*CAMBRIDGE GREEK TESTAMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES*

GENERAL EDITOR: R. ST JOHN PARRY, B.D.,
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE

# THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER

AND

# THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF

# PETER

AND

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF

# JUDE

Edited by

MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, LITT.D.,
Provost of King's College, Cambridge

*WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES*

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1912

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

# PREFACE
# BY THE GENERAL EDITOR

THE General Editor does not hold himself responsible, except in the most general sense, for the statements, opinions, and interpretations contained in the several volumes of this Series. He believes that the value of the Introduction and the Commentary in each case is largely dependent on the Editor being free as to his treatment of the questions which arise, provided that that treatment is in harmony with the character and scope of the Series. He has therefore contented himself with offering criticisms, urging the consideration of alternative interpretations, and the like; and as a rule he has left the adoption of these suggestions to the discretion of the Editor.

The Greek Text adopted in this Series is that of Dr Westcott and Dr Hort with the omission of the marginal readings. For permission to use this Text the thanks of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press and of the General Editor are due to Messrs Macmillan & Co.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
*Oct.* 1912.

## PREFATORY NOTE

IN the Introduction and Notes to these Epistles I have derived a large amount of help from the work of Professor J. B. Mayor (*The Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter*, 1907), and also from that of the late Professor C. Bigg (in the *International Critical Commentary*, 1901), and also from the admirable articles by Dr Chase in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

I have thought it important, in view of the fact that the book will be used by schoolboys, to make the notes brief, and to be sparing in the number of references and illustrations.

It is not usual or desirable that in books such as the present one new and untried theories should be advanced: but I have ventured to make some suggestions as to the *Assumption of Moses* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*.

M. R. J.

*Oct.* 1912

# CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

The reading of most of the Epistles in the New Testament is a difficult task for young students. The subjects with which they deal are to a great extent abstract—things of the mind. Words such as justification, grace, glory, and even faith, convey no very clear idea to a beginner. A proper name or a bit of narrative is welcomed as a relief.

This is very natural. The real value of the Epistles can only emerge when more of life has been experienced : and yet it ought to be interesting at any period of life to know what were the thoughts of such men as Peter, Paul and John about the meaning of the facts which they spent their lives in telling to men all over their world. We shall be more apt to realize the living interest of the Epistles if we recollect that the men who wrote them were not trained from an early age to use a certain kind of language, but were for the most part making for themselves the vocabulary which they used.

The abstract words of which I spoke—grace, justification, and the rest—were not, as now, smooth stones from the brook, worn down by constant attrition, but were rather blocks freshly hewn from the quarry. By their first readers these letters were most anxiously looked for ; every word was of importance ; and they would determine the line of action and mould the daily life of a whole community. Moreover, on these documents, next to the reports of our Lord's own life and teaching, the foundation of the whole enormous structure of Christian theology has been raised. They have ruled the lines along which millions of Christian lives have moved. The Gospels are the most important

books in the world, and the Epistles are only less important than the Gospels. "Une espérance immense a traversé la terre." The Epistles are among the first books written to show what effect this hope ought to have upon the lives of ordinary men and women.

A beginner may perhaps have some notion of this: but I am sure that it will be good for him to remind himself of it, and to insist upon attaching some definite meaning to the words he reads. It is not to be expected that he will get as much out of them at an early stage of his career as will come in after years; but at least, in setting out upon the study of these writings, he should start with the conviction that the writer whose work he is to read had a very clear idea of what he meant: that his words were addressed to simple people; that the meaning of them can be attained in a measure by the simple as well as by the clever of our own days; and that it is well worth attaining.

## The Connexion between 2 Peter and Jude.

The Epistles before us (2 *Peter* and *Jude*) must be studied together. It has long been recognized that there is a close connexion between them. No one can read the second chapter of 2 *Peter* and the Epistle of Jude without seeing that the authors must have used a common source, or else that one of them has borrowed from the other.

An examination into this connexion is of primary importance: for the result of it must very materially affect our view of the value and authenticity of the two Epistles. We will therefore put this question at the head of our investigation, and will begin by placing side by side the words and passages in which the similarity is most strongly marked.

| 2 Peter ii. | Jude |
|---|---|
| 1. False teachers *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι.* | 4. Impious men stealing in: *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.* |
| 2. *ἀσέλγεια.* | 4. *ἀσέλγεια.* |

2 Peter ii.

3. οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.

4. God spared not the angels who sinned but imprisoned them εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους.

4. σειροῖς ζόφου.

6. Sodom and Gomorrha He destroyed, making them ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν.

10. τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.

11. Rash and heady, these men δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

12. οὗτοι δὲ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς...φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται.

13. σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (or ἀγάπαις) αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν.

15. καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ...δς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν.

17. οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι.

17. οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.

18. ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθέγγομενοι.

III. 1. ἀγαπητοί.

2. μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος.

3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.

Jude

4. οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα.

6. The angels who left their habitation εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας τετήρηκεν.

6. δεσμοῖς...ὑπὸ ζόφον.

7. Sodom and Gomorrha πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου.

7. (These cities) ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας.

8, 9. σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας.

10. οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

12. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι.

11. τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.

12. νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.

13. (ἀστέρες πλανῆται) οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.

16. καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.

17. Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

18. ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι.

There are, besides this central passage, other striking resemblances scattered through the text of the two Epistles. Thus

| 2 Peter | Jude |
|---|---|
| I. 12. Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, καίπερ εἰδότας. | 5. Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα. |
| I. 5. σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες. | 3. πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος. |
| III. 1, 14, 17. ἀγαπητοί. | 3, 17, 20. ἀγαπητοί. |
| III. 14. σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ. | 24. τῷ...δυναμένῳ...ὑμᾶς...στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους. |

## Explanation of the Connexion.

Now the connexion between the two Epistles will not be denied. How is it to be explained? As was mentioned above, there are three possibilities, viz.:

(*a*) 2 *Peter* and *Jude* were using a common source, written or oral.

(*b*) *Jude* borrowed from 2 *Peter*.

(*c*) 2 *Peter* borrowed from *Jude*[1].

With regard to (*a*). We may dismiss the idea that both writers used a single *oral* (or spoken) source. The resemblances of vocabulary are so minute that we could only entertain the notion by supposing that both writers heard the words spoken simultaneously—that both took notes of a discourse spoken in their presence.

It is a more plausible view that both used a single *written* source. But a great objection to this theory is the fact that if we take away from *Jude* the portions common to it and 2 *Peter*,

[1] The fourth possibility, namely that the passages in question are interpolations, is one which, though it has been seriously advanced, need not be considered at any length. An examination of the language of 2 *Peter* such as has been carried out by Professor Joseph Mayor shows quite clearly that the similarities between it and *Jude* extend over the whole Epistle and are not confined to the particular passage i. 1—iii. 2.

so little of the Epistle remains that one cannot see why it should have been written or preserved in preference to the source whence it was taken. Nor is it at all easy to imagine what the source can have been or by whom it was written. If it was so important that a great apostle and a venerated apostolic teacher both thought it worth while to borrow largely from it, how does it happen that the source itself has disappeared and left no trace of its existence?

The possibility remains that the prediction quoted in both Epistles (2 Peter iii. 3, Jude 17—18) of the coming of the mockers may have been drawn from a third source: but if it should appear that one writer did borrow from the other, then it is a simpler and more probable supposition that the prediction was part of the matter borrowed.

On the whole, then, we dismiss explanation (*a*) as improbable, and we are left to consider the other two possibilities that 2 *Peter* is indebted to *Jude*, or that *Jude* is indebted to 2 *Peter*.

Each of these views has found many supporters of ability and distinction. To myself it seems likely that a majority of those who have regarded *Jude* as the borrower have been influenced by the feeling that, if 2 *Peter* is the borrower, that Epistle can hardly be regarded as the genuine work of the Apostle, and that it would be a disastrous admission to allow that a work which could be called spurious had found its way into the New Testament. The feeling is natural enough: but it should not be allowed to influence us in the search for the truth. We shall see later on that great difficulties have been felt at various stages in the history of the Church with regard to the authenticity and canonicity of 2 *Peter*, on other grounds besides the possibility of its indebtedness to *Jude*.

But whatever may have been the attitude of those who approached the question, it does seem to me that the supporters of the priority of 2 *Peter* have failed to explain some of the principal difficulties which confront them. There is one passage at least in 2 *Peter* which appears to be almost certainly secondary in relation to the corresponding passage in *Jude*.

This is 2 *Peter* ii. 11 compared with *Jude* 9:

They quake not at glories, blaspheming, whereas angels, who are greater in strength and power, do not bring against them before the Lord (*various reading* from the Lord) a railing accusation.

and they blaspheme glories.

But Michael the archangel, when he was speaking with the devil in controversy about the body of Moses, did not presume to bring against him a railing accusation, but said "The Lord rebuke thee."

Both writers are here illustrating the attitude of certain false teachers with regard to dignities (whether angelic or earthly) by contrasting it with the conduct of Angels. But while in 2 *Peter* the illustration leaves us at a loss with regard to the incident referred to, the illustration in *Jude* is quite clear and definite.

It has been supposed that 2 *Peter* is referring to the *Book of Enoch*. Two passages have been suggested. In one, the four great Archangels bring to God the complaint of men about the oppressions of the Giants, and receive God's sentence against the Angels whose offspring the Giants were. The point of the illustration is that the Angels refer the complaint to God, instead of themselves dealing with the sinful Angels. This explanation requires the (probably true) reading *παρὰ* Κυρίῳ. In the other passage the Angels, called the Watchers, receive the judgment of God against the sinful Angels, and commission Enoch to announce it to the culprits. In other words, they shrink from announcing judgment to their fellows, but commit the task to a mortal. This interpretation requires us to read *παρὰ* Κυρίου.

It is possible that one or other of these explanations may be right: but it will not be denied that the allusion is a very obscure one. Nor does it seem applicable to the particular offence which is here reproved, that of *βλασφημία*, or evil-speaking.

As to *Jude*, on the other hand, no doubt exists as to the allusion. We have it on good and early evidence that it is taken from a book called the *Assumption of Moses* (of which more hereafter): and it is appropriate; for Satan had indeed

blasphemed Moses, calling him a murderer, and perhaps also God, calling Him a liar.

It is *possible*, to be sure, that Jude, writing with 2 *Peter* before him, and not taking the point of the allusion, substituted for it one which was clearer.

But I submit that by far the more natural view is that 2 *Peter* is here putting into more general terms, and thus obscuring, an allusion in *Jude* which the writer considered to be of doubtful authority.

The probability that this is the case is increased by another consideration. *Jude* seems pretty clearly to quote the *Assumption of Moses* in one or two other places in the Epistle. One of these quotations recurs in 2 *Peter* in a form a little more remote from the original (*Jude* 16 τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, 2 *Peter* ii. 18 ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι)[1]. This is intelligible if 2 *Peter* quotes it through the medium of *Jude*: it is very difficult to believe that the converse process took place, and that Jude, penetrating the obscure allusions in 2 *Peter*, referred back to the original source of them.

Another aspect of the question, from the point of view of general probability, leads us to the same result. Assuming the dependence of one Epistle upon the other, we can put the possibilities of priority and genuineness in all their forms, as :

(*a*) Both Epistles are genuine, and *Jude* borrows from 2 *Peter*.
(*b*) Both Epistles are genuine, and 2 *Peter* borrows from *Jude*.
(*c*) Both Epistles are spurious, and *Jude* is the borrower.
(*d*) Both Epistles are spurious, and 2 *Peter* is the borrower.
(*e*) 2 *Peter* only is genuine, and *Jude* is the borrower.
(*f*) 2 *Peter* only is genuine, and 2 *Peter* is the borrower (*i.e.* St Peter borrows from a spurious letter of Jude).
(*g*) *Jude* only is genuine, and *Jude* is the borrower.
(*h*) *Jude* only is genuine, and 2 *Peter* is the borrower.

(*a*), (*b*) are tenable suppositions. The difficulty of (*a*) is that (as was said above) so little is left of *Jude* after

[1] See further p. xlv.

the borrowings from 2 *Peter* have been removed, that it is difficult to account for its preservation.

(*b*) is tenable. Its ultimate reception or rejection must depend on other considerations.

(*c*), (*d*) are possible, but less likely than (*a*), (*b*). As to (*c*): if *Jude* be the borrower and also spurious, one cannot imagine how it came to be written. This difficulty is but slightly lessened by the adoption of (*d*).

(*e*) To this the same remark applies.

(*f*) Extremely unlikely. Under what circumstances could a spurious *Jude* be so introduced to St Peter as to gain credit with him?

(*g*) Again, it is most unlikely that a spurious letter of St Peter could gain credence from Jude.

(*h*) Tenable, and, like (*b*), depends for ultimate reception upon other considerations.

Yet again, looking at the matter from the point of view of general probability: in view of the brevity of *Jude*, and of its likeness to 2 *Peter*, it is very difficult to imagine why it should have been deemed worthy of preservation if it were later than 2 *Peter*. We must remember that many Epistles of Apostles and apostolic men have almost certainly been lost: from St Paul's extant letters we can divine the existence of important letters written by him to leading Churches, which we no longer have. *Jude* is not definitely addressed to any special Church, nor is there a tradition that any particular community held it in high estimation.

To put the matter quite shortly, it is very difficult to account for either the writing or the continued existence of *Jude* (a short work by a person of whom little is known), except on the supposition that it is a genuine work of the man whose name it bears. No such difficulty exists in the case of 2 *Peter*, which both contains more matter than *Jude*, and is current under a widely-known and honoured name. So far as the present argument goes, both Epistles *may* be genuine: *Jude* almost certainly *is*.

## 2 PETER.

### External Evidence.

We have seen reason for thinking that 2 *Peter* is later than *Jude*, and has borrowed from it. This state of things is consistent with a belief in the genuineness of 2 *Peter*. It is quite possible that the Apostle made use of the Epistle of Jude, whom he must have known and respected: and it would not be strange that he should make no acknowledgment of the borrowing. In older times Isaiah quoted a passage from Micah (Isa. ii. 1—4, Mic. iv. 1—3). Passages from earlier prophets are to be found in the later chapters of Jeremiah. The Gospel of St Mark is extensively used in Matthew and Luke. The idea of property as connected with an author's writings is not ancient, and was certainly not present to the minds of the New Testament writers. There is, in short, no difficulty and nothing derogatory in supposing that Peter borrowed from Jude without acknowledgment.

But, apart from the borrowing from *Jude*, is the genuineness of 2 *Peter* clearly established? The answer to this question must be in the negative. We will examine the history of the Epistle and its reception.

Complete collections of the early quotations and criticisms of the Epistle will be found in the commentaries of Professor Bigg and Professor Joseph Mayor (to mention the two most recent English editions). It will be sufficient to summarize their results here and to quote the most important.

The phrases which are quoted from the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Fathers (Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Melito, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenaeus, the Martyrdom of Polycarp), as indicating an acquaintance with 2 *Peter*, are wholly inconclusive. One expression which occurs in several of these writers as a quotation, Ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη (2 *P.* iii. 8), is a Jewish commonplace: something very like it is in Psalm xc. 4: "a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday."

There are two or three cases, on the other hand, where a reminiscence of the Epistle does seem probable.

In the Apology of Aristides (possibly as early as 129—130 A.D.) we have ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἥτις τοὺς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν. This may combine recollections of two passages, 2 *Peter* ii. 2 ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας and i. 11 ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν.

In the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (177—179 A.D.) preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 1) this sentence occurs (v. 1. 45): ὁ δὲ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς οὐκ ἀργὸς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος ἐγένετο. In 2 *Peter* i. 8 οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν. This is a marked resemblance. The same Epistle uses the word ἔξοδος to mean death, as does 2 *Peter* i. 15, and also has resemblances to the language of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, of which book more will be said.

Theophilus of Antioch († 183—185) has two phrases which recall 2 *Peter*: (1) ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν. 2 *Peter* i. 19 λόγον ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ. (2) οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι. 2 *Peter* i. 21 ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

Immediately after this date, in the writings of men who were younger contemporaries of Theophilus, we find quite clear evidence of the use of the Epistle. Thus we are distinctly told by Eusebius in the fourth century and by Photius in the ninth, that Clement of Alexandria (died about 213 A.D.) wrote notes upon *all* the Catholic Epistles in a lost work of his called the *Hypotyposes*, or *Outlines*.

We have a Latin version, made by Cassiodorus or Cassiodorius in the sixth century, of some notes by Clement on 1 *Peter*, 1, 2 *John* and *Jude*. Cassiodorius contradicts Eusebius and himself, saying that Clement had *not* commented on 2 *Peter*, 3 *John* or *Jude*. But his utterances are confused, and the testimony of Eusebius is to be preferred. One or two phrases in Clement's extant works recall 2 *Peter*, but there is no overt quotation in them.

Hippolytus of Rome, who may have died about 225 A.D., has

several expressions which come very close to the language of 2 *Peter*, *e.g.* (on Daniel iii. 22) *ᾧ γὰρ ἄν τις ὑποταγῇ τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται*, 2 *Peter* ii. 19 *ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ δεδούλωται.*

Origen, who died in 253, says of Peter that he left one Epistle, which is acknowledged, "and perhaps a second also: for there are doubts about it." The quotations from 2 *Peter* or allusions to it (about eight in all), which are found in Origen's works, all occur in works which are only preserved in a Latin version: and it is possible that these are due to the translator (Rufinus of Aquileia) and not to Origen himself. One phrase, however, which is characteristic of Origen's manner, and probably due to him, may be quoted. He is speaking (in his Homilies on Joshua) of the trumpet-blasts which preceded the fall of Jericho, and compares the utterances of the apostles to trumpets. "Peter, too," he says, "sounds aloud with the two trumpets of his Epistles."

Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, writing to Cyprian about the middle of the third century, makes unmistakable allusion to 2 *Peter*. So does Methodius of Patara in Lycia late in the same century.

The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, written about 324, is the source to which we go for a well-considered expression of the opinion of that day as to the reception and *status* of the various writings in the New Testament. He speaks of the two Epistles of Peter together, and after saying that the First is of acknowledged authority, and was used by the elders of old time in their writings, says: "That which is circulated as the second Epistle has been handed down to us as not canonical (*οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον*), but yet, since it has appeared useful to many, it has been held in estimation (*ἐσπουδάσθη*) along with the other Scriptures."

In another place, in classifying the Scriptures of the New Testament as acknowledged (*ὁμολογούμενα*), disputed (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*), and spurious (*νόθα*), he puts 2 *Peter* into the second class. "Of the books which are disputed, but yet well known to most (*γνωρίμων τοῖς πολλοῖς*) the Epistle of James is in circulation, that of Jude, and the Second Epistle of Peter."

Jerome, whose authority became paramount in the Western Church through his great work of translating the Bible into Latin, expresses no doubt as to the authenticity of the Epistle in the letter to Paulinus, which was throughout the Middle Ages used as a preface to the Latin Bible. But in a collection of short notices of Church writers usually known as *De viris illustribus* (much of which is borrowed from Eusebius) he says of Peter that "he wrote two Epistles which are called *Catholic*: of which the Second is denied by very many to be his, because of the disagreement (dissonantia) of its style with that of the First."

We need not prolong the list of testimonies drawn from the Fathers[1]; but a word must be said as to the ancient versions of the New Testament into other languages. It is important to notice that 2 *Peter* was not included in any Syriac version older than the Philoxenian, of the sixth century. Again, the present Latin text of the Epistle, as Dr Westcott points out, "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 renderings of words common to both." And he continues, "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 (*i.e.* 1 *Peter* and *Jude*) at once becomes unnatural."

One interesting bit of evidence pointing in the same direction has been deduced by Dr Chase from the great Vatican manuscript of the Greek Bible, written in the 4th century, and known as B. This venerable book, like other manuscripts, divides the various books of the Bible into chapters or sections, by means of numbers marked in the margin. Now in the Catholic Epistles there

[1] It may be well to mention quite shortly a number of important authorities of somewhat late date who express no doubt as to the Epistle and reckon it as Canonical:
Athanasius, *d.* 373 (Alexandria),
Cyril of Jerusalem, *d.* 386 (Palestine),
Gregory of Nazianzus, *d.* about 391 (Asia Minor),
Didymus, *d.* 394 (Alexandria),
The 3rd Council of Carthage, 397 (Africa),
Augustine, d. 430 (Africa).

are *two* such sets of chapter-numberings, one older than the other. "This twofold division is found in all the Catholic Epistles *except* 2 *Peter*," from which we conclude that the manuscript from which B was copied, and which furnished the *older* set of chapter-numbers, did not contain 2 *Peter*.

We must not altogether neglect the argument from silence. It is very noteworthy that some of the early Church-writers, of whom we have considerable remains, do not seem to have known the Epistle. Irenaeus is one of these: yet it must not be forgotten that the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons seems to quote 2 *Peter*, and that Irenaeus stood in close connexion with the author of this. Tertullian, many of whose works we possess, is another important instance. Yet here again some who lived in his time and in his country seem certainly to have known the *Apocalypse of Peter*, a writing which we are to consider in connexion with the Epistle; I mean the writers of the *Passion of St Perpetua* (about A.D. 203).

The Latin fragment called the Muratorian Canon, which expresses the views of some member of the Roman Church about 170 A.D. as to the authority of the N.T. books, has suffered from corruptions, and is difficult to understand in many places. The author of this appears certainly to mention the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and to omit the Second Epistle. Efforts have been made so to emend the text as to introduce a mention of 2 *Peter*: but I cannot think that they are either necessary or successful.

On the whole we may say that the *external* evidence (with which we have been dealing) shows that a very hesitating reception was accorded to 2 *Peter* by those writers of the early centuries who were best qualified to judge, and that it is weaker than can be produced in favour of any writing of similar importance in the N.T.

In later times, at the period of the Reformation, such men as Luther, Calvin and Grotius felt great doubts as to the authenticity of the Epistle. Grotius put forward the untenable conjecture that the author was Symeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, who is said to have been crucified in Trajan's time at the age of 120.

### Internal Evidence. Relation to 1 Peter.

We have now to consider the *internal* evidence afforded by 2 *Peter* as to its authenticity and genuineness. It will be useful among other things to enquire how far it resembles the First Epistle, which was of acknowledged authority, and also to examine certain likenesses to writings of later date which have been pointed out.

With regard to the First Epistle (1 *Peter*) we must bear in mind that St Peter's claim to be considered the author of this has also been contested.

For an investigation of the authenticity of 1 *Peter* this is not the place: I shall content myself with the statement that its position in comparison with that of 2 *Peter* is exceedingly strong. The question before us is whether 2 *Peter* so resembles it in style or in thought as to justify us in assigning both writings to the same author.

In considering the question of style I shall avail myself of the exhaustive examination so admirably carried out by Professor Joseph Mayor in pp. lxviii—cv of his edition of 2 *Peter and Jude*.

### Resemblances of Phrase and Vocabulary between 1 Peter and 2 Peter.

The salutation. 1 P. i. 2. 2 P. i. 2. *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*. (An imitator, be it noted, is by no means unlikely to copy exactly such accessories as this: or a salutation may be following a common form.)

2 *Peter* i. 3 *τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς διὰ δόξης*. Cf. 1 Peter i. 15, ii. 9, 21, iii. 9, v. 10, in all of which God's calling is spoken of.

2 *Peter* ii. 18 *ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις* (and ii. 2). 1 Peter iv. 3 *πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις*.

2 *Peter* i. 16 *ἐπόπται*. 1 Peter ii. 12 *ἐποπτεύοντες* (and iii. 2).

2 *Peter* iii. 14 *ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι*. 1 Peter i. 19 *ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος*.

2 *Peter* ii. 14 *ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας* (*v.l.* for *ἀκαταπάστους*). 1 *Peter* iv. 1 *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*.

Of a total of 100 words which are common to the two epistles there are very few which appear to constitute what can be called a striking resemblance. They are the following:

ἀναστροφή, twice in 2 *Peter*, six times in 1 Peter: five times elsewhere in N.T.

ἀπόθεσις, once in each epistle, nowhere else in N.T.

ἀρετή, thrice in 2 *Peter*, once (in the plural) in 1 Peter: once elsewhere in N.T.

ἀσέλγεια, thrice in 2 *Peter*, once in 1 Peter.

ἄσπιλος, once in each epistle: twice elsewhere in N.T.

### Differences.

*Words used in* 1 *Peter and not in* 2 *Peter.* These amount to 369, of which 59 occur only in 1 Peter and not elsewhere in N.T.

*Words used in* 2 *Peter and not in* 1 *Peter.* These are 230 in number, of which 56 do not occur elsewhere in N.T.

There is enough here to justify the assertion (current as we saw above in Jerome's day) that there is a *dissonantia* between the styles of the two epistles: that "at all events the Greek of the one is not by the same hand as the Greek of the other" (Mayor). But this is not conclusive. St Peter may have employed Silvanus (1 Peter v. 12) to write the First Epistle in Greek at his dictation; and may have employed another man as the vehicle of the Second. Are there, we must now ask, such differences or such similarities of *thought* as to help us to a conclusion?

For the answer to this question, again, Mayor's edition affords most valuable material.

Under the head of *resemblances* he points out three topics which are common to the two epistles: the Second Coming, the saving of Noah from the Flood, Prophecy.

As to the first: 2 *Peter* speaks of it mainly as the day of *judgment* and of destruction of the elements, and "seems to look forward to its being put off for an indefinite period." 1 *Peter* dwells on it as the time for the revelation of Jesus Christ, of reward of the faithful, of glory and rejoicing, though the judgment of the wicked is also mentioned.

As to the second: 2 *Peter* speaks of the Flood of water as

illustrative of the possibility of a coming destruction of the world by Fire: and again, as a punishment of the ungodly in the ancient world, when Noah—a preacher of righteousness—was saved. 1 *Peter* uses the deliverance of Noah as an illustration of baptism. Two similarities of language occur: both epistles speak of the μακροθυμία of God—1 *Peter* in connexion with the Flood, 2 *Peter* in connexion with the final Fire. Both use the words δι' ὕδατος—1 *Peter* of the saving of Noah, 2 *Peter* of the constitution of the present earth.

The third topic, Prophecy, is treated of in the following passages in the two epistles: 1 Peter i. 11, 2 Peter i. 21. It is not possible in this case to trace a marked resemblance or a marked discrepancy between the two writings. There is a touch of similarity between the statements of 1 *Peter* that it was revealed to the prophets ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτὰ ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν, and that of 2 Peter, οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, κ.τ.λ.

Under the head of *Differences* Mayor points out that, while 1 *Peter* is full of allusions to the words and acts of our Lord, 2 *Peter* has but very few such allusions. The following are all that can be collected under this head:

The allusion to the Transfiguration. i. 16.
The prophecy of Peter's own death. i. 14.
The creeping-in of false prophets. ii. 1. (Also in *Jude*.)
Denying the Lord. ii. 1. (Also in *Jude*.)
The last state worse than the first. ii. 20. (Matt. xii. 45.)
The day of the Lord as a thief in the night. iii. 10. (Matt. xxiv. 43.)

These are mostly utterances of judgment, and severe in tone. 1 *Peter* on the other hand dwells especially on love, faith, hope and joy as connected with the thought of Jesus Christ.

Again, when we turn to the O.T., 1 *Peter* is full of allusions and quotations. In 2 *Peter* only five passages are marked as quotations by Hort: to which Mayor adds nine or ten other allusions. This is a strong point.

It is worth while to quote Mayor's final conclusion (p. cv). "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."

### 2 Peter. Relation to other Writings. Josephus.

It was said above that suggestions had been made that 2 *Peter* showed obligations to certain writings of later date.

First among these is the *Antiquities* of Josephus (completed about A.D. 94). Dr Edwin Abbott has pointed out very marked resemblances, as he considers them, between the Preface to this work and 2 *Peter*, and again in Josephus' description of the last words of Moses (*Ant.* iv. 8. 2). The most striking of these are the use of the phrases : *μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες*,—*οἷς κακῶς ποιήσετε μὴ προσέχοντες*,—*ἀρετή* of the excellence of God: and the saying of Moses to the general effect that he leaves behind him laws for the people that they may not take to evil courses. We have also the words *τὴν μεγαλειότητα τοῦ θεοῦ*, *θεοῦ φύσις*, and a number of coincidences in the use of quite ordinary words and particles.

It is possible to make a rather imposing list out of the materials: but upon examination it will be found that very few of the examples are strong. They do not include the most characteristic features of the Petrine vocabulary, and they are not evidence of borrowing *ideas*. It would be possible, moreover, to construct a very similar list of 2 *Peter's* coincidences with the language of Philo[1]: and in the Preface to the *Antiquities* Josephus is himself under an obligation to Philo.

The true view of the resemblances probably is that they are to be reckoned as belonging to the ordinary literary Greek of the time, and not as evidence of use of the works of one writer by the other[2].

[1] *e.g.* in the case of *ἀρετή* used of God.

[2] The phraseology of an inscription of about A.D. 22 (a decree of the town of Stratonicea in Caria) cited by Dr Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 360) shows similar resemblances to the language of 2 *Peter* (*e.g.* *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεσθαι*, *τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετάς*).

### The Apocalypse of Peter.

There is another writing under the name of St Peter which shows undoubted resemblances in language to 2 *Peter*, but whose spuriousness is universally acknowledged. This is the *Revelation* or *Apocalypse of Peter*. It does not exist in its entirety: there are a few quotations from it in early ecclesiastical writers, and there is also a considerable fragment in Greek, which was discovered in Egypt in 1886—7, and published in 1892 along with portions of the *Book of Enoch* and of the *Gospel of Peter*[1].

The book is very frequently spoken of by ancient writers and enjoyed a high reputation. The Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons has probably derived some expressions from it. So, quite certainly, has the Passion of Perpetua. Clement of Alexandria wrote comments upon it: the Muratorian Canon mentions it (adding that "some of our number refuse to have it read in church"), but, as we saw, does not speak of 2 *Peter* at all. Methodius (who does quote 2 *Peter*) quotes the *Apocalypse* as a "divinely inspired writing." Macarius Magnes (probably in the fourth century) quotes it, but not as authoritative. In the time of Sozomen (a fifth-century ecclesiastical historian) it was still read once a year in some churches in Palestine. Eusebius classes it among the spurious writings.

It was a short book, equal in length to the Epistle to the Galatians, and it is evident from the quotations that the chief subjects treated in it were the state of souls, especially sinful souls, in the next world, and the final judgment. The fragment we possess begins with the closing words of what is most likely a prediction of our Lord's about the end of the world. Then we find the Twelve with our Lord, upon a mountain. They ask Him to show them one of the righteous who have departed out of the world. Two men appear in a glorified form and great beauty, which is described in very glowing terms. Next, Peter is shown the abode of the blessed, and thereafter the place of

[1] There are many editions, *e.g.* Robinson and James, Cambridge, 1892; Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, 1901. On a recent discovery of another text see the Additional Note, p. lvii.

torment, to which the greater part of the fragment is devoted. The punishment of various classes of sinners is described, and the principle enunciated that the torment corresponds to the sin.

The book draws its materials, to some extent, from Greek sources. Those who were initiated into the Orphic mysteries were taught to believe in punishments and rewards allotted very much on the lines which are laid down in this *Apocalypse*. In this lies the explanation of what has been noted in the *Apocalypse*, namely, that there are similarities between it and the Sixth Aeneid. The truth is that in that book Virgil also is employing Orphic literature.

The influence of the *Book of Wisdom* is also, to me, very perceptible in the *Apocalypse*.

The following phrases and passages in the *Apocalypse* show marked similarity with 2 *Peter*.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 1. | πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφῆται | 2 Pet. ii. 1. |
| | δόγματα ποικίλα τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν | „ „ |
| | τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας. | ii. 8 (ψυχὴν δικαίαν... ἐβασάνιζεν). |
| | ὁ θεὸς...κρινεῖ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας. | ii. 3 (οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ). |
| § 2. | The Apostles go εἰς τὸ ὄρος | i. 18. |
| | ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου | ἔξοδον i. 15. |
| | ποταποί εἰσι | iii. 11. |
| § 6. | I saw ἕτερον τόπον αὐχμηρὸν πάνυ | i. 19. |
| | κολαζόμενοι | ii. 9. |
| | οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης<br>οἱ ἀφέντες τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ | ii. 2, 15, 21. |
| | ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ θεοῦ | ii. 21, iii. 2. |
| § 8. | βόρβορος § 15. ἐκυλίοντο | ii. 22. |
| | Fragment in Macarius Magnes | |
| | The heaven and earth are to be judged | iii. 10, 12. |

The principle of 2 *Peter* ii. 19 ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ δεδούλωται (which is itself perhaps derived from *Wisdom* xi. 16, xii. 2, 27, xvi. 1, 2) underlies a great part of the *Apocalypse*.

In view of these passages it has been held that the two writings come from the same hand, or that one is under an obligation to the other. To me it seems safest to class them together as works composed in the same circle but not necessarily by the same author, and as perhaps containing expansions of teaching which tradition—possibly trustworthy—had handed down as coming from the Apostle.

### Other indications of Late Date.

The result of our investigations so far has been to suggest that 2 *Peter* is not a genuine work of the Apostle. It is unlike 1 *Peter* (whose claims to be regarded as genuine are strong), it borrows from *Jude*, it resembles another undoubtedly spurious Petrine work. In addition to this its reception in early times was by no means general: strong doubts were felt about it in the 3rd and 4th centuries.

Other indications which confirm the idea of its late date are

(*a*) The allusion to the Epistles of Paul (iii. 15, 16). First, the definite mention of the writings of one N.T. author by another is unique, and, in itself, rather suspicious. Paul and Luke mention writings of their own (and Luke speaks of others unnamed who have drawn up narratives of the life of Christ): but the reference here, partly commendatory, partly warning, is of a different kind. It points, moreover, to a time when Paul's Epistles were collected and read by Christians; and it is difficult to resist the feeling that the words ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς do place the Epistles on a level with Scripture. Is this a state of things easily conceivable before 64 A.D., the probable date of St Peter's martyrdom?

(*b*) Again, take the words of the mockers (iii. 4) who say "Where is the promise of His coming? for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation." These words surely point to a time when the first generation of Christian witnesses had passed away. It is possible, of course, to regard the passage as referring to the more ancient prophets: yet this is not satisfactory. It is more natural to look upon it as the expression of the thought of the actual

writer—a man living after the date of the apostles and eye-witnesses of Christ. A further indication of the same kind is given in the words τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν (iii. 2), which *may* include the writer, but, again, are more naturally interpreted as drawing a distinction between the writer and the Apostles. If this is the case, we must admit that the writer was inconsistent with himself: see the notes on i. 1—3.

(*c*) The reference in i. 14 to our Lord's prophecy of St Peter's death is most naturally explained (on the assumption that the Epistle is not by St Peter) by a reference to the Gospel of St John (xxi. 18). But if he is referring to the written Gospel we must place him after 100 A.D.[1]

(*d*) The description of this Epistle as "the Second" written by the author gives to me the same impression as does the reference to Paul: namely that the First Epistle had been long current and was of recognized authority. But there is nothing in this that can be described as a *proof* of late date, and it must be remembered that certain critics of distinction (*e.g.* Dr Zahn) take the view that the "first epistle" here mentioned was not our 1 *Peter*, but a lost letter addressed to the church (whatever that was) to which 2 *Peter* was written.

(*e*) In i. 15 the writer speaks of a further work which he proposes to put forth, the effect of which will be to keep alive in the minds of his hearers, after his death, the remembrance of his teaching. Some have thought that the work here referred to is the Gospel of Mark, which, according to a probably true tradition, contains the teaching of St Peter. In that case we should here have another reference to a N.T. book, and another suspicious feature in a writing which we already regard with more than suspicion. But we must also allow for the possibility that by the promised writing we are to understand the *Apocalypse* which told of the παρουσία of Christ (cf. i. 16) or even the *Preaching of Peter* (see below): for I think we must exclude the *Gospel of Peter*, which seems to have nothing in common with 2 *Peter*.

(*f*) The reference to the Transfiguration (i. 17, 18) is yet

[1] For another possible explanation of the allusion see the notes *in loc.*

another instance of overt confirmation of other N.T. literature; precious if occurring in a work of unquestioned authority, but operating unfavourably in this case.

### Date. Other Writings attributed to St Peter.

On the whole Professor Mayor inclines to place the date of 2 *Peter* somewhere in the second quarter of the second century, *i.e.* between 125 and 150 A.D. To myself it seems that this may be slightly too late, and that the first quarter (100—125) is a very possible date. In assigning this earlier date I am influenced by the consideration of the other Apocryphal writings connected with St Peter's name: the *Apocalypse*, the *Preaching*, the *Gospel*, and the *Acts*[1].

The *Apocalypse* we have already examined and have seen that its language shows strong likenesses to 2 *Peter*. We have to consider next the book called the *Preaching* (Κήρυγμα) *of Peter*. Of this we have important fragments quoted by Clement of Alexandria: in the principal passage the religions of the Greeks, the Egyptians, the Jews, and the Christians are described and contrasted. Now, it seems fairly clear that the Apology of Aristides is indebted to the *Preaching*: the Apology has been dated at 129—130 or 140. In it we have also found (p. xviii) what seems a clear reference to 2 *Peter*. I do not think it is possible to trace resemblances between the language of 2 *Peter* and of the *Preaching*. Yet the following may be cited.

*Preaching*. The Greeks by worshipping creatures as gods ἀχαριστοῦσι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τούτων ἀρνούμενοι αὐτὸν εἶναι. 2 *Peter* ii. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. And also there is an emphatic reference to the prophetic scriptures as foretelling the circumstances of our Lord's life. Cf. 2 *Peter* i. 19.

The *Preaching* does not seem to have been in any way a heretical work. Its origin has been with probability assigned to Egypt, on the ground of the references to Egyptian idol-worship, with which the writer seems to have been familiar.

[1] The fragments of the *Apocalypse*, *Preaching*, and *Gospel* may be consulted in Preuschen's *Antilegomena*, 1901; the Acts in Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apocrypha* I.

The *Apocalypse* has likewise been assigned to Egypt. The mixture of Jewish and Greek ideas which it displays was certainly to be found there in great vigour.

The *Gospel* of Peter is of a different complexion. It was probably written about 150 A.D., and seems certainly to have used all our four Gospels. It is characterised (in the fragment which we possess of it) by a violent hatred of the Jews, and also by a wish to show that the sufferings of our Lord in His Passion were only apparent: in other words, that His human body was not really a body like ours, but only a seeming one: in yet other, and technical, language, the author held the *Docetic* view of the Incarnation. This doctrinal tendency caused an orthodox bishop (Serapion of Antioch, A.D. 190—203) to denounce and condemn the book as heretical. Here again no important resemblance of thought or language to 2 *Peter* can be found. It is likely enough that the *Gospel* was written in Syria.

Lastly the *Acts of Peter*. There are apocryphal Acts of Peter current in profusion, in many languages and of many dates: but those with which we are here concerned exist partly in Latin and partly in Greek (and Coptic), and were written perhaps as late as 200 A.D. (but as I think somewhat earlier) by a person who, though he may not have left the Church, clearly held the Docetic view of our Lord's person. In this book there is an account of the Transfiguration which evidently echoes the language of 2 *Peter* (in the words "Dominus noster volens me maiestatem suam videre in monte sancto," cap. xx). We have in it also the story of a prophecy by our Lord of St Peter's crucifixion,—altogether different from that in John xxi.—which was *possibly* suggested by the language of 2 *Peter*. These *Acts* are the latest of the writings which we are considering.

It seems to me that these Petrine apocrypha fall into two groups. The earlier consists of the *Apocalypse* and *the Preaching* (and 2 *Peter*), which may have been written in Egypt in the first quarter of the second century: the later of the *Gospel*, followed at some interval by the *Acts*, which may both come from Asia Minor. Of these the *Apocalypse* and 2 *Peter* are most closely allied, while the *Preaching* is used in 130 or so by a man

(Aristides) who also knew 2 *Peter*. The *Gospel*, whether by accident or not, shows no trace of 2 *Peter*; but the *Acts* do. They, however, were written at a time when 2 *Peter* was certainly current.

I have referred above to the possibility that the earlier group of Petrine apocrypha may contain true reminiscences of the Apostle's teaching. This may be especially true of the *Preaching*, but it is also to be kept in mind with regard to the *Epistle* and the *Apocalypse*. We have not, at the date which I assign to these writings, reached the epoch of the active production of Christian apocrypha, and the earliest of such pure inventions as we do possess differ from the Petrine group in that they are "tendency-writings," composed for the purpose of inculcating some peculiar form of doctrine. There is then the possibility that some fragments of genuine Petrine matter may be contained in all three of these writings.

### Can 2 Peter be called a Forgery?

But the question remains: Is not the writer of 2 *Peter* guilty of forgery in issuing a document under St Peter's name which St Peter did not write? It is quite certain that such a proceeding, if carried out in our time, could not be qualified by any other name. But in the second century the situation was a very different one. We must consider the habits of the time. There are in existence a large number of writings belonging to the years immediately preceding the composition of 2 *Peter*, which are fathered upon Jewish patriarchs and prophets or upon pagan seers. What was the intention of their real authors with regard to them? and how were they regarded by their readers? Take, for instance, the Apocalypses which were written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem: those of Ezra (2 Esdras in our Apocrypha) and Baruch. Their ostensible authors are men who lived at the time of the other great catastrophe of the Holy City, under Nebuchadnezzar, and they try to explain the causes of the present troubles of Israel and hold out prospects of a future re-establishment of the polity and of happiness in another world. They are meant to come to the oppressed people like a cheering

strain of music out of the distance, or the beloved and familiar voice of one no longer seen, bringing the message which that voice would have spoken in life. They are no more meant to deceive than is an ancient folk-tale that tells of the perils and ultimate triumph of a hero: and to such tales they may fairly be likened, except that they have a more serious purpose and a more sacred form. But just as the children who hear the fairy tale believe it, and as it passes into the daily dramas of their games, so but few decades passed before these Apocalypses were put on a plane which their writers had not intended them to occupy, and were ranked with the ancient scriptures, which they were only designed to recall and interpret. This result shows the mischievous nature of the device innocently adopted by the Apocalyptic writers. There was danger inherent in it.

As soon as the Christian Church began to regard certain of its early representatives in the same light as the patriarchs and prophets of Israel, and to look upon their writings as "Scripture," the possibility of using their names as the names of Jewish heroes had been used came into existence, and along with it came the danger inherent in the device. At first, as I have suggested, the non-authentic writings that were fathered upon the Apostles were such as may have embodied real reminiscences of their teaching. But very soon the device was employed with the mischievous purpose of gaining credence for special forms of doctrine for which insufficient support was to be found in the older scriptures. It is in these circumstances that we are justified in applying the name of forgery to apocryphal writings.

Applying these considerations to 2 *Peter*, I think of it as the work of a man who was confronted with a special crisis. Two forms of false teaching were current in his circle: one that of the Libertines, the other that of the deniers of the Second Coming. There was need that the members of his church should be reminded of the teaching of the first preachers of the word upon these points. Those preachers had predicted the coming of false teachers, and had inculcated the uncertainty of the time of the Second Coming, on the authority of our Lord Himself. To meet the danger of the Libertine teaching he borrows and expands the words of an

Apostolic writer (Jude) who himself refers back to the Apostles: to meet the other error he quotes, it may be, real words of St Peter or else an ancient writing in the prophetic manner: and he puts the whole of his warning into the form of a letter from St Peter, feeling that he is taking the attitude which St Peter himself would have taken, and, perhaps, knowing that he is to a great extent using words which were handed down to him as St Peter's own.

If there were an element of conscious deceit connected with the writing, it must have lain principally in the manner in which the Epistle was introduced to the Church. If it was produced as a new discovery, or if a romance was invented to explain its having been previously unknown, then we cannot wholly acquit the writer. But if the document were recognized by those to whom it was read as a crystallizing of oral apostolic teaching put forward to meet a particular difficulty, we shall be still able, even if we dislike the device which the writer adopted, to think of him as a man of sincere purpose and not as a designing impostor.

### Contents of the Epistle.

The contents of the Epistle, shortly summarized, are as follows:

i. 1. Greeting to the sharers of the writer's faith.

2—4. The knowledge of God, who has called you, makes it possible for you to attain the highest life and partake of the Divine nature and escape the corruption of the world.

5—7. Let your belief in God lead you to cultivate certain virtues, culminating in Love.

8. This process will make your knowledge of God and Christ of practical and operative value.

9—11. Neglect of it induces blindness of the soul. Beware of this and make your calling a reality. This will lead you into Life.

12—15. It will be my care to remind you of this as long as I live (which will not be long), and to provide you after my death with the means of remembering.

16—19. My teaching to you was not based on delusion but on my personal experience, for I witnessed the Lord's glory. And that sight made me the surer of the value of the prophets.

You rightly value their guidance in the dark interval which precedes the full day.

20, 21. Remember that prophecy is not a matter of private interpretation, any more than, when first uttered, it came at the will of those who uttered it.

ii. 1—3. But, besides true prophets, there were false prophets in Israel, and so there will be among you. Their immoral life will bring discredit on the Christian name. But they will not remain unpunished.

4—9. God did not spare the angels who sinned by lust, nor the men before the Flood (who also sinned by lust), nor the cities of the Plain. Yet in these instances punishment was not indiscriminate. Noah and his family were saved from the Flood, and Lot from Sodom. Both of them had protested against the wickedness around them. So we see that it is in God's power and is His practice to destroy the wicked and deliver the good.

10, 11. The false teachers are very bold and high spoken, and make light of the leaders of the Church, but they will come by a fall.

12—16. They give themselves up to animal enjoyment and will die the death of brutes. They make the assemblies for worship the means of dissipation, and of pecuniary gain for themselves, reminding us of Balaam.

17—19. Unproductive of any good, they do actual harm, especially to those newly turned from paganism, and this under the specious name of Christian freedom, whereas they are really slaves to their vices.

20—22. The pity is that they ever became Christians at all. They have lost all the reality of the Christian life, and their end is worse than their beginning.

iii. 1, 2. This is the second letter I have written to you: both are meant to keep alive in your minds the messages of the prophets and apostles which you have heard.

3, 4. And especially remember that they warned you of men of loose life, who should rise up among you and should deride the idea of our Lord's return to judgment.

5—7. They forget that the world is created subject to change.

There was a great catastrophe in the old time when the whole race of men was wiped out by a flood of water, and we believe that another is to come when fire will be the instrument of destruction.

8, 9. And as to the delay of the Second Coming. Time has no place with God. A thousand years are nothing to Him. He is waiting in order to give all men a chance of repentance.

10—13. Nevertheless He *will* come when He is least expected: and should not that thought lead you to prepare yourselves for His coming, in your life-walk? you must be righteous if you are to inhabit a kingdom of righteousness.

14—16. Try then to keep a clear conscience before God, and think of Him as the God who waits patiently to ensure your salvation. That is the teaching of my brother Paul in his letter to you; and in his other letters he has much to say on these topics, which must be studied with care, since, like the other scriptures, they have put wrong ideas into the minds of ill-informed readers, who are not grounded in the faith.

17—18. *You* are forewarned: keep to your principles and grow in the knowledge of Christ: to whom be glory.

## THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

### The Author, Date, and Destination.

The author of the Epistle of Jude describes himself in his opening words as a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James. By this James it is usually held that we are to understand James the Brother of the Lord, author of the Epistle and first Bishop of Jerusalem, who, according to the story preserved by the early Church historian Hegesippus, ended his life a martyr, having been precipitated from a pinnacle of the Temple shortly before the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. This Jude or Judas will therefore be identical with the person mentioned in Matt. xiii. 55 as a Brother of Jesus. He is the last in the list there given, "James and Joses and Simon and Judas," and last but one in Mark vi. 3. The controversy that has been waged over the meaning of the words "Brother of the Lord" need not occupy us

here. It has been held that they were (*a*) sons of Joseph by a former marriage, and so older than Jesus ; (*b*) sons of Joseph and Mary, younger than Jesus ; (*c*) not really brothers at all but cousins. We gather from 1 Cor. ix. 5 that more than one of them was married[1].

As to the life of Judas or Jude, the Brother of the Lord, we know absolutely nothing. But there is a story, told by Hegesippus and preserved by Eusebius, about two of his grandsons. Domitian had ordered all descendants of David to be put to death. These men were therefore informed against by certain heretics, as being of the seed of David and of the kindred of the Christ. They were brought before Domitian, who, like Herod, had heard of the "coming" of Christ, and was afraid that it implied a political disturbance. The men confessed their descent from David, and being further questioned, stated that they owned between them property to the value of 9000 denarii invested in land, which they cultivated themselves ; and showed their horny hands as a proof. Asked concerning the kingdom of Christ, they said that it was not temporal or terrestrial, but would come at the end of the world when Christ should return to judge the quick and dead, and reward every man according to his works. Domitian discharged them unharmed, and revoked his edict against the Davidic clan.

The two men became bishops of churches, and survived till the time of Trajan. Eusebius does not give their names, but in another source they appear as Zoker and James : and it is probable that this additional detail is derived from Hegesippus.

If Jude's grandsons were alive in Trajan's reign, what do we gather as to Jude's own date ? Mayor gives the following estimate, on the hypothesis that Jude was younger than our Lord.

Jude may have been born in 10 A.D., may have had sons before 35 A.D., and grandsons before 60 A.D. In the first year of Domitian (81 A.D.) he would have been 71. If the Epistle was written in 80 A.D. he would have been 70 and his grandsons

[1] For a full discussion see Lightfoot's *Galatians*, 252 sqq., and Mayor on the Epistle of St James, v. sqq.

about 20. There is nothing in the story to indicate at what time in Domitian's reign the interview took place.

If Jude was older than our Lord and was born shortly before 6 B.C., and if his Epistle was written between 75 and 80, he would be an old man (85 or so) but not incredibly old: his grandsons would be over 40 when brought before Domitian.

As to Jude's position in the Christian community, and as to the special Church to which his Epistle is addressed, we are quite in the dark. Two points only emerge. Jude writes as one whose word will command respect: and he is known—at least by name, but probably more familiarly—to his readers. In v. 3 he speaks of having already contemplated writing to them in more general terms about the Christian hope, when the sudden appearance of false teachers among them compelled him to write at once, and to meet the special crisis, the Epistle which we have. We may naturally deduce from his words that the contemplated writing would have been something in the nature of a pastoral Epistle.

We may place the community to which he writes very much where we please: Dr Chase's conjecture that it was at or near the Syrian Antioch is as good as any. There is no reason for confining our view to Palestine.

## External Evidence.

The external evidence for the Epistle of Jude may be given at less length than that which concerns 2 *Peter*. We have seen reason for thinking that 2 *Peter* copies *Jude*, and that 2 *Peter* may be assigned to the first quarter of the second century. It is therefore an early witness to the existence of, and to the respect felt for, *Jude*.

In the *Teaching of the Apostles* or *Didachē*, a second-century (?) document, there is a probable allusion to *Jude* 22: *Did.* ii. 7 *οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ δὲ ὧν προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις.*

The Epistle of Polycarp and Martyrdom of Polycarp (155 A.D.) give the same form of greeting as *Jude* 2 *ἔλεος (ὑμῖν) καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.*

The Muratorian Fragment of about 170 A.D. says: "Epistola sane Iudae et superscripti Iohannis duae in catholicis habentur."

There are quotations with and without specification of source in the *Paedagogus* and *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, and also comments (from the *Hypotyposes*, in a Latin version) on the text. Tertullian names the Epistle. Theophilus of Antioch and Athenagoras (cir. 180) probably allude to passages in it.

Origen mentions it with commendation: and in another place with the words "if anyone should accept the Epistle," words which point to doubts being entertained of its authority.

Eusebius classes it with *James* as controverted but well-known and recognized: and elsewhere as not mentioned by many old writers, but yet as having been publicly used in the churches. It exists in the Old Latin but not in the Syriac (Peshitto) version.

The opposition to it indicated in the words of Origen and of Eusebius seems to have been due to its use of apocryphal writings. This, at least, is the reason definitely given by Jerome. The nature of the objection shows that it arose in an age when criticism had begun, and therefore not in the very earliest times. We may fairly think of it as having been most vigorous in the great Antiochene school, where Christian scholarship was strongest, and may couple this idea with the fact of the exclusion of the Epistle from the Syriac version.

## Contents.

The contents of the Epistle may be shortly summarized thus:

1, 2. Greeting. Mercy, peace, love to you.

3. I was engaged in writing to you generally about our common salvation when circumstances compelled me to desist from this and write at once urging you to stand fast to your faith.

4. For I hear that false teachers have made their appearance among you, men whose final destiny was long ago foreseen (by Enoch): whose teaching amounts to a perversion of grace into lust and a denial of their Redeemer.

5—7. I warn you against following them. Remember that Israel, redeemed (as you have been) from Egypt, perished in the wilderness. (This applies to their fate and yours if you follow them.) Then again, remember the punishment of the angels who (like these teachers) were guilty of backsliding: and that of the cities of the Plain who were ruined (like these) through lust.

8—11. Besides their other evil courses these men have no respect for authority, celestial or human; they are highly abusive. How different from Michael the chief angel, who did not rail against even the fallen angel, but appealed to God. These men, I say, are abusive, and also brutally ignorant. They recall the angry disobedience of Cain, the covetousness of Balaam, the rebelliousness of Korah.

12, 13. Greedy and unproductive, they are men who might have been useful had they kept within bounds; but they have strayed hopelessly from the path.

14—16. Their end was foreseen (as I said) by Enoch the primeval seer: speakers of hard things he called them, and so they are.

17—19. You see that this crisis was not unforeseen. Besides Enoch, the Apostles predicted the coming of such men. They are the "separators" you have read of, and though they arrogate to themselves the name of "spiritual" they are just the reverse.

20—23. Follow them not: keep your faith as it was taught to you: pray: keep in communion with God: look to Jesus Christ. Do your best to save those who have joined or are likely to join the false teachers: but there is danger in the contact with them: be alive to that.

24, 25. And so to Him who is able to preserve you from all such danger be glory.

## Apocryphal Writings quoted by Jude. The Assumption of Moses.

Two Jewish apocryphal writings, the *Assumption or Ascension of Moses* and the *Book of Enoch*, are indisputably quoted by Jude: a fact which, as we have seen, operated unfavourably with some

upon the reception of his Epistle. Something shall be said here as to the nature and contents of both these books.

But with regard to the difficulty which has been felt by many as to the use of apocryphal books by New Testament writers, it may be remarked that it is less a matter for surprise that they should be quoted at all than that they should be quoted so seldom; and, further, that in all probability if we possessed the Jewish apocryphal literature in a more complete state than we do, we should recognize the existence of a good many more allusions to it than we now can. It is clear, for instance, that portions of the imagery of the Revelation of St John are derived from the *Book of Enoch*, and that St Paul was acquainted with, and alludes to, more than one apocryphal book. The mention of Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. iii. 8) may be due to such a book: the same *Assumption of Moses* which Jude quotes seems to be cited in Gal. iii. 19. And the allusion to the "Rock which followed" Israel in the wilderness is at least derived from Jewish legend. Again, the influence of the *Wisdom of Solomon* is clearly perceptible in *James* and in *Hebrews*, and it is probable that *Enoch* is quoted in 1 *Peter* as well as in *Jude*. In the Christian writings which stand next in date to the N.T. (*e.g.* the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement) the use of apocryphal writings is conspicuous. A long process of criticism was needed before the claim of these books to an authority resembling that of the O.T. was finally set aside, and the ill effects of using them recognized. The men of the first century had no such means as we now possess of judging whether a writing presented to them as ancient, and enjoying the respect of large circles, really deserved that respect or not.

We need not then think it derogatory to the good sense of Jude or to the worth of his Epistle that he should have made use of books which were valued in his day and which he had been brought up to regard with reverence.

His first plain allusion to the *Assumption of Moses* is in the well-known 9th verse—a passage which has probably excited more curiosity than any other in the minds of his readers. It runs thus:

"But Michael the archangel when he was speaking with the Devil in controversy (*or* when, contending with the Devil, he was speaking) about the body of Moses, did not presume to bring against him a railing accusation, but said *The Lord rebuke thee.*"

Now that this illustration *is* drawn from the *Assumption of Moses* is expressly attested by several writers of early date who knew that book, namely Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymus. Quotations from the same book are made by the first two of these three writers, and by others of later date.

The name of the book occurs in several lists of apocryphal writings, together with a statement of its length, which shows it to have been of the same length as the Revelation of St John.

In 1861 a large fragment of an old Latin version of it was discovered in a palimpsest manuscript at Milan by Ceriani, the celebrated Librarian of the Ambrosian Library. This fragment which may contain the first third, or rather more, of the whole book, gives us the means of judging of its date and character: and a recent editor, Dr R. H. Charles[1], considers it to have been written between A.D. 7 and 29, by a member of the Pharisaic party in Palestine, who wished to urge upon his fellow-believers the adoption of a policy of quietude and patience, as opposed to that spirit of national self-assertion and rebellion against Rome, which ultimately led to the destruction of Jerusalem.

The portion of the book which we have in a continuous form unhappily does not contain the episode quoted by Jude. The contents of it, shortly summarized, are these:

In the 120th year of Moses and 2500th year of the world Moses calls Joshua to him and gives him the charge over the people, seeing that his own death is at hand. Joshua is to take into his keeping the books (probably the Pentateuch) which Moses will give him. Then a long prophecy of the course of Israel's history is given by Moses, bringing it down to the times of Herod the Great, and the domination of the Sadducean party. Thereafter (at a time which is really in the future as regards the actual writer of the book) a terrible tyrant—a sort of Antichrist—is to come and persecute the faithful, and, after this, the final

[1] *The Assumption of Moses*, 1897.

judgment of Israel's enemies and their deliverance is to take place.

Upon hearing this and the announcement of Moses' approaching death Joshua is overwhelmed with grief, falls at Moses' feet, and utters a lament over the departure of his master, and his own unfitness to succeed him. Moses raises him up, sets him in his own seat, and comforts him by an assurance of God's faithfulness and the continuance of His care for Israel, whom He will never forsake. And here the fragment ends.

The rest of the story of the book as known to Jude has to be pieced together from various short quotations made by church writers.

It must be remembered that in the long fragment the scene is laid, not on the mountain where Moses died, but in the camp. There is reason for thinking that in the book Joshua next accompanied Moses to the mountain, and Moses saw the land of promise. Then Joshua returned to announce the death of Moses to the people, and to summon Caleb. The people from below saw a cloud of light surrounding and covering the place where Moses was. Michael with other angels came to receive his soul, and bury his body. It is probable that just before the moment of death Moses held a dialogue with God, in which he refused to allow his soul to be separated from his body, like that of other men, by the angel of death, and that God eventually kissed him, and at the kiss his soul left the body (this at least is a constant feature of the story in rabbinic tradition).

At this point, perhaps—certainly after the moment of the death of Moses—we may place the contest between Michael and Samael or Satan. Michael and his angels were preparing to bury Moses, when Samael appeared and said that the body was his, because he, Samael, was the Lord of matter. Michael withstood him with the words "For of His Holy Spirit all we were created," and again "From the face of God His Spirit went forth and the world came into being." In other words Samael is *not* the Lord of matter: all things were created by God. And probably it was in connexion with this that Michael charged Samael with having done his best to mar that creation: for we are told that he

accused the devil of having inspired the serpent to become the means of Adam and Eve's transgression.

But Samael had another accusation in reserve. Moses, he said, was not deserving of burial at all: he was a murderer, for he had slain the Egyptian (see Exod. ii.). This blasphemy doubtless kindled the wrath of Michael, but he restrained himself, and instead of retorting that Samael was a murderer from the beginning, he said, "The Lord rebuke thee, O slanderer (διάβολε)," in the words of the angel in Zech. iii.[1]

It is most likely that at this reply Samael fled in confusion. We gather that his object in trying to obtain possession of the body of Moses was that the Israelites might be induced to make a god of it and worship it.

After the flight of Samael the angels proceeded with their task. It seems that Joshua and Caleb may have been witnesses of the dispute, as they certainly were of the concluding scene. They were now borne up by the Spirit into the air and saw a marvellous sight: Moses appeared in two forms. One (the soul) was being carried up by angels into Heaven; the other—the body—was being buried in a rocky gorge, also by the hands of angels. Of these two witnesses, one, Caleb, was unable, owing to his more earth-bound character, to see so clearly or so much as Joshua, but descended to earth sooner. Joshua, however, remained until all was accomplished, and upon his return to the camp described all that had passed to the people. One detail of the story was that so pure was the body of Moses that the angels contracted no ceremonial uncleanness from contact with it, and needed not to purify themselves.

It is not beyond hope that some further light may be thrown upon the course of this very interesting story by future researchers. In the mean time the above must stand as the best and fullest reconstruction I am able to provide.

[1] One authority tells us that Satan "also said that God had been guilty of deceit, in bringing Moses into the land which He had sworn that he should not enter." It is not clear that this is taken from the *Assumption*. It would supply good ground for an accusation of blasphemy on the part of Michael: but the words κρίσιν βλασφημίας do not (probably) mean more than a railing accusation.

But the verse which has served as our text so far is not the only allusion in *Jude* to the *Assumption of Moses*. In *v.* 16, immediately after the express quotation from the *Book of Enoch*, we read, "These are murmurers, *grumblers*, walking after their own lusts, and *their mouth speaketh great swelling words, respecting persons for the sake of profit.*" The clauses which I have italicized have been thought (and, as it seems to me, quite rightly) to be quotations from the *Assumption*. In the Latin fragment we have a prediction of the domination of a set of men (pretty certainly the Sadducees) whose vices are described at some length (Chapter VII.). It is said (VII. 7) that they will be *querulosi*, which corresponds to Jude's μεμψίμοιροι, and in VII. 9 *os eorum loquetur ingentia* cf. Jude, τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα. And earlier in the book (v. 5), where a similar class of wicked rulers is being prophesied, it is said of them *erunt mirantes personas cupiditatum* (perhaps *locupletum* or *nobilitatum*) *et acceptiones munerum* (Jude θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν).

Further (and this point has not, I think, been noticed before) in *Jude* 19 we have the words Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες (rendered "These are they that make invidious distinctions," Mayor). In the verse of the *Assumption* quoted above (VII. 7) the word *querulosi* is immediately preceded by *exterminatores*, which has usually been taken as meaning "destroyers," but which, I think, is probably a too-literal rendering into Latin of the same Greek word ἀποδιορίζοντες that is used by Jude; or at the least, of a word of similar sense.

## The Book of Enoch.

The other apocryphal book which is certainly quoted by Jude is the *Book of Enoch*. My account of this may be shorter, inasmuch as the book is extant in a complete form, and accounts and editions of it are accessible without much difficulty[1].

The Book of Enoch as we have it (and apparently as Jude also had it) is a book of considerable length, made up of portions belonging to various dates,—from about 160 B.C. to a time not

[1] *e.g.* R. H. Charles's edition, 1893.

later than the Christian era. We possess it in an Ethiopic version (made from Greek and this, again, from Hebrew), and also a portion of the text in Greek, discovered in 1886—7 in Egypt; besides smaller fragments in Greek and Latin. Its contents are very various. At the beginning is an account of the sin of the angels who mingled with the daughters of men and begat the race of giants: of how Enoch was commissioned to denounce to them their guilt and its punishment: of how he was conducted by angels over the universe, and was translated. In other sections of the book there are disquisitions on the movements of the heavenly bodies, visions of the history of Israel, parables, the story of the birth of Noah, and prophecies of various kinds. The influence of the book is perceptible in several parts of the N.T., and not least in the Revelation of St John.

This very interesting writing or collection of writings is known as the *Book of Enoch, par excellence*; there is another important Revelation of Enoch (usually called the *Secrets of Enoch*) which exists only in Old Slavonic: and there is a third very much later *Vision* in Armenian. But the older *Book of Enoch* was long regarded with great veneration in the Christian Church: and indeed has, both in itself, and because of the use made of it by Christian writers, a strong claim on our respect.

The use made by Jude of *Enoch* is considerable in proportion to the length of his Epistle. Most obvious is the quotation in *v.* 15: "To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." The Greek of this, as it appears in the Egyptian MS., is as follows: *En.* i. 9 *ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν τοῖς (ταῖς) μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων <τῶν> ἔργων αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς*, which differs from *Jude*, but has in common therewith the words I have underlined. The Ethiopic, as translated by Dr Charles, reads: "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."

The clause *περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ* is not from *En.* i., but, as it seems, from xxvii. 2 *περὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σκληρὰ λαλήσουσιν.*

The introductory phrase of Jude, "Enoch the seventh from Adam," occurs in *En.* lx. 8 "My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam."

No less certain, though less obvious, is the use made of *Enoch* in *v.* 6 "And the angels which kept not their own dignity but left their proper dwelling-place hath He reserved unto the judgment of the great day in eternal chains under darkness."

The story of these angels, who came to earth and mingled with the daughters of men, occupies a large place in the early chapters of *Enoch*, and besides the general allusion, *Jude* is the debtor to *Enoch* for some phrases: *En.* xii. 4 speaks of the angels "who have abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place": in x. 5 are the words, "Cover him (*i.e.*, Azazel, one of the principal offenders among the angels) with darkness, and let him dwell there for ever": x. 12 "Bind them...until the day of their judgment": xxii. 11 "unto the great day of judgment." And in liv. 3 sqq. the immense chains prepared for the hosts of Azazel are shown to Enoch.

Passing over other less striking resemblances to *Enoch* (which will be recorded in the notes on the text of the Epistle) we have a third clear instance of quotation in *v.* 13, "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." *Ἀστέρες πλανῆται*, be it noted, in this verse, does not mean planets in our sense of the word, but stars which have deserted their appointed orbits. Compare *En.* xviii. 14, where Enoch is shown "the prison of the stars and the powers of heaven; and the stars that are rolling in the fire are those which have transgressed the precept of the Lord in the beginning of their rising, for they went not forth in their season, and He was wroth with them and bound them until the season of the accomplishment of their sin,

ten thousand years." And xxi. 2 sqq., "I beheld...a place of disorder (ἀκατασκεύαστον) and terrible...and there I saw seven stars of the heaven bound....These are those of the stars of heaven which transgressed the command of the Lord, and were bound here until they fulfil ten thousand years." In later chapters (lxxx., lxxxvi., lxxxviii., xc.) are allusions to the sin and punishment of stars (which, however, here represent the sinful angels): they are bound in an abyss which is narrow, deep, horrible and dark.

It may be remarked that this bringing together within the limits of a short Epistle of so many passages from different parts of *Enoch* argues that Jude must have known the book very intimately and regarded it with great veneration.

### The False Teachers of 2 Peter and Jude.

One of the sayings anciently attributed to our Lord, but not recorded in the Gospels, is "There shall be schisms and heresies." Whether He uttered the words or not, they are almost a commonplace in the writings of the Apostles, and especially in those of Paul. There were, indeed, bound to be differences and divisions so soon as a new outlook upon life was opened up to the world at large. Men of all races and classes were being invited to become members of a single community: that community had only the most rudimentary organization, and was constantly being confronted with questions to answer and moral problems to solve. The moment that one of its answers or decisions was rejected or disputed, schism or heresy began. These two words, familiarized to us by the Litany, are invested with a mysterious and sinister atmosphere. We are tempted when we hear them to imagine men who take a demoniac pleasure in devising evil doctrines and misleading the simple. In truth, there were schismatics and heretics who seceded from the Church from motives of ambition or with a view to sensual enjoyment; but there were also many who acted from honest conviction. Of the latter kind were some of those whom we hear of in the New Testament; I am thinking principally of the Judaizers—the

reactionary party. We know the terms in which St Paul speaks of them. If we may judge, however, from the language of *Jude* and 2 *Peter* the schismatics with whom the writers of these two Epistles had to do were of a lower order.

Let us see what are the main accusations brought against them. *Jude* says that they changed the grace of God into lasciviousness and denied our Lord (4), indulged in fleshly lusts (7, 8), spoke evil of dignities (8, 9), were greedy of gain (11, 16), discontented and conceited (16).

2 *Peter* repeats these accusations (except that of discontentedness), but lays more stress upon the luxurious habits of these persons, and adds that they promise *liberty* to their hearers (ii. 19). In iii. the writer speaks of men who throw doubt upon the Second Coming; it is not clear that they are the same persons who are attacked in ii.

There are two features here which may point to unorthodox teaching on the part of the accused; but the main stream of the invective is directed against their general conduct and bearing. Of the two charges which relate to teaching, the first is expressed rather differently in the two Epistles: in *Jude* we have "denying our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ"; in 2 *Peter*, "denying the Master that bought them." To be sure this *may* be but another reference to conduct: the false teachers deny Him in their lives; indulge in practices incompatible with the rules He has laid down. So Titus i. 16, *Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται.* But 2 *Peter* connects it with the bringing in of *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*, and with both writers it seems to be the head and front of offending. And since we know that erroneous teaching as to our Lord's Person was rife in early times, there is no good reason to doubt that such teaching is aimed at here. There were various types of it. Simon Magus—a shadowy and problematical figure enough—is represented as thrusting Jesus aside altogether and arrogating to himself the position of a divine being. Cerinthus, who is traditionally said to have been contemporary with St John, held, in common with other men who had been brought up in Jewish circles, that Jesus was only associated with the Divine Power at His baptism,

and deserted by it at His crucifixion. Again, the *docetic* teachers denied the objective reality of the Incarnation. The human life of our Lord was but an appearance: His body was not tangible: He did not eat or drink: He was not really crucified. The apocryphal *Acts of John*, a product of this school of thought, put these words into John's mouth, "Sometimes when I would lay hold of Him, I met with a material and solid body, and again at other times when I felt Him, the substance was immaterial and bodiless." Another form of teaching, the offspring of a mixture of pagan ideas, both Greek and Oriental, with Christianity, made Him one of a multitude of supernatural beings, one link in a mystic genealogy proceeding from the Supreme Being, and thus—even if unintentionally—detracted from the unique significance of His Person. Such teaching—it is roughly labelled as "Gnostic"—was commonly combined with a docetic view of the Incarnation. These were the main tendencies of unorthodox teaching about our Lord, and any of them might be described as a denial of the Master.

The other charge is that of "promising liberty to their followers." This is stated openly in 2 *Peter*; a phrase in *Jude*, "turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness," may perhaps be taken to be of the same import. Either of two evils may have been in the mind of the writers. There is, first, the exaggeration of the Christian liberty which St Paul preached—the making into it a "cloke for licence." A man might say that restrictions such as those laid down in the Apostolic decree of *Acts* xv. were not binding upon enlightened persons like himself, though very proper for weaker brethren: and this would lead him to unrestrained intercourse with the heathen, to the eating of meats offered to idols, and so forth: in fact, to the practices which are condemned in the earlier chapters of the *Revelation*, and are there associated with the names of Balaam and of the Nicolaitanes. Secondly, there is the view that since the body, in common with all other material things, is evil, no abuse of it can affect the soul, of which it is the temporary prison. A tradition preserved by Clement of Alexandria attributes to Nicolaus the deacon, the supposed founder of the

Nicolaitane sect, the precept "Abuse the flesh." Some (including probably Nicolaus himself) interpreted this to mean "Mortify the flesh," and lived an ascetic life: others indulged themselves in every gratification of the senses and called this abusing the flesh. It is to such antinomians (of whom there were many groups in the second and third centuries, distinguished by the names of their leaders or their special tenets[1]) that the words of our Epistles would best apply.

The other excesses attributed in *Jude* and 2 *Peter* to the false teachers are characteristic of many who have combined high pretensions with low aims. They have arrogated to themselves the right to speak, in defiance of the constituted authorities with whom they have quarrelled; they have traded on the readiness of their simple-minded hearers to supply them with bodily comforts; and they have jealously insisted on a recognition of their own superiority. Such teachers might be only schismatics, not heretics: that is, their doctrine might be orthodox enough, and only their attitude towards the main body of the Church incorrect. But we have seen that there is ground for thinking them to have held wrong views upon cardinal points of Christian theology and conduct.

Denunciations of false teachers are found in other parts of the New Testament. We remember the "wolves in sheep's clothing" and the "false Christs" of the Gospels. These are special forms of error combated by St Paul in *Colossians* and *Ephesians*, and mentioned in *Philippians*. The *Pastoral Epistles* are full of invective, which reminds us far more closely of 2 *Peter* and *Jude* in its general tone: only here little is said of sensuality and impurity; indeed, we are told that some of the teachers are ascetics, "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" (1 Tim. iv. 3). Covetousness, however, and mercenary

[1] Notably the Carpocratians, with regard to whom Clement of Alexandria says "It was *à propos* of these and similar heresies, I think, that Jude in his epistle said prophetically: *Likewise also these filthy dreamers* (for not even in their dreams do they approach the truth) down to *and their mouth speaketh great swelling words*" (*Strom.* III. 2, p. 515).

practices are mentioned more than once. In the *Epistles of St John* the denial that Jesus is the Christ, and the denial of His coming in the flesh, are specially mentioned. In the *Revelation of St John*, as noted above, the teachers of Balaam and of the Nicolaitanes are singled out. What one notices is that the accusations of our Epistles and of the Pastorals are, generally speaking, vaguer than those found elsewhere, and that it is extremely difficult to draw a distinct or consistent picture from them.

Nothing has been said so far as to those who questioned the Second Coming (2 Pet. iii.). The passages quoted in the notes show that there were some Jewish thinkers of not very dissimilar views. But we are also reminded of the teaching of Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18), "who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already." Similar to this is the doctrine attributed in an early book, the *Acts of Paul*, to Demas and Hermogenes, that "the resurrection has already taken effect in our children (*i.e.* that in our children our own life is perpetuated) and that we rise again by attaining to the knowledge of the true God." That is a view not unknown to philosophers of our own days. We cannot wonder that all such teachings should have been strongly condemned by the first preachers of Christianity, when we consider their probable effect either upon men who had been always brought up to look for a day of reckoning, or upon those who had just been assured that such a day was coming, and coming shortly. The sudden removal of such an incentive to watchfulness and sobriety would in the large majority of cases be highly mischievous, and we see from his concluding words that the author of 2 *Peter* regarded the matter from that point of view, "Seeing then that these things are to be destroyed, what manner of men ought you to be in holy conversation and godly life?"

MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS.

Of the Greek manuscripts written in uncial letters[1], which contain the Catholic Epistles including 2 Peter and Jude, the three oldest give us the complete text, viz.

ℵ Sinaïticus, at Petersburg: IVth century.

A Alexandrinus, at the British Museum: Vth century.

B Vaticanus, at Rome: IVth century.

Besides these

C Codex Ephraemi rescriptus, at Paris, Vth century, contains the greater part of the text;

K Mosquensis, at Moscow, IXth century; and

L in the Biblioteca Angelica at Rome, IXth century (late), are complete;

and P Porfirianus Chiovensis, at Kief, IXth century, is nearly complete.

Investigation of the "cursive" or minuscule manuscripts is still progressing. A recent editor of the text of our two Epistles (J. de Zwaan, Leiden, 1909) appears to distinguish four important groups, each headed by a single manuscript, which I will enumerate:

13. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Gr. 14: IX—Xth cent.

27. London, British Museum, Harleian MS. 5620: XVth cent.

214. Lambeth Palace Library 1182: XII—XIIIth cent.

100. Moscow 334: XIth cent.

Of ancient Versions into other languages the most important for our purpose are

I. The Old Latin, *i.e.* the Latin version or versions anterior to the revision made by St Jerome. The principal remains of this for our Epistles are in

(*a*) The Palimpsest of Fleury, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale (Latin, 6400 G) of the Vth century, which contains 2 Pet. i. 1 to ii. 7.

[1] *i.e.* roughly speaking, in capitals. Such manuscripts are classed by themselves as belonging to an earlier period than those which are in cursive or minuscule letters, *i.e.* in ordinary running hand. The "uncials" are distinguished by letters of the alphabet, the "cursives" by numerals.

(*b*) The Freising fragments at Munich of the VIIth century, containing 2 Pet. i. 1—4.

(*c*) The passages quoted in two collections of Biblical texts called the Speculum Augustini and the Speculum Pseudo-Augustini.

(*d*) Quotations made by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, who died in 371.

II. The Philoxenian Syriac Version, made for Philoxenus, bishop of Mabug or Hierapolis, about 508. This was the first rendering into Syriac of our Epistles.

III. The revision of this made by a successor Thomas of Harkel (Heraclea), about a century later and called the Harklensian.

IV. The Egyptian or Coptic Versions, namely the Lower Egyptian, formerly called Memphitic, now usually Bohairic, and the Upper Egyptian (in a different dialect), formerly called Thebaic, now Sahidic. The former is complete, the latter fragmentary.

## Corruptions in the Text of the Two Epistles.

The Greek text of both these Epistles contains some doubtful passages. The text of the N.T. differs from that of classical authors in this, that we have so many copies, versions and quotations from it going back to a very early date, that there are very few places in which we are justified in saying that the text is corrupt, and in calling in the help of conjecture to restore it. But both in 2 *Peter* and in *Jude* there are such places.

(1) The first is in 2 *Peter* iii. 10 *καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται.* This is the reading of the two earliest Greek MSS. ℵ and B and of the later uncials KP as well as of one of the Syriac versions. The older Egyptian version (called Sahidic) reads *οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται.* The second-best uncial as we may call it (A) and another (L) with two versions reads *κατακαήσεται*, another good uncial (C) *ἀφανισθήσονται.* Later MSS. (followed by our Received Text) give *καυθήσεται* or *κατακαυθήσονται.* The Latin Vulgate omits the clause.

The words as they stand do not yield a right sense: that is certain. We need instead of *εὑρεθήσεται* a word which shall mean "destroyed" in some form. The simplest way of mending the passage is to insert *οὐχ* as the Sahidic version does: and this may after all be the right solution. The negative may have been omitted by the writer himself or by his first copyist. The phrase *οὐχ εὑρεθῆναι* in a similar connexion may be illustrated from Apocalyptic writings. Thus Daniel xi. 19 has: *καὶ προσκόψει καὶ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται.* Rev. xvi. 20 *καὶ πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγεν, καὶ ὄρη οὐχ εὑρέθησαν* (cf. xii. 8 *οὐδὲ τόπος εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*): xviii. 14 *καὶ πάντα τὰ λιπαρὰ καὶ τὰ λαμπρὰ ἀπώλετο ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ αὐτὰ εὑρήσουσιν* (this being a periphrasis for the passive): xviii. 21 *βληθήσεται Βαβυλὼν...καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἔτι*: xx. 11 *ἔφυγεν ἡ γῆ καὶ οὐρανός, καὶ τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς.* Compare also the passage quoted from the Sibylline Oracles in the note on this verse. A passage from the "Second Epistle of Clement," quoted in the Note on the Destruction of the World by Fire (p. 35), gives ground for another suggestion.

Another way, very simple in itself, but producing a very forced turn of language, is to read the sentence as a question (Weiss), "the earth and the works that are therein, shall they be found?"

The other readings of the MSS. *κατακαυθήσεται* and the like give the right sense, but do not in any way account for the presence of *εὑρεθήσεται.* This must be the oldest reading: it could not have been changed into any of the others.

Other conjectures which are worth mentioning are

*ῥυήσεται* or some compound of it (Hort),

*ἀρθήσεται,*

*πυρωθήσεται.*

*βρασθήσεται,* De Zwaan (1909).

Another, not, I think, recorded in print, was suggested by the late Henry Bradshaw, and is worth recording, *τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα ἀργὰ εὑρεθήσεται.*

(2) In *Jude* 5 "I wish to remind you...*ὅτι* Κύριος (or Ἰησοῦς) *λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.*"

Κύριος is read here by ℵC and the mass of later copies. Ἰησοῦς by AB, five cursive MSS., the Latin, Egyptian, Ethiopic versions and several Fathers. ὁ θεὸς by another small group. Ἰησοῦς is the "best attested" reading in the view of Hort, but "can only be a blunder." His explanation is interesting. It is that the original text had

ὅτιὁ ΛΑΟΝ, etc.,

that the letters ΟΤΙΟ were wrongly read as ΟΤΙΙC̄ (IC̄ being the universal early abbreviation for Ἰησοῦς) and also perhaps as ΟΤΙΚC̄ (abbreviation for Κύριος).

(3) In *Jude* 22, 23, is the hardest passage of all. Let us first take the reading of the Received Text and Authorized Version.

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι
οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

Then the text of Tischendorf and Tregelles (which is that of the "Alexandrine" MS., A)

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες κ.τ.λ.

Then that of Westcott and Hort (which is that of the Vatican MS. B):

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες κ.τ.λ.[1]

To these we must add:

ℵ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες κ.τ.λ.

(*i.e.* as A, but with ἐλεᾶτε for ἐλέγχετε in the first clause).

C οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες.

[1] De Zwaan, *II Petrus en Judas* (1909), reads οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε *διακρινομένους*, οὓς δὲ ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε *ἐν φόβῳ*, and apparently regards the marked words as interpolations.

In these various texts one principal difference is that some (AN) give three clauses, others (textus receptus, BC) only two.

The Latin, Egyptian, Ethiopic and Armenian versions have *three* clauses, Clement of Alexandria *two*. The Syriac versions agree with him.

The text of B is very awkward: we must translate it thus:

> And those on whom you have compassion as waverers, save, snatching them from the fire: but on others have compassion in fear, etc.

That is, we must take the first οὓς as a relative pronoun and the second as a demonstrative; and the first ἐλεᾶτε as indicative and the second as imperative.

Hort's suggested remedy is to omit the first ἐλεᾶτε and render "and some who are waverers save...but on others have compassion in fear, etc."

It is almost as simple to suppose that οὓς (δὲ) has dropped out after διακρινομένους, which ends with the same letters. And it is rather difficult to account for the presence of ἐλέγχετε.

On the whole, if a satisfactory interpretation of the words can be given, I incline to agree with Mayor in adopting the text of A, which keeps ἐλέγχετε and gives three clauses[1].

## ADDITIONAL NOTE

### *The Apocalypse of Peter.*

Since my account of this Apocalypse (pp. xxvi—xxviii) was printed, more light has been thrown upon it by the discovery of a large portion of the text in an Ethiopic version. Particulars of this will be found in a series of articles by me in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for 1910–11 (vol. XII.). In the new portions there are two passages which recall 2 *Peter*. One is a description of the final fire, upon which great stress is laid; the other relates an appearance of Moses and Elias on the Holy Mountain and the

[1] The threefold division is supported, perhaps, by the *Didache*, see p. xxxviii.

utterance of a voice from Heaven. The relation of this section of the Ethiopic to the Greek text described on p. xxvi has yet to be determined. The fact that both in 2 *Peter* and in the *Apocalypse* there is mention of a scene on the Holy Mountain, and of a voice from Heaven, is noteworthy.

I may add that I now incline to the view—previously entertained by more than one critic—that the Greek fragment is really a portion of the *Gospel of Peter*, which had incorporated, with some changes, a large section of the *Apocalypse*; the latter having been already current for some time as a separate book.

### *The Apocalypse of Baruch.*

Another early writing, I have recently noticed, has some notable coincidences of language with 2 *Peter*. This is the *Apocalypse of Baruch*[1], a book of considerable length and great interest, which exists in a complete form only in a Syriac version. It is Jewish, not Christian, in origin, and the latest date assigned to it in its present form is 130 A.D. The portion of it which contains the coincidences I have referred to is the concluding section (chapters lxxviii.—lxxxvii.), which gives us the text of an Epistle addressed by Baruch to the nine and a half tribes who had been deported across the Euphrates in the First Captivity.

The resemblances I have noted are these:

lxxviii. 2. The greeting "Mercy and peace."

„ 5. Wherefore I have been the more careful to leave you the word, of this epistle before I die (2 Pet. i. 12, 13).

„ 7. For if ye so do these things, He will continually remember you (2 Pet. i. 10).

In what follows, especially in lxxxiii., there are warnings of the coming judgment, and exhortation against worldly thoughts:

lxxxiv. 1. Behold, I have therefore made known to you these things while I live...and I will set

[1] I quote from Dr R. H. Charles's edition of 1896.

before you some of the commandments of His judgment before I die.

lxxxv. 8. Again moreover the Most High also is long-suffering towards us here (2 Pet. iii. 9).

„ 9. Before therefore judgment exact its own...let us prepare our soul (2 Pet. iii. 11).

The prophet, like the Apostle, has been warned of his speedy departure from this world, and it is possible that the passages I have quoted are only accidentally similar to the phrases in 2 *Peter*. But they deserve to be noticed, and further investigation may show that there is a real connexion between the two writings.

# ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β

**1** [1]Σιμὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιο-
σύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·
[2]χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ
θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, [3]ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς
θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δε-
δωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς
διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, [4]δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν
ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας
κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπι-
θυμίᾳ φθορᾶς. [5]καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπουδὴν πᾶσαν
παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν
τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, [6]ἐν δὲ τῇ
γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπο-
μονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν, [7]ἐν δὲ τῇ
εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν
ἀγάπην· [8]ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα
οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν· [9]ᾧ γὰρ μὴ
πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων, λήθην λα-
βὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν.
[10]διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν
κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες
οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε· [11]οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχο-
ρηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

12 Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων, καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 14 εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι· 15 σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. 16 οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα,— 18 καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει. 19 καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν· 20 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 21 οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

**2** 1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν· 2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται· 3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται· οἷς

τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει. 4εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους, 5καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας, 6καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς, 7καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρύσατο,— 8βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ἐνκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν,— 9οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 10μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταί, αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν, βλασφημοῦντες, 11ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν [παρὰ Κυρίῳ] βλάσφημον κρίσιν. 12οὗτοι δέ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται, 13ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας· ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, 14ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπάστους ἁμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα, 15καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βεὼρ ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν 16ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας. ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον

ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν. 17οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. 18ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, 19ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς· ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται. 20εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. 21κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς· 22συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καί Ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

**3** 1Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 2μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, 3τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι 4καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ, 6δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο· 7οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ

λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. 8 Ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. 9 οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι. 10 Ἥξει δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται. 11 Τούτων οὕτως πάντων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν [ὑμᾶς] ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις, 12 προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας, δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται· 13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. 14 Διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 15 καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, 16 ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν. 17 Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, 18 αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

# ΙΟΥΔΑ

[1]Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς· [2]ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

[3]Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. [4]παρεισεδύησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. [5]Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, [6]ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν· [7]ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι. [8]Ὁμοίως μέντοι

καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. 9Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος. 10Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. 11οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. 12οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι, ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα, 13κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται. 14Ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, 15ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. 16Οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.

17Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 18ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. 19Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. 20Ὑμεῖς δέ,

ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν
πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς ἐν
ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ τηρήσατε προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 22 Καὶ
οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπά-
ζοντες, 23 οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ
τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους καὶ
στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλ-
λιάσει 25 μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία
πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς
αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

# NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST PETER.

I. 1. **Σιμών.** This is the reading of the Vatican MS. B, of many cursive MSS. and of the Versions: but an important group including the uncials ℵAKLP reads Συμεών. This latter form occurs in but one other passage in N.T., Acts xv. 14, where James the brother of the Lord says "Symeon hath declared unto us," etc. It is the Hebrew form of the name, while Σίμων would pass muster among Greeks and Latins: *Simo*, derived from σιμός *simus* (snub-nosed), occurs as a slave-name in the plays of Plautus and Terence.

*Simon*, then, is the commoner form of the name, and, if it were the original reading here, one cannot see why *Symeon* should have been substituted for it. Westcott and Hort, in deference to the Vatican MS., give *Simon* a place in the text: but, with Mayor and Bigg, I venture to prefer *Symeon*. Its presence here is one of the few features which make for the genuineness of the Epistle. It does not occur in the spurious Petrine writings, and may be a true reminiscence of a habit of the Apostle.

**δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος.** δοῦλος stands alone in *Jude* and *James*. ἀπόστολος alone in 1 *Pet.*: δοῦλ. and ἀπ. together in *Rom. Tit.*

**τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.**

No local Church is named.

**λαχοῦσιν** implies that faith is the gift of God (cf. Ro. xii. 3, 1 Co. xii. 9), not due to human merit. The author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* speaks of Solomon as having been allotted a good soul (viii. 19 ψυχῆς ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς): not an "orthodox" thought.

**ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν.** "Conveying the same privileges to you as it does to us (the Apostles)." The word has a civic sense: cf. a passage quoted by Field (and others) from Josephus (*Antiquities* xii. 3. 1) ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχείᾳ πολιτείας αὐτοὺς ἠξίωσε καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν ἰσοτίμους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσι καὶ Ἕλλησι. Cf. Tit. i. 4 κοινὴν πίστιν.

**ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.** Best taken with *ἰσότιμον*. The equality is due to the justice of God, who makes no distinction between the Apostles and the rank and file of the Church.

**τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χ.** Are both God the Father and God the Son spoken of here, or is the Son alone intended? Probably the latter: for note that the two substantives *θεός* and *σωτήρ* have but the one article: and that in three other places in this Epistle we have the phrase *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος* Ἰ. Χ., viz. i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18: also in iii. 2 *τοῦ κυρίου κ. σωτῆρος*: in all of which the *κύριος* and *σωτήρ* must apply to one person. It would thus be in accordance with our author's habit to join the *θεός* and *σωτήρ* here.

On the other hand, in *v.* 2, if we accept the reading of most authorities we have a distinction made between the Father and the Son, in the words *τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. And the *direct* connexion of *θεός* with Ἰησοῦς Χριστός has no certain parallel in N.T.

Yet, in the second century, Ignatius, in the preface to his letter to the Ephesians speaks of Jesus Christ as *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*: and his date is near that which we assign to 2 *Peter*.

**2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.** Identical with the salutation in 1 Pet. i. 2. *χάρις* and *εἰρήνη* without the verb are the rule in the Pauline salutations. See on Jude 1. Jude has the verb but differs in the substantives.

**ἐν ἐπιγνώσει.** For a very full treatment of this word see Dean Robinson's excursus in his Comm. on *Ephesians*.

Grace and peace will be increased as the knowledge of God grows.

**τοῦ θεοῦ κ. Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.** This is the reading of most MSS.: but the uncial P, some important Latin MSS., and some good cursives omit *τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ*, giving merely *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* or *τ. κ. ἡμ.* Ἰ. Χ.

There is some reason for preferring the shorter form, since the phrase is one which was much more likely to be expanded than abbreviated: but the weight of authority is difficult to resist. It is a very odd feature that the Sahidic version leaves out the whole verse.

**3. ὡς.** It is a question whether we ought to place a comma or a full stop immediately before this word. If a comma, then we must take this sentence with the preceding one and translate, "May grace and peace be multiplied, etc....(*as it surely will*) seeing that His divine power has given, etc." and come to a full stop at the end of *v.* 4. If a full stop, we must render thus, "Seeing that His divine power has given, etc....you must give all diligence, etc." The next full stop will then be at the end of *v.* 5. It is, however, awkward in this case to give a proper sense to the words *καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο*

δὲ in *v.* 5. They are better suited to the beginning of a Greek sentence. I think the comma is to be preferred.

This is a case in which the early MSS., devoid of punctuation, do not help us.

**θεία δύναμις** does not occur elsewhere in N.T., but is very common in philosophical writings. It is also found (along with several other coincidences of language with 2 *Peter*) in an inscription of Stratonicea in Caria, mentioned in the Introduction (p. xxv, note).

The divine power has supplied us with all that is needed for life and godliness (*ζωή* is probably life in this world, not in the next) by means of the knowledge of Him who called us by His own glory and excellence. Probably *us* means the Apostles. Christ called them to Him by showing them His glory (as at the Transfiguration), and His *ἀρετή*, His inner perfection, in His life and teaching. Thus, if the readers of the Epistle come to know Him, they will be in a position to live soberly and godly in this present world.

**διὰ δόξης κ. ἀρετῆς.** So BKL and a few other authorities: ℵACP and most versions read *ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ κ. ἀρετῇ*. A majority of editors (including the most recent) prefer the latter reading.

**ἀρετή** is rare in N.T. It only occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 9 *ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος*, where it may be rendered by "mighty works" or "praises": in Phil. iv. 8 *εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε*: and in verse 5 of this chapter.

**4. δι' ὧν** has been taken in three ways: (1) of "us" the Apostles, (2) of *τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν*, (3) of *δόξα καὶ ἀρετή*. This last seems by far the best: Christ calls us by His excellence and gives us (*δεδώρηται* is *active*) the promises, which help us to attain likeness to Him.

**γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.** Though the author here uses a phrase more characteristic of Greek philosophy than of the Bible, his meaning is really that of John i. 12 *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι*. For the phrase compare Plato, *Protagoras* 322 A *ὁ ἄνθρωπος θείας μετέσχε μοίρας*. The condition necessary to this partaking of God's nature is expressed in the next sentence, *ἀποφυγόντες*, etc. The corruption consists in lust, and is in "the world." St James (i. 21) and St John (1 Jo. i. 16) speak to the same effect.

**5. καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ.** The two passages usually quoted to exemplify the use of *αὐτὸ τοῦτο* are (1) Xenophon, *Anab.* I. 9. 21 *καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὗπερ αὐτὸς ἕνεκα φίλων ᾤετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργοὺς ἕξοι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο συνεργὸς τοῖς φίλοις κράτιστος εἶναι*, (2) Plato, *Protag.* 310 E *αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἥκω παρά σε*. In both these passages, as in our text, the phrase means "for this very reason." God has put within

your reach the means of participating in His nature: this fact ought to incite you to exertion on your side.

**παρεισενέγκαντες.** This compound usually has the force of "smuggling in, bringing in by stealth": but it does not seem practicable to give it such a meaning here. *εἰσφέρεσθαι σπουδήν* without the *παρά* is, as Mayor shows by a number of examples, a common phrase in later Greek.

**ἐπιχορηγήσατε.** The best English equivalent here is perhaps "provide." The virtues enumerated immediately afterwards are to be the contribution of man to meet what God gives. We have the verb again in i. 11, and three times in the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. ix. 10 *ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν σπέρμα τῷ σπείροντι*... Gal. iii. 5 *ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα*. Col. ii. 19 *πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν...ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον*).

**ἐν.** The force of the preposition is not clear. It may import that each of the virtues named is to be infused or grafted into that which precedes. But the order in which the virtues are set out does not seem to bear very strict investigation. The base on which all is founded is *belief* in Christ, and the culmination is *love* to God and man. The intermediate steps, we feel, might admit of variation or addition.

Eight in all are named: after *πίστις* comes *ἀρετή*. We may take this in the general sense of virtue (our list seems to put some words of larger import at the beginning) or give it a more special meaning of strength and bravery in the domain of morals. The former is preferable.

6. **γνῶσις.** Mayor well compares Joh. vii. 17 *ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς*. Only, here, the knowledge that will come of *ἀρετή* is not only knowledge *about* God, but knowledge *of* Him and of His will.

**ἐγκράτεια.** Control over self in all matters.

**ὑπομονή.** On this St James lays great stress (i. 3, 4 and 12), and so does St John in the Apocalypse (*e.g.* i. 9, ii. 2, 3, 19, etc.). We may think of it as meaning to the early Christians two things in particular —endurance under persecution, and patient waiting for the Return of the Lord. Perhaps the latter meaning was the one more present to the writer's mind: he speaks at length about it in the third chapter.

**εὐσέβεια,** like *ἀρετή*, is so general a word that it is puzzling. We have it in 1 Tim. vi. 11, along with other words of this list: *δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἀγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραϋπαθίαν*. Our author has used it in verse 3, and we shall not be far wrong if we render it in both places as "godly conduct."

7. **φιλαδελφία.** It is interesting to see how this word has been

transformed in meaning under Christian (and Jewish) influences. To the Greek proper it meant only the affection of a brother for his own actual brother. In a Jewish book (2 Maccabees xv. 14) we find the prophet Jeremiah called *φιλάδελφος*, because he "prays much for the people." Thus to the Jew, all the nation were beginning to be thought of as brethren. In the N.T. no expression is more familiar to us than "the brethren" applied to those who are united in a common *belief*. We are reminded of *φιλαδελφία* and *ἀγάπη* by the passage 1 John iv. 20 *ἐάν τις εἴπῃ Ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῇ, ψεύστης ἐστίν.*

With this list of virtues may be compared (besides 1 Tim. already quoted) Gal. v. 22. In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, written early in the second century, is a genealogical tree of virtues which somewhat resembles ours: *Πίστις, Ἐγκράτεια, Ἀπλότης, Ἀκακία, Σεμνότης, Ἐπιστήμη, Ἀγάπη.*

**8.** If these qualities be in you and increase (the idea of *growth* is in *πλεονάζοντα*) they will indeed prevent you from being either inactive or unfruitful in what relates to (or in gaining) the knowledge of our Lord. The words *οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους* are quoted in the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (see p. xviii).

**9.** On the other hand their absence makes a man spiritually blind, or at least short-sighted.

**μυωπάζων** (the more natural form of the word would have been *μυωπιάζων*, cf. *μυωπία*) means screwing up the eyes in order to see, as a short-sighted man does. It *limits* the word *τυφλός*, and does not emphasize it.

**λήθην λαβών**, etc. He forgets the cleansing of his former sins, which took place when he was baptized. A phrase in Heb. i. 3 combines two of the words used here "*δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.*" Among other passages quoted by Mayor, one from 1 Cor. vi. 11 is specially apt: *καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε.* The man's forgetfulness of the cleansing he received in baptism paralyses his efforts to put away evil habits.

**10.** **διὸ μᾶλλον.** With this blessing and this curse in view, you should be the more eager to do *your* part—the part which God allows, and indeed requires from you—in making effective the call which has come to you from Him. As Christians you are called and chosen: but that fact does not render exertion on your part unnecessary. You must walk worthily of the calling wherewith you were called (Eph. iv. 1) (where however *κλῆσις* is not parallel to *καλέσαντος* of *v.* 3 here).

**ταῦτα** refers back to the list of virtues.

**οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.** St James (iii. 2) says *πολλὰ γὰρ πταίομεν*

*ἄπαντες*. Our author does not mean that his readers will be sinless : he is thinking of such *final* stumbling as the Psalmist speaks of, "my feet were almost gone, my treadings had well-nigh slipped." Your progress will be continuous, he says, and your entrance into the (future) kingdom of glory triumphant. Compare the words of Aristides quoted on p. xviii.

**11.** **εἴσοδος** would most naturally mean the place of entrance, but here, as in Heb. x. 19 and elsewhere in N.T., it clearly means the action of entering.

**12.** **Διό.** Seeing the great issues which hang upon all this.

**μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν.** "I shall be about to remind you always" is undoubtedly a very awkward phrase. The R.V. gives "I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance," but from the context one would judge that the writer is speaking of something which he means to do forthwith. The only parallel in N.T. is Matt. xxiv. 6 *μελλήσετε ἀκούειν πολέμους...ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροεῖσθε*, where the sense seems to be "you must be prepared to hear of wars." The difficulty was felt by some authorities (the late uncials KL and the late Syriac versions) which give *οὐκ ἀμελήσω* (adopted by the A.V. "I will not be negligent"): two Latin authorities have the equivalent of *οὐ μελλήσω*. There is no old authority for the reading which really seems preferable, namely *μελήσω*, suggested by Dr Field of Norwich: but it is possible that the Greek lexicographer Suidas (or his source) had this passage in mind when he wrote *μελήσω, σπουδάσω, φροντίσω*. Two other lexicographers, Hesychius and Photius, give the same interpretation of *μελλήσω*, which is undoubtedly a mistake, whether of their own, or of the scribes who copied out their works.

In other places of the N.T. where *ἔμελεν* or *μέλει* occur (Jo. xii. 6, 1 P. v. 7, Matt. xxii. 16), many MSS. write *ἔμελλεν, μέλλει*.

**ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.** *παρούσῃ* is not easy to interpret satisfactorily. We may render "the truth which has come to you" as in Col. i. 5, 6 *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς*: but *εἰς ὑμᾶς* is needed: or "the truth which is within your reach," cf. Deut. "The word is very nigh unto thee." An interesting suggestion is that of Spitta, which would emend the word to *παραδοθείσῃ*, comparing Jude 3 *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*.

**13, 14.** It is the more necessary for me to remind you, since I shall not be long with you.

**ἐν** is here used of the instrument.

**ταχινή,** speedy: we may take it to mean that the change is to come soon, and also that it will be sudden and violent when it comes:

certainly the former. ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν says St Paul at a similar time, 2 Tim. iv. 6.

**ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματος.** In N.T. the metaphor is employed in 2 Cor. v. 2—4. The word occurs 1 Pet. iii. 21 σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου. The verb is common, e.g. ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια, Acts vii. 58.

**καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἐδήλωσέν μοι.** We have of course an account of one occasion on which our Lord spoke of St Peter's death, and predicted that it would be a violent one (possibly even by crucifixion) in Joh. xxi. 18, 19. It has been usual to interpret our passage as referring to that. On the other hand, it is urged that the point of the prophecy in John is the *violent* death, while here the writer seems to say that he has been told that he is to die *shortly*. There is a famous and ancient legend that St Peter fleeing from the Neronian persecution at the instance of the brethren met our Lord just outside the gates of Rome, and asked whither He was going (Domine, quo vadis?). "I am about to be crucified again" (ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυρωθῆναι in the oldest form of the story) was the reply: and Peter turned back and fulfilled his destiny. The Lord's words here have been variously interpreted. (*a*) Since *you* flee I am come to be crucified in your stead; (*b*) more probably: It is ordained that you are to be crucified, and I suffer in the person of all my disciples who suffer; (*c*) the word ἄνωθεν is not impossibly the origin of the story that Peter was crucified head downwards.

Possibly this legend may have been in the mind of the writer of 2 *Peter*.

**15. σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε...** "I will take measures (besides reminding you while I am alive) that you shall have the means of reminding yourselves of these truths whenever you please, after my death." In other words, "I will leave my teaching with you in a permanently accessible form"—in some written work which the writer means to provide. What work is meant? Not the Epistle; the future σπουδάσω excludes that; and, besides, the context shows that the promised work was to be one which would strengthen the reader's belief in the truth of Christianity: it would contain some narrative of facts (see *v.* 16).

It has been strongly urged that the Gospel of Mark is here meant. The probably true tradition of its origin, which goes back to a personal disciple of the Lord, John the Presbyter, represents Mark as dependent upon Peter for his information, and Clement of Alexandria adds that Peter's hearers at Rome begged Mark to put the substance of the Apostle's discourses into writing, and that the record was subsequently confirmed and authorized by Peter. This relation between Peter and Mark would justify the expressions in our text.

There are other possibilities. If 2 *Peter* is not the work of the Apostle the reference to St Mark's Gospel is as likely as ever: but we can also conceive that another pseudo-Petrine work is meant, *e.g.* the *Preaching of Peter* (see Introd.) which may very well have contained both religious instruction, and also some narrative portions: or, just possibly, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which contained teaching about the *παρουσία* of Christ (see *v.* 16).

**16—18.** Remember that we Apostles had ocular evidence for the truth of what we preach to you, for instance at the Transfiguration, when we saw the glory and heard the voice.

**μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες** is one of the phrases common to this Epistle and to Josephus' Preface to the *Antiquities of the Jews*, § 3, *οἱ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τὴν αἰσχύνην μετέθεσαν.*

**σεσοφισμένοις.** Not common in the passive. I think Christian belief is here contrasted with heathen.

**δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν.** The power and (second) coming of the Lord, cf. Matt. xxiv. 30 *ἐρχόμενον...μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.* The Transfiguration, immediately afterwards described, was an anticipation of the glory of the second coming.

**ἐπόπται** has here practically the same sense as *αὐτόπται* in Luc. i. 2. It is an interesting word, being that used for those who were admitted to the final stages of initiation at Eleusis. For the *verb* see 1 P. ii. 12, iii. 2.

**17. λαβὼν γὰρ....** There is an anacoluthon here: *λαβών* has no verb. It is probable that the writer had intended to complete the sentence by writing *ἐβεβαίωσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον* (in *v.* 19)—for *v.* 18 is a parenthesis.

**ὑπό.** Mayor would read *ἀπό*, for which the only authorities are the Syriac versions and the Latin Vulgate (*delapsa a*). **μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης**, a reverential paraphrase, as Dr Bigg calls it, for God. Similar phrases are found in Jewish apocryphal books, *e.g. Enoch* xiv. 18, 20, a lofty throne...and the Great Glory (*ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη*) sat thereon. In the *Testament of Levi* (in the book called the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) *ἡ μεγάλη δόξα* abides in the highest heaven of all. Also in the Epistle of Clement of Rome (ix. 2) Let us look steadfastly at those who perfectly served *τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.*

**Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.** The words are reported thus in the Gospels:

Matt. xvii. 5 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.*

Mark ix. 7 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπ., ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.*

Luc. ix. 35 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.*

**Compare the words at the Baptism :**

Matt. iii. 17 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.*

Mark i. 11 *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπ., ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.*

Luke iii. 21, identical with Mark.

The words of the Epistle agree most closely with the form in Matt., but stand alone in the position they assign to *οὗτός ἐστιν*, and in giving *ἐγώ*, and *εἰς ὅν*.

**18. ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει.** It was the Transfiguration that made the mountain holy (Bigg), just as the vision of the Burning Bush made that site "holy ground" (Exod. iii. 5). The "holy hill" *par excellence* of the O.T. is Mount Sion.

It is interesting to note that the Acts of Peter (see Introd.) make St Peter select the story of the Transfiguration as the subject of a special discourse, perhaps from a recollection of the passage before us; there, too, the phrase *holy mountain* is used.

**19. καὶ ἔχομεν.** It is best to connect this sentence with the preceding. "The vision and the voice confirmed, and still confirm to us the authority of the prophets." Other commentators make these words the starting-point of a new topic. "*We* Apostles had the evidence of the vision : *you* have what is better, because more permanent—the evidence of Scripture."

It is worth noting that both in Peter's speeches in the *Acts* (ii. iii.) and also in the fragments of the apocryphal but early *Preaching of Peter*, great stress is laid on the evidence of prophecy; so also in 1 Peter i. 10—12.

**ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.** Josephus *Ant.* xi. 6. 12 again has the same phrase, *οἷς ποιήσετε καλῶς μὴ προσέχοντες.*

**λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.** There are two good instances of a similar phrase applied to an individual prophet. Our Lord says of John Baptist (Joh. v. 35), He was *ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων* : and in 4 Esdras (2 Esdras of our Apocrypha) xii. 42 the people say to Esdras, "(thou alone hast survived of all the prophets) sicut lucerna in loco obscuro" (we no longer possess the book in Greek).

**αὐχμηρῷ.** The meaning, dark or dusky, which is undoubted here, is not the original one; the word properly means dry and parched. The *Apocalypse of Peter* has our phrase, clearly in the sense of dark : "I saw a *τόπον...αὐχμηρότατον*, and those in it had their vesture dark, *σκοτεινὸν...κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου.*"

**ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ**, etc. Compare the refrain in the Song of Solomon, "Until the day break and the shadows flee away."

**φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ.** Mal. iv. 2 speaks of the Sun of righteousness arising : in the *Benedictus*, Luc. i. 79, the Christ is *ἀνατολὴ ἐξ*

ὕψους: the ancient hymn quoted in Eph. v. 14 says, ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός. These passages (except the last) point to the Second Coming as being meant by the dawn of day. But the words *in your hearts* make us think of the expression of our Lord, "the Kingdom of God is within you." The writer is addressing people who, though Christians, have not necessarily attained to the fullest understanding of the Gospel. The language should not be so pressed as to imply that it had not even dawned upon them as yet. The study of Scripture will be a help to them until God fully enlightens their hearts.

20. **τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.** The same words recur in iii. 3.

**πᾶσα—οὐ.** Hebraistic for *οὐδεμία*.

**προφητεία γραφῆς** prophecy of Scripture—included, contained in Scripture.

**ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.** Words productive of much dispute. The principal meanings assigned to them have been:

(*a*) Prophecy is not to be interpreted by private individuals apart from the Church.

(*b*) It is not to be interpreted by man apart from the Holy Spirit.

(*c*) Does not come from human ingenuity: is not a successful attempt to solve a difficulty, originated by the prophet himself.

(*d*) It could not be interpreted by the prophet himself. He did not always know the meaning of the vision he saw. Daniel and Zechariah, for example, ask what it is that is shown to them.

(*e*) Prophecy is not confined, not subject to, a single interpretation; it is capable of many fulfilments besides the immediate and local one.

Something similar is said in iii. 16. Unlearned persons wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. There seems to be in both passages a warning against unauthorized interpretation of prophecy.

The writer goes on here to assign a reason why prophecy is not *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως*. "*For* it was not at any time conveyed by the will of man." The prophets themselves could not prophesy when and as they pleased. If that was the case, how little can you expect to interpret their prophecies without God's help! Note that the aid of Christ Himself was required to "open" the Scriptures to the first disciples (Luc. xxiv. 25 etc., 44 etc.). Thus the warning against private and unauthorized exposition of prophecy seems to be most prominent; but there may be also contained in the passage the greater truth that prophecy is capable of several and ever-widening fulfilments.

**θελήματι ἀνθρώπου** is opposed to *ἀπὸ θεοῦ*.

Theophilus of Antioch, in a passage quoted on p. xviii, seems to paraphrase this verse, as well as to allude to *v.* 19.

**ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι**, cf. *θεοφόρητος*, *θεοφορεῖσθαι*, the latter verb being often used of prophets by Philo, Justin, etc., quoted by Mayor. It may be right to emphasize the absence of the article from *πνεῦμα*, "borne by a holy spirit" of wisdom. Cf. Wisdom vii. 22.

II. So far we have had but an introduction to the writer's chief topic. Throughout he has had in view the warning of his readers against a particular danger: so he has begun by insisting on their keeping firm in the right way. Now he begins to enlarge on his special subject, leading up to it by the mention of prophecy. The value of prophecy, he says, cannot be exaggerated, though its use must be guarded. *But* there was false prophecy in Israel, and false teaching is now coming in upon the new Israel.

It is here also that the writer begins most clearly and continuously to use another source, the Epistle of Jude. There have been, in his first chapter, resemblances to its language (see Introd.), but from the point we have reached the parallels are much closer.

**ψευδοπροφῆται.** The primary force of *ψευδο-* in *ψευδοπροφῆται* and *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* is not that the prophets and teachers utter what is false, but that they are sham prophets and sham teachers—they do not deserve the name. But of course the reason why they are so called is *because* they teach what is false.

**ἐν τῷ λαῷ**, Israel, *λαόν* Jude 5.

**παρεισάξουσιν** in an evil sense: *παρεισφέρω* was used in a good sense in i. 5. Cf. *παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους* in Gal. ii. 4.

**αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.** *αἵρεσις* is used in a neutral sense in Acts, of the Sadducees, of the Pharisees, and by an adversary, Tertullus, of the Christians: in xxiv. 14 Paul speaks of *τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν*, again not necessarily in an abusive sense. In his Epistles the thing is deprecated. 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19 couples *αἱρέσεις* with *σχίσματα*: Gal. v. 20 with *διχοστασίαι*, so that it seems equivalent to "schism." In Tit. iii. 10 *αἱρετικὸν ἄνδρα...παραιτοῦ* the context shows that what is meant is an opinionated and disputatious person. By the time of Ignatius (110) it is clearly used in our sense of heresy. He warns the Trallians "to abstain from the noxious herbs of heresy," and says to the Ephesians "Among you no heresy dwells." Here the general meaning is put out of doubt by the addition of the word *ἀπωλείας*, so that it is possible to hold that the writer could conceive of *αἱρέσεις* that were not "destructive."

**ἀπώλεια** is a favourite word with our writer, occurring again in this verse and in ii. 3, iii. 7, 16.

**καί**, emphatic. Even denying.

**τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι**, Jude 4. The parallel with Jude forbids us to think that the incident of Peter's denial of *his* Master is referred to.

**ἀγοράσαντα.** 1 Cor. vi. 20 *ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς.* Rev. v. 9 addressed to the Lamb *ἐσφάγης καὶ ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου.*

In Acts xx. 28 this purchasing is ascribed to the Father, to whom the title *δεσπότης* is applied wherever else it is used in N.T. (*e.g.* Luc. ii. 29, Acts iv. 24, Rev. vi. 10). Accordingly, some understand *δεσπότης* of the Father here, and some of the Son. The phrase in Jude is *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν* 'I. X., which at first sight seems plainly to mean One Person, and that the Son: but there again it is pointed out that *κύριος* is one of the words which in such a sentence can stand without an article, so that two Persons might be meant. I incline to interpret both passages as referring to the Son.

Note that *δεσπότης* and *ἀγοράζειν* give point to the word *δοῦλος* so often used by the Apostles of themselves.

**2. ἀρνούμενοι.** They deny by their lives that Christ is their Master, and also in some cases by their teaching: for many who had grown up in the strong Monotheism of the Jews and had accepted Christianity to some extent, denied the divinity of Christ. In 1 Joh. ii. 22 we read of some who denied that Jesus was Christ.

**ἐξακολουθήσουσιν** as i. 16.

**δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.** This thought, of bringing discredit on the Christian name, is not uncommon in N.T.: Rom. ii. 23–4, iii. 8, Tit. ii. 5, James ii. 7: cf. Acts xix. 9. We know that, as a matter of fact, the most ghastly stories of the excesses of the Christians were current in Roman society. Though the greater part of these tales were due to the fact that Christians met secretly for worship, it is possible that the proceedings of the teachers described here may have supplied some material that was not fictitious.

There is a coincidence of language here with the *Apocalypse of Peter*, § 7, *οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης* (see below, *v.* 21), and also, as noted on p. xviii, with the Apology of Aristides.

The "way of truth" is a phrase due to Ps. cxix. 30.

**3. καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ** *κ.τ.λ.* A distinguishing mark of the false teachers was that they sought to make money: not merely to be supported by their hearers, which, as we see from St Paul's letters, was not considered wrong. *ἐμπορεύεσθαι* is usually to traffic in something: not quite so here: "you" are the source of profit to them.

**πλαστοῖς** usually "fictitious," as of a false accusation: here probably the thought is not so much of the falsity of the teaching, as of insinuating address: what St Paul in 1 Thess. ii. 5 calls λόγος κολακείας. He mentions *πρόφασις πλεονεξίας* in the same place.

**ἔκπαλαι** again in iii. 5.

**4** sqq. **εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεός** κ.τ.λ. to the end of *v.* 10. The sentence has a different climax to that which we expect. The *protasis* is, roughly, this: "Speedy punishment awaits these men. For if God did not spare the angels...nor the old world at the Flood...nor Sodom and Gomorrah,"—the natural *apodosis* would be, "He will not spare these false teachers." But as a matter of fact the writer's thought is diverted, when he comes to his second example (of the Flood), to the preservation of Noah; and, at his third example, to the saving of Lot. And so in his *apodosis* he puts the saving of the righteous from among sinners in the *first* place, though he does not omit the punishing of the wicked.

Note that his examples vary from those in Jude, who has (1) the people saved out of Egypt, (2) the angels, (3) Sodom and Gomorrah. The first example in Jude is obscurely expressed, and perhaps this is why our writer substitutes another for it.

Note also the recurrent participial construction:

*ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν...ἐφύλαξεν—ἐπάξας...τεφρώσας κατέκρινεν.*

**ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων** κ.τ.λ. The example is taken from the Book of Enoch. See Introd. p. xlvii.

**σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν** (*Jude, δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν*). There is a curious question of reading here:

ABC have *σειροῖς* and ℵ *σιροῖς*: KLP, the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac, and one Egyptian version *σειραῖς*. **σιροῖς** or **σειροῖς** means pits, specially underground receptacles for the storage of grain. We do not find the word in that portion of Enoch which exists in Greek, but we read of angels and stars being confined underground in wildernesses—in the glens (*νάπαι*) of the earth and in various abysses.

**σειραῖς** "chains," answers to the *δεσμοῖς* of Jude, and chains are specially mentioned in Enoch; but here again the word *σεῖραι* does not occur. Both words are uncommon, but *σειροῖς* is the more unusual: *σειραῖς* would be an "elegant" word for chains, and it is rather characteristic of our writer to refine the vocabulary of Jude; but in strength of attestation *σειροῖς* has the better claim to be adopted.

**τηρουμένους.** Another reading *κολαζομένους τηρεῖν* (the words occur again in *v.* 9) has rather strong attestation (ℵA, the Latin and Egyptian version; against BCKLP). Our author's style does not

forbid us to think that he may have repeated the words just as he has repeated *οὐκ ἐφείσατο* in *vv.* 4 and 5 and *κόσμος* in *v.* 5.

**5. ἀρχαίου κόσμου.** *ὁ τότε κόσμος* iii. 6. The absence of the article here is noticeable: in the next verse again it is absent (*πόλεις Σοδόμων κ.τ.λ.*). Ecclus. xvi. 7 *οὐκ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων.*

**ὄγδοον** with seven others: *αὐτόν* is commonly added in these phrases.

**Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.** The ancient writing which lays most stress on Noah's preaching is the *Sibylline Oracles*, Book I. (a Jewish book altered by a Christian), which devotes some fifty lines to two addresses of Noah. There is also an allusion to it in 1 Peter iii. 20 in the word *ἀπειθήσασιν.*

**5, 6.** As in the next chapter, the destructive agencies of water and fire are here placed side by side.

**6. πόλεις Σοδόμων.** The genitive, as in *urbs Romae*, is of apposition.

**τεφρώσας.** Examples are quoted from Dion Cassius describing an eruption of Vesuvius, and from Lycophron (who in his so-called play the *Alexandra* or *Cassandra* heaps together all the obscure words he can find): l. 227 *τεφρώσας γυῖα Λημναίῳ πυρί.* This means "reduce to ashes." The passage in Dion Cass. means "covered with ashes."

**καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν** is the reading of the large mass of authorities, BC alone omitting *καταστροφῇ*, and P reading *κατέστρεψεν.* The meaning would be either "condemned *by* overthrowing" or "condemned *to* overthrow" (the latter unclassical, but paralleled by Matt. xx. 18 *κατακρίνουσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ*). I think the word should be restored to the text.

**ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς**=*Jude πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου.* For *ἀσεβέσιν* (BP) the bulk of authorities read *ἀσεβεῖν*, induced probably by the presence of *μελλόντων*, with which an infinitive is expected. A good parallel to these verses is in 3 Maccabees ii. 4, 5 (in a prayer of the high-priest Simon):

*Σὺ τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν ἀδικίαν ποιήσαντας ἐν οἷς καὶ γίγαντες ἦσαν ῥώμῃ καὶ θράσει πεποιθότες διέφθειρας, ἐπαγαγὼν* (cf. *ἐπάξας*) *αὐτοῖς ἀμέτρητον ὕδωρ. Σὺ τοὺς ὑπερηφανίαν ἐργαζομένους Σοδομίτας...πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ κατέφλεξας, παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγενομένοις καταστήσας.*

The date of 3 Macc. is uncertain, but it is a Jewish book, probably written about the Christian era.

**7. ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς.** The structure reminds us of the clause i. 4 *τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς.*

**ἀθέσμων** again in iii. 17, and nowhere else in N.T. *ἔκθεσμος* is used by Philo of the inhabitants of the cities of the plain.

**8.** A parenthesis, telling why Lot needed deliverance.

**δίκαιος** is preceded by the article ὁ in all MSS. except B. Westcott and Hort follow B. Some difference in rendering is entailed; omitting ὁ we translate "righteous in respect of looking and listening," like the man in Isa. xxxiii. 15 "that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil." The Latin Vulgate takes this view, "aspectu enim et auditu iustus erat." Inserting ὁ, we must connect the datives *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* with *ἐβασάνιζεν* as A.V., "in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul," etc.

**ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας** = *καθ' ἡμέραν*. It occurs in Ps. xcvi. 2 (LXX) "Be telling of His salvation from day to day."

**ψυχὴν...ἐβασάνιζεν.** Compare *Apocalypse of Peter*, § 1, And then shall God come to my faithful ones that hunger and thirst and are afflicted, *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βίῳ τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας*. But though the idea of *testing* may underlie *ἐβασάνιζεν* here, it is not safe to discard the ordinary N.T. meaning of "tormented."

The Latin Vulgate must have had a different text, which is not found in any Greek MS. It reads, "habitans apud eos qui de die in diem animam iustam iniquis operibus cruciabant," *i.e. ἐν αὐτοῖς οἳ... ἐβασάνιζον*.

**9.** The apodosis: see on *v.* 4.

**κολαζόμενοι**: *present* participle. In *Enoch* x. the sinful angels are bound in torment from the moment of their capture till the great day of judgment.

**10.** With this verse the writer returns to the denunciation of the false teachers. Like the angels, the men before the Flood, the men of Sodom, they had sinned through lust.

**ὀπίσω σαρκός** in Jude 7.

**ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ.** Adjectival as *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*, ii. 1.

**κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.** This is the main theme of the next verse and of Jude 8, 9, *δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες κ.τ.λ.* The primary application of both *κυριότης* and *δόξα* may well be to orders of angels. The men of Sodom, in particular, had not recognised the angels. But the words seem to have another meaning when applied to the false teachers, and to indicate the authorities of the Church against whom they were in revolt. They are spoken of repeatedly as anarchists, and compared to Korah, who withstood Moses. We are reminded of the angels of the seven churches in Rev. i.—iii., by whom the bishops of the churches are often thought to be meant.

**κυριότης** is used by St Paul of a definite order of angels, Eph. i. 21 (singular), Col. i. 16 (plural); "dominions" (A.V.): in the medieval hierarchy of angels, *Dominationes*.

**11.** A veiled description of the incident of Michael and Satan which is openly told in Jude 9. See Introd. p. xiv.

**12.** Contrast this with Jude 10. Jude says: These men speak evil of what they do not know: what they do know by natural instinct, like irrational beasts, they turn to a bad use.

2 Peter: These men, like irrational beasts, whose natural end is to be snared and killed, speaking evil of what they do not know (a vague phrase), will certainly perish.

It affords a good example of the elaboration of Jude by our writer and of the consequent loss of clearness. Jude has a clear antithesis, which is set aside in 2 Peter: yet the language of the altered half of the antithesis (*ἀλόγα ζῷα, φυσικά*) is retained and used to a different end.

Such is the impression I gather: Dr Bigg, on the other hand, says: "Jude has rewritten this rugged sentence and made it much more correct and much less forcible."

**γεγεννημένα...εἰς ..φθοράν.** Wetstein gives a good illustration from a rabbinic source: "a calf led to the slaughter ran to Rabbi Judah, put its head into his bosom and wept: but the Rabbi said, 'Go: thou wert created for this end.'"

**ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ** *κ.τ.λ.* Cf. *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκται* iii. 3. Best taken as an emphatic prediction of destruction.

**13. ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας.** This is the reading of ℵ (first hand) BP, one Syriac version and the Armenian, whereas a corrector of ℵ, ACKL, the Latin, Egyptian, and another Syriac version give the undoubtedly easier *κομιούμενοι* "destined to receive." It has rather a close parallel in Col. iii. 25, *ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομίσεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν*. But the future (*κομιούμενοι*) is against the reading: all the other participles near by (and there are many) are in the present.

*ἀδικούμενοι* is quite hard to translate. I prefer the rendering of Tischendorf, "being defrauded in respect of the wages of iniquity." *μισθὸς ἀδικίας* is used just below of Balaam: and like Balaam the false teachers will not receive the gain they hoped for, but destruction.

If it were permissible to take *ἀδικεῖν* in the sense which it often has in Rev. (*e.g.* vii. 2, 3, etc.) of "hurting," we might render "being hurt as the reward for harming." But this is not in the manner of our author, and besides would seem to require *ἀδικήσεως*, not *ἀδικίας*.

**ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν.** This hard clause finds an explanation in the *Psalms of Solomon* (1st century B.C.) xiv. 4. "Not so are the sinners and transgressors *οἳ ἠγάπησαν ἡμέραν ἐν μετοχῇ ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, ἐν μικρότητι σαπρίας ἡ ἐπιθυμία* (or *ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ*) *αὐτῶν*. They were contented with a day while they were partners together in sin: their desire was in (was satisfied with) a short space of

corruption." So these false teachers reckoned the shortlived enjoyment of a day to be true pleasure.

Another good interpretation depends on a passage in the *Assumption of Moses* (iv. 4). Those who are denounced are described as "omni hora diei amantes conuiuia." This is in favour of the R.V. rendering, "men that count it pleasure to revel in the day-time." Compare Rom. xiii. 13 "let us walk honestly as in the day: not in revellings and drunkenness" etc.

**σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι, ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν.** Jude 12 *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι.*

*ἀπάταις* is read by ℵ, the first hand of A and C, KLP and others; for it B, the second hand of A and C, and the Latin have *ἀγάπαις* (agreeing with Jude). The addition of *αὐτῶν* here is "in favour of *ἀπάταις*." So Mayor, who also points out that *ἀπάταις* and *σπίλοι* are characteristic modifications of the similar *ἀγάπαις* and *σπιλάδες* in Jude.

**σπίλος** occurs in Eph. v. 27 *μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον*: and *ἄσπιλος* in our Epistle (iii. 14): the verb *σπιλόω* in Jude 23 and also in James iii. 6.

**μῶμος**, which in classical Greek means reproach or disgrace, is used to mean blemish (as it does here) in the LXX. of Leviticus. *ἄμωμος* is in Jude 24. See also 1 Pet. i. 19.

If we adopt the strongly supported reading *ἀπάταις* it is not easy to get a clear notion of the meaning of the clause. Two ways of taking it are suggested: (*a*) revelling when they join in your feasts, to which by their deceitful conduct they have gained admission; (*b*) revelling in their deceitfulness, when they feast with you. In any case the writer has in his mind the love-feast of the Christians which these men perverted and profaned.

**14. ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος.** Dr Bigg unhesitatingly rejects *μοιχαλίδος* as a blunder for *μοιχείας*: the only various reading in the MSS. is *μοιχαλίας* (ℵA and three cursives) which is not a possible word. *μοιχαλίδος* does not seem to yield a tolerable sense, though it is accepted by commentators as meaning "eyes which see an adulteress in every woman." The general sense "eyes full of lust" is undoubted.

**ἀκαταπάστους ἁμαρτίας.** So AB. The other authorities give *ἀκατα-παύστους* (compare for the idea 1 Pet. iv. 1 *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*). Hort, preferring *ἀκαταπάστους*, says that it might be explained as a derivative of *παύω* on the strength of such forms as *ἀναπαήσεται*: but prefers to take it as meaning insatiable, and derives it from *πάσασθαι* (*πατέομαι*) which according to Athenaeus was used in his time to = *πλησθῆναι*: so that *ἀκατάπαστος* = *ἄπαστος* etc. But Mayor points out that *ἄπαστος* etc. wherever found means "fasting."

**γεγυμνασμένην**, exercised in, familiar with: used with *θαλάττης*, *πολέμων*, *σοφίας* by Philostratus.

**κατάρας τέκνα** means no more than "accursed." We hear of "children of obedience" (1 Pet.), "son of perdition" (Joh.), "sons of disobedience" (Eph.).

**15. ἐξακολουθήσαντες**, for the third time in this Epistle (i. 16, ii. 2). The sentence about Balaam is loosely constructed. There are some various readings. For Βεὼρ (B and two versions) Βόσορ is read by the other uncials except ℵ which has Βεωρσορ, showing a consciousness of both forms. Βόσορ cannot be satisfactorily explained.

Next, for *ὃς μισθ. ἀδικ. ἠγάπησεν*, B and one version read *μισθ. ἀδικ. ἠγάπησαν*. But this cannot be right, for *ἔσχεν* in the next clause must refer to Balaam, and the change of subject is intolerably awkward.

**16. ἰδίας** seems unnecessarily emphatic: it may not have been so intended by the writer. In later (and in modern) Greek the word tends to lose its force and become little more than a possessive.

**προφήτου** is put in to mark the contrast with the *ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον*. **παραφρονία** is not found elsewhere: but forms in *-οσύνη* (we should expect *παραφροσύνη*) and in *-ονία* do exist side by side, as *ἀπημονία ἀπημοσύνη*.

These two verses 15, 16 are based on a single verse in Jude (11) *οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς* (hence *κατάρας τέκνα*) *ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν* (*καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν* 2 P.) *καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν*. Jude adds *καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο*: but our writer as before (4—10) deserts his original in order to amplify one of the examples used.

**17.** "Waterless springs and mists driven by a gale: for whom darkness is reserved." In Jude the list of comparisons is longer; Waterless clouds, barren trees, wild waves, wandering stars, for whom darkness is reserved. It is conceivable that some words have dropped out of the text of our Epistle.

**πηγαί.** One who sets up to be a teacher ought to be a fountain of wisdom. These men yield none.

**ὁμίχλαι** *κ.τ.λ.* "Mists" which veil the light, not clouds which promise fertilising rain. And the mists are to be swept away by a tempest into darkness. Compare Wisdom v. 14 "the life of the ungodly is *ὡς φερόμενος χνοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνέμου καὶ ὡς πάχνη ὑπὸ λαίλαπος διωχθεῖσα λεπτή*."

**οἷς ὁ ζόφος** *κ.τ.λ.* This cannot be pressed into connexion with the metaphor of springs: to the mists it is not inapplicable. In its original place in Jude it applies, with complete suitability, to stars. The masculine *οἷς* here must, as the text stands, be referred to the

men who are described under these various images: but a *lacuna* seems not improbable.

**18. ὑπέρογκα** κ.τ.λ. **ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός.** This is the last case of borrowing from Jude for some time. It answers to Jude 16 *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.*

**ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις.** *σαρκός* is best taken with *ἐπιθυμίαις*. The whole phrase is rather pleonastic to our ideas. *ἀσελγείαις* serves perhaps to define *ἐπιθ. σαρκ.* The general meaning is that the false teachers proclaimed to their followers the lawfulness of indulgence in passions, under the name of Christian liberty, and so converts who had been nearly drawn away, and with great difficulty, from the licence which prevailed in heathen society were now slipping back. Their first teachers had preached to them the importance of purity: these new ones told them that it was of no consequence. The havoc which such teaching must have wrought upon the morals and upon the very being of young Christian communities amply justifies the tremendous denunciation which we find here.

**τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας** κ.τ.λ. For *ὀλίγως* (AB, a corrector of ℵ, and Syriac, Latin and Egyptian) a group including ℵCKLP reads *ὄντως*. For *ἀποφεύγοντας* (ℵABC) the aorist participle *ἀποφυγόντας* is read by KLP.

*ὀλίγως* is rendered in the Vulgate by *paululum*, for a little time: it is an uncommon word, but is found meaning "in a slight degree" and (inapplicable here) "quickly." The escape is recent or incomplete.

**τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους**: almost certainly the heathen.

**19. ἐλευθερίαν** κ.τ.λ. This degeneracy of liberty into licence was a constant danger. *πάντα ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει* (1 Cor. x. 23). Gal. v. 13 *μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί.* 1 Pet. ii. 16 *μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.* Men have been found in all ages to say either openly or in effect: "Rules made for weaker brethren do not apply to me: I have penetrated into the mysteries of divine things, and know that what my body does cannot affect my soul." But this, as our writer points out, is just where they are mistaken; they become slaves of the most abject kind to their habits and passions. Yet, slaves as they are, they dare to promise freedom to others!

**ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται**: so Sophocles in old age spoke of passion as a *λυττῶν καὶ ἄγριος δεσπότης* from whom he had escaped. Whoever committeth sin is the slave of sin, Jo. viii. 34: cf. Ro. vi. 16.

Another kindred thought is that in Wisdom xi. 16 *δι' ὧν τις ἁμαρτάνει, διὰ τούτων κολάζεται*: a ruling idea in the *Apocalypse of Peter.*

**20. ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.** We revert to the language of chapter i. (i. 4 *ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*). **ἐν ἐπιγνώσει** *κ.τ.λ.* i. 2.

In the words *δελεάζειν*, *ἀποφεύγειν*, *ἡττᾶσθαι* we have fresh instances of our author's tendency to use words over again at short intervals.

**τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων**, one of the few citations of our Lord's words in the Epistle (see Introd. p. xxiv). These occur in Matt. xii. 45.

**21. τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης** occurs in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, §§ 7, 13. It is not a common phrase.

**22. τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας**: a usual phrase for introducing a proverb, as Lucian, *Dialogues of the Dead*, viii. 1, *τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας*.

**Κύων** etc. The equivalent is in Prov. xxvi. 11, the LXX. has *ἔμετον* for *ἐξέραμα* which is a very unusual word.

**Ὑς λουσαμένη** "after a wash." In the ancient *History of Ahikar* (ed. Rendel Harris 1898) which the writer may well have known, there is a proverb of the pig that went to the bath, and on coming out saw some mud and rolled in it.

There may be a second thought in the writer's mind of the latter end of these men in the *βόρβορος* of Hell: which figures in the *Apocalypse of Peter*, as it did also in the Orphic mysteries.

III. **1.** It is natural to most of us on a first reading to assume that the *first* Epistle here alluded to must be what we know as 1 Peter; but this has been denied by critics of eminence, who hold that 1 Peter does not answer to the description before us: and further that 2 P. speaks of personal intercourse between writer and readers (i. 16 *ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν*) which is not the case in 1 Peter. One point which is urged is undeniably true, namely, that many apostolic letters must have perished, and there is no *necessity* to regard 1 Peter as being meant: but the objections to doing so are not conclusive.

**διεγείρω ἐν ὑπομνήσει** occurred above, i. 13.

**εἰλικρινῆ**, pure, genuine, unmixed: then pure, morally. *εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι* in Phil. i. 10 is the only other occurrence of the adjective in N.T. The substantive *εἰλικρίνεια* is coupled with *ἀλήθεια* in 1 Cor. v. 8.

**2. μνησθῆναι** *κ.τ.λ.* He is specially anxious to hold his readers fast to their first beliefs in view of the new false teaching.

**ἁγίων προφητῶν** as in the *Benedictus*, Luke i. 70.

**καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τ. κυρ. κ. σωτῆρος.** The array of genitives has its awkwardness, but is not obscure.

**τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν**: *ἡμῶν* (a very natural alteration) is read by some cursives, but no uncials. "The preachers who evangelized you," not necessarily the Twelve, may be meant; but this is one of the phrases which suggest that the Epistle belongs to the sub-apostolic age.

3. With this verse we return to the borrowing from Jude (17) *ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τ. κυρ. ἡμ.* 'I. X.

**τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες**, above, i. 20. The grammar is loose.

**ὅτι ἐλεύσονται** κ.τ.λ., the last considerable borrowing, from Jude 18 *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.*

The possibility that *both* writers are *independently* quoting the same prophecy has been mentioned and dismissed in the Introduction.

A passage from an apocryphal book (unknown, but not improbably the prophecy of Eldad and Medad) which is quoted both in the genuine Epistle of Clement of Rome (cir. 90 A.D.) and in the ancient sermon known as his Second Epistle deserves to be given here. "Miserable are the waverers, that waver in their soul and say, 'These things we heard long ago even in our fathers' days, but we, expecting them day after day, have seen nothing of them.' (Variant: 'And, lo, we have grown old, and none of these things has befallen us.') O fools, compare yourselves to a tree. Take the vine. First it sheds its leaves, then comes a shoot, then a leaf, then a flower, then a young grape, and then the cluster is ready. Even so also my people hath suffered disturbance and affliction and thereafter shall be recompensed with good."

Similarly an ancient Jewish comment on Ps. lxxxix. 50 "slandered the footsteps of thine anointed" is "they have scoffed at the slowness of Messiah's coming"; and again "He delays so long, that they say, He will never come."

It is possible that our writer is referring to the Jewish book quoted by Clement, or to a similar source. At least we see that the murmuring was current outside Christian circles.

**ἐμπαιγμονῇ**, this form occurs here only. *ἐμπαιγμός, -μα* are the forms used in Biblical Greek.

4. **Ποῦ ἐστιν** κ.τ.λ. They ask the question, not as those who long for the fulfilment of the promise, but as disbelieving that it will ever be fulfilled: and therefore they are at liberty to indulge their passions (*πορευόμενοι*, etc.).

**παρουσίας**, above i. 16.

**οἱ πατέρες.** Cf. *ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων* in the prophecy quoted above from Clement. The phrase inevitably suggests that the first generation of Christians had passed away.

**οὕτως,** *in statu quo.* Compare the reading of some Latin authorities in Joh. xxi. 22, *Sic* or *Si sic eum uolo manere.*

The unbelievers say: Where is the promise of His coming? the first disciples to whom it was promised are dead, and there is no sign: the world goes on in its course as it has since the creation. That is where you are wrong, replies our writer. It has not gone on without one great convulsion. There was the Deluge; and there will be the final fire.

5. **ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν** *κ.τ.λ.* There were of old heavens and an earth, (the latter) having its being out of water (it rose out of the water over which the Spirit brooded) and *δι' ὕδατος.* This difficult expression I am inclined to interpret as "between the waters," supported on water, according to Jewish belief, and with an over-arching firmament above which were waters. Compare the use of *διά* to express intervals: *διὰ χρόνου, διὰ πέντε σταδίων* etc.

**ἔκπαλαι,** above, ii. 3.

**τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ** = *ῥήματι θεοῦ* Heb. xi. 3.

6. **δι' ὧν.** I am inclined (in spite of the fact that the word is rather remote in position) to think that *οὐρανοί* is the antecedent of *ὧν.* "There were heavens...by means of which the old world was deluged." The other alternative, that the two "waters" are the antecedent, also yields a fairly good sense. Mayor with one good cursive MS. reads *δι' ὃν* and refers it to *λόγος.* De Zwaan (1909) agrees.

**ὁ τότε κόσμος,** cf. *ἀρχαιὸς κόσμος* ii. 5. The human beings who perished at the Flood are primarily meant.

7. **οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοί.** He seems to speak of the Flood as if it had destroyed heaven and earth (in the Book of Enoch hyperbolical language of that kind is used of the Flood lxxxiii. 3, in a vision "the heaven collapsed and was borne off and fell to the earth"): and it may have been his view that the upper firmament did fall in and overwhelm the earth. But the general run of thought seems to be this. Of old the heavens were the means of destruction: in the future the heavens themselves will be destroyed (by fire).

**τεθησαυρισμένοι πυρί,** stored up—reserved—for fire; not stored with fire, which would mean that there was fire latent in them which would some day burst forth and consume them. That was the belief of Valentinus, a great heretical teacher of cent. ii.

**τηρούμενοι** *κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ii. 4, 9.

8. **ὑμᾶς,** emphatic, opposed to *αὐτούς* in *v.* 5.

Not only are the mockers mistaken as to the immutability of the world: they forget also (but you must not) that time is nothing in God's sight. He delays His vengeance in mercy, but it will come.

**μία ἡμέρα** κ.τ.λ. The words go back to Ps. xc. 4 *χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθὲς ἥτις διῆλθεν, καὶ φυλακὴ ἐν νυκτί.*

The writer does not apply the words in a sense which very usually attached to them among Jews and Christians. The belief arose (we cannot exactly trace by what steps), that since the world had been created in six days, and since a day and a thousand years are in God's sight the same, so it would last six thousand years; and, as at creation the seventh day of rest followed, so the six thousand years would be succeeded by a seventh thousand of Sabbatical rest, *the* Millennium, as it is commonly called. We cannot dwell upon the importance of the belief in a Millennium: but the text before us was constantly invoked in support of that belief.

**9. βραδύνει** with a genitive only here: it is compared with the use of *ἁμαρτάνω, ὑστερεῖν, λείπεσθαι.*

**μακροθυμεῖ.** Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 20 *ἀπειθήσασιν ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε.*

**εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Evidence is divided here both as to the preposition and the pronoun.

*εἰς* BCKLP Armenian, one Egyptian version.

*δι'* ℵA 3 good cursives, Latin, one Egyptian version (the older), Syriac, Aethiopic.

*ὑμᾶς* ℵABCP, most versions.

*ἡμᾶς* KL, later Egyptian version.

**μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας** κ.τ.λ. The first clause is emphasized greatly in Ezek. xviii. With the second we may compare 1 Tim. ii. 4 *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν.*

**10. Ἥξει δὲ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης.** This must have been a commonplace of Apocalyptic prophecy. We have the image in the eschatological discourse of our Lord, Matt. xxiv. 43 "If the goodman of the house had known in what watch (of the night) the thief would come" and again in Luke xii. 39. In 1 Thess. v. 2, Ye know clearly *ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται* (whence the MSS. CKL add *ἐν νυκτί* here). Rev. iii. 3 *ἥξω ὡς κλέπτης*, xvi. 15 *ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ὡς κλέπτης.*

**οἱ οὐρανοὶ...παρελεύσονται.** Mc. xiii. 31 *ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται.* The destruction of the heavens, which were thought of as a solid firmament arched over the earth, is spoken of in Isa. xxxiv. 4 *καὶ ἑλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον.* This whole verse of Isaiah seems

to have been introduced into the *Apocalypse of Peter*. It is quoted in Rev. vi. 13, 14 *καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς βιβλίον ἑλισσόμενον* and in the Sibylline oracles III. 81 *ὁπόταν θεὸς αἰθέρι ναίων | οὐρανὸν εἰλίξῃ καθ' ἅπερ βιβλίον εἱλεῖται.*

**ῥοιζηδόν**, with a rushing or whizzing round: *κλαγγηδόν*, *κοναβηδόν* are words of similar formation also descriptive of sound.

**στοιχεῖα**. The heavenly bodies are very probably intended. *στοιχεῖα* was used in the sense of "luminaries": in a letter of Polycrates the bishop of Ephesus (about 190 A.D.) he says "among us also (in Asia, that is, as well as in Rome) *μέγαλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηνται* great luminaries rest": and he goes on to specify John the Evangelist and others.

St Paul's use of *στοιχεῖα* Gal. iv. 3, Col. ii. 8, 20 is interpreted as meaning the spiritual beings who have charge of the stars and of other provinces of creation.

**καυσούμενα** must be from *καυσόομαι*, a medical word applied to feverheats.

**εὑρεθήσεται**. See Introd. p. xlix.

A passage in the Sibylline oracles II. 252 sqq. shows what is meant by *ἔργα* and favours the reading *οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται*.

*κούκέτι πωτήσονται ἐν ἠέρι ἄπλετοι ὄρνεις,*
*οὐ ζῷα νηκτὰ θάλασσαν ὅλως ἔτι νηχήσονται,*
*οὐ ναῦς ἔμφορτος ἐπὶ κύμασι ποντοπορήσει,*
*οὐ βόες ἰθυντῆρες ἀροτρεύσουσιν ἄρουραν,*
*οὐκ ἦχος δένδρων ἀνέμων ὕπο· ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντα*
*εἰς ἓν χωνεύσει καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξει.*

**11. λυομένων** possibly implies that creation is even now declining to its fall: but compare the present tenses of *τήκεται*, *κατοικεῖ* below.

**ποταπούς**, a late form and use: *ποδαπός* "of what nation" is the classical word. Our word occurs elsewhere in N.T. and in the *Apocalypse of Peter*.

**ὑπάρχειν**, how ought you to be equipped—ready for the catastrophe when it comes.

**ἀναστροφαῖς, εὐσεβείαις**, plural as *ἀσελγείαις* several times above.

**12. σπεύδοντας**. The thought is well compared with Peter's words in Acts iii. 19. Repent...*ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως*. As sins (cf. *v.* 9) delay the coming, so righteousness will accelerate it.

**θεοῦ ἡμέρας**, usually *ἡμ. Κυρίου*. In Rev. xvi. 14 we have "the great day of God Almighty."

**δι' ἣν**. *ἐν ᾗ* above in *v.* 10. We might render "on the occasion of which": the destruction takes place *because* the Day has come.

Notice the repetition of words, *λυθήσονται, στοιχεῖα, καυσούμενα.* We have already encountered many such in our text.

**τήκεται** is the reading of ℵABKL. C has *τακήσεται*, P *τακήσονται*. Hort conjectures *τήξεται*, which is found with a passive sense in Hippocrates.

**13. καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανούς** *κ.τ.λ.* The new heaven and earth are prophesied in the concluding chapters of Isaiah: lxv. 17 *ἔσται γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή*, lxvi. 22 *ὃν τρόπον γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινὴ ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ*, cf. li. 6 Lift up your eyes to the heavens, etc.

The prediction is quoted in Rev. xxi. 1. *Καὶ εἶδον οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν· ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος οὐρ. κ. ἡ πρώτη γῆ ἀπῆλθαν.*

**ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.** Cf. Isa. i. 21 of Jerusalem, *ἐν ᾗ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ* and xxxii. 16 *δικαιοσύνη ἐν τῷ Καρμήλῳ κατοικήσει*, together with what follows.

**14.** Cf. Jude 24 *στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους.* The use of *εὑρεθῆναι* is rather like that in Phil. iii. 9 "that I may be found in Him, not having my own righteousness," etc.

**15. καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος.** It has been usual to take *καθὼς* as referring to the topic of the end of the world, and to suppose that the Epistles to the Thessalonians are specially indicated. But others (incl. Mayor) would refer *καθώς* to the sentence immediately preceding about *μακροθυμία*, and point to certain passages in *Romans*, especially ii. 4 *καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;* also iii. 25, 26, ix. 22, 23, xi. 22, 23. *ὑμῖν* would then naturally mean that this Epistle is itself addressed to the Romans.

**κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.** Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10 *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι.*

**16. ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς.** *πάσαις ταῖς* is read by ℵKLP: ABC omit the article, and are followed by Westcott and Hort. The phrase reads very awkwardly without it. There is no great difference in sense, whether we read "in all letters" or "in all his letters."

**ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα** *κ.τ.λ.* Not specially referring to the subject of *μακροθυμία*, nor to the end of the world, but, generally, to those parts of Pauline teaching which had been exaggerated or misrepresented, *e.g.* about things offered to idols (1 Cor. viii. etc.): utterances about the Law which might form an excuse for men to say that they were not bound by the Decalogue (Rom. iii. 20, vii. 7—11 etc.): of becoming all things to all men: and so on.

**ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.** If the phrase occurred in a later document, we should not hesitate to render it "the rest of the Scriptures" and to take it as including both O.T. and N.T. Scriptures. But the

fact that we have here a writing under the name of an Apostle, and of early date, causes a difficulty. We shall be overstating the case if we say that the writer here places Paul's Epistles exactly on a level with the O.T. and implies the existence of a body of Christian Scriptures that were so regarded: but it is fair to say that he knows of the Pauline Epistles as writings read to Christian congregations and on the way to be put upon the level of Canonical Scripture. Cf. p. xxviii.

**17.** **ἀθέσμων, πλάνῃ**, ii. 7, 18.

**συναπαχθέντες** as Gal. ii. 13, *Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει.*

**18.** **αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι**, cf. i. 8 *πλεονάζοντα. αὐξάνω* is oftener than not intransitive in N.T. but in classical Greek transitive, and so in 1 Cor. iii. 6 (*ὁ θεὸς ηὔξανεν*).

**εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.** An uncommon phrase: Ecclus. xviii. 10 is quoted: as a drop of water out of the sea, or a grain of sand, *οὕτως ὀλίγα ἔτη ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος.* It is strange to find this expression in a doxology, where *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* (*τῶν αἰώνων*) is almost invariable.

### Note on the Destruction of the World by Fire.

The passage iii. 5—13 is the only one in the New Testament which speaks of the destruction of the world by fire. The coming of Christ, the Resurrection, and the Final Judgment are dwelt upon by other writers, but of a general conflagration nothing is said by them. This is a noteworthy fact; so widely spread is the notion of a final fire, that it comes as a surprise to most people when they realize how very slender is the Biblical foundation for that belief.

Whence did our author derive it? We know that the Stoics held that there would be an *ἐκπύρωσις* of the world: but their view was that it was an event which would recur at the end of vast periods of time, and that each burning would be succeeded by a *παλιγγενεσία*, a re-constitution of the world. This differs from the Christian idea, which was that there would be one final burning, and that human history would not repeat itself.

Among the Jews the belief was entertained by some: but it has not left any considerable trace in the apocalyptic literature. Philo argues strongly against the Stoic belief in his tract *on the Incorruptibility of the World.*

In certain early Christian books pretending to high antiquity the final fire is dwelt upon. The fourth book of the Sibylline oracles,

which is assigned to the reign of Titus or Domitian (and is appealed to upon this point by Justin Martyr in his *Apology*) says (172—177):

> εἰ δ' οὔ μοι πείθοισθε κακόφρονες...
> πῦρ ἔσται κατὰ κόσμον ὅλον...
> φλέξει δὲ χθόνα πᾶσαν, ἅπαν δ' ὀλέσει γένος ἀνδρῶν
> καὶ πάσας πόλεας ποταμούς θ' ἅμα ἠδὲ θάλασσαν,
> ἐκκαύσει δέ τε πάντα, κόνις δ' ἔσετ' αἰθαλόεσσα.

There is a longer description in the later second book of the oracles (196—213). It is pretty clear that this book derives its matter very largely from the *Apocalypse of Peter*, in which we now know that the burning of the world was described at some length. See the *Additional Note*, p. lvii.

Justin Martyr also appeals to a book called *Hystaspes* as agreeing with the Sibyl. This we no longer possess, but we can tell from scattered quotations that it was a prophecy revealed to an ancient king of the Medes; it seems to have been Christian, and quite early in date.

Another early book which speaks of this, in words which recall 2 Peter, is the so-called Second Epistle of Clement (really a sermon of the second century): cap. xvi. γινώσκετε δὲ ὅτι ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος (Malachi iv. 1 ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα ἔρχεται καιομένη ὡς κλίβανος) καὶ τακήσονταί τινες (corrupt: perhaps αἱ δυνάμεις) τῶν οὐρανῶν (Isa. xxxiv. 4 and *Apocalypse of Peter*, quoted above), καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλιβος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Can this last clause (καὶ τότε φανήσεται κ.τ.λ.) be taken as showing that the writer actually had 2 Peter before him, and that his copy of it read εὑρεθήσεται? One is tempted to guess that this was the case, and that he interpreted τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται as meaning "the works that are therein shall be manifested."

It is not practicable to trace the gradual growth of the belief: but it did grow, and in later times at least, when the Sibylline oracles and other such books were forgotten, the passage in 2 Peter became the authoritative one on the subject.

# NOTES ON THE EPISTLE OF SAINT JUDE.

**1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.** So in James i. 1 (where *θεοῦ καὶ* is prefixed): the word is also in 2 P. i. 1 *δ. καὶ ἀπόστολος* 'I. X.

**ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.** Jude was a "brother of the Lord" but does not say so, perhaps from motives of humility. The person he mentions is, there can be little doubt, James the first bishop of Jerusalem. Three persons of this name are mentioned in N.T., (1) James the son of Zebedee, "James the great" martyred by Herod (Acts xii.), (2) James the son of Alphaeus Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, in the list of the Twelve, coupled with Thaddaeus: Luke vi. 15, between Thomas and Simon Zelotes, Acts i. 13 between Matthew and Simon, (3) James the brother of the Lord, Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3. This last was the first bishop of Jerusalem, and presided at the council of Acts xv.

It has been usual in the Western Church to identify nos. 2 and 3 of the above list. The Eastern Church, however, has always commemorated three Jameses, and there can be little doubt that this is the right view. Of James the son of Alphaeus we really know nothing beyond his name.

**τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ** *κ.τ.λ.* A difficult sentence. The late uncial MSS. KLP give *ἡγιασμένοις* for *ἠγαπημένοις* (ℵBA) which is a very much easier reading, but on that account suspicious. Westcott and Hort suggest that *ἐν* is out of place and that we ought to read *τοῖς θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημ. καὶ ἐν* 'I. X. *τετηρημ.* The possibility has been suggested (by Bishop Chase) that after *ἐν* a place-name was meant to be inserted (as in Eph. i. 1): the letter being a circular letter, and the name varied according to the place where it was read. The sentence would run "to those at —— who are beloved of God the Father" etc. As they stand the words are not free from confusion, and I believe that their order must be incorrect. It would be better if *ἠγαπημένοις* followed *κλητοῖς*. The three substantives in the next

verse may each refer to one of these three descriptive words, thus: ἔλεος to κλητοῖς, for the calling of God shows His mercy: εἰρήνη to τετηρημένοις, for peace is the condition of those who are kept safe: ἀγάπη to ἠγαπημένοις. I do not think it altogether safe to build much upon words which are in the nature of a formula: yet this particular salutation is not identical with any other in N.T. The substantives in Rom., 1, 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1, 2 Thess., Tit., Philemon, are χάρις (ὑμῖν) καὶ εἰρήνη: so too in Rev. (i. 4), 1, 2 Pet. In 1, 2 Tim. χάρις, ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη: also 2 Jo. 3. So Jude does use a form which is varied, doubtless intentionally. The verb πληθυνθείη is common to him and 1, 2 Pet.

3. **Ἀγαπητοί** recurs in 17, 20 and often in 2 Peter. It is also frequent in 1 John, but there a great many other forms of address are used as well.

**πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν...ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι.** Distinguish between the use of the present tense in the first clause and that of the aorist in the second: we may infer that Jude was contemplating the writing of a treatise (or more probably an Epistle) on more general lines περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, when he was suddenly compelled to write at short notice and warn his readers against a special danger. We are reminded of the intention expressed in 2 Peter i. 12—15.

**ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι**: not common in the sense of defending, which is its meaning here. Plutarch (quoted by Mayor) speaks of the philosopher Cleanthes ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τῇ ἐκπυρώσει, *i.e.* defending the Stoic doctrine of the destruction of the world by fire.

**τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.** ἅπαξ "once for all," cf. *v.* 5 and Heb. vi. 4. παραδοθείσῃ, compare the Pauline use in 1 Cor. xi. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 15, and the παραθήκη of 1 Tim. vi. 20. ἁγίοις. Bodies of Christians are called ἅγιοι in Acts ix. 32, 41 (at Lydda and Joppa), 1 Cor. xvi. 1 etc.

**πίστει.** Here not the act of believing but the truths believed. Paul preached the faith, τὴν πίστιν, which once he used to destroy (Gal. i. 23). The phrase belongs to a time when a creed (of however simple a kind) was delivered to converts by their teachers: a confession of faith which they were required to repeat in public at the time of their baptism.

4. **παρεισεδύησαν** κ.τ.λ. It is here that the parallelism with 2 Peter begins most obviously. To comment upon the matter common to the two Epistles would be to repeat the notes on 2 Peter. I shall therefore only call attention to selected points.

**προγεγραμμένοι.** Not "predestinated" but predicted by Enoch (*v.* 14) and others.

**χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν.** By making Christian liberty an excuse for licence. Cf. Rom. vi. 1, 1 Peter ii. 16.

**ἀρνούμενοι.** Perhaps by teaching, as many Gnostics did, that Jesus was a mere man upon whom a heavenly spirit, Christ, descended at His baptism, leaving Him before or at the Passion. (In the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* the cry of our Lord on the Cross is given in this form, "My Power, My Power, why hast thou forsaken me?") Or else by the doctrine that the God of creation (*ὁ μόνος δεσπότης*) was not the supreme God.

**5.** Jude's first example of sin and punishment is not used in 2 Peter, probably because it seemed too vague and obscure. It is indeed somewhat difficult. The general sense is like that of the passage 1 Cor. x. 1—11. In that we are reminded how Israel was delivered, and nourished in the wilderness (1—4); and how for all that they sinned and were punished (5—11). The same theme recurs over and over again in Ps. lxxviii. The special sin which Jude has in mind seems to be Israel's want of faith when the spies brought back reports of the Promised Land (*τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας*). But no good explanation of the words *τὸ δεύτερον* has been suggested. They are less emphatic, and therefore less awkward, if we are allowed to read (with ℵ 68 and several versions) *κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν σώσας*. With the text before us I see no other reasonable rendering but to take *τὸ δεύτερον* as simply equivalent to *ὕστερον*, "afterwards": but no authority has been cited for such a use. There are other points of uncertainty about the text of this verse which it is worth while to note: for *εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα* ℵKL and others read *εἰδ. ὑμᾶς* (which Mayor adopts), B has *εἰδ. ὑμᾶς ἅπαξ* and for *κύριος* (read by ℵCKL etc.) AB 13 and four versions read *Ἰησοῦς* (see further Introd.). This was interpreted by some Fathers, *e.g.* Jerome, as signifying Joshua (who, of course, in Greek and Latin is called Jesus). But the subject of both this and the next verse is the same, and Joshua cannot be the subject of *v.* 6. If Jude did write *Ἰησοῦς*, it was not without a recollection of Joshua. The identity of name appealed to many early Christian writers.

**6.** On the source see Introd. p. xlvii.

**7.** **ὅμοιον τούτοις**, i.e. the false teachers.

**8.** **μέντοι**, however, "in spite of these warnings" (Mayor).

**ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι.** This probably refers to the pretended revelations of the false teachers, who laid claim to a special inspiration. Cf. Deut. xiii. 1. In what follows, Jude sums up their conduct: they are of loose life, and rebellious against constituted authority. See on 2 Peter ii. 10.

**9.** For the matter see Introd. p. xli.

**κρίσιν βλασφημίας** = *βλάσφημον κρίσιν* 2 Pet. ii. 11 (cf. James i. 25 *ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς*) not "an accusation of blasphemy," but cf. Field *ad loc.*

**10.** Corresponds to 2 Peter ii. 12 but in that place is differently turned. Here *φυσικῶς* means by instinct: and it is said of the false teachers that they come to ruin (*φθείρονται*) by means of the knowledge—and that a contemptible sort of knowledge—which they possess, while they speak evil of what they do not understand—perhaps primarily of the spiritual world—*δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν v.* 8.

**11.** Of the three examples of sin punished which Jude uses 2 Peter only adopts one, Balaam. Cain is perhaps chosen as an instance of one who defied the simplest and most obvious laws of God by murder, or else as having consulted only his own natural instincts in choosing an offering for God. Balaam is chosen as having prostituted the prophetic gift for gain (and the false teachers made money one of their objects). Korah rebelled against divinely appointed authority.

The phrase used of Balaam is not lucid. *πλάνῃ* is susceptible of two meanings, active, in the sense of deceiving others, and passive, in the sense of being deceived. *ἐξεχύθησαν* is used of indulging unrestrainedly in pleasure: Ecclus. xxxvii. 29 *μὴ ἐκχυθῇς ἐπ' ἐδεσμάτων.* The whole sentence may be paraphrased: they have let themselves go in the deceiving course of Balaam, for gain. We learn what is meant by the deceit of Balaam from Rev. ii. 14 "thou hast there some that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit fornication." The laxity of the false teachers is here again in Jude's mind.

**12.** **οὗτοί εἰσιν** recurs again in *vv.* 16, 19. As Dr Chase has remarked, it is a favourite phrase in Apocalyptic writings. The seer is shown something and asks what it is? his guide—usually an angel—introduces his explanation by these or like words, cf. Zech. (i. 10 etc.), Rev. vii. 14, among Biblical passages. In each of the cases where Jude uses it we may fairly suspect that he is alluding to a passage of some writing. He is certainly doing so in *v.* 16, and as I think also in *v.* 19. In these two places he quotes the *Assumption of Moses*; perhaps he is doing so in *v.* 12 also: we cannot be certain, for the book is mutilated.

**ἀγάπαις**, the right reading here. It is the only mention in the N.T. under this name of the love-feasts, which were universally so called a little later. We hear of the germ of this Christian feast, as distinct from the Eucharist, in Acts iii. 46 *κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον*

*ἄρτον*, and of the abuses and confusion which sometimes occurred in connexion with it, in 1 Cor. xi. 18 sqq. At first it was a meal for all members of the Christian community and was celebrated immediately after the Eucharist. In later times it was separated therefrom by an interval of some length. Gradually it came to be regarded as a charitable provision for the poorer members of the congregation.

**σπιλάδες.** 2 Peter has in the corresponding place *σπίλοι*, which certainly means spots or stains. The ordinary meaning of *σπιλάς* is *ὕφαλος πέτρα*, a sunken rock. In a late, perhaps fourth century, hexameter poem on the virtues of precious stones, attributed to Orpheus, and called the *Lithica*, there is a description of the agate as *κατάστικτος σπιλάδεσσιν* (l. 614) mottled with spots, and the Lexicon of Hesychius (which may be dependent on this passage of Jude) gives *σπιλάδες=μεμιασμένοι*. These two passages (coupled with 2 Peter) constitute all the evidence at present available for rendering *σπιλάδες* here as "spots." But the evidence of 2 Peter is rather strong and that of the *Lithica* (a pagan composition) quite clear. I incline to accept it.

**ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες.** Ezek. xxxix. 8 (Westcott and Hort) *ἐβόσκησαν οἱ ποιμένες ἑαυτούς*.

The similes employed by Jude in *vv.* 12, 13 are these:

Stains (or rocks). Waterless clouds. Barren trees. Waves. Wandering stars:

and those in 2 Peter are:

Stains. Waterless springs. Driven mists.

**νεφέλαι** *κ.τ.λ.* The clouds are not only useless but purposeless, driven about by winds. Jude accumulates attributes, both here and in the next clause.

**φθινοπωρινά.** Mayor has carefully investigated the use of this word (which A.V. renders "(trees) whose fruit withereth," R.V. rightly "autumn trees") and shows that the word comes from *φθινόπωρον*, late autumn. This is the time when we expect to find fruit on trees, and therefore the adjective must be taken with the next word *ἄκαρπα*: the trees have no fruit at the season when they ought to have it, like the barren fig tree in the Gospels.

**δὶς ἀποθανόντα**: twice dead: applying to the men rather than the trees. The men are twice dead because they were once dead in sin before baptism and have fallen away from the truth since baptism.

**13. κύματα** *κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Isa. lvii. 20. "The wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt" (Mayor).

**ἐπαφρίζοντα**, casting up their own shame, exposing it, as the sea

casts up refuse on the beach. Moschus *Idyll.* v. 5 (ἁ δὲ θάλασσα κυρτὸν ἐπαφρίζῃ) is the only author quoted for the rare verb.

**ἀστέρες πλανῆται,** on this see Introd. p. xlvii.

**οἷς ὁ ζόφος** κ.τ.λ. Notice that these words are applied in 2 Peter with far less appropriateness to the waterless springs and driven clouds.

**14, 15.** On the quotation from *Enoch* see Introd. p. xlvi.

**16.** Largely from the *Assumption of Moses* : see Introd. pp. xliv, xlv.

**17.** We find several examples in N.T. (e.g. Acts xx. 29, 1 Tim. iv., 2 Tim. iii. etc.) of predictions of false teaching and wickedness in the Christian body, but not of mockers, as here. Jude need not be referring to a written document, but to a spoken warning often uttered (ἔλεγον) by the Apostles. But see above on 2 Peter iii. 3. The mockers, teaching as they did the lawfulness of many lax practices, would deride those who held the stricter view.

**19. ἀποδιορίζοντες,** making distinction, saying "stand aside, touch me not : I am holier than thou." In the Introd. p. xlv I suggest that this again is an allusion to the *Assumption of Moses*. The false teachers would claim possession of special knowledge in divine things.

**ψυχικοί,** sensual. 1 Cor. ii. 14 a ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, xv. 44 σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. James iii. 15 speaks of a wisdom which is ἐπίγειος, ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης. There it is definitely the opposite of πνευματικός.

**πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες,** though doubtless they claimed to possess it in a special degree.

**20. ἐποικοδομοῦντες...πίστει.** Polycarp's letter to the Philippians (iii. 2) seems to contain a reminiscence of this (Bigg and Mayor). "If you study the epistles of the blessed Apostle Paul, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν." St Paul often uses the metaphor of building, notably in Eph. ii. 20 sqq. The solidarity of the brotherhood is contrasted with the divisions introduced by the ἀποδιορίζοντες.

**πίστει,** used very much as in *v.* 3.

**ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι,** cf. Eph. vi. 18 προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι.

**21. προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος** as Symeon in Luke ii. 25. Cf. Titus ii. 13 προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα κ.τ.λ.

**22, 23.** He abruptly returns to the thought of the false teachers suggested perhaps by the words ἑαυτοὺς τηρήσατε, "keep yourselves." "And what about your relation to others? what is your duty to them?"

I have discussed the reading in Introd. pp. lvi, lvii, and prefer that which gives *three* clauses.

**22. οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους.** A.V. reads *διακρινόμενοι* and translates "making a difference" which is only correct as a rendering of *διακρίνοντες*. *διακρινόμενος* in James i. 6 means "wavering, doubting," and this gives a good sense here. "Some you must convince when they are wavering." The alternative rendering is "when they dispute with you," and this has support from *v.* 9 of this Epistle.

*οὓς δὲ* **σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.** The idea is that of a brand plucked out of the burning, which occurs in Amos iv. 11 (coupled with a reference to Sodom and Gomorrah: cf. Jude 7) and also in Zech. iii. 2 of the High Priest Joshua (cf. Jude 9, where the words *ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος* are taken by Westcott and Hort as referring to the same verse in Zech.).

**23. οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες** *κ.τ.λ.* In the reference to the garment there may be again a recollection of Zech. iii., where the High Priest is clad in filthy garments.

The threefold division marks a growth of danger. The first class of those who have come under the influence of the false teachers are waverers. These the faithful are to dispute with, and convince. The next are in the fire and must be snatched out. The third cannot be touched without danger: perhaps all that can be done is to pity them.

**24, 25.** The beautiful ending of the Epistle grows naturally out of the preceding words. The thought of the fate that attends those who have gone astray leads to a prayer that the faithful may be preserved in their faith. Compare the opening words with Rom. xvi. 25.

**ἀπταίστους** only here in N.T., but the verb *πταίω* occurs in 2 Peter i. 10 *οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε* in a very similar connexion: also in James ii. 10, iii. 2.

**στῆσαι κατενώπιον** *κ.τ.λ.* The thought of Col. i. 22 is very like this: *παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει.* Compare also Eph. i. 4 *εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.* These two passages—certainly the last—refer to the present life. Jude is speaking of the future.

**ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.** The substantive occurs in the Greek fragment of *Enoch*, v. 2 "the years of their joy *πληθυνθήσεται ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.*"

**25. μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν**, cf. *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην v.* 4, Rom. xvi. 27. *Θεὸς σωτήρ* occurs in the *Magnificat* Luke i. 47 and in 1 Tim. i. 1,

ii. 3, iv. 10. *μόνῳ* perhaps emphasized because false teachers held that the God of the Jews, the Creator, was distinct from the true God.

**διὰ Ἰ. Χ.** (cf. Rom. i. 8) is best taken with what follows, "glory to God through Jesus Christ," not "God, our Saviour through Jesus Christ." In 1 Pet. iv. 11 it is said "that God may in all things be glorified through Jesus Christ."

**μεγαλωσύνη** occurs several times in the Greek fragment of *Enoch* but in N.T. only in Heb. i. 3 "sat down on the right hand of the *majesty* on high."

**ἐξουσία**, cf. Rev. xii. 10 *ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ*, which however is a statement of what has happened, not an ascription of praise. It does not occur elsewhere in doxologies (Mayor), though *δύναμις* and *ἰσχύς* do.

**πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος** stands by itself: we have *πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων* in 1 Cor. ii. 7, and in Prov. viii. 23 Wisdom says "God founded me *πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος*."

**εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας** again is a unique variant of the ordinary *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

# GENERAL INDEX

## TO THE INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.