

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

not been adduced in favour of common authorship for the appendix to Mark and the *Dialogue of Jason and Papisclus* is that Celsus in 160 and Jerome in 375 both employ the two, Jerome in particular evincing, as Zahn justly argues, acquaintance with a longer and more original form of the text in Mark xvi. 14f. than any known to us. But few who have studied the problem of the *Dialogue* will be disposed to look in it for the source of the appendix. What we have now presented should suffice to prove that even if Ariston of Pella were proved to be its author the reasons are but slight for regarding Ariston of Pella or Papias' Ariston, or any other of the name, as author of Mark xvi. 9-20.

BENJ. W. BACON.

#### THE PROBLEM OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

THE object of this paper is to discuss the question whether the Second Epistle of St. John was written to a literal Mother and Children or whether it was addressed to some Church personified as a Mother with her Children.

These two opposing theories may for convenience be distinguished as the *literal* and the *figurative* hypotheses.

Opinion has been much divided on this question. Thus, without attempting to give an exhaustive list, Alford, together with the contributors in the *Speaker's Commentary* and in Ellicott's *Commentary*, support the literal hypothesis. On the other hand Meyer and Wordsworth are in favour of the figurative theory. The latter view was also taken by Lightfoot and Westcott. Thus Lightfoot wrote: "I take the view that the *κνρία* addressed in the 2nd Epistle of St. John is some Church personified, as indeed the whole tenor of the Epistle seems to imply." (*Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, p. 303 note.)

And again : "The Second Epistle of St. John presents a close parallel (to 1 Peter v. 13). A salutation is sent in the opening verse to the elect lady (ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ) : at the close is a message, 'the children of thine elect sister. (τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς) salute thee.' The intermediate language shows that we have here the personification of the Communities, etc. (Clement of Rome, vol. ii. p. 491)."

Westcott, while holding that "the problem of the address is insoluble with our present knowledge," thought that "the general tenor of the letter favours the opinion that it was sent to a community and not to one believer." (See his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, p. 224.)

*The word κυρία, 2 John 1.*

It is undeniable that the most obscure word in the Epistle has hitherto been the word κυρία in 2 John 1. Since the commentary of Westcott appeared light has been thrown upon the usage of this word from an unexpected quarter. In an article which appeared in the EXPOSITOR for March, 1901, Professor Rendel Harris showed that the Oxyrynchus Papyri furnish examples of an idiomatic use of κύριος in letters. Thus he quotes Papyrus No. cxii., which runs as follows :—χαίροις, κυρία μου Σερηνία, παρὰ Πετοσείριος. Πᾶν ποιήσον, κυρία, ἐξελθεῖν τῇ κ' τοῖς γενεθλίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δήλωσόν μοι ἢ πλοῖφ ἐξέρχει ἢ ὄνω ἵνα πεμφθῇ σοι ἀλλ' ὄρα μὴ ἀμελήσης, κυρία. ἔρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις. In this letter what is important to observe is not only that κυρία is used by itself, but that it is *joined with the proper name Σερηνία*.

Two more instances of a similar use of κύριος occur in Papyrus No. cxxiii. The opening words of the letter are κυρίῳ μου υἱῷ Διονυσοθέωνι ὁ πατὴρ χαίρειν. And the letter ends ἔρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις κύριε υἱέ. Here κύριος is joined with υἱός precisely as κυρία with Σερηνία in the first instance.

The evidence for the idiomatic use of *κύριος* in letters is not however limited to the Oxyrynchus Papyri. There is an idiomatic use in letters by Christian writers of the 3rd century A.D.

Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, towards the close of a letter to the Church of Antioch, writes as follows:—*ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν, κύριοί μου ἀδελφοί, τὰ γράμματα ἀπέστειλα διὰ Κλήμεντος τοῦ μακάριου πρεσβύτερου.* (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. p. 165.)

So Africanus, Bishop of Emmaus, begins a letter to Origen with the words:—*χαῖρε, κύριέ, μου καὶ υἱέ καὶ πάντα τιμιώτατε Ωρόγενες, παρὰ Ἀφρικανοῦ* (*Rel. Sac.* p. 225).

No comment is needed on the use of *κύριοι* in the first of these two instances. With regard to the second example it may be noticed that the *κύριε*, though separated from *Ωρόγενες* by the insertion of *υἱέ* and *τιμιώτατε*, may quite well belong to it.

Thus it may be regarded as established that *κύριος* could in letters be used idiomatically, joined with some such word as “son” or “brother” or with a proper name. It is at least possible therefore that we have in 2 John an instance of a similar use.

It may be remarked in passing that if this view be taken it must not be regarded as proved that the Epistle was “a real letter written to a real woman.”<sup>1</sup> It is quite conceivable that the writer used the idiom even on the hypothesis that the Epistle was sent to a Church. If a writer chose to think of a Church under the figure of a Mother with her Children, there is no reason why he should not use the terminology appropriate to a literal mother.

An objection, however, to taking *κυρία* in 2 John as an instance of the idiomatic Epistolary use, arises from the position of *κυρία*, which ought, in order to make the

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Rendel Harris in EXPOSITOR article.

parallel with the instances quoted above complete, to precede and not to follow *ἐκλεκτῇ*. This constitutes a rather serious difficulty, as such an Epistolary formula as that with which we are concerned would tend to become stereotyped.

On the whole, therefore, it seems better to regard *κυρία* in 2 John as a title of honour and respect added in apposition to *ἐκλεκτῇ*. That a woman is being addressed is shown by the gender of *ἐκλεκτῇ*, which can by itself signify "To an elect woman," while *κυρία* indicates that the person addressed is regarded with respect.

The use of *κύριος* and *κυρία* as titles of respect may be illustrated both from non-Christian and from Christian sources. Reference to the Corpus Inscr. Graecarum shows that *ὁ κύριος* was one of the titles applied to certain of the gods, and that in like manner *ἡ κυρία* was one of the titles applied along with other titles to certain goddesses.<sup>1</sup> There is, further, an instance in a Macedonian epitaph (quoted in Lightfoot's *Philippians*, p. 55, note), which runs:—*Εὐτύχης Στρατονίκη τῇ συμβίῳ καὶ κυρία μνείας χάριν*. This inscription is quoted by Lightfoot as an evidence of the "deferential language used by the husband speaking of the wife," and is by him connected with the prominence of women in Macedonia, which on other grounds seems probable.

For a similar use of *κύριος* in Christian writings, we may refer again to the letters of Alexander and Africanus. Thus Africanus, towards the close of the letter already quoted, writes, *τοὺς κυρίους μου πάντας προσαγόρευε* (*Rel. Sacr.* p. 228).

And Alexander, in a letter to Origen, of which a fragment remains, uses the word several times in speaking of those who had in former days befriended him: *πατέρας γὰρ ἴσμεν τοὺς μακαρίους τοὺς προοδεύσαντας, πρὸς οὓς μετολίγον*

<sup>1</sup> To ten gods (once to Kronos, 10 times to Hermes, etc.). To five goddesses (3 times to Artemis, 2 times to Isis, etc.). (C.I.G. index iii.)

ἐσόμεθα. Πάνταινὸν τὸν μακάριον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ κύριον καὶ τὸν ἱερὸν Κλήμεντα, κύριόν μου γενόμενον καὶ ὠφελήσαντα με καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερος τοιοῦτος. He also applies it to Origen himself, for the quotation ends: δι' ὧν σε ἐγνώρισα τὸν κατὰ πάντα ἄριστον καὶ κύριόν μου καὶ ἀδελφόν (*Rel. Sacr.* pp. 166, 167).

Of the instances quoted that which gives the closest parallel is the Macedonian inscription, in which *συμβίφ* answers to *ἐκλεκτῆ* and *κυρία* to *κυρία*, the distinctive title in each preceding the more general title.

*The Personification of a Community—The Old Testament.*

It is sometimes urged as an argument in favour of a literal hypothesis that it has the advantage of simplicity, whereas the figurative hypothesis is unnatural and fanciful. To this it must be answered that on the assumption that the writer was a Jew the personification of a Christian Community as a woman would present no difficulty. Even a slight acquaintance with the Prophetic writings of the Old Testament would render him familiar with this idea.

For in fact the personification of a Community is one of the most frequently recurring phenomena of Hebrew prophetic writing from the time of Amos onwards.<sup>1</sup>

We may distinguish two groups of passages:—

(1) In the first group the citizens are regarded collectively as the daughter of the City. Thus in Zephaniah iii. 14, "Sing, O daughter of Zion: shout, O Israel: be glad and rejoice with all thy heart, O daughter of Jerusalem."

Zechariah ii. 7: "Deliver thyself, O Zion that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon"; and in verse 10, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion." Again in ix. 9, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem."

<sup>1</sup> See Kirkpatrick's Amos (*Camb. Bible*, p. 176)—Driver's *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, p. 183.

Micah iv. 8: "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion. . . the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Amos v. 2: "The virgin of Israel is fallen; she shall no more rise." Jeremiah xiv. 17: "The virgin daughter of my people is broken"; xlv. 11, "Go up into Gilead and take balm, O virgin, the daughter of Egypt"; li. 33, "The daughter of Babylon is like a threshingfloor." Lamentations iv. 21: "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom (cf. verse 22). Isaiah xxxvii. 22: "The virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee . . . the daughter of Zion hath shaken her head at thee"; xlvii. 1, "Come down, O virgin daughter of Babylon . . . there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans." Cf. also Lamentations i. and ii. etc., etc.

We may add two passages from the Psalms, viz., ix. 14, "The daughter of Zion," and xlv. 12, "The daughter of Tyre."

(2) In the second group the city is personified as a mother with her children. See for instances the following passages:—Isaiah xlix. 21: "Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children?" li. 18, "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth"; liv. throughout especially verses 1, 6, 11, 13; lx. 1-5 ("Thy sons shall come from far and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side," verse 4). xlvii. 8, 9—of Babylon—"Therefore hear now this, thou . . . that sayest in thine heart, I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children. But these two things shall come to thee in a moment, the loss of children and widowhood."

To these passages may be added the following from Psalm cxxxvii. 8, 9: "O daughter of Babylon . . . happy shall he be that . . . taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."

From such passages as these it is clear that the personification of a community was "habitual with the prophets," and there is no reason to suppose that the writer of 2 John was oblivious of this.

The appearance of the figure in Baruch and 2 Esdras has an even more direct bearing on the question of what would have been 'natural.' In both these books Jerusalem is personified as a mother with her children; thus in 2 Esdras ii. 2, "the mother that bear them saith unto them, Go your way, ye children, for I am a widow and forsaken"; verse 15, "Mother, embrace thy children and bring them up with gladness . . . for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord." Compare Baruch iv. v., where the personification, as in 2 Esdras ii., is maintained throughout.

The adoption of the figure by these later writers would tend to familiarize the later Jews with the idea of the city being regarded as a person.

*Internal Evidence of 2 John points to a Community  
being addressed.*

Turning to the Second Epistle of St. John we observe that it exhibits certain phenomena which can only be explained on the supposition that a community is being addressed. (1) We observe that in the main part of the epistle, i.e., from verses 5 to 12, the writer uses the *plural*. Thus in verse 5 *νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία, οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινὴν, ἀλλὰ ἣν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους*. Here the force of *ἀγαπῶμεν* is made evident from the words which follow:—*καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὕτη ἡ ἐντολὴ ἐστὶ, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατήτε*. The use of the second person plural (*ἠκούσατε, περιπατήτε*) shows that in writing *ἀγαπῶμεν* the writer is urging not that there should be mutual love between himself and her

whom he addresses, but that there should be mutual love on the part of his readers among themselves ; i.e., he is *identifying himself with his readers*. We have a parallel in the First Epistle : *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους* (1 John iii. 11). So too in 1 John iii. 14, the writer uses the first person, though in verse 13 he had used the second person. The use of the plural in 2 John must therefore be regarded as beginning with the word *ἀγαπῶμεν* in verse 5. From this point it is used consistently down to the end of verse 12, i.e., to the end of the main part of the Epistle. (See, e.g., in verse 8, *βλέπετε. ἀπολέσητε, ἀπολάβητε* ; also *ὑμᾶς, λαμβάνετε* and *λέγετε* in verse 10, *ὑμῖν* and *ὑμῶν* in verse 12).

When, however, we come in verse 13 to the closing salutation we find that there is a sudden change to the *singular* (*ἀσπάζεται σε. . .*). (2) Further, it is noticeable that in verse 13 no salutation is sent from the elect sister herself, but *only from her children*.

Now these phenomena require explanation. On the literal hypothesis this explanation is very hard to give. On the figurative hypothesis all difficulty disappears. In the main part of the Epistle the figure is dropped, the members of the Church being addressed directly. The form which is given to the closing words is due to literary considerations and the figurative mode of expression is resumed. When the writer sends the greeting "the children of the elect sister salute thee," he is not excluding either the children from receiving the salutation in the one case nor the mother from sending it in the other. The variety of expression is simply a matter of literary style. We may refer in illustration to Baruch iv. 32, *δείλαια ἡ δεξαμένη τοὺς υἱοὺς σου*, where Babylon is figured as a woman who receives *the children* of another woman (i.e. Jerusalem). The following words, also from Baruch iv., show clearly that a community could be ad-

dressed alternately as a mother or as children:—τέκνα μακροθυμήσατε τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσαν ὑμῖν ὀργὴν, κατεδιώξέ σε ὁ ἐχθρὸς, καὶ ὄψει αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἐν τάχει, καὶ ἐπὶ τραχήλους αὐτῶν ἐπιβήσῃ (Baruch iv. 25).

Finally it may be regarded as agreeing well with the figurative hypothesis that in verse 4 of 2 John we have the writer saying, ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι εὔρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. It may be justly inferred from the phrase ἐκ τῶν τέκνων that the number of the children was considerable. Now it is of course quite conceivable that there should have been a large family of sons and daughters some of whom had proved faithful while others had apostatized. On the other hand, the form of expression does undoubtedly accord well with the idea of a Community figured as a family.

The internal evidence of the Epistle thus supports the hypothesis that St. John is here personifying communities.

*ἐκλεκτῇ and ἐκλεκτῆς.*

The use of the term *ἐκλεκτῇ* in verse 1 (cf. too *ἐκλεκτῆς* in verse 13) must next be investigated.

As used in the *Old Testament* Israel is specially thought of as a chosen nation. Thus in Jeremiah xxxiii. 24, "The two families whom the Lord hath *chosen*." So Ezekiel writes (xx. 5):—Thus saith the Lord God, "In the day that I *chose* Israel . . ."

In Deutero-Isaiah we meet with the idea frequently. See e.g. xli. 8: "But thou Israel, my servant Jacob, whom I have *chosen*." Isaiah xliii. 20: ". . . to give drink to my people, my *chosen*." The reason for the recurrence of this idea in this prophet is that he wished by insisting on the fact that Israel was a chosen people to bring fresh hope and courage to the desponding nation. "It is," writes Prof. A. B. Davidson, "part of the comfort which he is charged to address to the people. Israel . . ."

was dispersed among all peoples, itself no more a people, etc." (*Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 171).

In the *New Testament* the term "Elect" is applied to Christians. Thus St. Paul writing to the Colossians says, ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι σπλάγγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ (Col. iii. 12). The putting on of a heart of compassion, etc., is urged upon the Colossians on the ground that they are the elect of God, consecrated to Him and the objects of His love. Here the fact that the Colossians are "chosen" is made the ground of an appeal to cultivate the graces of the Christian character. All three terms ἐκλεκτοὶ, ἅγιοι and ἠγαπημένοι have been transferred from the Old Covenant to the New.<sup>1</sup>

The epithet "Elect" is also used by St. Peter in chap. i. 1, being applied to the Christians of the five provinces to whom he writes. Here the motive appears to be the same as that which actuated the writer of Deutero-Isaiah. Those addressed were, as the words *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς* show, regarded as scattered among the nations. When St. Peter addresses them as "elect" he puts before them the same comfort as that with which the prophet of the old covenant sought to cheer the literal Israel.

In 1 Peter v. 13 we meet with the word *συνεκλεκτή*. The fact that this word occurs in the closing salutation, and that *ἐκλεκτοῖς* has been used in the opening salutation, suggests that the two words are to be connected, and we conclude that in *συνεκλεκτή* as well as in *ἐκλεκτοῖς* there is a conscious reference to the terminology of the Old Covenant.

There is thus a strong probability that in the *ἐκλεκτῆ* and *ἐκλεκτῆς* of 2 John we have examples of terminology transferred and adapted from the Old Testament. And if this be so, we have additional support for the view that the writer was adapting the Old Testament figure of a mother and her children to describe a Christian Community.

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *Commentary on Colossians*, p. 219.

*The Meaning of ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή.*

The importance of the expression in 1 Peter v. 13, as bearing upon the present discussion, is obvious. Not only does it, as in 2 John, form part of a salutation; but it contains the very epithet ("elect") which is in question. If, therefore, we can throw any light on the meaning of the words in 1 Peter, it will be of material service to us in the solution of our problem.

Two preliminary points are important to note. *First*, it is clear that in a letter intended for circulation over a wide area particular care would be felt to be necessary in drawing up the opening address and the closing salutation.<sup>1</sup> *Secondly*, internal evidence justifies the conclusion that St. Peter in writing this Epistle had specially in mind the writings of the prophets. There are quotations from eight chapters of Isaiah—also quotations from Hosea, Jeremiah and Daniel.<sup>2</sup>

If with these considerations before us we recall what has already been shown, viz., that the Epistle is addressed to men who are styled "elect," "sojourners" and "of dispersion," and that the *συν* of *συνεκλεκτή* must be taken as referring to *ἐκλεκτοῖς*, we may not unreasonably surmise that in sending a greeting from "her who is in Babylon, elect together with them," St. Peter is consciously adopting the prophetic figure of speech according to which Israel is regarded as a woman taken into captivity into Babylon. Micah iv. 10 may be specially compared, where the prophet writes, "Be in pain . . . O daughter of Sion, like a woman in travail, for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou shalt dwell in the field, and thou shalt go even to Babylon." Cf. also Isaiah lii. 2:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Deissman on the literary character of the Epistle considered as a consequence of a wide circulation (*Bible Studies*, p. 51).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Westcott and Hort, Greek Test. (small ed. p. 607).

“Loose thyself, O captive daughter of Zion.” Cf. also Baruch iv. 32.

The adoption of the prophetic figure of a captive woman could not fail to be understood when read in connection with the *διασποράς* of i. 1. And if, as is probable on other grounds, St. Peter was writing from the capital of the empire, there would be a peculiar fitness in the reference to Babylon. At the same time the reference to Babylon would equally well suit any important city, and cannot be regarded as deciding the question that the Epistle was sent from Rome. Presumably the readers of the Epistle would know where St. Peter was at the time of writing, and would not require to be told. The expression is rather literary than literal. The objection that the personification of a Community would require the possession of a more vivid imagination than St. Peter had proceeds on a false assumption. The use of such a figure would on this hypothesis be the result not so much of the imagination as of familiarity with the prophetic modes of speech.

If then our interpretation of 1 Peter v. 13 be correct, the case for the figurative explanation of *ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία* in 2 John acquires additional strength. For it would then be possible to say that in personifying a Church, St. John was not striking out (so to say) an entirely new line, but was rather accommodating himself to a way of regarding a community which was peculiarly Jewish.

#### *Summary.*

To sum up the foregoing considerations (1) we started with the purely linguistic question of the meaning of *κυρία*, and found that there were grounds for regarding it as a title of respect placed in apposition to *ἐκλεκτῆ*. (2) We considered the objection that the figurative hypothesis is unnatural, and showed that when confronted

with the usage of the Prophets of the Old Testament this objection could not stand.

(3) We proceeded to a minute examination of the Epistle which we found to exhibit certain phenomena which were most simply explained by the assumption that the writer was dealing with communities.

(4) The associations of the term "elect" were discussed, and it was seen that these were those of the Old Testament—a fact which seemed to justify the inference drawn from the similarities between 2 John and the Old Testament Prophets.

Finally (5) the meaning of the ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή of 1 Peter v. 13 was subjected to an independent investigation with the result that we were led to the position that St. Peter is here personifying a community. It was accordingly submitted that we have a valuable corroboration of the figurative interpretation of the ἐκλεκτή of 2 John 1.

#### *Conclusion.*

From these considerations we arrive at the conclusion that on the whole the evidence is in favour of our regarding the Second Epistle of St. John as addressed not to an individual Christian matron, but to a Christian Church, personified—after the prophetic manner—as a Mother with her Children.

H. J. GIBBINS.

### *STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE OF JESUS."*

#### XIII. THE CAUSES OF OFFENCE.

(1) THE saying of the Fourth Evangelist, "He came unto His own home, and His own people received Him not" (John i. 11) expresses the tragedy and the mystery of the Advent of the Son of God among the chosen people of God. Although "God sent forth His Son when the fulness of