεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1. 2 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τ. Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τ. κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1. 8 τῆς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιγνώσων, 1. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1. 14 οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐδόθη σέλεν μοι, 1. 16 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἴησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν, 2. 30 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 3. 18 ἐν γνώσει τ. κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, J. 1 'Ἰουδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλους, ἱδ. τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαμημόνεσι καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς, 4 τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κυρίων ἴησοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀρνοῦμεν, 5 Ἰησοῦ (ἀλ. Κύριος, see pp. clxxxi f.) λαῶν ἐκ γῆς Διόγητον σώσας, 17 τῶν ἀπουσάκων τοῦ κυρίου ἴησοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 21 τὸ ἱερό τοῦ κυρίου ἴησοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 25 δία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

i ν a : 2 Π. 1. 4 ἐπαγγέλματα διδόμετο ἕνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως, 3. 17 φυλάσσεσθε ἐνα μὴ ἐκπέμψατε.

Ἰουδας : J. 1. 1.

c. d. ῶ σ ῶ τ ῶ μ υ ῶ s : 2 Π. 1. 1 τοὺς ἰδιότον ἡμῶν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, pp. ii. 181.

i σ τ ται μι : J. 24 τῷ δυναμείῳ στήσατε κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.

i σ χ υ s : 2 Π. 2. 11 ἀγγελοὶ ἵσχυ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες.

b. κα θαρισμόσ : 2 Π. 1. 9 λήθην λαβῶν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν.

κα θ έν τα η μι : 2 Π. 1. 8 ἀκάρτους καθίστησαν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἴησοῦ Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ ἐπιγνώσων.

κα θώσ : 2 Π. 1. 14 καθός καὶ οἱ κύριοι ἐδόθησαν μοι, 3. 15 καθός καὶ οἱ ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῶν ἀδελφοὶ Παύλου ἐργασάμεν ἡμᾶς.

κα ι : both 2 Π. 3. 18 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 25 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

'also' 2 Π. 1. 14 καθός καὶ οἱ κύριοι ἐδόθησαν μοι, 2. 1 ἐγένοστο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήτην ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστατο, 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρὸνται (ἀλ. καταφθαροῦσαι), 2. 19 ψ της ἔτην ποῦ τούτῳ καὶ (om. al.) διδοῦσανται, 3. 15 καθός καὶ οἱ ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῶν ἀδελφοί, 3. 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ἱδ. ὡς καὶ ταῖς λοιπὰς γραφὰς, J. 8 ὀμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὕτω, 14 ἐπροφήτευε δὲ καὶ τούτοις; 'even' 2 Π. 2. 1 καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτὸς ἀρνοῦμεν, J. 23 μισοῦστε καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστιλωμένον χίτωνα.

K a i n : J. 11 τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.
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καίνος: 2 Ρ. 3. 13 καίνος δόρανος καὶ γῆν καίνην προσδοκῶμεν.
καίπερ: 2 Ρ. 1. 12 καίπερ εἰδότας.
καλέω: 2 Ρ. 1. 8 τοίς καλέσταντος ἡμᾶς ἱδία δόξη καὶ ἄρετῆ.
καλός: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὦμῶν ἔργων (ομ. αὐτ.).
καλῶς: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 ὃ καλός ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.
καρδιά: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 ἐός οὐ φωσφόρος ἀνατελῇ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὦμῶν, 2. 14 καρδιὰς γεγυμνασμένην ἔχοντες.
κατά: c. gen. 2 Ρ. 2. 11 οὐ πέφορτον κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρύσιν, J. 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, 15 ἐδάλεψαν κατ' αὐτοῦ.
κατακλυσμός: 2 Ρ. 2. 5 κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσβέσθος ἐπάσας.
κατακρίνω: 2 Ρ. 2. 6 πόλεις... καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, p. σχεν.
καταλείπω: 2 Ρ. 2. 15 καταλείποντες (αὐτ. καταλείποντες) εἴθειαν ὄνον.
καταπονέω: 2 Ρ. 2. 11 Ἀρτι καταπονοῦμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελεγίᾳ ἀναστροφῆς.
κατάρα: 2 Ρ. 2. 14 κατάρας τέκνα.
καταστροφή: 2 Ρ. 2. 6 [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν (ομ. WH.): see p. σχεν.
καταφθείρω: 2 Ρ. 2. 12 ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρῆσονται (αὐτ. καὶ φθαρ).
καταφρονέω: 2 Ρ. 2. 10 κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.
καταστάσεως: 2 Ρ. 2. 9 στασίς καταστάσεως τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.
κατοικεῖ: 2 Ρ. 3. 13 ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.
καὶ: c. d. e. καινός: 2 Ρ. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα καινούμενα λυθῆσεται, 3. 2 στοιχεία καινούμενα τήκεται, p. 1x.
κήρυξ: 2 Ρ. 2. 5 Νῦν δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.
κλέπτης: 2 Ρ. 3. 10 ἢζεί ἢμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης.
κλῆσις: 2 Ρ. 1. 10 βεβαιάν ὄμων τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖται.
κλητός: J. 1 τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.
κοιμάω: 2 Ρ. 3. 4 ἀφ' ὧν οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν.
κοίνος: J. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς συγγραμμᾶς.
κοινός: 2 Ρ. 1. 4 θείας κοινοῦν φύσεως.
κολάζω: 2 Ρ. 2. 4, 9 κολάζομένους τῇ πείν (in 4 some read τηρουμένους).
κομίκω: 2 Ρ. 3. 13 κομίουμενοι (αὐτ. ἀδικοῦμενοι) μισθῶν ἀδίκιας.
κορέ: J. 11 τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορε ἀπόλοντο.
κόσμος: 2 Ρ. 4. 1 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἑπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 2. 5 ἀρχαίων κόσμων οὐκ ἐφεύσατο κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσβέσθος ἐπίκες, 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, 3. 6 ὃ τῶτε κόσμος κατακλυσθεῖς ἀπώλετο.
κράτος: J. 25 Θεός κράτος καὶ ἔξωστια.
κρείττων: 2 Ρ. 2. 21 κρείττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὄδον ἢ ἐπηγνώσθην κ.π.λ.
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κρίμα: 2 P. 2. 3 ois to kríma èkpatai ouk árgiei, J. 4 progeγgramménoi eis touto to kríma.
κρίσεις: 2 P. 2. 4 eis kríson thronu'ménoi, 2. 9 eis ãmean kríseos kolaζó-
ménoi threein, 2. 11 ou férousin katei autón pará Kuriów blásoφhým
krísan, 3. 7 throu'meini eis ãmean kríseos, J. 6 eis krísan meγálh
ãmeiras teýhýrekei, 9 krísan epteugekein blásoφhýmas, 15 toùsai krísan
kata pátwn.
κινίσεις: 2 P. 3. 4 â' árgês khísow.
a. c. d. κυλισμός: 2 P. 2. 22 eis kylisimón (al. kylisma) borbóron,
p. lxii.
kýma: J. 13 kymata ágora thalássowhs.
b. d. κυρίστης: 2 P. 2. 10 kuryístos kataφronoúntas, J. 8 kuryísthsa
athanous, p. viii.
lambda
λαγγάνων: 2 P. 1. 1 tois isótimein èmín lakoúswn píston.
λαίλαψ: 2 P. 2. 17 òmíxhla hipò laìlaspas elanwmenai.
λάλω: 2 P. 1. 21 élallhsan ã γîn ou òv (al. âpó) Theou anbropou, 3. 16
lallon én autáis peri tou'ton, J. 15 peri pántwn tou's skleíron òn
élallhsan, 16 to stóma autón laléi upéroyga.
λαμβάνων: 2 P. 1. 9 lýthn labyón tou' katharismou tou' pálai au'tou
ámartwów, 1. 17 labbwn para' Theou patróp timh kai daxan.
λανθάνων: 2 P. 3. 5 lathánei ýar autóus òti, 3. 8 touto ou' lankhánete
ýmws òti.
λάος: 2 P. 2. 1 égywnto dé kai psévdophrítas en tou' lao', J. 5 lao'n èk
ýtis Athognwv óssonas.
λέγων: 2 P. 3. 4 légonites Póu èstivn ã epaggeĩlia; J. 14 proeφýntesen
Eivnòs légon, 17 marnstthe tón ðmíatón twn proeφhmenón ùpò twn
ápostolwv òti elégon.
c. λήθη: 2 P. 1. 9 lýthn labwón tou' katharismou.
λόγος: 2 P. 1. 19 twn proφótrikon lágon, 2. 3 plástowis lágon, 3. 5 tó tou'
Theou lógwv, 3. 7 tó au'tó lógw téðhansuménoi eisín.
λοιπὸς: 2 P. 3. 16 òs kai tás loipás grafías.
λόω: 2 P. 2. 22 òs louaménn.
λόχος: 2 P. 1. 19 òs loghí fainonti.
λοόω: 2 P. 3. 10 stoikheia kanoiówneina luthýsetai, 3. 11 tou'ton pántwn
lóowwv, 3. 12 úranaí tropiównei luthýsontau.
ότ: 2 P. 2. 7 óknav diakon lósw kataφronoúmenov.
b. μακροθυμεῖ: 2 P. 3. 9 makrothumieî eis úrmás.
μακροθυμία: 2 P. 3. 15 tôm tou' kuriów makrothumían swtirian ãgeiwsie.
μάλλωτα: 2 P. 2. 10 mállwta òe tou's òpíwv harcós proerewnémwnov.
μάλλον: 2 P. 1. 10 diò méllwv spoudhásate.
b. ματαιότητα: 2 P. 2. 18 úpérhgya matatitóptov phegγymenov.
μεγαλείοτητα: 2 P. 1. 16 épopta tis ekkeúnon meγaléiótovtov.
c. μεγάλοπροπίτης: 2 P. 1. 17 ápò tis meγalopropitóvous dóxas.
b. μεγάλος: 2 P. 2. 4 dé ón tâ mégista kai týmâ òmín epaggeýlmata
dedorjyetai (reading uncertain), p. xiii.
μείζων: 2 P. 2. 11 áγgelou òschi kai dýnavme meîzovne òntes.
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μ. Ελαμ: 2 P. 1. 12 δι' μελλήσθω ( lok ) ύμας αλεί ὑπομνήσκεν περὶ τούτων, p. lx, 2. 6 ἵππος μελλόντων ἁσβέσιν τεθείκος, p. cxxiv.

μ. Ελω, see 2 P. 1. 12 and p. cxxiii.

b. c. d. μ. ε. ρ. ψ. i. μ. ο. ρ. o: J. 16 γογνυστά μερμψαροι.

μέν: J. 8 σάρκα μεν μαινοῦσιν, κυριότητα δε ἁθετοῦναν δόξας δε βλασφημοῦσιν, 10 δοκι μμ δύον ὑπερήφανος βλασφημοῦσιν, δοκι δε φυσικὸς ἔπωσταν ... ἐν τούτοις οὕτως, 22, 23 οὐς μὲν ἑλέγχεται διακρινομένους, οὔς δὲ σώζετε ... οὔς δὲ ἑλέστε (readings differ).

μέντοι: J. 8 ὁμοίως μὲντοι καὶ οὖτοι σάρκα μαινοῦσιν.

μ. εστός: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤχοντες μεστοῖς μοιχαλίδος.

μ. τά: c. acc. 2 P. 1. 15 μετά τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον.

μετάνοια: 2 P. 3. 9 βουλόμενοι πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρίσατε.

μ. τάτι θ. μ. i: J. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατίθεντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.

μ. ἦ: pp. 1, c with imperat. 2 P. 3. 8 τούτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς ὅτι; with part. 2 P. 3. 9 μακροθυμεῖ μὴ βουλόμενος τινας ἀπολέσαι, J. 10 οὔτω εἰσών ἂν ἀποδορίζοντες, πνεύμα μὴ ἤχοντες; with part. and article, J. 5 οὕτω η μή πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλησεν, ἐ τοὺς μὴ τῆρησαντας τὴν ἐαντών ἄρχον ὑπὸ ἐξοφον τετήρηκεν.

μ. υ. c. ὑπ. 2 P. 2. 21 κρείττον ἢ μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὠδὴν ... ἦ.

μ. η. c. rel. 2 P. 1. 9 ὃ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα τυφλὸς ἑστιν.

μ. ι. αἰων: J. 8 σάρκα μὲν μαινοῦσιν.

μ. ι. ἀ. σ. μ. a: 2 P. 2. 20 ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μάσσατα τοῦ κόσμου.

μ. ι. a. σ. μ. o: 2 P. 2. 10 τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπίθεμα μισμοῦ πορευομένους.

μ. ι. μ. υ. σ. κομαί: 2 P. 3. 2 μηνισθήναι τῶν προερημένων ῥημάτων, J. 17 μηνισθήνε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προερημένων.

μ. ι. σ. ε. ω: J. 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτώνα.

μ. ι. σ. θ. ό: 2 P. 2. 13 κομιομένου (αλ. ἀδικομένου) μισθὸν ἀδίκια 2. 15 μισθὸν ἀδίκιας ἡγάπησεν, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαμί μισθὸν ἔξεχθησαν.

μ. μ. ν. η. σ. κομαί: 2 P. 1. 15 τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖται, pp. xxxiv. lx.

μ. μ. ν. ἀλ. γ. εἰς: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤχοντες μεστοῖς μοιχαλίδος.

μ. ν. ο. ν. ο. ν. ο: J. 4 τῶν μοῦν δεσπότην καὶ κύριον 'I. X. ἀρνομένου, 25 μοῦν Θεὸ σωτῆρ᾽ ἡμῶν.

μ. ο. θ. o: 2 P. 1. 16 σεσοφισμένους μύθους ἐξακολούθησαντες.

μ. μ. ρ. μ. ο: J. 14 ἦλθεν Κύριος εν ἀγίαις μυριάσαν αὐτοῖ, p. xxxi.

μ. μ. ν. ω. ά. ξ. ω: 2 P. 1. 9 τυφλὸς ἑστιν μυστάξιων, p. ix.

μ. μ. ω. o: 2 P. 2. 13 στόλοι καὶ μῶμοι.

μ. ω. ν. σ. η: J. 9 τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσείως σώματος.

ν. Εφ. η η λ. η: 2 P. 2. 17 ἄμχαλαι (αλ. νεφέλαι) ὑπὸ λαίλατος ἐλαυνόμεναι, 12 ὑπεύχο ἢ εἰς ... νεφέλαι ἀνείβοι ὑπὸ ἀνέμου παραφερομένα.

ν. ν. τ. η: 2 P. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοί καὶ ἡ γῆ τεθησαυρομένοι εἰσὶν πυρί, 3. 18 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, J. 25 μοῦν Θεὸ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

μ. μ. τά ά. ω: 2 P. 2. 3 ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάξει.

Ν. η: 2 P. 2. 5 ὀγδοος Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κύριοι τεφυλάζειν.
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"γδοος": 2 P. 2. 5 ὄγδοον ἐνεκτικουντις κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, pp. vii, 192

e. ὡδος: 2 P. 2. ἡ ὄδος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 15 καταληπτοῦτες (al. καταλείποντες) εὐθεῖαι ἄδων, ἵδ. εξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὄδε τοῦ Βαλαίμ, 2. 21 ἐπεγράψε τῇ ὅδε τῆς δικαστικῆς, J. 11 τῇ ὅδε τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.

οίδα: 2 P. 1. 12 καίπερ ἐπίστασις καὶ ἑσπηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείᾳ, 1. 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχύν ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνομάτος μου, 2. 9 οἴδεν Κύριος εὐσεβείς ἐπ τεωσιμοῦ ῥύσαθαι, J. 5 ὑπομνήσεται ὃμας βουλῆμα εἰδότας ὃμας πάντα, 10 ὅσα μὲν οὐκ ἔδωκαν βλασφημοῦσιν.

οίκη η τ ρ ι ου: J. 6 ἀπολυτίσατο τῷ ἔνων οἰκητήριον.

e. d. ἀλήγω ως: 2 P. 2. 18 δελείζουσιν τοὺς ἀλάγων ἀποφεύγοντας, p. excviii.

e. ὅμοιος: J. 7 τὸν ὄμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἑκπορεύεσθαι.

οἱ μοί: J. 8 οἱ ομοίοις μέντοι καὶ οὕτω σάρκα μαίνουσιν.

e. ὅπισω: 2 P. 2. 10 τοῖς ὅπισω σαρκὸς περιεομένους, 2. 21 εἰς τὰ ὅπισω ὑποστρέφεται (al. ομ. εἰς τὰ ὅπισω), J. 7 ἀπελθόνσα ὅπισω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.

ὁ διον: 2 P. 2. 11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι οὐ φέρονσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν βλασφημον κρίσιν.

ὁ πάρος, pp. 55 ff.

ὁ ρος: 2 P. 1. 14 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἄγῳ (al. τῷ ἄγῳ ὄρει), ἰν, cxliv.

ὁς, ἡ, ὁ: 2 P. 1. 4 δι’ τὸ μέγαστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, 1. 9 πῶς γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα τυφλὸς ἐστιν, 1. 17 ὃ ὅσοι εἰς ἡν ἐγὼ εἰδόκεισα, 1. 19 τῶν λόγων ὁ καλὸς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, ὡς οὐ ἡμῖν διαγνάσῃ, 2. 2 δι’ οὐσὶν ὁ ὃδος βλασφημηθήσεται, 2. 3 οὓς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, 2. 12 ἐν οἷς ἄγνωον εἰς βλασφημώντες, 2. 18 ὃς μυστικὸς ἀδικίας ἠγάπηση, 2. 17 οἷς ὃξος τετηρηθή, 2. 19 ὃς τὴν ἑτηρίαν τούτων καὶ δεδοιλωται, 3. 1 διεταβαν ὡς γραφό ἐπιστολῆλ, ἐν αἷς δειευκρινοῖς, 3. 4 ἀφ’ ὃς αἱ πατέρες ἐκκαμηρόθησαν, 3. 6 δι’ ὅτι ἐν οἷς οὐρανοὶ παρελεύσθησαν, 3. 12 ὃς ὃς ωκυχθησαν καὶ ἐπεξερεύνησαν οὖς, 13. 15 ἐν αἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ, 13. 16 ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσπρόσει πινα, ὃ ἀμαθεῖς στρεφλοῦσιν, J. 13 οἷς ὁ ἐξόφος τετηρήθη, 15 τὴν παντὸς τῶν ἑργῶν ἀσεβείας ὃν ἠγέβησαν, καὶ τὴν πάντων σκληρὸν ὧν ἐλάλησαν, 22, 23 οὖς μὲν ἑλέγχετε, οὖς δὲ σώζετε, οὖς δὲ ἑλάτε (readings differ).

ὁ σος: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰμί ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, J. 10 ὅσα μὲν οὖκ ὀδηγοῦν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ἐπίσταται ἐν τούτῳ φθείρονται.

ὁ στε: 2 P. 2. 1 ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι οἴνιν παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀποστειλάσι.

ὁ τε: J. 9 ὃς (al. ὅτε) Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὃτε (al. τότε) τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενοι διελεύστο.

ὁ τι: (‘that’) 2 P. 1. 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι, 1. 20, 3. 3 γνώσκοντες ὅτι, 3. 5 λαύθαινε ὅτι, 3. 8 λαυβανέων ὅτι, J. 5 εἰδότας ὅτι, 18 μνήμης τῶν ῥήματων ὅτι ἐλεγον ὅμοιν [ὅτι] ἐσονταί.

(‘because’) J. 11 οὐλαί αὐτοῖς ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν.

ὁ, ὁς, pp. 1 ff.

ὁ οὐ: J. 11 οὐλαί αὐτοῖς ὅτι.

ο ὅδε: 2 P. 1. 8 οὐκ ἀργοῦς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους.
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οὐν: 2 P. 3. 11 τοῦτον οὖν (al. οὗτος) πάντων λυμένων, 3. 17 ημεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητέ, φιλάσσοντες.

οὗτος: 2 P. 1. 18 φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν, 3. 5 οὐρανοὶ ἔσταν ἐκπαλαί, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ, 3. 10 οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοξέδουν παρέλθονται (al. om. οἱ), 3. 12 οὐρανοί παραμένουν λυθόσταται, 3. 13 καινοὶ δὲ οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆν καινὴν προσδόκομεν, p. xxxiii.

οὗτος: 2 P. 1. 17 οὗτος ἄστιν δ ὑός μου δ ἀγαπητός, 1. 18 ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἤκονταμεν, 3. 1 ταύτην ἡγεῖτε δευτέραν ἡμῖν γράφω ἔπιστολήν, 1. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τούτο δε (al. καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ) σπουδὴν πάσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε, 1. 20, 3. 8 τούτῳ πρώτῳ γυνώσκοντες, 3. 5 λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο θέλοντας, 3. 8 ἐν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λανθανέτο ἐμᾶς, 1. 13 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 2. 19 ὥρα της ἡττησα τούτῳ διδούλωται, 2. 12 οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἀλογα ἔσται, 2. 17 οὗτοι εἰσὶν πηγαί ἀνδροί, 1. 8 ταύτα ἡμῖν ὑπάρχοντα, 1. 9 ὥρα μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα, 1. 10 ταύτα ποιοῦντες, 3. 14 ταῦτα προσδοκοῖτε, 3. 4 ἵψα διὰ τούτων γένοιτο θείας κοινοὶ φίλοις, 1. 12 ὑπομιμήσεις περὶ τούτων, 1. 15 τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 3. 11 τούτων οὖν πάντων λυμένων, 1. 16 λαλῶν περὶ τούτων, 2. 20 τούτους δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες, 3. 1 πάλαι προγεγαρμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα, 5 εἰδότας ἡμᾶς τούτο (al. πάντα), ἡ ὲμείς μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἑναντίοντο, 19 οὗτοι δὲ διὰ μὲν ὦν οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, 12, 16, 19 οὗτοι εἰσὶν, 7 τὸν ὄμοιον τρόπον τούτοις, 10 ἐν τούτοις φθειρόνται, 14 ἐπροφητήσεις δὲ καὶ τούτου. Prospective use p. xciii f, 25.

οὗτος: 2 P. 1. 11 οὗτος γὰρ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγήθησατ, 3. 4 πάντα οὗτος διαμένει ἀπ' ἄρχης κτίσεως, 3. 11 τούτων οὗτος (al. οὖν) πάντων λυμένων.

ὁ θάλασσος: 2 P. 2. 14 ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔχοντες μεστοῖς μοιχαλίδοι.

πάλαι: 2 P. 1. 9 τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν, J. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγαρμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα.

πάλιν: 2 P. 2. 20 τούτων πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες.

παρά: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 17 λαβὼν παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμήν.

(c. dat.) 2 P. 2. 11 οὗ φέροντι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ (al. om. π. Κ., see p. cxxvi) βλασφημών κρίσιν, 3. 8 μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτῶν.

παραγγέλλα: p. 64.

παραδίδοσις: 2 P. 2. 4 παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν πραγμάτευμον, 2. 21 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῦ ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, J. 3 τῇ ἁπάξ παραδοθείση τοῦ ἁγίου πόλεως, pp. 61 f. 1 P. 23 23 παρεδίδον τῷ κρίμοντι, pp. xxviii f.

παράδοσις: pp. 61 f.

παραβηθήκα: p. 62.

παρακαλέω: J. 3 παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωγίζομαι.

παρομοία: 2 P. 2. 16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἐσχήν ιδία παραομολόγησα.

παρερέσσω: J. 12 νεφέλοι ἄνδροι ὑπὸ ἄνεμου παραφρόμεσαν.

παρερέσσω: 2 P. 2. 16 τὴν τοῦ προφητίον παραφρόνναι.

παρέστη: 2 P. 1. 8 πάσαν ἡμῖν πάροντα (al. ὑπάρχοντα), 1. 9 ὥρα μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένους εἰς τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ (παραδοθείση Ἰσπ.).

παρεστίζω: 2 P. 2. 1 παρεστίζομεν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.

παρεστίζω: J. 4 παρεστίζομεν τινὲς ἀνθρώπων.
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c. d. παρείσφερω: 2 P. 1. 15 σπουδὴν πάσαν παρεισεγκατε, pp. lx, lxii.

παρέρχομαι: 2 P. 3. 10 οἱ οἴνοι κρύβοντο παρελεύσονται.

παροιμία: 2 P. 2. 22 τῆς ἀληθοῦς παρομαίας.

παρουσία: 2 P. 1. 16 Ἰ.Χ. διάφορα καὶ παρουσία, 3. 4 ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, 3. 12 τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, pp. lxxix f., 195.

πάς: 2 P. 1. 3 πάντα τὰ πρὸς ἔως, 1. 5 σπουδὴν πάσαν παρεισεγκατε, 1. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, 3. 4 πάντα οὕτως διαμένει, 3. 9 πάντα εἰς μετάνοιαν χαρῆσαι, 3. 11 τούτων ὁ νῦν πάντων λυμένων, 3. 16 ἐν πάσαις ἑσπερολαῖς (al. ταῖς ἐπ.), J. 3 πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιομένου, 5 εἰδοταὶ ὑμᾶς πάντα (readings differ), 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀδεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ... καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν, 25 μόνον Θεοῦ δόξα πρὸ παντοῦ τοῦ αἰῶνοι καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

πατὴρ: 2 P. 1. 17 παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, 3. 4 οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, J. 1 τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαμένοις.

Παῦλος: 2 P. 3. 15 ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος.

περισσότερος: 2 P. 2. 9 εἰσεβεῖς ἐκ περισσοῦ ῥύεσθαι.

περὶ: (c. gen.) 2 P. 1. 12 ὑπομονήσκειν περὶ τούτων, 3. 16 λαλῶν περὶ τούτων. J. 3 περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν συνηρίας γράφαι, 9 διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσείου σώματος, 15 ἐλέγξαι περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν.

περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ: 1 P. 2. 6, p. xeviii.

περισσεύω: pp. 93 f.

περιφάσις: (ἐπιγνωσίας: pp. 172 f., 213.

Πέτρος: 2 P. 1. 1 Συμεών Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰ.Χ.

πηγὴ: 2 P. 2. 17 οὕτως εἰςν πηγαῖ ἀνύδρα.

πιστεύω: J. 5 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύοντας ἀπόλεσων.

πίστις: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῖς ισότιμων ἡμῶν λαχυσών πίστιν, 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, J. 3 ἐπαγωγήσατε τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθέλῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει, 20 ἐπικοινωνοῦντε τούτοις τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.

πλαύνω: 2 P. 2. 15 ἐπανήλθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαίμα.

πλανή: 2 P. 2. 18 ἐν πλάνη ἀναστρεφομένος, 3. 17 τῇ τῶν ἀδέσπρων πλάνη συναπαθήνετε, J. 11 τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ ΒαλαΪμ έξεχύθησαν.

πλάνη: 13 άστερες πλανήται (al. πλαγίατε).

πλαστός: 2 P. 2. 3 πλαστοὶ λόγους ὑμᾶς ἐμπροεύησαν.

πλεονάζω: 2 P. 1. 8 ταῦτα πλεονάζοντα ὑμᾶς ἀργοὺς καθιστήσαν.

πλεονέκτει: 2 P. 2. 3 ἐν πλεονεκτεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐμπροεύησαν, 2. 14 καρδίαν γεγοναμενίσθη πλεονεκτεῖ ἔχοντες.

πληθυνθεί: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεί, J. 2 ἔλεος ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεί.

πλουσίως: 2 P. 1. 11 πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγήθησα ὑμῖν ἡ έσόδος εἰς τὴν αἰῶνον βασιλείαν.

πνεύμα: 2 P. 1. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν, J. 19 ψυχικοῖ, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες, 20 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, p. xxiv.
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ποίεω: 2 P. 1. 10 βεβαιών ὑμᾶς τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν ποιεῖσθαι, ἵνα ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες, 1. 15 τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ὡς καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες. J. 3 πᾶσιν ἀποδέχεται, 15 ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, p. xlix.

ποιμαίνω: J. 12 ίαπτοὺς πομαίνοντες.

πόλεως: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεως Σιδώνων καὶ Γομίρρας, J. 7 αἰ τέρατα πόλεως.

πολέως: 2 P. 2. 2 πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσασιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀστείγεισι.

e. πορεύομαι: 2 P. 2. 10 τόσο ὅπερ σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μασμοῦ πορευόμενος, 3. 3 κατὰ τὰς ἔνδος ἑπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, J. 11 τῇ ὅδε τοῦ Καίν ἐπορεύθησαν, 16 κατὰ τὰς ἑπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, 18 κατὰ τὰς ἑκτὸς ἑπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσβεσίων.

b. d. ποταπός: 2 P. 3. 11 ποταπός δὲ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς.

ποτέ: 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταῖσθε ποτὲ, 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπων ἴνα ἄρᾳ προσφερέσθαι ποτὲ.

ποῦ: 2 P. 3. 4 τοῦ ἑστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; p. lii.

πρό: J. 25 μόνῳ Θεῷ ἔξυπνα πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ ἄινων.

προγνώςκω: 2 P. 3. 17 προγνώςκοντες φιλάσσοντες.

προγράφω: J. 4. 5 πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.

προεῖρηκαί: 2 P. 3. 2 μηνήσθαι τῶν προειρημένων ῥήματων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, J. 17 μηνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

πρόειρηκαί: J. 7. 11 πόλεις πρόκεινται δεῖγμα.

προσβλύσθην πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αὐτῶν ἄπωλειν.

προσδέχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ὑμᾶς.

προσδοκώντας τὴν παρουσίαν, 13 κανούν δὲ οὕρους προσδοκώντες.

προσέχει: 2 P. 3. 1. 19 ὡς καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.

πρόσωπον: J. 16 θαυμάζουσιν πρόσωπα.

προσφέρει: 2 P. 1. 20 πάσα προφητεία γραφής ἱδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 1. 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπων ἴνα κυριεύῃ προφητεία ποτὲ.

προσφέρεσθαι (al. προφητεύεσθαι) δὲ καὶ τούτου Ἐνάγνω.

προφήτης: 2 P. 2. 16 τῆς τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίας, 3. 2 μηνήσθην τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν.

β. δ. προφητικὸς: 2 P. 1. 19 καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον.

πρωτόσω: 2 P. 2. 20 γέγονεν αὐτῶσα τὰ ἐξαχτα χειρόν τῶν πρῶτων, 1. 20, 3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινομένος.

προτέως: 2 P. 1. 10 οὐ μὴ πταῖσθε ποτὲ.

πυροειρήτων τῶν προφητῶν, J. 17 μηνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.
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b. c. d. ροιεξηδήν: 2 P. 3. 10 οἱ ὀφανοὶ μοιχὸδον παρελεύσωνται.
ρύομαί: 2 P. 2. 7 δίκαιον Δωτ ἔρρύσατο (ἀλ. ἔρρυσατο), 2. 9 οἷς Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι.

e. σάρξ: 2 P. 2. 10 τοῖς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθύμῳ μιασμοῦ παρεπαινοῦν, 2. 18 διελεύσων ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ σαρκὸς ἀφελείᾳ τοὺς ὀλύμους ἀποψευγόντας, 1. 7 ἀπελθοῦσα ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, εἰς ἐννιαξάμοναι σῖκαρα μὲν μιανοῦν, κυρώτητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, 23 μισοῦσες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστιλαμβάνων χιτῶνα.
σειρᾶ, see σειρός and p. exciv.

c. d. σειρός (al. σειρός): 2 P. 2. 4 σειροῖς (al. σειραῖς) ζόφου ταρταρίωσες παράδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους.
ε. σκῆνωμα: 2 P. 1. 13 ἐφ’ ὅσαν εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, 14 ταχύνῃ ἐστίν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος μου, pp. cxx, cxxi.
κ η ρόσι: 2. 15 περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν (al. add. λάγων) δὲν ἐλάγχσαν. σκότος: 2 P. 2. 17 and 13. 10 ὁ δὲ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται. Σύνομα: 2 P. 2. 6 πόλεις Σωδόρων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας κατέκρενεν, 1. 7 Σώδομα καὶ Γομόρρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις πρόκειναι δείγμα.
σοφία: 2 P. 3. 15 κατὰ τὴν δοξεῖαν αὐτῶς σοφίαν.
σοφία: 2 P. 1. 16 σεποσμισµένος μῦθος ἐξακολουθήσατε.
σοφία: 2 P. 2. 15 κύστες Θεῶν (al. ὁμ. σοφοῦ).
πενθεύσατο: 2 P. 3. 12 στενοῦσαν τὴν παρουσίαν τής τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠμέρα.

b. d. σπίλοι: 2 P. 2. 13 σπίλοι καὶ μοῖροι ἑνρυφώντες εἰν ταῖς ἀπάταις (αλ. ἀγάπαις) αὐτῶν συνενχούμενοι ὑμῖν.
σπίλοι: 2 P. 2. 17 τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπυλωμένων χιτῶνα.
σπόνδασε: 2 P. 1. 10 σπονδάσατε βεβαιαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 15 σπονδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, 3. 14 σπονδάσατε ἀστικοὶ καὶ ἀμφιμνητὸς αὐτῶς εὐθυρήσαν.
σπόνδασε: 2 P. 1. 15 σπονδή πάσαν παρεισενέγκαντες, 3. 3 πᾶσαν σπονδήν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν.

b. c. d. τηρείμος: 2 P. 3. 17 φυλάσσοντες ἑνα μὴ ἐκπέπτετο τοῦ ἰδίου στρεβλοῦμα.
τηρείμος: 2 P. 1. 12 ἐστηριγμένοις ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθεία. τηρείμος: 2 P. 3. 10 στοιχεῖα κανοσούμενα λυθήσεται, 3. 12 στοιχεία κανοσούμενα τήκεται.

στὸμα: 1. 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπόρογκα.

στὸμα: 2 P. 3. 16 δυσνόητα τίνα ἀ ὁ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν.
στὸμα: 2 P. 3. 17 ύμείς οὐν, ἀγαθητοί, φυλάσσεσθε, 1. 7 ύμείς δὲ, ἀγαθητοί, μνημήθητε τῶν ῥημάτων, 20 ύμεῖς δὲ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐαυτοὶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τιρῆσατε, 2 P. 1. 5 ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, 1. 10 σπονδάσατε βεβαία ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν ποιεῖσθαι, 1. 19 ὥς οὖν ἡμέρα διαγάγῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 3. 1 διεγειρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῇ εἰλημμέρη διάνοια, 3. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς, 1. 12 οὔτοι εἰσὶν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες, 20 τῇ ἀγωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, 1. 8 ταῦτα ὑμῖν παράστα, 1. 11 ἐπιχορηγηθῇται ὑμῖν ἢ ἐσόδος, 1. 16 ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 2. 1 ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2. 13 συνελαφυμένοι ὑμῖν, 3. 1 δευτέραν
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γέμιν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, J. 2 ἔλεος, ἡμῖν πληθυνθείη, 3 γράφειν ἤμῖν, ὤδ. γράφοι ἡμῖν; 2 P. 1. 12 ἡμᾶς ἐπομενήσκειν, 1. 13, 15, 2. 3, 3. 8, 9, 11, J. 24. συν μβαινω: 2 P. 2. 22 συμβεβήκηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἄλλησθος παρομαία. Συν μβαινο: 2 P. 1. 1 Σύμεων (α. Σύμων) Πέτρος, pp. 180 f. ii. σὺν: 2 P. 1. 18 σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ ἄγως. σύν οὐκ αὐτῷ: 2 P. 3. 17 τίνι τῶν ἀδέσποτων πλάνη συναπαθέντες.


σύνεις τοι: 2 P. 3. 5 γη ἐξ ὦδατος καὶ δε ὄδατος συνεστώτα τῷ τού Θεοῦ λόγῳ.

σώ: 2 P. 1. 7 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Δυσύπτου σώστα, 23 οὐς μὲν ἔλεατε διακρινομένους οὐς δὲ σῶζετε.

σωματος: J. 9 περὶ τοῦ Μονογένος σώματος.

σωματος ἤμω: 2 P. 1. 1 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ.Χ., 1. 11 τὴν αἰωνίων βασίλειαν τῶν κυρίων καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ.Χ., 2. 20 ἐν ἐπηγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ.Χ., 3. 2 τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, 3. 18 αὔξάνετε ἐν γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, J. 25 μόνον Ἰηο σωτήρ ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰ.Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἦμων.

σωματος ἦμω: 2 P. 3. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἠγείρεθε, J. 5 πάειν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ἠμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἦμων σωτηρίας.

a. ταρταρώω: 2 P. 2. 4 σειροῖς ἢφοιντα ὁσμάσας παρέκπεκεν, pp. vi, lxii.

b. c. ταχίνος: 2 P. 1. 14 ταχίνη ἄστιν ἡ ἀπάθειας τοῦ σκορφύματος μου, 2. 1 ἐπάγωντες ἀνατολὴν τιμῇν ἀπόλειαν.

tē: J. 1. 6 ἄγγελοι σε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσασιν τὴν ἀειποίν ἄρχην . . . τετήρηκεν. tēknôn: 2 P. 2. 14 κατάρας τέκνα.

b. c. d. τεφρω: 2 P. 2. 6 τόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομώρρας τεφρώσα τατεκὼμεν, p. vii.

c. τήκω: 2 P. 3. 12 στοιχεῖα καντούμενα τήκεται.

τήρεω: 2 P. 2. 4 εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους (α. κολαζομένους τηρεῖν), 2. 9 ἄδικοις εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 2. 17 οἰς ἡ ζῴδος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται, 3. 7 οἱ δὲ τὴν ὁμόθλοι τετήρηκεν. 3. 7 οἱ δὲ τὴν ὁμόθλοι τετήρηκεν. 3. 18 οὗ τοῦ κρίσιν οἰς εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται, 21 ἐαντόν ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.

tiθηκα: 2 P. 2. 6 ὑπάρχειμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείς (α. ἀσεβεῖν) τεθεικα.

τιμή: 2 P. 1. 17 ἀβαίνης παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός τιμή καὶ δέξαν.

τίμωσι: 2 P. 1. 4 τὰ τίμωσα καὶ μεγίστα ὡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα (α. τὰ μεγίστα καὶ τίμωσα ὡμῖν ἔπαγγέλματα).

tis: 2 P. 2. 19 ὁ γάρ τις ἔθηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδουλώταται (α. ὡμός καὶ), 3. 9 ὡς τινες βραβεύτων ἡγούσανται . . . μὴ βοήθησας ταῖς ἀποδεσθάντας, 3. 16 ἐν αἷς ἔστιν δυνατόν τινα, J. 4 παρεισεδόθη σφήνα τινες ἀνθρωποι.

The interrogative τίς does not occur.


c. d. τολμᾶ: J. 2 P. 1. 17 τολμᾶται αὐθάδεις.
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c. d. φθυνοπορμόνος: J. 12 ἀνεν, ἔκδρα φθυνοπορμῶνα ἄκαρτα, pp. 55-59,
φθορά: 2 P. 1. 4 ἀποτροφύνετε τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, 2. 12
γεγενημένα φυσικά εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν... ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ
θαρσόσθεναι, 2. 19 δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, pp. 190, 176-9.
d. e. φ. χ. δ. ε. φ. ι.α: 2 P. 1. 7 (ἐπιχορηγήσατε) ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τῆς
φιλαδελφίας, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τῆς ἀγάπης.
φόβος: J. 23 οὐσὶ δὲ ἔλεατε ἐν φόβῳ.
φυλακτηρόσω: 2 P. 2. 5 ὁγόνοι Νόε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, 3. 17
φυλάσσεται ἵνα μὴ... ἐκπέσῃ τοῦ ἱδίου στηριγμοῦ, J. 24 τῷ
δυνάμενον φυλάζει ὑμᾶς ἀπαίτστους.
d. φυσικῶς: 2 P. 2. 12 ζῶα γεγενημένα φυσικά εἰς ἅλωσιν, p. viii.
c. d. φυσικῶς: J. 10 ὥστε δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἑπιστάνται.
φύσις: 2 P. 1. 4 ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως.
φωνή: 2 P. 1. 17 φωνὴς ἐνεχθέσθης αὐτῷ τοιαύτη ἐπὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλο-
πρεπούσης δόξης, 1. 18 ταύτῃ τῇ φωνής ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, 2. 16 ὑποζύγων
ἀφόνων ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ φωνῇ φθεγχάμενον, p. 1xi.
c. d. φωσφόρος: 2 P. 1. 19 ἔσις οὖν φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις
ὕμων.

χάρις: 2 P. 1. 2 χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 3. 18 αὐξάνετε ἐν
χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, J. 4 τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατι-
χάριν: J. 10 θαμμαζόντες πρόσωπα ὀφελίας χάριν.
χάρις: 2 P. 3. 8 μία ἡμέρᾳ παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτη καὶ χίλια ἐτη ὡς
ἡμέρα μία.
χάρις: J. 23 μισοῦντες καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπελομένων χιτῶνα.
χρόνος: 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` ἔσχατου χρόνου.
χρόνος: 2 P. 3. 9 πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρήσαται.

a. c. ψευδοδίδασκαλος: 2 P. 2. 1 ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσονται ψευδοδι-
δάσκαλοι.
b. ψευδοροφήτης: 2 P. 2. 1 ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοροφήτητι ἐν τῷ
λαῷ.
ψυχή: 2 P. 2. 8 ψυχῆν δικαίων ἀνόμων ἐργοὺς ἐβασάνιζεν, 2. 14 διελάξοντες
ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους.
c. e. ψυχικός: J. 19 οὕτω εἰςων ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἐχουτε, pp. xxiv,
ciixxxvii f.

ἀς: followed by substantive (a) 2 P. 1. 19, 2. 12, 3. 8, 3. 10, 3. 16, J. 7, 10;
followed by verb (β) 2 P. 2. 1, 3. 9; followed by participle
ὅ φιλία: J. 16 ὀφελίας χάριν.
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Abraham, Assumption of, 36
Adjectives in J. and 2 P. xli; in 1 P., xcv
Advent, Second, 209 f.
Adverbs, li, ci
Agapé, 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, clvii-clxvi, 73
Antecedent of relative, ambiguous, xli, xcv
Aorist Ind. answering to English Perfect in J. and 2 P. xliii; in 1 P., xcv f.; Aor. Imper. of urgency, xliii f., xcvii; Aor. Inf. of a momentary act, xliii f.; Aor. Part. expresses antecedence either temporal or logical, xlv-xlvi, used for Perf. Part., xlvii f., xcvii f.; Pres. and Aor. combined ὑποτεύχθη, 22; τιμήθη and τιμήσατε, xcv; Aor. and Perf. Part. combined xcvii
Apocalypse of Peter, resemblance to 2 P., cxxx-cxxiv
Apocryphal books used by early Christian writers, especially Jude, ciii foll. See under Enoch, Moses, Apocalypse of Peter, Testaments of the Patriarchs
Ark a symbol of the Church, vii, lxxxi-lxxxiii
Arnold, T., on the interpretation of prophecy, 196-198
Article, use of, in J. and 2 P., xxvi-xxxv; in 1 P., lxxxix, xc; omission of the article in poetry and prophecy, xxxiv, xxxv; art. with two nouns, xxxv, 27; wrongly inserted in text J. v. 5 (clxxxiv); in J. v. 12 (elxxxv); 2 P. 26 (excv)
Authenticity, see Evidence
Babylon a name for Rome with the early Christians, cxxxv
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, lxxxii-lxxxiii; sin after, vii, xii, xx, 30, 96, 97
Batiffol on the Agape, 200 f.
Bede, 28
Bengel, 33, 131
Bigg, ix, xvii, xxii, xxiv, xxvii, xlvii f., xcv, cii, 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 ψευδ-, 115; with ἑτέρος, see ἐπαγωγὴς, ἐπιγραφής; with παρά, lx; compound adverbs, 119
Conflagration, final, 154, 155, 158 foll., 207-209
Confusion between ἡμῖν and ὑμῖν, excvii, xcix f., excix, 87; between ἡ and εἰ, excvii
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 -ον from nouns in -ων, 137; in -ος from -ος, 147
Divine nature, 87; man's participation in, 190
Döllinger, xxi f.
INDEX OF SUBJECTS

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., lxi; in 1 P., cii
Enoch, contrasted with Noah vii; book of, ciii 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, exiv, exv; for 2 P., exvi-cxxiii; internal for Jude, exlii foll.; for 2 P. exxiv-cxxvii
Ewold, 29, 35
Excommunication, 70 f.

Faith, right and wrong ways of defending it, 70, 71
Feltoe, 118
Field, exci, 36, 64, 99, 107

Gender in J. and P. xl., in 1 P. xcm
Gospel of St. Mark alluded to, 194
Gow, 55
Grammar of Jude and 2 P. Introd. ch. ii, xxvi-lxiv
Gwynn, cxxxv foll.

Harnack, exiv, 67
Hare, Julius, 50
Hatch, 172
Hell, harrowing of, lxxxiii f.
Hellenism in 2 P., iii
Hendadys, liv
Heresies of the later part of the First Cont., exvii-cxxx
Hofmann, 25, 129, 132, 134
Horner, G., 1, clxxx, foll.
Hort, xxii, xxv, lxxxv, lxxv, xvii, cv, clxxxv, cxxiv; 20, 21, 25, 52, 139, 162, 167, 184, 187, 188
Hundhausen 88, 90, 94, 136, 140, 141, 159

Imperative, xliii f., xvii
Infinitive with art, xvii, rare in N.T., xlv; other uses, xliv f., xvii 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, clxvi-clxvi; use of apocryphal books, clxii-clxvi; his account of the Libertines, clxvii foll.; fondness for triplets, lvi f.; written to Jews, 20, fragment contained in Fayoum papyrus, cxxxvi; authenticity, cxv f.; date clxv

Kenyon, F. G., cxxvii, cxi
Knowledge of God, its effects, 183-7

Life, meaning of, 187-9
Lightfoot, Bp. 18, 24, 26, 34, 41, 52 n., 57 f., 85, 87, 117, 171 foll., 177, cxxvii, cxxxvii foll., clxxxii
Luther, 51

Mark, his connexion with Peter, lxviii; his Gospel alluded to in 2 P. 15, clxiv foll.
MSS., 1; errors caused by love of uniformity, 82, ὑεις and ὑεις confused, 87
Michael contending for the body of Moses, 74; story generalized in 2 P., ix
Miracles, 202
Moods, xliii f., xvii f.
Moral difficulties of the O.T., clxv
Moses, Assumption of, cxxvii
Moulton, J. H., Gr. of N.T., xxvi, xxxv f., xlii f., xliv, xvii f., li, lxxxix
Munro on damno c. abl. = καταστροφή καταργία, 124

Negative in J. and 2 P., 1 f.; in 1 P., 6, cii
Nestle, 83, 127, 128, 152, cxxix
Number in J. and 2 P., xxxix, xl; in 1 P. cxxii
Nicolaian heresy, 38, 39, cxxxvi f., clxxx

Ogdoad, vii, lvii, cxxvi, 192
Old Testament, allusions in 1 P. and 2 P. lxxxv-lxxxi

Optative rare in N.T., xliv, xvii

Participle sometimes used instead of finite verb, xlvi, xvii, see aorist
Paul, his letter cited in 2 P. 31, 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, cxxxvii foll.
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Peace caused by the knowledge of God, 183–187
Periphrasis, liii; ‘reverential,’ xvii f.
St. Peter, names by which he is known, 180; Life and character as seen in the N.T. cvi-cxiv; agree with 1 P. not with 2 P. cxi, cxiv f.; Chase and Zahn on his later life cxi foll.; his crucifixion, clxi
2 Peter, vagueness of, ix; love of iteration, lvii f.; criticisms on his style, lxi-lxvi; reference to a former epistle, xiii; its relation to 1 P., lxix-cxv; probable date, cxxvii; not addressed to the readers of 1 P., cxxv; addressed to a Graeco-Jewish church, cxxvi
1 Peter, influenced by the writings of St. Paul, xxiv, xxv; sense of rhythm, civ; full of reminiscences of Christ’s life and teachings, lxvi-lxx; Grammar and Style, lxxix-cxxv; allusions to O.T. lxxxv; ambiguity in, cv
Peter, Gospel of, lxxxiv
Philo, resemblances to 2 P. cxxix f.
Plummer, liii, ciii
Plummer, xxii, 161 f.
Pluvalme, 48
Plural of abstract nouns, 161
Prayer in the Holy Spirit, 78
Prepositions, excess of, in N.T., lxv, xcii
Pronouns in J. and 2 P., xi-xlvi; in 1 P. xciii-xlvi
Prophecy, 111–115; spoken of both in 1 P. and 2 P., lxxvii f., cxli; 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, cei f.
Reiteration in 2 P., liii; 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., lxxvii, 86
Robinson, A., 19, 26, 63, 74, 171 foll. 176, 179
Rome, church in, cxxviii foll.; Peter’s connexion with, cxi f.
Ryle, clix, clxvi.

Salutation, form of, 21; in 2 P. 182
Sanday, cxxxi
Satan, cxxi foll., 74–76
Seven, a mystic number, lii, 44, 192
Silvanus, cxxiv; in Rome, cxxvii, clxi
Simon Magus, clxxxvii f.
S., Soden, 94
‘Sons of God,’ how explained, clxviii foll.
Sorites or climax, 90 f.
Spirits in prison, lxxiii f.
Spitta, xxii f., clxxxiv, cxxiii, cxxiv, 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, xiv, cxvi
Superlatives joined with positive, 86, cxii

Taylor, C., 39
Tennent, clxi f.
Tenses, xlii f., xcv f.
Texts of the Patriarchs, clv, clxii
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, clxxxii
Trench, 57
Triplet a feature of J.’s style, lvi; found also in James, lvii

Vansittart, cxvii n.
Verb, inflexions, xxvi; moods and tenses, xlii f., xcv f.
Version revised, faults in, 93; versions, Syriac and Egyptian, clxvi
Virtues, Christian, list of, lvii, 90 f., 191; divine and human, 86
Vocabulary of 1 P. and 2 P. compared, lxix-lxxvi; 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, clxli f., clxxv, 20, 24, 25, 30, 39, 167, 168 f.
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