EXEGETICA.

VII.

"WITHOUT REPENTANCE."

Ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. xi. 29). A fresh example of the synonymous ἀμετανόητος in the sense of "irrevocable," as applied to a gift, is furnished by the contract of 291 A.D. published in "Oxyrhynchus Papyri," vol. ix. pp. 245 f., where the seller acknowledges that, in return for a fixed sum of money, "the land is bestowed upon you as a present (ὡς προσφερή [i.e. προσφοράν] and gift (χάριν) unchangeable and irrevocable (ἀναφέρετον καὶ ἁμετανόητον)."

VIII.

If all prophesy, and any one enters who is an unbeliever or uneducated, he is convicted by them all, condemned by them all; the secrets of his heart (τὰ κρυπτά τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ) are made manifest (1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25).

Epictetus, in describing the teaching of Musonius Rufus, the philosopher, says that "he used to talk in such a way that we who sat there imagined that somebody had given information to Rufus about every one of us; οὗτος ἡπτετο τῶν γινομένων, δυτῳ ἐφαρμῶν ἑτίθηε τὰ ἐκάστου κακά (Diss. iii. 23. 29).

IX.

"NOT ASHAMED."

The author of Hebrews uses this phrase (οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται) twice. (a) In ii. 11 he writes: For the sanctifier and the sanctified have all the same origin (ἐξ ἐνὸς πάντες); wherefore he is not ashamed to call them brothers. (b) In xi. 16, speaking of the patriarchs and the faith they evinced, he
therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he has actually prepared a city for them. What is in the writer's mind, as he develops the argument of the second chapter, is the notion, which was perhaps connected with a veneration for angels among his readers, that it was degrading for the Son of God to assume human nature. It is argued that Christ had far more in common with men than with angels. Men were "sons of God," to be conducted to glory, and Christ, as God's Son, therefore became man. The thought here is the motive for the incarnate and redeeming life of Jesus Christ. In (b) the thought resembles that of Mark xii. 26 f. God is not ashamed to be called the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they are dead. The reason is that their faith on earth is rewarded by the fellowship of the living God in heaven; He actually has prepared a city for them, and therefore has a right to be called their God. His present relation to them, with a reward in store for their faith, corresponds to that title. We might expect, from the counsels against being ashamed of God on earth, that the writer would develop the thought of God being proud of human faith and loyalty; but this does not seem to be prominent in the epistle.

The Epistles to the Seven Churches (Rev. ii.–iii.).

The structure and phraseology of these epistles may be compared with such a document as the letter or rescript of King Darius I. to a provincial governor, Gadatas, in Asia Minor.

\[\text{Ancient Greek text}\]

X.

This text is a transcription of the ancient Greek manuscript, which uses the script of the ancient Greek language. The transcription includes the Greek text with diacritical marks and other marks to indicate the pronunciation and meaning of the words. The text is a part of the Epistles to the Seven Churches and discusses the relationship between God and the people, as well as the relationship between God and the Son of God, Jesus Christ.
The inscription, which was found in 1886 in Magnesia on the Maeander, breaks off here. It is only a copy of the original, and if, as Kern conjectures, it belongs to the second century, it can hardly have been before the writer of the Apocalypse. But it is possible that Persian inscriptions of this kind were familiar to him in Asia Minor; the general cast and tone of such addresses was not a new thing.

Herr Gunnar Rudberg, in a recent article in *Eranos* (1911, pp. 170–179), therefore suggests that John’s letters to the seven churches were modelled consciously or unconsciously upon such edicts and epistles of the Persian monarchy. He calls attention to some parallels, none of which, however, is particularly decisive. Thus, the Darius letter begins with commendation, and then proceeds to censure; so do the majority of the apocalyptist’s letters. Again, he compares the μη μεταβαλομένων of the Darius-letter with the μη τεταρτάζων of Revelation ii. 16, and notes the interesting parallel of the τάδε λέγει in the address, a formal and solemn phrase, which often occurs at the opening of Oriental royal epistles (LXX and Josephus, passim).

XI.
“LIKE FROGS.”

In Revelation xvi. 13 f. the seer recounts how he saw the kings of the East summoned to the Armageddon of a supernatural conflict from across the Euphrates by three

---

1 Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia von Maeander*, 1900, pp. 102 f.
impure spirits like frogs, issuing from the mouth of the Dragon and from the mouth of the Beast and from the mouth of the false prophet; they are demon-spirits working miraculous signs, which go out to the kings of the universe, to muster them for the battle of the great Day of Almighty God . . . and they mustered them at the spot called in Hebrew Harmagedon. Nine years ago I called attention, in the Hibbert Journal, to a Zoroastrian basis for the detail of the frog-like spirits; frogs were detested by the pious Zoroastrian as the agents and creatures of Ahriman, the antagonist of the true God. Almost simultaneously F. Hrozny (in Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde d. Morgenlandes, 1903, 328) suggested a Babylonian origin for them in the legend of Istar's descent to the lower world, where Ea's messenger, sent to bid Ereshkigal release the goddess, is changed into a frog. The seer's reference to the Euphrates, he pointed out, corroborated the hypothesis of a Babylonian source for the vision, and in the Greek magical papyri the consort of Ereshkigal is named 'Τεσσαμεγάδων, which echoes the 'Αρμαγέδών of Revelation xvi. 16. The analogies between the Babylonian legend and the vision are not clear, however, as Professor Steinmetzer has shown (Biblische Zeitschrift, 1912, pp. 252–260), the single frog in the former is an envoy of help whereas the three frogs in the latter are agents of evil; besides, these three are not changed into frogs from their original shape. Finally, the suggested origin for the obscure Harmagedon is too far-fetched to be convincing. Professor Steinmetzer does not seem to be aware of the Zoroastrian parallel. But when it is correlated with the ancient idea, preserved by Artemidorus, that frogs symbolised ἄνδρας γούτας καὶ βωμολόχους, it absolves us from the need of falling back upon Babylonia for an explanation of this curious detail in the apocalyptic vision.

James Moffatt.