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In the case of this document a question preliminary to the ordinary heads of Introduction arises; the question of the Unity of the Epistle. For it contains two formal and solemn conclusions. The first is "That in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ to Whom belongs the glory and the victory to the ages of the ages. Amen;" and the second, "Now the God of all grace, he who called you to his eternal glory in Christ, himself shall refit you after brief suffering, shall confirm you, shall strengthen you, shall establish you. His is the victory to the ages of the ages. Amen." The latter conclusion is followed by a postscript which ends with yet another formula of conclusion "Peace to you all who are in Christ".

The address at the head of the document stamps it as a circular letter or an encyclical epistle. The three conclusions divide it into three parts. Of these the last and shortest part may fairly be taken as a true postscript. The writer (we may suppose) takes the pen from the secretary, to whom he has been dictating, and appends a greeting in his own handwriting. St. Paul did the same thing in the Epistle to the Galatians. In such a case the value of the postscript would be greater than in the case of a circular letter addressed to widely separated churches in different provinces or countries. The Galatian letter would naturally be preserved in the chest of the chief church of the province; and St. Paul's autograph would be prized as proof of the authenticity of the exemplar, copies of which were doubtless made and supplied as need and demand arose. But in this case also the autograph has a value of its own, inasmuch as it gives the credentials of the bearer, who presumably went from place to place and read it out to the assembled Christians, letting them see the postscript before he travelled on. So the third part of the letter may well be an integral portion of this encyclical.

But this postscript is preceded not by one conclusion but by two; and in this the document bears witness against its own unity. And
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further it is to be noted that the first conclusion is followed by a
general form of address—"Beloved"—which has occurred at an
earlier point.\(^1\) In fact, apart from the formal superscription—X to
Y greeting—the second part\(^2\) of the Epistle is a complete epistle in
itself. And it is natural enough that a circular letter, addressed to
different communities, should contain alternative or additional letters,
if the writer was aware that the conditions or circumstances were
not identical in every case. The formal severance of the second
part may, therefore, be taken as indicating that all the communities
addressed were not necessarily in the condition, which that part
implies.

1. The Recipients.—Eusebius of Caesarea, whose Ecclesiastical
History belongs to the beginning of the fourth century, is the earliest
(extant) writer, who inquired systematically into the origins of the
Christian literature. For him there is no question about the nation-
ality of the first recipients of this document: they are Hebrews or
Jewish Christians. He insists that the compact made between St.
Peter and St. Paul at Jerusalem\(^3\) was faithfully observed, as their
respective writings and the evidence of St. Luke agree to testify:
"That Paul, on the one hand, preached to those of Gentile origin and
so laid the foundations of the churches from Jerusalem and round
about as far as Illyricum is plain from his own statements and from
the narratives, which Luke gives in the Acts. And, on the other hand,
from the phrases of Peter it is clear in what provinces he for his part
preached the Gospel of Christ to those of the Circumcision and
delivered to them the message of the New Covenant—I mean, from
his acknowledged epistle in which he writes to those of Hebrew origin
in the dispersion of Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia and Asia, and
Bithynia.\(^4\)

Just before this\(^5\) plain statement Eusebius quotes verbally from
Origen’s exegetical commentary upon Genesis: “Peter seems to have
preached in Pontus and Galatia and Bithynia, in Cappadocia and
Asia to the Jews in dispersion”. Origen’s assertion rests presumably
on the authority of the address of our document, although the order
of the provinces differs in respect of Bithynia from the generally
accepted text. When Eusebius speaks for himself he restores the
conventional order of the provinces and explicitly quotes the authority
of “the acknowledged Epistle”. It does not seem at all probable
that either Eusebius or Origen had any other evidence for their belief
than such as is preserved for modern investigation. Both knew of

\(^{1}\) ii. xi. \(^{2}\) iv. xii.-v. xi. \(^{3}\) Gal. ii. 7-9. 
\(^{4}\) Eus. H. E. iii. 4. \(^{5}\) Eus. H. E. iii. 1.
the compact, in virtue of which Peter was to continue his work among the Jews: both construed the direction of the Epistle as proof that the writer had preached the Gospel to his readers: therefore in virtue of the compact his readers were Jews—Jews of the Dispersion, but still Jews.

The evidence upon which both Eusebius and Origen seem to rely is extant; the deduction drawn—characteristic as it is of patristic exegesis—is not necessarily valid, and it is not supported by any pretence of independent tradition.

The compact to which James and Cephas and John, on the one side, and Paul and Barnabas, on the other, were consenting parties, cannot be held to prove these Christians to be Jewish Christians—even if it could be made out that St. Peter "the Apostle of the Circumcision," who writes to them, converted them to Christianity.

The appellation of the Dispersion is on the face of it a weightier argument, because Dispersion is a technical term and comprises in itself all the Jews who lived outside Palestine. Whatever its provenance, the term is Jewish through and through, for it insists upon the First Cause of all such scattering and upon the central shrine from which the exiles are removed. The mere Greek spoke and thought of exiles as fugitives and had a collective term φυγάτα to correspond with the Jewish διασκαρδή. But the Jewish word recognises that those dispersed are placed here and there—as exiles, traders, and what not?—by God. Jewish as it is, this appellation is capable of extension to the new Israel and does not necessarily imply that the persons addressed were born Jews. Ultimately and fundamentally it does not denote privilege like the term Israel but rather penalty—removal from the place which was traditionally associated with the visible presence of Jehovah. The writer may, perhaps, be taken to use it without a precise definition of a centre corresponding to the Holy Land of the Jew; but there is no valid ground for doubting that he could apply it to Gentiles, who were in the world and not of it by virtue of their faith in Christ. Situated as they were among unfriendly friends these Gentile churches are collectively the new Dispersion.

These Gentile Churches—for there is more than one passage in our document which seems to settle the point, apart from general probabilities to be derived from the traditions of St. Paul's missionary activity. In the first place, St. Peter 1 applies to his readers the words of Hosea 2; ye who were once no People but now are God's People, who were not in a state of experiencing His mercy, but now have

---

1 ii. 10.  
2 See Hosea ii. 23.
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come under its influence." At a definite time God had shown mercy to these Christians, who before—according to the strict Jewish point of view—had been outside the pale of His mercy. And, if we may argue from silence as from the tenses employed, they were formerly not a people at all, to say nothing of their being no people of God. In fact they were just tribes and Gentiles—not a λαὸς but just ἑθνοῦ. It is true that Hosea was speaking of the children of Israel, who had apostatized, and of the final restoration, when all the dispersed should be gathered together. It is true, again, that St. Paul uses the prophecy conformably with the apparent intention of the prophet; but he cites it more fully than St. Peter in connexion with the calling of the Gentiles. The Christian Church is God’s, Israel the heir of His promises; and—who knows?—the writer may have added the title of the Dispersion partly because it is written in the book of Hosea," and I will sow her unto myself upon the earth, and I will love her who was not beloved, and I will say to Not-my-people, Thou art my people and he shall say, Thou art the Lord my God.” It is a great prophecy and a Jewish Christian would be slow to forget its first intention. No line of argument can exclude the possibility that some of the Christians, to whom his letter is addressed, were born Jews. And if he thought less of them and most of the aliens, who, perhaps, outnumbered them, at any rate his own mind was Jewish and he spoke to his Jewish self, before he wrote or dictated his letter. It must have been a strange experience for a Jew to preach a Messiah, whom his Nation had rejected, to a motley collection of Gentile believers and to use such prophecies as this.

But whatever emotions the words stirred up within his heart they remained there. The thought of his countrymen does not shake him visibly as it shook St. Paul; and from this self-repression one might conclude that the Jewish element in these churches was insignificant, or that the decree which severed him and them from the unbelieving Jews was already made absolute.

The probable significance of this use of Hosea’s phrase is supported by the words, “For ye were once wanderers like sheep but now ye have returned to the shepherd and overseer of your souls.” It is, of course, possible to exaggerate the force of ἐπιστρέφεσθαι, ye have returned, as if it implied a previous association with God. But the word means no more than obedience to the invitation Repent, which Christian missionaries addressed to all the world; in the Septuagint it is used of Jewish apostasy without implying previous

1 Rom. xi. 28-32. 2 Rom. ix. 24-26. 3 Hosea ii. 23 (LXX). 4 Rom. ix. 1 ff. 5 ii. 25.
apostasy, and here it is fitly applied to the adherence of Gentiles, who previously had no faith in God. In fact its proper force is represented by *turn* rather than *return*.

Another capital passage would seem to be sufficient in itself to show that the writer regarded the churches to whom he speaks, as composed of Gentile Christians: “Sufficient is the time that is past for the accomplishment of the ideal of the Gentiles, when you walked in . . . unlawful idolatry”.1 If they were Jews by birth, who are so reproached for their pre-Christian life, it is clear that they must have been renegades, who had forfeited their title to be reckoned as Jews. For so great an apostasy there is no evidence whatever. That individuals in the Dispersion did succumb to the attractions of the life outside the ghetto is probable enough. Philo, for example, warns his fellow countrymen against the seductions of pagan mysteries; and his own nephew gave up his faith in order to become a soldier of fortune. But the interpretation, which makes Jews of the readers, involves an impossible assumption of wholesale perversion. The persons in question are, surely, Gentiles; before their conversion they lived as their neighbours lived, and, after their conversion, they excited the surprise of their neighbours by their change of life.2

The internal evidence of the Epistle is borne out by what is known of the evangelisation of the provinces named. With the exception of Cilicia all Asia Minor is included and Asia Minor was the great field of the labours of St. Paul and his companions. There is nothing to suggest that St. Peter was addressing converts of his own as Origen and Eusebius3 seem to assume.

*The Author.*—The beginning and the final conclusion of this document certify it to be the letter or epistle of *Peter the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, who speaks of Silvanus and Mark as his companions and writes from “Babylon”. The certificate was accepted and remained unquestioned until quite modern times. Irenæus, whose connexion with Polycarp is certain, quotes the document as written by the Peter of the Church—Simon, son of John, to whom Jesus gave the name of Cephas or (in Greek) Peter. When P. C. Baur (for example) speaks of the “alleged apostolic authorship of writings which bear the marks of pseudonymity so plainly on their face,” 4 he illustrates the reaction which ran riot, when once the doctrine of the inspiration and authority of canonical books was called in question. The authorship of this document does not

---

1 iv. 3. 2 iv. 4. 3 See above page 4. 4 *Church History* (English translation: London, 1878), p. 131 (note) in reference to the Epistle of James and the First Epistle of Peter.
necessarily decide the question of its authority—all or none—as it did in the time of uncritical devotion to the letter of Scripture. But Baur’s brave words do no more to solve the problem than the stolid reiteration of traditional dogmas. And it is to be remembered that Catholic traditions have often been rehabilitated by critical researches.

To the question, “Do you at this time of day venture to attribute this document to Simon Peter?” the answer is, “Why not?”

Such a conservative attitude excites the pity—if not the contempt—of the “advanced” critics. They find no difficulty in treating the Canonical Epistles as most men have treated the Epistles of Phalaris—ever since Bentley wrote his dissertation. Bentley said\(^1\) out of Galen, “That in the age of the Ptolemies the trade of coining false Authors was in greatest Practice and Perfection... When the Attali and the Ptolemies were in Emulation about their Libraries, the knavery of forging Books and Titles began. For there were those that to enhance the price of their Books put the Names of great Authors before them, and so sold them to those Princes.” But Bentley proceeded to demonstrate that the Epistles of Phalaris contained blunders incompatible with their authenticity; and—for all their exquisite reasons—the critics, who treat the First Epistle of Peter as falsely so-called, have not yet found their Bentley. Indeed, their reasons are chiefly interesting as symptoms of presuppositions inherited from past controversies. They reveal (for example) a tendency to resent the attribution of divine authority to the Apostles, and a tendency—which others share—to ignore the relatively mature theology to which, as a matter of fact, the first Christian missionaries were bred, before ever they became missionaries or Christians at all. For those who believe that the Church has been directed by the Holy Spirit it is not easy to suppose that others than James and Peter, Jude and John were as destitute as they were full of divine inspiration. And it is not difficult to acquiesce in the excommunication of Marcion and all others who regard Christianity as a new thing descended from heaven with no affinity to any earthly antecedents.

In a natural and simple phrase this document professes to be written by Peter. But Harnack\(^2\) has put forward the hypothesis that the opening and closing sentences\(^8\) are an interpolation by another hand and argues against the assumption that the whole is a forgery. “If,” he says, “the hypothesis here brought forward should prove erroneous, I should more readily prevail upon myself to regard the improbable as possible and to claim the Epistle for Peter him-
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\(^1\) Wagner’s edition (London, 1883), pp. 80, 81.
\(^2\) Chronologie, p. 457 ff.
\(^8\) i. 1, 2 and v. 12-14.
self than to suppose that a *Pseudo-Petrus* wrote our fragment as it now stands from the first verse to the last, soon after A.D. 90, or even from ten to thirty years earlier. Such an assumption is, in my opinion, weighed down by insuperable difficulties.¹

So far as extant evidence goes Harnack’s hypothesis of interpolation has nothing on which to rest. It remains to consider the chief objections which have been urged to prove that the traditional view is improbable. Peter cannot have written the Epistle (it is said) because (1) it is clearly indebted to Paulinism, (2) it contains no vivid reminiscences of the life and doctrine of Jesus, (3) it is written in better Greek than a Galilean peasant could compass, and (4) it reflects conditions which Peter did not live to see.

The first reason is regarded as decisive by Harnack:² “Were it not for the dependence [of 1 Peter] on the Pauline Epistles, I might perhaps allow myself to maintain its genuineness: that dependence however, is not accidental, but is of the essence of the Epistle”. Dr. Chase has examined the affinities between 1 Peter and the Epistles of the N.T., and it is sufficient to state the results at which he arrives. “The coincidences with St. James can hardly be accounted for on the ground of personal intercourse between the two writers. . . . The coincidences with the Pauline Epistles other than Romans and Ephesians are not very close and are to be accounted for as the outcome of a common evolution of Christian phrases and conceptions rather than as instances of direct borrowing. . . . There is no doubt that the author of 1 Peter was acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans. Nor is this surprising if the writer is St. Peter. . . . The connexion of Ephesians with 1 Peter (here he adopts the words of Hort) is shown more by the identities of thought and similarity in the structure of the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase. . . .” In his summing-up he says: “All that we learn of St. Peter from the New Testament gives us the picture of a man prompt and enthusiastic in action rather than fertile in ideas. His borrowing from St. James’ Epistle shows that his mind was receptive and retentive of the thoughts of others. The Epistle undoubtedly owes much to St. Paul. But it is only when the Pauline element is isolated and exaggerated that it becomes a serious argument against the Petrine authorship of the Epistle.”³

It is to be remembered, also, that St. Paul did not invent Paulinism and that St. Peter manifests (according to the narrative of

² *Chron.* p. 364 (quoted by Chase).
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Acts) a disinclination to associate with the Gentile which suggests that he also was a strict Pharisee. There can be no doubt that of the Apostles of Christianity, who are known to us, St. Paul's was the master-mind. And there can be no doubt that St. Paul brought to the service of the Church a body of doctrine which he had inherited from Gamaliel and the masters of Gamaliel. The common notion that Christianity was something absolutely new planted by St. Paul and watered—watered down—by St. Peter and finally by St. John is inconsistent with known facts and with general probability. It is, indeed, the vicious product of the artificial isolation of the New Testament literature from the literature and the life of Judaism.

Others than St. Paul modified their inherited theology in the light of their belief, that Jesus, having been raised from the dead, was the promised and anointed deliverer—the Messiah, who by revealing God's will more fully than the prophets or the scribes, but not independently of either, introduced to men more fully the Sovereignty of Heaven, under whose yoke he lived and died. Inevitably and insensibly the first Christian teachers learned from each other and profited by their own and each other's experience. But they all inherited and already possessed the presuppositions and categories of the Scribes, whose teaching their Master had endorsed and extended. Into this body of theology they fitted the new fact of a crucified Messiah—into the framework of Pharisaism—as Pharisees fitted all new facts which threw fresh light upon the will of God. If St. Paul was the first (as our fragmentary evidence suggests) to find a deep significance in it, it is not derogatory to St. Peter to suggest that he may have been indebted to St. Paul both here and elsewhere, and such indebtedness is not necessarily an argument against the authenticity of this Epistle of Peter.

The second objection is that our document contains no vivid reminiscences of the life and doctrine of Jesus such as we should expect from a personal disciple.

The alleged expectation is not altogether a reasonable one. If the document is, as an unbroken chain of tradition affirms, a pastoral letter addressed to Christian Churches already in being, there is no reason to expect reminiscences of the life and teaching of Jesus. The Church was built upon the belief that Jesus was raised from the dead and so declared to be the promised deliverer. His submission to death—and the death of the cross—was the crown and the summary of His life as it was the fulfillment of His teaching. So far as other facts and traditions were relatively necessary to the faith of the converts they were naturally communicated—formally or informally—by those who founded or confirmed the Churches. But in an epistle
like this they would have been irrelevant and inconclusive. The occasion called for the emphatic isolation of the glorious resurrection, which followed the culmination of the sufferings of Jesus and in which His past miracles were swallowed up like stars in the sunshine. As for the teaching of Jesus our records are plainly incomplete, and, whether the Fourth Gospel be permitted to give evidence or not it is quite clear that the arguments used by Jesus and the topics He treated were determined for Him by the character of those to whom He addressed Himself. When the Christian missionaries addressed themselves to men of different nationalities, they could not presume in them knowledge of Jewish presuppositions and therefore, quite apart from its relative insignificance they postponed indefinitely much of the teaching of Jesus. For in any case this teaching was relatively insignificant in their view; the essence of their message was Jesus and the Resurrection. Particular incidents and particular sayings may have their value as links in the chain of proof that—witness here and witness there—Jesus was He of whom Moses and the Prophets had spoken. But such proof belongs properly to the controversy with the Jews and, in many cases, not to the original phase of it. Historical or biographical sermons upon which the Gospel according to St. Mark is by tradition asserted to be based, were a sequel to the summons, "Repent and believe". It may well be that St. Peter did so preach, and that he dwelt rather upon the record of Jesus' life in Galilee of the Gentiles, because his own audience had little in common with the Jews of Jerusalem; but his reminiscences of the ministry prior to the Passion were not, as has been said,1 "the best, the most inspiring message that he could deliver at such a critical time". He himself had seen and heard these things; yet, when the crisis came, he himself denied and repudiated Jesus. The impressiveness of these things, which failed to convince an eye-witness, was not likely to be heightened, when he repeated them to strangers. And there can be little doubt that, if he had inserted a reference to the Transfiguration (for example), it would be said nowadays that this was the mark of a sedulous forger, anxious to keep up the part he was playing. In his intercourse with Jesus St. Peter had learned and unlearned here a little and there a little. But at the last his faith was not

1 Von Soden, Early Christian Literature (English Translation), London, 1906, pp. 278 f.: "It is evident that St. Peter cannot have written this epistle. The oldest personal disciple of our Lord would never have omitted the slightest reference to that which must above all things have distinguished him in the eyes of his readers. And how, especially at such a critical time, could he have refrained from speaking of reminiscences which formed the best, the most inspiring, message that he could deliver?"
proof against the appearance of failure. When, therefore, he con-
verted and began to establish his brethren, he imparted to them the
convictions he had acquired, and did not parade the diverse and
devious steps by which he had painfully reached that height.

A third objection is that the Greek of this Epistle is better than
a Galilean peasant could compass and that a Palestinian Jew would
not possess such a familiar knowledge of the Old Testament in
Greek.

Such an objection seems to take no account at all of certain
known facts and of general probability. Even a Galilean peasant,
who stayed in his native place, needed and presumably acquired
some knowledge of the Greek language in his intercourse with the
non-Jewish inhabitants of the land, whom Josephus calls indifferently
Greeks and Syrians. If he went up to Jerusalem for the feasts
he there came into contact with Jews of the Dispersion, most of
whom lived in the Greek-speaking world. The part played by these
assemblies in cementing the solidarity of the whole nation is
commonly overlooked; and therefore it is worth while to quote
Philo's explicit statement on the subject.¹ "The Temple made with
hands," he says, "is necessary for men in general. They must have
a place where they can give thanks for benefits and pray for pardon
when they sin. So there is the temple at Jerusalem and no other.
They must rise up from the ends of the earth and resort thither, if
they would offer sacrifice. They must leave their fatherland, their
friends and their kinsfolk, and so prove the sincerity of their religion.
And this they do. At every feast myriads from East and West,
from North and South repair to the Temple to be free for a little
space from the business and the confusion of their lives. They
draw breath for a little while, as they have leisure for holiness and
the honouring of God. And so they make friends with strangers
hitherto unknown to them; and over sacrifices and libations they form
a community of interests which is the surest pledge of unanimity."

In the face of this, it seems impossible to accept the modern dis-
tinction between Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism as corre-
sponding to an absolute severance in life, language and religion in
the first century of the present era. Apart from this normal inter-
course of all classes of religiously minded Jews, those who aspired
to direct their fellows as Sages or Scribes seem to have travelled in
foreign countries as a part of their training. And further, it is
known that the delivery of the Temple dues at Jerusalem was
regarded as a pious duty which the foremost members of each

¹ De specialibus legibus, i. (de templo), §§ 67-70 (Cohn and Wendland, vol. v. pp.
17 f.; ii. p. 223, Mangey).
community were selected to perform. In these and other ways the Jews of Palestine became acquainted with the Greek language and, so far as they engaged in religious discussion with their visitors or hosts of the Dispersion, with the Old Testament in Greek also. The translation known as the Septuagint was still a triumphant achievement, through which the Jews of the Greek world were retained within the fold of Judaism and the Greeks outside were offered knowledge of the Law. And even when the Christian missionaries began to utilise in the interests of their own creed the laxities of the Septuagint, the non-Christian Jews produced the Greek versions of Aquila Symmachus and Theodotion. In fact, so far as and as long as any sect of Judaism engaged in missionary enterprise knowledge of the Greek language and the Greek Bible was indispensable to its agents.

It is therefore entirely in keeping with the tradition that this document is the Epistle General of St. Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, that it should be written in passable Greek and bear evident traces of familiarity with the Septuagint. In order to prove that Jesus was the deliverer for whom the prophets had looked, he was bound to appeal to the Scriptures, and to the Scriptures in that version which was established as the Bible of the Greek Dispersion.

If in spite of these and other considerations it is felt that the general style of the Epistle is too literary for one who had lived the life and done the work of St. Peter, there is still another line of defence for the traditional view. In other words, it is still possible to believe that the document as it stands gives a just and true account of its own origin. In the postscript the author says, "I write (or I have written) to you, briefly by means of Silvanus the faithful brother, as I reckon him".

If the phrase I write by means of Silvanus may be taken to imply that Silvanus was not only the bearer of the Epistle but also the trusted secretary who wrote out in his own way St. Peter's message, then all the difficulties derived from the style of the document and its use of Pauline ideas vanish at once. And in any case this mention of Silvanus proves that St. Peter was closely associated with the sometime colleague of St. Paul, who had actually helped to preach the Gospel in Syria, Cilicia and Galatia. For there seems to be no reason for questioning the identification of the Silas of the Acts with the Silvanus of the Pauline Epistles and this Epistle.

The interpretation of the phrase διὰ Сιλωανοῦ is still in dispute. Professor Zahn maintains the view that "Silvanus' part in the

composition was so important and so large that its performance required a considerable degree of trustworthiness. . . . It purports to be a letter of Peter's; and such it is, except that Peter left its composition to Silvanus because he regarded him as better fitted than himself . . . to express in an intelligible and effective manner the thoughts and feelings which Peter entertained toward the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor”.

Dr. Chase quotes Professor Zahn as arguing that Silvanus “must have been either a messenger who conveyed the letter or a friend who put St. Peter's thoughts into the form of a letter”. Against this interpretation, he says, four “considerations seem together decisive”; and he concludes that Silvanus carried the Epistle and did not write it. It is of course possible that the phrase may bear this meaning, but the other is not to be excluded. The parallels quoted are, with two exceptions, ambiguous, and of the exceptions each supports one of the rival views. In Acts xv. 22, for example, it is said that the Apostles chose Judas and Silas and wrote by their hand. Clearly they were the bearers of the letter, as it is said that they delivered it at Antioch; and “being prophets they exhorted and confirmed the brethren”.

But it is certainly possible if not definitely probable that they actually wrote each a copy of the letter for himself at the dictation of St. James. The case on which Dr. Chase chiefly relies is the postscript of Ignatius' letter to the Romans: “I write these things to you by the worthy Ephesians: Crocus whom I love is by my side with many others”. But even here the other interpretation is not impossible. They certainly were the bearers, but for safety's sake each may have written his own copy of the letter. The journey from Smyrna to Rome was long and dangerous, and apart from considerations of safe delivery each of them may well have desired to have his own copy. And there is one clear case in which this ambiguity disappears: Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writes to Soter, Bishop of Rome, in acknowledgment of a letter received from the Roman Church, which (he says) “we shall always have to read for our admonition like the former
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1 Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (1900), vol. iii. p. 790.
2 γράφατος διὰ χειρός ἀντίων.
3 Acts xv. 30, οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες κατήλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ συν- αγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος ἐπίθοκαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.
4 Acts xv. 32.
5 Ad Romanos, xiv. 1, γράφω δὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἀπὸ Ομώνυμης δι' Ἐφεσίων τῶν ἀξιωματικῶν. οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡμα τοῦ σὺν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ Κράκος τὸ ποθητὸν μοι ἐνομα.
Epistle written to us through Clement. Here the preposition clearly denotes the interpreter who writes in the name of the Church and cannot cover the messenger also, because the bearers of the Epistle—Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Bito, and Fortunatus—are named at the end.

Since, therefore, εἷς can in such contexts designate the writer as well as the bearer of an Epistle, it is hardly safe to say that Silvanus cannot have been both in this case. If St. Peter had not so far profited by his general experience and in particular by his association with Silvanus and other missionaries as to write moderately good Greek and to employ "Pauline" ideas, then we may suppose that he permitted Silvanus to write the Epistle for him. He was none the less the real author if he employed a letter-writer whose position and experience enabled him to supplement the author's alleged deficiencies in respect of the language and modes of thought familiar to the persons addressed. The postscript indicates St. Peter's approval of the draft thus made and submitted to him. The tone of authority which is used in the addresses to separate classes is naturally reproduced by the secretary from his recollection of what St. Peter had said. The secretary's intervention affects only the manner of the Epistle at most. If Silvanus had really contributed to the matter he would have been joined with St. Peter in the salutation. On the other hand, there is every reason to suppose that Silvanus was also St. Peter's messenger plenipotentiary and would, as when he was sent by the Apostles of Jerusalem, "proclaim the same things by word of mouth".

The fourth objection to the traditional view is that the Epistle reflects conditions which were definitely later than the date of St. Peter's death. No other book of the New Testament offers any plain information about St. Peter at any time after the hypocrisy he practised at Antioch. But Christian tradition connects him not only with Antioch and Asia Minor—statements which are probably simple inferences from the statements of St. Paul's Epistle to the...
Galatians and the First Epistle of St. Peter respectively—but also with Rome. For this part of the tradition there is no obvious hint in the New Testament which can be used to explain away its origin, unless it be supposed that the bare mention of Babylon in the First Epistle of St. Peter is sufficient of itself to have given birth to so complete a legend. It is not surprising that Babylon should have been interpreted as meaning Rome from the first; but the tradition, that St. Peter died at Rome under Nero, has nothing on which to rest in the Epistles or elsewhere.

Tertullian is the first to state this tradition explicitly. We read, in the Lives of the Caesars, "Nero first laid bloody hands upon the rising faith at Rome. Then was Peter girded by another when he was bound to the cross." 1 But apart from the definite date, the tradition is as old as Clement of Rome, who cites St. Peter and St. Paul as "noble examples of our own generation" in his Epistle to the Corinthians: "By reason of envy and jealousy the great and righteous Pillars were persecuted and struggled on till they died. Let us put before our eyes the good Apostles—Peter, who by reason of unrighteous envy endured not one or two but many labours and so became a martyr and departed to the place of glory which was his due". 2 A brief account of St. Paul's sufferings, based largely on New Testament evidence, follows; and the conclusion that St. Peter suffered before St. Paul and both at Rome is commonly drawn. After this Clement goes on to say: "To these men of holy life was gathered a great multitude of elect persons who by reason of envy suffered many outrages and torments and so became a noble example among us". 3 This further illustration of the terrible effects of envy and jealousy—the theme to which all these references are incidental—is most naturally interpreted as describing the victims of the Neronian persecution of A.D. 64, of whom Tacitus 4 speaks as "a huge multitude". If, then, Clement has put his illustrations in

---

1 Vitae Caesarum legimus: Orientem fidei Romae primus Nero cruentavit. Nunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur (Scorpiace, 15). The fact is so stated as to indicate the fulfilment of the word of Jesus reported in John xxi. 18:

2 διὰ ζῆλον καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιώτατοι στόλοι (cf. Gal. ii. 9) ἔδικτησαν καὶ ἔστησαν θῆλησαν. λάβειςν πρὸ ὀφθαλμόν ἡμῶν τοὺς ἁγαθοὺς ἀποτελέσαν Πέτρον διὰ διὰ ζῆλον ἐδικτα τινῖς ἐστιν καὶ ἔκλεψε τὸν τιμῶμεν ἐν χέρις (1 Clementis ad Corinthios, v. 2-4).

3 τούτων τοὺς ἁγάθους ὅσως πολιτευομένων συνηθρόον ἐπὶ τολμᾶς ἀλλάς αἰκίας καὶ βασάνων διὰ ζῆλος παθῶντες ὑπόθεμα κάλλιστον ἔγνωντο ἐν ἡμῖν (1 Clementis ad Corinthios, vi. 1).

4 Annals, xv. 44.
chronological order, he agrees with Tertullian in asserting that St. Peter died as a martyr under Nero and, being a conspicuous pillar of the Church, before the mass of the Christians. To this assertion Origen, quoted by Eusebius,\(^1\) adds the statement that “at the end Peter being at Rome was crucified head-downwards having himself requested that he might so suffer”.

Eusebius in his account of the Neronian persecution endorses this tradition of St. Peter’s martyrdom and cites evidence to prove its truth: “So then at this time this man who was proclaimed one of the foremost fighters against God was led on to slaughter the Apostles. It is related that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself and that Peter was likewise crucified in his reign. And the history is confirmed by the inscription upon the tombs there which is still in existence. It is also confirmed by an ecclesiastic named Gaius, who lived at the time when Zephyrinus was Bishop of Rome, who writing to Proclus, the leader of the Phrygian heresy, says these very words about the places where the sacred tabernacles of the aforesaid Apostles are deposited, ‘But I can shew the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church. And that they both became martyrs at the same time Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writing to the Romans proves in this way. You also by such admonition have compounded the plant of Romans and Corinthians which came from Peter and Paul. For they both of them came to our Corinth and planted us, teaching like doctrine, and in like manner they taught together in Italy and became martyrs at the same time.’\(^2\)

All the other extant evidence\(^3\) agrees with this, and we may fairly conclude that from the end of the first century it has been the unchallenged belief of the Christian Church that St. Peter was put to death at Rome in A.D. 64. The question therefore arises, Is this tradition compatible with the traditional ascription of this document to St. Peter?

**DATE, CIRCUMSTANCES, AND PURPOSE.**

If St. Peter was the author of this document and if St. Peter perished in the persecution under Nero, it follows that the document

---

1. *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, iii. 1: δε καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Ρώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς στομάς αὐτὸς ἔξισεν παθεῖν.
3. See Dr. Chase’s article on Peter (Simon) in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii.
must have been written before A.D. 64. The conclusion is challenged on the ground of the circumstances implied by the document and consequently one or other of the premises is invalidated. The circumstances implied and indicated are supposed to belong to a date definitely later than the time of Nero; and from this supposition it follows either that St. Peter did not write the Epistle or that he did not perish under Nero. In either case the Epistle is now commonly assigned to the reign either of Domitian (A.D. 81-96) or of Trajan (A.D. 98-117). Professor Gunkel (for example) in a popular commentary recently published\(^1\) ends his introduction with the words: “The more precise dating of the Epistle must be determined in accordance with the persecutions above mentioned, with which, it must be confessed, we are not perfectly acquainted. Now the Neronian persecution affected only Rome and not the provinces. On the other hand more general persecutions seem to have taken place under Domitian. The time of Trajan, under whom a persecution (A.D. 112) to which the letters of Pliny to the emperor testify, certainly took place in Asia Minor, is open to the objection that then the Christians were compelled to offer sacrifice—to which the Epistle has no reference. Our Epistle is therefore best assigned to the early period of Domitian’s reign. A still later dating (sc. than the reign of Trajan?) is excluded by the lack of references to Gnosis and the Episcopate.”

Professor Ramsay similarly suggests, on the basis of the contents of the Epistle: “The First Epistle of Peter then must have been written soon after Vespasian’s resumption of the Neronian policy in a more precise and definite form. It implies relations between Church and State which are later than the Neronian period, but which have only just begun.”\(^2\)

Professor Cone\(^3\) urges that the conditions implied by the Epistle fit the time of Trajan, and argues, as against Professor Ramsay, that “since they also fit the later date, they furnish no ground for excluding it in favour of the earlier”. His conclusion is: “The data supplied in the Epistle and in known and precisely determinable historical circumstances do not warrant us in placing its composition more definitely than in the last quarter of the first, or the first quarter of the second, century”. For this he relies partly on Professor Ramsay’s opinion that “the history of the spread of Chris-

---

\(^1\) *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt...* Gottingen, 1908.


\(^3\) *Encyclopedia Biblica III.*, “Peter, the Epistles of”. 
Christianity imperatively demands for 1 Peter a later date than A.D. 64"; and from it he deduces the corollary: "The later date renders it very probable that Babylon is employed figuratively for Rome, according to Rev. xv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 2, 10, 21 ".

Professor Cone's corollary deserves attention. He seems to assume that the Christians started afresh—de novo or ex nihilo—to evolve modes and idioms of thought for themselves. Such an assumption is demonstrably untenable. In the particular case of such cipher-language as this, it is certain that the Christians appropriated the inventions of the Jews, who in their own oppressions and their own persecutions had learned to veil their hopes from all but the initiated. Babylon was the great and typical oppressor, and her successors in the part naturally received her proper name. Rome was not the declared and inflexible enemy of the Jewish nation as a whole before the time of Caligula; but Rome stood behind Herod the Great, and Pompey had desecrated the Temple at Jerusalem. Philo might forgive and forget the outrages which Pompey and Herod had perpetrated in order to heighten the enormity of Caligula's offences, but the Psalms of Solomon and the evidence of Josephus suffice to prove that for some Rome was already the enemy in the last century B.C. Formal proof that the Jews actually spoke of Rome by the name of Babylon before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is, indeed, wanting. But the identification of Rome with Babylon and the consequent transference of the paraphernalia of Babylon to Rome is part and parcel of the apocalyptic vocabulary and passed over into the language of the Rabbis. The author of the Epistle had no more need to explain his use of Babylon than had the Jewish poet who wrote in the name of the Sibyl and said in reference to Nero:

"Poets shall mourn for thee, thrice-hapless Greece,
What time the mighty king of mighty Rome,
Coming from Italy, shall pierce thine Isthmus—
A God-like mortal, born (they say) of Zeus
By lady Hera, who with dulcet songs
Shall slay his hapless mother and many more.
A shameless prince and terrible! He shall fly
From Babylon . . ." ¹

And again he prophesied that after a time and times and half a time²

¹ Oracula, Sibyllina, v. 137-143 (Geffcken: Leipzig, 1902).
² Ibid. 154: "ἐν τερπάτῳ ἀρχέος"; compare Daniel vii. 25.
"From heav'n into the sea a star shall fall
That shall consume with fire the ocean wide,
And Babylon herself, and Italy..."  

Nero's achievements added matricide to the specification of Antichrist; but the book of Daniel and other apocalypses, which were directly or indirectly inspired by the experience of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes, had long ago established the code of language by which each particular persecutor was identified with the vanished type. In the time of Antiochus such disguise was a necessary precaution; and it was so again in the time of Nero or Vespasian, of Domitian or Trajan. In fact, Professor Cone's corollary has nothing to do with his conclusion. Whenever any Christian community became exposed for whatever reason to attack by any representative of the State, the State became for them the enemy, and therefore Babylon.

For Trajan's attitude towards the Christians of Bithynia we have ample testimony—thanks to the lack of independence displayed by his legate, the younger Pliny. In A.D. 112 Bithynia was in a bad state. There were many abuses which called for remedies, and the province was distracted by factions. The law which forbade the formation of clubs or associations for different purposes had fallen into abeyance, and Pliny began by re-enacting it in accordance with Trajan's mandate. On this policy Trajan insisted so strongly that he refused to authorise a fire brigade in Nicomedia, in spite of Pliny's protestations that only 150 men would be enrolled, only carpenters, and for the sole purpose of dealing with such a conflagration as had recently devastated the city. From experience he held that all corporations, whatever name they bore, quickly became political associations. This rigid interpretation of the law made the ordinary meetings of the Christians at once illegal; and there were so many Christians in Bithynia that the temples were almost deserted and the customary sacrifices were omitted. When the edict was

1 Or. Sib. v. 158-160.
2 Trajan to Pliny, xxxii. (xlii.): "Meminerimus idcirco te in istam provinciam missum, quoniam multa in ea emendanda appuerint; xxxiv. (xliii.) meminerimus provinciam istam... factionibus esse vexatam".
3 Pliny to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.): "Edictum meum quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram".
4 Pliny to Trajan, xxxii. (xlii.): "Tu, domine, dispice an instituendum putes Collegium fabrorum dumtaxat hominum Cl. Ego attendam ne quis nisi faber recipiatur neve iure concesso in alium utatur; necerit difficile custodire tam paucos".
5 Trajan to Pliny, xxxiv. (xliii.): "Quodcumque nomen ex quacumque causa dederimus eis qui in idem contracti fuerit... hetaerias que brevi sint".
published, some Christians — apparently renegades, who abjured Christianity when challenged by Pliny—asserted that either they or the Christians generally gave up either the practice of meeting for a common meal or their religious meetings also. It is improbable that those who persisted in their wicked and immoderate superstition should have abandoned their weekly assemblies at which they recited a hymn to Christ as God, but it is unnatural to distinguish between these assemblies and the subsequent meetings for the common meal, and the statement of the renegades may reasonably be confined to their own obedience to the edict.

Professor Ramsay, however, infers from Pliny's language that the statement refers to the Christians as a whole: “They had indeed, been in the habit of holding social meetings, and feasting in common; but this illegal practice they had abandoned as soon as the governor had issued an edict in accordance with the Emperor's instructions, forbidding the formation or existence of sodalitates”. And he asserts that Pliny's language implies a distinction between the illegal meetings of the evening and the legal meetings of the morning: “The regular morning meetings which Pliny speaks about and which, as we know, must have been weekly meetings, were not abandoned, and Pliny obviously accepts them as strictly legal. Amid the strict regulations about societies the Roman government expressly allowed to all people the right of meeting for purely religious purposes. The morning meeting of the Christians was religious; but the evening meeting was social, including a common meal, and therefore constituted the Christian community a sodalitas. The Christians abandoned the illegal meeting, but continued the legal one. This fact is one of the utmost consequence. It shows that the Christian communities were quite alive to the necessity of acting according to the law, and of using the forms of the law to screen themselves as far as was consistent with their principles.”

Against this view it must be urged, in the first place, that the common meal of the Christian community had a definitely religious character and could not be abandoned without a breach of their principles; and, in the second place, that Pliny's language is by no means so explicit and clear as is suggested. The authors of the statement are a large number of persons accused of Christianity, either by an anonymous letter or by an informer: all of them convinced Pliny that they had never been Christians, or had ceased to be Christians, by offering sacrifice to idols and blas-

1 The Church in the Roman Empire, p. 206.
2 Ibid. pp. 219 f.
pheming Christ.\textsuperscript{1} As regards their past Christianity—if ever they had practised Christianity—they affirmed that this was the sum and substance of their crime, that they had been accustomed to assemble on a fixed day before sunrise and to repeat alternately a hymn to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by an oath—not to commit any crime, but—to abstain from theft, brigandage, adultery, breach of faith, and refusal of any deposit; which done they usually departed and assembled again to take food, which food was taken by all together, and involved no crime. And even this, they said, they had ceased to do after the edict.\textsuperscript{2}

Here, surely, Pliny is concerned only with renegades who proved to him that the Christian faith which they had abandoned had led them into no crimes of which he must take cognisance. Their oath was not proof of conspiracy and their meal was not a cannibal feast. To satisfy himself that their denial of the charges brought against them was well founded, Pliny examined two slaves, who were called deaconesses, under torture. Finding nothing in them but a foul immoderate superstition, he submitted the case to the Emperor.\textsuperscript{3}

The fact is that the large number of persons involved and the doubt whether those who had repented of their Christianity had thereby deserved free pardon, gave Pliny food for reflection. Christianity had been rampant in his province, but his experience of these apostates gave him good hope that it might be checked. Apostates would naturally be more zealous heathens, and therefore good

\textsuperscript{1} Pliny to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.): "Propositus est libellus sine auctore multorum nomina continens. Qui negabant esse se Christianos aut fuisses cum praeeunte me deos appellarent et imaginis tuae, quam propter hoc iussaram cum simulacris nominum adficeri, ture ac vino supplicarent, praeterea male dicenter Christo, quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt se vera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi. Alii ab indice nominati esse se Christianos diexerunt et mox negaverunt; fuisses quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante plures annos non nemo etiam ante viginti quoque. Omnes et imaginem tuam deorum simulacra venerati sunt et Christo maledixerunt."

\textsuperscript{2} Pliny, ibid. "Quo magis necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis quae ministrae diebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quaerere. Nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam immodicam. Ideo dilata cognitione ad consulendum te decurri".

\textsuperscript{3} Pliny, ibid.: "Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae vel erroris quod esset soliti statu die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in aeculuis aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegaret; quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium; quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram".
citizens, in future. To execute them all would have been to diminish seriously the population of his province.\footnote{Ibid.: \textit{Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione maxime propter periclantium munere. Multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; \textit{quae videtur siti et corrigi posse}. Certe satis constat prope iam desolata tempora coepisse celebrari et sacra sollemnia diiintermissa repeti pastumque venire victimarum cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor.}} As a conscientious governor, he was anxious to bring this section of his subjects to their senses, and he believed that the extension of clemency to those who repented of their Christianity would be the means most likely to secure that end.\footnote{Ibid.: \textit{Ex quo facile est opinari quae turba hominum emendari possit si sit paenitentiae locus".}} If room for repentance was given, all the Christians might be induced to recant. He does not contemplate a policy of religious toleration at all. Though there might be no crimes inherent in the profession of Christianity, Christians were still guilty of \textit{sacrilegium} when they refused to worship the gods of the Empire, even if they satisfied Pliny that their meetings were purely religious in character and, therefore, did not constitute them a \textit{sodalitas} within the meaning of the law. Obstinate Christians had three opportunities of recantation: if they did not take advantage of their opportunities, they were executed summarily—or, if they were Roman citizens, they were transported to Rome. It was an accepted and a familiar fact that a Christian was, as such, a criminal\footnote{Ibid.: \textit{Interrogari ipsos an essent Christiani. Confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogari, supplicium miram: perseverantes duci iussi. \textit{Neque enim dubitatum, qualescumque esset quod faterentur, pertinaciam certe et inflexiblem obsti- nationem debere puniri. Fuerunt alii similis amentiae quos, quia cives Romani erant, adnotari in urbem remittendos.}})—so familiar, indeed, that Pliny leaves their crime of sacrilege to be inferred from the sacrifice required of those who would prove their apostasy. He confesses that he never occupied such an official position as to be called on to decide or advise in the case of Christians, and was therefore ignorant of the precise nature of the proceedings.\footnote{Professor Ramsay's paraphrase of Pliny's words (ibid.): \textit{Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam; ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quieri".}} But he did not hesitate to condemn the obdurate,\footnote{See note (t) supra.} although he might doubt whether the name itself, if it involved no crime, or the crimes attaching to the name were thereby punished.\footnote{Ibid.: \textit{Nec mediocriter haesitavi sitne aliquid discrimen aetatum an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus different, detur paenitentiae venia an ei qui omnino Christianus fuit desisse non prosit, nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an Flagitia cohaerentia nomini puniantur".}
Such doubts as this arose from his examination of the renegades and the slaves who were called deaconesses, in which he learned that there were no crimes other than sacrilegium involved in the name, and, therefore, was emboldened to suggest that renegades should be pardoned.

Trajan’s answer authorises the policy suggested: “Any one who denies that he is a Christian and gives plain proof of his truthfulness, that is, by worshipping our gods, though his past may not be above suspicion, shall obtain pardon by his repentance”.¹ No anonymous accusations are to be entertained,² and Christians are not to be sought out. If they are brought before the governor and convicted of being Christians they must, of course, be punished. Pliny did well to investigate the cases of the so-called Christians, who had been brought before him.³ No general policy can be laid down. Trajan is content to endorse the existing practice of punishing obdurate Christians as Christians, and to sanction the pardon of such Christians as were prepared to renounce their Christianity and to ratify their renunciation by performance of heathen rites.

Trajan’s endorsement of the action which Pliny took without hesitation against the Christians as such, proves that “persecution for the name” was already an established and familiar part of Roman policy. If Pliny had been present at trials of Christians before becoming governor of Bithynia, he might have learned that the vulgar were wrong in ascribing foul crimes to the Christians, as such. But there is no question that Christians, as such, were liable to capital punishment. In the first instance, when he had only to do with those Christians who refused to apostatize, Pliny condemned them to death almost instinctively as a matter of routine and immemorial tradition.

Under Domitian (according to Dio Cassius) Flavius Clemens was put to death on the charge of atheism, and many others who embraced the customs of the Jews were condemned to death or

¹Trajan to Pliny, xcvi. (xcviii.). . . . puniendi sunt ita tamen ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est supplicando dis nostris, quamvis suspectus in praeteritum, veniam ex paenitentia impetret ".
²Ibid.: "Sineauctores vero propositi libelli in nullo crimine locum habere debent. Nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est."
³Ibid.: "Actum quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in'excutiendis causis eorum qui Christiani ad te delati fuerunt secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid quod quasi certam formam habeat constituit ‘potest. Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt ". . . .
deprived of their goods. His wife Domitilla, a relative of the Emperor, was merely banished to Pandateria.¹

Suetonius² describes Flavius Clemens as a man of contemptible inactivity—a conventional description of Christians³—and says that he was put to death on the barest suspicion. Eusebius⁴ asserts explicitly that Domitilla was banished with many others, because she bore witness to Christ. Probably the Christians were regarded as a Jewish sect who could not claim the privileges of Jews proper. Evidently the sect was proscribed. A Christian as such was liable to death, banishment, or confiscation of his goods. Domitian (as Eusebius⁵ says) was the second persecutor of the Christian Church and made himself the heir of Nero's battle with God. But according to Hegesippus,⁶ as reported by Eusebius,⁷ Domitian stopped the persecution after examining the grandsons of Judas, the brother of Jesus.⁸

¹ lxvii. 14 (epitome of Xiphilinus): Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει (A.D. 95) ἐλλογε τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἀνέθεσεν, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὁ θάνατος, καὶ γυναῖκι καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενέαν ἐπιστεύσαντα, κατέστρεφεν ὁ Δομιτιάνος ἐπίθετος ἐκκλησίας ἢ ἀμφότερος ἀκολούθησαν, ψυχῆς ἢ καὶ ἄλλου εἰς τὰ τῶν ἱστοριῶν ὁθόν εξελλογεῖτο πολλοῖς κατευθύνθησαν, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπίστους, οἱ δὲ τῶν γονέων οὑσίων ἔστησαν ἢ Δομιτίλλα ἄξωρωσθῇ μόνον εἰς Πανδατερίαν.

² Domitian xv. Denique Flavium Clementem patreulum suum contemplissimae inertiae... repente ex tenuissima suspicione tantum non ipso eius consulatu interemit: quo maxime facto maturavit sibi exilium.

³ Compare Tertullian's Apology, xlii.: "Sed alio quoque iniuriarum titulo postulamur et infructuosae in negotiis dicimus. Quis modo infructuosae videmus negotiis vestris, cum quibus et de quibus vivimus, non scio. Sed si carminias tuas non frequento, attamen et illa die homo sum."

⁴ Historiae ecclesiasticae, iii. 18: "εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ ἐρα... τῆς ἡμέρας πιὸν διελεμητείδες θεορεῖ ὑποκατάλειπόν τε τοῖς αὐτῶν ἑτορίαις τοῦ τοῦ διωγμοῦ καὶ τὸν αὐτῷ μαρτύρια παραδοτοῦν. οὕτως εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ ἐνσυνήματο, ἐν τοῖς πανταιακάκεσις Δομετιανῷ μετὰ πλειστῶν ἐπέρεμεν καὶ Φλαβιανῷ Δομετιλλῶν ἤτορίζοντο, εἰς ἐκεῖνῇ γεγονάν Φλαβίου Κλήμεστος, ἐνδό τῆς της ὁμοιότητος εἰς Ρώμης ὅπως εἰς τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίας ἱνεκές, εἰς νήσου Ποικίλια κατὰ τιμωρίαν δεδομένῃ."

⁵ Historiae ecclesiasticae, iii. 17: "Τῆς Νέρωνος θεομορφίας τε καὶ θεομαχίας εὐδοχείων ἃντων κατεστήσατο. διὰ τούτου θάνατον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦς Χριστόν καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Οὐσιωδότατον μὴν καθ' ἡμῶν ἄτοπον ἔστινος τότε."

⁶ Hegesippus was an Eastern—probably a native of Palestine. He visited Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus (A.D. 155-156) and published his five books of Memoranda or Memoirs (Ὑπομνήματα) in A.D. 180. See Bardenhewer, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, i. pp. 483-490.

⁷ Historiae ecclesiasticae, iii. 20: "εἰς δὲ μήδεν αὐτῶν κατεγραφὰ τῶν Δομετίλλων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς ἐντελῶς καταφρονήσατα, ἐλευθέρως μὴν αὐτοῦ ἀνείον, κατασώζοι δὲ διὰ προστάγματος τὸν κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίας διωγμόν.
Eusebius\(^1\) quotes Tertullian\(^8\) to the same general effect: "Domitian, a semi-Nero in cruelty, attempted to condemn the Christians; but, being also a man, he readily stopped the course of action he had begun, and even recalled those whom he had banished ".

But Nero was the first to persecute the Christians\(^8\) and something is known of his procedure from Tacitus,\(^4\) who represents his persecution as a final effort to divert from himself the suspicion of having given orders for the fire of Rome. Human assistance, public largesses, services of expiation, all failed to banish the calumny. So to put an end to the rumour, Nero made the Christians, as they were commonly called by the vulgar who hated them for their crimes, scape-goats in his place and visited them with the most elaborate penalties. Christ from whom their name was derived was executed by the procurator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius. For a time this fatal superstition was suppressed, but it broke out afterwards not only in Judaea, the birthplace of the mischief, but also in Rome . . . Accordingly, in the first instance those who confessed were arrested; and afterwards on their information a huge multitude were sent to join them not so much on the charge of arson as on that of hatred of the human race.

Tacitus emphasises the fact that the Christians were guilty and deserved to suffer the last penalty of the law.\(^5\) Public feeling condemned them as enemies of civilised society; but the outrageous mockery with which Nero had them executed, and the common suspicion that the alleged arson was a mere pretence produced a revul-

---

1 Historia ecclesiasticae, iii. 20.
2 Apology v.: "Temptaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate; sed qua et homo (ὁ λαὸς οὖν τοῦ συναγωνίου, Eusebius) facile coeptum repressit, restituitis etiam quos relegaverat.
3 Tertullian, Apology, v.: "Consulite commentarios vestros; illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romae orientem Caesariano gladio feroxissimam. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostrae etiam gloriarnur. Qui enim scit illum, intelligere potest non nisi grande aliquid bonum a Nerone damnatum."
4 Annals, xv. 44: "Sed non ope humana, non lardonibus principis aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia, quin iussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subsidit reos, et quaesitisissimis poenis afferat, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos (sic) appellabat. Auctor nominis eius Christus, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in praeconis exitiabilis superstitione rursus erumphebat, non modo per Judaeam originem eius mali sed per urbem etiam. . . . Igitur primo correpti qui faterabant, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendi quam odio humani generis coniuncti sunt."
5 Ibid.: "sontes et novissima exempla meritos". 
sion in their favour.\textsuperscript{1} The bare punishments—cruciﬁxion, burning at the stake, and death by wild beasts—were right and proper. But the people to whom Nero threw open his gardens, in order that they might witness such sights, found Nero himself among them dressed in the garb of a charioteer\textsuperscript{2}—the ancient equivalent of a jockey. If the Christians were really magicians, as their punishments implied,\textsuperscript{8} and their stories of healings may have suggested, the situation was too serious for such buffoonery. Nero’s conduct was enough to dis-credit his plea of reasons of state.

It is clear, then, that Christians, who confessed their Christianity or were denounced as Christians by such confessors, were put to death by Nero after the great ﬁre of Rome in a.d. 64. It was alleged that they were incendiaries or magicians, but these allegations were not proven. The reference to the execution of the founder of the sect suggests that they were, in accordance with that precedent, liable to capital punishment in Rome or in the provinces.

Suetonius records that under Nero many practices were severely punished and prohibited and many others set up. No food was henceforth to be sold in the cook-shops (for example) except vegetables; and punishments were inﬂicted upon the Christians—a kind of men who embraced a new and maleficient superstition.\textsuperscript{4}

The natural inference that Nero’s action in the matter of the Christians formed a precedent which was followed generally and in the provinces unless further regulations were introduced by himself or his successors, is probable in the nature of the case, and it is expressly asserted by Sulpicius Severus, who follows Tacitus, and may have known parts of his \textit{Annals} which are no longer extant. This, he says, was the beginning of the savage treatment of the Christians.

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Annals}: “pereuntibus addita ludibia, ut ferarum tergis contecti, laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affini, aut flammandi, atque ubi deﬁcisset dies in usum nocturni luminis urerentur . . . Unde . . . miseratio oriebat, tamquam non utili-tate publica sed in saevitiam unius absumerentur.”

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Ibid.:} “Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et Circense ludicum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel circulo insistentes”.

\textsuperscript{3} So Ramsay, \textit{Church in the Roman Empire}, p. 236: “\textit{Odium humani generis} was, as Arnold aptly points out, the crime of poisoners and magicians. . . . The punishments inﬂicted on the Christians under Nero are those ordered for magicians. Paulls, Sentent. v. 23 M.: “Magiae artis conscios summo supplicio afﬁci placuit, id est, bestiis obicii aut cruci sufﬁgi. Ipsi autem magi vivi exuruntur.”

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Vita Neronis}, xvi.: “Mutua sub eo et animadversa severe et coercita nec minus instituta . . . interdictum, ne quid in popinis cocti praeter legumina aut holera veniret cum antea nullum non obsonii genus proponeretur; adﬁcti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae.”
Afterwards also laws were laid down by which the religion was proscribed and edicts were issued by which it was publicly declared illegal to be a Christian. Then Paul and Peter were condemned to death.¹

To the three first persecutors of the Church—Nero, Domitian, and Trajan—Sulpicius Severus suggests that Titus should be added. If he is following good authority—say, Tacitus, here as elsewhere—Titus held a council to decide the fate of the Temple, when Jerusalem was taken in A.D. 70. Of his counsellors some urged that a consecrated house famous beyond all mortal things ought not to be destroyed. Its preservation would bear witness to Roman moderation; its ruin would be an eternal mark of their cruelty. Others, and among them Titus himself, held the Temple should be destroyed at once, in order that the religion of the Jews and Christians might be more completely undone; inasmuch as these religions, though opposed to one another, nevertheless came from the same parent stock. The Christians sprang from the Jews. If the root were taken away the branch would naturally perish.²

From this survey of the evidence it appears that the non-Christian authorities bear out the assertion of Tertullian that from the year 64 A.D. Christianity was distinguished from Judaism and, therefore, proscribed. It had lost the protection of the ancient and famous lawful religion, which sheltered it at the first.³ Nero set the law in motion against it for his own purposes and attempted to justify his action to the people. But such action once taken, persecution of the Church was part of the law of the Empire, as Suetonius, Sulpicius Severus, and Tertullian aver.⁴ There is nothing in the evidence to

¹ *Chronicon*, ii. 29: “Hoc initio in Christianos saevirico coeptum. Post etiam datis legibus religio vetebatur, palamque edictis propositis Christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus et Petrus capitis damnati.”

² *Chronorum*, ii. 30: “Fertur Titus adhibito consilio prius deliberasse ant templum tanti operis everteret. Etenim nonnullis videbatur aedem sacratam ultra omnia mortalitatem illum non oportere delere, quae servata modestiae Romanae testimonium, diruta perennem crudelitatis notam praebere. At contra alii et Titus ipse evertendum imprimis templum censebant, quo plenius Judaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur: quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, isdem tamen ab auctoribus protecetas: Christians ex Judaeis extitisse: radice sublata stirpem facile perituram.”

³ Tertullian, *Apology*, xxii.: “Antiquissimis Judaecorum instrumentis sectam . . . suflultam . . . sub umbraculo insignissimae religionis certe licitae”.

⁴ In addition to passages quoted above, see Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, i. 7: “Principe Augusto nomen hoc ortum est: Tiberio disciplina eius influxit: sub Nerone damnatio invaluit ut iam hinc de persona persecutoris ponderetis, si pius ille princeps, impit Christiani . . . si non hostis publicus, nos publici hostes: quales simus dannator ipse demonstravit, utique aemula sibi puniens: et tamen permansit eras
suggest that the Neronian persecution slackened, because the citizens of Rome saw through the pretexts of arson and witchcraft. On the contrary the evidence suggests that the name was condemned by Nero.

It was still possible for Titus and for Dio Cassius to recall the fact that Christianity was a sect—a schismatic sect of Judaism. Perhaps the condemnation of the sect carried with it a partial proscription and prohibition of its name. But there is no trace of any real change of attitude between the policy, on which Nero embarked in sudden desperation, and the action taken by Pliny, when he began to put the affairs of Bithynia in order. Pliny assumed that the name of Christian was proof of guilt and only inquired why, when he found himself dealing with special and extenuating circumstances. Nero in special circumstances had sought to save himself from popular suspicion by making the name of Christian proof, first of special and then of general guilt.

It remains to examine the relations of the Christian Church and the Roman State, as they are reflected in the First Epistle of St. Peter, and to inquire which of the first three persecutions known to us they best fit.

In the first part of the Epistle, which ends at iv. 11, the writer speaks generally of manifold temptations. He exhorteth them—to quote the summary of the revisers of 1611—from the breach of charity . . . he beseecheth them also to abstain from fleshly lusts, to be obedient to magistrates, and teacheth servants how to obey their masters, patiently suffering for well-doing after the example of Christ. He teacheth the duty of wives and husbands to each other, exhorting all men to unity and love, and to suffer persecution. . . . He exhorteth them to cease from sin by the example of Christ, and the consideration of the general end that now approacheth. . . .

In the second part of the Epistle the writer comforteth them against persecution. He exhorteth the elders to feed their flocks, the younger to obey, and all to be sober, watchful, and constant in the faith: to resist the cruel adversary the devil.” Here only it is suggested that Christians may be put to death for the Name. For certain churches, to whom the bearer would read this part of the letter and whose special circumstances the writer had in mind, a trial was imminent: their adversary the devil was walking about, as a roaring lion,

omnibus hoc solum institutum Neronianum: iustum denique, ut dissimile sui auctoris”.

1 i. 6.  

2 iv. 12.
seeking whom he might devour. In the earlier and general part the references to persecution and persecutors are vaguer, and stress is laid upon the railing or reviling to which the Christians are exposed, but must not retaliate in kind. In both parts the example of Christ is put before them as their model—He suffered and they must suffer as He suffered—but only in the second part is it added that they must commit the keeping of their souls to God, as He did. The first part, in fact, does not seem to contemplate state-persecution so much as the discredit and discomfort inevitably incurred by those who dissent from an established religion.

But such a distinction between the two parts of the Epistle, even if it be accepted as valid, does not relegate the second part to a later period. In some of the Churches of Asia Minor, at any rate—and there is no evidence to show which—the conditions described in the second part existed already. And so the evidence of the Epistle as a whole must be taken.

The faith of the Christians addressed is undergoing a trial: for a season (if need be) they are in heaviness through manifold temptations. In different ways their faith is being tested. The tests—whatever they are—cause a temporary grief in the midst of their permanent joy, but will only refine their faith and purge it of dross. Half-hearted Christians will fall away. They have already purified their souls by obedience to the truth revealed to them, and must lay aside all malice and all guile and hypocrisies and envies and all evil speakings. They must abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul, and, by their good conduct, refute the common rumour which speaks of them as evildoers. Pending the visitation of God, they are exhorted to be obedient to the Emperor and his officers, and as loyal citizens stop the mouths of ignorant fools. There is no room, here, for the later test of their loyalty: the writer could not exhort them to offer sacrifice to Caesar. No one can really harm them, if they obey these commands; but they may have to suffer for righteousness' sake. They must not be afraid. They must be ready to defend themselves and to reply to every one who inquires about their hope. Good behaviour and gentle answers may put their calumniators to shame; in any case it is essential.

In certain places Christians are already sharing in the sufferings of Christ, and therefore must rejoice therein. Their suffering may be misrepresented as the just punishment of murderers, thieves,
criminals or busybodies: they must correct by word or deed all such misrepresentations and make it clear that they are reproached—or what not?—simply because they are Christians.\(^1\) Their adversary the devil—in the persons of all his agents—goes about seeking whose faith he may destroy; they must resist him and survive the ordeal.\(^2\) Throughout the world the Christian brotherhood is exposed to the same temptations and varied persecutions.

From this evidence Professor Ramsay\(^3\) concludes that the Epistle belongs to the time when Vespasian revived the policy of Nero. "The Christian communities of Asia Minor north of the Taurus are regarded as exposed to persecution (i. 6), not merely in the form of dislike and malevolence on the part of neighbours, . . . but persecution to the death (iv. 15, 16), after trial and question (iii.-15). The persecution is general, and extends over the whole Church (v. 9). The Christians are not merely tried when a private accuser comes forward against them, but are sought out for trial by the Roman officials (v. 8, iii. 15). They suffer for the Name (iv. 14-16) pure and simple; the trial takes the form of inquiry into their religion, giving them the opportunity of 'glorifying God in this name'.'"

Of this persecution by Vespasian there is no evidence except an inference from the statement of Sulpicius Severus, that Titus his son and successor wished to exterminate both Judaism and Christianity, and the general deduction from the letter of Pliny, that persecution for the Name was an established practice. Apart from this objection, it may fairly he said that even the rigorous interpretation which Professor Ramsay puts upon different passages is not necessarily inconsistent with the conditions of the reign of Nero when persecution of the Church did, as a fact, begin. If the vague terms, in which the various sufferings of Christians are described, are to be pressed and limited to mean State persecution and persecution to the death, there still remain indubitable references to unofficial persecution which did not go to such lengths. The author, as Professor Ramsay himself says, looks forward to a period of persecution as the condition in which Christians have to live. Further he exhorts Christians to be loyal subjects and therein proves that the obvious test of loyalty had not yet been applied to them. And he definitely excludes the narrow interpretation of the roaring lion, when he urges the Christians to resist it.

For these and other reasons, Professor Ramsay's theory is re-

\(^1\) iv 13-16.  
\(^2\) v. 8 f.:  
\(^3\) The Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 279 ff.
jected by Dr. Chase on the one hand and Professor Schmiedel on the other. But many of his arguments hold good against the date under Trajan, to which Professor Schmiedel adheres. Pliny’s correspondence with Trajan, however, is not easily made to fit the state of things reflected in the First Epistle of St. Peter. For one thing, in Pliny’s time Bithynia was so far infected by real or nominal Christianity that the temples were deserted. The unlawful superstition was so far predominant that many of its adherents conformed without any conviction. Pliny’s anticipation that clemency shown to such penitents would result in the annihilation of Christianity suggests an altogether different state of things.

On the whole—whether St. Peter perished under Nero or, as Professor Ramsay urges, at a later date—the Epistle may not unreasonably be referred to the time when Nero inaugurated the attack upon the provincial Roman Christians and gave the cue to all provincial governors who wished to earn his favour by endorsing the rightfulness of his action under whatever pretext. Already they were distinguished from the Jews, and, therefore, stood under the ban of the law as an unlicensed corporation. They were magicians who prophesied the destruction of the world, and the fire of Rome was proof of their power. They might plead innocence of crimes associated with the name by vulgar suspicion; but even when they cleared their name it was in itself sufficient to condemn them. That is the pagan view. The Christian view is that Christ suffered and they must follow in His steps. No colour must be given to the misrepresentations of their enemies. They must take every opportunity of removing them. This done, though death be their penalty, they will die to the glory of God, resisting the slanderer and remaining firm in their faith.

**Canonicity.**

There are two different ways of treating the fact that any given book of the New Testament Canon is first quoted as authoritative Scripture and as the work of its commonly reputed author by a later writer of known date and recognised authority. You may say that the said book is thereby recognised as canonical and as authentic either not before or as early as such and such a date. In the former case the endorsement of tradition is regarded as an innovation, in the latter as an explicit regularisation of previous, but inarticulate, practice.

1 *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. i.: “Christian, name of”.
The former interpretation of such facts has the advantage of appearing to appeal to what is apparent and to nothing else. But it involves axioms which require to be proved. We must suppose that the Canon was definitely fixed by authority and was not a thing of gradual growth. And, if we are to argue from the silence of ecclesiastical writers, we must ignore the fact that many of them are no longer extant and postulate for them an interest in such matters as canonicity equal to our own. In fact it seems more reasonable to allow ourselves the exercise of a sober imagination in dealing with the evidence. In the case of 1 Peter at all events there is no sign of any attempt to force a new forgery upon the acceptance of the Church. It contains no innovation of doctrine such as might need the support of Apostolic authority.

The Epistle, then (we may say), is used by Irenæus as early as the third quarter of the second century. Behind Irenæus in all probability there lies a period, in which the idea of the New Testament Canon grew up and in which its contents were gradually reduced for reasons which appeared to those in authority to be adequate. Of that period we certainly do not know everything. All the Gnostics whom Irenæus has pilloried are represented only by fragments and summaries of their doctrines contemptuously preserved by their opponents at a later time. But, even so, it appears that the Gnostics in their efforts to elucidate the philosophy of the Christian religion and to advance to something higher than the somewhat pedestrian and commonplace theology of the ordinary ecclesiastic laid stress upon Scripture. And in so far as they tended to relegate the Old Testament to a definitely inferior place in the development of true religion they necessarily devoted themselves to the writings of the Apostles—the Scriptures of the New Testament. Inevitably the Gospels, which contained the sayings of Jesus, and the works of St. Paul occupied the first place in their estimation. The Lord and the Apostle exercised an authority to which the Church must bow. So the Gnostics applied themselves to New Testament exegesis—not always for the purposes of theological controversy. The controversies, which ensued upon the deductions they drew from such exegesis, led to the delimitation of the Canon and there is a strong presumption in favour of the traditional view of the books which survived the ordeal. 1 Peter is not a book which was likely to be much to the mind of daring thinkers who could discriminate between the different degrees of inspiration latent in different sayings of the Lord and who were determined to be done with Judaism. The Gnostics professed to be wiser than the Apostles—Irenæus their posthumous conqueror.
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1 Peter is a book more congenial to such a man as Polycarp, who was more fitted to be a simple recipient of the general tradition. And it is to be remembered that Polycarp takes us back to a time when the idea of a Canon of New Testament Scripture was in its infancy.

Our document is first quoted with the formula Peter or Peter in his Epistle says in the latter part of the second century.

Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, whose book Against Heresies was written while Eleutherus was Bishop of Rome (A.D. 175-189),1 is the earliest witness to its reception as such. He appealed to it (for example) along with Paul and Isaiah: “et Petrus ait in epistula: Quem non videntes diligitis, inquit, in quem nunc non videntes credistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili”.2 In another place it is quoted after Moses and the Lord: “et propter hoc Petrus, ait, non velamentum malitiae habere nos libertatem sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei”.

Tertullian, a little later, puts Peter on a level with Paul in respect of his inspiration, and explains their agreement as due to the fact that they were inspired by the same spirit: “de modestia quidem cultus et ornatus aperba praescriptio est etiam Petri cohibentis eodem ore quia eodem et spiritu quo Paulus, et vestium gloriam et auri superbiam et crinium lenonium operositatem”.3 In his Antidote to the poison of the Gnostics, which may perhaps be dated A.D. 213, he cites 1 Peter as addressed to the natives of Pontus: “Petrus quidem ad Ponticos, Quanta enim, inquit, gloria si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis. Haec enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis, quoniam et Christus passus est pro nobis, relinquens vobis exemplum semetipsum, uti adequantmini vestigia ipsius. Et rursus Dilecti ne expavescatis ultionem quae agitur in vobis in temptationem, quasi novum accidat vobis; etenim secundum quod communicatis passionibus Christi, gaudeste, uti et in revelazione gloriae eius gaudeatis exultantes: si dedecoramininomine Christi, beati estis, quoniam gloria et dei spiritus requiescat in vobis, dum ne quis vestrum patiatur, ut homicida aut fur aut maleficus aut alieni speculator. Si autem ut Christianus, ne erubescaet, glorificet autem dominum in nomine isto.”4

1 Irenæus, Adv. Haer., iii. 3. 3 (Harvey’s edition).
2 Adv. Haer. iv. 19, 2 = 1 Peter i. 8.
4 1 Peter ii. 16.
5 De Oratione, xv. referring to 1 Peter iii. 3 and Tim. ii. 9; compare Clement of Alexandria, Paedagogus, iii., xi. 66, quoted above.
6 Scorpiace xii. = 1 Peter ii. 20, 21 and iv. 12-15.
Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 150- (? ) 210) commented on 1 Peter in his Hypotyposes, but the commentary is only preserved in a Latin abridgment.\(^1\) In his extant works he quotes freely from the Epistle and uses it as if it were familiar to his readers. In the Paedagogus\(^2\) (for example), which is addressed to catechumens, he says:

\[\text{ἐγνωκότες οὖν τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φοβῷ τῶν τῆς παροικίας ὄρων ἀναστράφητε, εἰδότες διτοῦ φαραγοῦ, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἑλπιδόθημεν ἐκ τῆς μα-

\[\text{ταίας ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατριπαραδότου, ἀλλὰ τιμῶν αἰματι ὡς ἄμοι ἀμώμου καὶ ἀπιλοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀρκε-

\[\text{τὸς οὖν ὁ παρελθητὸς ἔργον—ὁ Πέτρος φησὶ—τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἑθῶν κατειργάθηκα, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσέλγειας, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφυλαγίαις, κύριοις, πότοις, καὶ ἀθιμίοις ἐκβιολοκαρείαις.\(^3\) And in the Stromateis,\(^4\) which were intended for more advanced Christians he has, after quotations from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: 816κοὶ ὁ δοπέδως Πέτρος φησὶν. ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροικοὺς καὶ παρεπιθήμους ἀπέχεσαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἰτίνες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, τῆς ἀναστροφῆς ὑμῶν καλὴν ἐχοντες ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν. ὅτι οὕτως ἔστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιλοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἐργασίαν, ὡς ἔλευθοροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἐχοντες τῆς κακίας τῆς ἕλευθερίαν, ἀλλὰ ὡς δούλοι θεοῦ. On one occasion\(^5\) he fuses together the sumptuary laws for women laid down by St. Paul and St. Peter: προσέναι δὲ αὕτης ὁ παλιδαγωγὸς κελεύει ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, μετὰ αἰδοὶς καὶ σωφροσύνῃς κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς,\(^6\) ὅποτασσομένας τοῖς ίδίοις ἄνθρᾳσιν, ὡς καὶ εἰ τινὲς ἀπειθείοις τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀ-

\[\text{ναστροφῆς ἀνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύονται, φησὶ, τὴν ἐν λόγῳ ἄγνην ἀναστροφῆν ὄμων. ἐν ἐστὼ ὁδὸν ἐξεθεὶς ἐμπλοκῆς καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐν-

\[\text{δύσεως ἑματίων κόσμος, ἀλλὰ ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπος ἐν τῷ ἀφάρω τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεῦ-

\[\text{ματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνάποιν τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελεῖς.\(^7\) This fusion is characteristic: both St. Paul and St. Peter wrote Scripture, and Clement follows popular usage, which never has insisted upon a nice discrimination between the authors of "texts". Indeed in another place\(^8\) he refers part of the first Epistle to Timothy\(^9\) to St. Peter:

\(^{1}\) Potter's edition, pp. 1006 f.  \(^{2}\) III., xi. 85. \(^{3}\) I Peter i. 17-19, iv. 3.

\(^{4}\) III., xi. 75. \(^{5}\) Paedagogus, III., xi. 66. \(^{6}\) I Tim. ii. 9.

\(^{7}\) I Peter iii. 1-4. \(^{8}\) Paedagogus, II., xii. 127. \(^{9}\) Tim. ii. 9 f.
The fact of the matter is that even Clement used, at any rate in his Paedagogus, manuals of extracts from Scripture classified according to their subjects. His Paedagogus or instructor is the distinguished successor of a line of humbler books of the same kind. The Christian catechist had his armoury of appropriate texts just as the missionary to the Jews had his. The extracts were arranged under headings: sayings of Moses, the Prophet, the Psalmist, the Sage, the Lord and the Apostle followed each other in various orders and with different degrees of precision in attribution. The inevitable results were that the extracts were affected by their new neighbours in respect of their text, and that their proper ascription was lost sight of. As the learning and the security of the Church increased, these results were corrected. Complete Bibles in the Church chests superseded the manuals, and Origen (for example) laboured to restore the purity of the text. The new state of things is reflected in the Stromateis of Clement: there Jesus Son of Sirach receives credit for his wisdom, which in the Paedagogus is ascribed to wisdom, the Paedagogue, or Solomon; and the text of the extracts conforms to the standard of the uncial manuscripts. But the literature which preceded Clement was popular rather than scholarly, and the phenomena presented by his use of Scripture in the Paedagogus contribute to confirm the conclusion that the argument based upon the silence of his predecessors is fallacious, and that their silence can fairly be construed as a denial of the Petrine origin or authorship of 1 Peter.

These examples of the use of 1 Peter made by Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria have been given in full to show what the raw material of the evidence really is. Samples only as they are, they suffice to show that 1 Peter was recognised as St. Peter's Epistle about A.D. 200 in Gaul, Africa, and Alexandria. By a stretch of the imagination it might be supposed that Tertullian was dependent upon Clement for this knowledge; but Irenæus and Clement represent a tradition which they inherited independently from a distant past. Now Clement was the earliest Christian scholar, whose works have come down to us, and Irenæus is linked to the apostolic age by his connexion with Polycarp.

In his Epistle to the Philippians, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna,
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who died a martyr on 23rd February, A.D. 155 at the age of 86 years, has left, as Eusebius noted, a valuable witness to the earlier history of the New Testament Canon.

So far as the Canonicity of 1 Peter is concerned the evidence of the Epistle is overwhelming. It is true that Polycarp does not give the name of the authority, which he uses so often. It would be unreasonable to expect that he should. "Paul" and "the Lord" are the only authors named. The words of the Lord have naturally a higher authority than those of His Apostles—at any rate at this stage in the development of the Canon. And St. Paul as the founder of the Church at Philippi had a special claim upon their obedience: "Neither I (Polycarp says) nor anyone like me can attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who, when he came among you, before the face of the men of that time taught accurately and surely the word of truth, who also when he was absent wrote letters to you into which if you look you will be able to be built up in the faith given unto you." Other Scriptures, even the first Epistle of St. John, Polycarp's teacher, are used just as 1 Peter is used—anonymously and not always with a clear formula to stamp the quotations as quotations.

The following passages contain clear cases of Polycarp's use of 1 Peter:—

I. (1.1-3) ὅτι ἡ βεβαια τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ἐξ . . . μετα ἑνδυμηθεὶς καὶ καρποφορεὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν . . . εἰς δὲν ὃς ἠδὼντες πιστεύετε χαρὰ ἀνεκλαλητῷ καὶ δεδομένη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν.6

II. διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφύας ὑμῶν δουλεύσατε τῷ θεῷ . . . πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν καὶ θρόνον ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ . . . μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κάκον ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιπόν ἄντι λοιπόν ἀντὶ γρόνου ἢ κατάραν ἀντὶ κατάρας.8

V. καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, διὸ πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τὸν πνεῦματος στρατεύεται.9

VII. ἐπὶ τὸν ὅδε ἀρχὴ ἡμῶν παραδοθέντα λόγον ἐπιστρέψωμεν ν ἡ φοντεσ πρὸς τὰς ἐν χάσ 10 καὶ προσκαρτεροῦμεν ἡστείαις.

1 So Bardenhewer, Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur, i. p. 149.
2 iii. 2. 3 1 Peter i. 8. 4 Compare 1 Peter i. 12. 5 1 Peter i. 3.
6 1 Peter i. 21. 7 1 Peter iii. 9. 8 Compare 1 Peter iii. 9.
9 1 Peter ii. 11 conflated with Galatians v. 17. 10 Peter iv. 7.
NOTE.

This edition is based on a course of lectures delivered, in the first instance, to a class of honours men who were expected to use the late Professor Bigg's commentary as a text-book. The lectures were, therefore, made independently of that commentary and with a view to the exhibition of new material and processes rather than results. In particular, an attempt was made to illustrate the reference of the Septuagint and Jewish literature generally to the exegesis of the New Testament. In the reduction of these notes to their present form the commentaries of Alford, Bigg, Hort, Kühl-Meyer, and Von Soden were consulted.

The text is taken from the facsimile of the great Vatican Codex (B), the lines of which are indicated by spaces.

The editor gratefully acknowledges the kindness of the Rev. George Milligan, D.D., and the Rev. R. St. John Parry, B.D., who read the commentary in proof.
\[ \text{πέτροι Α'}. \]

**CHAPTER I.**—Vv. 1, 2. Peter the High Commissioner of Jesus, who is Messiah of Greeks as of Jews, sends greeting after the Christian fashion, in which the Greek and Jewish formulae have been combined and transformed, to the Churches of Northern Asia Minor. They are the dispersion of the New Israel, chosen out of the whole world in accordance with God's foreknowledge of their fitness, to undergo the hallowing of His Spirit, and with a view to their reception into His Church. For the result, and therefore the purpose, of their election is that they may profess obedience and receive the outward sign of sprinkling, being baptised into the death of Jesus Christ. For them may grace (and not mere greeting) and peace (God's peace not man's) be multiplied! For discussion of writer and readers see Introduction.

**Ver. 1.** ἵκκτοι παριγκάμπος dispersion, a combination of titles of Israel appropriated to Christians in accordance with the universal principle of the early Church. (i.) The Jews were the chosen race (ii. 9 from Isa. xiii. 20) as Moses said, Because He loved thy fathers therefore He chose their seed after them (Deut. iv. 37; cf. Rom. xi. 28). So Jesus said to His disciples, I have chosen you (John xv. 16, 19, etc.), and refers to them in the eschatological discourse as the elect (Mark xiii. 20). (ii.) Being chosen out of the world—in the world, indeed, but not of it, John xv. 16 ff.—Christians are alien sojourners during their life on earth. Their fatherland is the city that hath foundations (i. 7, ii. 11; Heb. xiii. 14; Phil. iii. 20). In Heb. xi. 9-13 the Patriarchs are credited with the same idea and Philo says that the sages of Moses' school are all introduced as sojourners (p. 416 M). So Abraham said to the Sons of Heth, "I am a stranger and sojourner (πάροικος καὶ παρεβδήμης — ἄνθρωπος) with you" (Gen. xxiii. 4); Jacob speaks of the days of the years of my pilgrimage (ἀπομνήμην ἐκ τῶν παροικίασ); and the Psalmist anticipates Peter and Heb. in the generalisation I am a stranger and sojourner (πάροικος καὶ παρεβδήμης) in the earth as all my fathers were (Ps. xxxix. 13). Deissmann (Bible Studies, p. 149) quotes two examples of παρεβδήμης from wills of the third century b.c., one of a Jew resident in the Fayyum (Ἄμελλον ἑλπίζω to συνάντήσως). In P. Tor. 8 (b.c. 118) παρεβδήμηται καὶ κατοικοῦσι are contrasted. (iii.) Moses said to Israel thou shalt be scattered among the kingdoms of the earth (Deut. xvii. 25); and the rendering of the LXX διαστήματος is probably the earliest example of the technical designation (cf. John vii. 34) of the Jews, who—for whatever reason—lived outside the Holy Land. The collective term (Rabbinic הַרְפָּעָה) implies the real unity of these scattered communities, whose scattering is no longer regarded as God's punishment for sin. It thus serves well the purpose of one, who, like St. Paul, insists on the unity of the whole brotherhood of Christians (e.g., v. 9); but this application of the principle that the Church is the Israel of God is subordinate to others which imply that there is
no earthly correlative to it. When St. James addresses the twelve tribes which are in Dispersion, he may on the other hand be contrasting the saints of Jerusalem with those abroad (as St. Paul did in the matter of the Collection) if indeed he is not speaking simply to his fellow-countrymen as a Jew to Jews. But St. Peter writes from "Babylon" and the capital of Christendom is no longer Jerusalem. The collocation of παρετέρωσις and διασπορά implies that this scattering, which in the case of the type was God's punishment for sin, will not be permanent for the antitype. For the Christian Church the Jewish hope of the ingathering will be fulfilled, as is indicated by the emphatic ἐκκλησία—for Jesus said, "The Son of Man shall gather together his elect from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven" (Mark xiii. 26, 27; cf. Deut. xxx. 4). Compare Didache ix. 4, "For as this was broken [bread] scattered over the hills and being gathered together became one, so may thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom," and Justin Martyr, Dial. i. 13, "As Moses...so also Jesus the Christ (corresponding to J., the Son of Nun) shall turn again the Dispersion of the People...shall give us the possession eternally."

Πάντες...Ἀγίας. The order indicates the route of the messenger, who landed presumably at Sinope or Amastris and, if the omission of καὶ Βουθιῶν be accepted, left the country at Ephesus or Smyrna. The (Armenian) Acts of Phocas (Martyr of Sinope under Trajan) are addressed to the brethren dwelling in Pontus and Bithynia in Paphlagonia and in Mysia in Galatia and in Cappadocia and in Armenia (Conybeare, Monuments of Early Christianitv, p. 103). See Introduction.

Ver. 2. The three clauses καὶ...νῦν...et al. quality ἐκκλησία and perhaps also ἀνάστασις (as Oecumenius) Peter himself is elect and shares their privileges but had no need to magnify his office, as had St. Paul. Yet see Acts xv. 7 ff.

καὶ Πρόγνωσεν...The noun occurs only in Acts ii. 23 (speech of St. Peter) in reference to the slaying of Christ τῷ Φαρώνει βοῦλη καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ, cf. i. 20. The use of nouns instead of verbs is characteristic of this Epistle. The same idea is expressed more elaborately by St. Paul in Rom. viii. 29 (q.v.). Cf. Origen, Philocalia, xxv. Oecumenius infers that the Apostle is thus the equal of the prophets, especially Jeremiah (v. Jer. i. 5).—ἐν ἀγίασμοι πνεύματος, subjective genitive like ἔσος, being elect they are within the sphere of the proper work of the Holy Spirit. The context excludes the rendering hallowing of the human spirit. Peter uses the stereotyped phrase; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 13 (which corresponds exactly to the whole context) ἐπαύεται ὁ θεός ἐπ' ἐρυθρᾶς (κατὰ πρὸ τοῦ τοῦ...ἐν ἀγίασμι πνεύματος καὶ πιστεύει ἐλπίδεις ἐπὶ τοῦ...ἐπὶ ἄρκον...I. Χριστοῦ, the goal or purpose of their election. Obedience is a technical term: sc. to God; cf. i. 14, where it is contrasted with the ignorant disobedience of their past lives (v. 22). As Christians, they obeyed God and not men (Acts iv. 19, v. 29); God gives His Holy Spirit to them that obey Him (Acts v. 32). Compare the Pauline obedience of faith. This obedience implies a change of mind in Jew and in Gentile, which is effected by the sprinkling of blood of Jesus Christ. They are now cleansed from sin, which is disobedience in Jew or Gentile. Jesus Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, sprinkles those whom God selected with His own blood, as Moses sprinkled the children of Israel who had promised obedience with the blood of oxen (Exod. xxiv. 7 f.; cf. Heb. ix. 19). But references to other sprinklings of the O.T., unconnected with obedience, must not be excluded. The word ἀνάστασις is appropriated, for example, to the water in which the ashes of the heifer were dissolved (Num. xix.); and a less obvious explanation is supported by Barnabas, "that by the remission of sins we might be purified, that is in the sprinkling of His blood for it stands written...by His bruise we were healed" (Isa. liii. 5). Indeed the best commentary is supplied by the Epistle to the Hebrews in which evidence of the O.T. is reviewed and the conclusion drawn that according to the
law everything is cleansed by blood. All the types were summed up in the fulfilment (see especially Heb. ix.) whether they related to the Covenant or to the Worship. So in Heb. xii. 24 the blood of Abel the first martyr is drawn into the composite picture of typical blood sheddings. It would be possible to take ὑποκατάστασις with Ἰσραήλ Ἰσμαήλ, and to render either that ye might obey Jesus Christ (cf. i. 22; 2 Cor. x. 5) being sprinkled with His blood or that ye might obey as He obeyed even unto death (cf. Heb. v. 8; Phil. ii. 8). This full form is found also in 2 Pet. and Jude. For precedent see Dan. iii. 31. Its use here is not merely a convention peculiar to the Petrine school; peace are multiplied to match the growth of hostility with which the Christians are confronted, lest the word of Jesus be fulfilled διὰ τὸ πληθυσμὴν τὴν ἀνθρώπων σωτήριον ἡ ἀνάπαυς τῶν πολλῶν (Matt. xxiv. 12); cf. Rom. v. 20 f. In the Pastoral Epistles ἄλογος (cf. ver. 3) is inserted between χρίσθην, and εἰς, so 2 John 3. From Gal. vi. 16 it appears that ἄλογος stood originally in the place which ἀπέρατος usurped (as distinctively Christian and reminiscent of the familiar ἀπεραυτοῦ); so that the source will be Num. vi. 24-26. ὑποκατάστασις σὲ . . . καὶ δόθη σοι εἰρήνη.

Vv. 3-5. Blessed be God whom we have come to know as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! For He has granted us to the crowning manifestation of His great mercy. He has raised Jesus Christ from the dead and us thereby to newness of life. So you may hope for and in part enjoy the inheritance which was prefigured by the Promised Land. This heavenly treasure God has kept for those whom He guards with His power. So your faith respond, He is guarding you for the salvation which will be revealed at the last.

Ver. 3. ἐνθυμηθήσομαι. The verbal adjectival is recognised, perhaps coined by the LXX as proper to the Benediction of the Name. This usage is reflected in N.T., Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; note Mark xiv. 61. δ ὅποιος . . . ἡμῶν, part of the formula (cf. 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3) based on the saying “I ascend to your father and my father, unto your God and my God’ (John xx. 17). κατὰ τὸ πολὺ ἄλογος, the more elaborate κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ of Eph. i. 7 (cf. ii. 4). ἀναγεννήσας (cf. i. 23). Else the verb only occurs in N.T. as variant to γεννηθηναι γεννηθαι in Old Latin (and Irenæus) text of John iii. 5, which prompted St. Peter's Christian use of the word, see especially i. 23. Later it is used to describe the outward sign of baptism (e.g., Justin Apol. i. 51) for the benefit of pagans as to the limitation of worshippers of Isis (Apuleius, Met. xi. 26, ut renatus quodammodo staatim sacrorum obsequio desponderetur). And of Mithras (in aternum renati). Here the regeneration of the Christian corresponds to the resurrection of Christ (Chrysostom on John) and implies a previous mystical or figurative death to sin—see ii. 24; iii. 17 f.; iv. 1—which is repeated in the practice of their unnatural virtue (iv. 14).

The simple idea of regeneration underlies St. Paul's elaborations of the doctrine of the cathe pislav. Hort refers to Philo, de incorruptibilitate mundi (i. 489 M.) where ἀναγεννηθης is used for the more usual παλιγγενεσις—rebirth of the world—of the Stoics. ἔλεος εἰς ἡμᾶς.

The omission of the definite article is characteristic of St. Peter. The Hope
is a recognised technical term (Acts xxiii. 6, etc.) of the Pharisees, corresponding to μετάκτων. ξεναρεῖσι stamps the Christian hope as Divine since life is God's prerogative (cf. i. 23 and the living bread, water of John) and effective (cf. the corresponding use of dead faith, Jas. ii. 17, 20). Cf. Sap. iii. 4. ἡ δεξίως αὐτῶν δήμαρχες πλήρης. δι' αὐτῶν with ἀναγνώσεως rather than ξεναρεῖσι: three prepositional clauses are thus attached to δι', as to ἀλεξίπτως (and ἀποστόλους) in ver. 2. The resurrection of Jesus is the means and guarantee of the spiritual resurrection of the Christian (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17) from the death of the sinful and fleshly life. Ver. 4. εἰς κληρ... ἀμέραντον, as God's sons in virtue of their regeneration they are God's heirs (Gal. iv. 7) and have an heavenly inheritance. The accumulated adjectives recall various images employed to describe it—and emphasise the fact that it is eternal (Heb. xi. 15) and spiritual. It is ἀμέρατον, incorruptible (cf. i. 23, iii. 4) because it belongs to the future life which the risen dead (1 Cor. xv. 52) share with God Himself (Rom. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 17). It is set where "moth doth not corrupt (μαθηματικοί, Luke xii. 33: Matt. vi. 19 ff. has ἀφιάνοις," apart from this incorruptible world (cf. Isa. xxiv. 3). It is the incorruptible crown (1 Cor. ix. 25). The second epithet ἀμαρτρτον is applied to the great High Priest, Heb. vii. 26 (cf. Heb. xiii. 4; Jas. i. 27) and implies again separation from this sinful world of which it is written ἐμφανεῖται τὴν γῆν μου καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἐκεῖνοι εἰς βδελυγμα (Jer. ii. 7). Compare the description of virtue in Sap. iv. 2, στεφανοφοροῦσα τοπτεῖται τού τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ἄμωμα νικήσασα. ἀμαρτρτον is peculiar to 1 Peter in N.T., cf. ἀμαρτρτον (v. 4): it is perhaps derived from Sap. vi. 12, ἀμαρτάτσας λέγειν ὁ θεὸς, and thus presupposes the identification of eternal life with knowledge of God (John xvii. 3). Compare the application of Isa. xl. 6 f. (cf. infra 24) in Jas. i. 11. All three suit or are associated with the wreath presented to the victor in the games—a metaphor which the Lord Himself used according to the Apocalypse (ii. 10, cf. 1 Peter v. 4; Jas. i. 12). Origen (?) in Cramer's Catena notes that the words contradict Chiliasm. τὰ περιπλάνητα εἰς ἄμωα, reserved (1) with a view to you, cf. John xii. 7, ὅταν τὴν ἡμέραν... τηρήσῃ. 2 Peter ii. 4. εἰς κρίσιν τηρουτόν; for same use of εἰς in similar context see Rom. viii. 18. (2) ... until you came— a sense which would suit the other examples of τηρουτόν els. (3) ... for you, εἰς = ἐπὶ = dative (so Syriac), the writer or translator being influenced by εἰς above and below. The inheritance is still, as it has always been, kept back, but the Christians are sure to succeed to it. So Enoch refers to the secrets of the righteous which shall be revealed (xxviii. 3); the lot of the righteous which the Son of Man preserves (xlviii. 7); and says Blessed are ye ye righteous and elect for glorious will be your lot... it will be said to the holy that they should seek in heaven the secrets of righteousness the heritage of faith (Iviii. 5).

Ver. 5. The Christians addressed are—to complete the metaphor from other passages in the Epistle—a spiritual house (ii. v.), which is besieged by the devil (v. 8) but guarded and garrisoned by God's Power. So long as they have faith (v. 9) they are safe: "our faith lays hold upon this power and this power strengthens faith and so we are preserved" (Leighton). Without responsive faith God's power is powerless to heal or to guard (cf. Mark vi. 5 f. and accounts of Jesus' miracles generally, Jas. i. 6 f.). The language seems to echo Rom. i. 16, δόγματι θεοῦ εἰς τηρείσαι πάντι τοῦ πνευματικοῦ, combined with Gal. iii. 23 (cf. Phil. iv. 7) where also the distinctive φωτεῖν occurs in similar context. The Power...
Codex Alexandrinus with others adds ἐνοτατικῶν (first hand of Codex Sinaeiticus and many cursives) and λυτρηθέντης (one cursive and the Vulgate) are due to the connexon of ἐνοτατικῶν with its context, the parenthetical character of the phrase being disregarded.

The idea of the revelation of salvation comes from Ps. xcvi. 2 (cf. Isa. lvi. 1) which has influenced St. Paul also (Rom. i. 16 f.). ἐπιτίμησις seems to be simply the equivalent of ἑτοίμασθαι, which St. Paul renders with more attention to current usage than etymology by μακαρισμόν (Rom. viii. 18; Gal. iii. 23; so 1 Peter v. 1). This weaker sense begins with Deut. xxxii. 35 (LXX, πάροικος ἐπιτίμησις, as Peter here) and prevails in new Hebrew (Tarphon said . . . the recompense of the reward of the righteous is for the time to come. Aboth, ii. 19). But the proper significance of the word is recognised and utilised in the Parables of Jesus, Matt. xxiv. 4, 8. καίρῳ ἐπιτίμησι, still anarthrous as being technical term—indefinite as the time is unknown as well as in accordance with authors' custom (cf. ἑτοίμασθαι, παράκατον, τιμῶνται above); cf. John ii. 18.

Vv. 6-9. Exult then. These various temptations to which you are exposed cause present grief. But they are part of God's plan for you. Even material perishable gold is tried in the fire. So is your faith tested that it may be purged of its dross and the good metal be discovered when Jesus Christ is revealed. You love Him whom you never saw; though you see Him not you believe on Him. Exult then with joy that anticipates your future glory. You are winning the prize of your faith, the ultimate salvation of souls. St. Peter returns to the present and regards it from the point of view of those whom God is guarding—but only to advance again to the glorious future (7 fin. 9) when Jesus Christ the present object of their love and faith shall be revealed. He is the central figure of this section which is based upon two of His sayings which are appropriate to the circumstances of these His persecuted followers (so iv. 13) v. Matt. v. 12 = Apoc. xix. 7 from Ps. xxi. 1, cxviii. 24. Compare Jas. i. 2-4 and John cited below.

Ver. 6. ἐν γῇ. There are four possible antecedents. (1) καίρῳ, (2) Jesus Christ, (3) God, (4) the state of things described in 3-5. (1) would imply that they must live in the future and is least probably right. (2) is supported by 8 but is unlikely at this point. The choice lies between (3), God being hitherto the dominating figure; and (4); cf. Luke i. 47 = 1 Sam. ii. 1 a—d. with ἐν in LXX as well as ἐν τῇ ἀγάλαξοθα. Indicative (with or without quasi future meaning) rather than Imperative. Bye form of ἀγάλλωμαι (Homer downwards) first found in LXX especially as aseonant rendering of ἰὴρ: used later in bad sense (λαοδειται, Hesych): here borrowed from Matt. v. 11f. καλαγάλλωμαι to. ἀγαλλιασθε. διαγνωστε, (1) for a little time, or (2) to a small extent (contrast John xvi. 6, ἢ λείπην πεπληρωμένον ῥήμα ἐν πώλησεν, 2 Peter v. 10). These, it would be felt, do not but feel grief at their trials (John xvi. 20, ύπατη λυπηθείσα, ἢ δε λυπή) but some προσεχσεις, but they must not indulge their natural weakness. To take the “necessity” as referring to their trials (for not all the Saints are oppressed, Oec.) limits ἀγάλλωμα to the external sense of vexation without reference to the feelings of the grieved corresponding to the feelings implied in ἀγάλλωμα. The contrast is thus destroyed, but this sense ἀγάλλωμα would suit the other military metaphor, τῶν (προφορουμένων, ἡ πολκλοσις πειράσμοι, the adjective rules out the
limitation of π. to external trials which St. James who has the entire phrase seems to put upon it.

Ver. 7. τὸ δοκίμα. The evidence of the papyri (Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 259 ff.) shows that δοκίμα is a bye form of the adjective δοκήμερον approved; so Ps. xii. 7, δείγματος πετυμέτρον δοκίμα (cf. τ. Χρον. xxxix. 4; Zech. xi. 3, where it occurs as τ. i. for δοκίμα). Hence the phrase (here and in Jas. i. 3?) corresponds exactly to St. Paul's τὸ τῆς ῥαμίδος ἑγκατάστασις γνήσιον—"the genuineness of your faith or the approvedness")... So Arethas on Αρ. ix. 4, οἱ δὲ τὸ δοκίμα λέοντα δόμη τοποθέτησαν. The substantive ὅιομεν δὲ τοποθετεῖ, "means of trial, testing" which does not suit this context, or a specimen of metal to be tested. —πολυ-

τιμέτρον, to justify the common rendering (A.V., R.V.) according to which τ. κ.τ.λ. are taken as in apposition to τὸ δοκ., δὲ must be supplied as if omitted by haplography after πολ. But there is no need for emendation, if πολ. be taken as predicate thrown forward for the sake of emphasis. —χρυσῆς κ. τ.λ. St. Peter adapts the familiar comparison of man's suffering to the fining-pot of precious metal, insisting on the superiority of the spiritual to the material gold. The stress lies on διὰ πολύς. True faith is tested by trials, just as gold is proved by fire. It is more valuable than gold which is perishable. If men test gold thus, much more will God test faith which outlives the present age, cf. Hebrew ix. 23. Cf. use of πολυμεῖα, iv. 12. For the image, Zech. xiii. 9, δοκιμασμένος ὡς δοκιμασμένος, τὸ χρυσᾶ; Ps. lxvi. 10; Prov. xxvii. 13; Sir. ii. 5, etc.—Τὸ ἄπολ-

λυμένον, cf. John vii. 27, τὴν βροχὴν τὴν ἄρ. (contrasted with imperishable food; here gold generally is contrasted with faith) and φθαρτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσῆς below.—τοῦ κραίλινος, cf. 2 Peter iii. 14, σπουδάσας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄπολυματος, cf. Ps. xxviii. 3, ἐδοκίμασα τὴν καρδίαν μου... καὶ οὐκ ἔφηδος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ. —εἰς πραγματίζων... must be taken with the whole sentence, unless ὧν be supplied. So εἰς might introduce the predicate (better stronger) of εὑρ., cf. Rom. vii. 10. εἰς taken as = ἐκ expressing transition into a new state or condition (as Rom. vii. 10). —πραγματίζων is the verdict. "Well done good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The Christian is the true Jew and receives at last the praise which the name Judah signifies. In Rom. ii. 29, ἐν τῷ κρύπτῳ οὐδεὶς... εἰς τὸ κρύπτῳ, Paul follows the alteration of the original ἐξωμολόγηται (Gen. xxix. 35, LXX, and Philo) consequent upon the transference of the praise (τὴν ταύτην) from God to men (cf. Gen. xlix. 9, ἐν τῷ κρύπτῳ ἐν λατρείαις ἀνθρώπων, cf. σκέφτομαι εἰς τιμήν, Rom. ix. 12, for the less obvious word. Hort compares Marcus Aurelius xiii. 12, μὴ τοιαῦτα ἐλλα ἢ ἐκεῖς μᾶλλα ὃ ὁ τάξις ἐπαινεῖ,—ἐκ ἄπολυματος ἐπαναλαμβάνεται. iv. xv., when οὗς Χριστὸς ἐκκλησία ἑω.; Of course. The expression is derived from the saying κατὰ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἦλθα ἣ μόνο ὁ ὁλοθρόπον ἀποκαλυπτεῖται (Luke xviii. 30). As Judge He will pronounce the verdict of approval and bestow glory and honour. The reference to present glorified joy in the midst of trial suggests that the writer has advanced beyond the simple belief in a final theophany and contemplates a spiritual revelation of Jesus Christ as each Christian (cf. Gal. i. 16) realises the meaning of His Resurrection; but cf. μὴ ὀρθοπεδίως below.

Ver. 7. The Christians addressed were not personal disciples of Jesus but converts of the Apostles (12). As such they could claim Beatitude μακάριος of μὴ ἔναθαν καὶ παντεύονται (John xx. 20). Their love began and continues without sight of Him; even now when they expect His coming they must still believe without seeing Him and exult. The Latin version of Augustine, gives
three distinct clauses referring to the past, the present and the future climax whom you knew not: in whom now—not seeing ye believe; whom when you see you will exult. But for lack of support it must be set aside in favour of the Greek text (which regards present as leading up to future culmination without a break) as being a redaction of the passage for separate use. ei .ov, with πιστεύοντες, μή δρόμοι being parenthesis added to explain force of πιστεύειν. (Heb. xi. i ; Rom. viii. 24)—χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτω καὶ σάλωσε·σετρέφοντο. Their faith enables them to pass beyond their present sufferings to the joy which belongs to the subsequent glories. Thus their joy being heavenly is unspeakable and glorified. Language cannot express the communion with God which the Christian like St. Paul may enjoy (2 Cor. xii. 3 f.; compare Rom. viii. 26, αὐτῷ τὰ πνεύμα ἐνεργοῦνε ἐν τοῖς πνεύμασι τῶν ἀλαλόντων. And this joy is glorified because it is an earnest of the glory which shall be revealed; cf. iv. 14.

Ver. 9. The connexion with mention of persecution suggests that the writer is here thinking of the saying, in your patience ye shall win your souls and perhaps also of the contrast between the persecutors who have only power over the body. Whatever happen to the body the conclusion—the consummation of their faith—is assured them.—κομιδέω implies that already they are receiving what is due to them (cf. v. 4) and therefore they rejoice with Hannah in God the Saviour. In the Attic Orators who use a refined form of colloquial Greek the verb is common in the sense of recouping debts, as in Matt. xxv. 27, ἐκομισμόνω ἐν τῷ ἔμω. St. Paul applies it to future recompense (2 Cor. v. 10, ον κομισματίζῃ ἐκατὸς τά διὰ τοῦ σώματος; Eph. vi. 8 ; Col. iii. 25 ; cf. 2 Macc. viii. 33, τὸν ἔξον τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκατό τῶν μυστάντων). In Heb. iii. 4, it is used of receiving promises.—τὸ τέλος. The common meaning fulfilment or consummation gives a fair sense but the connection with κομιδέω is thus somewhat strange. The parallel of v. 4, taken with Pindar, Ol. x(xi.) 81, Διότι εἴσηγεν τοὺς μῖν τὸ τέλος, suggests as a possible rendering because ye receive the reward. The Septuagint, again (Num. xxxi. 28, etc.), uses το to translate το τοῦ τῶν = proportion to be paid, tax. And this use is well established in Greek literature for τά τέλη, cf. λυστελέν, etc. Accordingly Suidas defines τέλος as το τι διδόμενον τοῖς βασιλείσιν. The particular connotations can hardly be pressed here but these uses give some colour of support to the Syriac rendering recompense and the mercedem of Augustine; cf. Rom. vi. 22. —σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν = σωτηρίαν above. ψυχῶν is added to console the readers for their sufferings in accordance with Mark viii. 35, δότως διὰ τῶν ἁστυνόμων. Ψυχήν αὐτοῦ δικαιεῖ τοῦ ἐναγκαλίου σώσει αὐτήν = John xii. 25; cf. Luke xxi. 19 ; Jas. i. 21. The soul for St. Peter is the self or personality as for Jesus Himself.

Vv. 10-12.—The ancient prophets prophesied concerning the grace which was destined for you and enquired diligently about this salvation. They were the unconscious instruments of the revelation of God and their first duty done continued to pore over the inspired descriptions of the sufferings and subsequent glories of the Messiah. They asked themselves to whom does this refer and when shall these things be. And to them the revelation was made that they were only the administrators of an estate which others—you in fact should enjoy. The subjects of their prophecies have now been proclaimed to you by your Christian teachers who, like the prophets, were inspired by
the Holy Spirit—with this difference that now the Spirit has been sent from heaven whereas of old He dwelt only in minds of a few. And these are the mysteries into which angels long to peep.

St. Peter has utilised a saying of Jesus to explain the great problem of unfulfilled prophecy and expounded it. Among the prophets he includes the so-called apocalyptic writers like Daniel and his successors. Gradually the coming of the Messiah and the dawn of the new age had been pushed further and further back until the inspired prophets realised that—as the Christians held—the Messiah would only come just before the end of all. The Messiah was not Hezekiah despite the Rabbis, nor yet the best of the Hasmonian house of Enoch hoped. Διεκκαλίφη. Such was the revelation or Apocalypse from which the latest of the prophets derive their common name; and St. Peter credits all the line with the curiosity which characterised the last of them and his own contemporaries; cf. Acts ii. and Heb. xi. 13 ff. The saying in question on which St. Peter builds is reported differently: According to Matt. xii. 17, Jesus said, οκλος ἐνοίκηται καὶ δικαίους ἐκθέσασαν . . . according to Luke x. 24, φησίν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἠφίλησαν . . . according to St. Peter φησίν ἐν οἴκου (10) καὶ γῆγελοῦ. The mention of the righteous derives support from Heb. xi. 13-16, and John viii. 56, and an original ἵνα ἐνοίκηται “the righteous” would easily be altered in the course of transmission into ἤνα ἐνοίκηται = princes earthly or heavenly (cf. Dan. x. 21; LXX, ἰσαάκ δὲ γῇγελοὶ). The motive which prompted the interpretation γῆγελοῦ is due to the influence of the Book of Enoch (see note below) which explains the writer’s conception of the prophets.

Ver. 10. The prophets were concerned with the Messianic salvation and searched their own writings and those of their predecessors for definite information about it. They are honoured by the Christians who realise that as a matter of fact they prophesied concerning the grace which was destined for the Christian Church.—τῇ ἔλεγεν ἑαυτῷ, the grace which belongs to you, cf. τῇ ἐλεξαντων περὶ (xi).

Ver. 11. The construction of εἰς ἐλαχ. ἕρματος, the grace which belongs to you, is probably due to a writing of the LXX, which reads εἰς ἐλεξαντὼν περὶ. The construction, however, is common (cf. 2 Co. ii. 14).
For Rendell Harris (Side-Lights on New Testament Research, p. 207) conjectures that διακονουσα should be read in accordance with the statement of the Book of Enoch, “I contemplated them (the things heard in the vision) not for the present generation but for one that was far distant”. See Henoch, i. 2, καὶ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ γενέας διακονουμένη ἀλλὰ ἐκ πόρρω ἦσαν ἐγώ λαλῶ. Dioscorus of verse 13 is cited in confirmation of the conjecture.

evangelica (Acts iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 23).

The phrase corresponds exactly to the original ἡ ἀγγέλιον ἐστιν ἐνέκοβν: standing for the ἐστιν (periphrasis for construct state).— τάς περὰ ταῦτα δόθης, the plural glories implies some comprehension of the later doctrine, e.g., John, which recognised that the glory of Jesus was partially manifested during His earthly life; although the definition subsequent reflects the primitive simplicity and if it be pressed the glories must be explained as referring to the resurrection ascension triumph over angels as well as the glorious session (viii. 21 f.).—οὖν δὲ ἔκαλυψη, so St. Peter argues that Joel prophesied the last things (cf. Sir. xlvii. 24) and that David foresaw and spoke concerning the resurrection (Acts ii. 17, 31, cf. iii. 19). Compare Dan. ix. 2, xii. 4, etc., for examples of partial revelations of this kind proper to apocalyptic writers. Heb. i.c. supr. credits the Patriarchs with the same insight.—οὐχ ἰδοὺ οἱ μὴν ἔφη διακονοῦν, the negative and positive presentation of the past for emphasis is common in this Epistle.— διηκόνων αὐτό, “they were supplying, conveying the revelations granted to them—primary the prophecy and the revealed solution of it alike,” cf. iv. 10. cf. ἰδοὺ δὲ διακονοῦντες. The context shows, if the word διακονοῦν does not itself connote it, that herein they were stewards of God’s manifold grace—channels of communication. For Acc. with διακονοῦν, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 3, ἐπισκοπὴ Ἰησοῦ διακονοῦσα ἐν Ἰησοῦ, viii. 19, τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ τῇ διακονοῦσα ἐν Ἰησοῦ, from which it may be inferred that it connotes what the context here suggests, cf. ἐν δὲ διακονοῦσα ἐν τῷ διακονεῖἑα ἀποκάλεσεν ἐν τῷ διακονεῖ ἔχει ἀποκάλεσαν ἐν τῷ διακονεῖ ἐκ τῶν ἀγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. St. Paul spiritualises the idea “to me . . . this grace was given to preach to the Gentiles . . . in order that now might be made known to the principalities and the authorities in heavenly places by means of the Church the very varied wisdom of God” (Eph. iii. 8 ff.).

St. Peter reproduces faithfully the simplicity of the original and represents this longing as still unsatisfied since the Church is not yet perfect or complete. It thus becomes part of the sympathetic groaning and travelling of the whole creation (Rom. viii. 22 f.). In iii. 21 St. Peter states on the same authority that
Christ preached to the spirits in prison; adding that when he ascended all angels were subjected to Him. The apparent contradiction is due to the discrepancy between the ideal and its gradual realisation and not to an imperfect coordination of these conceptions of the universal sovereignty of God. See 1 Cor. xv. 25 f., Heb. ii. 7 f., not yet do we see...—παρακάτω has lost its suggestion of peeping through its use in the LXX for οπταί look forth though it is not employed by them in the places where God is said to look down from heaven (Ps. xiv. 2, etc.). The patristic commentators seem to hold by the Evangelist rather than the Apostle in respect to the saying, as they refer exclusively for illustration to the O.T. figures, Moses (Heb xi. 26), Isaiah (John xii. 41). Oecumenius notes that Daniel is called by the angel εν αγάλματι of longings (Dan. ix. 25). That the angels of Peter are due to Enoch and secondary seems to be borne out by the Targum of Eccles. i. 8, "In all the words that are prepared (about) to come to pass in the world the ancient prophets wearied themselves and could not find their ends".

Vv. 13-21. Practical admonitions. In this section St. Peter is engrossed with the conception of the Church as the new Israel which has been delivered from idolatry—the spiritual Egypt—by a far more excellent sacrifice. Jesus Himself endorsed such adaptation of the directions given for the typical deliverance (Luke xii. 35) and the principle that the worshippers of Jehovah must be like Him (John iv. 23 f.; Matt. v. 48, etc.).

Ver. 13. διέ introduces the practical inference. —ἀνατρέπεται, κ.τ.λ., the reference to the directions for celebration of the Passover (Exod. xii. 11, σῶτερ διὰ φάγετε αὐτόν· αι δοφῆς ὑμῶν περιεξόμεναι...μετὰ σταυροῦ) is unmistakable. The actual deliverance of the Christians is still in the future; they must be always ready against the coming of the Lord. Oec. refers to Job xxxviii. 3. The particular compound occurs only twice in LXX—one in this phrase of the

manly woman in Prov. xxxi. 17, ἀνατρέπεται λυχνίων τὴν δοφήν αὐτῆς, where it implies preparation for serious work. In 2 Kings iv. 29 ff. (Elisha's mission of Gehazi which is in some ways a type fulfilled by Jesus' mission of the Seventy, cf. Luke x. 4), ἡσσαί τὴν δοφήν σου is the preparation for an urgent errand. The addition of τῆς διανοίας implies that the readiness required is spiritual. St. Paul uses καρδία in the same way (Eph. i. 18, πεφυσιζόμενος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν) and from Mark xii. 30 = Deut. vi. 4 f. it appears that διανοία is a recognised equivalent of λύχνη heart. —φόντες τελειοὶ. In cases like this it is natural to take the adverb with the preceding verb. τελείοι (only here in N.T.) has much the same force as τῆς διανοίας; so the adjective is applied to the antitype as contrasted with the type in Heb. ix. 11, τῆς...τελείοι σημεῖα καὶ τας. The patristic commentators seem to be borne out by the Targum of Eccles. i. 8, "In all the words that are prepared (about) to come to pass in the world the ancient prophets wearied themselves and could not find their ends". Ver. 14. οὐ is inasmuch as you are, cf.
13—17.

**PETROU Ą**

1. The termination 

2. The command 

3. Vv. 15f. The command 

4. Adjective and adverb are formed from 

5. LXX = "Ω Ν Ν Ν Ν receive (lift up) the face of, i.e., be favourable and later partial, to. The degeneration of the phrase was due to the natural contrast
between the face and the heart of a man, which was stamped on the Greek equivalent by the use of πρόσωπον for "mask" of the actor or hypocrisie.—κρίνοντα. If the tense be pressed, compare the saying of Jesus recorded in John xii. 31. τὸν κρίνοντα ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ. Rom. ii. 16 is referred to the last judgment by ἔντι Χριστοῦ ζησοῦ. But the present participle may be timeless as in ὁ καλῶν, ὁ βασιλέως, etc.—κατὰ τὸ ἔκτασιν ἔργον, a commonplace Jewish and Christian, cf. Ps. xii. 12 (cited Rom. ii. 6). ἔντι ἀπόστασις ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (Hebrew has the word). R. Aquiba used to say . . . . The world is judged by grace and everything is according to the work (Pilgr. Aboth., iii. 24). For collective singular life-work, cf. also 1 Cor. iii. 13-15, etc.—ἐν φόβῳ. Fear is not entirely a technical term in N.T. Christians needed the warning to fear God (so Luke xii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10), although love might be proper to the perfect.—Gnostic or Pharisee—I John iv. 18. The natural and acquired senses exist side by side, as appears in the use of ἀφοβος. Compare ἀφοβος σάν διναστεια λακαθομένη (Sir. i. 22 with ἐν τούτῳ ἀφοβος εἰμὶ (Ps. xxvii. 2, Symmachus = in Him I am confident)—τον τις παρουσίας χρονον, during your earthly pilgrimage, which corresponds to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt (Acts xiii. 17). If God is their Father, heaven must be their home (i. 4); their life on earth is therefore a sojourn (see on i. 2). St. Paul has his own use of the metaphor (Eph. ii. 19). Gentile Christians are no longer strangers and sojourners, but fellow-citizens of the saints. Ver. 18. Amplification of Isa. iii. 5 f., Δωρεάν ἐκαθήμη καὶ στὸ μετὰ ἄργυρον λυτρωθῇσθε (cf. xiv. 13 . . . εἰς Ἀγγελον κατήθη δ λαδός σου τὸ πρότερον παρουσίασαι εἰς. The deliverance from Babylon corresponds to the deliverance from Egypt. To these the Christians added a third and appropriated to it the descriptions of its predecessors.—οἱ φθορτεῖς. The preceding negative relief to positive statement is characteristic of St. Peter, who here found it in his original (Isa. i.e.). φθορτεῖς echoes ἀπαλλαγμένων and is probably an allusion to the Golden Calf of which it was said These be thy gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt (Exod. xxxii. 14). According to Sap. xiv. 8, it is the proper name for an idol: τὸ δὲ φθορτὸν θεὸς ἄνωθεν. So the dative represents the agent and not only the instrument of the deliverance.—παταλεῖς supports the view taken of ἐν, for the gods of the nations are vanity, ματαίαν (Jer. x. 3, etc.).—πατροπαράβατον, ancestral, hereditary. The adjective indicates the source of the influence, which their old way of life—patrius mos, patrii vitum—still exercised over them. The ancient religion had a strength—not merely vis inertiae—which often baffled both Jewish and Christian missionaries: “to subvert a custom delivered to us from ancestors the heathen say is not reasonable” (Clem. Ac. Protr. x.). This power of the dead hand is exemplified in the practice taken by the Stoics and New Pythagoreans to conserve the popular religion and its myths by allegorical interpretation. Among the Jews this natural conservatism was highly developed; St. Paul was a sealot for the ancestral laws. But the combination of patriach and tradition does not prove that the persons addressed were Jewish Christians. The law, according to which the Jews regulated their life, was Divine, its mediator Moses; and there is a note of depreciation in the words not that it is derived from Moses only from the Fathers (John vii. 22). παρεξ is contrasted with παρεξια (17) as παράβησθον with the direct calling. Ver. 19. The blood of Christ, the true paschal lamb, was the (means or) agent of your redemption. The type contemplated is composite; the lamb is the yearling sheep (τὸν πρόβατον, but Targum-Onkelos has ὅπως lamb and ἦσσω is rendered ἦσσω in Lev. xii. 8; Num. xvi. 11; Deut. xiv. 4) prescribed for the Passover (Exod. xii. 5). But the description perfect (τῆς ἑαυτῶς) is glossed by ἄμφωο (cf. Heb. xii. 14), which is the common translation of ἐνυσσάω in this connection, and ἐνυσσάω which summarises the description of sacrificial victims generally (v. Lev. xxii. 22, etc.). ἐνυσσάω would be unintelligible to the Gentile, because it has acquired a peculiar meaning from the
conceptions of Angels and Wisdom as well as of the Messiah all led up to this belief. Apart from the express declarations of Jesus recorded by St. John, it is clear that St. Peter held to the real and not merely ideal pre-existence of Christ, not deriving it from St. Paul or St. John and Heb. It is no mere corollary of God’s omniscience that the spirit of Christ was in the prophets. — προεγνωσμένον, cf. κατά πράγματα, ver. 2; only here of Messiah, perhaps as a greater Jeremiah (cf. Jer. i. 5)—but see the description of Moses cited above. — πρὸ καταβολὴς κόσμου. The phrase does not occur in LXX but Matt. xiii. 35 = Ps. lxxviii. 2 renders πρὸ καταβολῆς (LXX ἐν άρχής) Philo has καταβολή γενέσεως and καταβολαὶ σπερμάτων and uses ἐκ κ. = afresh. In 2 Macc. ii. 29, καταβολή is used of the foundation of a house; cf. κατασκευασμένοι in Heb. — φανερωθεὶς, of the past manifestation of Christ. In v. 1 of the future implies previous hidden existence, cf. i Tim. iii. 16 (quota- tion of current quasi-creed) ἐφανερωθή ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The manifestation consists in the resurrection and glorification evidenced by descent of spirit (21): cf. Peter’s sermon in Acts ii. risen, exalted, Jesus has sent the spirit: therefore let all the house of Israel know surely that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ. St. Paul speaks in the same way of the revelation of the secret, which is Christ in you; see especially Col. i. 25-27. Compare John i. 14.—εἰς ἐκάστον τῶν χρόνων, at the end of the times, cf. ἐν ἐκάστω τῶν ἡμερῶν (Heb. i. 1 and LXX). The deliverance effected certo tempore by Christ’s blood is eternally efficacious, cf. αἷμαν λυτρών εἰσφάγον Heb., ix. 12 and the more popular statement of the same idea in Apoc. xiii. 8, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Ver. 21. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, for the sake of you Gentiles, i.e., ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσώπῳ ἀποκαθιστήσῃ τῷ θεῷ, iii. 18. The resurrection of Jesus and His glorification are the basis of their faith in God and inspire not merely faith but hope.—διὰ οὐρανοῦ. Compare for form Acts iii. 16, πάσας ἐν οὐρανῷ and for thought Rom. v. 2. Eph. ii. 13—πεπραγμένος εἰς θέαν. This construction occurs not infrequently in the Beran text and is simply equivalent to π. with
the Dative (Acts xvi. 15) corresponding to ἵκτι ἤτοι. But πιστός, keeping construction has changed its meaning. Already it is semi-technical = believing, sc. in Jesus and here πιστῶ ... ἵκτι θεόν follows immediately. So the verb πιστοῦσα is a true gloss; the addition of ἵκτι θεόν corrects the common conception of faith, which ultimately gave rise to a distinction between belief in Christ and belief in God. — ἰδεῖν αὐτῷ δόντα, so e.g. the prophecy (Isa. iii. 13) ἵκτι μου ... ἰδεῖσθε τὴν φόβρα was fulfilled when the lame man was healed by St. Peter and St. John; ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ ... ἰδεῖσθαι τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἱησοῦν (Acts iii. 13). But the glory is primarily and generally the glorious resurrection and ascension, in which state Jesus sent the Holy Spirit (καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν οἴκῳ Ἰωάννου, John.) — ἵκτι τε ... θεόν καὶ δίκαιον may be part of the subject of ἵκτι θεόν, so that your faith and hope are in God, or predicate so that your faith is also hope in God. In either case ἵκτις is rather confidence than hope, in accordance with LXX usage (= ὑπομονή), and supplies an adequate climax — patient faith leads up to the appropriation of the Hope of Israel.

Vv. 22-25. The combination of purification of souls with love of the brotherhood suggests that the temptations to relapse were due to former intimacies and relationships which were not overcome by the spiritual brotherhood which they entered. Different grades of society were doubtless represented in all Christian churches and those who were marked out for leaders by their wealth and position were naturally slow to love the slaves and outcasts. As at Corinth old intimacies and congenial society led the better classes (iv. 3 f.) to fall back on the clubs to which they had belonged and in the company of their equals to sneer at their new brothers — "the brethren" (ii. 1). St. Peter reminds them that they must purify their souls from the taint with a side-glance perhaps at the rites proper to the associations in question. They must love the brotherhood and its members as such. Earthly relationships are done away by their regeneration; they have exchanged the flesh for the spirit. The section is full of echoes; compare ἡγιάσετε with ἀγίασον (15), ἰδεῖς ἀγίασμα (2), τὴν ἁπάντητον πάντως θεότητα (14), ἄναγγελλόμενοι with ἀναγγέλλεσθαι (3), φθάνοντες with φθάνοντας (18), εὐαγγελισθέν ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελισμάτων (12). It should be compared throughout with Eph. iv. 18-24. — ταῖς ... ἡγιάσετε from Jer. vi. 15, "see what is the good way and walk in it and you shall find purification (ἀποκαθάρισμον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου) to your souls. & usually of ceremonial purification in LXX. Compare Jas. iv. 8, ἀγιότατε καρδίαις διπλώματι (cf. ἀναπαύεσθαι). The perfect participle is used as indicating the ground of the admonition, so ἀναγγέλλομεν (23). Pagan rites professed to purify the worshipper but cannot affect the soul, the self or the heart any more than the Jewish ceremonies can (Heb. ix. 9 f.). Scripture declares ὁ φῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνάγκης τῆς ἁληθείας, in your obedience to the truth, cf. Jer. i.c. above. They are no longer ignorant (14) but have learned the truth (cf. John xvii. 17-19, and γνώσις τῆς τῆς ἅληθες, John viii. 32) from the missionaries. They must persist in the obedience to it which they then professed, in contrast with those who are disobedient to the truth (Rom. ii. 8; cf. Thess. ii. 12). Hortsays: "St. Peter rather means the dependence of Christian obedience on the possession
The three great uncials (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus) put φθαρτής for σποράς keeping φθαρτῆς: the variant was probably a paraphrase of the whole phrase and possibly implied the identification of αφθαρτόν with ζωτος Θεου και μεντος.

1. The addition of εις τον αληθης το μεντος is due to verse 25.

of the truth," relying on Eph. iv. 24, and the probability that "St. Peter would have distinctly used some such language as εις τον αληθης τον Θεου". In regard to the latter point it should be observed that St. Peter is curiously fond of using nouns instead of verbs (e.g., 2).—εις φιλοσεβασμον, love of the brethren, Vulgate, in fraternalis amore, mutual love which exists between brothers. It is the primary Christian duty. Matt. xxiii. 8, the first fruits of their profession of which St. Paul has no need to remind the Thessalonians, I Thess. iv. 9.—αυτοι εις τοιον ροιτον, unsigned, contrasted with the love which they professed towards their fellow Christians (cf. ii. 1) which was neither hearty nor eager. There was pretence among them whether due to imperfect sympathy of Jew for Gentile or of wealthy and honourable Gentiles for those who were neither the one nor the other. For a vivid illustration of this feigning see Jas. ii. 15 f. and ii. 1-5, etc., for the friction between rich and poor.—Διαλλαγος αγαπης. St. John's summary of the teaching of Jesus (John xiii. 34 f., xv. 12, 17) which he repeated in extreme old age at Ephesus, till the disciples were weary of it: "Magister quare semper hoc loqueris". His answer was worthy of him: "Quia praeceptum Domini est et si solum fiat sufficient (Hieron. in Gal. vi. 10).—κτισμω, intentionis (Vulg.), in LXX of "strong crying to God" (Jonah iii. 8 = πραιτω violently, cf. Jud. iv. 12; Joel i. 14; 3 Macc. v. 9: in Polybius of a warm commendation (xiii. 22, 12) a warm and friendly welcome (viii. 21, 1), a warm and magnificent reception (xiii. 16 4).

Ver. 23. εαναγεγεννημενοι. So St. John εαναγεγεννημενοι διά... των αγαπων εκ του Θεου γεννηνηται; cf. John iv. 17, v. 2—εκ σπορας αφθαρτου, i.e., of God regarded as Father and perhaps also as Sower (cf. ver. 24): the two conceptions are combined in John iii. 9, της αγαπης εκ του Θεου εμφασια αν Ποιει οτι σωμα αυτων μενει. Compare Philo, Leg. All., p. 123 M. Αλιπα... εις ουθεν γεγενην του λαμβανον της στολας... άλλων αυτων του Θεου.—δια λογου... μενεις, the connection of ζωτος κ. μενει, is doubtful; the following quotation might justify the abiding word and Heb. iv. 22, the living word in accordance with Deut. xxxii. 47—cf. 3, άλλας ζωνας. On the other hand the rendering of the Vulgate, per verbum dei vivi et permanentis, is supported by Dan. vi. 26 (αυτος γερ λοιπον θεος μενει και ζων) and supports St. Peter's argument: earthly relationships must perish with all flesh and its glory; spiritual kinship abides, because it is based on the relation of the kinsfolk to God living and abiding. For the word of God as the means of regeneration, cf. Jas. i. 18, βοηθησεις απεκρυπτης ζημια λογος αληθειας. For its identification with ζωνα of the quotation, cf. Acts x. 36 f.

Ver. 24 f. = Isa. xi. 6-8, added as endorsement of the comparison instituted between natural generation and divine regeneration, with gloss explaining the saying of Jehovah (cf. Heb. i. 1 f.). The only divergences from the LXX (which omits—as Jerome notes, perhaps through homoeoteleuton—quia spiritus dei flavit in eo: vere foenum est populus; asuit foenum cecidit flos) are that δε is inserted before χ. (so Targum), and that αυτης is put for ανθρωπου (so Heb., etc.) and Κυριου for του Θεου ζημια (in accordance with the proper reading of Jehovah in the omitted verse).

Ver. 25. το ευφοεις θεων comes from του ευφοεις θεων of Isa. xi. 9 which the Targum explains as referring to the prophets.
II. I ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν καιρὶν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπὸ κρίσιν καὶ φόνους ἑν, πᾶσας ἑκάσταλιᾶς δὲ ἀρτιγίνητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄθολον.

1 φόνους is an error (peculiar to Codex Vaticanus) for φόνους.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. Continuation of practical admonition with appeal to additional ground-principles illustrating the thesis of i. 10.

Ver. 1. Put away then all malice—all guile and hypocrisy and envy—all backbitings. o ὑπ. resumes διο (i. 13). The faults to be put away fall into three groups, divided by the prefix all, and correspond to the virtues of i. 22 (ὁποτέκρινον ἀννυσκόπον). The special connection of the command with the preceding Scripture would require the expression of the later idea, that such faults as these are inspired by the prejudices of the natural man and belong to the fashion of the world, which is passing away (i. John ii. 17).—ἀποθέεντες, putting off. Again participle with imperative force. St. Peter regards the metaphor of removal as based on the idea of washing off filth, cf. σαφὴς ἀπόθεσις, δόλου (vii. 21). St. James (i. 22, διὰ ἀποθέουμεν πάσαν ἰματικὴν καὶ πειραστὴν κακίαν) which seems to combine these two phrases and to deduce the familiarity of the spiritual sense of ἁμαρτία (cf. Apoc. xxii. 11, ἄφιενα αἵματος). St. Paul has the same word but associates it with the putting off of clothing (Col. iii. 5 ff.; Eph. iv. 22; Rom. xiii. 12—all followed by ἀποθέουσα).—κακία, probably malice rather than wickedness. Peter is occupied with their mutual relations and considering what hinders brotherly love, not their vices, if any, as vice is commonly reckoned. So James associates the removal of κακία with courtesy; and St. Paul says let all bitterness and anger and wrath and shouting and ill-speaking be removed from you with all malice (Eph. iv. 31; cf. Col. iii. 8). κε γενικείαν to ήσσεως ἐν τῷ κατά τὰ παιδίαν of 1 Cor. iv. 6 (cf. i. 12).

Ver. 2. ὡς, inasmuch as you are new-born babes; cf. ᾠδαγγευόμενοι (i. 23). The development of the metaphor rests upon the saying, unless ye be turned and become as the children (ὡς τὰ παιδία) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xviii. 3).—βρέφη (only here in metaphorical sense) is substituted for παιδία (preserved by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 20) as = babies at the breast. A παιδία might have lost its traditional innocence but not a βρέφος (= either child unborn as Luke i. 41, or suckling in classical Greek). For the origin of the metaphor, which appears also in the saying of R. Jose, "the proselyte is a child just born," compare Isa. xxviii. 9. Whom will he teach knowledge? . . . Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts, which the Tar¬ gum renders . . . To whom was the law given? . . . Was it not to the house of Israel which is beloved beyond all peoples? —τὸ . . . γέλα. The quotation of ver. 3 suggests that the milk is Christ;
The variant διακρίθητε for ἀδειθήτε illustrates the possibilities of variation and consequently of emendation: at the same time it directs attention to the omnipotence of God and the relative impotence of man.

compare St. Paul's explanation of the tradition of the Rock which followed the Israelites in the desert (1 Cor. x. 4) and the living water of John iv. 14. Milk is the proper food for babes; compare Isa. lv. 1, ὁμοίως τὸ μέλλοντα (cf. i. 18). This milk is guileless (cf. ἀκάκολος of ver. 1) pure or unadulterated (cf. μὴ ἑξανατείνῃ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 2). The interpretation of λόγον (pertaining to λόγος) is doubtful. But the use of λόγος just above (i. 23) probably indicates the sense which St. Peter put upon the adjective he borrowed (?) from Rom. xii. 1, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν. There and elsewhere λογία = rationabilis, spiritual; here belonging to contained in the Word of God, delivered by prophet or by evangelist. St. Paul in his use of λογία and of the metaphor of milk (solid food, 1 Cor. iii. 1 ff.) follows Philo and the Stoics.—Τα... σωτηρίαν, that fed thereon ye may grow up (cf. Eph. iv. 14 f.) unto salvation; cf. Jas. i. 21, "receive the engrafted word which is able to save your souls".

Ver. 3. St. Peter adopts the language of Ps. xxxiv. 9, omitting καὶ ἄλλα as inappropriate to γῆς. ἤχοθτος (identical in sound with ἤχος) = dulcis (Vulg.) or kind (cf. ἤχοπτος θεοῦ, Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22). Compare Heb. vi. 4 f. γενναμένους τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπονάσαν καὶ καλὸν γενναμένους θεοῦ ρήμα.

Vv. 4-10. Passages of scripture proving that Christ is called stone are first utilised, then quoted, and finally expounded. The transition from milk to the stone may be explained by the prophecy the hills shall flow with milk (Joel iii. 18), as the stone becomes a mountain according to Dan. iii. 21 f.; or by the legend to which St. Paul refers (1 Cor. x. 4); compare also ποιήσαι of Isa. xl. 10, which is used in ver. 9. This collection of texts can be traced back through Rom. ix. 32 f. to its origin in the saying of Mark xii. 10 f.; Cyprian (Test. ii. 16 f.) gives a still richer form.

Ver. 4. ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἐπιστευχὲς from Ps. xxxiv. 6, προσελθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν (Heb. and Targum, they looked unto Him; Syriac, look ye...). Cyprian uses Isa. ii. 2 f.; Ps. xxiii. 3 f. to prove that the stone becomes a mountain to which the Gentiles come and the just ascend.—αἴθων ζῶντα, a paradox which has no obvious precedent in O.T. Gen. xlix. 24 speaks of the Shepherd the stone of Israel, but Onkelos and LXX substitute γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ γινεῖται, for ἡ πέτρα which might be taken as meaning reviving or living stone, if connected with the foregoing instead of the following words. The LXX supports this connection and secures a good sense by inserting a negative; the Targum gives a bad sense throughout. ἐγείρων, though by men rejected, not in God's sight elect precious. ἀκάκολος comes from Ps. cxviii. 22 (see ver. 7); ἀκάκολος from Isa. xxviii. 6 (see ver. 6). ἄγνωστος is probably due to Rabbinic exegesis "read not ἄγνωστος of the ἀστικὸς, but σωτηρίαν of the ἀστικὸς, — ἀγνωστος, a spiritual house for an holy priesthood. The connection with priesthood (Heb. x. 21) and the offering of sacrifices points to the special sense of the House of God, i.e.,
be excluded altogether here. The whole clause is in fact the pivot on which the Epistle turns. Hitherto Peter has addressed himself to the Christians and their mutual relations, now he turns to consider their relations to the outside world (1. r f.). In 2 Peter i. 3, & correspond to θεία δύναμις, a sense which might be supported by Ps. L.c. (for discussion of other — very uncertain — evidence see Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 95 ff., 362) and the events of Pentecost (see especially Acts ii. 11.) — τοῦ ... Φως is derived from Ps. L.c.; the natural antithesis light is readily supplied (cf. Eph. v. 8, 14); darkness = heathenism in cf. 10.

Ver. 10, from Hosea i. 6, ii. 1.; cf. Rom. ix. 25 (has καλῶς κάλεσον of Hose.) the terms are so familiar that μοι is omitted by Peter as unnecessary (cf. γένος τοῦ γ. μου 4.).

Vv. 11 f. indicate generally the subject to be discussed. Beloved I exhort you to abstain from the lusts of the flesh, because they wage war against the soul. Slanders and even torments can only affect the body. But the lusts natural or acquired which you have renounced may hinder your salvation, as they have already impeded your mutual love. For the sake of your old friends and kinsfolk refuse to yield to their solicitations. If rebuffed they resort to persuasion of whatever kind, remember that it is only a passing episode of your brief exile. Let your conduct give them no excuse for reproach; so may they recognise God's power manifest not on your lips but in your lives.— ἀγαπητέ, not an empty formula but explanation of the writer's motive. He set before them the great commandment and now adds to it as Jesus did, Love one another as I have loved you, John xiii. 34.— ὁ π. καὶ παρεκκλήσεις with ἀπεχ. (motive for abstinence in emphatic position) rather than παρεκκλήσεις (as vouchsafe ὃς ἐβδολόν, 2 Thess. iii. 15—the motive of exhortation is here expressed by ἅγ. ) echoes παρεκκλήσεις of i. 1 and παροικίας of i. 17. The combination (= ἰδιός ὁ θεός) occurs twice in LXX (Gen. xxxiii. 4; Ps. xxxix. 13.). Christians are in the world, not of the world.— ἀγάπησον, cf. Plato, Phaedo, 82 C, true philosophers, ἀπεχνάται τῶν καθαρῶν σώματα ἐνθυμοί ἄπαθῶν— not for fear of poverty, like the vulgar, nor for fear of disgrace, like the ambitious, but because only so can he, departing in perfect purity, come to the company of the gods”.— τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμίων, the lusts of the flesh. St. Peter borrows St. Paul's phrase, ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀναγράφθημεν ποτε μέ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκός ἡμῶν ποιοῦντες τὰ σκληράματα τῆς σαρκός καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν (Eph. ii. 3), but uses it in his own way in a sense as wide as τὰς κοσμικὰς ὅ. (Tit. ii. 12). For the flesh is the earthly life (cf. Col. iii. 5) the transitory mode of existence of the soul which is by such abstinence to be preserved (i. 9).— ἡμεῖς ... ἡμᾶς, because they are campaigning against the soul.— στρατεύεσθαι (cf. iv. 1 f., for military metaphor) perhaps derived from Rom. vii. 23, “I perceive a different law in my members warring against (ἀντιστρατεύοντα) the law of my mind;” cf. Jas. iv. 1, the pleasures which war in your members, and 4 Macc. x. 23, ἵππαν καὶ εξωφυλλάταν στρατεύεσθαι περὶ τῆς εὐονεῖας.— κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. The lusts of this earthly life are the real enemy for they affect the soul. Compare Matt. x. 28, which may refer to the Devil and not to God, and the Pauline parallel, θὰ ἔριξεν τὴν πλείωσιν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἡμῶν τῆς ὑστατοῦσας ... τοῦτο γὰρ ἀλλότριος ἀντικεῖται (Gal. v. 17).

Ver. 12. Adaptation of the saying, ὅπως ἔστων ἡμῶν ἤμων καὶ καλῇ ἐνα καὶ δεξιοτέρων τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς ὑπαρχοῖς (Matt. v. 16). The good behaviour on which the resolved ἀναγράφθημεν permits stress to be laid is the
fruit of the abstinence of ver. 11; cf. Heb. xiii. 8; Jas. iii. 13. This second admonition is disjointed formally—against formal grammar—from the first; cf. Eph. iv. 11, parakaló... ὑμᾶς... ἀνεχόμενοι.—ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦ, the people of God (ii. 9) is a correlative term and implies the existence of the nations, who are ignorant and disobedient. The situation of the Churches addressed justifies the use of Dispersion in i. 1. But the point of the words here is this: you—the new Israel must succeed where the old failed, as it is written my name is blasphemed ἐπὶ τῷ ἐνεργῷ on your account (Isa. iii. 5; LXX, cited Rom. ii. 24).—Ἀποκάλυψις, in order that as a result of your good works they may be initiated into your secrets and come to glorify God in respect to your conduct when He at last visits the world, though now they calumniate you as evildoers in this matter.—ἐν τῷ case of the thing in which, i.e., your behaviour generally; cf. iii. 10, iv. 4, and for τῶν ἐνεργῶν in iv. 11, 16.—καταλαμβάνων ὑμᾶς. Particular accusations are given in iv. 15. This popular estimate of Christians is reflected in Suetonius' statement: Adfecti supplicii Christiani, genus hominium superstitionis novae et maleficae (Ner. 16).—ἐποπτεύοντες takes Acc. in iii. 2 (overlook, behold, as in Symmachus' version of Ps. x. 24, xxxiii. 13); but here the available objects are either appropriated (θέων with θεόν) or far off (Ἀναπτυξις). It will therefore have its ordinary sense of become ἐποπτέως, be initiated. The Christians were from the point of view of their former friends members of a secret association, initiates of a new mystery, the secrecy of which gave rise to slanders such as later Christians brought against the older mysteries and the Jews. St. Peter hopes that, if the behaviour of Christians corresponds to their profession, their neighbours will become initiated into their open secrets (for as St. Paul insists this hidden mystery has now been revealed and published).—διὰ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦ τῶν Θεῶν, come to glorify God—like the centurion, who said of the crucified Jesus, Truly this was the Son of God (Mark xv. 39)—i.e., recognise the finger of God either in the behaviour of the Christians or in the whole economy (see Rom. xi.).—ἐν ἡμῖν. ἐπισκοπής, from Isa. x. 3, What will ye do—ye the oppressors of the poor of my people—in day of visitation (τῇ ἐπέτροπῇ) i.e. (Targum), when your sins are visited upon you. But St. Peter looks for the repentance of the heathen at the last visitation (cf. iv. 6), though the prophet found no escape for his own contemporaries. Compare Luke xix. 44.

Vv. 13-17. The duty of the Christian towards the State: compare Rom. xii. 17.—πάντα ἀνθρωπίνης κτισών, every human institution, including rulers (iv.), masters (iv. 18), and husbands (iii. 1). κτισίων is used ordinarily in many senses, e.g., of peopling a country, of founding a city, of setting up games, feasts, altar, etc. In Biblical Greek and its descendant it is appropriated to creation. Here κτισίων is apparently selected as the most comprehensive word available; and the acquired connotation—creation by God—is ruled out by the adjective ἀνθρωπίνης. It thus refers to all human institutions which man set up with the object of maintaining the world which God created. —διὰ τοῦ κύριου, for the sake of the Lord. Διὰ may be (i) retrospective—i.e., because Jesus said, Render what is Caesar's to Caesar or, generally, because God is the source of all duly-constituted authority; or (ii) prospective for the sake of Jesus (Yehovah); your loyalty redounding to the credit of your Master in heaven.—βασιλεύς, the Roman Emperor, as in Apoc. xvii. 9, etc.; Josaphus B.J., v. 136, v. infra.—ὑπέρσχοντος, pre-eminent, supreme, absolute, as in Sap. vi. 5, where ὡς ὑπέρσχοντος corresponds to those who are underlings of His Sovereignty (4), to whom power was given from the Lord (3); cf. διὰ αὐτοῦ below.—Ὑγειόνων, properly Governors of provinces, but Plutarch uses the singular = Imperator. Peter rather follows the conventional rendering of the saying of Jesus, ἵνα ἄνθρωπον καὶ βασιλέων σταθησθείη, interpreted in the light of popular usage
16 of Luke xxvi. 12) or of Jer. xxxix. 3, ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἀλλαγμένων ἀγαθίαν, which explains the nature of the self-subjection required. Christians are free (Matt. xvii. 26 f. q.v.; John viii. 36; Gal. ii. 4) and therefore must submit to authority. Peter generalises summarily St. Paul's argument in Gal. v. 13, which refers to internal relations.—καὶ μὴ... ἔλευθερῶν, and not having your freedom as a cloak of your malice. For καὶ... Menander (apud Stobaeum Florileg.) πλεονεκισθεὶς διὰ τυλίγματος ἔλευθερῶν. The verb is used in Ps. cited Rom. iv. 7 = ἀνέβεμεν; and this sense may perhaps be contemplated here; early Christians regarded their freedom asconstituting a propitiation for future as for past sins.

Ver. 17. Sweeping clause based partly on Rom. xiii. 7 f. (cf. Matt. xxii. 21), partly on Prov. xxvii. 21, θBJBBēH τόν θεόν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ μηθερέφ αὐτῶν ἀπειδήθησα.—πάντας τιμήσατε. The aorist imperative is used because the present would be ambiguous; cf. ἀπειδήθησα, Rom. l.c., and for matter, Rom. xii. 10, τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους τροπογονοῦμεν, since πάντας covers both the brotherhood and the emperor.—οἱ οὐκ ιτίτα, vocative; the word is chosen as being milder than δύολους and also as suggesting the parallel between slaves and Christians who are God's household (ii. 5)—ὁ πατρὸς ἡμῶν has force of imperative resuming τίμησατε (17) as being a particular application of that general principle.—τοῖς διστατίσις, to your masters, not excluding God, the Master of all, as is indicated by the insertion of in all fear (cf. 17, etc.) and τοὺς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἔπισκοποῖς (cf. Ps. lxxxvi. 4, σὺ κύριος χριστός καὶ ένικηθης).—τοῖς σκολοίς, the perverse, cf. Phil. ii. 15. Οὐ γὰρ... ταῦτα διὰ δῶμα μάλαν γενέσθαι σκολοίς καὶ διαστραμμένης, where the full phrase is cited from Deut. xxxiii. 5 (σκ. = δύσκολος). The Vulgate has dyssolitis = δυσκόλοις; Hesychius, σκολοίς. τίκος; Prov. xxviii. 18, ἤ σκολοῖς ἀκομήντος πορεύμονος. ὁ πορεύμονος δύσκολος.

Vv. 19 f. Summary application of the teaching of Jesus recorded in Luke vi. 27-
The third corrector of Codex Sinaiticus puts κολαφίζομενον for κολαφίζεται with the assent of some cursives. Such variations may be due to careless copying or they may result from erroneous expansion and interpretation of abbreviations.

36 = Matt. v. 39-48. χάρις seems to be an abbreviation of the O.T. idiom to find favour (בְּנֵתָּה) with God—cf. χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ (20)—taken from St. Luke's version of the saying, εἶ ἵππος τοὺς ἵππους ὄμοι, ποιὰ ὥσπερ χάρις δεστὶν (vi. 32).—Compare χάριτας = בְּנֵתָּה that which is acceptable in Prov. x. 32.—καὶ συνελήσας Θεοῦ, (i) because God is conscious of your condition (Θεοῦ subjective genitive), a reproduction of thy Father which seeth that which is hidden (Matt. vii. 5, etc.); so συνελήσας in definite philosophical sense of conscience is usually followed by possessive genitive or (ii) because you are conscious of God (Θεοῦ objective genitive), cf. σ. ἀπαρτίας, Heb. x. 2. The latter construction is preferable: the phrase interprets διὰ τῶν καύρων with the help of the Pauline expression διὰ τὴν σ. (Rom. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 25) entailed in the same context. —παρὰ δὲ δίκαιος, emphatic. Peter has to take account of the possibility which Jesus ignored, that Christians might deserve persecution; cf. 20, 25. —παρὰ κλος, what praise rather than what kind of reputation (κλῆς neutral as in Thuc. ii. 45) cf. ποια χάρις τίνα μισθών, Matt. κλ. (only twice in Job in LXX) corresponds to στάνων above: χάρις παρὰ δὲ shows that the praise of the Master who reads the heart is intended.—κολαφίζομενον, from description of the Passion, Mark xiv. 65. ἤδεις τίνας... κολαφίζεται αὐτῶν: cf. Matt. v. 39, δόστι σε βασιλεί. So also St. Paul recalls the parallel between Christ's and the Christians' sufferings (1 Cor. iv. 11) κολαφίζεμαι.—διὰ τῶν θαυμάτων, explained δίκαιος (19).—χάρις, see on χ. ver. 19.

Ver. 21. εἰς τοῦτο, sc. to do well and to suffer, if need be, without flinching, as Christ did.—καὶ λήθησθε, sc. by God; cf. διὰ τὴν συνέλησαν Θεοῦ.—εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔφεσθε ὑμῖν, ver. 22 supplies the essential point, which would be readily supplied, but Christ's suffering was undeserved (Δύκας ὑπὲρ δίκαιων, iii. 18).—καὶ οὖν with reference to the similar experience of Christians; so Phil. ii. 5. οὐκ ὄφειν όποιος ὑπήρξεν ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ. —ὑπὸ γραμμένον (i) outline, 2 Macc. ii. 28, to enlarge upon the outlines of our abridgment; (ii) copy-head, pattern, to be traced over by writing-pupils (Plato, Protag., 227 D; Clement of Alexandria, Strom., v. 8, 49, gives three examples of which βεβιάσμεθαιληλιτρον σφηνις is one).—παλαιοθρυσίωτες, reminiscence of Jesus' word to Peter, ἀπελευθέρωσις στυφλέων, John xiii. 36. Ver. 22 = Isa. liii. 9, ἄμμ. being put for ἀναγέννησιν (ܡܲܪܒܐ) and εὑρ. δόλον (so ἀμα ΑΟ. etc.) for δόλον (= Heb.) of LXX. The latter variation is due to conjunction of Zeph. iii. 13, σὺ μὴ εἰσέβη ἐν τῷ στόματί αὐτῶν γλώσσα δόλων: Christ being identified with the Remnant. The former appears in the Targum: 'that they might not remain who work sin and might not speak guile with their mouth'.

Ver. 23. Combination of the Scripture οὐκ ἤνει ἰδοὺ τὸ στόμα (Isa. liii. 7) with the saying ἦταν ἀναβίωσαν καὶ διώκουσαν (Matt. v. 11). For λοι-, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 12. λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν (καταφέν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιηματ. of Matt. l.c.), John ix. 28, the Jews ἤλειδόρησαν the once blind man as Jesus' disciple and, for O.T. type Deut. xxxiii. 8, ἤλειδόρησαν αὐτῶν ἐκ οἴκου ἀντίλογος (Levi = Christ the Priest, cf. ἀντίλογος, Heb. xii. 3).—οὐκ ἔχεις τῆς, the prophecy ἔχεις τῆς ἀντίλογος (Isa. lixi. 14) is yet to be fulfilled (Luke xiii. 27). Occ. notes that He threatened Judas, seeking to deter him and reviled the Pharisees, but not in re-
The superfluous αὐτοῦ after οὗ τῷ μάλωπι is omitted by Codex Vaticanus and other authorities. It would be repugnant to the ear of a Greek, but is not therefore to be regarded as necessarily absent from the original.

Ver. 25 = Isa. liii. 6, πάντες ὃς πρόβατα ἐκλαμάθησαν combined with Ez. xxxiv. 6, where this conception of the people and their teachers (the shepherds of Israel) is elaborated and the latter denounced because τὸ πρόβατά μου καὶ τοὺς θυσίας ἀντέχομαι. Further the use of this metaphor in the context presupposes the saying I am the good shepherd. . . . I lay down my life for the sheep (John xii. 15).

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-6. Duty of wives (Eph. v. 21-24; Col. iii. 18; Tit ii. 4)—Submissiveness and true adorn-
The variant οὖν for εἰς τίνες serves as a reminder that in uncial manuscripts ε is apt to be confused with ο and that words were not written separately from one another.
secured by supplying ἀνδρόσων with τοῦ ἐξόνευται and taking κα. as predicate: your ornament be cf. οὕτως ἐκόσμου ἀννατές (ver. 5). But the order in ver. 3 is against this and a Greek reader would naturally think of the other sense of κ. = world universe and remember that man is a microcosm and “the universe the greatest and most perfect man” (Philo, p. 471 M.). — δὲ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδιᾶς ἀνδρόσων, the hidden man that is the heart (or which belongs to the heart) is the equivalent of the Pauline inner man (Rom. vii. 22), i.e., Mind as contrasted with the outward man, i.e., flesh (Rom. 13.2, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16). St. Peter employs the terms used in the Sermon on the Mount; cf. St. Paul’s δὲ τῷ κρυπτῷ οὐδείς and περὶ τοῦ καρδιῶς, Rom. ii. 29.— ὡς ἔριψατε πάντα χαλκὸν, clothed in the incorruptible thing (or ornament, sc. σάρκα) contrasted with corruptible goldens; cf. Jas. ii. 2, ἀνεργοὶ ... ἐν λαθρεῖᾳ λατρείᾳ — τοῦ ... πέντεματος, namely, the meek and quiet spirit. The adjectives are perhaps derived from the version of Isa. lxvi. 2, known to Clement of Rome (Ep. i. xiii. 4), ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιβλέψιν ἄλλῳ ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν προσκήνιον καὶ ἱππότα μου τὰ λόγια. Jesus professed Himself, προσκήνιον καὶ παντελῶς τῇ καρδίᾳ. For πέντεματος compare πεντάμα ἄγγελον, Rom. i. 4. In Rom. ii. 29, πνεῦμα is coupled with heart as contrasted with flesh and outwardness. δὲ which spirit or the possession of which reference.— τὸν τελεῖας suggests use of conception of Wisdom which is precious above rubies (Prov. iii. 15, etc.); cf. Jas. i. 21, iii. 13, ἐν προφήτηι σοφίας and description of the wisdom from above, ib. 17.

Ver. 5. ὑπάρχει refers vaguely to O.T. history as part of 1... θαέαν. Reference to the holy women of the O.T. are rare in N.T. and this appeal to their example illustrates the affinity of Peter to Heb. xi. 11, 35. Hannah is the obviously appropriate type (cf. Luke i. with 2 Sam. i. 1 f.); but Peter is thinking of the traditional idealisation of Sarah.

Ver. 6. ἡς ... καλοῦσα. The only evidence that can be adduced from the O.T. narrative is Sarah laughed within herself and said ... “but my lord is old” (Gen. xviii. 12). The phrase, if pressed, implies a nominal subjection as of a slave to her lord, but the context at any rate excludes any hope in God. Philo, who starts with the assumption that Sarah is Virtue, evades the difficulty; her laughter was the expression of her joy, she denied it for fear of usurping God’s prerogative of laughter (de Abr., ii. p. 30 M). The Rabbinic commentaries dwell upon the title accorded to Abraham and draw the same inference as Peter; but there are also traces of a tendency to exalt Sarah “the princess” as superior to her husband in the gift of prophecy, which St. Peter may wish to correct (as St. James corrects the exaggerated respect paid to Elijah, Jas. v. 17).— ἡς ... τέκνα. Christian women became children of Sarah who is Virtue or Wisdom (Philo) just as men became children of Abraham. But the fact that they were Christians is still in the background; the essential point is that they must do the works traditionally ascribed to Sarah (cf. Rom. iv.; John viii.) and so justify their technical parentage, whether natural or acquired. Oec. compares Isa. ii. 2, Sarah your mother.— ἡ ... οὐσία, the present participle emphasises the need for continuance of the behaviour appropriate to children of Sarah.— μὴ ... ποιῶσιν, from Prov. iii. 25, LXX. Peter regards Sarah’s falsehood (Gen. Lc.) as the yielding to a sudden terror for which she was rebuked by God. Fearlessness then is part of the character which is set before them for imitation and it is the result of obedience to the voice of Wisdom. Rabbinic exegesis associates the ideas of ornament with the promised child and that of peace between husband and wife with the whole incident.

Ver. 7. Duty of husbands to their wives. Application of principle πάντας τοὺς ἡμῶν.— κατὰ γνώσιν, for the
woman is the weaker vessel—the pot—which the stronger—the cauldron—may easily smash (Sir. xiii. 2). οἷς, κ.τ.λ. point with comma after γυναῖκαν and τοῖς ἥερους κατὰ γυναῖκαν (Gen. ii. 7 f.). In the prophets it is developed and applied variously (Isa. xlv. 9 f., lxv. 8; Jer. xviii. 6). In Sap. xv. 7, there is an elaborate description of the maker of clay images, in which κεφάλαιον replaces πλάτος and vessels which serve clean uses are distinguished from the contrary sort. Thence St. Paul adopts the figure and employs it to illustrate the absolute sovereignty of the Creator, as Isaiah had done (see Rom. ix. 21), distinguishing vessels intended for honour from those intended for dishonour. Lastly 2 Tim. ii. 20 exemplifies the particular application of the figure, on which Peter’s use of κεφάλαιον rests—in μεταξὺ and καί οἴκες (1 Peter ii. 5, iv. 17) κ.τ.λ. The comparative διπλούστερος proves that both husband and wife are vessels and assists to exclude the notion that St. Paul could mean to call a wife the vessel of her husband in 1 Thess. iv. 4—�行 ... ἐγὼ ἡμεῖς, inasmuch as they are also heirs with you of the grace (i. 10, 13) of life (ii. 24): the heavenly inheritance is not distributed according to earthly custom, which gave the wife no rights of her own.—τὰς ... ἐφ᾽αν. If the prayers are those of all (ver. 5) compare 1 Cor. vii. (τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἀδελφῶν ... ἵνα σχελάσῃ τὴν προ- σνύσῃ). Peter teaches that married life need not—if the wife be properly honoured—hinder religious duties, as St. Paul feared (ib. 32 ff.). If ἡμῶν = γαῖα husbands (as v.l. πουκληρονοῦν requires) cf. Jas. v. 4.

Vv. 8 f. Sweeping clause addressed to all, inculcating detailed ἀδελφολία after Rom. xiii. 10, 15-17.

Ver. 8. τὰ ... τέλος, finally. Oecumenius brings out the possible connotations of the word goal and also the law for all love since love is the end of the law—διὰ φρονοῦντες, of one mind, united, an Epic word. St. Paul’s τὰ αὐτὰ φρονοῖν, but here wider than parallel expressing Rom. xii. 16, τὰ αὐτὰ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες—συμπάθεια is summarised χαίρετε κατὰ χαίρενταν κληρονομοῦσατε. ο εἰς τοῦτο εἰς κληρονομίαν εἰσέκλητον. καὶ εὐλογία καὶ κληρονομία εἰς τοῦτο εἰς κληρονομίαν. —ξωτ. 9 ἡ λοιπόν ἂν ἀντὶ λοιποῦ κατὰ παντὸς τὸν κατὰ τὸ εὐλογίαν τὸν εὐλογεῖται τούτῳ. So St. Paul reverses the current view which identified the Jews with Isaac and the Gentiles with Ishmael (Gal. iv. 22 ff.).

Vv. 10-12 = Ps. xxxiv. 12-17a. intro-
Ver. 10. Peter omits the rhetorical question τίς δικαιοίς ἀθρόων, which introduces θὴλων in the original (LXX = Hebrew) but is influenced by it in the substitution of the third for the second person throughout. The change of ἄγανων (= Hebrew) to ἄγανων καὶ removes the barbarisms θὴλων ζωῆν and ἄγανων ἁπλώ (= Hebrew) and secures the balance between the clauses disturbed by the omission of the opening words.— ἡμᾶς δὲ ἄγας ἄγας is the natural sequel of the alteration of the original (days to see good), which is already found in the LXX (θηλω καὶ ἄγας ἄγας).— ἐρχέται = earthly life in the original corresponding to days. The text adopted by Peter makes it mean eternal life, parallel good days. Only with this interpretation is the quotation pertinent to his exhortation: cf. that ye might inherit blessing (9) with fellow-inheritors of the grace of life (7).— χαίρετε, κ.τ.λ., parallel μὴ ... λαυδίσων (9); cf. ii. 22 E.

Ver. 12. προσκεκόλαξεν Κύριον, Jehovah's face, i.e., wrath (Targum, the face of Jehovah was angry) as the following clause, to cut off the remembrance of them shows; cf. Lam. iv. 16; Ps. xxi. 9. But Peter stops short and leaves room for repentence.

Ver. 13. κακῶν κατανέμει echoes τοιοῦτος κακά (as ζητήσει μου τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; but the phrase comes also from O.T.: Isa. 1. 9, Κύριος βοηθήσει μοι τε κακώσει με; τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ζητήσει μου τοῦ θεοῦ) but the phrase comes also from O.T.: Isa. 1. 9, Κύριος βοηθήσει μοι τε κακώσει με; τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ζητήσει μου τοῦ θεοῦ. The scripture...
corresponding to the saying, Fear not them that kill the body; but fear rather him that can destroy both soul and body (Matt. x. 28 parallels Luke xii. 4 f. where the description of God is modified). The sense of the original, fear not what (the people) fear; Jehovah of Hosts Him shall ye count holy and let Him be the object of your fear, has been in part abandoned. For it is simpler to take the fear as referring to the evil with which their enemies try to terrify them, than to supply the idea that their enemies employ the means by which they themselves would be intimidated. Compare iii. 6.— τὸν Χριστὸν, gloss on κτόρνα = Jehovah; cf. ii. 3.— σατανάς καὶ φόβοι, with mark- ness (cf. ver. 4) and fear of God (Luke ii. c., has the same play on the senses of fear).— σατανάς καὶ φόβοι, intermediate step between διὰ σ. τόου and the quasi-personification of σ. α., in ver. 21; so St. Paul says οὐλά γὰρ ἐμαντυὶ σῶμα (1 Cor. iv. 4) but goes on beyond the contrast between self-judgment and that of other men to God's judgment. Ver. 17 supplies the explanation here.— ἐὰν . . . ἀναστροφῆς, generalisation of Peter's personal experience at Pentecost, when the Jews first scoffed and then were pierced to the heart (Acts ii. 13, 37). Misrepresentation is apparently the extent of their present suffering (17) and this they are encouraged to hope may be stopped. The heathen will somehow be put to shame even if they are not converted (ii. 12).— ἐν σ. in the matter in respect of which; see ii. 12. — περί ἔκπραξεως, occurs in Luke vi. 28, προσέγγισθε περὶ τῶν ἐπιπροσάντων ὑμᾶς, and therefore constitutes another hint of contact between St. Luke and Peter (cf. χάρις, ii. 10). Aristotle defines ἐπιπραξιμάδος as "hindrance to the wishes of another not for the sake of gaining anything oneself but in order to baulk the other"—the spirit of the dog in the manger. Ordinarily the verb means to libel, cf. λαλήσαι διόλον (10).— ὑμῖν . . . ἀναστροφῆς, your (possessive genitive precedes noun in Hellenistic Greek) good-in-Christ behavior: ἐν Χριστῷ (iv. 14, 16) is practically equivalent to Christian, cf. if any is in Christ a new creature.

Ver. 17. κρίτων, cf. ii. 19 f., where χάρις κλήσις corresponds to παιδιός περισσοῦ of the sources.—ἐν θέλει τῇ θελήμα τοῦ. Again optative implies that it is a purely hypothetical case (cf. ver. 14). For the semi-personification
Ver. 18. The advantage of suffering for well-doing is exemplified in the experience of Christ, who gained thereby quickening (ver. 21) and glory (ver. 22). How far the pattern applies to the Christian is not clear. Christ suffered once for all according to Heb. ix. 24-28; the Christian suffers for a little while (ver. 10). But does the Christian suffer also for sins? St. Paul and Ignatius speak of themselves as περιήγησαν περικεκλείσαν; compare the value of righteous men for Sodom. But even if Peter contemplated this parallel it is quite subordinate to the main idea, in which (spirit) even to the spirits in prison he went and preached them that disobeyed once upon a time when the patience of God was waiting in the days of Noah while the ark was being fitted out. . . . The spirits who disobeyed in the days of Noah are the sons of God described in Gen. vi. 1-4. But there as in the case of Sarah St. Peter depends on the current tradition in which the original myth has been modified and amplified. This dependence supplies an adequate explanation of the difficulties which have been found here and in ver. 21, provided that the plain statement of the preaching in Hades is not prejudged to be impossible. The important points in the tradition as given in the Book of Enoch (vi.-xvi. cf. Jubilees v.) are as follows: the angels who lusted after the daughters of men descended in the days of Jared as his name (Descent) shows. The children of this unlawful union were the Nephilim and the Elijud. They also taught men all evil arts so that they perished appealing to God for justice. At last Enoch was sent to pronounce the sentence of condemnation upon these watchers, who in terror sought him to present a petition to God on their behalf. God refused to grant them peace. They were spirits eternal and immortal who transgressed the line of demarcation between men and angels and disobeyed the law that spiritual beings do not marry and beget children like men. Accordingly they are bound and their children slay one another leaving their disembodied spirits to propagate sin in the world even after it has been purified by the Flood. But Christians believed that Christ came to seek and to save the lost and the captives; all things are to be subjected to Him. So Peter supplements the tradition which he accepts. For him it was not merely important as connected with the only existing type of the Last Judgment or an alternative explanation of the origin and continuance of sin but also as the greatest proof of the complete victory of Christ over the most obstinate and worst of sinners.—ἐκάθεν, even to the typical rebels who had sinned past forgiveness according to pre-Christian notions.—τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ προεδροῦσιν, the spirits in prison, i.e., the angels of Gen. li. who were identified with μυρίστες Gen. vi. 3, and therefore described as having been sent to the earth by God in one form of the legend (Jubilees, l.c.). The name contains also the point of their offending (Enoch summarised above); cf. 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6; and the prophecy of Isa. lixi. 1 (which Jesus claimed, Luke iv. 8 f.), δορυφόροι εἰχανάτως ἔφεσαν. These spirits were in ward when Christ preached to them in accordance with God's sentence, bind them in the depths of the earth (Jub. v. 6).—ἐκάθεν = εἰσελθομενοίτω, cf. Luke iv. 8. Before Christ came, they had not heard the Gospel of God's Reign. Enoch's mediation failed. But at Christ's preaching they repented like the men of Nineveh; for it is said that angels subjected themselves to Him (22, cf. ἔστρατον, throughout the Epistle.—διά τῆς αἰώνος τοτε, their historic disobedience or rebellion is latent in the narrative of Gen. vi. and expounded by Enoch; cf. ii. 71, iii. 1, iv. 17. In LXX. commonly = rebel (ἐκακοῦν).—ἐπεδίδησεν . . . μεγαθεοῦμαι, God's long-suffering was waiting. The reading ἐπεδιδότων is attractive, as supplying a reference to the present period of waiting which precedes the second and final Judgment (Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22). The tradition lengthens the period of πάντων (Rom. iii. 25); but
St. Peter limits it by adding while the Ark was being fitted out in accordance with Gen. If Adam’s transgression be taken as the origin of sin the long-suffering is still greater. The idea seems to be due to ἐνθυμηθέναι. I reflected, of the LXX, which stands for the unworthy anthropomorphism of the Hebrew I repented in Gen. vi. 6. Compare for language Jas. v. 7; Matt. xxiv. 37 f.; Luke xvii. 26 f. — els ήν, sc. entered and. — δᾶλυγοι, κ.τ.λ. St. Peter hints that here in the typical narrative is the basis of the disciple’s question, δᾶλυγοι στάδιαμα- νοι (Luke xiii. 23). — δῶ τὸ ψυχαλ, so Gen. vii. 7; ψ. = persons (of both sexes), cf. Acts ii. 43, etc. The usage occurs in Greek of all periods; so Ψηφιακ in Hebrew and soul in English. — διασκόθη—σήν διάποτος, were brought safe through water. Both local and instrumental meanings of διά are contemplated. The former is an obvious summary of the whole narrative; cf. also διά τὸ διοφθέρα (Gen. vi. 7). The latter is implied in the statement that the water increased and lifted up the ark (ib. 17 f.); though it fits better the antitype. So Josephus (Ant. I., iii. 2) says that “the ark was strong so that from no side was it worsted by the violence of the water and Noah with his household διασώθητα”. Peter lays stress on the water (rather than the ark as e.g., Heb. xi.) for the sake of the parallel with Baptism (Rom. vi. 3; cf. St. Paul’s application of the Passage of the Red Sea, 1 Cor. x. 1 f.).

Ver. 21. Baptism is generally the antitype of the deliverance of Noah. Christians pass through water (in both senses) to salvation; in each microcosm are the sins which must be washed away and the remnant which is to be saved. Therefore the antitypical water saves us (δ = τὸ διοφθέρα > διάποτος) being oφ σαρκί, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Tit. iii. 5.—β πητεί- σμα, if not an interpolation explains δ αντ. which corresponding to the (pre-existent) type (cf. Heb. ix. 24 the earthly temple is ἀντίτυπα τῶν δαιμόνων). The following definition by exclusion contrasts Christian baptism with Jewish and pagan lustrations and also with the Deluge which was a removal of sin-fouled flesh from the sinners of old (iv. 6); the former affected the flesh and not the conscience (Heb. ix. 13 f.), the latter removed the flesh but not the spiritual defilement proceeding from past sin. σάρκος and συνεθάθενος stand before their belongings for emphasis and not merely in accordance with prevalent custom. For ἀνθρωπίνας ὑποτι συμπαρακεραμον compare Isa. iv. 4 (sequel of the description of the daughters of Zion which is used above iii. 3). Jehovah shall wash away their filth (τῶν βρωκόν; LXX chivalrously prefixes of the sons and). ἐκκρίσιμος is explained by Oecumenius as meaning earnest, pledge as in Byzantine Greek law. Its use for the questions put to the candidate in the baptismal service (doth thou renounce . . . ?) is probably due to St. Peter here. In ordinary Greek (Herodotus and Thucydides) it = question (ἐκων, having no force, as if implying a second additional question arising out of the first). Here the noun corresponds to the verb as used in Isa. lx. 7, quoted by St. Paul in Rom. x. 20, ἐκφήσεις ἔφεσαν τούτων ἡμι ἐπερωτοῦσοι = (1) a seeking, quest after God or (2) request addressed to God (supported by els; cf. the formula ἐκκρίσεις εἰς τὸ βασιλείῳ ἰδίωμα, a petition addressed to the king’s majesty). In the latter case Peter will still be thinking as above and below of the disobedient spirits who presented a petition (ἐκτύνημα) to God inspired by an evil conscience (see Enoch summarised above). At any rate συνέκρισε is probably subjective or possessive rather than objective genitive. The believer who comes to baptism has believed in Christ and repented of his past sins, renounces them and the
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IV. Καὶ θεὸν ἀναστάτων ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγέλων ἡ ζωή

1 After the Vulgate adds declutienis mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficiamur.

2 The variant apostolicon for apostolos is a simple case of erroneous transcription which does not affect the sense. Codex Alexandrinus adds the Christian gloss ὑπὸ τῶν αἰωνίων.
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4 For ἀμαρτίαι most manuscripts have ἀμαρτίας.

5 After γὰρ the secondary uncials supply ἠμῖν, and the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus with many cursive ier.
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spirits which prompted them and appeals to God for strength to carry out this renunciation in his daily life. — ἐν δὲν ἀναστάτων ὑπὸ τῶν αἰωνίων, with σελείρα; compare 1 Cor. xv. 13-17.

Ver. 22. Christ went into Heaven— and now is on God's right hand (Ps. cx. 1)—when angels and authorities and powers had subjected themselves to Him in accordance with prophecy (Ps. viii. 7; cf. Heb. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.). For the orders of angels see also Rom. viii. 38; Eph. i. 21. Clearly they include the rebels of ver. 19 f. whom Jubilees calls the angels of the Lord (Jub. iv. 15) and Onkelos the sons of the mighty and their children (7) the giants.

Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. Christ having died to flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought that (or because) he that died hath ceased to sins. — πάθην ταῦτα ἐκεῖνον. Peter goes back to the starting point of iii. 18 in order to emphasise the import of the first step taken by Christ and His followers, apart now from the consequences. The new life implies death to the old. — τὸν αὐτὴν ἐννοιάν. 1 only occurs once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. iv. 12, τῶν ἐννοιάσεων καὶ ἐννοιών καταβίας, but is common in LXX of Proverbs; compare (e.g.) Prov. ii. 11, ἐννοια ἄνοια (γνῶσις, discernment) shall keep thee. Here it is the noun-equivalent of ἐπιτρέπει δ καὶ ἐν χρίστε (Phil. ii. 1), Christ's thought (or purpose) which He had in dying is shared by the Christian; and it is defined by διηκοστεὶς, κ.τ.λ. — διακοστεὶς, sc. for the fight with sin and sinners whom you have deserted. — τὰ δὲ ... ἀμαρτίαι. This axiom is better taken as explaining the same thought than as motive for ἐν. St. Paul states it in other words, διὰ γὰρ ἀποκλεισμένα θεολόγου ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας; compare the death-bed confession of the Jew, "O may my death be an atonement for all the sins ... of which I have been guilty against thee". One death—literally or spiritually—hath rest in respect of sins assumed or committed; so Heb. ix. 28 insists that after His death Christ is χριστὸς ἀμαρτίας. πνεύμα ἐφοίτοι τοὺς απλάστους of iii. 10. In the Greek Bible the perfect passive occurs only once (Exod. ix. 34) outside Isa. i.xxxix., where it is used three times to render ἀκοή (cf. καπετασμός, Heb. iv. 9). The dative ἐν of is analogous to that following ἔν ἀποκλεισμένα (παθεῖν); the v.l. ἀμαρτίας is due to the common construction of παθεῖν.

Ver. 2. Christians who were baptised into Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. vi. 2-11) are not taken out of the world at once (John xviii. 15); they have to live in the flesh but not to the flesh, because they have been born not of the flesh nor of man but of God (John i. 13). Their duty is to their new Father. — ἐν γὰρ ... διὰ τῶν ἀποστάσεων. Ver. 3. The use of the rare ἄρκητες indicates the saying which St. Peter here
apply, sufficient unto the day [that is past] six evil. Compare Ezek. xiv. 6, 
leanness of body and nakedness of the members thereof. The detailed description of the evil follows the traditional reduction of the simple picture of absorption in the ordinary concerns of life which Jesus is content to repeat (Matt. xxiv. 37, etc.). Eating, drinking, marrying were interpreted in the worst sense to account for the visitation and become glutony, drunkenness and all conceivable perversions of marriage; see Sap. xiv. 21-27, followed by Rom. i. 29, etc.—τὸ ποιεῖται τὸν ἀλβήμαν ἄνεμον, from 2 Kings xviii. 8; ἀφράτητος τοῦ θησαυροῦ τῶν ἀθηροῦν τῶν ἔθνων. The construction is broken (for the will to have been accomplished ... for you walking) unless κατὰ be taken as if middle to πεποίητο, as subject.—

ποτήρια, acts of licentiousness (as in Polybius); so Sap. xxiv. 26. Earlier of wanton violence arising out of drunkenness (Demostenes)—οἶνος φλυγή, wine-bibbings, Deut. xx. 20, oinos phlegis = νῦν. Noun occurs in Phil coupled with παιδεία, education. —καμάρι, revelings associated with alien rites, Sap. xiv. 26. For πετρών cf. ποτρύνον θαμάνων, 1 Cor. x. 14 ff.—

περίπληκτος ἑλθολατρεία, a Jew’s description of current Pagan cults, which were often illicit according to Roman law. For ἀποκρίνεται, cf. Acts x. 28, it is unlawful for a Jew to associate with a foreigner, and 2 Macc. vi. 5, vii. 1 (of wine flesh). Ver. 4. ἦν γὰρ, whereat, i.e. (i.) at your change of life (2 f.) explained below by μὴ συντρέχει ... or (ii.) on which ground, because you lived as they did.—ἐξέλθονται, are surprised, as in ver. 12, where this use of ἐξ. (elsewhere in N.T. entertain, except Acts xvii. 20, ἐξέλθοντα) is explained by ὅτι ἤλθον ... συγκέλεσθε. Polybius has it in the same sense followed by dative, acc., ὑπὲρ with accusative and dative. So in Josephus Adam was surprised (ἐκτελοῦσα) that the animals had mates and he none, Ant., i. 1, 2 and the making of garments surprised God (ib. 4).—συντρέχοντες, from Ps. l. 18, LXX, if thou satest a thief, συντρέχοντες αὐτῷ, and with adulterers thou didst set thy portion; where
6 των ἐτῶν κρίνοντι. 1 ζητάς καὶ κεκροῦς εἰς τότε γὰρ καὶ νεκρὸς ἀναγεννήθη ἵνα κρίθωσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνδρῶν·
7 ποις σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θὸν πνεύματι. πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἡγιακὸς· σωφρόνης· τε οὖν καὶ νήφατε εἰς προσευχήν·
8 πρὸς πάντων· τὴν εἰς ἑαυτὸς ἀγάπη· ἐκείνη ἐχοντες δτί·
9 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἀμαρτίων· φιλοῦν εἰς ἀλλήλους.

1 Codex Sinaiticus with the bulk of the manuscripts has ἔχοντες κρίνατi for κρίνοντi.

Ver. 6. The judgment is imminent because all necessary preliminaries have been accomplished. There is no ground for the objection "perhaps the culprits have not heard the Gospel". As regards the living, there is a brotherhood in the world witnessing for Christ in their lives and the missionaries have done their part. As regards the dead, Christ descended into Hades to preach there and so was followed by His Apostles. And the object of this was that though the dead have been judged as all men are in respect of the flesh they might yet live as God lives in respect of the spirit. — ἐiles τοῦτο, with a view to the final judgment of the world. — ἔπεφτε, to dead men generally, but probably as distinct from the rebel spirits who were presumably immortal and could only be imprisoned. Occumenius rightly condemns the view, which adds in trespasses and sins or takes dead in a figurative sense, despite the authority of e.g., Augustine (Ep., liv. 4, §§ 1-18). — διὰ τῆς γενέσεως, the Gospel was preached, the impersonal passive leaves the way open for the development of this belief according to which not Christ only but also the Apostles preached to the dead. Hermas, Sim., ix. 165-167; Cl. Al. Strom., vi. 645 f. So was provision made for those who died between the descent of Christ and the evangelisation of their own countries. — ἐπεφτε, κ.τ.λ., that though they had been judged in respect of flesh as men are judged they might live in respect of spirit as God lives. The parallel between the dead and Christ is exact (see iii. 20). Death is the judgment or sentence passed on all men (Ecclus. xiv. 17 = Gen. ii. 17, iii. 19). Even Christians, who have died spiritually and ethically (Rom. vii. 10), can only hope wistfully to escape it (2 Cor. v. 2 ff.). But it is preliminary to the Last Judgment (Heb. ix. 27), at which believers, who are quickened spiritually, cannot be condemned to the second death (Apoc. xx. 6).

Ver. 7. But the end of all things and men has drawn nigh; Christians also must be ready, watch and pray, as Jesus taught in the parable of Mark xiii. 34-37 (cf. xiv. 38). — σωφρόνης· σωφρόνης parallelēs ἔπεφτε, ἐκείνη, the paramount duty of Christians is prayer especially for the coming of the Lord (Apoc. xxii. 20; Luke xi. 2; cf. iii. 7).

Ver. 8. πρὸς πάντων, St. Peter emphasises the pre-eminent importance of love of man as much as St. John; cf. i. 22. — ἐπεφτε put for ἐπεφτε in accordance with the saying thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself as much as with the contemporary practice. — διὰ παραρτεῖν, quotation of Prov. x. 12, love hides all transgressions which was adduced by Jesus (Luke vii. 47). The plain sense of the aphorism has been evaded by the LXX (πάντας τούτους μὴ φιλοῦν· κατακυνῆτε καλύπτει φίλα) and Syriac translators substitutes shame for love. The currency of the true version is attested by Jas. v. 20, he that converted a sinner... καλύπτει πλήθος ἀμαρτίων.

Ver. 9. Hospitality is the practical proof of this love; its practice was necessary to the cohesion of the scattered brotherhood as to the welfare of those whose duties called them to travel. The inns were little better than brothels and Christians were commonly poor. Chrysostom cites the examples of Abraham and Lot (cf. Heb. xiii. 2). The united advocacy of this virtue was successful—so much so that the Didache has to provide against abuses such as Lucian depicts in the biography of Peregrinus "a Christian traveller shall not remain more than two or three days... if he wishes to settle... is unskilled and
loos πάνω χαράω Δικαιώσεις καθὼς ελάβεν χάρισμα
εἰς εὐαγγελίαν ὧν διὰ κονοῦτες ὡς καλοὶ ὁικονόμοι τοικῆς
χάρισμα Θεοῦ εἰς τις λαλεῖ ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ εἰς τις διάκονον

will not work he is a Χριστιανός, makes his Christian profession his merchandise."—ἀλλὰ λέον, used despite
διάκονος above and below, perhaps because the recipients of hospitality belong necessarily
to other Churches.—ἀνεύ γοῦς, προσφέρεται, St. Peter guards against the
imperfection of even Christian human nature. Eccles. xxix. 25-28 describes
how a stranger who outstays his welcome is first set to menial tasks and then driven
out.

Vv. 10 f. supplement the foregoing directions for the inner life of the Church
and rest partly on Rom. xii. 6 (with simpler classification of gifts), partly on
the concept of disciples as stewards (Luke xi. 42) serving out rations in God's
house.—διάκονος, in the widest sense (as διακονοῖς in Acts vi. 1, 4; 1 Cor.
xxii. 5) in accordance with the saying, the Son of Man came... to minister
(Mark x. 45), which is interpreted here, as part of the pattern, by the addition of
an object (only here and 112): cf. 2
Cor. viii. 19, τῷ χάριτι... τῷ διακο
νίωτῃ ὑμῖν... ὁ λόγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ
The title is applied to all and not only to the
governors as by St. Paul (1 Cor. iv. 1; Tit. 1. 7); compare the question of St.
Peter which precedes the source (Luke
xii. 41 f.).

Ver. 11 follows the primitive division of ministry into that of the word and
that of tables (Acts vi. 2-4); compare
prophesying and ministry (in narrower sense like διακονεῖ here) of Rom. xii. 6.—
λέον covers all the speaking described in 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10, to one by means of the
spirit hath been given a word of wisdom, etc... xiv. 6, 26.—ὁ λόγιος Θεοῦ (perhaps echoes κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν of
Rom. xii. 6) as being God's oracles or as speaking God's oracles. The Seer is the
model for the Christian preacher: Num.
xxiv. 4, φθανον ἄκοινος λόγιον θεοῦ. His message is the particular grace of God
which he has to administer like the
prophets and evangelists, i. 10-12.—
διακονεῖ includes all forms of the
ministration of God's gifts other than
those of speech—primarily almsgiving, hospitality and the like.—Ἡ, κ.τ.λ. A
liturgical formula such as this is necessarily
capable of many special meanings.

—ἐν τοῖς μετανοούσιοις may refer particularly to
the gifts or their possessors—hardly to the
Gentiles as Occ. suggests (Matt. v. 16)—
but so to limit it would be a gratuitous in-
justice to the author. The saying ὁ πατὴρ
ἐδωκέντος ὁ πατὴρ μου ἵνα καρπόν πολὺν
φέρηση καὶ γνήσιον ημῶν μαθήται is
sufficient to justify this appendix to the
exhortation love one another in deed
—διὰ τῆς ἡμετεροῦ ἡμῶν, through Jesus Christ
through whom the spirit descended on each of you, Acts ii. 33.
through whom you offer a sacrifice of praise (Heb. xii. 15); cf. διακο
νίωται, τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὑμῖν τοιούτῳ.
... The insertion of ὅτι changes the doxology to
a statement of fact and thus supports the
interpretation of ὃς as referring of the
immediate antecedent Jesus Christ. Al-
ready He possesses the glory and the
victory; realising this His followers en-
sure joyfully their present suffering and
defeat.

Ver. 12. ἐναποτελεῖ marks the be-
ing of the third division of the
Epistle in which Peter having cleared
the ground faces at last the pressing
problem.—εὐθείας ἴσως ἄγαμα, be surprised, as
in ver. 4.—τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν παρέσθε, the ordeal which is in your midst or rather in your hearts.—ἐν ὑμί
νι, cf.
τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν παρέσθε (v. 1) but the test
is internal—in what frame of mind will
they meet it? Will they regard it as a
strange thing or as a share in Christ's
sufferings, part of the pattern?—逻
σεῖ. This conception of suffering as
a trial not vindictive is stated in Jud.
viii. 25, 27, ἔκλαυσαν ἐν πύρῳ εἰς ἐτα
σῶν καρδίας αὐτῶν; compare Zach.
xiii. 19, πυρά ἄγαμος ἐν πυρώναται ἀργύριον, Prov. xxvii. 21, Χρυσὸς πυρώνασι
parallels but a man is tried... π. also
occurs in the sense of blazing, Amos iv.
9; Apoc. xviii. 9, 18.
After θέξης the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus with the consent of many manuscripts adds καὶ τῆς ἔννοιας αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 15. γάρ. I assume that you suffer in Christ's name as representing Him and bearing only the reproach which attaches to it per se. The crimes of which slanderers had accused Christians are given in the order of probability and are selected as belonging to the pattern. Christ Himself was implicitly accused thereof by His persecutors and acquitted of each by independent witnesses, as the Gospels are at pains to show. He suffered the fate from which the murderer was preserved (Acts iii. 14) by the petition of the Jews; shared it with thieves or brigands, being delivered up to the secular arm as a malefactor (John xviii. 30). Such slanders the Christian must rebut for the credit of his Lord; that he must not be guilty of such crimes goes without saying.—Διδωτιστικος is distinguished from the preceding accusations by the insertion of ὅς; it is also an addition to the pattern of Christ, unless stress be laid on the sneer, He saved others. The word was apparently coined to express the idea of the itinerant philosopher of whatever sect current among the unphilosophical. Epictetus defends the true Cynic against this very calumny; he is a messenger sent from Zeus to men to show them concerning good and evil (Arrian, iii. 22, 23). . . . a spy of what is helpful and harmless to men: he approaches all men, cares for all (ib. 81). . . . neither meddler, περιπάτης—nor busybody is such an one: for he is not busy about alien things—τὰ ἀλλήλαι τοιούτα μοι—when he inspects the actions and relations of mankind—ὅταν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἑνσωκυνεῖν (ib. 97). This zeal for the welfare of others was certainly the most obvious charge to bring against Christians, who indeed were not always content to
The secondary uncials have μέμειρεν for δνόματι.

testify by good behaviour without word. St. Paul heard of some at Thessalonica, μηδέν άργος φαινόμενον ἀλλὰ περιφανεμό-ματίν (2 Thess. iii. 11). Women generally if unattached were prone to be not merely idle but meddlers speaking what they should not (1 Tim. v. 23). So St. Peter (cf. 1 Cor. x. 27) has emphasised the duty of all Christians—even of the wives of heathen husbands—to preach Christianity only by example and now deprecates their acquiescence in what some might reckon a title of honour. The fate of Socrates is the classical example of the suffering of such; and later one philo-osopher was scourged and another beheaded for denunciation of the alliance of Titius with Berenice (Dio Cassius, lv. 15). Punishment of this offence would depend on the power of the other man concerned who, if not in authority, would naturally utilise mob-law like Demetrius (Acts xix.).

Ver. 16. εἰ δὲ άλλοι Χριστιανοὶ, if some were not followers of Christ, in the name of Christ (14). See in Acts ix. 26 and Introduction.—μη αἰσχυνεῖσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ echoes the saying, Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words of him also the Son of Man shall be ashamed when he cometh in the glory; so St. Paul says I suffer thus but am not ashamed (2 Tim. i. 12; cf. 8).—διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, by martyrdom if necessary, for this sense the phrase has acquired already in John xxix. 16.—εἰ τῷ αὐτῷ, if He the God of faithfulness (πάντως Ἰσραήλ, Ps. Lc.) is the faithful Creator to whom the soul He gave and redeemed (Ps. Lc.) may confidently return.

Chapter V.—Ver. 1. ὅπως, therefore—since your suffering is according to God's will and calls only for the normal self-devotion, which Christ required of His disciples—go on with the duties of the station of life in which you are called. —προσβεβήσαντες, not merely older men as contrasted with younger (ver. 5),
but elders, such as had been appointed by Paul and Barnabas in the Churches of Southern Asia (Acts xiv. 23). The collective τῶν κληρῶν (ver. 3) and the exhortation, shepherd the flock (ver. 2) prove that they are the official heads of the communities addressed. Similarly St. Paul bade the elders of the Church (Acts xx. 17) at Ephesus take heed to themselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit appointed you overseers. The use of the term in direct address here carries with it a suggestion of the natural meaning of the word and perhaps also of the early technical sense, one of the first generation of Christians. Both Jews and Gentiles were familiar with the title which was naturally conferred upon those who were qualified in point of years; the youthful Timothy was a marked exception to the general rule (i Tim. iv. 12). In ὑμῖν. Peter does not address them as mere officials, your elders, but prefers a vaguer form of expression, elders who are among you; cf. τὸ ὑμῖν ποιῆμαν, which also evades any impairing of the principle, ye are Christ's.—οὗτος ὑμῖν ποιήσας τοῦ θεοῦ. Christians is God's flock among you—for yours but God's. As a matter of constraint contrasted with ξενοφιλεῖς, willingly—not as pressed men but as volunteers. In times of persecution lukewarm elders might well regret their prominence; hence the need for the aphorism if any aspire to oversight he desireth a noble work (i Tim. iii. 1). So of gifts of money St. Paul requires that they be μὴ ἄναγκα (2 Cor. ix. 7). It is possible that St. Paul himself had been wrested.—αὐτοὶ ἡπελείως. If the work be voluntarily undertaken, the worker has a reward according to St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 16 f.). Base gainers are those who wish to make gain whence they ought not (Aristotle, Nic. Eth., v. 1, 43).—προφητεύω. The adverb occurs in 2 Chron. xxix. 34, LXX, where the Levites eagerly purified themselves; Heb. the Levites upright of heart to. The verb προφητεύω is used in Chron. to render Ββλιο offer free will offerings.

Ver. 3. Application of the saying, the reputed rulers of the nations lord it (κατακράτειον) over them . . . not so among you; but whosoever would be great among you he shall be your servant . . . for the Son of Man came . . . to serve (Mark x. 42 f.).—τῶν κληρῶν, the lots, i.e., the portions of the new Israel who fall to
your care as Israel fell to that of Jehovah (Deut. ix. 29, ὄντος λαοῦ σου καὶ κληρονομοῦ σου). The meaning is determined by the corresponding τουμαρίσμα του and supported by the use of προσκληράθησαν were made an additional portion in Acts xviii. 4. So it is said of God’s servant that οἱ κληρονομοῦ θεοῦ πολλοί (Isa. liii. 12). The Vulgate has dominantes in clericis, and Oecumenius following the usage of his time explains the phrase likewise as equivalent to τὸ λεγόνς σώτηρ, i.e., the inferior clergy.—τοῦτο γενόμενον, i.e., as servants according to Mark i. 29; cf. 1 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 12.

Ver. 4. φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμνου, at the manifestation of the chief Shepherd, i.e., Christ. ἁρχιποίμνης is the equivalent of ὁ ποίμνης ὁ μέγας of Heb. xiii. 20, being formed on the analogy of ἀρχιμαράνθης = ἀρχιμαράνθης; else it occurs only as Symmachus’ rendering of ἀρχιμαράνθης (LXX, νεκριπή) in 2 Kings iii. 4 and in a papyrus. Cf. appeal to Jehovah, ὁ ποίμνης τῆς Ισραήλ... ἐγέρθη τοῦ Πσαλμ. lxxx. 1.—τὸν... ἐστι ἡ ἀρχιποίμνη = the crown of life which He promised (Jan. i. 12). The metaphor is probably derived from the worship of fading flowers presented to the victor in the games (cf. ἀμαράντην); but it may also be due to the conception of the future age as a banquet, at which the guests were crowned with garlands (Sap. ii. 8, στέφασμα ἡδῶν κάλεσα πρῶτοι ἤ μαρανθήναι). See on i. 4.

Ver. 5. νεότεροι, the younger members of each Church were perhaps more or less formally banded together on the model of the σύνοιτοι τῶν νεών, which are mentioned in inscriptions as existing distinct from the Ephebi in Greek cities, especially in Asia Minor (Ziebarth Die Griechische Vereine, 111-115). Compare the modern Guilds and Associations of Young Men. In 1 Tim. iv. 1, these natural divisions of elders and younger are also recognised.—πάντες δὲ... Elders must serve; youngers submit. May all be lowly-minded towards one another—there is no need to add detailed commands.—ἡ γὰρ ἐπιβάστασθαι is explained by Oecumenius as εἰνήθησθαι εἰς περιβάλλεσθαι (wrap yourselves in, put round you), so the command corresponds to ἐνδώσατε... ταταίηνοφροσύνην of Col. iii. 12. But the choice of this unique word must have some justification in associations which can only be reconstructed by conjecture. The lexicographers (Hesychius, Sindas, etc.) give κύριοι κοσμομάχοι and ἐγκαθίσθαι as synonyms. Pollux explains ἐγκαθίσθαι as the apron worn by slaves to protect their tunic; so Longus, Pastoralia, ii. 35 f., in “casting his apron, naked he started to run like a fawn”. Photius (Epistle 150) takes George Metropolitan of Nicomedia to task for his suggestion that it was a barbarous word: “You ought to have remembered Epicharmus and Apollodorus... the former uses it frequently and the latter in the ‘Runaway’ (a comedy) says τὴν ἐτέμαντα στέφασιν διπλὰ ἀνωθεν ἐνεκοβισμόνας.” But the LXX of Isa. iii. 18 has τοὺς κοσμομάχοις = front-bands and Symmachus τὰ ἐγκαθίσθατα in ver. 20 for bands or sashes. Peter is therefore probably indebted again to this passage and says gird yourselves with the humility which is the proper ornament of women. If the word be taken in this sense a reference to John xiii. 4 ff., Taking a napkin He girded Himself, may be reasonably assumed.—θεὸς... χάριν = Prov. iii. 34, LXX (θεὸς being put for κύριος, which to a Christian reader meant Christ); the Hebrew text gives scoffers he scoffs at but to the humble he shows favour. The same quotation is employed in similar context by St. James (iv. 6); the devil (see below) is the typical scoffer.

Ver. 6. ταταίηνοφροσύνην εἰς... echoes the exhortation and its accompanied
scripture in ver. 5—obey in order that the promise (Luke xiv. 11) may be fulfilled for you, he that humbleth himself shall be exalted (sc. by God). So too St. James, subject yourselves therefore to God (iv. 7).

God's mighty hand is a common O.T. expression; see Exod. iii. 19, etc. for connexion with deliverance and especially Ex. xx. 33 f., etc. In Greek, κρατᾶν (κράτος) is the source of part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 25 ff.).—δικαίων comes from Ps. iv. 12, ἡμᾶς ἀνέβας ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον ἡμᾶς, which is the subject of the passage of Jesus' amplification and application of the metaphor. God cares for His flock as the hireling shepherd does not (οὕς μέλες αὐτοῦ περὶ τῶν προβάτων, John x. 13).

Ver. 8. γνωστὸν ἡγεμόνα, cf. i. 13, iv. 7. So St. Paul, γρηγοροῦμεν καὶ γνῶμαιοι... ἡμᾶς ἤμοιο τῆς γῆς (1 Thess. v. 6, 8) drawing up the common source in the Parables of the Householder and Burglar, etc. (Matt. xxiv. 42 ff.) which set forth the sudden coming of the Kingdom.—δικαίως ὑμῶν διάβολος, your adversary, Satan—工业园区 adversity in law suit—is used in the general sense of enemy in LXX. Of the description of Satan, as a roaring lion comes from Ps. xxii. 14, ὡς λέων ὁ ἀράχος καὶ ὄρνημα; walketh from Job i. 7, where Satan (ὁ διάβολος LXX, Σατανᾶς, Ἀδ.) perlelθὰν τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐπιπερικυπτὰς τὴν ἐν οὐρανόν πάραιμι; seeking to devour identifies him with Hades the lord of death; cf. Prov. i. 12, where the wicked say of the righteous man, κατακαίμων αὐτὸν ὢντες ἀνεβάζει ζωὴν. The present sufferings of the Christians are his handiwork as much as the sufferings of Jesus (1 Cor. ii. 6, 8) and of Job.

Ver. 9. ζήτητε. St. James adds the same exhortation to his quotation of Prov. The connexion is not obvious but is perhaps due to the traditional exposition of γνωστὸν παθήματι τῇ ἐκτὸς ὑμῶν, however interpreted as referring to the Devil and his children. As God ranges Himself against scoffers, so must Christians resist the Devil who is working with their slanderous tempers. Oecumenius and Crâmer's Catena both appeal to an extract from Justin's book against Marcion (?) which is preserved in Irenæus and quoted by Eusebius. The main point of the passage is that before Christ came the devil did not dare to blaspheme against God, for the prophecies of his punishment were enigmatic; but Christ proclaimed it plainly and so he lost all hope and goes out eager to drag down all to his own destruction.—στερεῖν τῇ ἔκτηθεν, rock like in your faith, abbreviation of ἐκτίσετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένον καὶ ἐδραίον, Col. i. 23; cf. τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως, Col. ii. 5 and Acts xvi. 5, al... ἐκείνης ἡ ἐκτεκνοῦντο τῇ πίστει. The metaphorical use of στερεά in a good sense is not common. Peter perhaps thinks of the στερεά πέτρα (Ἰησοῦς) of Isa. ii. 1 and warns them against his own failing.—λήσται... ἐπιτελείσθαι. The rendering (first suggested by Hoffmann) knowing how to pay (that you are paying) the same tax of sufferings as the brotherhood in the world is paying appears preferable to the common knowing that the same kinds of sufferings are being accomplished for (by) ... it assumes the proper idiomatic force of ἐπιτελείσθαι and accounts for τὰ αὐτὰ (sc. τῆς) followed by the genitive. Xenophon who is a good authority for Common Greek uses ἔκτηθεν thus twice.—Mem. iv. 8. 8, "but if I shall live longer perhaps it will be necessary to pay the penalties of old age (τὰ τοῦ γής ἐπιτελείσθαι) and to see and hear worse ..." Ἀπολ. 33 nor did he turn effeminate at death but cheerfully welcomed it and paid the penalty (ἐπιτελείσθαι). For the dative with τὰ αὐτὰ same as, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 5, ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἔξοδῇ.
but God has called you to His eternal glory; first for a little you must suffer, His grace will supply all your needs. Ver. 9 is practically a parenthesis; δ ἐστιν stands over against δ ἄντιθέσεις (ver. 8) as διὰ shows. δ καλέσας, for the promise of sustenance implied in the calling; cf. 1 Thess. v. 23 f.; 1 Cor. i. 8 f.—ἐν Χριστῷ goes with δ...δέχεσθαι; God called them in Christ and only as they are in Christ can they enter the glory; cf. 2 Cor. v. 17-19, εἰ τίνς ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ τίνις πέφυγε...δόθη ἐν Χριστῷ κοσμιμόν καταλήψεων ἑαυτῶν.—διὰ λόγου παράδονα, after you have suffered for a little while. The same contrast between temporary affliction and the eternal glory is drawn by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 17, τὸ παρανόητα ἐλάφρυν τῆς θλίψεως...ἀμώνων βέβαιος καταγγέλεται, where in addition to the anti-thesis between eternal glory and temporary suffering the weight of glory (play on meanings of root ἄλφα) is opposed to the lightness of tribulation.—ἀντός has the force of πιστῶ δ καλῶν (1 Thess. v. 24).—καταρτίζει, shall perfect. When Simon and Andrew were called to leave their fishing and become fishers of men James and John were themselves also in a boat mending—καταρτίζοντες—their nets (Mark i. 18-19). The process was equally necessary in their new fishing and the word was naturally applied to the mending of the Churches or individual Christians who by their good behaviour must catch men (see e.g., 1 Cor. i. 10). Only God can fully achieve this mending of all shortcomings; cf. Heb. xii. 25.—στηρίζεις, shall confirm; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 17, etc.; when the Kingdom of Heaven was stormed the stormers needed confirmation (Acts xviii. 23). This was the peculiar work assigned to St. Peter—θόρυμα παρακαλῶν—the brethren (Luke xxii. 32).—στηρίζεις is only apparently unique, being equivalent to ἐνεχύσασθαι or ἔκμενον (Hexychius) cf. Col. i. 12, ἐν ἑαυτῷ δυναμοῦντας κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς βίως αὐτῶν and Heb. xi. 34, ἐνεχύσασθαι ἐκ δυνάμεως (parallel to ἐλάφρυν παράλληλα). Ver. 11. Liturgical formula, adapted in iv. 11 (ἐστιν), which occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 16; John 25; Apoc. i. 6; v. 13.

Vv. 12-14. Postscript in St. Peter's own handwriting, like Gal. vi. 11-18 (ἡμεῖς θηλίκαι ὑμῖν γράφομεν ἐγγραφή τῆς ἡμῶν χειρὸς). 2 Thess. iii. 17 f. (ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς ἡμῶν χειρὸς Παύλου).—διὰ Σιλούανου, by the hand of my scribe S.; so Ignatius writes διὰ Βορρῶν to the Philadelphians (xi. 2) and the Smyrnaeans (xii. 1), but wishes to keep him with himself (Eph. ii. 1). That S. was also the bearer of the Epistle is indicated by the recommendation which follows. There does not seem to be any good reason for refusing to identify this S. with the companion of St. Paul and Timothy who wrote with them to the Church at Thessalonica and preached with them at Corinth (2 Cor. i. 19).—τοῦ πιστοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμῖν ὁ λόγῳ...One main object of the postscript is to supply S. with a brief commendation. He is presumably the appointed messenger who will supplement the letter with detailed application of its general teaching and information about the affairs of the writer. So St. Paul's Encyclical ends with that ye may know my circumstances how I fare Tychicus the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord shall make known all things to you (Eph. vi. 21 f.). S. was known probably to some of the Churches as St. Paul's companion: in case he was unknown to any, St. Peter adds his own certificate. For this use of λόγῳ compare 1 Cor. iv. 1, ὅθεν ἄγγελος λογίζεται ἄθρωτος; 2 Cor. xi. 5, λόγῳ γάρ μηδὲν ὀσπρείτεκα τῶν ὁποίων ἀποστόλων.—παρακαλῶν...θεοῦ, motive and subject of the Epistle. St. Peter wrote exhorting as he said I exhort you (ii. 11, v. 1) and the general content of his exhortation may be given by the subordinate clause which follows: "That you stand in the grace, which I bear witness is truly God's grace". The acquired sense of the verb comfort (LXX for ἐφησε) is not directly contemplated. The Epistle is a λόγος παρακαλήσεως in the sense of δ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακαλήσει, Rom. xii. 8.—ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, testifying to...not...in addition. The verb does not
occurs elsewhere in O.T. (LXX has ἐπιπαρτόρωμαι) or N.T.; but Heb. ii. 4 has the compound συνεπιπαρτόρωμαι τοῦ θεοῦ, ταῦτα, τὰ ταῦτα, θεὸν, that this is true grace of God, i.e., the grace—in the widest sense of the word which is theirs (i. 10) which God gives to the humble (v. 5). St. Peter was witness of the sufferings of Christ which they now share; he testifies from his experience that the grace which they possess is truly God’s grace, though sufferings are a passing incident of their sojourn here.—εἰς ηὸν στήνετε, paraenetic summary of τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐκ τῶν χῶν ταῦτα ἐν τῇ δικαιομον ἐκ τῶν χων ταῦτα (Rom. v. 2), from which the easier reading δικαιομον is derived.—ἡσ... συνεκκλησία. As the co-elector exhorts the elders so the co-elect (woman) greets the elect sojourners (i. 1). The early addition of Church represents the natural interpretation of the word, which indeed expresses the latent significance of ἐκκλησία, the called out, compare St. Paul’s use of ἐκκλησία in Rom. xi. 7. In v. 1 ff. Peter addresses bodies rather than individuals and in v. 9 he uses a collective term embracing the whole of Christianity. Accordingly the woman in question is naturally taken to mean the Church—and not any individual (see on Μάρκος). Compare the woman of Apoc. xii. 1 f. who is Israel—a fragment which presupposes the mystical interpretation of Canticles (see Cant. vi. 10) and generally the conception of Israel as the bride of Jehovah, which St. Paul appropriated, as complement of the Parables of the Marriage Feast, etc., and applied to the Church in Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 2). So in Hermas’ Visions the Church appears as a woman, ἐν Βασιλείᾳ, in Rome, according to the Apocalyptic Code, the use of which was not merely a safeguard but also a password. Compare Apoc. xviii. 5, on the forehead of the woman was written a mystery, “Babylon the great,” xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 2; Apoc. Baruch, xi. 1. So Papias reports a tradition (“they say”) that Peter composed his first Epistle in Rome itself and signifies this by calling the city allegorically Babylon. The point of the allegory is that Rome was becoming the oppressor of the new (and old) Israel, not that it was the centre of the world (Oec.). Literal interpretations (i.) Babylon, (ii.) Babylon in Egypt are modern.—Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. Oecumenius interprets son of spiritual relationship and adds noting that some have dared to say that M. was the fleshly son of St. Peter on the strength of the narrative of Acts xii. where P. is represented as rushing to the house of the mother of John M. as if he were returning to his own house and lawful spouse. So Bengel, “Coelesta sic coniugem suam appellare videtur; cf. iii. 7. Erat enim soror; i Cor. ix. 5, Et congruent mentio filii Marci.” But granting that Petroella (?) was missionary and martyr and that Peter may well have had a son— though Christian tradition is silent with regard to him—what have they to do sending greetings to the Churches of Asia Minor in this Encyclical?

Ver. 14. Φιλήματι ἀγαπητή. So St. Paul concludes 1 Thess. with greet all the brethren with an holy kiss (v. 26; cf. i Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16). “Hence,” says Origen, “the custom was handed down to the Churches that after prayers (so Justin Apol., i. 65) the brethren should welcome one another with a kiss.” Chrysostom (Rom. i. c.) calls it “the peace by which the Apostle expels all disturbing thought and beginning of smallmindedness... this kiss softens and levels”. But the practice was obviously liable to abuse as Clement of Alexandria shows, “love is judged not in a kiss but in good will. Some do nothing but fill the Churches with noise of kissing... There is another—an impure—kiss full of venom pretending to holiness” (Paed., iii. 301 F.). Therefore it was regulated (Apost. Const., ii. 57, 12, men kiss men only) and gradually dwindled.—ἐκ τῆς. The simple Hebrew salutation is proper to Peter’s autograph postscript and links it with the beginning. —τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, cf. iii. 16, v. 10, and the saying, Thus have I spoken to you that in me ye might have peace: in the world ye have tribulation but be of good cheer I have conquered the world (John xvi. 33).
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CHAPTER I.
AUTHENTICITY AND DATE.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Fourth Century.—In considering the external evidence for the authenticity of 2 Peter, it will be found most convenient to proceed from the earliest date when its place was fixed in the Canon of the New Testament. This date must be found in the fourth century A.D. Even then, the Epistle was rejected by the Syrian Church, where it was not accepted till early in the sixth century, and only by the Monophysites. The view of the Church of Rome is represented chiefly by Jerome, whose influence was paramount in the formation of the Vulgate Canon. He mentions the doubts raised by the differences in style and character between 1 and 2 Peter (Quaest. ad Hedib. Migne, Pal. Lat., xxii. 1002). Jerome, however, is clearly expressing only the objections of scholars. He says: “Scripsit duas epistulas, quae Catholicae nominantur ; quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur, propter stilum priorem dissonantiam,” where “a plerisque,” and the nature of the difficulty expressed, both point to the opinion of the learned class, which he does not himself share. The Epistle is quoted in the last quarter of the fourth century by “Ambrosiaster” 1 and by Ambrose of Milan (de Fide, iii. 12). In an African list, Canon Mommsenianus, belonging to the middle of the fourth century, 2 Peter is found inserted, but with a protest, which indicates rejection in the mind of the scribe. Didymus, who wrote a commentary on 2 Peter, towards the end of the fourth century, uses the following words, which are a fragment come down to us in a Latin translation, “non igitur ignorandum praesentem epistolam esse falsam, quae licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est”. How are we to explain the words in italics, in view of the fact that in the De Trinitate, a later treatise, Didymus quotes repeatedly from 2 Peter? Chase suggests that the phrase represents the Greek words ós νοθεύται αὐτή ἡ ἐπιστολή, which would

mean that the writer was only stating the opinion of others, more or less contemporary. Zahn (Gesch. Kan., i. i. p. 312) urges that Didymus is here recording a judgment of the second or third century, but there appears to be no conclusive reason to doubt that he is recording a contemporary opinion. Eusebius (H. E., iii. 3) discusses the canonicity of 2 Peter, and makes the following important statement: τὴν δὲ φημὴν αὐτοῦ δευτέρου οὐκ ἐνυπάρχον μὲν εἴναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὡς δὲ πολλοίς χρήσιμος φανέρα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων διο- πουδάθη γράφων. “The opinion has been handed down to us that the so-called Second Epistle (of Peter) is not canonical, but it has been studied along with the other Scriptures, as it appears profitable to many.” In the H. E., iii. 25, 2 Peter is placed among the διοπερείχομεναι, although “accepted by the majority” (γραφήματα δ' οὖν διως τοῖς πολλοῖς). Eusebius had a second class of διοπερείχομεναι which he regarded also as spurious (νόθα), and 2 Peter is classed with James, Jude, 2 and 3 John as disputed books which were also γραφήμα. The evidence of Eusebius is specially valuable (1) because he records the opinion that in his day 2 Peter was regarded as uncanonical; (2) because he records a judgment of the past against it; (3) he failed to find any recognition of the book as Petrine in the earlier literature known to him, and his knowledge was wide. There can be little doubt that Eusebius himself rejected the idea of Petrine authorship, but he was also one of those to whom it was a “profitable” book. Constantine entrusted Eusebius with the preparation for use in the new Capital, of fifty copies of the Scriptures, which contained 2 Peter. This quasi-official standard practically did away with the distinction between ‘acknowledged’ and ‘disputed’ books (Chase, H. D. B., iii. 806 a).

Another indication of fourth century opinion is the inclusion of 2 Peter in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen (d. 391), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Athanasius (d. 373). One catalogue which is contained in the Codex Claromontanus (sixth century), and regarded by Tischendorf and Westcott as earlier than the fourth century, recognises seven Catholic Epistles, together with the Shepherd of Hermas, Acts of Paul, and Apocalypse of Peter. On the other hand, in the list of Amphlochius, Bishop of Iconium (c. 380), only one Epistle of Peter is recognised. We have already seen that the Syriac-speaking churches unanimously rejected 2 Peter, and considerable importance is to be attached to the fact that Chrysostom acknowledges only the Catholic Epistles, and that Theodor of Mopsuestia describes five Epistles, among which is 2 Peter, as “mediae auctoritatis”. “Since Chrysostom's expositions, at any
rate, were addressed to popular audiences, the rejection of the Epistle
by the great teachers in question must have reflected the usage of
the Antiochene Church in general.” (Chase, op. cit., iii. 805.)

If we pass in review the evidence afforded by the usage of the
fourth century in regard to this Epistle, we find that there was a
considerable prevailing feeling of doubt as to the Petrine authorship,
along with instances of definite rejection. It is, however, specially
significant, in view of the modern tendency to depreciate the Epistle,
that it seems to have gained a place in the Canon by virtue of its
contents and its useful opposition to the doctrines of false teachers.

Third Century.—Methodius, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the
third century, who suffered in the Diocletian persecution, explicitly
quotes 2 Peter iii. 8 in the fragment De Resurrectione. Zahn
(Gesch. Kan., I. i. p. 313) has collected some passages in the same
treatise which seem to echo 2 Peter iii. 10-13, and while in these the
thought, rather than the language, recalls 2 Peter, there seems no
reason to doubt the reference. Methodius regards the Apocalypse
of Peter also as inspired (Comm.; Virg., ii. b). A further pre
sumption in favour of the use by Methodius of 2 Peter is found in
the Dialogue of Adamantius, written probably in the later years of
Constantine, which makes large use of the works of Methodius. In
this work 2 Peter is quoted. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia,
evidently refers to 2 Peter in a letter to Cyprian (No. 75). His
words are: “Stephanus adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et
Paulum beatos apostulos . . . qui in epistolis suis haereticos exsecrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt.” The allusion to heretics
applies only to 2 Peter.

We come now to the evidence of Origen. In his extant Greek
works there is a reference to 2 Peter of a somewhat ambiguous kind.
“Peter left one recognised Epistle, and perhaps a second; for it is
disputed” (Πέτρος δὲ . . . μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογούμενην καταλείποντεν· ἐστο
δὲ καὶ δεύτεραν· ἄμφιβαλλεται γάρ;) (quoted Eusebius, H. E., VI. xxv.
8). In the Latin translation of his works by Rufinus there are some
passages expressly quoting 2 Peter, e.g., 2 Peter, i. 4, “ad participa
tionem capiendam divinae naturae sicut Petrus Apostolus educuit”
epistola sua dicit. Gratia ubis et pact multiplicatur in recognitio
enim scriptum esse, quia unusquisque a quo vincitur huic et servus
addicitur” (in Exod. xii. 4. Ed. Lomm., ix. p. 149). Also in a
passage which contains an allegorical use of the trumpet blasts
before Jericho, it is written, “Petrus etiam duabus epistolaram
VOL. V.
These passages have had grave doubt cast on their genuineness by Dr. Chase (op. cit., p. 803b). There can, at least, be no doubt, judging from the one undisputed reference, that Origen reflects a serious division of opinion in his time, and that his own opinion tends towards rejection of the Petrine authorship.

As regards Clement of Alexandria, the main question to be settled is whether in the Hypotyposeis he comments on 2 Peter. If we are to take the statements of Eusebius (H. E., VI. xiv. 1) and Photius (Bibliothec, 109), he commented "on all the Catholic Epistles". On the other hand, Cassiodorus, who wrote some 300 years afterwards, gives most conflicting evidence. At one time he says that Clement expounded the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments "from beginning to end," and in another passage, where he is giving a list of the canonical Epistles expounded by Clement, he omits 2 Peter. Moreover, in Cassiodorus' translation of Clement's Expositions, none are given of 2 Peter. The difficulty may be solved by supposing that in Clement's work, 2 Peter had a place beside the Apocalypse of Peter, which was included in the Hypotyposeis. (So Chase, op. cit., 802 a, and Zahn. Forsch. iii. p. 154.) Clement distinctly quotes the Apocalypse of Peter as the work of Peter, and as Scripture (Eclogae ex Script. Proph., xli., xlviii., xlix). Accepting the statements of Eusebius and Photius quoted above, and supposing that for purposes of exposition 2 Peter was merged in the Apocalypse of Peter, we may find confirmation of the first statement of Cassiodorus in certain passages of Clement's writing which have been collected by Mayor (The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, Introd., cxix.) and Bigg (Commentary on First and Second Peter, p. 202). In these the word-parallels are striking, but they would not necessarily constitute valid evidence in themselves.

In the writings of Cyprian we find no trace of 2 Peter, but it must not be forgotten that Firmilian's letter to him, quoted above, contains a clear allusion. In Hippolytus there are found passages that point to acquaintance with 2 Peter (Chase, 804 b, Bigg, p. 203). A portion of evidence that must not be omitted here is afforded by the division of sections in Codex B. In this manuscript there are two divisions of sections, and one is older than the other. The double division is preserved in all the Catholic Epistles except 2 Peter, where the older division is wanting. The conclusion is inevitable that in the older form of Codex B, 2 Peter was wanting.
INTRODUCTION

To sum up the evidence of the third century, we find that 2 Peter was in use so far as to influence the thought of Hippolytus in Rome, to be commented on by Clement of Alexandria, and to be expressly quoted by Firmilian and Methodius in Asia Minor. Although no reference is found in the writings of Cyprian of Carthage, yet Firmilian’s letter with the quotation is addressed to him. This is scarcely evidence, but it certainly implies Cyprian’s knowledge of the Epistle, and also that he would concur in its use as a source of quotation. Again, the two great Egyptian versions of this century, the Sahidic and Bohairic, both contain 2 Peter. If we accept a conjectural emendation of Zahn’s in the language of the Muratorian Canon, there is contained in it a reference to the division of opinion in the Church with regard to this Epistle (Gesch. Kan. i., p. 110 n.).

Origen’s statement that “it is disputed,” represents a widespread doubt as to its genuineness. This attitude, combined with a general willingness to respect its contents, must be regarded as the mind of the church about 2 Peter in the third century.

Second Century.—In a document which is preserved in a seventh century MS. entitled Actus Petri cum Simone (xx., ed. Lips., p. 67) there occurs a passage which contains several striking parallels with 2 Peter. The following phrases may be noted (1) “majestatem suam videre in monte sancto,” (2) “vocem eius audivi talem qualem referre non possum”. In (2) there is a parallel to the rather remarkable phrase, ψωνῆς τοιάδε, of 2 Peter i. 17. It is true that the extant MS. only represents a Latin translation of the original Greek, and that editors and translators may interpolate. At the same time, it is difficult not to regard Chase as over-sceptical in seeking to discredit the parallel by regarding the whole passage as an interpolation (op. cit., 802 b). There seems no reason why we should not accept the passage as an important second century attestation of 2 Peter, and as an indication that the Epistle had already some position in the Church.

Turning next to the Clementine Literature, we have in the Recognitions (v. 12) what appears to be a reference to 2 Peter ii. 19: “Unusquisquis illius fit servus cui se ipse subjecerit”. Rufinus

1 The passage in question reads, as amended by Zahn, “Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri (unam) tantum recipimus (epistolam; fertur etiam altera), quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt”. The emendations are apt, but is it possible, if we have regard to the loose grammatical construction everywhere in the document, that no change is needed? The Apocalypse of Peter may be referred to as the document “quam quidam, etc.,” and we have seen reason to believe (e.g., in case of Clement of Alexandria), that a Peter and the Apoc. Petri were sometimes regarded as one whole.
is again the translator of the *Recognitions*, and we are reminded of his translation of Origen (*In Exod. Hom.*, 12), "Unusquisque a quo vincitur huic et servus addicitur". The translations are both of the same passage in 2 Peter, and the variety in the language, so far from countenancing a theory of interpolation on the part of Rufinus may well indicate that he is translating at different times separate references to the same passage. In the *Homilies* (xvi. 20) there occurs a reference, pointed out by Salmon (*Introduction*, p. 488 n.) to 2 Peter iii. 9, *τὸν ναύτιον μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ*. The context also is confirmatory. Peter is speaking of the blasphemies of Simon Magus, which appear to have been similar in character to the false teaching that is denounced in 2 Peter. All things have been as they were from the foundation of the world. The earth has not opened; fire has not come down from heaven; rain is not poured out; beasts are not sent forth from the thicket to avenge their spiritual adultery. Then come the words quoted, "But, on the contrary, he is long-suffering, and calls to repentance". Yet Chase says, "It is difficult to see what there is in the context which specially recalls 2 Peter."

The coincidences mentioned by Salmon (*op. cit.*, p. 488) in the writing of Theophilus of Antioch are inconclusive, although the words in ii. 9, οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι recall 2 Peter i. 21. In ii. 13, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, φαίνεις διστέρ λόγος ἐν σειράματι συναχομένη, may be compared with 2 Peter i. 19. Similarly, in Tatian, *Or. ad Graecos*, 15 (Otto vi., p. 70), σκήνωμα (= body) is reminiscent of its similar use in 2 Peter i. 13. To found an argument, however, for the use of 2 Peter by these writers on such single words and expressions is precarious. They might well be part of the current vocabulary. In the *Apology of Aristides* (129-130) a passage occurs that naturally suggests 2 Peter i. 11 and ii. 2. ἡ ὅδε τῆς ἀληθείας ἢτις τούς ὄνειροις αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγώγησα καὶ αὐτῇ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ποιητικὸν ἀνθρώπις βασιλείαν (*Apolog.*, xvi.). Irenæus introduces a quotation from 1 Peter with the words, "Petrus ait in epistola sua" (iv. 9, 2), but this does not necessarily imply that he knew only one Petrine letter. He knew 2 John, and yet quotes 1 John in the same phrase. The phrase in 2 Peter iii. 8 occurs in Irenæus v. 23, 2, "Dies Domini sicut mille anni," and in v. 28, 3, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χιλια ἡμέρα. In both passages, however, the words are connected with Chiliasm, which is absent from the thought of 2 Peter. In the *Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne*, with which Irenæus was closely connected (date 177-179) we find the words ὁ δὲ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς ὁ ἄγιος αὐτοῦ ὁδὴ ἄργος οἰκονομίας ἐγένετο (cf. 2 Peter i. 8).

The most important question in the external evidence of the second
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century arises in connexion with the APOCALYPSE OF PETER, to which Harnack assigns the date 110-160, or probably 120-140. The work is used by the Viennese Church, and therefore the earlier date is more likely. Only a fragment of the Apocalypse is preserved to us, in which there are some striking coincidences with 2 Peter (cf. M. R. James, A Lecture on the Revelation of Peter). Some of these may be quoted here: (1) πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἔστωτε ψευδοπροφήται, και διδάσκαι καὶ ἐγγυμάτα ποιῶν τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάσκουσιν... ἐκεῖνοι δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας γενόνται. καὶ τότε ἔλεωται δὲ θεὸς... καὶ κρυπτὶ τοὺς ὕνωσ τῆς ἀνομίας (Apoc. § 1; cf. 2 Peter ii. 1, iii. 7, 12.) (2) ὁ Κύριος ἔφη, ἠγοράσαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος... ἀνεφέρχομεν δὲ μετὰ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί (Apoc. § 2; cf. 2 Peter i. 18). The passage goes on to say that the Apostles desired "that He would show them one of our righteous brethren who have departed," ἵνα βουμεν ποταποῖ (2 Peter iii. 11) εἰς τὴν μορφήν, καὶ θαρασσάμενε παραθαρασσώμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούσαντάς ἡμῖν ἀδράτους (cf. ἐγγυμόμενοι ὅμως, 2 Peter i. 16); ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον (i. 19). (3) τότε... ἀνακαλεῖν πάνω;... ἀκούσαν εἰς γον εἰς τὸ ἑνδυμα κατὰ τὸν ἀδρά τού τόπου (§ 6; cf. i. 19). (4) A frequent use of κόλλαξεν, or the noun (cf. §§ 6, 7, 10, 11, 2 Peter ii. 9). (5) οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὅδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης (§ 6; cf. § 13 and 2 Peter ii. 2, 21). (6) (a) λίμνη τῆς... πενηλημμένη βορβόρου (§ 8. βόρβορος occurs in § 9 twice, and in § 16); (b) ἐκλειπόντο (§ 15; cf. ii. 22). (7) ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ θεοῦ (§ 15; cf. ii. 21, iii. 2). (8) (a) ἢ γὰρ παραστήσας πάντας τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως καὶ αὐτὴ μέλλουσα κρίνεσαι σὺν καὶ τῷ περιεχόμενοι φύλακα (quoted by Macarius Magnus, Apocr. iv. 6). (b) ταχθήσεται πᾶσα δύναμις φύλακα, καὶ εἰσχερεῖται ὁ φύλακα ὡς βιβλίον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀστρά πεσοῦται Mac. Magn. op. cit. iv. 7; cf. 2 Peter iii. 10-13; see Mayor, ed. pp. cxxx. ff.).

All scholars are agreed that these and other coincidences are more than accidental (cf. Salmon, op. cit., p. 591). Various hypotheses to account for them are suggested.

(1) Did 2 Peter borrow from the Apocalypse? (Harnack, Chronologie, p. 471). A comparison, however, of the language of the two documents suggests that 2 Peter is simpler and shorter in the expression of the same ideas; and in some cases, ideas and phrases, separated in 2 Peter, are gathered together in one passage in the Apocalypse (cf. (1), (2), (8) above). Bigg (op. cit., p. 207) also contends against this hypothesis on the ground that the description of hell is suggested by Plato, Aristophanes, Homer, and especially Virgil, and points to a later date than the Epistle. The rare word τορταρώνως is indeed used by 2 Peter of the punishment of the wicked after death, and the conception is undoubtedly derived from heathen
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mythology. The word, however, is found in Jewish writings, which 2 Peter may have read (see note on ii. 4).

(2) Are 2 Peter and the Apocalypse by the same author? (Sanday, Inspiration, p. 347). This view is opposed by Chase (op. cit., 815) on the ground of the difference in style. "The Apocalypse," he says, "is simple and natural in its style. There is nothing remarkable in its vocabulary." The argument would seem to be conclusive, as the style of 2 Peter is unmistakable, and would be easily recognised. At the same time, the undoubted similarity between the two writings "not only in words or indefinitely marked ideas, but also in general conceptions—e.g., in both there is the picture drawn of Christ on the mountain with His Apostles, the latter being admitted to a secret revelation which they should afterwards use for the confirmation of their disciples—seems to be an argument of some strength in favour of the view that the two documents are the product of the same school" (Chase).

(3) Does the Apocalypse borrow from 2 Peter? Some of the arguments already adduced against the contrary hypothesis (i.) are really in favour of this supposition. The "naturalness of the words and phrases as they stand in their several contexts in the Apocalypse," which is brought forward by Chase as an argument against this third hypothesis (op. cit., p. 815 b) is really only a compliment to the style of the writing, and an indication that the writer has no intention of slavishly imitating 2 Peter, or of forming a kind of mosaic of his own and another's diction. As regards the absence in the Apocalypse of the strange and remarkable phrases of 2 Peter, that they were strange and remarkable might be precisely the reason why they were avoided or modified. Ἰβασάνικα in 2 Peter ii. 8 is rendered by δοκιμᾶτα in Apocalypse, § 1; the reference to the Transfiguration in the Apocalypse is fuller than in 2 Peter, and would seem to indicate reflection on the Petrine narrative (e.g., cf. addition of οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί to simple ἡμεῖς in 2 Peter i. 18; and expression τὸ δροσ for τῷ ἀγίῳ δρει). Such a phrase as ἐν τῷ σκοτεινῷ, might well be a paraphrase of ἐν ἀνύμητῳ τόπῳ, a much rarer word, and it is extremely unlikely that ἀνύμητο would be substituted for σκοτεινός. It is therefore most probable that the Apocalypse is indebted to 2 Peter, which would suggest a date for the Epistle earlier than 120-140 (cf. p. 181).

In the so-called Second Epistle of Clement (130-170) there is a passage deserving of notice. γνώσκετε δὲ δι' ἐρχεται ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καὶ μάλιστα καὶ ταχυστάναι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν ὀφραντών καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς πλευσθεῖσα ἐπὶ πορί τηκόμενος καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια.
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1 Where does the writer derive the conception of the day of judgment as meaning the destruction of the universe by fire? He clearly quotes Mal. iv. 1, Isa. xxxiv. 4, but these passages are not sufficient to suggest the idea unless to one already familiar with the doctrine. Bigg (Comm. pp. 214-15) argues at some length that this doctrine is ultimately to be traced to 2 Peter. Justin (Apol., i. 20) traces the belief in the world-fire to the Sybil (Book iv.) and Hystaspes. Bigg holds that both these belong to the same family as the pseudo-Petrine literature. The destruction of the world by fire was not an article of faith among the Jews, and Philo argues strongly against it (On the Incorruptibility of the World). The office of fire in the O.T. is to purify, and not to destroy (Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxvi. 15, 16, 22; Mal. iv. 1). In the N.T. (e.g., Heb. xii. 26-29; 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 8; Apos. xxi. 1) the conception of fire is distinctly that of a purifying agency. It is to be noted, however, against Bigg's view, that the conception of 2 Peter is not altogether at variance with the doctrine of the N.T. about the office of fire. The destruction of the present universe is vividly described in Chapter III., but the writer evidently has the idea of purification in his mind, and not of annihilation. "Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (iii. 13). Accordingly, if the passage quoted from 2 Clement is to be taken in the sense of annihilation by fire, it cannot be regarded as founded exclusively on 2 Peter.

2 Is there anything in the language to connect the two? ἡμέρα κρίσεως is found in N.T. only in St. Matthew's Gospel (x. 15, xi. 22, 24), in 1 John (iv. 17), and in 2 Peter (ii. 9, iii. 7). In 2 Peter iii. 10, however, the expression is ἡμέρα κυρίου. θηκομαί is also a word common to 2 Peter (iii. 12) and the passage in 2 Clem. An important coincidence is τοινές... ἐργα, which may be an attempt to make sense of the very doubtful reading in 2 Peter iii. 10 (ἐργα εὑρεθησαν). On the whole, the similarity of language and the affinity of thought in the two passages must be regarded as establishing a connexion. (For other coincidences, see Spitta, Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas, p. 534 n.)

In the Epistle of Barnabas (130-31, Harnack), in a Chiliastic passage, the words occur, ἢ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. ἀνάβανες οὖν μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, ἵνα ἡμέρα κυρίου ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη (xiv. 4). It has been pointed out that παρ' αὐτῷ is very close to 2 Peter's παρά κυρίῳ, and the repetition of the words points to the quotation of some
recognised utterance of Scripture. Barnabas, also, is in the habit of using λέγει to introduce his quotations from Scripture. The question is whether he is quoting 2 Peter iii. 8 or some other source. The context in Barnabas is different from that in 2 Peter. He is dealing with the mystical interpretation of the passage Gen. ii. 16. Also, in 2 Peter no Chiliastic meaning is attached, as in Barnabas. In all probability, 2 Peter iii. 8 is regarded by Barnabas as an authority for Chiliasm, along with Rev. xx. 4 ff., which he quotes. In The Shepherd of Hermas (110-140, Harnack) there are certain words and phrases that are found only in 2 Peter, μαστός (Sim. v. 1, 2); βλέπω (in different sense = appearance; Sim. vi. 2, 5); διονύστος (Sim. ix. 14, 4); αὐθάδεις, applied to false teachers (Sim. ix. 22, 1). In Clement of Rome (93-95, Harnack) we find several phrases which, in N.T., are peculiar to 2 Peter: τοῦτο δὲ εὐτυχείβαι ὑπάρχοντας εἰς κόλασιν καὶ αἰμαρμόν τίθησαν (xi. 1); ἐπότης (used, however, of God) (lix. 3); αὐθαδή (i. 1); μῦμος (ixii. 1); μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δὲς αὐτῶ (ix. 2), but μεγαλοπρεπεῖ βουλήσει occurs previously in same paragraph; Νῦν ἐκήρυξεν μετάρρυμα (vil. 6). The passage in Clem. xxxiv. may also be noted: εἰς τὸ μετάρρυμα ἡμῶς γενόμεθα τῶν μεγάλων κ. ἐνδιξείς ἐπαγγελίων αὐτῶ (cf. 2 Peter i. 4). These coincidences in Barnabas, in Clement, and in the Didache are scarcely conclusive as quotations, but they suggest a milieu of thought corresponding to 2 Peter.

To what conclusion does the evidence of the second century lead? Chase says, "If we put aside the passage from the Clementine Recognitions and that from the Acts of Peter, as open to the suspicion of not accurately representing the original texts, there does not remain, it is believed, a single passage in which the coincidence with 2 Peter can, with anything approaching confidence, be said to imply literary obligation to that Epistle" (cf. Bacon, Introd., 173). It ought, however, to be noted that the passage in the Clementine Recognitions can only be set aside on the ground that Rufinus can fairly be accused of interpolation; and the evident coincidences in the Actus Petri cum Simone can be dismissed only on account of distrust of the Latin translator of the work. We have also the evidence of

1 Of the passages collected by Zahn (der Hirt der Hermas, p. 431) as having affinity with 2 Peter, the most striking is Sim. vi. 4, 4: τῆς τρφής καὶ ἀπάτης ὁ χρόνος ἔρα δυτὶ μία. τῆς δὲ βασάνου ἡ ἐρα τριάκοντα ἡμέρας δύναμιν εἴχε. ἐὰν οὖν μίαν ἡμέραν τρφήσῃ τις καὶ ἀπάτηθι κ.τ.λ. (cf. 2 Peter ii. 13).

2 Spitta, p. 354 n., points out a passage in the Didache (iii. 6-8) having a remarkable affinity with Jude and 2 Peter. γέγυγνοις, a rare word (Jude 16) is used. βλασφημία, αὐθαδής and τρέμων are twice repeated (cf. 2 Peter ii. 10).
dependence in the Apocalypse of Peter. It is doubtful whether any of the Apostolic Fathers make use of the Epistle, but the coincidences in word and thought in 2 Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Didache, and Clement of Rome cannot be ignored. They at least suggest a possible atmosphere of thought for 2 Peter. On the whole, the evidence of the second century would suggest a date for the Epistle not much later than the first decade. There is an entire absence of evidence for the Petrine authorship.
CHAPTER II.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF AUTHENTICITY.

1. The obvious first step to be taken is to examine the References to the Gospel History in the Epistle, and to consider what light they may throw on the authorship of the Epistle.

(1) Chap. i. 3. τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς. The reference of the participle is to ἤτοι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (cf. note). Does ἡμᾶς refer to the Apostles, and in particular to the call of St. Peter? This interpretation involves that ἡμῶν in i. 1 likewise refers to the Apostles. Other indications, however, in the Epistle point to a group of scattered Christian communities in Asia Minor as the recipients of the letter, and the sense in i. 1 seems to be that the readers of the letter, who are isolated and harassed by false teachers, are set on equal terms with "us," who occupy a less difficult position, and enjoy greater outward privileges. Again, in i. 4 the best attested reading is ἡμῶν (not ἡμῖν), and clearly there the reference is to the writer and readers together. So ἡμῶν ought to be taken in i. 2. ἡμᾶς must therefore consistently be referred to the body of readers with whom 2 Peter identifies himself in thought, as united in their common faith, and not to the Apostles alone. Spitta (op. cit., pp. 37 ff.), arguing for the reference to the Gospel History, takes ἡμᾶς as referring to the calling of the immediate Apostles, in contrast to those who believed in response to their preaching. Such a sense would by no means suit ἡμῖν in i. 4. Also, in i. 10 καλεῖν clearly refers to writer and readers taken together. Moreover, καλεῖν in N.T. is by no means confined to the call of the first disciples (cf. Matt. ix. 13). In Rom. ix. 24 the thought is almost exactly parallel to this passage, "even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles".

(2) Chap. i. 16 ff.—The Transfiguration.—If we compare the reference here with the Synoptic accounts, there emerge some interesting points of difference. All three Synoptics speak as though the glory had its source from within. Such can only be the significance of μετεμορφώθη (Matt. and Mark): and the ἐγένετο . . . ἐτερον of
Luke is an indication that he interpreted the phenomenon as an inward change. He also tells us that it was ἐν τῷ προσώπω ἔμεθα, “as he was praying,” that the change took place (Luke ix. 29). 2 Peter, on the other hand, seems to think of the glory as having an outward source, like what happened in the case of Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 29 ff.; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff.), as a reflection of the glory of God, an outward attestation in addition to the voice (λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ παρὰ τῷ ὄντι καὶ ἔδειξεν, i. 17). Spitta argues that this is a more natural and primitive account, and therefore independent of the account in the Synoptics, which shows traces of later thought playing upon the incident. There can be no doubt that the conception of the glory as external is found in 2 Peter, but it is not regarded as an attestation previous to the voice, as in the Synoptics. On the contrary, the two aorist participles imply coincident action, the first really taking the place of a finite verb (cf. the common phrase, ἀνοικριθείσης εἰσε). “He received honour and glory when there came to Him,” etc. Moreover, τιμή can only refer to the attestation of the voice (see note on passage). To this extent 2 Peter differs from the Synoptic gospels. Are we then justified in regarding the disparity as a mark of the eye-witness? There are, however, other characteristics of the passage in 2 Peter which rather point to literary dependence on the Synoptic account. (a) The reading of ΝΑΚΚΛ, adopted in the text, is οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγάπητός, εἰς ἐν ἄγω εὐδοκήσα, which differs from Matt. xvi. 5 only in respect that (a) εἰς ἐν is substituted for ἐν ὑπὸ (see note on passage), (β) ἔγω is inserted, and (γ) ἀκοῦσεν αὐτοῦ is omitted. Again, σκηνώματι (ii. 12) σκηνώματος (ii. 14) and ἔξοδον (v. 15) occurring together, seem to indicate that the vocabulary of the Synoptic account was lingering in the mind of the writer. σκηνώμα, a rare and unusual word in this sense, is used characteristically in the sense of the ordinary σκήνως, and may have been suggested by the σκήνη of the Gospel narrative. ἔξοδος belongs to Luke’s own vocabulary in reporting the conversation of the three men, and its employment indicates acquaintance with his Gospel. “Omission of details of the history (e.g., the presence of Moses and Elias) in an allusion contained in a letter cannot reasonably be taken to show that a writer is giving an account independent of, or more primitive than, that of the Synoptists” (Chase, op. cit. iii. 809 b, but cf. Zahn, Introd. II., pp. 217 f.). Moreover, ἐν τῷ ἄγω ὑπὲρ indicates a later stage of thought than the simple εἰς ὄρος ὑψῆλον (Mark, ix. 2; Matt. i. 7), or εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Luke ix. 26). It implies not only the assignment of a definite locality, but also the ascription of a “sacred” site, “a known mountain which had now become consecrated as the scene of the vision” (Mayor, op. cit.,
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cxliv.). It is, of course, also possible to take ἐν τῷ ἄγιῳ ὅρα in sense of Isa. xi. 9, lxii. 25, where it is used of the Messiah's kingdom. "Perhaps 2 Peter means that in the Transfiguration the three Apostles were admitted to behold the glories of that kingdom, without alluding to any particular Jewish mountain" (Mayor, iv., note 1). The passage betrays reflection on the original incident, and is written from the standpoint of one who is concerned chiefly to interpret the "glory" of Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration as prophetic of His δόξα καὶ παρουσία, which is the theme of the Epistle (ὑπάρχουσι τῆς ἑκαίνου μεγαλειώμην), and as establishing the truthfulness of the Apostles who preached the παρουσία.

(3) Chap. i. 14: Prophecy of the death of St. Peter.—ταχύτερον ἀπὸ καθός καὶ δύναμιν ἤμων καὶ δύναμιν μοι. Clearly there is here a reference to the incident in John xxi. 18. In the notes, ταχύτερον is taken to mean "imminent" and not in the sense of sudden death Spitta, amongst others, has argued strongly (pp. 88 f., 491 f.) that there is here no reference to the Gospel history, and is supported by Mayor. It is contended that the words ἄν γεραίης, in John xxi. 15, imply that death was not imminent, and that in old age a man does not require a prophecy to tell him that death is near. Moreover, in the Johannine passage, the emphasis is not on the time but on the manner of St. Peter's death. It is further suggested that some special revelation by Jesus to St. Peter of the near approach of death, not recorded in Scripture, must be meant, and that a reference may be intended to the story contained in the legend, "Domine quo vadis?" found in the Clementine Homilies, and in the Apocalypse of Peter. The foregoing argument is founded on the supposition that καθός necessarily refers to the whole preceding clause, ἄν ... μοι. It need not be so. The writer speaks as an old man, and the reference would then be to the prophesied death in old age. The objection that old age in itself is a warning of approaching death seems trivial. That fact would not prevent the mention of a prophecy regarding it. Again, it is not necessary to suppose that 2 Peter actually has the passage John xxi. 18 in his mind. He may be referring independently to the incident. It is suggestive to compare the use of καθός καὶ here with iii. 15. There the καθός καὶ is added as a kind of afterthought, and is not really dependent on the principal verb ἔγειρε. It has really the significance of another principal clause. The syntax would seem to be similar in i. 14. The matter of knowledge (εἴδος) is that death is near at hand, however that knowledge is suggested to him, and the clause καθός καὶ is added by way of further illustration. It is unreasonable to demand that the thought in 2 Peter
must be an exact replica of the passage in John, if the reference is to be the same.

(4) Chap. ii. 20 (γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐσχήματα χειρών τῶν πρῶτων) is clearly a reminiscence of the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. xii. 45, Luke xi. 29.

These four references to the Gospel history have now been examined. The first may be set aside, and the other three may be regarded as indicating no more than a knowledge of the Gospels, and especially of two incidents in the life of St. Peter. They do not nearly amount to evidence that the writer is the Apostle himself.

The paucity of references to the Gospel history, in an Epistle purporting to be written by the Apostle Peter, is remarkable. It contains only one reference to the actual words of Jesus (ii. 20), but indirectly these may be referred to in ii. 1 = Matt. x. 33; i. 8 = Luke xiii. 7-8; iii. 4 = Matt. xxiv. 37-42. We would expect that the mind of an intimate disciple would have been saturated with reminiscences of our Lord's teaching, and would have dwelt easily on the great events of His Life. In this respect we may compare 2 Peter most unfavourably with the genuine first Epistle. In the former there is no mention of the Passion or Resurrection, and there is a strange absence of that vivid sense of the Risen Lord as living and reigning in grace, which is so characteristic of the writings of the Apostles, who "had been begotten again unto a living hope". It is also a matter for serious consideration as against the genuineness of the Epistle, that the references to the Gospel history are introduced apparently to support the character of one writing as St. Peter, and to distinguish his statements from σεσοφισμένου μιθού (i. 16). (But cf. Bigg. p. 231.)

2 The Personality of St. Peter in the Epistle.—(1) Chap. i. 1: Συμεών Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The significance of the form Συμεών is very obscure. The point to be emphasised at present is that St. Peter is here represented as the writer of the Epistle. If, however, the Petrine authorship is untenable, how is the expression to be justified? In this connexion, one or two questions call for consideration.

(a) Does the form of the words afford any indication that the name of St. Peter is being used by a later writer? His own description of himself in 1 Peter i. 1 is Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The form Συμεών is used only in one other passage, viz., Acts xv. 14, in the address of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem. δοῦλος is found in Jude 1, and in view of the evident dependence of 2 Peter on Jude, this fact may be regarded as significant. Again, if Spitta is right in supposing that by the use of the pre-Christian name, Συμεών, the writer
puts himself on a level with those whom he addresses, and prepares the way for the epithet ἐσορίων ("equally privileged," as between Jew and Gentile), it is evident that the whole title given to St. Peter is carefully chosen by a process of reflection. There is, therefore, a presumption that another mind is at work here, which has also borrowed largely from Jude in chap. ii.

(b) If the name of St. Peter has been thus used, the Epistle is pseudonymous. What is the distinction between pseudonymity in early Christian writings and forgery? Does pseudonymity imply ethical fault, and does it affect the authority of a writing? A most uncompromising position in this regard is characteristic of the older criticism. Westcott (Canon, pp. 352 f.) in speaking of the disputed books of the Canon, says: "The Second Epistle of St. Peter is either an authentic work of the Apostle, or a forgery; for in this case there can be no mean. . . . It involves a manifest confusion of ideas to compensate for a deficiency of historical proof by a lower standard of canonicity. The extent of the Divine authority of a book cannot be made to vary with the completeness of the proof of its genuineness. The genuineness must be admitted before the authority can have any positive value, which from its nature cannot admit of degrees; and till the genuineness be established, the authority remains in abeyance." In a note, Westcott adds, "These books (2 Peter, James, Jude, Hebrews) have received the recognition of the Church in such a manner that, if genuine, they must be canonical". The use of the term "forgery" in such a connexion ought to be avoided. In the first place, the expression is an entire misunderstanding of the origin of much of the pseudepigraphic literature of the time, and on other grounds the term is equally objectionable. It is, in effect, an attempt to browbeat the judgment into the acceptance of such books as genuine, on account of the difficulty of believing that the Church could accept into the Canon what is supposed to be the product of fraud and deceit. The question of pseudonymity cannot be settled "by a profession of moral indignation". The idea that literary property is guarded by ethical considerations is essentially modern. "Believers frequently borrowed from the books of other believers or of unbelievers, without mentioning any source, and without considering themselves in any way as thieves." "With the best intentions and with the clearest consciences they put such words into the mouth of a revered Apostle as they wished to hear enunciated with Apostolic authority to their contemporaries, while yet they did not regard themselves in the smallest degree as liars and

1 Zahn, who himself upholds the Petrine authorship, says "The mere occurrence of Peter's name in an ancient writing is no proof of authorship" (Introd., ii., p. 270).
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The standard of genuineness applied to the early Christian writings, and especially in the formation of the Canon, was their conformity to the teaching of the Church. Were they orthodox or heretical? A case in point is the story related by TERTULLIAN (De Baptismo, xvii.) of the writer of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, who was compelled to give up his office “on the ground that he imputed to Paul an invention of his own” (quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans). He defended himself by saying that he wrote out of regard for Paul, and that therefore he had not an evil conscience. The plea was evidently accepted, and he was convicted, not of literary fraud as such, but because he dared to advocate the heretical view that women had a right to preach and to baptise. We must also take into account in our estimate of pseudepigraphy what Jülicher calls “the boundless credulity of ecclesiastical circles to which so many of the N.T. Apocrypha have owed their lasting influence”. Eusebius (H. E., i. 13) quotes as genuine an Epistle purporting to be written by Christ to Agbarus. “It is evident,” says Mayor (p. xxv., note 1), “that there were among the early Christians good and pious men who had no scruple about impersonating not saints alone, but the Lord of saints Himself. We should gather the same from the readiness with which the orthodox worked up and expurgated the religious romances by which the heretics sought to popularise their doctrines.”

The practice of pseudepigraphical writing is exemplified in the O.T. in Ecclesiastes, and in the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Esdras, Baruch, Bnoch, and the Sibylline Oracles. The second century produced many pseudonymous books, such as the Gospel of Peter, which, after being read in the churches of Cilicia for some time, was at length forbidden by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, about the end of the century, on account of its docetic teaching. The unknown writer of 2 Peter made use of the name of St. Peter, both in order to mark his views as important, and because he believed them to be in accordance with what would have been St. Peter's teaching under similar circumstances.

(c) The foregoing may enable us to rid our minds of prejudice when we come to consider the question as to whether any genuine teaching of St. Peter is contained in this Epistle. Are there contained in the Epistle any actual reminiscences of St. Peter's teaching, and is the work written by a disciple of St. Peter?¹ No attempt, of course, can be made to disentangle from the rest of the writing

¹ Cf. Ramsay, Church in Roman Empire, pp. 492-3; Moffatt, Historical New Testament, p. 598.
what might be regarded as the utterances of the Apostle, but a
presumption in favour of the hypothesis of actual reminiscence
may be obtained from a comparison of 1 and 2 Peter (see chap. iv.).
Weiss has said that "no document in the N.T. is so like 2 Peter
as 1 Peter". Moreover, there is probably a reference in the second
Epistle itself (i. 15), which is corroborated by tradition, to the
fact that St. Peter's teaching was subsequently embodied in the
xcliii. ff.) also favours this view, and successfully defends it against
the objections of Zahn (*Introduct. ii.*, pp. 200-9).¹ Bigg considers that
the statement in i. 15 gave rise to the whole body of pseudo-Petrine literature (*op. cit.* p. 265). It is to be noted also that in two passages in
the Epistle the pseudonymous writer betrays the consciousness that
he is faithfully and honestly setting forth nothing inconsistent with
the teaching of the Apostle. In iii. 1 he is not afraid to set the con-
tents of his Epistle alongside those of 1 Peter without fear of contra-
diction,² and again in iii. 15, his concern is evidently to show that
there is no inconsistency between the Petrine and the Pauline teach-
ing. These, and the other considerations adduced above ought to be
a guarantee at least of the good faith of the writer of this Epistle.

(2) Another instance where the personality of St. Peter is
allowed to obtrude itself is found in i. 16, in the use of the word
ἐπόπται. The word means eye-witness, with perhaps an added sense,
derived from Gnostic sources, of spiritual vision. In the Apocalypse
of Peter, there is an account of the Transfiguration which contains the
words ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τῆς μαθητείας ἔδειξαμεν ὡς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἲνα ἔκκλησιν τιτανοὶ εἰσὶ τὴν μορφήν
(cf. Mayor, cxlv. note). Similarly in i. 18, of the Voice at the Trans-
figuration, 2 Peter has ἡμεῖς ἡκοσμαμεν. Jülicher, in commenting on
the pseudepigraphic character of 2 Peter, says that "the author
never loses consciousness of the part he is playing," and "constructs
his fiction methodically". Among other instances, he cites this
passage describing the Transfiguration. He sees in the structure
of the Epistle only "an artificial production of learned ingenuity"
(*Introduct.*, E. Tr., pp. 240, 241). It may be granted that the choice

¹ If the words μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔνωσιν are taken as implying that the Apostle was
not yet dead, we are immediately involved in all the insuperable difficulties connected
with a date for the Epistle earlier than A.D. 64, the traditional date of Peter's martyr-
dom. On the other hand, it is easy to see how this expression might be put into
the mouth of Peter by a later disciple, who well knew his mind and the preparations
he had made for preserving his teaching after his death.

² For consideration of the question whether the reference here is really to 1 Peter,
see p. 205.
of the Transfiguration as the only incident in the Synoptic account of St. Peter's life, to which reference is made, is an indication that the writer has made choice of this incident as suitable to his theme. At the same time, if it was legitimate for him to write under the honoured name at all, he could hardly have done so more naturally than he does in i. 16-18, especially as it is extremely probable that here he is making use of an actual reminiscence of the teaching of St. Peter himself (cf. notes on the passage).

(3) Chap. iii. 15.—ἀγαπητέ μεμεν διδασκάλος Παύλος. The examination of the whole passage in the Commentary leads to the conclusion that the Epistles of St. Paul are regarded as in the same rank with the O.T. Scriptures. The date thus implied makes it impossible that the actual writer is St. Peter. Why, then, the conjunction of the two names? There can be little doubt that 2 Peter wishes to impress upon his readers the consistency of the teaching of St. Peter and St. Paul against the Antinomian interpretation of the Christian faith. The affectionate terms in which St. Paul is spoken of are exactly those that might have been used by St. Peter himself of his fellow-apostle, and if St. Peter were known to be already dead, how could there be any sane intention to deceive the readers? The phrase ἀγαπητέ μεμεν διδασκάλος is used by St. Paul of Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7) and of Onesimus (Col. iv. 9; Philem. v. 16). No doubt the readers of this Epistle were acquainted with the disagreement between the two Apostles described in Galatians ii. 11-14. 2 Peter only reiterates the fact that there was never any fundamental opposition between their teaching. St. Peter's full sympathy with the Pauline teaching is evident in the First Epistle, and this passage may easily be true to his mind. It is indeed significant that the attitude taken up towards the Pauline teaching is not without reserve (iii. 16, ἐν αἷς ἄγων δυνάμει τινα), but the warm-hearted reference may be a real reminiscence.
CHAPTER III.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AS TO DATE.

We have next to examine any hints that may be given in the Epistle itself as to the Date of its composition.

(1) Chap. i. 15.—Here reference is made to the death of St. Peter as imminent. Other considerations render it impossible to hold that this Epistle was published during the lifetime of the Apostle who died c. 64 A.D. (see pp. 189 f.). The context shows that if the words μετὰ τὴν ζωὴν ξεδον are put into the mouth of St. Peter by a later writer, the period of writing must have been some time after his decease.

ἐκάστοτε (as occasion arises) in v. 15 implies that occasion has arisen more than once to refer to the posthumous teaching. ἕχειν δὴς, κ.τ.λ., implies a document or documents already in the possession of the Church. Again, if we are to see in this verse a reference to the tradition connecting St. Peter with the Gospel of Mark, we know that this tradition is at least much earlier than the time of Papias (140-160), who is quoted by Eusebius (H. E., iii. 39) as saying, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε, Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνεύτης Πέτρου γενόμενος δειλὰς ἐμμηνόθεν ἀκριβῶς ἐγραφείν, οὐ μὴν τάξει, τὰ ὅπω τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λειβατῖνα ἢ πραξάθεντα. Papias himself is reporting the testimony which he had received orally from the Presbyter. From the perfectly natural way in which the reference is introduced, we would conclude that 2 Peter has not in view a tradition which he found in such a writer as Papias, but betrays either a personal knowledge of the intentions of St. Peter himself, or an acquaintance with those who did know his mind. Hence a date not very much later than the end of the first century is probable.

(2) In chap. iii. 4 the words occur, ἄφ᾽ ᾧ γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὖνς διαμένει ἄφ᾽ ἀρχής κτίσεως. Here οἱ πατέρες refers to the immediately preceding generation of Christians. The whole sentence reflects the disappointment and disillusionment experienced by those who saw men and women believing in the coming of the Lord in their life-time, and dying without having realised their expectation, and who felt that all signs of an immediate coming in their
own day were absent. Such an atmosphere of thought would be most intense in the second generation of Christians, and much of the Epistle is meant for the encouragement of those who still expected the delayed Parousia of the Lord, and whose minds were likely to feel the element of truth in the words of the false teachers. 

It need not denote a long interval of time (cf. Luke vii. 45). It may therefore be possible that the Epistle is addressed to the second generation of Christians. Moreover, chap. i. 16-18 is most naturally regarded as addressed to those “who have not seen, and yet have believed,” and the superior position of the eye-witnesses therein implied is an idea that would be most prominent in sub-Apostolic times.

(3) Chap. iii. 8.— As an indication of an early date for the Epistle, the absence of any millennial significance in this passage has been adduced (Bigg, pp. 214, 295). Against this, Mayor (op. cit. cxxvi.) has pointed out that we learn from Justin Martyr (Dial., chap. 80) that there were also many orthodox believers in his time who refused to accept the millenial teaching. It may, however, be noted that the passage in Justin hardly negatives Dr. Bigg’s conclusion. There it is said that “many think otherwise,” i.e., in opposition to a millenial doctrine. In 2 Peter, the context in which the words are used is entirely apart from any millenarian notion at all. The significant thing is that 2 Peter, unlike all subsequent writers does not employ Psalm xc. 4. in connection with the idea. He is dealing with the very verse out of which Chiliasm arose, and he could hardly have so completely ignored the opinion unless he had been writing at a date previous at least to its later widespread acceptance in the Church.

At what time the view became common in the Early Church is uncertain. In Barnabas xv. 5 we meet with the conception, but there is no trace of the doctrine in either 1 Clem., Ignatius, Polycarp, the Epistle to Diognetus, or the Didache. Hermas is not uninfluenced by the idea. In none of the apologists, except Justin, is there any trace of Chiliasm. 2 Peter iii. 8, therefore, with its peculiar use of Psalm xc. 4 would indicate a date certainly much earlier than Justin Martyr (140-161), who refers to the belief as a tenet of the orthodox faith, and probably earlier than Barnabas. If the absence of reference to millenial doctrine in 1 Clem., Ignatius, and the Didache means the same as in 2 Peter, a date at the very end of the first century and the very beginning of the second is probable for our Epistle.

(4) Chap. iii. 2.— τῶν ἀποστόλων ύμαν. The writer must be regarded as including himself among the Apostles (cf. i. 1), and not as
making any distinction between himself and them. The phrase need not necessarily mean "the Twelve," but rather missionaries from whom the knowledge of the Gospel was first received. Of these the writer is one (i. 16). ἀπόστολος is so used Phil. ii. 25, 2 Cor. viii. 23 (cf. discussion of term in Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, Bk. iii. ch. i.). The passage, therefore, does not exclude a date later than the Apostolic Age.

(5) Chap. iii. 16.—Two considerations are suggested by this reference to St. Paul that have a bearing on the date of the Epistle. (a) Paul's Epistles are included in a body of writings called γραφαί, and we have reason to suppose that τὰς λαοῦς γραφάς probably refers to the O.T. Scriptures. (b) The "unlearned and unstable" distort these Epistles of Paul to their own destruction. Both these statements require that the date of the Epistle be postponed so as to leave room for them. (a) renders it quite impossible to fix a date in the life-time of Peter. The statement implies not necessarily a collection of Pauline letters such as we have in the Canon of the N.T., but the epithet γραφή would be applied if certain letters of Paul were accustomed to be read in the churches. That interpretation would not require a date later than the end of the first century. At the same time (b) demands that time must be allowed to enable the Pauline Epistles to gain such a position of recognised authority in the Church as Scripture that they can be misinterpreted by "unlearned and unstable souls". All these circumstances would be met by a date quite early in the second century.

(6) Chap. ii.—The resemblances in this chapter to the Epistle of Jude are undoubted. There are parallels in thought and language also in Jude 1, 2 = 2 Peter i. 1, 2; Jude 3, 2 = Peter i. 12; Jude 17-19 = 2 Peter iii. 1-3; Jude 20-25 = 2 Peter iii. 14-18. Spitta, Zahn, and Bigg are among the foremost defenders of the view that 2 Peter is prior to Jude. Irresistible arguments, however, may be adduced for the opinion that the relationship is the other way. For the discussion of the question the reader may be referred to the Introduction to Jude. At the moment we are concerned with the question only in so far as it has a bearing on the date of 2 Peter. A date not later than A.D. 90 is assigned to Jude by Chase, Mayor, Salmon, Plummer, Spitta. The limits 100-180 are accepted by

1 Two conceptions of the term "apostle" are found in the early church, a wider, based on the Jewish official use of the term, and a narrower, confined to the "Twelve". The two conceptions existed side by side, and "the narrower was successful in making headway against its rival" (Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, i. p. 408). If the wider use is found here, it would amount to an argument for an early date to the epistle.
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Jülicher and Harnack. The arguments for the second century date are examined by Chase (op. cit., pp. 803 f.), and found insufficient.¹

If the date in the last decade of the first century be accepted for Jude, 2 Peter must be later; but there is not that evidence of advance in the Gnostic views opposed in 2 Peter upon those in Jude to warrant our assigning to 2 Peter a date much later than Jude.

To sum up the internal evidence for the date of 2 Peter, the considerations adduced in (3) would fix the terminus ad quem at least previous to 140-160, the probable date of Justin, in whose day Chiliasm was an orthodox belief. On the other hand, (1), (2), (5) would render it possible to regard the Epistle as the product of a time not very much later than the apostolic, and perhaps (4) may also be regarded as confirmatory in this connexion. The relationship to Jude would suggest a date not earlier than A.D. 100. The external evidence, as we have seen, would render possible a date not later than the first decade of the second century. Perhaps A.D. 100-115 may be tentatively suggested as the extreme limits.

¹ A summary of the evidence may here be given:—

1. πλοτος, spoken of in Jude 3-20, as a formulated deposit, is used in practically the same way in Gal. i. 23, iii. 23, vi. 10, etc.

2. In ver. 17 the language need not imply that the apostolic period is long past. The mention of oral instruction (Ἀγγελος) would quite suit a date in early sub-apostolic times, when some of the Apostles were dead and some scattered.

3. The argument from the use of apocryphal books is invalid. Of the two quoted by Jude, Enoch is assigned by most scholars to a date B.C., and the Assumption of Moses was probably written within the first thirty years A.D.

4. The Gnostic views attacked in the Epistle are not necessarily of late date.
CHAPTER IV.

RELATION TO 1 PETER.

It is a very generally accepted result of criticism that the two Epistles of Peter are not by the same hand. Jerome (Script. Eccles., I), in connexion with 2 Peter, remarked on the "stili cum priore dissonantiam" (see p. 175). So marked are these differences between the two Epistles, that even Spitta and Zahn, who defend the authenticity of 2 Peter, are therefore obliged to give up the real Petrine authorship of 1 Peter. They admit that 2 Peter is a letter from the Apostle's own hand, and attribute the First Epistle to Silvanus, under the direction of the Apostle, in accordance with their interpretation of 1 Peter v. 12 (Spitta, op. cit., pp. 530 ff.; Zahn, Introd. II., pp. 149 ff.).

Space does not permit of a full discussion of this question, and the reader is referred to the minute and elaborate treatment of the subject in Mayor's edition (pp. lxviii. ff.). Reference may be made briefly to the following points:—

1. Resemblances in Vocabulary and Style.—(1) Vocabulary—(a) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 2 Peter i. 2; 1 Peter i. 2; use of καλεῖν, 2 Peter i. 8 and 1 Peter i. 15, ii. 9, 21, iii. 9, v. 10; with κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν, 2 Peter i. 10, may be compared the foregoing references to use of καλεῖν in 1 Peter, and the use of ἐκλεκτός, 1 Peter i. 1, ii. 4, 9; θλήσα 2 Peter i. 21, and 1 Peter ii. 15, iii. 17, iv. 2, 19; with ἐν ἐπιθυμίας σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις cf. πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις 1 Peter iv. 3; ἐπότια, 2 Peter i. 16, and ἐποπτεῖοντες, 1 Peter ii. 12, iii. 2; ἀσπίδα καὶ ἀμάχητοι, 2 Peter iii. 14, and ἄμοις καὶ ἀσπίδας, 1 Peter i. 19; ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, 2 Peter ii. 14, and πέποιται ἀμαρτίας, 1 Peter iv. 1.

The foregoing resemblances are remarkable as extending to the uses of the same words or ideas in similar connexions. The following single words may be noted as being largely confined, in their use in the N.T. to 1 and 2 Peter:—
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2 Peter. | 1 Peter. | Rest of N.T.
---|---|---
διστροφή . | 2 | 5 | 5
ἀπόθεσις . | 1 | 1 | 0
ἀπειτή . | 3 | 1 (pl.) | 1
ἀσεβης . | 1 | 1 | 6 (3 in Jude.)
ἀθλεία . | 3 | 1 | 6 (1 in Jude.)
ἀπολαος . | 1 | 1 | 2
προγυμνώς . | 1 | 1 | 3

(b) Including these already mentioned, Mayor, op. cit., pp. lxix., lxx. gives a list of 100 words common to both Epistles. He also gives a list of 369 words occurring in 1 Peter and not in 2 Peter, 230 words occurring in 2 Peter and not in 1 Peter.

(c) One remarkable difference is in the word used for the Second Advent. In 2 Peter παρουσία (i. 16, iii. 4, 12), in 1 Peter ἀποκάλυψις (i. 7, 13, iv. 13) is used.

The facts contained in (a) are sufficient at least to suggest literary dependence between the two Epistles, but (b) and (c) entirely negative the possibility that they are by the same hand.

(2) Style. “The style of 1 Peter is simple and natural, without a trace of self-conscious effort. The style of 2 Peter is rhetorical and laboured, marked by a love for striking and startling expressions” (Chase, D. B., iii. 812 a). As against this estimate, it may be questioned whether the two Epistles are so far apart in style as it is usual to say they are. Mayor says, “There can be no doubt that the style of 1 Peter is, on the whole, clearer and simpler than that of 2 Peter, but there is not that chasm between them which some would try to make out” (p. civ.). As regards grammatical similarity, he sums up the results of a most learned discussion (chap. iv.) as follows: “As to the use of the article, they resemble one another more than they resemble any other book of the N.T. Both use the genitive absolute correctly. There is no great difference in their use of the cases or of the verbs, except that 1 Peter freely employs the articular infinitive, which is not found in 2 Peter. The accusative with the infinitive is found in both. The accumulation of prepositions is also common to both. The optative is more freely used in 1 Peter than in 2 Peter. In final clauses 2 Peter conforms to classical usage in attaching the subjunctive to ἢνα, while 1 Peter, in one place, has the future indicative. 2 Peter is also more idiomatic in the use of such elliptical forms as ἡς ὅσ, ἕσον, ἕφη Ἐς. On the other hand, 1 Peter shows special elegance in his use of ἡς in comparisons, and emphasises the contrast between the aorist and the present imperative by coupling τιμήσατε with τιμάτε in ii. 7” (pp. civ., cv.). It is
incumbent on scholars to give every weight to these utterances, especially in view of such extreme criticism of the style of 2 Peter as that of Dr. E. A. Abbott (Exp., ii., vol. iii.; From Letter to Spirit, §§ 1123-1129).

2. **Attitude to the Old Testament.**—It has been reckoned by Hort (Appendix, Notes on 1 Peter, p. 179) that there are thirty-one quotations from the O.T. in 1 Peter as against five in 2 Peter. Also, an examination of the quotations in 2 Peter (ii. 2, 22, iii. 8, 12, 13), and of the references to O.T. history (Noah, ii. 5; Lot, ii. 6-9; Balaam, ii. 15-16) show that they are not only much fewer in number, but that 2 Peter never formally quotes the O.T., and that the actual allusions are of a much less intimate and spiritual character than in 1 Peter. Incidentally it may be pointed out (cf. Chase, op. cit., p. 813 a) that this is the opposite of what we would expect if St. Peter wrote the Epistle to Jewish Christians (so Spitta and Zahn).

3. **Relation to the Pauline Epistles.**—1 Peter displays a close connexion of thought with Romans and Ephesians in particular. "The connexion though very close, does not lie on the surface. It is shown more by identities of thought and similarity in the structure of the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase" (Hort, 1 Peter, p. 5). 2 Peter, on the other hand, is extremely non-Pauline in thought. The idea of the μακροθυμία of God in chap. iii. might easily be the common property of the Christian consciousness. Even granting that there were special circumstances in the origin of 1 Peter, that would largely account for the presence of Pauline thought in the mind of St. Peter as he wrote (cf. Chase, D. B., 788, 789), it cannot be regarded as possible that the difference in the circumstances both of writer and readers which we find in 2 Peter would lead to such a complete freedom from Pauline influence.

4. **Devotional Expression.**—There is a great contrast in devotional thought and feeling between the two Epistles. It has already been noted (pp. 186-9) that the references to the great events in the life of Christ are strangely few. The only allusion to His sufferings and death is contained in τὸν ἀναστασίαν αὐτῶν δειπνόν (ii. 1). The only crisis in His life that is mentioned is the Transfiguration. No mention is made of the Holy Spirit except as the source of inspiration of the ancient prophets (i. 21). Prayer is not alluded to. The Apostles were essentially witnesses to the Resurrection, but on the Resurrection 2 Peter is silent. Instead, the writer guarantees the truth of the Apostolic teaching by an appeal to the Transfiguration (cf. 1 Peter i. 2, 3, 11, 19-21, ii. 24, iii. 18, 21, 22).

There is also a striking difference between the two writers in
their personal attitude and relationship towards Jesus Christ. A warmth and intensity of feeling is apparent all through 1 Peter, which displays a much more vivid and tender sense of the reality of the grace and presence of the Risen Christ in the individual heart (cf. i. 8, 18, ii. 9, 21, iv. 12 f., v. 16) than the second epistle. "The flame of love," so bright in the first epistle, burns but dimly in the second. 2 Peter contains what Mayor calls "reverential periphrases," such as θεία φῶς, θεία δόξας, μεγαλειώτης, μεγαλοπρεπής δόξα, κυρίας. ἐπίγνωσις, ἐπιγνώσκω are the only words that are used of the deepest and most intimate religious experience, communion of heart with the Living Christ. It is true that the thoughts of God's long-suffering (iii. 9-15) and His care of the righteous (ii. 9) are full of tender meaning, but we do not find in 2 Peter that sense of personal relationship to Christ, founded on memories of past, and an actual sense of present discipleship, which transfixes the thought of the first epistle, and we miss the penitential sense of cleansing through the death of Christ so prominent in 1 Peter (cf. 1 Peter i. 18-19, ii. 21-23). The references to the Risen Lord in 2 Peter are few, and are pervaded chiefly by a sense of His majesty (cf. i. 16, ii. 1, 3, 12, 17, 20, 21, iii. 7, 10, 12). Even where the language is purely hortatory, as in 2 Peter, chap. i., the difference of tone and manner compared with 1 Peter is quite clearly marked. Thus the religious and devotional atmospheres in the two Epistles are far apart. Allowance must no doubt be made for the varying circumstances under which they were written. The one is written to a scattered body of Christians who are suffering persecution, and are in special need of spiritual comfort and stimulus; the other is directed against the immoral influences of false teaching. At the same time external circumstances are quite insufficient to account for these fundamental differences in the religious attitude of the two writings. Such a change could not take place in the history of a single personality, unless through some crisis completely revolutionising thought and feeling.
CHAPTER V.

VOCABULARY AND STYLE OF 2 PETER.

The extreme limit of depreciatory criticism of the style of 2 Peter is reached in the epithet applied by Dr. E. A. Abbott, (Expositor ii., vol. iii.; From Letter to Spirit 1121-1135), who describes it as “Baboo Greek”. The most moderate treatment of the subject is found in the article, so often referred to, by Dr. Chase. We may briefly summarise the chief points of criticism.

1. The large number of words found in 2 Peter, and nowhere else in the N.T. The full list may be given:

- εἰδωλίων, 1
- ἄραθρος, 2
- ἀμώμητος, 2, 8
- ἀποφεύγειν, 12
- ἄργειν, 12
- ἀστήρικτος, 2
- ἀδαχμηρός, 2
- βλέμμα, 2
- βόρβορος, 12
- βραδύτης, 2
- διανύειν, 2
- δυσοπτής, 2
- ἐκάστοτε, 2, 5
- ἐκπαλαι, 3
- ἐλεγίας, 1
- ἐμπαιγμόνη, 1
- ἐντρυφάν, 1
- ἐξακολουθεῖν, 12
- ἐξεραμα, 1
- ἐπάγγελμα, 2
- ἐπότης, 12
- ἑσύμων, 12
- κατακλύζειν, 12
- καυσοῦθα, 2
- κύλισμα, 1
- μεγαλοπρεπής, 13
- μέγιστος, 13
- μίασμα, 12
- μιασμός, 1
- μιμήτος, 12
- μιμότιμος, 12
- μιμοτιμός, 12
- μόμος, 13
- μάχης, 13
- παραφροσυνία, 12
- παρέσαγεν, 12
- παρεσφέρειν, 2, 8
- πλαστός, 2
- ποιητής, 12
- πεισός, 2
- περιγραμμός, 2, 5
- στοιχεῖον, 2, 5
- στρεβλούν, 12
- ταρταροῦν, 1, 3
- τεφροῦν, 1, 3
- τήκεσθαι, 1, 3
- τοιγοῖς, 1, 3
- τοιχητής, 1, 3
- φωσφόρος, 2
- φυσιοδιδάσκαλος.

One or two remarks on the list may be offered.

1. Largely on the ground of the use by 2 Peter of such a remarkably long list of ἄξως λεγόμενα the vocabulary of 2 Peter has been characterised as an “ambitious” one (Chase). It has also been described as “bookish,” ** with a strong inclination for striking and poetical words.

It is undoubtedly true that many of the words marked 2 are found only in the Greek dramatists or historians, but it is rash to conclude that at the time 2 Peter was written all of them were still poetical words. Moreover, the use of poetical language is not incompatible with the prophetic tone in 2 Peter. The words marked 3 are found in various Papyri, representing the vernacular of daily life, in which much of the N.T. was written. It will be noted that

* Words marked 1 are found in LXX, 2 in classical writers, 3 in Papyri (for ref. see Comm.).

in four cases the so-called σταξ λεγόμενα of 2 Peter are found both in the classics and in the vernacular. This suggests that most ordinary of all occurrences in the history of words, the passing of a word from the language of literature into the language of common speech. Again, the case of words such as ἀμώρητος, ἀργεῖν, etc., taken along with the fact that the study of colloquial Greek is in its infancy, suggests that caution is required in peremptorily condemning the use of certain words in 2 Peter as barbarisms. No less than sixteen words in the above list are found in Papyri.

(2) At the same time it is undoubtedly true that the style of 2 Peter is often rhetorical, and contains some most successful attempts after sonorous effect, (e.g., note the rhythm of ii. 4-9, and cf. the remarks of Mayor, p. Iviii. and Bigg, pp. 227 ff.). The writer is himself impressed with the majesty of his theme, and it is of great interest to note that in some cases he may probably be making use of the liturgical language of his day. An inscription has been discovered in Stratonicea in Caria, dating from the early imperial period, containing a decree of the inhabitants in honour of Zeus Panhermos and of Hekate. Deissmann (Bible Studies, E. Tr., pp. 360 ff.) has pointed out one or two most suggestive parallels in the inscription with 2 Peter i. 3 ff. The phrases τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετᾶς, τῶν κυρίων ἱερείων αἰεὶν ἀρχῆς, πάσαν σπουδὴν ἐλοφέρεσθαι, and the superlative μεγίστων (θεῶν) occur. In the case of θεία δύναμις, where 2 Peter was usually supposed to be employing philosophical language, he appears really to be quoting a current religious term, well known perhaps to the very readers of his Epistle. With the phrase θείας κοινωνίας φύσεως (i. 4) may be compared φύσεως κοινωνίας ἀνθρώπινης from a religious inscription of Antiochus I. of Kommagene (middle of first century B.C.). It is probable, also, that the use of words like μεγαλοπρεπής, ταρταροῦν and ἐδυσθεία (which also occurs in the Carian inscription, and is a common N.T. word); δωρέω, ἀρέτη (i. 3), ἐπιχορηγεῖν, and phrases like διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει may be traced to the same liturgical source.

2. Solecisms.—Chase gives a list of certain expressions in the Epistle “which, so far as our knowledge of the language goes, appear to be contrary to usage.” These are βλέμμα (ii. 8), καμποτίθα (iii. 10-12), μελλόν (i. 12), μὴν ποιεῖσθαι (i. 15), μνημόθεν (i. 9), παρεισφέρειν (i. 5), σπάζ (ii. 4). For discussion as to the meaning of these see the Commentary in loc. That something may be said for their use is proved by the remarks of Mayor (pp. ix. ff.).

3. Reiteration of Words.—There is a well-marked reiteration of words in the vocabulary of 2 Peter, e.g., ἐπιχορηγεῖν (i. 5, 11); βεβαιοσ
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(i. 10, 19); ὀπομμησκειν, ἐν ὀπομμήσει, μνήμην ποιεῖται (i. 12, 13, 15; iii. 1); ἐνεχθέισης, ἐνεχθείσαν (i. 17, 18); ἀπώλεια (ii. 13, iii. 7-16); ἐφείσατο (ii. 4, 5); τηρεῖν (ii. 4, 9, 17; iii. 7); στοιχεία καυσούμενα (iii. 10, 12).

Chase asserts that "the extraordinary list of repetitions" stamps the vocabulary as "poor and inadequate" (op. cit., 808). In reply, it may be urged, (1) This sweeping condemnation is scarcely consistent with the occasional use of very rare words on the part of the writer. (2) Reiteration may arise from other causes than a limited vocabulary. It may arise "either from a liking for resonant sounds, or from a desire to give emphasis by the use of line upon line, or from both" (Mayor, p. lvii. f.). (3) A similar habit of repeating words is found in 1 Peter (cf. Bigg, pp. 226 f.).

The foregoing remarks on the vocabulary and style of 2 Peter are necessary and timely, in view of the current tendency to depreciate these. Many of the phrases in 2 Peter have found a permanent place in the religious language of the Christian Church. It would be rash to acquit the writer entirely of all faults of style that have been attributed to him, but his ordinary intelligence must at least be vindicated. Chap. iii., "On the Style of 2 Peter," of Mayor's edition is worthy of close study, as tending to restore the style of 2 Peter to that respect which enabled it to be studied in the time of Aurelius, though not regarded as canonical, along with other Scriptures, "as it appears profitable to many".
CHAPTER VI.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WRITING.

1. Readers.—To whom was the Epistle written? The crucial passage in this connexion is iii. 1, where the Epistle referred to is most naturally understood to be 1 Peter. The objection is urged by Spitta, Zahn, and more recently by Mayor, that the description of the contents in iii. 1, 2 is inapplicable to 1 Peter. Yet in 1 Peter i. 10-12 we have almost an exact parallel to τῶν προειρημένων ἡμάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, and 1 Peter is full of reminiscences of the teaching and example of Jesus (τῆς... ἐκτολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος) (cf. 1 Peter i. 15, 16, ii. 13-17, 23, etc.; cf. also ii. 1, τούτο δὲ ἐστιν τὸ βῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς). The ethical difficulty caused by this interpretation of the reference, if the two Epistles are not by the same author, is no greater than that aroused by the use of the apostolic name in i. 1 (see Introd., pp. 189-91). Moreover, we have no reason to expect anything but a statement in iii. 1 of what the two Epistles have in common. The words do not exclude the supposition that their contents differ in many respects. The readers, then, are, in general, those mentioned in 1 Peter i. 1, viz., Christian communities of Asia Minor.

Mayor (op. cit., pp. cxxxvii. ff.) has again defended the view that 2 Peter is written to the Roman Church. He founds his argument on 2 Peter iii. 15, καθώς καὶ ὁ ἄγαπητός ἡμῶν Παύλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, holding that καθώς must be explained by the immediately preceding admonition, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἥγεσθε, which is more distinctly stated in Romans ii. 4, iii. 25, 26, ix. 22, than elsewhere. Various objections may be urged against this view. (1) It is extremely doubtful whether the reference καθώς can be thus narrowed, so as to include only ver. 14. The introduction of the comparison with Paul seems to arise from a desire to show that in general there is no discrepancy between the Petrine and the Pauline teaching. (2) Even although the Epistle to the Romans is meant, it would be no proof that 2 Peter was written to the Roman Church, as it is evident from

1 So Grotius, Dietlein.
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ἐν τοῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, and τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς (ver. 16), that the Epistles of Paul had reached the rank of γραφαὶ, and were known to the Church at large. (3) Even if the narrower reference of καθὼς is adopted, the idea of μακρωθύμια is echoed also in 1 Corinthians and Thessalonians (1 Cor. xv. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 16). If the wider reference is taken, almost any of the Pauline Epistles may be meant, as the doctrine of God’s free grace is reflected in many of them. It is also, of course, quite possible that the reference may be to a lost Epistle.¹

That practically the same class of readers as in 1 Peter is meant, is confirmed by τοῖς ἰσότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν (i. 1).² The phrase may be regarded as referring in general to the isolated position of the readers, who are made to feel, as in 1 Peter i. 1, 2, that they too are recipients of the grace of God and objects of His special choice. The words in 2 Peter may well be a succinct expression of the idea in the opening verses of the First Epistle. In the one case the readers are suffering persecution; in the other, they are being led astray and harassed by false teaching. In both cases the words carry a message of comfort.

The question may be raised whether i. 16, ἐγραψαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου . . . δόμαν καὶ παρουσίαν, implies that the Apostle himself had preached to these readers, and whether this is compatible with an Asiatic community as recipients of the letter. In 1 Peter the Apostle does not appear to have been personally acquainted with his readers or to have himself laboured among them, and there is no trace in the career of St. Peter of an Asiatic ministry. The words, however, do not necessarily imply that Peter had himself preached the Gospel to those who are addressed. The plural may be used of a single person (cf. Moulton, Proleg., p. 86). The mask would seem to be thrown off for the moment, and the actual personality of the unknown writer to obtrude itself in this pseudonymous Epistle. That he should have taken no special pains to prevent this, is itself an indication of good faith on the writer’s part, and of his lack of any intention to deceive. He himself is the preacher.

The general character of the address in 2 Peter is undoubted. The Epistle is written to a wide class of Christians readers

¹ Hofmann (vii. 2, 113 ff.) argues that the reference is to Ephesians. An important discussion of whole question is found in Spitta (pp. 286-88).
² In connexion with these words, it has been argued whether they indicate Jewish or Gentile Christians. The presumption is in favour of the latter (see Commentary in loc.). The use of a word like παραπότομος (ii. 4) indicates a Hellenic atmosphere of thought, and the phrase in ii. 20, ἀποφυγότες τὰ μισήματα τοῦ κόσμου seems most applicable to Gentiles.
who are not recent converts (i. 12), "ein für weite Kreise der Kirche bestimmtes pastorales Rundschau" (Spitta, op. cit., p. 483).

1 Peter also is general in its destination. 2 Peter may well be addressed to the same localities as 1 Peter, although to a later generation of Christians, under different circumstances. This would also supply a motive for the use of the Apostle's name.

2. False Teachers.—The description of the false teachers given in chap. ii. is taken in the main from the Epistle of Jude. It ought to be noted, however, that the object in view in the two Epistles is somewhat different. Jude is, above all, a polemic against the false teaching. 2 Peter is written with a view to confirming the faith of the Christian communities in the face of the delayed Parousia. The false teachers in 2 Peter "have brought a new idea into the field. . . . They cast doubt on the Christian eschatological expectation . . . appealing in support of their view to a deeper knowledge of Christ (i. 2, 3, iii. 18, cf. i. 16-18), a particular conception of the O.T. (i. 20, iii. 16), and certain Pauline positions (iii. 15 f., cf. ii. 19") (Von Soden, op. cit., p. 194). They are "mockers" (διασκέδασται) who say, ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παροιμίας αὐτοῦ; (iii. 4). In this fact, we may find a partial explanation of the use made by 2 Peter of Jude. He makes use of an authoritative description of their real character, making certain changes dictated by his own views as to the use of apocryphal books (e.g., omission of story of Michael), and by the special circumstances of those he addresses.

A remarkable circumstance in the language employed is that the writer speaks at one time of the false teachers as about to come (ii. 1 f., iii. 3), at another as though they were already active (ii. 11, 12, 17 f., 20, iii. 5, iii. 16). All such explanations as that the writer projects himself into the future, and from that point of view vividly regards future events as actually happening; or that he is at one time thinking of communities where the ψευδοδιδασκάλοι are actually at work, and at another of communities where their influence has not yet penetrated, may be set aside. The simplest explanation seems to be that again the writer, when he speaks of them in the present tense, throws off the prophetic mask, and depicts what he knew was actually happening.¹

Do the characteristics mentioned in this Epistle point to a Gnostic sect? It has been pointed out that there is one important difference between the libertines of Jude's Epistle and those of

¹ Henkel suggests that the False Teachers, who are active in other communities, are regarded as presenting only an imminent possible danger to the readers of 2 Peter (Der Zw. B. des Apostelfürsten Petrus, p. 37 ff.).
2 Peter (cf. Chase, op. cit., iii. 811). In the former, not so much teaching as practice, was in question, while, in 2 Peter, they are called ἀληθευόμενοι, and seem to have been engaged in the active propagation of false doctrine. The use of γνώσις in i. 5 f. can scarcely be without reference to that intellectualism, with its hidden wisdom, and exclusive mysteries, so characteristic of Gnosticism (cf. Lightfoot, Colossians, pp. 73-113). The word ἐπίστημη (i. 16) is a Gnostic term meaning one who has been initiated into the mystery. Jude, on the other hand, seems to feel that the movement he combats is also doctrinal in its import; for he urges his readers “to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints” (ver. 3), and the heresy he opposes must have had a certain materialistic basis (κυρίωτα δὲ ἄθετοις, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, ver. 8). There is also implied a certain doctrinal process in the words, κέρια μετατίθεντες εἰς ἀθλητικαν καὶ τῶν μόνων δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστον ἀρνούμενοι (ver. 4). Thus, in both cases, the readers are warned against what was really a matter both of life and of doctrine, and the situation in 2 Peter need not necessarily imply a stage at least much later in the development of the false teaching. In these Epistles it can scarcely be doubted that we are in the presence of an incipient Gnosticism, and the two directions in which the Gnostic tendency led, viz., Intellectualism and Antinomianism, are clearly marked. On this latter aspect, the emphasis is laid, not only in the Epistles, but in the N.T. generally. The new movement caused great anxiety to the leaders of the Church, owing chiefly to its immoral tendency. For long the heretics were in communion with the Christian Church, and it was not until the second century that the cleavage widened out to its true limits (cf. E. F. Scott, Apologetic of the N.T., pp. 146 ff.). These false teachers in Jude and 2 Peter were partakers in the rites of the Christian Church (Jude 12; 2 Peter ii. 13). Incidentally, it may be mentioned that their description in 2 Peter does not in itself warrant a date for its composition in the second century, and certainly not a date so much later than Jude, as is usually supposed.

2 Peter, then, gives us in general a picture of the prevalence of Antinomian heresy, which has as its results the corruption of morals, and a certain materialistic tendency which led to disbelief in the Person of Christ (ii. 1), and a denial of the ethical nature of God (iii. 8, 9; cf. also Philipp. iii. 18 f.). 2 Peter is throughout eminently ethical in its tone. Religion and life are inseparably connected, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ἔως καὶ εὐσεβείαν διδασκαλίας ἃ δίκτης ἐπιγνώσως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς (i. 3). The true γνώσις must contain ethical qualities (i. 6). The Christian must take pains “to
make his calling and election sure" by godliness of life (i. 10). We are not, however, left without traces of the doctrinal position of these false teachers. The Gnostic position which demanded γνῶσις, or a hidden wisdom which leads to perfection, is tacitly opposed in the use of the word ἐπίγνωσις, which is used by St. Paul to denote "complete knowledge" or "saving knowledge" (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Phil. 6). Mayor suggests (op. cit., p. 171) that ἐπίγνωσις came into use to distinguish the "living knowledge of the true believer from the spurious γνῶσις which had then begun to ravage the Church". The true ἐπίγνωσις carries with it "all that is needed for life and godliness" (i. 3). These Gnostics evidently held that Revelation in itself was incomplete. Those, however, who possess ἐπίγνωσις are made θεῖας κοινωνίας φύσεως, a phrase which originates in a philosophic atmosphere, and no doubt reflects a sense of opposition to the pure intellectualism of these false teachers, who would claim to be κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως by means of wisdom or γνῶσις alone. τυφλὸς ἄτιν μυστάξιν (i. 9) is a reference to the darkness which was mistaken for light, because the γνῶσις that accompanied it was so unethical (cf. the whole passage, i. 5-9). σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις (i. 16) refers to those fictions connected with the emanation of σέληνων, so characteristic of the Gnostic system (cf. 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14), by virtue of which the Person of Christ was regarded as the emanation of an σέλην, in union with a human body. In contrast to this idea, the writer claims that the Apostles were ἐπίσταται . . . τῆς ἔκεινος μεγαλειότητος. The Voice proclaims Him to be actually ὁ νῦν μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου (i. 17). What seems to be a denial of the Person and Work of Christ is referred to in i. 1 τῶν ἀγορασμάτων ἀπό τῶν διεσπητῶν ἄρωμάτων. πλαστοῖς λόγοις (fictitious words) of i. 3 may be compared with σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις of i. 16. κυριότητος καταφρονούσας (ii. 10), δόξας ὁ τρέμοντος (ii. 11) evidently cannot refer to any denial of human authority, but rather to sceptical views regarding the influence of spiritual powers, good or evil, upon the life of the individual. Such a belief was part of the orthodox Jewish thought of the time (see Commentary in loc.). ἀλεθερίαν . . . ἐπαγγελλόμενοι (ii. 19) may be set alongside the passage dealing with the misuse and misinterpretation of the Pauline doctrine of free grace (iii. 16), which provided the theoretic basis for Antinomianism. These false teachers questioned the truth of the Parousia expectation (iii. 4) on the ground (1) of the uniformity of nature (πάντα οὖσα διαμέρισται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως) which is met by the argument that the heavens and the earth were created by the word of God, and that the earth has already been flooded by the same divine agency (iii. 5-7). (2) The indestructibility...
of matter, against which it is asserted that in the day of the Lord
οἱ ὀφρανοὶ ὑπὲρ ὁδόν παρελώνονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσώμενα λυθήσονται (iii.
10). Finally, we are told that the false teachers use the Scriptures
of the O.T. as a basis for their heretical teaching (iii. 16).

It is thus apparent that in 2 Peter, far more than in Jude, the
doctrine as well as the life of the false teachers is in question.
Their ethical character is described in words largely borrowed from
Jude, and in no measured terms. They speak evil of the way of
truth (ii. 2); make merchandise of their followers (ii. 3); are fleshly
and lustful (ii. 10-12); practise a vulgar hedonism (ii. 13); defile the
love-feasts by their presence (13); deceive the hopes of their followers,
like waterless fountains (16). They are Christians in name, steal
into the Church without disclosing their impious views (ii. 1, 20, 21),
and are boastful and irreverent (ii. 10, 18).

The question arises whether these false teachers can be identified
with any known heretical sect. Some critics have sought to distin-
guish between the libertines of chap. ii. and the mockers of
chap. iii., but there is really no difficulty in identifying the two.1
The denial of the Parousia by the mockers is really the outcome of
a materialistic philosophy, and the denial of a future judgment would
have the tendency to emancipate from all moral restraint. “There
may have been shades of difference between them; some, perhaps,
had a philosophy, and some had not; but in the eyes of a Christian
Preacher, judging the party as a whole by its practical results, they
would all seem to wear the same livery” (Bigg, op. cit., p. 239, cf.
Henkel, op. cit., p. 37).

Harnack, who holds that Jude was written 100-130, suggests that
the attack in that Epistle is aimed at some of the older forms of
Gnosticism, among which he mentions the Nicolaitans. This sect is
known to have had considerable influence in Asia Minor, and is
mentioned by name in Rev. ii. 6, 15, in the Epistles to Ephesus and
to Pergamum. In the case of the latter Church they are represented
as existing side by side, and probably as identical with a sect of
“Balaamites” (ii. 14). No doubt the same sect is accused of immor-
ality in the Epistle of Thyatira (ii. 20). In 2 Peter ii. 15, 16 the
example of Balaam is adduced as a parallel to the conduct of the
false teachers, and it would appear that the name of Balaamites was
given as a nickname to the Nicolaitans. Irenæus (iii., c. 1) tells us
that the Nicolaitans held the doctrine of two Gods—the God who
created the world, and the Father of Jesus; that an æon descended
upon Jesus, and again returned into the Pleroma before the Cruci-

1 Cf. Henkel, op. cit., pp. 21 ff., where the question is fully discussed.
The language of 2 Peter iii. 5-9, relative to the creation and the present government of the world, through the long-suffering of the Creator, might well have in view some such doctrine as this. The accusation, also, of distorting the Scriptures of the O.T. (iii. 16) would also be explained, as also the statement in Jude 4 and 2 Peter ii. 1 about the heretics' denial of Christ. It is probable that these views were common to the Nicolaitans along with other early Gnostic sects, such as the followers of Simon Magus (cf. Mayor, op. cit., pp. clxxviii. ff.).

On the intellectual side, Gnosticism originated in a compromise with Greek thought, and an attempt to adapt the Christian teaching to the current philosophy. It is probable that, on the side of conduct, the immoralities that are so vividly denounced in Jude and 2 Peter were due to a similar compromise with the customs and ideas of the Graeco-Roman society of the day. The Nicolaitan teaching, as described in Rev. ii., was "evidently an attempt to effect a reasonable compromise with the established usages of Graeco-Roman society, and to retain as many as possible of those usages in the Christian system of life. It affected most of all the educated and cultured classes in the Church, those who had most temptation to retain as much as possible of the established social ideas and customs of the Graeco-Roman world, and who by their more elaborate education had been most fitted to take a somewhat artificial view of life, and to reconcile contradictory principles in practical conduct through subtle philosophical reasoning" (Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches, pp. 337 ff.).

It had evidently become the custom in the Early Church to use the most unsparing language in denouncing these Gnostic errors. Both in Revelation and in Jude, the language is violent, and 2 Peter deals with the false teachers in the same temper. This may render it difficult, at the present day, to understand the exact theoretic position of a sect like the Nicolaitans, and it is a well-known fact that certain philosophic positions in religion, adopted and advocated by men who are themselves of blameless life, may really lead in the case of weaker followers to great moral laxity. If we consider the picture of Graeco-Roman society drawn by St Paul in Romans i., it is not to be wondered at that these heresies, which led to such moral compromises, should be vigorously denounced by the Christian teacher. Nothing else "could have saved the infant Church from melting away into one of those vague and ineffective schools of philosophic ethics. . . . An easy-going Christianity could never have survived; it could not have conquered and trained the world; only
the most convinced, resolute, almost bigoted adherence to the most uncompromising interpretations of its own principles could have gained the Christians the courage and self-reliance that were needed" (Ramsay, op. cit., ibid.).

3. Place of Writing.—On this topic, there is very little ground for judgment beyond vague conjecture. Chase favours the view that 2 Peter is of Egyptian origin. He founds his opinion (1) on the supposition that the Apocalypse of Peter and 2 Peter belong to the same school, (2) that Clement of Alexandria appears to have placed the two documents side by side, and (3) commented on them together in his Hypotyposeis, (3) certain resemblances in thought and word with Philo and Clement of Alexandria (op. cit., p. 816 f.). Jülicher (Introd., E. Tr., p. 239) suggests that the Epistle originated either in Egypt or in Palestine. Palestine is selected on the ground that the Epistle is directed against one of the earlier and less known Gnostic sects which flourished in that country or in Syria. Deissmann, on the basis of the Stratonicean inscription already quoted (op. cit., pp. 367 f.) inclines to the view that the local colouring of the Epistle belongs to Asia Minor. He awaits the result of further inquiry “how far its peculiar vocabulary has points of contact with that of literary sources (of the imperial period) from Egypt, or Asia Minor, including those of the papyri and the inscriptions”. There can be little doubt that the readers are in Asia Minor, but does not the form of address, τοῖς ἱστίμων ἡμῶν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, point to a writer at some distance from his readers, though well acquainted with their circumstances? (cf. p. 206).
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ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β.

I. ΣΥΜΕΩΝ Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἑόρτιμον ἡμῶν ἁλαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖν ἐν

1 Σύμεων ἹΑΚΛΠ συπτ., Treg., Ti., WHm; Σύμεων B, vulg., sah., boh., WH.

CHAPTER I. Vv. 1-2. The Greeting. “Simeon Peter, slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained a faith of equal honour with our own, through the justice of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you in the saving knowledge of our Lord.”

Ver. 1. The form ΣΥΜΕΩΝ is only once used elsewhere of Peter in Acts xv. 14. τοῖς κ.τ.λ. The question as to who are the actual recipients of the letter, is matter for discussion in the Introduction (chap. vi. 1). The presumption is in favour of a body of non-Jewish Christians. ἡμῶν probably means, in accordance with its use elsewhere in the chapter, the whole Christian community to which the writer belongs (see Introd. p. 186). ἑόρτιμον. It is doubtful whether ἑόρτιμον means “like in honour” or “like in value”. Both meanings are found (cf. Mayor, p. 80). We may compare the sense of τιμή in v. 17 (see note), where the sense is clearly of an honour conferred (cf. 1 Peter i. 7), which would suggest the same meaning here. ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ . . . Χριστοῦ. ἐν is instrumental. Χριστοῦ has the sense of “justice” or “impartiality,” and is opposed to προσωπολημψία. God is no respecter of persons. There is no distinction in His sight between the faith of an eyewitness, and the faith of those “who have not seen”. With this non-theological sense of δικαιοσύνη cf. δικαίος in Hebrew vi. 10; also 1 John i. 9. θεοῦ refers to Christ, cf. John xx. 28. σωτῆρος, a title used by the Emperor. “Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland’s contention (ZNTW, pp. 335 ff.) that Christians from the latter part of i. a.d. onward, deliberately assumed for their Divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men” (i.e., the Emperors). Moulton, Proleg. p. 84 (cf. Spitta, p. 523; Chase, D. B. iii. 796). πίστιν ἐν δικαίοτητι can hardly be taken together (cf. Eph. i. 15, i Tim. iii. 13), as the relation of the believer to Christ in this epistle is rather that of γνώσεως or ἐπιγνώσεως (cf. v. 2). (Cf. Zahn. Introd. ii. pp. 218-9).

Ver. 2. χάρις . . . πληθυνθεῖν: the same form of salutation as in 1 Pet. i. 2. ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. (For history of ἐπιγνώσεως see Mayor’s note, pp. 171 ff.; Robinson’s Excursus in Ephesians.) ἐπιγνώσεως in this epistle corresponds to πίστις in the Pauline sense (Spitta, p. 522). In Rom. i. 21 γνώσεως is used of the imperfect knowledge of God possessed by the heathen world, and in v. 28 he contrasts it with the Christian or perfect knowledge of God. (Cf. i Cor. xiii. 12, Col. i. 9. “ἐπιγνώσεως, involving the complete appropriation of all truth and the unreserved acquiescence in God’s will, is the goal and crown of the believer’s course” (Lightfoot, note on Col. i. 9). Cf. Introd. p. 209; note v. 8; Paget, Spirit of Discipline, pp. 112 ff. ἐπιγνώσεως implies a more intimate and personal relationship than γνώσεως. It would be a useful word, seeing that γνώσεως had become associated with Gnosticism, then incipient in the Church. Mayor quotes Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 372, and Str., vi., p. 759, where κατ’ ἐπιγνώσεως is twice opposed to κατὰ περίφασιν (= on a broad general view, cf. Mayor’s note, p. 213). Grace and peace are multiplied in and through this more
intimate heart knowledge of Jesus Christ, in contrast to a mere barren γνώσεως.

Vv. 3, 4. The Promises and their Source. "Inasmuch as His Divine Power has granted us all things that are needed for life and piety, by means of the personal knowledge of One who called us by the impression of his own glory and excellency; and through this glory and excellency have been granted promises that are precious to us and glorious, in order that, by means of these, ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature, escaping the corruption that is in the world owing to lust."

Throughout this passage, the contrast between ζητέω, θησάς, and 2 p. plur. in γνώσεως (ver. 4) must be preserved. θησάς implies the apostolic circle, who, by virtue of their own experience of the δόξα and ἀρετή of Christ, are able to transmit to these readers certain promises "precious to us, and glorious." (So Spitta, Van Soden).

Ver. 3. θείας δυνάμεως is originally a philosophic term (Plato, Ion. 534 C; Arist. Pol. viii. 4) cf. ταύτα as used by St. Paul in speaking to philosophers at Athens (Acts xvii. 29). The subject is Christ (cf. δύναμις κυρίου, Luke x. 17; 1 Cor. v. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 9; and v. 16, of this chapter). The phrase θείας δυνάμεως is contained in an inscription of Stratonicia in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemeros and Hekate, belonging to the early Imperial period. Peter would thus be alluding himself of one of the familiar forms and formulæ of religious emotion" (Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 367). ἀρτοῦ is taken as referring to Κυρίου in ver. 2, which would confirm the reading adopted. τάντα... τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ ἐσώρευσιν. ζωὴ is the new life that belongs to believers in Christ. ἐσώρευσις is also found in the inscription quoted above. This word and its cognates are found in N.T. only in Acts, this Epistle, and in the Pastoral Epistles. They are also common in inscriptions of Asia Minor, and were apparently familiar terms in the religious language of the Imperial period.

In ἐσώρευσις, the emphasis of meaning lies towards "godliness" in its practical, rather than its devotional aspect, i.e., what God requires of man "pious conduct". In 1 Tim. iii. 16 Christ is spoken of as "the secret of piety" (τὸ τῆς ἐσώρευσες μυστήριον). The conjunction of the two ideas πίστις and ἐσώρευσις is significant. Religion does not narrow, but expand the province of life. The life in Christ is not "a little province of pecuicular emotion... If we fear that it may lose itself in the vast and often lawless universe of life beneath, the danger is to be averted not by wilfully contracting it within a narrower field, but by seeking greater intensity of life in deeper and more submissive communion with the Head Himself in the heavens" (Hort, The Way, the Truth, and the Life, p. 147). ἐνορμητεύει (="gifted" or "granted"). This word and its cognates always carry a certain regal sense describing an act of large-handed generosity. Cf. Mark xv. 45 of the giving by Pilate of the body of Jesus to Joseph; John iv. 10; James i. 17. The same sense is found in Gen. xxx. 20, Prov. iv. 2, Isa. lxi. 3; and O.G.I.S. 517 (iii. a.d.) with reference to the gift by Marcus Aurelius of a new law-court, ὕπεται ἐκ[ρήσασ]ήμο[το τὴν πατρ[ίδ] ἡμῶ[ν] [τὴν ἀγοραν τῶν δικαίων τοῦ καλό[ναιτος ἡμᾶς]. Judging from usage elsewhere in N.T., the reference would here be to God, who is always the Caller. 2 Peter, however, shows great independence of thought in other directions, and it is more likely that the reference is to Christ, especially as ἑνεγνωσότα is used consistently in relation to Christ (i. 8, ii. 20). (So Spitta, Von Soden, Mayor). "Cognitionem dei praesupponit haec epistulâ, ver. 3. Cognitionem autem Domini nostri neque Jesus Christi urget propriâ" (Bengel). Cf. 2. Clem. ix. 5. χριστός... ἐξεντεύξας καὶ ὄντως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν. ἐνεγνωσότα δόξα καὶ ἀρετή. Has ὄντως an intensive force here, or has it an exhausted sense.
merely equivalent to a personal pronoun? The emphasis conveyed in the former interpretation would better carry on the sense of πάντα. ἰδία is used in sense of John i. 14. ἀρετή is an interesting word. There is considerable evidence to prove that it is not used here in the ordinary Greek philosophical sense of "virtue," but rather in the sense of "gift." The use of ἰδία and ἀρετή is not infrequently found in philosophical writings (cf. Plat. Symp. 208 D. Plut. Mor. 535). Deissmann, following the Stratonicean inscription already mentioned, renders "manifestation of power," i.e., in miracle (cf. cit. pp. 95-97). In 1 Pet. ii. 9 it is used in plural, in LXX sense = "praises" (καὶ ἀρεταί). (Cf. Thuc. i. 33.) In P. Hib. xv. 3 ff. (iii. n.c.) the younger men are exhorted to employ their bodies ἐκείνως τὴν ἀνάδειξιν ποιουμένως τῆς αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς, "in a timely display of their prowess" (G. and H.). In later papyri ἀρετή is used as title of courtesy, e.g., P. Oxy. 71, ii. 18 (iv. a.d.). ἰδίαν ἰδίαν τῇ ἀρετῇ = "if it please your Excellency." Fovart defines ἀρετή as "vim divinam quae mirabilem in modum homini laborantibus salutem afferet" (cf. Hort's note, x Peter, p. 129 and MME, Sept. 1908). The phrase τοῦ καλῶσαντος ... ἀρετῆ contains one of the finest ideas in the N.T. What could be a more effective answer to the intellectualism of the Gnostic teachers or its modern equivalent, than the impression produced on the lives of men, and especially the early disciples, by the Personality of Jesus? They beheld His glory in the evidences of miraculuous knowledge and power which Jesus showed at the time of their call (John 2. 43, 47-51; Luke v. 4). Their sense of His moral greatness overcame all resistance on their part (Luke v. 8; John i. 49). If 2 Pet. is lacking in devotional expression, his apologetic for the person of Christ is cast on most effective lines. Reason can only compass the facts of Revelation, in terms of antinomies, and it is vain to meet inadequate theories of the person of Christ by dogmatic subtlety. The Life and Death of our Lord, if its significance is to be fully understood, must be looked upon largely as an acted parable, and Christian experience—the impression of ἰδία καὶ ἀρετή—is an indispensable constituent of dogmatic expression.

Ver. 4. ἰδία ... ἀρετῆ. Reference is to ἰδία καὶ ἀρετῆ (so Kühl, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner, Mayor) ἐπαγγελματα = "promised blessings." No doubt what 2 Peter has chiefly in view is the particular comprehensive ἐπαγγελμα of His Second Coming (cf. iii. 4, ἐπαγγελία and iii. 13). The Parousia will be the vindication of all moral and spiritual effort. Christ promised forgiveness to the sinful, rest to the weary, comfort to the sad, hope to the dying and life to the dead. If the reference adopted above of ἰδία ἀρετῇ is correct, the sense would be that in the character and deeds of the Incarnate One, we have a revelation that is itself a promise. The ἐπαγγελματα are given, not only in word but also in deed. The very life of Christ among men, with its ἰδία and ἀρετή is itself the Promise of Life, and the Parousia expectation is also a faith that He lives and reigns in grace, having "received gifts for men." ἰδία ... ἀρεταί. Passive, see note on ver. 3. ἵνα ἐπεφώνησεν τοῦτων ... φόνοις. τοῦτων refers to ἐπαγγελματα. The hope and faith kindled in us by the promises are a source of moral power. "The history of the material progress of the race is the history of the growing power of man, arising from the gradual extension of his alliances with the forces which surround him ... He arms himself with the strength of the winds and the tides. He liberates the latent energy which has been condensed and treasured up in coal, transforms it into heat, generates steam, and sweeps across a continent without weariness, and with the swiftness of a bird. ... Moving freely among the stupendous energies by which he is encompassed, he is strong in their strength, and they give to his volitions—powerless apart from them—a large and effective expression. The his-
tory of man's triumphs in the province of his higher and spiritual life is also the history of the gradual extension of his alliance with a Force which is not his own... In Christ we are 'made partakers of the divine nature' (Dale, Atonement, pp. 416, 417). The idea of participation in the Divine Nature is set between the two pictures, one of hope, to παύειν ἕναν καὶ μήνυεν ἐπεμνήματα, the other of despair, τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φόροις. The way to God is through the Redemption of Christ. The approach to God is an "escape," and not an act of intellectual effort. ὕπολος in philosophic writers is the counterpart of γίνεσθαι, cf. Plat. Rep. 546b, Phæad. 95b. Aristot. Phys. 5, 5, 6. It expresses not sudden but gradual dissolution and destruction. The scriptural meaning alternates between destruction in the moral, and in the physical sense. In the N.T. the significance is physical, in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, Col. ii. 22, Gal. vi. 8, ii. Pet. ii. 23; moral here, as in 2 Pet. ii. 19, Rom. viii. 24. Man becomes either regenerate or degenerate. Either his spiritual and moral powers are subject to slow decay and death, the wages of sin (ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ), or he rises to full participation in the Divine. In ἐπιθυμίᾳ, a compact phrase. The corruption consists in ἐπιθυμίᾳ, which may be interpreted in the widest sense of inordinate affection for earthly things. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ; cf. Rom. viii. 21. ὕπολος becomes personified as a world-wide power to which all creation including man is subject. In Mayor's edition there is a valuable study of ὕπολος and cognates (pp. 175 ff.). The idea contained in ὕπολος, moral decay, is illustrated in Tennyson's "Palace of Art," and "Vision of Sin"; also in Byron, 4th Stanzas for Music; Vv. 5-7. Faith is not only illumination but character. "Nor is this all. On your part bring the utmost earnestness to bear, and in your faith supply moral energy, and in your moral energy understanding, and in your understanding self-control, and in your self-control patient endurance, and in patient endurance piety, and in piety brotherly love, and in brotherly love love.

Ver. 5. καὶ αὕτος τούτῳ ἢ, a phrase that emphasizes the fact of the ὑπερμαχαί as having its logical outcome in character.

"The soul of religion is the practic part" (Bunyan). On the other hand, 2 Peter here teaches that so-called practical Christianity without the spiritual motive is incomplete and unintelligent. ἐπιθυμίᾳ πάσην παρεισχύνεσθαι, an impressive phrase. Cf. similar ideas in Rom. xii. 11, Heb. vi. 11. It is a warning against sluggishness and self-indulgence in the spiritual life. ἐπιθυμητός. The A.V. trans., "add to," is insufficient. χρηστός in Attic drama is one who defrays the cost of the chorus, at the bidding of the State, as an act of citizenship (Dem. 496, 26). It was a duty thus prompted to lavishness in execution. Hence χρηστός came to mean "supplying costs for any purpose," a public duty or λατουργεία, with a tendency, as here, towards the meaning, "providing more than is barely demanded." In P. Oxy. 284b ff. (30-35 A.D.), a man complains that his wife had deserted him, although ἐπιθυμητόν ἀποτέλεσε πάντα τὰ ἐξέδω καὶ ἐνέργειαν ("I provided for her suitably and beyond my resources"). ὑπερμαχαί denotes a particular application of χρηστός (cf. Moulton, Proleg. p. 113). ἐν is used each time of that which is supposed to be theirs" (Alford). ἄρα: "strenuous animae tonus ac vigor" (Bengel) — a manifestation of moral power. γνώσις, understanding, implying insight, circumspection, discernment (cf. i Cor. xvi. 18). Cf. Didache, ix. 3 (in Eucharistic prayer), xi. 2, where γν. is conjointed with διακατοσκύλη.

Ver. 6. ἐγκρατείαν: "self-control": accompanied by, and arising from, knowledge, and not a mere product of fear or submission to authority. ὑπερμαχαί: "steadfastness"—not turned aside from the faith by trial and suffering (cf. Luke vii. 15, Rom. v. 3 ff.). The desponding
doctrine of the false teachers would itself call for "φιλοσοφία οντωμονην" in the readers. Mayor compares the Aristotelian καρτερία (cf. Heb. xi. 27). εὐσεβείας. In the Epistle the false teachers are ἅσεβεις (cf. note on v. 3).

Ver. 7. φιλαδελφίαν: "affection towards the brethren," i.e., of the same Christian community. ἀγάπην: probably love towards all, even enemies; not directed by sense and emotion, but by deliberate choice (cf. Matt. v. 44). Mayor interprets: "Love to God manifesting itself in love to man and to the whole creation, animate and inanimate."

Vv. 8-11. Further emphasis on the connexion between faith and morality, and its result. "If you have these virtues, and are not sparing in your use of them, you will not be ineffective and unfruitful in the direction of deepening your Christian experience. Where these virtues are not present a man is blind, near-sighted as it were, and entirely forgetful of the great fact that he is purified from the sins of the past. With this danger in view, your earnest purpose ought to be to make sure your calling and election. Steadily practise these virtues and you will not stumble; for thus there will be ministered unto you an abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom."

Ver. 8. πλεονάζωτα: "abound". In classical use = "exaggerate". The word here again emphasises the display of a regal, uncalculating and unwearied spirit in the practice of the Christian graces. ἄργους. Perhaps "ineffective" or "ineffectual," a meaning which is further emphasised in ἀκάρτιον. In The Didache, 12, are given directions for discriminating genuine from false among the itinerant teachers. "If he wishes to settle with you and is a tradesman, let him work and let him eat. If he has no trade, according to your wisdom provide how he shall live as a Christian among you, but not in idleness (μὴ ἄργος). If he will not do this, he is making merchandise of Christ. Beware of such men." Here is illustrated the passage from the ordinary sense of ἄργος, which really signifies "idle" for want of occupation, and not by choice, to the ethical significance. Cf. James ii. 20, "Faith without works is ἄργη". Matt. xx. 6, "Why stand ye here all the day, ἄργοι?" and the reply. Cf. also use of ἄργης in ii. 3. In P. Par. II. 4(9) (iii. B.C.), certain quarrymen complain that they "are idle (ἄργοι) for want of slaves to clear away the sand," Cf. P. Par. II. 20. ἀπεξερ.. μὴ ἄργης τὰ πλαίσια. P. Lond. 208 (ii. A.D.). ἄγος ἄργους ἄργησαντες. In P. Lond. III. p. 27 (a census-return of 160 or 161 a.D.) a certain Apollonius is described as belonging to "the leisureed class of Memphis". (τῶν ἀρετῶν ἄργων). P. Fior. I. p. 165 (both ii. A.D.). ἰδιαουργίαν ἄργον = "an oil-press which is out of working order" (εἰς τὴν εἰκόνα ἰδιαουργίαν). Here the writer returns to the idea, introduced by ἰδιαουργίας... ἰδιαουργίας in ν. 4, that morality and religion are intimately connected. Some have sought to interpret the words as meaning "with reference to the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," on the ground that ἰδιαουργία has already been postulated as the source of "all things needed for life and godliness," and cannot now be regarded as an end to be attained. Yet ἰδιαουργία may be regarded as both the beginning and the end of morality (cf. iii. 18, Col. i. 6 ff. Phil. i. 9). The translation of A.V. is correct (εἰς εἰς, in, expressive of result). ἰδιαουργ. contrasted with γνώσις marks "a higher degree of intensity, an energy of deeper penetration. It is not a quiescent state, the resting in an acquirement, but the advance of one to whom easy attainment is but the impulse of fresh effort; one who is not content to know, but ever, in Hosea's words (vi. 3), follows on to know" (Paget's words (vi. 3), follows on to know) (Paxt, Spirit of Disciplines, p. 112). Each advance in the Christian life deepens and widens our spiritual understanding. "Die ἰδιαουργ. ist ihrer Natur nach etwas, was wächst" (Von Soden).

Ver. 9. μμυρώδες: "short-sighted". Only once elsewhere in Greek literature in Ps. Dionys. Eccl. Hier. iii. 3. This is one of the words to which exception has been taken in 2 Peter. It is both rare, and it seems to contradict τυφλός. Spitta and Von S. translate "willyblind". Mayor (p. xii.) (following Beza,
Grotius, Huther, etc.) interpret the word as limiting ταῖας. "He who is without the virtues mentioned in i. 5-7 is blind, or to put it more exactly is shortsighted; he cannot see the things of heaven, though he may be quick enough in regard to worldly matters." κλῆσιν λαβὼν. A periphrastic form. Cf. Jos. Ant. ii. 6, 9; also 2 Tim. i. 5, Heb. xii. 29. τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. Is the reference to baptism? This view is rendered very probable by the use of πάλαι. For the idea of cleansing from pre-baptismal sin, cf. Barnabas, xi. 11, Hermas, Mand. iv. 3, Vis. ii. 1. Spitta adheres to the general interpretation of καθαρίζω as the work of Christ on the moral life. Cf. i. 20-22, 1 Jn. iii. 3. While καθαρισμὸς is used of the ceremonial washings of the Jews, John iii. 25, it is also used of the work of Christ in Heb. i. 3 (cf. Zahn. Introd. ii. 232).

Ver. 10. στοιχεῖασαι. An Imperative. "A sharp and urgent form" (Moulton, Proleg. i. 173). Βεβαιαί. Cf. Deissmann, B. S. pp. 105 ff. The word has a legal sense. Βεβαιωθείτε is the legal guarantee, obtained by a buyer from a seller, to be gone back upon should any third party claim the thing. Here the readers are exhorted to produce a guarantee of their calling and election. This may be done by the cultivation of the Christian graces, Cf. Eph. iv. 1. "To walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye are called." κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν. What is the difference between these two? καλὲς used in Gospels = "bid to a feast". κλῆσις would, therefore, imply those hidden; ἐκλογή = those who have become true partakers of God's salvation. Cf. Matt. xxii. 14. Not all who hear the Divine Voice (κλῆσιν) progress in Christian conduct, which is the token of ἐκλογήν. οὐ μὴ πεισθῆναι as a blind or shortsighted person might do.

Ver. 11. Note the accumulation in this verse of words suggesting splendour and fulness. ἐπιχορηγήθησατα. Cf. note on v. 5. Mayor says that here the word "suggests the ordering of a triumphal procession," and compares Plut. Vit. 994, ὁ δήμος θεάτρῳ τῶν θεάτων ἁμαρτῶν παύσας ἐφορευθήσαται. ἐσοδός. Cf. Heb. x. 19. In a theatre, σκηνή is the place of entrance for the chorus (Ar. Nub. 326; Av. 296), and in P. Par. ii. 41, we find ἐσοδός κοινῆς = of the door of a house.

The great description of the entrance of the pilgrims into the celestial city in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, Pt. i., may be quoted in illustration. ἐσοδόν βασιλεύσεως does not occur elsewhere in N.T. or Apostolic Fathers (cf. Aristotle's Apol. xvi., and Clem. Hom. x. 25), but ἐσοδῶν ἐφορεύει occurs in the Stratonicean inscriptions already quoted (Deissmann, op. cit. p. 361). Vv. 12-15. The aim of the writer, and the urgency of his message. "You are already acquainted with and established in the truth, so far as revealed to you, but, in view of the great issues, I shall always be prepared to awaken you to a sense of these things. In my lifetime I feel bound to do so, especially as I know that death is imminent, as Jesus declared to me. I shall also do my best to enable you to refer to these things as opportunities occur, even after my decease."

Ver. 12. μελλόνων. What is the exact significance of the future? It can hardly be simply a periphrastic future. "The idea is rather that the writer will be prepared in the future, as well as in the past and in the present to remind them of the truths they know, whenever the necessity arises." (Zahn. Introd., ii., p. 211; quoted with approval by Nestle. Text. Criticism of N.T. pp. 333-334). ἐντρήμων. This word is used by Jesus in the warning given of Peter's fall, and its spiritual result. καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέψας στήματος τοῖς ἁμαρτοῦσιν (Lk. xxii. 32). Cf. 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Pet. iii. 17, where ἐστρήμως = "stead-
A poetical word peculiar to 2 Peter in N.T. The process described by ἀπόθεσις can hardly be “sudden,” Plat. Ref. 553d, but there is always an impression of suddenness to the onlooker, who lifts up his eyes some morning, and finds the tent or the encampment gone where he had seen it yesterday. An inscription in C.I.A. III. 1344, reads ἦσας καὶ καρακτόν τέρμα δραμόν ταχίνων, where sense can only be “brief” (but see discussion in Zahn. Introd., ii., pp. 212 ff.). ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκην. ἀποστέλλω is used of “putting off a garment” (Acts vii. 58); and might here be connected with the idea of taking off a tent-cover (So Spitta). Probably “removal” is the proper translation. In B.G.U. 606 (iv. a.d.) ἐκδρόμος ἀπόθεσις ἀγρέων (for removal of a chaff-heap) is found. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21, “οὗ σταράσσει νόστου, καθὼς καὶ ἐνθάλασσεν μοι. There seems no reason to doubt the reference here to John xxi. 18, 19, as Spitta and others have done (see Introduction, pp. 188 f.).

Ver. 14. ταχίνη “imminent,” cf. ii. 1. A poetical word peculiar to 2 Peter in N.T. The process described by ἀπόθεσις can hardly be “sudden,” Plat. Ref. 553d, but there is always an impression of suddenness to the onlooker, who lifts up his eyes some morning, and finds the tent or the encampment gone where he had seen it yesterday. An inscription in C.I.A. III. 1344, reads ἦσας καὶ καρακτόν τέρμα δραμόν ταχίνων, where sense can only be “brief” (but see discussion in Zahn. Introd., ii., pp. 212 ff.). ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκην. ἀποστέλλω is used of “putting off a garment” (Acts vii. 58); and might here be connected with the idea of taking off a tent-cover (So Spitta). Probably “removal” is the proper translation. In B.G.U. 606 (iv. a.d.) ἐκδρόμος ἀπόθεσις ἀγρέων (for removal of a chaff-heap) is found. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21, “οὗ σταράσσει νόστου, καθὼς καὶ ἐνθάλασσεν μοι. There seems no reason to doubt the reference here to John xxi. 18, 19, as Spitta and others have done (see Introduction, pp. 188 f.).

Ver. 15. στούνδασον. The form is used by Polybius and later writers for the classical στουνδασμα. ἐκάστοτε goes with ἔχειν = “on each occasion when you have need.” The word is found apparently in the same sense in P. Gen. 31. ἐκάστοτε σοι κατ’ ἐνθήσεας παρενόησαν (“causing you annoyance on each occasion when you are at home”). τὴν τούτων μνήμην τοιοῦτον. What is the reference in τούτων? It must have the same reference as in verse 12, viz. to the practice of the Christian graces, and the larger reference must be to some systematic body of instruction. This might easily take the form of reminiscences of the example of Jesus Himself, and the allusion may be to the Petrine reminiscences contained in the Gospel of St. Mark (cf. meta δι τὴν τούτων [Peter and Paul] ἔδωκε Μάρκος τά ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσ-σύμματα ἐγγράφων ἢ ἡμῖν παραδόθηκεν Iren. iii. i. 1.). “He has already referred to Christ (v. 3), as having called them ἐδόθη καὶ ἐστητήτ”; surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that Peter should leave behind the picture of this δόξα καὶ ἐστητής drawn from his own recollection. And the following words, οὗ γὰρ συνεφοβόμενος κ.π.λ. (v. 16) seem to imply a statement of facts” (Mayor, cxiii., where see whole discussion against Zahn. Introd. ii., pp. 199 ff.). ἔδωκεν. The same word is used in Luke ix. 32 of the death of Christ. It seems to include the thought of subsequent glory (cf. Expl. v. 73 f. cf. Smith, Days of His Flesh, p. 274 f.) The meaning “death” is found in B.G.U. 168 (ii.-iii. a.d.). τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν (τοῦ) Εὐθαμάνας ἔδωκεν. τὴν τούτων μνήμην τοιοῦτον: “refer
always in Greek writers, from Herodotus down = "mentionem facere, "make mention of" (cf. Grimm-Thayer under μνήμη). The sense here seems much the same. The document "referred to" would be an authentic source of information. Cf. P. Fay, 1910 (ii. A.D.) "σαρκοβοστάτην μνήμην ποιούμενον.

Vv. 16-18. The fact of the Transfiguration as a guarantee of the writer's truthfulness. "For we are not without facts to rest upon. Our preaching of the power and coming of Jesus Christ was not based on sophistical myths. We were eye-witnesses of His Majesty. For He received from God the Father honour and glory, a voice coming to Him through the splendour of the glory, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased'. This voice we heard, as it was borne from heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount." (For a comparison of this passage, see the Synoptic account, see Introduction, pp. 186 ff.)

Ver. 16. σεισωματικὸς μισθὸς. Cf. σεισωματική μητρία; "suppositional mother". Greg. Nyssa. i. 171 D. This is evidently the character attributed to the facts of the Christian Gospel by the False Teachers. They specially sought to discredit the outlook for the Second Advent. μισθὸς is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful Gnostic genealogies (1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; Tit. i. 14). ἐγνώρισμαν. Used in N.T. of preaching the Gospel (e.g. 1 Cor. xv. 1). συνάμεναι καὶ συνεταιν. For collocation of words, cf. Matt. xxiv. 30, Mark ix. 1. For συναμεν, see note on verse 3. παρουσίαν. Chase (op. cit. 797a) regards the word here as denoting the first coming of Christ, because (1) the context speaks of history and not of prophecy; (2) the word itself naturally bears this meaning. He admits, however, that elsewhere in the N.T. and in this Epistle it is used of the Second Coming (cf. Ignat. Philad. 9). Justin (Dialogue 32) distinguishes "two advents,—one in which He was pierced by you; a second, when you shall know Him, Whom you have pierced". There is, however, no real difficulty here in taking παρα in the usual sense, which, indeed, is more in harmony with the context. The Transfiguration itself, as used by this writer, is regarded as a basis for belief in the Second Advent, against the False Teachers.

Dr. Milligan, in his recent edition of Thessalonians, gives a valuable note on παρουσία (p. 145). He mentions that it occurs frequently in the Papyri as a kind of terminus technicus with reference to the visit of the king, or some other official. (P. Petr. ii. 39 (e), 18 (iii. n.c.). P. Tebt. 48, 13 f. (ii. B.C.), 116 (ii. n.c.). P. Gren., ii. 14 (b), 2 (iii. b.c.).) Dittenberger, Sylloge, 226, 64 ff. (iii. n.c.). τῶν δὲ ἀρχαίων συναμενάσθην ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸν τῆς παρουσίας ἐμφανιστάντων βασιλέα. "We fall back upon" these examples of the word "the more gladly because for this particular sense of the word the Jewish sacred writings give us little help" (ibid.). The word must, therefore, have come into use, in this application to the Second Advent, in apostolic times, as faithfully representing the meaning of Jesus Himself (cf. Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39). The usual classical sense of the word as "presence" must not be disregarded. Taken together with the other meaning illustrated by the Κοινή, παρουσία would thus seem to combine in itself the meaning of "actual presence," and a near "coming". This combination of meaning in the consciousness of the early Church, with its perplexity as to the interpretation of our Lord's promise, would seem to be reflected in John xvi. 16-18. πετάται: used of those who had attained the highest degree of initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. Judging from the use of πετάται in 1 Peter, the word may have passed into ordinary speech, but no doubt is used here to enhance the splendour of the vision, and the honour done the disciples, at the Transfiguration—"admitted to the spectacle of His grandeur" (Moffat, H. N. T. p. 600). παρουσίας is applied to God in Esth. v. 1, 2 Macc. vii. 35, cf. O.G.I.S., 666b τὸν Ἡλιὸν Αἴμαχων πετάτην καὶ σωτήρα (reference to an Egyptian Sun-god). Hofmann holds that the reference is rather to the Resurrection and Ascension. μεγαλαυστητος. Cf. Luke ix. 43, Acts xix. 27.
Ver. 17. λαβὼν. It is well-nigh impossible to say what is the case agreement of the participle here. It is at least certain that the subject is Jesus. Dietlein, Schott, Ewald, and Mayor agree that the writer intended to go on, ἐβασίλευσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, for which he substitutes καὶ ἢμών ἐβασίλευσεν, after the parenthetic 18th verse. See Hort's note, 1 Pet. i. 2. The usage (without the article) indicates the growth of a special Christian terminology. The two words are treated as one proper name. τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν. A frequent combination, cf. Ps. viii. 6. Job. xl. 10. 1 Pet. i. 7. Rom. ii. 7, 10, 1 Tim. i. 17. Heb. ii. 7, 9. τιμὴ is the personal honour and esteem in which Jesus is held by the Father, cf. Hort's note on 1 Pet. i. 7. "Honour in the voice which spoke to Him; glory in the light which shone from Him" (Alford). φωτὶς ... τοιαύτης. This is the only instance of τοιαύτης in N.T. = "to the following effect". ἐν τῷ μεγαλοπρεπώ ἰδίᾳ. Reverting reading ἵνα, we may regard μεγ. ἰδίᾳ as a vehicle of expression. The voice expresses its significance. It is not a mere accompanying phenomenon of the voice. Cf. the instrumental dative in i. 21 after ἰδίᾳ, τιμήν ἰδίᾳ corresponds to "the bright cloud" (νεφέλη φωτεινῆ) of the Synoptics. ὁρατὸς is used in verse 18 to describe the source from which the voice came; “the sky,” cf. iii. 23, 13. ἐν ἐν ἰδίᾳ εὐδόκησα. Moulton (Proleg. p. 63) points out that this tendency in N.T. is for ἐν to encroach on the domain of ἐν. Cf. John i. 18, ἐν ἐλέῳ τὸν κλάτων (ib. p. 235).

Ver. 18. ἐν τῷ δραίῳ τῷ ἀγίῳ. The phrase indicates a view of the place and incident which has been taken up into and sanctified in the religious consciousness of the Church. The Gnostic Acts of Peter use the phrase "in monte sacro". ἀγίος signifies a place where Jehovah manifested Himself, cf. Exod. iii. 5. Isa. lxi. 1.

Vv. 19-21. The Transfiguration con-

forms Prophecy. "Thus we have still further confirmation of the words of the prophets, a fact to which you would do well to give heed, as to a lamp shining in a murky place, meant to serve until the Day break and the Day-Star arise in your hearts. Recognise, above all this, that no prophecy is restricted to the particular interpretation of one generation. No prophecy was ever born through the instrumentality of man's will, but men spoke, direct from God, impelled by the Holy Spirit."

Ver. 19. ἐβασίλευσεν. Originally a legal term. See note v. 10; cf. Phil. i. 7, 2 Cor. i. 21. τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, i.e. all in the O.T. scriptures that points to the Coming of the Messiah. The prophecy is now supported by its partial fulfilment in the Transfiguration. καὶ ἢμῶν τοιαύτης προφέτης, "to which ye do well to take heed." "καὶ ποιήσομεν τὰ τελευταία γεγονότα τῶν προφητῶν τῶν προφητῶν." Morning - star. Not found elsewhere in Biblical Greek. The LXX word is ἱεροφόροι. In the poets, the word is always applied to Venus (Cicero, Nat. Deorum, 2, 20).

This verse has been much discussed. It may be well to mention three grammatical points that emerge. (1) The reference of φ. It is simplest to understand it as referring to the content of the preceding clause, and not to τῶν προφητῶν λόγον alone, viz. the fact that the προφητικὸν λόγον is now βασιλεύων on account of the Transfiguration. (2) ἰδίᾳ ἐν κ.τ.λ. is to be taken with φανερῶν, not with προφήτης. (3) ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ is connected
1 Peter 2.20—21.

1 Peter 2.20.

"Recognising this truth above all else" (in your reading of Scripture). The False Teachers appealed to the O.T. scriptures in support of their doctrine. "No prophecy of S. is of such a kind that it can be nullified." But no satisfactory instance of ἐπιλύσεως in this sense can be adduced. (2) Accepting the sense of 18. ἐπιλύσις = "private," or "human interpretation," Von Soden sees a reference to the methods of the false teachers in their attitude to Scripture (cf. v. 16, ii. 1). ἡ γενικὴ ἐπιλύσις "is opposed to the φωνὴ ἐννοήσεως of i. 17." (3) It seems most satisfactory to understand 18. ἐπιλύσις as the meaning of the prophet himself, or what was in the prophet's mind when he wrote: the fulfilment in any particular generation or epoch. "The special work of the prophet is to interpret the working of God to his own generation. But in doing this, he is laying down the principles of God's action generally. Hence there may be many fulfilsments of one prophecy, or to speak more exactly, many historical illustrations of some one principle of Providential Government" (Mayor, p. 196). The genitive ἐπιλύσιμος is gen. of definition and not of origin. "No prophecy is of such a nature as to be capable of a particular interpretation."

1 Peter 2.21.

"αὐτοὶ γὰρ θελόμενοι ἀνθρώπου ἡμῶν ἐπιλύσεως ὑποτελεῖται." With ἡμῶν cf. vv. 17, 18. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ... φορέμουν, cf. Acts ii. 2. ἔστερον φορέμην τῶν βιασμῶν. Here we have the only reference to the Holy Spirit in the Epistle, and only in this connexion, viz. as the source of prophetic inspiration. The spirit is an agency rather than an agent. The men speak. The spirit impels. It is of much signific-
ance for the interpretation of the whole passage that ᾰφος occupies a position of emphasis at the end of the sentence, thus bringing into prominence the human agent. The prophets were not ignorant of the meaning of their prophecies, but they saw clearly only the contemporary political or moral situation, and the principles involved and illustrated therein.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-3. The False Teachers and their Judgment. "Yet there were also false prophets in the ancient community, just as among you there will be false teachers. They will not hesitate to introduce alongside the truth corrupting heresies, even denying their Redeemer, and bringing on themselves swift destruction. Many will imitate their vicious example, and thereby the way of truth will be discredited. Nay, further, actuated by covetousness, they will make merchandise of you by lying words. Yet you must not think that the judgment passed on all such long ago is inactive. Their destruction is awaiting them."

Ver. 1. Ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ. ἐν τῷ λαῷ is used for the chosen people in LXX. Ψευδοπροφήται. A class of False Prophets is frequently mentioned in the O.T. In the earlier ages it is not suggested that there was conscious deceit on the part of the prophet. His prophecy is false, if it is proved so by the event (Jer. xxvii. 9). "When a prophet lies, without being inspired by a false or impotent god, it is because God in His anger against Israel's sin means to destroy him, and therefore put into the prophets a lying spirit". (Schulz. O.T. Th. i. 257). Cf. 1 Kings xxii. 5 ff. These are the prophets who cry "peace, peace," when God is really going to bring judgment. In the later period superstitious acts and pagan practices, such as spiritualism, ventriloquism, professional sooth-saying, became common (e.g. Jer. xxvii. 9; Isa. viii. 19). The cardinal distinction between the true and the false prophet lay in the moral character of their teaching (Jer. xxviii. 21, 23). Ψευδοδιάδρακαλος. The characteristics of their teaching are well-marked in this Epistle. See Introduction, pp. 207 ff. Compare Phil. iii. 18 f., "enemies of the Cross," who brought tears of shame to the eyes of the Apostle; the abuses of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. xi.; also Galat. ii. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 13.

Παρεισάξουν. What is the force of παρα;? The idea of "stealth" or "secrecy"—"stealthily to introduce"—is hardly in accord with their character described elsewhere as τολμαίοι αθώοι, δέος οὐ μεριομοί βλαφημούντες (ii. 10). Rather the idea seems to be of the introduction of false teaching alongside the true, whereby the δίκαιος δικαιος is brought into disrepute. Cf. παρεισετευχάντες, i. 5. The idea of stealth is present in παρεισάσθωσιν (Gal. ii. 5). αὐτοκείμενοι. Clearly αὐτόκειμεν here is used in original sense of "tenet" ("animus," "sententia") (So Spitta, von Soden. Weiss, but cf. Zahn., op. cit. ii. 233). In Galat. v. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 19, the sense is "dissensions," arising from such diversity of opinion. It is used in the sense of "sect" in Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxiv. 5. The Ψευδοδιάδρακαλοι were within the Church. Even the "Alogi," who disputed the fourth Gospel in second century, were not excommunicated. They were, as Epiphanius says, "one of ourselves". Cf. M.M.E., Epiph. Feb. 1908. αὐτοκείμενος ἀναλείπει. The Genitive contains the qualifying idea—"corrupting tenets". Our identification with a great cause may be maintained, as in the case of the false teachers, but personal motives may sadly deteriorate, and the influence of the life may breed corruption. Cf. Ignat. Trau. vi. 1; Eph. vi. 2 καὶ τὸν ἀγωρό... ἀρνομούντο καὶ = "even". Cf. Mark i. 27. If the ordinary use of διαφοράς in early Christian writers is followed here, εἰσι, as referring to God, ἀγωρός would also be used of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. vii. 23). The reference here, however, is to Christ (cf. Mayor, p. xviii.). The N.T. use of ἀγωρός is illustrated in 1 Cor. vi. 20, where reference might be to God; but in ib. vii. 23 reference is clearly to Christ. So in Rev. v. 9. Cf. our Lord's words in Mark x. 45, about "giving his life a ransom" and Jude v. 47. The "denial" seems to have consisted in an inadequate view of the Person and Work of Christ, and their relation to the problem of human sin. Cf. Επ. of Peter, J. H. Jowett, pp. 230 ff. ταχύνων. See note on i. 14. ἐνέγοντες. The
middle might have been expected. Cf. v. 5, where the active is suitably used.

Ver. 2. ἀσελγείας are "acts of lasciviousness". ἄδεστος is the root-idea of "genuineness". It combines the ideas of the knowledge of God and His purposes in Christ; and of the human obligation to right living that springs from it. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light." The writer of 2 Peter is, as always, concerned to oppose a merely intellectual Gnosticism, which has its ultimate fruit in immorality. Cf. Ps. cxxix. 29, 30.

The whole Church suffered in reputation because of these men. Cf. Rom. ii. 24, i Tim. vi. 1.

Ver. 3. ἐκτελεσθήσασθαι means "to suffer". ἔργον is causal. τιμωρία means "censure" (Lachmann, Westcott, Blass). Luke xii. 15. ἐργάται here only in N.T., "manufactured," "feigned," "artificial". ἐπορευόμενοι Originally used in intrans. sense = "go a-trading". Cf. Jas. iv. 11. Then = "import," in trans. sense. Here = "make gain of," "exploit". Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 17, i Tim. vi. 5.

οὐκ ἐκτελεσθεὶς σε αὐτῷ. But having cast them into Tartarus, gave them over to chains of darkness, reserving them for judgment. He spared not the ancient world, but guarded Noah, with seven others, while the impious world was overthrown by a flood. So Divine judgment was extended to the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which were overwhelmed by ashes, and overthrown by earthquake, as an example of what is in store for impious persons, while righteous Lot was delivered, grieved and wearied as he was by the profligate life of the lawless. For day after day this man with his righteous instincts, in his life among them, was vexed with the sight and sound of their lawless deeds. In all this we have a proof that the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of trial, and to keep the ungodly under discipline until the day of judgment, especially those who follow the polluting lusts of the flesh and despise authority. It seems to mean "a golden chain" in II. viii. 19, 25. Plato, Theaetetus, i. 53 C. The meaning "skirt" peculiar to Peter (for var. lect. σημεῖον, see text. note). παρατηρῶτας = "cast into Tartarus". The verb is a ἀπαί οὐγ. τάρταροι occurs in three passages of LXX. (Job xi. 15 (40), xii. 22 (23), Prov. xxiv. 51 (xxx. 16): but in one of these there is no corresponding idea in the Hebrew. The word also occurs in Enoch xx. 2, where Gehenna is the place of
punishment for apostate Jews, and Tartarus for the fallen angels. In Homer (e.g. I. viii. 13) Hades is the place of confinement for dead men, and Tartarus is the name given to a murky abyss beneath Hades in which the souls of fallen Immortals (Kronos, Japetus, and the Titans) are punished. Hence 2 Peter uses this word in agreement with the Book of Enoch and Greek mythology, because he is speaking of fallen angels and not of men. As regards the cosmology that is here implied, it has been suggested that the earth is not regarded as flat, but the universe is conceived as two concentric spheres, the outer heaven, the inner the earth. The nether half of heaven is Tartarus, and the nether half of the earth is Hades (St. Clair, Expositor, July, 1902). The use of the word by 2 Peter is remarkable as implying an atmosphere of Greek thought in the circle in which he moved, and for which he wrote. ζόφος in Homer is used of the gloom of the nether world, Od. xx. 356, cf. Heb. xii., 18. Also v. 17 and Jude 6, 13. It is implied that fallen angels and unrighteous men alike undergo temporary punishment until the day of their final doom, cf. ver. 9. Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxxviii. 2.

Ver. 5. ἄρχανον κόσμου. The article is omitted, which is not a mark of illiteracy. This chapter is prophetic in form, and the omission of the article is characteristic of that style. Cf. Job. iii. 10, Judges v. 5. (See Mayor, Ed. xxxiv. xxxv.) δικαιοσύνης κόσμου. κόσμος in this sense is used in N.T. only here, and in 1 Tim. ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. 11. 2 Peter again borrows from Jewish tradition as to the preaching of Noah. Cf. Jos. Antiq. i. 3, 1, Clem. Rom. i. 7. κατακλυσμόν, cf. Matt. xxiv. 38, 39, Luke vii. 27, Gen. vi. 17. πτώχευσας. Aorist participle implies continuous action. "He saved N. . . . while he sent, etc." πτώχευσας is used of "setting-on," "letting loose," e.g. "dogs". Odyssey, xix. 445, Xen. Cyr. x. 19. δύσον, "with seven others". Classical Greek usage is to add αὐτὸν. There is much difficulty as to the significance of the numeral. The reference is no doubt to the number of Noah's family. The numeral is placed in a prominent place in the sentence to lay stress on the small number saved out of the inhabited world, as a striking example of mercy in the midst of judgment, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 20. Cf. F. Petr. iii. 28. ἐθέραματοστατετερτοί ρήτοροι ἐν (bis), cf. Abbott, J. G. § 562.

Ver. 6. πάλαις Σολ. καὶ Γεραιπ η. Not genitive of apposition, but cities of the district, where Sodom and Gomorrah were situated. Cf. Jude 7. Σ. καὶ Γ. καὶ αὐτὰς πάλαις κατακρυπτοκατέκρινεν. κατακρυπτοκατέκρινεν is dative of instrument, "condemned them by overthrow". Gen. xix. 24, 25 seems to imply some further destruction after the fire. Perhaps an earthquake is meant, a common accompanying phenomenon of volcanic disturbance. ἐφώδειμα ... τεθηκός, "constituting them an example to ungodly persons of things in store for them." With μᾶλλον. cf. Heb. xi. 20. Col. ii. 17. τεφρῶσας = "cover up with ashes" (not "reduce to ashes") —found in a description of the eruption of Vesuvius. (Dio. Cass. lxvi. p. 1094.)

Ver. 7. καταπανούμενον, the word applied to the condition of the slave whom Moses delivered, Acts vii. 24. It implies outward discomfort. ἐθνών. Cf. iii. 17,
"a stronger word than ἄνωμος, because θωσμός is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law" (Mayor).

Ver. 8. ἑλματε γάρ καὶ ἀκοὴ δικαίος. Two interpretations are possible (1) Instrumental dative after ἐβασάνιζεν, "He vexed his righteous soul by what he saw and heard." The objections are (a) the long interval that separates BL. κ.τ.λ. from ἐβασάνιζεν, (b) that ἑλματε is never elsewhere used of the thing seen, but is used of sight from the subjective, emotional, and volitional point of view. Hence (a), reading δικαίος without the article, and taking BL. κ.τ.λ. with that word, we may translate with the Vulgate "aspectu et auditu justus". His instincts of eye and ear were nobler than those of the society around him. ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας. "Day in, day out." Cf. ἡμέρα καθ ἡμέραν in Ps. lxviii. 19. ἐβασάνιζεν. It is somewhat peculiar that the active should be used. "He vexed, distressed his righteous soul." May it not be that in the use of the active a certain sense of personal culpability is implied? Lot was conscious that the situation was ultimately due to his own selfish choice (cf. von Soden).

Ver. 9. οἶδαν Κύριος, κ.τ.λ. Apo-o-deis to protaosis begun in ver. 4. πενασμόν. See Mayor's note on Jas. i. 2. The idea here is primarily of those surroundings that try a man's fidelity and integrity, and not of the inward inducement to sin, arising from the desires. Both Noah and Lot were in the midst of mockers and unbelievers. This πενασμός is the atmosphere in which faith is brought to full development. It was a condition even of the life of Jesus. ὅπερ ταῦτα ὑμῖν διεσμενοῦσαν μὴ ἴσθωτεν ἐν τοῖς πενασμοῖς μου (Luke xxii. 28). It is the word used by St. Luke of the Temptation (Luke iv. 13). On the one hand, πενασμός is not to be lightly sought (Luke xi. 4), or entered into carelessly (Mark xiv. 38); the situation of πενασμός may itself be the result of sin (1 Tim. vi. 9). On the other hand, it is a joyous opportunity for the development of spiritual and moral strength (Jas. i. 2, 12). πενασμός becomes sin only when it ceases to be in opposition to the will. The word is peculiar to the N.T. δικαίος δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίνεις καλομένους τιτινίαν ἐστὶν; μᾶλλον δὲ τοὺς ὅπως σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἔχοντες. Phil. iv. 1. There is (1) ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ a polluting desire; κυριότερος καταφρονοῦτες. κυριότερος cannot be taken in a purely abstract sense, "despising authority."
is used in the abstract sense of the Lordship of Christ in Didache iv. 1. Honour him who speaks the word of God, ὑμιᾶς τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν, ἕνεκεν ᾗ τῷ κυρίῳ λαλεῖται, ἕνα κυρίου ἅγιον ἁγία τιμή.

As is suggested by this passage in the Didache, we may conclude that by κυρίωτερος καταφρονοῦσα is meant a despising of the Lordship of Christ, which was the central theme of the apostolic teaching and preaching. The writer in ver. 106, goes on to speak of their attitude towards διάβασις or "angelic beings". Cf. Jude 8, κυρίωτερος καταφρονοῦσα, διάβασις ὑπὸ βλασφημοῦσαν. It is true that in Col. i. 16, κυρίωτερος form one of the ranks of angels in the false Gnostic teaching, but there is no indication that the Libertines here spoken of taught any elaborate angelology. On the contrary, they spoke lightly of the Unseen Powers generally. Their teaching seems to have been materialistic in tone. They were

Vv. 106-14 Further description of the False Teachers. "Presumptuous and arrogant, they do not shrink from irreverent speech about the unseen powers, while even angels, who are far superior to these false teachers in greatness and might, do not dare to bring against these powers an irreverent accusation. Their irreverence is therefore of an ignorant type, as of unreasoning animals, who are born creatures of instinct, and are fitted only for capture and destruction. Their destruction will be in keeping, and they will be defrauded of what is really the wages of fraud. Their notion of pleasure is to spend the day in delicate living. They are spots and blemishes, luxuriating in their pleasures, while they feast with you. Their eyes are full of adultery, and they are insatiable in sin, alluring unstable souls. With hearts experienced in covetousness, they are children of the devil.

Ver. 106. τομυραλᾶς αἰθάδες, αἰθ. is to be taken as an epithet of τομυραλᾶς. The idea in τομυραλᾶς is of shameless and irreverent daring. αἰθάδες (ἀγγέλων and ἤμοιοι) = "self-willed," "arrogant." In 1 Tim. i. 7, the ἀγγέλοις must not be αἰθάδες, where the thought seems to be of irresponsibility in regard to the community. Cf. Didache iii. 6, μὴ γίνου
We may note the tendency in 2 Peter exemplified here to put in general terms what Jude states in the particular, in the story of Michael and Satan. The particulars of Jude are omitted (as also the name Enoch afterwards) in order to avoid direct reference to apocryphal writings. Accordingly the sentence, ὡς φθορὰν καὶ αὐτῶν ἁλασμόν κρίνην, is only intelligible by reference to Jude, where Michael does not himself condemn Satan, but says ἐπέτιθησαν σοι κύριος. Cf. note on ἀλασμόντες, v. 10.

Ver. 12. γεγενημένα φυσικά—“born creatures of instinct.” Instinct is here distinguished from the rational centres of thought and judgment. They are ἄλογα ζώα. Their chief characteristic is that they are “alive,” and have no sense of the moral issues of life. Like animals, they exist ἐν ἁλασμῶν καὶ φθορᾶν. ἐν οἷς ἁλασμοῦντας ἀλασμόντες = ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄλογος καὶ φύσις ἀτιμητικός. "Speaking lightly of things they are ignorant of." Spiritually they are incapable. They know not what they do, in thus clouding moral issues. ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαράσσω. Here is a subtle example of the dependence of this epistle upon Jude. In Jude 10, we have ἐν τούτων φθαράσσω, referring to ἑαυτῷ φυσικὸν ἐπιτίθεντα. The sense in 2 Peter is confused, and there is no distinction between the two kinds of knowledge, although the intended meaning in both passages is the same. Cf. Rom. viii. 5, 6.

Ver. 13. ἄλογοντεις μετὰν ἄλογον ἄλογον (cf. v. 12). This playing upon words is characteristic of 2 Peter. ἄλογον has usually the sense of “doing harm to” (cf. Acts xxxvi. 10; Galat. iv. 12). Here it would seem to mean “being defrauded of the wages of fraud,” or “being done out of the wages of wrong-doing.” It has been customary to see in this phrase an illustration of the irresponsible use of women in 2 Peter. “Another example of the author’s love of far-fetched and artificial expressions” (Mayor). In P. Eleph., however 2725/ (iii. B.C.), the writers ask for a receipt with reference to a certain business transaction. τοῦτον δὲ γεγενημένον ἀπὸ φθορᾶς ὑποδόθηκεν "this having been arranged, we shall not be defrauded." To this may be added Mayor’s citation of Plut. Cato Mi. 17 (p. 706) εἶραν κρᾶς τῇ τεσσαροῦς τοῖς παλαιοίς ἠμαρτοντες καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις τοιαύταις ἐργασάμενοι, ἐπειδὴ ἦσαν ἄλογον ἄλογον ἄλογον ἄλογον. The accusative rall after ἄλογον is very unusual. In classical writers it is found only with ἄλογον ἄλογον suggests the experience of Balaam, of whom the same expression is used in ver. 15, who never received his promised hire from Balak (Num. xxiv. 11). Death deprives the false teachers of all their reward. For significance of the name “Balaam,” in connexion with the false teachers, see Introduction, p. 210. ἄλογον in N.T. only in a bad sense, cf. Luke viii. 14, Tit. iii. 3, Jas. iv. 13. τρυφεία only in N.T. in Luke vii. 25 where it is used of “delicate living,” a luxurious life, but with no special blame attached. The word is also used of gifts of wisdom in Prov. iv. 9, cf. Ps. xxxvi. 8, “the river of thy pleasures.” Eden is called χώρας ἔντρυφης, Gen. ii. 15, iii. 13, 24, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ "in the day-time," "in broad day-light." ἄλογον καὶ μέμοι, cf. Ephes. v. 27, 2 Pet. iii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 19, Jude 12. μέμοι "reproach," "disgrace." Cf. Hort. on 1 Pet. i. 19, where he traces the way in which μέμοι and ἄλογον came to be used with superficial meaning of "blemish," cf. Ephes. i. 4, v. 27, Heb. ix. 14. ἐντρυφῆς: "to be luxurious," cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 1, 30. "in the ἄλογον ἄλογον: to be taken with ἐντρυφὴ. ἄλογον is a favourite word of Hermas (Mand. viii. 5) and is frequently joined by him with τρυφὴ (Mand. xi. 12 and throughout Parable 6). According to Deissmann, ἄλογον in popular Hellenistic has the meaning "pleasure." Cf. Matt. xii. 22 — Mark iv. 19 (Luke viii. 14), (see his Hellenisierung des semitischen Monothelis-
A detailed analysis and interpretation of the Greek text of 2 Peter 2:12-15 and Jude 12, examining the possible misreadings and context. The text discusses the nature of spiritual vision and the depth of empathy in Balaam's story. It highlights the importance of recognizing spiritual depth and the power of empathy in connecting with others.
justice of the God who made them both, a cry of which we may be sure it has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. When animals are put to unnecessary suffering, either in the shambles or as beasts of burden, or in the interests of science or sport, or for any other reason, cases are sure to arise in which we may justly apply the words of our Epistle, and say of such poor tortured creatures that with their dying gaze, no less clearly than if they had spoken with man's voice, they forbade the madness of their torturers" (Mayor, p. 203). Cf. F. W. Robertson, Sermons, pp. 40 f.

Ver. 16. ηλαβων...και...τις...ο...και...ο...οργεται...και...ο...ορɡεται...και...ο...οργεται...και...ο...ο...
abuse, and might easily be dangerous to recent converts from heathenism. See Mayor's note, ed. p. 175. 

The gradual decay of spiritual and moral sense that follows on wilful self-indulgence.  

Ver. 20. Here, again, yap loosely introduces the subject of the victims allured by the false teachers away from their former faith.  

20. εἴς γὰρ τὰς ἁπάντας τῶν κόσμων ἐγνώκει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ, τούτοις ἐν πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἢττον, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐξώνομα χείρων τῶν πράξεων.  

Ver. 21. ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν ὑμῖν τὴν ἀρετήν. A strong ethical note pervades the teaching of 2 Peter.

Ver. 22. τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας παρομοία: "the content of the true proverb" has been "verified," or "realised" in their case. The first proverb is found in Prov. xxvi. 11. The second is apparently not derived from a Hebrew source. Both are quoted familiarly in an abbreviated form (cf. WM. p. 445). The interpretation of the second is an exegetical crux. Biggs takes λουσάμην = "having bathed itself in mud". The sense is, "not that the creature has washed itself clean in water (so apparently the R.V.), still less that it has been washed clean (as A.V.), and then returns to the mud; but that having once bathed in filth it never ceases to delight in it".

This, however, is to force the meaning of λουσάμην, which is consistently used of washing with water. Again, the point of the proverb is to illustrate τὰ ἐξώνομα χείρων τῶν πράξεων. The dups of the false teachers were cleansed and returned to pollution.

The question is important whether λουσάμην is Middle or Passive? Dr. Rendel Harris (Story of Akìkar, p. lxxvii.) may have discovered the original proverb in the following, appearing in some texts of Akìkar. "My son, thou hast behaved like the swine which went to the bath with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it." If this be the source of the παρομοία, λ. is Middle (Moulton, Proleg. pp. 238-39).

A friend of my own, with a knowledge of animals, tells me that the pig is often washed in certain forms of dishaalth, to open the pores of the skin. The animal, being unprotected by hair, finds the sun's heat disagreeable, and wallows again in the mud for coolness. The dried mud protects the skin from the rays. θερμόροφος found only here and in
Chapter III.—Vv. 1-4. Prophets and apostles have warned us that delay will lead to denial of the Second Advent.

For I am now writing my second letter to you. In both I seek to rouse you to honest reflection on the words formerly spoken by the holy prophets, and on the commandment of our Lord delivered by your missionaries. Especially realise the truth of their warning, that there will come in the last days scoffers, with scoffing questions, walking after their own lusts, and saying, 'Where is the promise of His appearing?' For,' say they, 'from the time the fathers fell asleep, everything remains as it has been from the beginning of creation.'


eīlkarp̣: cf. i Cor. v. 8, 2 Cor. i. 22, ii. 17. Phil. i. 10. eīlkarp̣ ἄνωσαν is a technical philosophic term used by Plato. Phaed. 66 A = "pure reason," such as the geometer employs. In Phaed. 81 C, ἐλευθερία is opposed to ψυχή, a mind uncontaminated and unwarped by sensual passion. The opposite state is described in Plato, Phaed. 81, "She thinks nothing true, but what is bodily, and can be touched and seen, and eaten and drunk, and used for men's lusts."

Ver. 2. Borrowed from Jude 17. μηθηρήν: expository infinitive. See grammatical note. καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων κ.τ.λ. Double possessive genitive "of the Lord's command delivered by your apostles." Chase (op. cit. p. 51) suggests that διὰ should be inserted after τῆς, and compares the title of the Didache, διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς διδασσόμενοι. ἀντιλήπτωσις—teaching of our Lord on the fulfilment of the moral law, cf. ii. 21. John xii. 22. ἀποστόλων: Are the Twelve meant? cf. Introd. pp. 195-6. Probably ἀπ. signifies just those from whom they received the first knowledge of the gospel, accredited missionaries of the Church. The word is used of Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 25, and of other than apostles, 2 Cor. vii. 23.

Ver. 3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκομεν. Accusative is required, but all MSS. have nominative, cf. Jude 18. ἐν ἐχάθειν τῶν ἡμέρων. Mockers are one of the signs of the approach of the end, cf. i John ii. 18. ἐν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκκαίρως:
Ver. 5. λαυθάνει γάρ αὕτη τῷ τοῦτο. "This escapes their notice." τῶν is nominative. "full" or "of their own purpose." ἐκταλαί (cf. note, ii. 3): "originally," i.e. before the creation of the world. The Rabbinical school of Shammai held that Gen. i. 1, ἐκ ἀρχῆς ἐκταλαίνει θέες τῶν ὀφέων καὶ τῆς γῆς meant that the heaven was in existence before the six days' work, i.e. ἐκταλαί. Perhaps this notion is present here, ἐκ ὀφέων καὶ ἐκ ὀφέων. Two kinds of water are meant. The first may refer to the primeval watery chaos—"the face of the waters" (Gen. i. 2). The second is perhaps connected with the formation of the dry land by "the gathering together of the waters into one place" (Gen. i. 9). But the meaning is obscure (cf. Mayor, ed. lxxxiii.; Chase, op. cit. 797). συνεστῶσαν="was formed." Cf. Philo, i. p. 330. ἐκ γῆς καὶ ὀφέων καὶ ὀφέων συνεστῶσαν δὲ ὁ κόσμος. The above interpretation is in substantial agreement with Alford's, who distinguishes "the waters above the firmament," and "the fountains of the great deep." The Hebrew had no notion of evaporation. The rivers run into the sea, and the water returns subterraneously to its sources again (Ecclus. i. 7).

Ver. 6. ηῶν. Mayor and Schmiedel, against the evidence of nearly all manuscripts, read ηῶν. This is rendered unnecessary (1) if the above rendering of ἐκ ὀφέων κ.τ.λ. is taken, and the plural ηῶν refers to the two waters. ηῶν would refer to ὕδωρ alone, or (2) if ηῶν refers to ὑδάτων and ὕδατα taken together, which would in some ways suit the sense of the whole passage better. The false teachers had ignored the agency of the Divine word. κατακλυσθεὶς; ἦν λεγ. in N.T.; found several times in P.Tebt. e.g. 54, 58 (b.c. 86) [ἐκτού ... συμβεβηκαν κατακλυσθή- ντα "So that in consequence of what happened, it was flooded"; 566 (late ii. b.c.) γινομένης ἢ περὶ τοῦ κατακλυ- σθεὶς τῷ πέδιον "but know about our plain having been inundated".}
7. οἱ δὲ τοῦ ὄραντος καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ ἀντὶ εἰς ημέραν κρίσεως καὶ απωλείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 8. Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λαθανέω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, οὓς μὲν ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χλὶδα ἐτής καὶ χλὶδα ἐτής ἡ ἡμέρα μιᾶ. 9. οὐ δὲ βραβεύει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὡς τοὺς βραβεύσεις ἡγούμενα, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενος τινα ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ τάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χαρῆσαι. 10. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς

τὴν ἐντώπιον ἈΒΠ, υλ. γ., σαβ., βοβ., ΨΗ., Τι.; τὴν ἐντὼν ΝΣΚΛ, σύγ., Τρεγ.

Ver. 7. τοῦτο τοποθητεύονται. According to the Jewish conception of the rainbow promise, water would not again be the destructive agency. The heaven and the earth are reserved for destruction by fire. τεθησαυρίαν: "set apart for". The writer means that both the rainbow promise and the delay are not to be regarded as implying that there will be no more great cosmic changes.

The idea of the association of a great cosmical change with the coming of Christ is an interesting one. It involves the question of our environment when the natural is exchanged for the spiritual body. This writer evidently expects not complete annihilation of the present environment, but a "new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (v. 13). St. Paul speaks of "the deliverance of the creation itself from the bondage of corruption into the glory of the liberty of the children of God". "We are not informed as to the nature of our future environment, yet it must be such as to satisfy all the longings, and give scope for all the activities of a perfected humanity" (Mayor, ed. p. 207. See also his most interesting and suggestive note: "Answer to the objection that no change is possible in the material universe"; and with whole passage, vv. 5-7, cf. Ruskin, Sesame and Lilies, p. 24.)

Vv. 8-10. A further argument to explain the apparent delay. "One thing beloved, you must not forget. The sense of the duration of time in the Divine Mind is not the same as in the human. One day is the same to God as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. God must not be judged as slack by human standards, in the fulfilment of His promise. He is better than the promise. He is long-suffering to usward, not willing that some should perish, but that all should come to repentance. We know not when His long-suffering will be exhausted. The day of the Lord will come as a thief. Then the heavens will pass away with hurring noise, and the elements being burned, shall pass away, and the earth and the works of men contained in it, will be made manifest."

Ver. 8. μιὰ ἡμέρα, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Ps. xl. 4. The literal application of this statement to the story of creation, employed by patristic writers, in which one day is interpreted as 1000 years, and therefore the creation in six days really means 6000 years, is of course absurd. On the other hand, it can scarcely be said that the writer of 2 Peter has attained to the conception that the category of time does not exist for the Divine Mind. Rather the meaning is that infinite compassion overrides in the Divine Mind all finite reckoning. Cf. Barnabas, 15, Justin, Dialogue, 81.

Ver. 9. οὐ βραβεύει ... ἡγεῖται. The idea that is combated is that God has made a promise and has not kept it, He is, however, better than His promise. The additional element of His μακροθυμία is brought into play. God is greater than men's conception of Him, especially if theirs is a mechanical view of the universe.—οὐ τίνες βραβεύσητε ἡγεῖται. As nowhere else in the Epistle, here the writer of 2 Peter enables us to view the summit of the Christian Faith, and to rise to a magnificent conception of God. μη βουλόμενος, κ.τ.λ. Delay does not spring from an unwillingness or impotence to perform. His will is not even that "some" should perish, though that is regarded by the writer as inevitable. Are we to see here opposition in the writer's mind to the purely logical interpretation of the Pauline teaching on Predestination? Some will perish, but it is not His Will. His Will is that all should come to repentance. The goodness of God should lead to repentance.

Ver. 10. ἡμέρα Κυρίου. No distinction is made between the Day of the Lord, and the Coming of Christ. This is remarkable, as excluding any idea of mil-
lenarian teaching, which speedily made its appearance in the Early Church. Of
day will surprise those who are clinging to the idea that no change is possible. 
καυτὸς, onomatopoeic, expressing the sound produced by rapid motion through the air, e.g., flight of a bird, or an arrow. It is also used of the sound of a shepherd's pipe. No doubt the sound of a fierce flame is meant.

"It is used of thunder in Luc. Ἰούν. Τραγ. 1; of the music of the spheres in Lamblich, Vit. Pyth. c. 15; Oecumenius says the word is especially used of the noise caused by a devouring flame."

(Mayor, ed. p. 157.) στοιχεία. Spitta interprets στ. as being the spirits that preside over the various parts of nature. But the situation of στ. between γή and οἰωνόμενοι makes it practically certain that the heavenly bodies are meant. The universe consists of οἰωνόμενοι, στοιχεῖα and γῆ, οἰωνόμενοι is the vault of heaven, "the skies". στ. would therefore mean sun, moon and stars. Cf. Justin. Apol. ii. 5, Tryph. 23. Cf. I sa. xxxiv. 4, Joel ii. 30, 31, Matt. xxiv. 29, Apoc. vi. 12-14 in illustration of the Jewish belief that the stars will share in the final destruction of the Last Day, καυσοφόροι. A medical term, used of the heat of fever (καυσοφόρος). This is the only known use of the word applied to inanimate objects. Whether the writer of 2 Peter has here indulged a fondness for unusual words, or whether καυσοφόρα was ever used in other than a medical sense in the Koινή, it is impossible as yet to say. In any case it denotes a violent consuming heat.

εὐφρατησται. The only alternative reading that is worthy of notice in connection with this difficult passage is κατα-
καθήσται, but one would expect a word expressing dissolution, like παρελευσόν-
tαι, or λυθήσται. εὐφρατησται is found in an absolute sense in Clement, Cor. ix. 3 (of Enoch) οὐχ ἐκβιασθεὶς τινὸς ἀνα-
tος, "his death was not brought to light". In 2 Clem. xvi. (see textual note) φεγγα-
ρεται is the paraphrase of εὐφρατησται (cf. Introd. pp. 182 f.).

Vv. 11-16. The ethical value of the Parousia expectation. "Seeing then that all these things are to be dissolved, how great an effect it ought to exercise on our whole moral and religious life, as we look forward to and hasten the coming of the day of God. The skies shall be set on fire and dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fiercest heat, but we look for new skies and a new earth according to His promise, in which righteousness shall find a home. Wherefore, beloved, with such expectations, endeavour to be found in peace, spotless and blameless. Do not reckon the long-suffering of our Lord as an opportunity for licence, but as a means of salvation, as our beloved brother Paul wrote you in the wisdom granted to him. He indeed spoke in all his letters of these things, in which there are some things hard to be understood, which ignorant and unstable persons wrest, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

Ver. 11. λυμένων. Present used for a future. Mayor translates "are in process of dissolution," as though the principle of φθορά were already at work; but this is a conception foreign to the mind of the writer, who uses it only in a moral significance. Nature is "reserved" (θεοπαρεσκευασμένα) for destruction. Dissolution is the goal in sight. πτωτωσάν. "What sort of men." A later form of τοποθέτω. ἡπάρχων implies not merely existence, but existential character. Διαστροφῆς καὶ εὐθείας. The use
of the plural in cases of abstract nouns is peculiar to the writer and to 1 Peter. He emphasises once more the close connexion between morality and religion.

Ver. 12. οὐσίων. Either (1) "earnestly desiring," cf. Isa. xvi. 5, οὐσίων δικαιοσύνης, or (2) preferably, "hastening the coming"; "The Church may be said to bring the day nearer when it prays, 'Thy kingdom come.'" (Bigg). The writer is here referring to the Jewish idea that the sins of men prevented Messiah from appearing. "Si Judaei poenitentiam facerent una die, statim veniret Messias, filius David."

The words are capable of a still more spiritual meaning, which, however, is rather beyond the consciousness of this writer. The kingdom of God is "within" us, and Christians may be said to hasten this coming by holiness of life. Christian conduct is itself both a rebuke to vice and a realisation of the presence of Christ in the hearts of His disciples.

τήκεταί. Again present for future. The phrases in this verse are repeated from ver. 10 in order to introduce the more impressively the idea in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. καὶ οὐράνιον . . . προσθετομένη. Cf. Isa. iv. 7. ἐσται γὰρ τὸ οὐράνιον καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ η οὐράνιον. Ἐνοχ xci. 16. See note on ver. 7. οὐράνιον might appropriately be translated "sky," or οὐσίων δικαιοσύνης κατοικία; "wherein righteousness dwells," or "has its home." In the word there is both the sense of permanence and of persuasive influence. Both in the hearts of men, and the new environment, there will be nothing that militates against righteousness. The Parousia is both judgment on the wicked and triumph for the kingdom. Cf. v. 7.

Ver. 14. ἀστικοὶ καὶ ἄμετροὶ αὐτῷ. αὐτῷ is dative = "in relation to Him," or "in His sight." Cf. Rom. vii. 10. ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία ἡ εἰς Ἰησοῦν αὐτὴν εἰς δόξαν; Ephes. i. 4. εἰναι ἄμετρον κατανύστερον αὐτῶν. For ἀστικοὶ καὶ ἄμετροί, cf. note on v. 13. ἄμετρος occurs in Epistle of Aristeas (ed. Wendland), with reference to sacrificial victims. ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Peace and righteousness are one. Cf. Ps. lxxix. 10. The "well-doers" will be able to meet the Parousia with calm expectation.

Ver. 15. καὶ τὴν τῶν κυρίων . . . ἀγίας. Cf. v. 9. The Divine long-suffering is capable of interpretation as "slackness," or as opportunity for license instead of as σωτηρίαν, an opportunity for repentance. καθός καὶ ὁ ἀγάπητος . . . ἔγραψεν οὐδὲν. The interpretation here largely depends on (1) whether the reference of καθὸς is confined to the idea in the first clause of the verse, or (2) is to be extended to include ἀστικοὶ καὶ ἄμετροί . . . εἰρήνῃ in ver. 14, or (3) is still further extended to include the whole treatment of moral disorder arising from delayed Parousia. In the case of (1) Romans would be the most appropriate among the known canonical epistles. In that epistle the idea of God's long-suffering is most prominent (cf. ii. 4, iii. 25, 26, ix. 22, 23, xi. 22, 23). (2) Almost any of St. Paul's epistles might be meant. (3) If the question of moral disorder arising from difficulties about the παρουσία is placed in the foreground, "none of the existing Pauline Epistles can be in question except 1 Corinthians (in this Church there were very similar extravagances, and the Resurrection was by some denied) and Thessalonians." (Bigg). A decision on this point involves the discussion on the destination of the epistle, for which see Introduction, pp. 205 f. (cf. Zahn., Introd. ii., pp. 211-2). ὁ ἀγαπητὸς . . . πᾶσος need not imply that Paul was alive. κατὰ τὴν δοξάν οὐράνιον σοφίαν. Cf. i Cor. iii. 10, Gal. ii. 9, I Cor. iii. 66, Col. i. 28. Ver. 16. ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς
This statement implies neither the inclusion of all the epistles that have come down to us, nor the formation of a canon. It is much more natural to take it as referring to a collection of letters made not long after Paul's death, and read in the churches. The term ἃ ἀναγέννησαν ἡμῖν ἐκλέξεις in ver. 15 would seem to refer to one whose memory is still quite fresh in the hearts of the readers. Ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ παρὲ ποιῶν: “where he touches on these subjects” (Mayor). παρέ ποιῶν indicates a widening of the reference to include Paul's treatment of the whole question of the Second Coming. The mention of Paul's name here implies a desire on the part of the writer to show that on this point the Pauline and Petrine teaching are at one. The false teachers founded their Antinomian doctrine on Paul's teaching about the Grace of God. This clearly involves that a collection of letters is meant. Ἄνωτατά τις. “What are the διωνύσια referred to? “Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. iii. 5-8), with his apparent disparagement of the law in Rom. iii. 20-28, iv. 15, v. 20, vi. 4, vii. 4-11; his teaching with regard to the πνευματικοι, 1 Cor. i. 13; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council, as to ἐκλέξεις (Acts xv. 20; Rom. 14; 1 Cor. viii.; x. 25); as regards the Resurrection in baptism (Rom. vi. 3-11; Col. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 12); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. ix. 11-21), and the Parousia (2 Th. ii.)” (Mayor). οἱ ἀναθρεμέοι καὶ ἀστήρικτοι. ἀστήρικτος is not used elsewhere in the N.T. It signifies not so much “unlearned” as “uneducated”; a mind untrained and undisciplined in habits of thought, lacking in the moral qualities of a balanced judgment. ἀστήρικτος refers more to conduct, those whose habits are not fully trained and established. The reference of ὁρκοττικος and ἀστήρικτος is of course not to the Libertines, but to a class among the readers. In ver. 17 ὅστρομος is used of the readers, in distinction to the False Teachers, who are called ἀδισμένοι. ὅστρομον: of persons, “to torture,” of things, “to twist.”
Gal. ii. 13. τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνη ἡ συναπαχθέντες ἐκκόψητε τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ στηρίγματος,
18. ἀδάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ συνάρπαστε ἡσυχίας
Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

στήριγμαν, "steadfastness"; perhaps "foundation" is better, although in this
sense we would expect στήριγμα. There
is, however, a tendency in N.T. to con-
fuse words in -μα -ματις. Cf. κύλισμα
(2 Pet. ii. 22). ἀρχαγγέλος (Phil. ii. 6).
The foundation is the χάρις and γνῶσις
of v. 18. ἡμέρα is in emphatic contrast to
the untrustworthy basis of the Libertine
teaching.

Ver. 18. ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ
Κυρίου, κ.τ.λ. The genitive is to be
taken with both words. γνώσει here
means "spiritual instruction," a know-
ledge that has its source in Christ Him-
self, as distinct from ἔνθυσε, which is
personal communion with Christ (see
note i. 5). γνώσει is the privilege of the
"friend" of Christ. Cf. John vii. 17,
xv. 15. αὐτῷ. Note that the doxology
is addressed to Christ, and, therefore,
kυρίου ἡμῶν. also refers to Him. ἐς
ἡμέραν αἰῶνος: "in the day of etern-
ity". The meanings of ἐς and ἐν
in later Greek are somewhat interchang-
able (cf. Moulton, Proleg. 234 f.). ἡμ.
αἰῶνος is a very rare phrase not found
elsewhere in N.T. It is found in Sir.
viii. 10, where the phrase is ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
αἰῶνος. The more usual expression is
ἐς τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰῶνων. "ἐς τὸν
αἰῶνα becomes so immediately the rul-
ing phrase that this Petrine doxology
cannot have been written after liturgi-
cal expressions had become in any degree
stereotyped" (Bigg).
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THE FIRST EPISTLE.

The first Epistle differs from all the other N.T. Epistles save the Epistle to the Hebrews in this, that it is anonymous. The author, however, claims to have been an eye-witness of the Word of Life (i. 1-3) and speaks throughout in a tone of apostolic authority, and there is abundance of primitive and credible testimony that he was St. John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and the last survivor of the Apostle-company.

1. The MSS. Titles.—AB ιωάννου (δύον) α : Ν ιωάννου ἐπιστολή α : L ἐπιστολή καθολική τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου ιωάννου : P ιωάννου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ ἀπο(τόλου ἐπιστολή) α. Two later MSS. have interesting titles—13 ἐπιστολή α ιωάννου εὐαγγελικὴ θεολογία περὶ χῦν TAXACAC 'HS-paid ιωάννης τάθε χριστιανών.1

2. Patristic Evidence.—Polycarp. ad Philip. viii.: πᾶς γὰρ δε ἐν μὴ ὁμολογῇ ἤσοιν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλαμάθεια, ἀντίχριστος ἐστιν—a manifest echo of 1 John iv. 2, 3. This proves the early date of our Epistle and the esteem in which it was held, and if it does not attest the Johannine authorship, it at least suggests it. Polycarp had known several of the Apostles and of those who had seen the Lord; he had been a disciple of St. John and had been ordained by him bishop of Smyrna; and he was the leading ecclesiastic in the whole of Asia. Cf. Jer. Script. Eccles.; Iren. III. iii. 4.

Busebius (H. E. iii. 39) says that Papias, whom Irenæus had called "a hearer of John and a comrade of Polycarp, an ancient man

1 St. Augustine’s discourses on the First Epistle are entitled "Ten Treatises on the Epistle of John to the Parthians (In Epistolam ιοαννος ad Parthos Tractatus Decem)," and he elsewhere quotes from the Epistle under this strange title (Quast. Ev. ii. 39). Probably the Epistle was entitled in some MS. ιωάννου τοῦ παρθένου, as the Apocalypse is entitled in 30 Στοιχεῖα τοῦ άγίου ανθοτόπου τοῦ αντίχριστον καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ παρθένου ηγατημένου εὐαγγελίσμου ἱωάννου τοῦ παρθένου, and ΤΟΥ-ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΥ was mistaken for ΠΡΟΚΩΝΔΟΥΣ. The Latin frag. of Clem. Alex.’s exposition of the Second Epistle begins: "Secunda ιοαννος epistola quæ ad virgines scripta," where "Ιοαννος ad virgines" probably represents ιωάννου τοῦ παρθένου.
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the Son, the resultant Commandment of Brotherly Love, the Walking in the Light, the Begetting of God, the Overcoming of the World, etc.; the antitheses of Life and Death, Light and Darkness, Love and Hate, Truth and Lying, Father and World, God and Devil, Children of God and Children of the Devil.'" Thus inextricably are the two works intertwined. "Our Epistle," says Rothe, "has throughout as its presupposition the peculiar conception of the person and history of the Redeemer, in general the peculiar conception of Christianity, which prevails in the Gospel. Consequently, if the Fourth Gospel is a work of the Apostle John, our Epistle also belongs as indubitably to him; as in the contrary case our Epistle could be no composition of the Apostle John."

The common authorship has nevertheless been called in question on the ground of certain alleged divergences which, says Schmiedel, "are explained much more easily on the assumption that the two writings come from different writers though belonging to one and the same school of thought." The divergences are (1) linguistic, and (2) doctrinal.1

(1) The words ἀγγελία, ἐπαγγελία, διάνοια, παρουσία, ὁλίσθ, ἀφομία, and others occur in the Epistle and not in the Gospel. But what then? A writer need not exhaust his entire vocabulary in a single writing: that would argue extreme barrenness of mind. Does it follow that the Third Gospel and the Book of Acts are by different authors because ὁλίσθ never occurs in the former and eight times in the latter, or that the Epistle to the Romans is not St. Paul's because ἱλασβντρὶν occurs in it and in no other of his Epistles? The only reasonable inference from the occurrence of words in the Epistle which are absent from the Gospel is that the former is not an imitation of the latter.

(2) The following instances of doctrinal divergence are adduced: (a) ἤλασμος in Ep. ii. 2, iv. 10 and nowhere else in the N.T.; whereas, says Martineau, "the gospel knows nothing of an atoning or propitiatory efficacy in the blood of Christ". It is true that the word is not found in the Gospel, but the idea is. Cf. i. 29, x. 11, 15, xi. 49, 52. (b) χρίσμα (Ep. ii. 20, 27) is another λεγόμενον. The very idea, however, is found in the Gospel (xiv. 26, xvi. 13). (c) The Gospel is more spiritual in its eschatology, representing the Judgment not as future but as present (iii. 18) and the Coming of Christ as happening in the experience of each believer (xiv. 3); whereas the

Epistle represents the παρουσία (ii. 28) as "a visible individual occurrence" on a particular day (iv. 17). This is simply erroneous. The Gospel also speaks of a final and universal Judgment (v. 29), "the last day" (vi. 39, 44, 54; xi. 24), and a personal Coming of Christ (xxi. 22, 23). The παράκλητος is the Holy Spirit in the Gospel, Jesus in the Epistle. Here, however, there is no divergence. The doctrine of the Epistle explains the Gospel's ἄλλον παράκλητον (xiv. 16). See commentary on ii. 1.

It is beyond reasonable doubt that the Epistle and the Gospel are from the same pen. "The identity of authorship in the two books," says Lightfoot, "though not undisputed, is accepted with such a degree of unanimity that it may be placed in the category of acknowledged facts." And they have a very intimate connection. This is abundantly apparent from internal evidence. The Epistle opens with a reference to the Gospel-narrative, and there is an unmistakable relation between 1 John v. 13 and John xx. 31 (see commentary). Indeed the Epistle throughout has the Gospel as its background and is hardly intelligible without it. It is, in the language of Lightfoot, "a devotional and moral application of the main ideas which are evolved historically in the sayings and doings of Christ recorded in the Gospel". And it is significant that the Muratorian Canon mentions the First Epistle in connection with the Gospel, and the Second and Third Epistles after an interval in their natural place among the other Epistles of the N.T.

The precise connection between them is nowhere indicated, but it appears from a consideration of the historical situation. The fall of Jerusalem in a.d. 70 dispersed the Church, and a colony of disciples found a home in Asia Minor. It was a considerable and increasingly influential community, including, in the phrase of Polycrates of Ephesus, "great luminaries (μεγάλα στοιχεῖα)"—not only the Apostles Philip and Andrew but, according to abundant and trustworthy tradition, St. John. The latter fixed his residence at Ephesus, where there was a church founded by St. Paul. It was the proudest boast of Ephesus that she was "the Temple-sweeper (κηνόφος) of Artemis" (Acts xix. 35), and the Temple which she had reared for her goddess was one of the Seven Wonders of the ancient

1 John xxii. is an addition to the Gospel, but it is by the same hand, "a postscript from the same pen as the rest" (Renan).
8 Ess. on Sup. Rel., pp. 186 f. 7 Ibid., p. 188.
6 On the credibility of this tradition see Drummond, The Char. and Auth. of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 814 ff.
7 Iren. III. iii. 4.
world; and in that historic and brilliant city St. John exercised his ministry to the end of his long life, which lasted until the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117).  

It was an active and gracious ministry. It had Ephesus for its headquarters, but it comprehended a wide area. St. John took oversight of all the Christian communities in the surrounding country—such as the churches of Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea (cf. Rev. ii.-iii.), counselling and strengthening them by letters and visitations. “He would go away when invited,” says Clement of Alexandria, “to the neighbouring districts of the Gentiles, here to appoint bishops, there to form new churches, and there to put into the office of the ministry some one of those that were indicated by the Spirit.” And Clement proceeds to relate an interesting story, μηδέν οἱ μηδέν. The Apostle once visited a neighbouring city—Smyrna, according to the Alexandrian Chronicle—and saw there a lad of stalwart form, charming face, and ardent spirit. “I deposit this lad in thy keeping,” he said to the bishop, “with all earnestness, taking the Church and Christ to witness.” The bishop accepted the trust and, when St. John returned to Ephesus, took the lad home, nurtured him, and finally baptised him. Then, thinking he had done enough, he let him alone, and the lad fell into evil company, committed a crime, and, fleeing to the mountains, became the captain of a band of brigands. By and by St. John revisited that city, and after settling the business which had brought him, he said: “Now then, bishop, restore us the deposit which the Saviour and I entrusted to thee”. The bishop was thunderstruck, supposing that he was being accused of some pecuniary intromission. “It is the lad that I am requiring,” explained St. John, “and the soul of the brother.” The bishop groaned and wept: “He is dead!” “How? When? And what death?” “He is dead to God,” said the bishop, and told the story. The Apostle rent his robe and with a loud cry smote his head. “A fine guardian of the brother’s soul did I leave in thee! Let me have a horse forthwith and some one to show me the way.” And he rode off and found the lost youth, and by tender entreaties won him to penitence and brought him back to the Church.

Such was the ministry of St. John at Ephesus, and it was far on in the course of it that he wrote his Gospel, “having employed all the time an unwritten message”. He wrote it, says the Muratorian Canon, “at the exhortation of his fellow-disciples and bishops,” i.e., his own congregation at Ephesus and his colleagues in the neigh-

---

1 Iren. III. iii. 4.  
2 De Div. Serv. 42.  
bouring churches within the circuit of his supervision. It was intended for the instruction and edification of the Christians all over that extensive area. And the Epistle is, in the phrase of Lightfoot, a "commendatory postscript" to the Gospel. This explains the circumstance of its having neither address nor signature. It was not sent to a particular community, and since it was an appendix to the Gospel, it had no need to be inscribed with the author's name.

The aim of the Epistle is twofold—polemical and religious. Irenæus says 1 that "John the disciple of the Lord desired by the declaration of his Gospel to remove the error which had been sown among men by Cerinthus and, much earlier, by those who are called Nicolaitans". And this is borne out by the companion Epistle. It is against these two heresies that the polemic of the latter is directed.

1. It is said that the Nicolaitans were the followers of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons (Acts vi. 5), 2 and this strange story is told of him by Clement of Alexandria 3: "He had, they say, a beautiful wife, and after the Ascension of the Saviour, being taunted by the Apostles with jealousy, he brought the woman forward and gave who would permission to marry her. This, they say, is in accordance with that expression of his: 'We must abuse the flesh'. And indeed the adherents of his sect follow up the incident and the saying absolutely and unquestioningly and commit fornication without restraint". Clement proceeds to attest the moral purity of Nicolas and explain his action as an inculcation of ascetic self-restraint, but certainly the sect which bore his name was given over to licentiousness. Clement says elsewhere 4 that they were "dissolute as he-goats," and others bear like testimony. 5 They were Antinomians, disowning moral obligation, nullam differentiam esse docentes in machando et idolothyton edere; 6 herein being forerunners of the Gnostics and justifying Tertullian's classification of them with the Cainites. 7 This heresy was rampant among the churches of Asia Minor in St. John's day (cf. Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15), and he deals with it in our Epistle. See i. 5-ii. 6, 15-17, iii. 3-10.

2. Cerinthus also was an Antinomian, 8 but his distinctive heresy was a theory of the Person of Christ. He taught in Asia, but he had been trained in Egypt, 9 and the foundation of his system, as of

---

1 Iren. i. xxiii.  2 Strom. iii. 4; cf. Eus. H. E. iii. 29.  3 Strom. ii. 20.  4 Strom. ii. 20.  5 Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. i. 29; Hippol. Phil. vii. 36.  6 De Præscript. Har. 33.  7 Dionysius of Alexandria in Eus. H. E. iii. 28.  8 Theodoret. H. E. ii. 3.
Marcion's, was that postulate of Greek philosophy—the inherent and necessary evil of matter. "He said that the world had not been made by the First God, but by a power which is separate from the Authority which is over the Universe and ignorant of the God who is over all. And he supposed that Jesus had not been begotten of a virgin, but had been born of Joseph and Mary as a son in like manner to all the rest of men, and became more righteous and prudent and wise. And after the Baptism the Christ descended into him from the Sovereignty which is over the Universe, in the form of a dove; and then He proclaimed the unknown Father and accomplished mighty works, but at the end the Christ withdrew from the Jesus, and the Jesus had suffered and been raised, but the Christ had continued throughout impassible, being spiritual." 1 The essence of this is the dissolution (λύσις) of the Person of our Lord, the distinction between the human Jesus and the divine Christ. St. John encountered Cerinthus at Ephesus, and strenuously controverted his error. Irenæus and Eusebius quote a story of Polycarp's that the Apostle once visited the public baths, and, seeing Cerinthus within, sprang out of the building. "Let us flee," he cried, "lest the building fall, since Cerinthus, the foe of the Truth, is within it!" 2 And all through our Epistle he has the heresy in view. See ii. 18-23, iv. 1-6, 13-15, v. 1-12.

The Epistle has also a religious purpose. Its key-note is Love. "Locutus est multa," says St. Augustine, "et prope omnia de caritate." Its doctrine of love is distinctive and profound. The love which it inculcates is love for God and love for the brotherhood of believers—love for God manifesting itself in love for the brotherhood, and love for the brotherhood inspired by the love wherewith the Father has loved all His children. Special emphasis is laid on the latter. It is the whole of religion, it is all that God requires (cf. ii. 8-11, iii. 10-18, iv. 7-v. 2); for it implies love for God, and love for God implies a right attitude of heart and mind toward Him. This is the dominant doctrine of the Epistle, and it was the constant message of the Apostle's later ministry, so much so that, it is said, his people grew weary of its incessant reiteration. See St. Jerome's story quoted in commentary on iv. 7.

This had not always been his manner. He had not always been the Apostle of Love. He had once been the precise opposite—self-seeking (cf. Mark x. 35-45 = Matt. xx. 20-28), fiery, passionate, and vindictive (cf. Luke ix. 51-56), meriting the title which Jesus gave him "the Son of Thunder" (Mark iii. 17). His doctrine of

1 Iren. I. xxi. 2 Iren. III. iii. 4; Eus. H. E. iv. 14.
the Supremacy of Love was a late discovery, and he proclaims it as such (see commentary on ii. 7-11). It was not merely an article of his polemic, a protest against the loveless intellectualism where-with St. Ignatius charges the heretical teachers (τοὺς ἀπερεδοξοῦτοις), who had "no concern for love, none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the distressed, none for the bondman, none for the hungry or the thirsty." 1 It was a personal confession. That was an aspect of the Gospel which St. John had himself too long failed to perceive; and it may be that it had been revealed to him by two life-transforming experiences. (1) His Exile in Patmos (Rev. i. 9). 2 During that season of retirement he could look back over his interrupted ministry and review his methods. Incidents like his encounter with Cerinthus would recur to him, and would appear to his chastened spirit ill accordant with "the meekness and sweet reasonableness of Christ" (2 Cor. x. 1). It was right that he should contend for the Truth, but had not his intemperate zeal too often caused needless offence and defeated its own end by hardening the hearts of his opponents? He would discover the truth of St. Paul's precept that "the Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle towards all" (2 Tim. ii. 24). (2) The writing of his Gospel. As he lived over again those three years of blessed fellowship and told "what he had heard and seen concerning the Word of Life," he would realise the pity and patience of the gentle Jesus, and feel as though he had never until that hour understood the Gospel-story. And he would address himself to what remained of his ministry in a new spirit. "Little children, love one another." "Master, why do you always say this?" "Because it is the Lord's commandment, and if only it be done, it is enough."

The Second and Third Epistles.

There is no doubt that the Second and Third Epistles are from the same hand. Cf. 2 John 1 with 3 John 1; 2 John 4 with 3 John 3, 4; 2 John 10 with 3 John 8; 2 John 12 with 3 John 13, 14. Are they also the work of St. John?

This was a disputed question in the early Church. Busebius in his chapter "On the Acknowledged Divine Scriptures and those that

---


are not such (περὶ τῶν ὁμολογομένων θείων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν μη τοιούτων)"\(^1\) includes the Second and Third Epistles of John (ἡ δυτικομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη ἱεράν) among "those that are controverted yet recognised by most (τῶν ἀπελεγομένων, γνωρίσμων δὲ ὑμεῖς τοῖς πολλοῖς)". So Origen: "He (John) has left an epistle of a very few lines; also, let it be granted, a second and a third, since not all allow that these are genuine. However, there are not a hundred lines in them both."

And in the fourth century an opinion was put forward, which still finds favour, that their author was indeed John, only not John the Apostle but another John denominated "the Presbyter".\(^8\)

There is, however, very strong evidence, both internal and external, on the other side. They exhibit coincidences of thought and language which link them with the First Epistle. Cf. 1 John ii. 7 with 2 John 5; 1 John ii. 18, iv. 1-3 with 2 John 7; 1 John ii. 23 with 2 John 9; 1 John iii. 6, 9 with 3 John 11. And the external testimony, though scanty, is weighty. The Muratorian Canon, despite the corruption of the passage, plainly attests the two epistles as works of the Apostle John and as accepted in the Catholic Church (superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur). Irenæus\(^4\) quotes 2 John 11 with the preface ἱεράνης δὲ ὑμῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθῆτης ἐπιτευγμένη τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑπ' ὑμῶν λέγονται βουληθεῖς. And again, after a reference to the First Epistle, he quotes 2 John 7, 8 as a saying of the Lord’s disciple John “in the aforesaid epistle”.\(^5\) This slip of memory only makes the attestation more effective. Irenæus knew that it was a saying of St. John that he was quoting: the Second Epistle no less than the First was the Apostle’s. Clement of Alexandria too recognised more than one Epistle of St. John, for in one place he quotes 1 John v. 16 as occurring “in his larger Epistle (ἐν τῷ μείζων ἐπιστολῇ),”\(^6\) and elsewhere he speaks of “the Second Epistle of John”\(^7\).

The ground for the ascription of the two smaller epistles to John the Presbyter is the fact that their author styles himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος. But it can hardly be maintained in view of his self-revelation in the Third Epistle. He appears there as exercising authoritative supervision over a wide circle of churches, writing to them, visiting them, interfering in their dissensions and settling these by his personal and solitary arbitrament, sending deputies and receiving their
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\(^1\) H. E. iii. 25.
\(^2\) Comm. in Ev. Ἰωάν. v. 3 (ed. Lommatzsch, vol. i., p. 165).
\(^4\) I. ix. 3.  
\(^5\) III. xvii. 8. 
\(^6\) Strom. ii. 15.
\(^7\) Adumbrat. in Ep. Ἰωάν. ii.
reports. This is precisely the sort of ministry which, as we have seen,\(^1\) St. John exercised in Asia Minor, and it would have been impossible for any lesser personage than an Apostle.\(^2\) It may, moreover, be questioned whether such slight compositions as these two little letters would have won recognition had they not been recommended by the name of the Apostle John. And it was natural that the latter should style himself \(δ \pi ρεασβότερος\). The term was not only an official designation (cf. 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19). The second generation of Christians used it of their predecessors, "the men of early days," \(Männer der Vorzeit\), who had witnessed the great beginnings. Thus, Papias uses it of the Apostles,\(^3\) and Irenæus in turn uses it of Papias and his contemporaries.\(^4\) It was therefore natural that St. John, the last of the Apostles, the sole survivor of "the elder men," should be known among the churches of Asia as \(δ \pi ρεασβότερος\).

And indeed it is very questionable whether this John the Presbyter ever existed. He was discovered by Busebius in the preface to Papias’ work \(Expositions of Dominical Oracles\), but "it is well," remarks Barth, "to distinguish between what Papias really says and what Eusebius has made of his words." Here are the words of Papias: "I shall not hesitate to incorporate for you with my interpretations as many things as I once learned well from the elders (τῶν \(πρεσβύτερων\)) and remembered well, guaranteeing their truth. For I did not, like so many, take pleasure in those that have so much to say but in those that teach the truth, nor in those that remember alien commandments but in those that remember the commandments that have been given by the Lord to the Faith and come from the Truth itself. Now if anywhere one came in my way who had been a follower of the elders (τοῖς \(πρεσβύτεροι\)), I would search\(^5\) the words of the elders—what Andrew or Peter had said (ἐκεῖνοι), or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples; and (I would search) the things which Aristion and the elder John (οἱ \(πρεσβύτεροι Ἰωάννης\), the Lord’s disciples, say (ἐγὼσαί))."\(^6\)

\(^1\) See p. 231.
\(^2\) Cf. Barth, \(Die Hauptprobl., S. 26\): "In der That nun ist diese 'patriarchalisch-mönachische' Autorität unerklärlich bei einem einfachen Presbyter einer Localgemeinde; sie erklärt sich aber vollkommen, wenn der \(πρεσβύτερος\) wie Paulus ein Apostel gewesen ist."
\(^3\) Eus. \(H. E. iii\). 39. \(^4\) V. xxxvi. \(et passim.\) Similarly in Heb. xi. 2.
\(^5\) \(ἀνεργος\), not "enquire about". Jerome \(Script. Eccles. under Papias\) rightly renders \(considerabam\).
\(^6\) Eus. \(H. E. iii\). 39.
And this is what Eusebius makes of the passage: “Here it is worthy of observation how he twice enumerates the name of John. The former of these he reckons along with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest of the Apostles, plainly indicating the Evangelist; and the other John after an interval he ranks with others outside the number of the Apostles, having put Aristion before him, and he plainly names him ‘an elder (πρεσβύτερος)’; so that the truth of their story is hereby demonstrated who have said that two persons in Asia have had the same name, and there are two tombs in Ephesus and each is called John’s to this day.”

Eusebius had a theological interest in putting this construction on the passage. He disliked the Chiliasm of the Apocalypse, and he was glad to find a second John to whom he could ascribe its authorship. And he has certainly perverted the passage. Papias is here defining the plan of his work. His method was (1) to quote a logos of Jesus, (2) to interpret it, and (3) to illustrate it by any story which he had gleaned from oral tradition. Such stories he derived from two sources. One was their followers’ reports of what they had heard from the lips of “the elders,” i.e., as Papias used the term, the Apostles. These reports he “searched” for suitable illustrations. But he was not wholly dependent on hearsay. Two of the men who had been with Jesus were still alive in the earlier years of Papias—Aristion, not an Elder or Apostle but a disciple of the Lord, and the Elder John; and he enjoyed the advantage of hearing their living voices, and he “would search” their discourses for the material he required. The transition from “had said (ἐξείπε)” to “say (λέγουσι),” though ignored by Eusebius, is significant and explains the double mention of St. John. Papias had derived his knowledge of St. John’s teaching from two sources: (1) from the reports of men who had accompanied him and the other Apostles while they still tarried at Jerusalem, and (2) from his own lips after his settlement at Ephesus, where, Irenæus says, Papias had been one of his “hearers.” δ πρεσβύτερος ἰωάννης must mean “the Apostle John,” since the Apostles have just been called “the Elders” (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), and it is impossible that the term should bear different meanings within the compass of a single sentence. In his phrase “from the Truth itself (δι’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας)” Papias echoes 3 John 12, and this renders it more than likely that he called St. John δ

1 Eusebius probably had this story from Dionysius of Alexandria (cf. H.E. vii. 25). It means simply that in the fourth century there were two rival sites for St. John’s burial-place.

2 See p. 243.
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πρεσβύτερος because the latter had so styled himself in each of the Epistles.¹

The Second Epistle is addressed ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, and the meaning of the address is a disputed question.² It was supposed by St. Jerome,³ and the idea is approved by many moderns, that “the elect lady”⁴ is a figurative appellation, signifying either the whole Church (Hilgenfeld, Mangold) or a particular community (Hofmann, Ewald, Huther, Wieseler). The main arguments are that the universal affection spoken of in verse 1 could hardly have been felt for an individual, and that it is “not improbable” that this is the Epistle referred to in 3 John 9.⁵ The metaphor is indeed paralleled by Eph. v. 22-33 and Rev. xxi. 9; but it is the Church which is thus designated, not a particular community, and, on the ecclesiastical interpretation, it is a particular community that is here addressed, since St. John sends greetings to the “elect lady” from “the children of her elect sister” (verse 13), i.e., presumably, his own congregation. And, moreover, the simplicity of the little letter precludes the possibility of so elaborate an allegory, while the tenderness of its tone stamps it as a personal communication.

It is therefore not a church but a lady that is addressed, and there are authority and reason for regarding Κυρία as her name.⁶ The name was common in those days, and it occurs, e.g., in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 498: Ἀνυρία Απρούτις Κυρία. ⁹¹⁴: Αὐτὴ Ἐισοδ Ὀρσούς Ἡρακλῆς Ἐρεσιτὸς ματρός Κυρίας. It is the Greek form of Martha, which means “mistress (domina)”. The objection has been urged that, if it be a proper name, St. John must have written not ἐκλεκτὴ Κυρία but Κυρία τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ on the analogy of Γατί τῇ ἀγαπητῇ in 3 John 1; but either construction is permissible. The former is paralleled by 1 Peter i. 1: ἐκλεκτὸς παρεπιθήμοι, and if

¹ On the identity of John the Presbyter and John the Apostle see Barth, Haupt-probl., S. 26-29; Farrar, Early Days, Exc. xiv.
² Cf. scholium quoted by Euth. Zig.: ἡ πρὸς ἐκλεκτὴν γράφει ἡ πρὸς τινὰ γυναῖκα διά τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἐπολοῦν τὴν ἀντίθεσι αἰκλῶν αἰκονομοῦσαν πνευ-

³ Ep. ad Ageruchian.
⁴ The words, however, can hardly mean more than “an elect lady”.
⁶ Others take Ἐκλεκτὴ as the name (“the lady Electa”). Clem. Alex.: “ad quandam Babyloniam (probably a confused reference, for which the translator is responsible, to 1 Peter v. 13) Electam nomine”. Clement apparently took Electa as the Church personified, for he proceeds: “significat electionem ecclesiae sanctae”. But then Ἐκλεκτὴς in verse 13 must also be a proper name, and two sisters can hardly have borne the same name.
INTRODUCTION

there be any irregularity, it is in the latter, where τῷ ἀγαπητῷ is a defining after-thought (cf. 1 John i. 2: τῷ ἱνὰ τῷ αἰώνιον, "the life, the eternal life"). Carpzov would identify Kyria (Martha) with the sister of Lazarus and Mary. The family of Bethany disappear from the Gospel-story after the feast in Levi’s house at the beginning of the Passion-week. They probably fled to escape the fury of the rulers, and it is just possible that they had found a home in Asia Minor like so many other refugees from Palestine. And now Martha is living in one of the cities of St. John’s diocese, a widow with a grown-up family; and it is natural that she should be dear to the Apostle and honoured by the whole Church. This is a pleasant fancy, but it is nothing more.

The facts are sufficiently interesting. The epistle is addressed to a devout lady named Kyria, who resided in one of the cities near Ephesus with a grown-up family. It is remarkable how large a part was played by women in the life of the primitive Church, especially in Asia Minor, and Kyria was an honourable and influential personage not only in her own community but all over that wide area (verse 1). It is probable that, like that of Nympha at Colossae, her house was the meeting-place of the Church, according to the custom of those days when there were no ecclesiastical edifices; and it appears from verse 10 that she afforded hospitality to the itinerant evangelists of whom the Third Epistle speaks. A sister of Kyria, presumably deceased, had a family resident at Ephesus and connected with St. John’s congregation; and several of Kyria’s sons had visited their cousins. The Apostle had met with them and found them earnest Christians, and in the gladness of his heart he wrote to their mother, testifying his gratification, giving some kindly counsel very needful in those days of intellectual unrest, and expressing the hope that he might ere long visit her.

The Third Epistle is addressed to “Gaius the beloved”. Gaius (never Caius) was one of the commonest of names, and there are three who bear it in the N.T. (1) Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), (2) Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), and (3) Gaius of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. i. 14). The name being so common, our Gaius may very well have been different from all these, but it is affirmed in the interesting Synopsis Sacra Scripturae ascribed to St. Athanasius that St. John composed his Gospel during his exile in Patmos and that Gaius of Corinth acted as his amanuensis and

published it at Ephesus. And it appears from the "Apostolic Constitutions" (vii. 46) that one Gaius was ordained by St. John first "bishop" of Pergamum.

Whatever be the value of these traditions, it is evident that Gaius was a prominent personage, probably bishop or presbyter, in one of the churches of Asia Minor, and St. Paul’s description of Gaius of Corinth, “the host of me and of the whole Church,” might have been written of him. Trouble had arisen in his congregation, the ringleader being Diotrephes, probably a wealthy layman. The primitive Church was rent by factions, each swearing by one or other of the great teachers (cf. 1 Cor. i. 10-17), and it may be that Diotrephes belonged to the Pauline faction and abjured St. John and disowned his authority. The actual truth, however, is that he was an opinionative and domineering man who insisted on having his own way in everything. The occasion of the trouble was a visit which had been paid to the Church of Gaius by a company of itinerant evangelists (wandernde Glaubensboten). This order of “prophets” was a recognised institution. Their office was to travel about preaching to the Gentiles and seeking to win them to the Faith. There were sometimes unworthy men among them who traded on the Gospel and merited the stinging epithet of “Christ-traffickers (χριστόμετροι),” and very stringent regulations are laid down regarding them in the Didache; but their ministry was a needful and heroic one. They abandoned everything for Christ’s sake and, to obviate misrepresentation, took nothing from the Gentiles—no food, no lodging. Thus they were dependent on the good offices of the believers wherever they went, and it was a debt of honour to see that they suffered no lack. Gaius had given a hospitable welcome to that company of “prophets”; but Diotrephes, disowning the Apostle’s authority, opposed the reception of his emissaries and would have denied them entertainment. On their return to Ephesus they reported the incident at a meeting of the Church; and St. John wrote this letter and sent it by Demetrius, commending the action of Gaius and intimating his intention of
visiting his Church at an early date and reducing the recalcitrant Diotrephes to order.

**THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLES.**

The accompanying Greek text is the *regia editio* (1560) of Robert Stephanus (Etienne), commonly known in England as the *Textus Receptus*.\(^1\) Constructed from a few late and inferior MSS. when the science of Textual Criticism was yet unborn, it is far from satisfactory; and the principal variants are presented in the critical notes, The long and patient labours of Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort have cleared away the rubbish of corruption and reduced uncertainty to a minimum; and Dr. Eberhard Nestle's text (British and Foreign Bible Society) is probably a very close approximation to the sacred autographs. It is "the resultant of a collation" of the monumental recensions of Tischendorf (8th edition, 1869-72), Westcott and Hort (1881), and Bernhard Weiss (2nd edition, 1905). "The readings adopted in the text are those in which at least two of these editions agree."

The *materia critica* is copious and excellent. 1. Greek MSS.:

- **N** Codex Sinaiticus, 4th c. Discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and 1859 in the monastery of St. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai. Now at St. Petersburg.
- **A** Codex Alexandrinus, 5th c. Brought from Alexandria to Constantinople by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 1638), and sent by him to King Charles I. in 1628 by the hand of Thomas Roe on the return of the latter from a Turkish embassy. Now in the British Museum.
- **B** Codex Vaticanus, 4th c. In the Vatican Library at Rome.
- **C** Codex Ephraemi, 5th c. A rescriptor palimpsest, written over in 12th c. with a Greek version of thirty-eight treatises of Ephraemus Syrus. In the National Library at Paris. In 1834-35 the librarian Carl Hase had the original writing revived by a chemical process, the application of Giobertine tincture. The codex was written, probably in Egypt, in 5th c.; corrected first, probably in Palestine, in 6th c. (C\(^2\)), then, probably at Constantinople, in 9th c. (C\(^3\)).
- **K** Codex Mosquensis, 9th c. Brought to Moscow from the monastery of St. Dionysius at Mount Athos.

---

\(^1\) See C. R. Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's *Nov. Test. Gr.*, pp. 212 sqq.
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L Codex Angelicus Romanus, 9th c. In the Angelic Library of the Augustinian monks at Rome.

P Codex Porflrianus, 9th c. A palimpsest found by Tischendorf in 1862 among the books of Bishop Porflrius Chiovensis.

D Codex Bezæ, 5th or 6th c. In the Library of the University of Cambridge, to which it was presented by Theodore Beza in 1581. The Greek text with a slavish Latin translation. Much mutilated, our Epistles being represented only by the Latin version of 3 John 11-15.¹

These manuscripts are uncials,² and there are besides upwards of two hundred minuscules or cursives, ranging in date from 9th c. to 16th c.³

2. Ancient Versions:⁴—

**Syriac—**

(1) Syrvg Peshitto or Vulgate, 3rd (?) c. Contains the First Epistle.

(2) Syrph Philoxenian or Heraclean Version, 6th c. The three Epistles.


**Vg** Latin Vulgate, St. Jerome's revision (a.d. 382-84). The three Epistles.

**Egyptian—**

(1) Cop Memphitic Version, 3rd (?) c. The three Epistles.

(2) Sah Thebaic Version, 3rd (?) c. The three Epistles.

**Aeth** Ethiopic Version, from 4th to 6th c. The three Epistles.

**Arm** Armenian Version, 5th c. The three Epistles.

These versions have no small value for the determination of the original text. It is usually plain which of several disputed readings the translator had before him, and whether his MS. contained a word or passage of doubtful authenticity.

**Literature.**

Clem. Alex. *Adumbrationes* in Epp. Joan. i., ii. (a rude Latin translation); Didymus, the blind teacher of St. Jerome in the Catechetical School of Alexandria (a.d. 308-95), commentary on the

¹ Gregory, pp. 345 seq.

² The signs *a b c affixed to uncials denote corrections by later hands,

³ Gregory, pp. 616 seq. ⁴ Ibid., pp. 803 seq.
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Cath. Bpp., translated into Latin by Epiphanius Scholasticus; Aug., *In Epistolam Ioannis Tractatus Decem* (1st Bp., stopping abruptly at v. 3); Bede, *Expos.*; Buthymius Zigabenus (12th c.).


1 The two last appeared after this commentary was written.
IΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΠΡΩΤΗ.1

I. 1. ὁ ἀρχή, ὁ κειμένος τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀπαντεῖς, ὁ ἔσοδος, καὶ τῷ ἰδεασάμεθα, καὶ 1 αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐπηλύφησαν περὶ b Ἰωνᾶ b Διονυσίου. c 6 Peter i. 16.


1 See Introd., p. 243.

2 Tert. (de Anim. 17; adv. Prax. 15) quotes thus: quod vidimus, quod audīvimus, oculis nostris vidimus et manus nostrae conrectaverunt de sermone vita, as though reading θεασάμεθα, ἀπεκάθαρμεν, ἀπαντεῖς τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ.

THE FIRST EPISTLE.


"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we beheld and our hands felt, concerning the Word of Life—and the Life was manifested, and we have seen and testify and announce to you the Life, the Eternal Life, which was with the Father and was manifested to us—that which we have seen and heard, we announce to you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us. Yea, and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. And these things we are writing that our joy may be fulfilled."

The Apostle here characterises and commendeth his Gospel (cf. Intro. p. 246). 1. Its theme—the earthly life of Jesus. No mere biography, since Jesus was not one of the children of men but the Eternal Son of God, the Word made flesh. (a) An ineffable wonder but no dream, an indubitable reality. His readers might doubt it, since they belonged to a later generation and had never seen Jesus; but St. John had seen Him, and he assures them, with elaborate iteration, that it is no dream: "These eyes beheld Him, these hands felt Him." "Because," says Calvin, "the greatness of the thing demanded that its truth should be certain and proved, he insists much at this point". (b) His narrative was necessarily incomplete, since the infinite revelation was larger than his perception or understanding of it. "He would give only a little drop from the sea, not the sea itself" (Rothe). A complete biography of Jesus is impossible, since the days of His flesh are only a segment of His life, a moment of His eternal years. 2. His purpose in writing it: (a) that his readers might share his heavenly fellowship; (b) that his joy might be fulfilled.

Ver. 1. ο, i.e. the Logos and the Eternal Life which He manifested. Cf. v. 4; τὰ ἡ γεγονότα μας with note. ἤν, "verbum aeternitatis significatum non habentis initium" (Clem. Alex.). It "was" ere it "was manifested". ἀρχή, ἀρχὴν (Gen. i. 1). The Logos already was when time began. "The design of the Apostle is to remove the idea of novelty which could lessen the dignity of the Gospel" (Calvin). Cf. Athan., Synops. Scrip. Sacr.: οὐκ οὖν θαλαμών ἦν ἐγκεκτείνα τῇ νεότερον εἶναι τό καθ' ἡμᾶς μυστήριον ἄλλα καὶ ἡ ἀρχή μὲν αἵ τε γνώσεως αὐτοῦ νῦν θαλαμώθηκεν ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ. ἀπεκάθαρμεν, "we have heard"; either the editorial "we" (cf. Rom. i. 5; Col. iv. 3); or, with Lightfoot, St. John and the elders of Ephesus who had certified the authorship and authenticity of the Gospel (xxvi. 24); or "I and the rest of the Apostles"—not hearsay but the testimony of eye-witnesses. θεασάμεθα, "we beheld"—a spectacle which broke on our astonished vision. This seems to be the force of the transition from perfect to aorist, though it may be simply an instance of the decay of the distinction between perfect and aorist.
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(see Moulton's Gram. of N.T. Gr., i. pp. 142 f.). διψάθησαν: the word is used of the fumbling of a blind man in Gen. xxvii. 12 LXX μη σκοτάεις με δ' αυτόν. ζωή, in Betreff des Wortes des Lebens (Holtzmann); i.e. "We did not grasp all the wonder but only its skirts". "Vom Worte des Lebens will er verkündigen, denn ihm selbst verkündigen zu können, dazu fühlte er sich nicht in Stande" (Rothe). τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, "the Word who gives life," "des Wortes, ohne welches es kein Leben gibt" (Holtzmann). Calvin: "Genitivus loco epitheti pro Vivifico". Rothe's "das Wort vom Leben (the word concerning life)" is Pauline (cf. Phil. ii. 16) but not Johannine.

Ver. 2. A parenthesis reiterating the assurance of the reality of the manifestation. The Apostle heaps assurance upon assurance with elaborate emphasis, and the cumbersomeness of his language should not be removed by devices of construction or punctuation, making ver. 1 a complete sentence: (1) "That which was from the beginning (is) that which we have heard, etc."; (2) "That which was from the beginning, which we have seen ... beheld, our hands also handled". Cf. Tert. in crit. n. ἡμαρτωλοὶ ἤτοι Χριστοῦ (Rev. i. 2, 9, xix. 10) was the apostolic ἀναγγέλλων, κ. τ. λ.: "Whence we gather that Christ cannot be preached to us without the Heavenly Kingdom being opened to us, so that, being wakened from death, we may live the life of God" (Calvin). Observe the note of wonder in the Apostle's language. Speech fails him. He labours for expression, adding definition to definition.

Ver. 3. διό, καὶ ἀκ., not merely a resumption but a reiteration of the proposition. καὶ φωνῇ, "ye also" who have not seen Jesus. κοινωνία, not merely knowledge through hearsay of what the Apostles had known as eye-witnesses, but personal and direct communion with the living Lord. This St. John proceeds to make plain. The phrase καὶ ... διό, et ... vero, alque eiam, introduces an important addition or explanation (cf. John vi. 51, viii. 16, 17, xv. 27; Acts xxii. 20; Heb. ix. 21; 2 Peter i. 5).

"Christ walks no longer in the flesh among us, but He appears still continually to the world of men and reveals Himself to those who love Him. Through faith a real personal contact with the Christ now glorified in the Spirit is possible" (Rothe). There is a gracious constraint on all who know this blessed fellowship to bring others into it. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 16. Bunyan, preface to The Jerusalem-Sinner Saved: "I have been vile myself, but have obtained mercy, and I would have my companions in sin partake of mercy too, and therefore I have writ this little book."

Ver. 4. μην, clearly the editorial plural. The reading μην seems at the first glance more attractive than μην as evincing a generous solicitude on the part of the Apostle for the highest good of his readers, viz., the fulfilment of their joy. Rothe: "Wer es weis, dass das unvergleichliche Leben erschienen ist und er mit demselben und dadurch mit dem Vater Gemeinschaft haben kann, dessen Herz muss hoch schlagen". In truth, however, μην evinces a still more generous solicitude—the very spirit of Jesus. As He could not be happy in Heaven without us, so the Apostle's joy was incomplete unless his readers shared it. Cf. Samuel Rutherford:—

"Oh! if one soul from Anwoth
Meet me at God's right hand,
My heaven will be two heavens
In Immanuel's land."

Vv. 5-10. The Message of the Incarnation and the Duty which it brings. "And this is the message which we have heard from Him and are announcing to you, that God is light, and darkness—in Him there is none. If we say
that we have fellowship with Him and be walking in the darkness, we lie and are not doing the Truth; but if we be walking in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from every sin. If we say that we have not sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the Truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, faithful is He and righteous to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from every unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we are making Him a liar and His Word is not in us."

Ver. 5. ἀναγγελία in N.T. only here and iii. 11. ἀναγγελία could only mean "promise" (cf. ii. 25). ἀναγγέλλεις and ἀναγγέλλω both mean "announce." the former with reference to the source of the message (ἀναγκαμένος καὶ αὐτοῦ) and the latter to its destination. "Quod Filius annuntiavit, renunciat apostolus" (Haupt). ὅποι δέστων ὀφθαλμοῖ: the double negative makes a stronger negative (cf. Luke xxiii. 53). The manifestation of God in Christ was to those who beheld it a splendid glory, the breaking of a great light into the darkness of a sinful and sorrowful world. Cf. Matt. iv. 14-16. Light means warmth, health, sight, in a word "life" (cf. ver. 2).

Light is given that we may "walk in it" and enjoy its blessings. It is thus that the Gospel attains its end and fulfills its purpose in us. The Apostle now proceeds to warn his readers against two heresies which ignored this condition of heavenly fellowship.

Vv. 6, 7. The heresy of Antinomianism, represented by the Nicolaitans (cf. Introd. p. 248). ἀναγγελῶν, a gentle and charitable hypothesis. He does not charge his readers with actually holding this pernicious doctrine, and he includes himself ("we," not "ye").

περιστατέων, Heb. περιστατέων, of the whole course of life. The Greek phrase is ἰσορρόφησθαι (conversari). God is light and sin darkness, peccata tenebra sunt (Aug.), and it is impossible to be living in sin or compromising with it and at the same time be enjoying fellowship with God. ἐξοικείος: we may believe the lie, being self-deceived (ver. 8); for disobedience to the Truth blinds us to it. Knowledge comes by doing (cf. John vii. 17). τὴν ἄφθονον, see note on ver. 8. "Walking in the light" has two blessed results: (1) "fellowship with one another," which may mean either fellowship with God—He with us and we with Him (Aug., Calv.), or communion of saints—our fellow-believers with us and we with them. In fact the one idea implies the other. They are inseparable. Communion with our brethren is the consequence and evidence of communion with God. Cf. iv. 20. (2) "Cleansing in the blood of Jesus." To ἀλάμ Ἰησοῦ, God's Infinite Sacrifice for the sin of the world—a N.T. phrase of peculiar poignancy and fragrance. Cf. Ignat. ad Rom. vii.: τὸ ἀλαμ αὐτοῦ, ὅ ὅντων ἀθάνατον ἔφθασαν. When we walk in the light, that demonstration of the length to which God has gone in sacrifice for our sakes, is ever before us, and the amazing spectacle subdues our hearts, takes possession of them, and drives out every evil affection. Cf. Catherine of Siena: "The blood and tears of the Divine Son are able
to cleanse us from head to foot". τάσσειν ἄμαρτίαν, " every sin," i.e. every outbreak of the sinful principle; not "all sin" (τάσσεις τῆς ἀμαρτίας). Cf. Rom. iii. 19: θὰ τῶν στόρα... τὸς ὁμοίως.

Vv. 8-10. The heresy of Perfectionism. Some might not say, with the Antinomians, that they were absolved from the obligation of the moral law, but they maintained that they were done with sin, had no more sinful propensities, committed no more sinful acts. In opposition hereto the Apostle asserts two facts: (1) Inherent corruption. Distinguish ἄμαρτίαν ἄχεων ("to have sin") and ἄμαρτίαν ἀχεων ("to sin"), corresponding to the sinful principle and its manifestation in specific acts. Our natures are poisoned, the taint is in our blood. Grace is the medicine, but recovery is a protracted process. It is begun the moment we submit ourselves to Christ, but all our lives we continue under treatment. πλανώμενον, "lead astray" (cf. Matt. xviii. 12). ἡ ἁλίθεια, in Johannine phraseology not simply "der Wahrheitsverfall, die Wahrhaftigkeit der Selbstprüfung und der Selbsterkenntnis" (Rothe), but the revelation of the "True God" (ver. 20; John xvii. 3), which came "through Jesus Christ" (John i. 17), Himself "the Truth" (John xiv. 6). Nearly equivalent to ὁ λόγος (ver. 10). The Truth is a splendid ideal, never realised here, else it would cease to be an ideal: always as we pursue it displaying a fuller glory, And thus the nearer we approach it the further off it seems; when we walk in the light we see faults which were hidden in the darkness. Self-abasement is a characteristic of the saints. When Juan de Avila (a.d. 1500-69) was dying the rector of his college approached him and said: "What joy it must be to you to think of meeting the Saviour!" "Ah!" said the saint, "rather do I tremble at the thought of my sins." (2) The frequent falls of the believer. We all "have sinned (ἁμαρτηκέμενοι)," i.e., committed acts of sin (ἁμαρτίας) manifesting the strength and activity of the sinful principle (ἡ ἁμαρτία) in our souls. This, however, is no reason for despair. There is a remedy—forgiveness and cleansing in the blood of Jesus; and there is a way of obtaining it—confession. πιστός, i.e., to His promise (cf. Heb. x. 23). ἡμεῖς: He would be unrighteous if He broke His promise ratified by the blood of Jesus. Peace is not got by denying our sinfulness and our sins, but by frankly confessing them and availing ourselves, continually and repeatedly, of the gracious remedy. "Woe to that soul which presumes to think that he can approach God in any other way than as a sinner asking mercy." Know yourself to be wicked, and God will wrap you up warm in the mantle of His goodness (Juan de Avila). "Remission of sins cannot be secured from penitence, nor can the peace of God belong to consciences where the fear of God does not reign" (Calv.).

Perfectionism has two causes: (1) The stifling of conscience: "we make Him a liar, i.e., turn a deaf ear to His inward testimony, His voice in our souls. (2) Ignorance of His Word: it "is not in us". Such a delusion were impossible if we steeped our minds in the Scriptures. Consider the lapses of the saints, e.g., David, Peter.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1, 2. The Remedy for the Sins of Believers. "My little children, these things I am writing to you in order that ye may not sin. And if any one sin an Advocate have we with the Father—Jesus Christ, a righteous One. And He is Himself the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world." Ver. 1. Observe the sudden change in the Apostle's manner. His heart is very tender toward his people, and he adopts an affectionate and personal tone: (1) He passes from the formal "we" to "I". (2) He styles them τεκνία μου, filioli mei, meine Kindlein—his favourite appellation (cf. ii. 12, 28; iii. 7, 18; iv. 4; v. 21). Not only was it very suitable
on the lips of the aged teacher, but it was a phrase of Jesus (cf. John xiii. 33). St. John had caught the phrase and its spirit. He remembered how the Master had dealt with His disciples, and he would deal with his people after the same fashion and be to them what Jesus had been to himself—as gentle and patient.

He assumes this tone because he is about to address a warning to them, and he would fain take the sting out of it and disarm opposition. He foresees the possibility of a two-fold perversion of his teaching: (1) "If we can never in this life be free from sin, why strive after holiness? It is useless; sin is an abiding necessity"; (2) "If escape be so easy, why dread falling into sin? We may sin with light hearts, since we have the blood of Jesus to cleanse us." "No," he answers, "I am not writing these things to you either to discourage you in the pursuit of holiness or to embolden you in sinning, but, on the contrary, in order that (Io) ye may not sin." Cf. Aug.: "Lest perchance he should seem to have given impunity to sins, and men should now say to themselves, 'Let us sin, let us do securely what we will, Christ cleanses us; He is faithful and righteous. He cleanses us from all iniquity,' he takes from thee evil security and implants useful fear. It is an evil wish of thine to be secure; be anxious. For He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, if thou art always displeasing to thyself and being changed until thou be perfected." As a physician might say to his patient: "Your trouble is obstinate; the poison is in your blood, and it will take a long time to eradicate it. But I do not tell you this to discourage you or make you careless; no, on the contrary, to make you watchful and diligent in the use of the remedy"; so the Apostle says: "My little children, these things I am writing to you in order that ye may not sin".

If, however, ye fall into sin, let us not lose heart, for Parakletos ἐγὼ εἰμί πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, Parakletos, "one called to thy side," so, in a forensic sense, "one who undertakes and champions your cause," "an advocate." Vulg., Advocatus; Luth., Fürsprcher bei dem Vater. Here of the ascended Jesus; in John xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, of the Holy Spirit, where Vulg. simply trans-literates Paracletus, and both our version give "Comforter," Luth., Träster—an impossible rendering, since the word is not act. but pass. Render "Advocate" in every case. Cf. saying of R. Li'ezer ben Jacob: "He who does one commandment has gotten him one advocate, and he who has committed one transgression has gotten him one accuser—παρακλητός, παράκλητος). Repentance and good works are as a shield in the face of punishment." In the days of His flesh Jesus was God's Advocate with men; He told the Eleven in the Upper Room that, though He was going away, God would not be left without an Advocate on the earth to plead His cause and win men to faith (John xvi. 16, 17). The Holy Spirit has come in the room of Jesus, and still from age to age performs the office of God's Advocate with men. Nor has the advocacy of Jesus ceased. He is our Advocate in Heaven, pleading our cause with God. The history of redemption is thus a progressive economy of grace: (1) the O.T. dispensation, when God was conceived as remote in high Heaven; (2) that of the Incarnation, when He revealed Himself as a Father and, by the advocacy of His Eternal Son, made His appeal to the children of men; (3) that of the Holy Spirit, under which we live in the enjoyment of a double advocacy—our Glorified Redeemer's, who "maketh intercession for us" (Rom. viii. 34) in the Court of Heaven (cf. Christina Rossetti's Verses, p. 41: "Day and night the Accuser"), and the Holy Spirit's down here, wooing us to faith by His gracious importunities, δίκαιον, Rothe: "Only the righteous One, the guiltless, the One that is separate from sin, can be the Advocate with God for sinners, in general the Mediator of salvation, and make His friendship for us prevalent with God, because only such a one has access to God and fellowship with God (Heb. vii. 25; 1 Peter iii. 18; John xvi. 8, 10)." "What better advocate could we have for us, than He that is appointed to be our judge?" (Jer. Taylor, The Great Exemplar, I. i. 3).

Ver. 2. Our Advocate does not plead that we are innocent or add extenuating circumstances. He acknowledges our guilt and presents His vicarious
work as the ground of our acquittal. He stands in the Court of Heaven ἄριστον ὦν ἐσφαγμένον (Rev. v. 6) and the marks of His sore Passion are a mute but eloquent appeal: "I suffered all this for sinners, and shall it go for naught?" τοῦ κόσμου, pro totius mundi (Vulgate), "for the sins of the whole world". This is grammatically possible (cf. Matt. v. 20), but it misses the point. There are sins special and occasional, in the believer; there is sin in the world; it is sin-ful through and through. The Apostle means "for our sins and that mass of sin, the world". Cf. Rothe: "Die 'Welt' ist ihrem Begriff zufolge überhaupt sündig, ein Sündenmasse, und hat nicht blos einzelne Sünden an sich". The remedy is co-mensurate with the malady. Bengel: "Quam late patet peccatum, tam late propitiatio".

Observe how the Apostle classes himself with his readers: "we have," "our sins" — a rebuke of priestcraft. Cf. Aug.: "But some one will say: 'Do not holy men pray for us? Do not bishops and prelates pray for the people?' Nay, attend to the Scriptures, and see that even the prelates commend themselves to the people. For the Apostle says to the common folk 'withal praying for us'. The Apostle prays for the folk, the folk for the Apostle. We pray for you, brethren; but pray ye also for us. Let all the members pray for one another, let the Head intercede for all."

Vv. 3-6. The Proof of our Interest in Christ's Propitiation and Advocacy. "And herein we get to know that we know Him—if we observe His commandments. He that saith 'I know Him,' and observeth not His commandments, is a liar, and in this man the Truth is not; but whosoever observeth His Word, truly in this man the love of God hath been carried to its end. Herein we get to know that we are in Him; he that saith he abideth in Him is bound, even as the Lord (ἐκεῖνος) walked, himself also so to walk." The Apostle foresees a question which may be raised: "How can I be assured that Christ is all this to me—my Propitiation, my Advocate? And how can I be assured that I have an abiding interest in Him?" He answers: (1) We attain to personal and conscious acquaintance with Christ by observance of His commandments (3-5a); (2) we attain to assurance of abiding union with Him by "walking even as He walked" (5b, 6).

Ver. 3. The principle is that it is not enough to understand the theory; we must put it into practice. E.g., what makes an artist? Not merely learning the rules of perspective and mixture of colours, but actually putting one's hand to brush and canvas. First attempts may be unsuccessful, but skill comes by patient practice. Cf. Rembrandt's advice to his pupil Hoogstraten: "Try to put well in practice what you already know; and in doing so you will, in good time, discover the hidden things which you inquire about". To know about Christ, to understand the doctrine of His person and work is mere theory; we get to know Him and to know that we know Him by practice of His precepts.

Ver. 4. μὴ τηρῶν, in classical Greek a gentle hypothesis, merely suggesting a possible case; but in later Greek μή is the regular negative with participles. It was an actual error, else the Apostle would hardly have spoken so emphatically about it. Φιλία, see note on i. 8.

Ver. 5. ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the love of God," is ambiguous like ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη, amor Dei, l'amore di Dio, l'amour de Dieu, die Liebe Gottes. It might be objective genitive, "love for God," "die Liebe zur Gott" (Rothe). But the believer's love for God is never perfected in this life. The genitive is subjective (cf. iv. 9), amor Dei erga hominem, per Christum nobis reconciliatus (Bengel).
and the idea is that the redeeming love of God has attained its end in the man who observes His Word. Cf. Isa. iii. 11. St. Augustine understands “the love of God” as His love for sinners, a forgiving love like that of Jesus when He prayed on the Cross “Father, forgive them”. “What is the perfection of love? It is both to love one’s enemies and to love them in order that they may be brethren.” By cultivating a love like this we get to know that we know Him. τούτων (b) points forward to δέ λέγων, κ.τ.λ., introducing a second assurance. It is not enough to know Him; we must be sure of continuing in fellowship with Him, of “abiding in Him” to the end. This assurance comes by “walking even as He walked”; i.e. the conformation of our lives to His is an evidence of our abiding interest in Him, our vital union with Him. We get like Him by imitating Him, and our likeness to Him is an irrefragable evidence to ourselves and the world that we are His, as a son’s likeness to his father proves their relationship. διεσέρχομαι, “is bound,” “is schuldig” (Rothe), of moral obligation. The claim (δέ λέγων) must be honourably attested. αὐτὸς in this section refers grammatically to Jesus Christ vv. 1, 2. The change of pronoun (ἐκεῖνος) does not imply a change of person, since here as in iii. 3, 5, 7, 16, iv. 17, ἐκεῖνος is not a mere pronoun. It is used like ille, and signifies “that great One,” “the Master”. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13. τερματικός, see note on i. 6. Aug.: “Perhaps He admonishes us to walk in the sea. Far from it! He admonishes us to walk in the way of righteousness.”

Vv. 7-11. A New Meaning in an Old Commandment. “Beloved, it is a new commandment that I am writing to you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye heard. Again, it is a new commandment that I am writing to you—a thing which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the light, the true light, is already shining. He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother is in the darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no stumbling-block in his way; but he that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not where he is going, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes.”

St. John has lately discovered the supremacy of Love in the Christian revelation (see Introd. pp. 249 f.). His imperfect realisation of this has been the defect of his teaching hitherto, and he would now repair it: “It is not a new commandment that I am writing to you; it is part of the Gospel which I have been preaching to you all along. But I have never adequately understood it, and therefore it is new to your ears as it is to my heart.”

Ver. 7. ἀγαπητὲς, St. John’s favourite style (cf. iii. 2, 21, iv. 1, 7, 11). About to enjoin love, he begins by loving. καυδά, “novel,” “new in kind” (novus) as distinguished from νέος, “new in time” (recent). ἐστίν ἄρχη, here not as in i. 1, but “from the beginning of your Christian life”. ἡ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς αἰωνίου.

Ver. 8. τὰλιν, “again,” i.e. in another sense, from another point of view, not in itself but in our recognition of it, “it is a new commandment”. ἐστίν ἄρχη, in opposition to ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—“a thing which is true,” viz., the paramount
necessity of Love. This truth, though
unperceived, is contained in the reveal-
tion of Jesus Christ (ο οικονομος) and proved
in the experience of believers (ο οικονομος).
It is a fact that hatred of one's brother
closes the soul and shuts out the light.
"I know this," says the Apostle, "because
the darkness is passing away and
the light, the true light, is already
shining," i.e. my eyes are getting accustomed
to the light of the Gospel-revelation,
and I have seen this truth which at first
was hidden from me. Adjectives in
- νος denote the material of which the
thing is made; and ακαθαρσία is used of
the real as opposed to the type
(cf. John vi. 33, xv. 1; Heb. viii. 2, ix.
24) or to the counterfeit (cf. Symb. Nic.:
Θεός ἀκαθαρσία ἐν Θεού ἀκαθαρσίαν "very
God of very God," i.e. the real God as
opposed to false gods, idols, which were
"things of naught"). The opposite of
τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀκαθαρσίαν is, on the one hand,
the dim light of the Jewish Law (the
type) and, on the other, the false light of
human speculation (the counterfeit).

Ver. 9. He says and perhaps thinks
he is in the light, but he has never seen
the light; it has never shone on him.
ἀκαθαρσία, on the lips of Jesus a fellow-
man (cf. Matt. v. 45; Luke xv. 30, 32),
in the apostolic writings a fellow-Christian
(cf. v. 1-2, 16)—one of the apostolic
narrowings of the Lord's teaching. Cf.
"neighbour"—with the Rabbi, a fellow-
Jew; with Jesus, a fellow-man (cf. Luke
x. 25-37). There is no contradiction be-
The best commentary on the latter is
John xii. 25.

Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει: he does
not merely catch glimpses of the light
but "abideth in it," being of one mind
with God, the common Father, who "is
light" (i. 5). σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἐστιν ἐν
αὐτῷ, "there is no occasion of stumbling,
nothing to trip him up and make him fall,
in his case,"—an echo of John xi.
9, 10. Another interpretation, less agree-
able to the context but more consonant
with the common use of σκάνδαλον (cf.
Matt. xiii. 41, xviii. 7; Rom. xiv. 13), is:
Because he is winsome and gracious,
there is in him no stumbling-block to
others, nothing to deter them from
accepting the Gospel. The love of
the primitive Christians impressed the
heathen. Cf. Tert. Apol. 39: "Vide,
inquiet, ut invicem se diligent: ipsi
enim invicem odorant; et ut pro alterutro
mori sint parati: ipsi enim ad occidentum
alterutrum paratoren erunt." Ep. ad
Diogn. 1: καὶ τίνα πρὸς ἀλληλους. This
spirit disappeared, and in view of the bitter
controversies of the 4th century the Pagan
historian Ammianus avowed that "the
enmity of the Christians toward each
other surpassed the fury of savage beasts
against man." Another interpretation
takes αὐτῷ as neuter: "There is no
occasion of stumbling in it," i.e. in

Ver. 11. St. John recognises no neutral
attitude between "love" and "hatred."
Love is active benevolence, and less than
this is hatred, just as indifference to
the Gospel-calling amounts to rejection of it
(cf. Matt. xxii. 5-7). Observe the climax:
"in the darkness is, and in the darkness
walketh, and knoweth not where he is
going." ἐστιν χάρισμα, aor. of the indefi-
nite past, where we would use the perf.
135 ff.). The penalty of living in the
darkness is not merely that one does not
see, but that one goes blind. The neg-
egated faculty is atrophied. Cf. the mole,
the crustacea in the subterranean lakes
of the Mammoth Caves of Kentucky.

Observe how St. John emphasises and
elaborates the old-new commandment
"Love thy brother," reiterating it, put-
ning it negatively and positively.

VV. 12-17. The Appeal of Experience.
"I am writing to you, little children,
because your sins have been forgiven you
for His name's sake; I am writing to you,
fathers, because ye have got to
know Him that it is from the beginning;
I am writing to you, young men, because ye have conquered the Evil One. I wrote to you, little ones, because ye have got to know Him that is from the beginning; I wrote to you, young men, because ye are strong, and the Lord of God abideth in you, and ye have conquered the Evil One. Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world. If any one loveth the world, the love of the Father is not in him; because everything that is in the world—the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the braggart boast of life—is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world is passing away and the lust of it, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.

The Apostle has been setting forth searching truths and is about to make an exacting claim; and here he pauses and with much tenderness reassures his readers: "I am not addressing you as unbelievers or casting doubt upon the sincerity of your faith. On the contrary, it is because I am assured thereof that I am writing this letter to you and wrote the Gospel which accompanies it." Ver. 12. τεκνία, all the Apostle's readers, his customary appellation (see n. on ii. 1). δεσπώται, perf., the Doric form of δεσπόται, το δόμα αὐτοῦ, the character, mind, purpose of God revealed in Christ. "The name of God" is "whatsoever there is whereby he makes himself known" (Westm. Larg. Catech.). Ver. 13. He now subdivides τεκνία into πατέρες, i.e., mature believers with a long and ever-deepening (ἐγνώκατε) experience behind them, and νεανίσκοι, who, though ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς is strong within them, have conquered the Evil One by the aids of grace—an evidence of the reality of their interest in Christ. δι' ἀρχῆς, as in i. 1. The ancient interpreters took τεκνία, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι as a threefold classification, according to age (Aug., Athan.) or according to Christian experience, κατὰ τὸν ἐν οἴκῳ ἐνδοτὸν (Euth. Zig.); but the order would then be either τεκνία, νεανίσκοι, πατέρες or πατέρες, νεανίσκοι, τεκνία. According to the variant γράφω ὑμῖν, παῖδα, τεκνία is a general appellation subdivided into πατέρες, νεανίσκοι, παῖδα. Ver. 14 should begin with ἐγραφαὶ ὑμῖν, παῖδα. The so-called ἐγραφαὶ ὑμῖν, τεκνία, regards πατέρες ... πατέρον as an interpolation. This is to cut the knot instead of untying it. παῖδα, a general appellation for all the Apostle's readers, practically identical with τεκνία. Strictly τεκνία carries the idea of relationship by birth-regeneration; cf. Aug.: "Quia re-mittuntur vobis peccata per nomen ejus, et regeneramin in novam vitam, ideo filii". παῖδα, on the other hand, are merely "children," pueri (Aug.), infantes (Vulg.), and the distinction is δι' ἐγνώκατε τὸν Πατέρα. All men are children of God, believers are children who "have got to know the Father".
greater. He gives the same reason also for writing to the young men, but he amplifies it: they have the strength of youth, but it is disciplined by the indwelling Word, and therefore they have conquered.

Ver. 15. He is dealing with believers who have a large experience of the grace of Christ, and on this fact he proceeds to base an appeal, a call to further advancement and higher attainment: "Love not the world". Yet God "loved the world" (John iii. 16). Observe that the Apostle does not say that the world is evil. It is God's world, and, "God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. i. 31). His meaning is: "The things in the world are transient. Do not set your affection on them, else you will sustain a bitter disappointment. The world is a good and beautiful gift of God, to be used with joy and gratitude; but it is not the supreme end, it is not the home of our souls". "Let the Spirit of God be in thee," says St. Augustine, "that thou mayest see that all these things are good; but woe to thee if thou love created things and forsake the Creator!"

If a bridegroom made a ring for his bride and, when she got it, she were fonder of the ring than of the bridegroom who made the ring for her, would not an adulterous spirit be detected in the very gift of the bridegroom, however she might love what the bridegroom gave?... God gave thee all those things: love Him who made them. There is more which He would fain give thee, to wit, Himself who made these things". Again: "There are two loves—of the world and of God. If the love of the world inhabit, there is no way for the love of God to enter. Let the love of the world retire and that of God inhabit, let the better get room. Shut out evil love of the world, that thou mayest be filled by the love of God. Thou art a vessel, but thou art still full; pour out what thou hast, that thou mayest get what thou hast not". "Love not the world" (1 John iv. 2). In antithesis to "love" the world, he amplifies it: they have the strength of youth, but it is disciplined by the indwelling Word, and therefore they have conquered.

Ver. 16. "Love not the world" (1 John iv. 2). In antithesis to "love" the world, he amplifies it: they have the strength of youth, but it is disciplined by the indwelling Word, and therefore they have conquered.

Thou art a vessel, but thou art still full; pour out what thou hast, that thou mayest get what thou hast not". "Love not the world" (1 John iv. 2). In antithesis to "love" the world, he amplifies it: they have the strength of youth, but it is disciplined by the indwelling Word, and therefore they have conquered.

Ver. 17. An explanation, especially of the word "braggart boasting". To set one's affection on the things of the world is "braggart boasting"; for they are not ours, they are transient. Cf. Mohammed: "What have I to do with the...
comforts of this life? The world and I—what connection is there between us? Verily the world is no otherwise than as a tree unto me: when the traveller hath rested under its shade, he passeth on.”


Vv. 18-29. A Warning against Heretical Teaching. “Little ones, it is the last hour; and, as ye heard that Antichrist is coming, even now have many antichrists arisen; whence we recognise that it is the last hour. From our company they went out, but they were not of our company; for, if they had been of our company, they would have abode in our fellowship; but the purpose of it was that it may be manifested that they all are not of our company. And ye have a chrismin the Holy One, and ye all know. I did not write to you because ye did not know the Truth, but because ye know it and because every lie is not of the Truth. Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist—he that denieth the Father and the Son. Every one that denieth the Son neither hath he the Father; he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also. As for you, that which ye heard from the beginning, let it abide in you. If that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning, ye also in the Son and in the Father will abide. And this is the promise which He Himself promised us—the Life, the Eternal Life. These things I wrote to you regarding them that would lead you astray. And as for you, the chrismin you which ye received from Him abide in you, and ye have no need that any one should teach you; but, as His chrismin you regarding all things, and is true and is not a lie, and even as it taught you, abide in Him. And now, little children, abide in Him, that, if He be manifested, we may have boldness and not be shamed away from Him at His advent. If ye know that He is righteous, recognise that every one also that doeth righteousness hath been begotten of Him.”

A heresy had arisen in the bosom of the Church (see Introd. pp. 248 f.). It was a fatal heresy, a denial of the possibility of the Incarnation, and therefore of the relation of fatherhood and sonship between God and man. St. John’s emphatic condemnation of it was justified, but his apprehension was groundless. He shared the prevailing expectation of the imminence of the Second Advent (cf. 1 Cor. xi, xv, 51; Phil. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 15 sqq.; Heb. x. 25; James v. 8; 1 Peter iv. 7; Rev. i. 1, 3, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 10, 12, 20), and saw in the heresy an evidence that the end was at hand. It was rather an evidence that the Gospel was winning its way. The era of simple and unquestioning faith in the apostolic testimony was past, and men were beginning to enquire and reason. A heresy has the same use in theology as a mistaken hypothesis in science: it provokes thought and leads to a deeper understanding. What seemed to the Apostle the pangs of dissolution were in reality “growing pains”.

Ver. 18. Aug.: “Pueros alloquitur, ut festinente crescere, quia novissima hora est . . . Proficite, currite, crescite, novissima hora est”. Ver. 28 puts it beyond doubt that ἀπὸ means “the end of the world,” and rules out various attempts which have been made to give it another reference and absolve the Apostle from the current misconception: (1) Aug. says vaguely: “the last hour is of long duration, yet it is the last” (novissima hora diuturna est; fames et novissima est). And Calv.: “Nothing any longer remains but that Christ should appear for the redemption of the world . . . He calls that ‘the last time’ in which all things are being so completed that nothing is left except the last revelation of Christ”. (2) Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., on
John xxi. 22, compares ὅσιος ἡ εἰς τὴν τελ. καὶ τὴν ἐντάξειν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, βασιλείας ἡ ἡγεμόνας τῆς καὶ αἰώνιον τοῖς αἰῶνιοι, ἡ ἡμοῦ αὐτῶν ρήματα, ἦν ἐν ἀρχήν. Cf. the contrast between the Word and the Baptist in John i. 1. 6.

Ver. 19. Cf. Aug.: "Sic sunt in cor-

pore Christi quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus: sic et mali quando exuntur, tunc Ecclesia relevarit. Et dicit quando eoe evomit atque proiectus corpus: Ex me exierunt uniores isti, sed non erant ex me. Quid esse est, non erant ex me? Non de carne mea praecisi sunt, sed pectus mihi premente cum inessent". Tert. De Bapt. 7: "Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur beneficata unctione de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo in coru in sacerdotium solemiit"; Aug.: "Uncio spiritualis ipse Spiritus sanctus est, cujus sacramentum est in unctione visibili"; but there is no reference here to this rite, which was of a later date and was derived from our passage. χρίσθης is suggested by ἀντίχριστος. "They are ἀντίχριστοι, you are χρίστοι." Cf. Ps. cv. (civ. LXX) 15: μὴ ἐγκαταλείπη τῶν χρίσθην μου. τοῦ Αἴγου, not the Holy Spirit. St. John has τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, and claimed to be an enlightened Christianity; yet, while calling themselves Christians, Cerinthus and his followers were adversaries of Christ. Wetst.: "Qui se pro Christo gerit, ideoque ei contrarius est", ἀντίχριστος τοῦλος, the exponents and representatives of the antichristian movement were a numerous party. ἀντίχριστος, "have arisen," in contrast to the true Christ who "was in the beginning". Cf. the contrast between the Word and the Baptist in John i. 1. 6.

Ver. 21. Ἑγγέρσω, "I wrote," may refer to the Gospel, which is an exposition of the Incarnation, ὁ τοῦ Σωτῆρος Χριστὸς ἐγεννήθη εἰς ἡμᾶς (cf. note on ver. 14); but more probably "aor. referring to the moment just past" (Jebb on Soph. O.T. 337). The aor. is appro-
priate. No sooner has he spoken of the antichrists than he hastens to reiterate his assurance of confidence in his readers. The denial of parentage (cf. iii. 8-10). His readers had only to be reminded of their experience (παντασα, and it would keep them from being led astray. An experience is an anchor to the soul in time of storm. "Tell me," said the dying Cromwell to a minister, "is it possible to fall from grace?" "No, it is not possible." "Then I am safe, for I know that I was once in grace" (Morley's Oliver Cromwell, V. x.).

Ver. 22. ναῦταις, cf. n. on i. 6. The Cerinthian distinction between Jesus and the Christ was a denial of the possibility of the incarnation, i.e., of the filial relation of man to God. δικαιοσύνη is a common Greek idiom, not unknown in English; cf. Shakespeare, Comedy of Errors, iv. ii. 7: "He denied you had in him no right.

Ver. 23. Since the Father is manifested and interpreted in the Son. Cf. John i. 18, xiv. 9.

Ver. 24. τῆς ἀρχῆς, as in ver. 7. The significant iteration of μένειν is lost in A.V. ("abide... remain... continue"). οὗ τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ: observe the order. The Son is the manifestation of the Father; through Him we reach the Unseen Father (cf. John xiv. 9).

Ver. 25. ἐπαγγελία, a new promise, "promised"; only here in the Johannine writings (see note on i. 5). αὐτὸς, i.e., the Father. God is the Promiser, and His promises are made in Christ (cf. 2 Cor. i. 20).

Ver. 26. ἐγραφα, see note on ver. 21. ὁ παλαιότερος, the heretical teachers. Pres. partic. "are leading astray" but unsuccessfully.

Ver. 27. The ground of the Apostle's confidence in his readers. They need not be taught but only reminded. Διὰ δὲ, αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς, a single sentence with one apodosis. Vulg. makes it a double sentence with two apodoses: "as His chrism is teaching you regarding all things, it is indeed true and is not a lie; and even as it taught you, abide in Him." Reading Διὰ δὲ, translate: "ye have no need that any one should teach you, but His chrism is teaching you... a lie; and even as, etc." Σημεῖας, of the continued teaching by the grace of the Spirit; Σημεῖαν, of the illumination at the hour of conversion. μένειν, plainly imperative, in next ver., can hardly be indicated here ("ye are abiding"). The reading μένετε ("ye shall abide") would express the Apostle's confidence in the steadfastness of his...
III. 1. "Is he not 1η ραπαθήναν ὄρατον δεδωκαν αἵματι ὁ πατήρ, ἵνα

τέκνα θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων σώσῃ"? 2. "Εἰ δὲ τούτῳ δόσοις ὑμῖν ἥμαρτεν, διὸ

πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην," ἡκατέρων τῆς ἐποίησεν τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἣν ὁ ἀγιός Πνεῦμα ἐγένετο.


v. 31, iv. ἰδίως ἀνομία γεγένηται. ἐπὶ πλείους, ὡς ἡ ἐποίησις τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ἵνα τέκνα θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων σώσῃ. "

182 ΙΩΑΝΟΥ Α. ΙΙ. 28—29. III.

CHAPTER III. Vv. 1-3. Our Present Dignity and Our Future Destiny. "See what unearthly love the Father hath given us, in order that we may be styled 'children of God'; and so we are. It is for this reason that the world doth not recognise us, because it did not recognise Him. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it was not yet manifested what we shall be. We know that, if it be manifested, we shall be like Him, because we shall see Him even as He is. And every one that hath this hope resting on Him purifieth himself even as the Lord is pure."

Ver. 1. St. John has been speaking of the salvation which Jesus has brought—His Propitiation and Advocacy, and He sees and would have his readers see in it an amazing expression of the love of God. Cf. John iii. 16. τοπανήθη (πανηθήθη), properly κυπάρισσα, "of what country," though approximating in late Greek to τοιούτος, quælitis, "of what sort" (cf. Moulton, Gram. of N.T. Gr., i. p. 95), retains something of its proper and original signification. The love of God in Christ is foreign to this world: "from what far realm? what unearthly love?" Cf. Matt. viii. 27: "What unearthly personage?"

2 Peter iii. 11: "How other-worldly!

Τῷ, κ.τ.λ., the purpose of this amazing..."
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The Obligation of our Dignity as Children of God. "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness. And ye know that He was manifested that He might destroy the one that destroyeth the sin; and sin in Him there is not. Every one that abideth in Him doth not keep sinning; every one that keepeth sinning hath not seen Him nor got to know Him. Little children, let no one lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous; he that doeth sin is of the Devil, because from the beginning the Devil keepeth sinning. To this end was the Son of God manifested, that He might undo the works of the Devil. Every one that hath been begotten of God doeth not sin, because His seed is in him abideth; and he cannot keep sinning, because of God he hath been begotten. Herein are manifest the children of God and the children of the Devil: every one that doeth not righteousness is not of God, and he that loveth not his brother. Because this is the message which ye heard from the beginning, that we love one another. Not as Cain was of the Evil One and slew his brother. And wherewith did he slay him? Because his works were evil, but his brother's righteous."

4.  ὃς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν τοιοῦτοι· καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀστῶν· καὶ ἡ ἀνομία ἀστῶν. 5. καὶ ὁποίας ἐστὶν ἐκείνος ἕφανερωθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν δρη. καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ ὁδόν ἐστιν. 6. πᾶς ὃς ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, ἀδικία ἀμαρτᾶτε· τὰς ἀμαρτίας, ἀδικία ἀφαίρεται αὐτῶν. 7. τεκνία, μὴ ἔχετε πλανάτω ἁμαρτάνετε.
righteous character expresses itself in righteous conduct. Christ (Ioséne) is the type. He was "the Son of God," and if we are "children of God," we must be like Him.

Ver. 8. ὁ πατὴρ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, an emphatic and interpretative variation of ἀμαρτάνω—"he that makes sin his business or practice". ἐκ of parentage (cf. vers. 9); "hoc est, ex patre diabolo" (Clem. Alex.). ἀρχή, a vague phrase. In i. 1 "ere time began"; in ii. 7, iii. 11, "from the beginning of your Christian life". Here "from the beginning of his diabolic career"; "a quo peccare capit incontrovertibiliter in peccando perseverans" (Clem. Alex.). ἀρχή, "loose," metaphorically of "loosening a bond," "relaxing an obligation" (Matt. v. 19; John v. 19), "pulling to pieces" (John ii. 19).

Ver. 9. The Reason of the Impossibility of a Child of God continuing in Sin. The germ of the divine life has been implanted in our souls, and it grows—a gradual process and subject to occasional retardations, yet sure, attaining at length to full fruition. The believer's lapsees into sin are like the mischances of the weather which hinder the seed's growth. The growth of a living seed may be checked temporarily; if there be no growth, there is no life. This is the distinction between ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ and ἀμαρτάνω. Alexander in Speaker's Comm. understands: "His seed," i.e., whosoever is born of God (cf. Isa. lxxvi. 22), "abideth in Him," i.e., in God. This is Pauline but not Johannine. "He cannot keep sinning," as the seed cannot cease growing.


Ver. 10. The Apostle reiterates the "old commandment" (ii. 7-11) as not only the paramount duty of believers but the evidence of their divine sonship. He has said that the evidence lies in "doing righteousness," and now he defines πατημὸς δικαιοσύνης as ἀμαρτάνω τῶν ἁγαπητῶν αὐτοῦ. See note on ii. 9. The "righteousness" of the Pharisees consisted in ritual observance, that of Jesus in love. Δικαιοσύνη had the meaning "kind," "sweetly reasonable". See Hatch,Ess.in Bib. Gk.,p. 50 ff. On Matt. i. 19 St. Chrysostom remarks: Δικαιοσύνη ἡ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐν ἑμῖν λέγεται. ἦν μὴ γὰρ δικαιοσύνη καὶ τὸ μὴ πλεονεκτεῖν· ἦστε δὲ καὶ ἡ καθολικὴ ἁρετή... Δικαιοσύνη οὐν δὲν, τούτων χρηστάς καὶ ἐτεκνεῖς.


Ver. 12. oμοίωσις, k.t.l., a loose, almost ungrammatical expression, analogous to John vi. 58. Were there no φρονοσ, ver. 11 might be regarded as a parenthesis: "he that loveth not his brother, even as Cain was, etc." The phrase is elliptical: "We must not hate our brethren, even as Cain was, etc." τοῦ ποιοῦ, see note on ii. 18. ἀφαίρεσις, a strong word, "slaughtered," "butchered," properly by cutting the throat (jugulare), like an ox in the shambles.

Vv. 13-24. The Secret of Assurance. "Wonder not, brethren, if the world hatest you. We know that we have migrated out of the domain of death into the domain of life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in the domain of death. Everyone that
hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that every murderer hath not life eternal abiding in him. Herein have we got to know love, because He laid down His life for us; and we are bound to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whosoever hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need and locket up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? Little children, let us not love with word nor with the tongue, but in deed and truth. Herein shall we get to know that we are of the Truth, and in His presence shall assure our heart, whereinover our heart may condemn us, because greater is God than our heart, and He readeth everything. Beloved, if the heart condemn not, we have boldness toward God, and whatever we ask we receive from Him, because we observe His commandments and do the things that are pleasing in His sight. And this is His commandment, that we believe the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another, even as He gave a commandment to us. And he that observeth His commandments in Him abideth and He in him; and herein we get to know that He abideth in us—from the Spirit which He gave us.

Ver. 13. It is natural that the world (see notes on ii. 15, iii. 1) should hate those whose lives contradict its maxims and condemn its practices. St. John frequently addresses his readers as ἀδελφοί, and ἀδελφοίοι; here only as ἄδελφοι. The term suits the context, where he enunciates love of the brethren. It is no wonder if the world hate us, and its judgment is not decisive. Nevertheless our business is not to be hated by the world, but to commend Jesus to it and win it. We must not impute to the world's hostility to goodness the consequences of our own unamiable or tactlessness. "It is not martyrdom to pay bills that one has run into one's self" (Geo. Eliot).

Ver. 14. ἡμεῖς emphatic: "Whatever the world may say, we know." The test is not its hatred but our love. metαβεβήκαμεν, "have migrated." The word is used of transition from one place to another (John vii. 3, xiii. 1), of passing from one form of government to another (Plat. Rep. 550 D), of the transmigration of souls (Luc. Gall. 4).


Ver. 16. τὴν ἀγάπην, "the thing called 'love'". The love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord is the perfect type. Till the world saw that, it never knew what love is. ἐκεῖνος, Christ; see note on ii. 6. ἡμεῖς emphatic, "we on our part". φιλομεν, see note on ii. 6.

Ver. 17. Love must be practical. It is easy to "lay down one's life"; martyrdom is heroic and exhilarating; the difficulty lies in doing the little things, facing day by day the petty sacrifices and self-denials which no one notices and no one applauds. τὸν βλέν τοῦ κόσμου, "the livelihood of the world"; see note on ii. 16. θεωρή of a moving spectacle; cf. Matt. xxvii. 55. κλείσαι; the metaphor is locking the chamber of the heart instead of flinging...
it wide open and lavishing its treasures. ἀνοιχτά, viscera, “the inward parts,” viewed by the ancients as the seat of the affections. Cf. Col. iii. 12: ἀνοιχτά σκέψεως. ἅ ἐγένετο τ. Θ., “love for God” (objective genitive), inspired by and answering to the love which God feels (subjective genitive). Cf. note on ii. 5.

Ver. 18. Observe the transition from instrumental dative to preposition ἐν: “not with word and the tongue but in the midst of deed and truth”—not in empty air but amid tangible realities. Cf. Bunyan, Good News: “Practical love is best. Many love Christ with nothing but the lick of the tongue.” Sheridan, Sch. for Scand. v. i.: “He appears to have as much speculative benevolence as any private gentleman in the kingdom, though he is seldom so sensual as to indulge himself in the exercise of it.”

Vv. 19-20. A crux interpretum. Read τὴν καρδίαν ἢμῶν, τ. ἄν (i.e. ἂν), and take the subsequent ἐν as “because”. The foregoing exhortation may have awakened a misgiving in our minds: “Am I loving as I ought?” Our failures in duty and service rise up before us, and “our heart condemns us”. So the Apostle furnishes a grand reassurance: “Herein shall we get to know that we are of the Truth, and in His presence shall assure our heart, whereintoever our heart may condemn us, because, etc.”. The reassurance is two-fold: (1) The worst that is in us is known to God (cf. Aug.: Cor ipsum abscendis ab hominibus; a Deo abscondes si potes), and still He cares for us and desires us. Our discovery has been an open secret to Him all along. (2) He “readeth everything”—sees the deepest things, and these are the real things. This is the true test of a man: Is the deepest that is in him the best? Is he better than he seems? His failures lie on the surface; is there a desire for goodness deep down in his soul? Is he glad to escape from superficial judgments and be judged by God who “readeth everything,” who sees “with larger other eyes than ours, to make allowance for us all”? Cf. F. W. Robertson, Lett. ivi.: “I remember an anecdote of Thomas Scott having said to his curate, who was rather agitated on having to preach before him, ‘Well, sir, why should you be afraid before me, when you are not afraid before God?’ But how very easy it was to answer! He had only to say, God is not jealous, nor envious, nor censorious; besides, God can make allowances”. So Browning:—

“Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and
escaped;
All I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel
the pitcher shaped.”

ἐνοικοστηθος αὐτῷ, and what matter how we appear ἐνοικοστηθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Matt. vi. 1)? πειθομέν, “persuade,” i.e. pacify, win the confidence, soothe the alarm, of our heart. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 14. Otherwise: “we shall persuade our heart... that greater is God.” But
how can love for the brethren yield this inference? γνώσης τάντα, “readeth every secret”. Cf. John ii. 25. A quite different and less satisfying sense is got by punctuating τινὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν· διὰ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. The second ἡμῶν is then a difficulty and has been dealt with in three ways: (1) It has been ignored as redundant: “For if our heart condemn us, God is greater, etc.” (A.V. fortified by the omission of the participle in some inferior MSS.). (2) An ellipse has been assumed—either of the substantive verb: “because if our heart condemns us, (it is) because God, etc.” (Alford), or of διὰ γὰρ (Field, who compares 1 Tim. vi. 7): “it is plain that God, etc.”. (3) ἡμῶν has been conjecturally emended into ἡμῖν (Steph., Bez.): “still greater is God, etc.”

Vv. 21-22. παρατείνω, see note on ii. 28. διὰ αἰτῶν λαμβάνων, though not always in the form we expect or desire; the answer may be different from but it is always better than our prayer. St. Augustine draws a distinction between the hearing of prayer “ad salutem” and “ad voluntatem,” comparing the experience of St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 7-9): “Rogasti, clamasti, ter clamasti: ipsum semel quod clamasti audivi, non averti aures meas a te; novi quid faciam; tu vis auferri medicamentum quo ueris; ego novi inimicitatem qua gravariss. Ergo iste ad salutem exauditis est, ad voluntatem non est exauditus. . . . Tu morbum confitearis, ille medicamentum adhiebeat.” Cf. Juan de Avila: “Go to prayer rather to hearken than to speak. Bend humbly and lovingly before God, expecting.”

IV. 1. ἀγαπητοί, μη παρτί πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμαζετε, to hearken than to speak. Bend humbly and lovingly before God, expecting.”

τηροῦν, see note on ii. 3.

Ver. 23. Cf. our Lord’s summary of the commandments in Matt. xxi. 34-40 = Mark xii. 28-31 and observe the apologetic narrowing of τῶν πληροφορῶν (cf. Luke x. 20-37) to ἠλλάξεις, i.e. τῶν ἄλλων (see note on ii. 9). τοῦ ὀνόματος, see note on ii. 12.

Ver. 24. τά δὲ διὰ ἀμφότερα, “the commandments of God,” resuming ver. 22. Cf. iv. 15. ἐκ, the assurance is begotten of the Spirit; see note on ii. 21. ὥστε for διὰ, by attraction to the case of the antecedent (cf. Luke ii. 20; Rev. xviii. 6). ἐκατοστάσεως, “gave,” i.e., when first we believed. For the thought cf. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, 14; also Rom. viii. 15, 16.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-6. The Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error. “Beloved, love not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are from God; because many false prophets have gone forth in the world. Herein ye get to know the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ come in flesh, is from God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus, is not from God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, wherof ye heard that it is coming, and now it is in the world already. Ye are from God, little children, and have conquered them, because greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world. They are from the world; therefore from the world they talk, and the world hearkeneth to them. We are from
God; he that is getting to know God hearkeneth to us; one who is not from God, hearkeneth not to us. From this we get to know the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error."

1. The Apostle has just said that the Spirit begets in us the assurance that God abideth in us. And this suggests a warning. The Cerinthian heresy also had much to say about "the spirit." It boasted a larger spirituality. Starting with the philosophical postulate of an irreconcilable antagonism between matter and spirit, it denied the possibility of the Incarnation and drew a distinction between Jesus and the Christ (see Introd., p. 249). Its spirit was not "the Spirit of Truth" but "a spirit of error," and thus the necessity arises of "proving the spirit." δοκιμαζέων, of proving, or "testing," a coin (φώσιμα). If it stood the test, it was ἄκομην (cf. 2 Cor. x. 18); if it was found counterfeit (κείθελον), it was ἄδοκομην (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. xiii. 5-7). Cf. Jer. vi. 30 LXX: ἀργυρίον ἀποδεικνυμένον ... δι' ἀπεδεικνυμένον αὐτόν Κόρεος. In, here of commission, not parentage; "from God," as His messengers. Cf. John i. 24; xviii. 3; Soph. O.C. 755-757: ἀπεδεικνυμηθαί ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, etc. The Church had a large following. ἔξωπάλαται τοῦ κόσμου, a monstrous reversal of John xvi. 18. They went forth from the Church into the world not to win but to deceive it.

2. The Test of the Spirits. γνώσεσται, as in ii. 29, may be either indicat. ("ye recognise") or, like ἵκτος, ὁμολογείτε, imperat. ("recognise"). The former seems preferable. δοκιμαζέων ἴησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκί ἐλπισθοτά, "confesseth Jesus as Christ come in flesh," an accurate definition of the doctrine which the Cerinthian heresy denied. The argument is destroyed by the false variant ἐλπισθοτά, "confesseth that Jesus Christ hath come," con-

fiteor Jesum Christum in carne venisse (Vulg.)

Ver. 3. The Test negatively expressed. Omit ἴησοῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλπισθοτά. τὸν ἴησοῦν, "the aforementioned Jesus," "Jesus as thus described." μὴ makes the statement hypothetical: "every spirit, if such there be, which doth not confess," The variant λέει τὸν "ἴησον, solvit Jesum (Vulg., Aug.), "dissolves" or "severeth Jesus," i.e., separates the divinity and the humanity, aptly defines the Cerinthian heresy. It was much appealed to in later days against Nesto-

rion. The ecclesiastical historian Socrates (see crit. note) says it was the primitive reading, and was altered by "those who wished to separate the deity from the man of the Incarnation." St. Augustine, defining heresy as schism due to lack of brotherly love, comments: "Ille venit
colligere, tu venis solvere. Distinguere vis membra Christi. Quomodo non negas Christum in carne venisse, qui disrupis Ecclesiam Dei, quam ille congregavit?" On the Antichrist see note on ii. 18. δ' ἀνεµεθείτε δι' ἑρχεται, "which ye have heard that it is coming"—the regular Greek idiom. Cf. Luke iv. 34: oun su τίς εἶ.

Ver. 4. ὅμως emphatic (cf. ii. 20, 27, iii. 14), as contrasted with the deluded world. The faithful are God's delegates (ἐκ), bearing His Master's commission and continuing His warfare (John xx. 21), and they have shared His victory (ἐνακμήτατα). ἀνέβαι, i.e., the false prophets (ver. 1). Eum (Vulg.): "Quem nisti Antichristum?" (Aug.). ἐν ὑμῖν, i.e., God (cf. iii. 24); ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, i.e., ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ τοῦτον (John xii. 31. xiv. 30).

Ver. 5. ἀνέβαι (as opposed to ὅμως) ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἴσειν, as its delegates, messengers, representatives, and as such ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦντες. λαλά, not "speak" (λέγων), but "talk," with a suggestion of prating (cf. John iv. 42). λαλάν takes accus. of the thing heard, genit. of the person from whom it is heard. Cf. Luke v. 1; Acts i. 4 (where both are combined). The world listens to those who speak its own language.

Ver. 6. Conversely, those who are getting to know God, understand the language of His messengers and listen to it. ἐκ τοῦτον, i.e., from their heartening or not heartening. Men's attitude to the message of the Incarnate Saviour ranks them on this side or on that—on God's side or the world's. Of course St. John does not ignore St. Paul's ἅλθησίντες ἐν ἀνέγγυτοι (Eph. iv. 15). The message may be the truth and be rejected, not because of the hearers' worldliness, but because it is wrongly delivered—not gracingly and winsomely. Cf. Rowland Hill's anecdote of the preaching barber who had made a wig for one of his hearers—badly made and nearly double the usual price. When anything particularly profitable escaped the lips of the preacher, the hearer would observe to himself: "Excellent! This should touch my heart; but oh, the wig!" τὴν ἀλλήλους, see note on i. 8. τὸ πν. τῆς πλάνης, "the spirit that leadeth astray.".

Vv. 7-21. The Blessedness of Love.

"Beloved, let us love one another, because love is of God, and every one that loveth of God hath been begotten and is getting to know God. He that loveth not did not get to know God, because God is love. Herein was manifested the love of God in us, because His Son, His only-begotten, hath God commissioned into the world, that we may get life through Him. Herein is the love, not that we have loved God, but that He loved us and commissioned His Son as a propitiation for our sins.

"Beloved, if it was thus that God loved us, we also are bound to love one another. God—no one hath ever yet beheld Him: if we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us. Herein we get to know that we abide in Him and He in us, because of His Spirit He hath given us. And we have beheld and testify that the Father hath commissioned the Son as Saviour of the world. Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, God in him abideth and he in God. And we have got to know and have believed the love which God hath in us.

"God is love, and he that abideth in love in God abideth, and God in him abideth. Herein hath love been perfected with us—so that we may have boldness in the Day of Judgment—because, even as He is, we also are in this world. Fear there is not in love, but the perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth hath not been perfected in love. We love because He first loved us. If one say,
I love God,' and hate his brother, he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, God whom he hath not seen, he cannot love. And this commandment have we from Him, that he that loveth God love also his brother.'

Ver. 7. St. John reiterates the "old commandment" (ii. 7-11). It is so all-important that he cares not though his readers be tired of hearing it. Cf. the anecdote which St. Jerome relates on Gal. vi. 10: "Beatus Ioannes Evangelista cum Ephesi moraretur usque ad ultimam senectutem, et vix inter discipulorum manus ad Ecclesiam deferretur, nec posset in plurae vocem verba contextere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas nisi hoc: Filioli, diligite alterumtur. Tandem discipuli et frater qui aderant, taeio affecti quod eadem semper audirent, dixerunt: Magister, quare semper hoc loqueris? Qui respondit dignam Joanne sententiam: Quia preceptum Domini est, et si solum fiat, sufficat." Love is the divine nature, and those who love have been made partakers of the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4); and by the practice of love they "get to know God" more and more.

Ver. 8. Conversely, a stranger to love is a stranger to God. ὅπερ ἤγγιζεν, "did not get to know," i.e., at the initial crisis of conversion. On αι see note on ii. 4.

Ver. 9. The Incarnation is a manifestation of the love of God because it is a manifestation of the divine nature, and the divine nature is love. ἐν ἡμῖν, "in our souls"—an inward experience. Cf. Gal. i. 16: ἐστιν λατρεία τὸν Θεόν ἐν ἡμῖν, "is rendered the μοναγμὸν μου, ἀπέσταλεν, "hath sent as an ἀπόστολον" (cf. Heb. iii. 1). An apostle is not simply nuntius, but nuntius vices mittenis gerens. Cf. Bab. Ber. 34, 2: "Apostolus cujusvis est sicut ipse a quo deputatur". The perf. is used here because the influence of the Incarnation is permanent. ἔρισμα, ingressive or inceptive aor. Cf. Luke xv. 24, 32; Rev. xx. 4, 5. Ταῦτα ἐρισμαν reconciles φανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη with ἡ ἔρισμα (i. 2). The Incarnation manifested the love of God, and the love was manifested that we might get life. Eternal Life is not future but present: we get it here and now. Cf. John xvii. 3. Amiel: "The eternal life is not the future life; it is life in harmony with the true order of things—life in God".

Ver. 10. The love which proves us children of God is not native to our hearts. It is inspired by the amazing love of God manifested in the Incarnation—the infinite Sacrifice of His Son's life and death. Aug.: "Non illum dileximus prius: nam ipsum omnia dilexit, ut diligamus eum." ἐπιστευτελεῖ: the aor. is used here because the Incarnation is regarded as a distinct event, a historic landmark.

Having inculcated love, the Apostle indicates two incentives thereto: (1) God's love for us imposes on us a moral obligation to love one another (i-16a); (2) If we have love in our hearts, fear is cast out (16b-18).

Ver. 11. Here, as in John i. i. 16, ὅπως may denote either the extent or the manner of God's love—"to such an extent," going such a length (cf. Rom. viii. 33); "in such a manner," righteously, not by a facile amnesty but by a propitiation. ὁμολογεῖ: see note on ii. 6. Noblesse oblige. If we are God's children, we must have our Father's spirit. Cf. Matt. v. 44-48. Thus we requisite His love. Aug.: "Petre, inquit, amas me? Et ille dixit: Amo. Passe ousme meas" (John xxi. 15-17).
Ver. 12. "God— no one hath ever yet beheld Him". By and by "we shall see Him even as He is" (iii. 2), but even now, if we love, we are no strangers to Him: He abides and works in us. 

Ver. 13. Cf. i. 24. The argument is that God would not have granted us this priceless gift if He were not in intimate relation with us and had not a steadfast purpose of grace toward us.

Ver. 14. The apostolic testimony (cf. i. 1-3). ἡμεῖς, either the editorial "we" or "I and the rest of the Apostles who were eye-witnesses". ἀποτέλεσαν, see note on ver. 9.

Ver. 15. ἀμολογήσεως, or, of a definite confession born of persuasion. Such a conviction implies fellowship with God. ἡμεῖς, here "you and I," as we believers. Observe the three stages: (1) "get to know" (γνώσεως), (2) "believe" (πιστεύειν), (3) "confess" (ἀμολογεῖν). In ἡμῖν, see note on ver. 9.

Another incentive to love: it casts out fear. τὸ ἐγκαταστάτη, "the love just mentioned". Cf. τὸν φόβον, ὁ φόβος (ver. 13).

Ver. 17. τετελειωμένος, cf. ver. 12. μεθ' ἡμῖν: love is a heavenly visitant sojourning with us and claiming observance. Love has been "carried to its end" when we are like Jesus, His visible representatives. οὐ... κρίσεως being parenthetical: "herein... because" (iii. 16, iv. 9, 10).

παραστασις, see note on ii. 28. ἐκεῖνος, see note on ii. 6. ἐστιν, "is," not ἦν, "was". Jesus is in the world unseen, and our office is to make Him visible. We are to seek Him where He was to the Father in the days of His flesh— Dei aspectas aspectabilis imago".

Ver. 18. Bern.: "Amor reverentiam necit". φόβος, the opposite of παραστασις. κόλασις ἤκει, "implies punishment," the portion of slaves. The portion of slaves is punishment (κόλασις) and their spirit fear; the portion of sons is chastisement (παιδεία) and their spirit boldness (παραστασις). Cf. Heb. xii. 7. Clem. Alex.: "Perfecto fidelis hominis caritas est". Aug.: "Major charitas, minor timor; minor charitas, major timor". Bengel has here one of his untranslatable comments: "Varius hominum status: sine timore et amore; cum timore sine amore; cum timore et amore; sine timore cum amore."

V. 1. Πάντα δὲ πιστεύοντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν Χριστός, εἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἂν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁλίτων, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄνθρωπον ἐστιν τῆς καθολικοῦ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἑνότητος τῆς καθολικῆς ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος.

3 ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ τῆς ἀνθρώπου τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος τῆς καθολικῆς ἑνότητος.

Ver. 20. Lest the vagueness of the objectless ἀγαπᾶτε encourage false security, St. John reiterates the old test: Love for the Invisible Father is manifested in love for the brother by our side, the image of the Father. Cf. Whittier:

"Not thin the bigot's partial plea,
Nor thin the zealot's ban;
Thou well canst spare a love of thee
Which ends in hate of man."

ψέως, see note on i. 6.

Ver. 21. The Old Commandment. Cf. ii. 7-11.

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-5. What makes the Commandments of God easy? "Every one that hath faith that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God; and every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him that hath been begotten of Him. Herein we get to know that we love the children of God, whenever we love God, and do His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we should observe His commandments; and His commandments are not heavy, because everything that hath been begotten of God conquereth the world. And this is the conquest that conquereth the world—our faith. Who is he that conquereth the world but he that hath faith that Jesus is the Son of God?"

Vv. 1-2. A reiteration of the doctrine that love for God = love for the brethren. Where either is, the other is also. Love for God is the inner principle, love for the brethren its outward manifestation. The argument is "an irregular Sorites" (Plummer):

Every one that hath faith in the Incarnation is a child of God;
Every child of God loves the Father;
Every one that hath faith in the Incarnation loves God;
Every one that loves God loves the children of God;
Every one that hath faith in the Incarnation loves the children of God.

These are the two commandments of God, the fundamental and all-embracing Christian duties—love God and love the brotherhood. And faith in the Incarnation (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν Χριστός) is an inspiration for both.

πιστεύω corresponds to πιστεύει (ver. 4). The lack of a similar correspondence in English is felt here as in many other passages (e.g., Matt. viii. 10, 13; ix. 28, 29). Latin is similarly defective: "omnia qui credidit," "fides nostra."

Ver. 3. ἄγαπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, here objective genitive; contrast ii. 5. fere ecatic (see
Moulton's *Gram. of N. T. Gk.*, i. pp. 206-9, where the classical idiom would require τὸ ἱερᾶς τηρεῖν. Cf. John xvii. 3; Luke i. 43. τὸς ἄνθρωπον, the two commandments—"love the God" and "love one another" (cf. iii. 21, where see note; iv. 21), καὶ τὸ ἄνθρωπον, κ.τ.λ.: cf. Herm. Past. M. xii. 4, § 4: οἱ τῶν αὐτῶν πάντων ἐξειδότα τὸν κόσμον, τὸν ἔργον τῶν αὐτῶν πνευματικάν, καὶ μακρὰν δεῖν νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνεργείαν ἐτξεῖ καὶ δειδεῖται. Aug. In Ἰωάν. Ev. Tract. xlviii. i: "Nostis enim qui amat non laborat. Omnis enim labor non amanibus gravis est."

Ver. 4. The reason why "His commandments are not heavy". Punctuate οὐκ εἰσίν, διὶ ταῦτα, κ.τ.λ. The neut. (πᾶν τὸ γεγ.) expresses the universality of the principle, "drückt die unbedingte Allgemeineinheit noch stärker aus als 'Jeder, der aus Gott geboren ist'" (Rothe). Cf. John iii. 6. τὸν κόσμον, the sum of all the forces antagonistic to the spiritual life. "Our faith" conquers the world by clinging to the eternal realities. "Every common day, he who would be a live child of the living has to fight the God-denying look of things, to believe that, in spite of their look, they are God's, and God is in them, and working his saving will in them" (Geo. MacDonald. *Castle Warlock*, xii.). St. John says first "is conquering," because the fight is in progress, then "that conquered," because the triumph is assured.

Ver. 5. St. John says: "Everything that hath been begotten of God conquereth the world." But he has already said: "Every one that hath faith that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God" (ver. 1). So now he asks: "Who is he that conquereth the world but he that hath faith that Jesus is the Son of God?" ("Son of God" being synonymous with "Christ," i.e., "Messiah"). Cf. John xi. 27, xx. 31). His doctrine therefore is that faith in the Incarnation, believing apprehension of the wonder and glory of it, makes easy the commandments of God, i.e., love to God and love to one another. The remembrance and contemplation of that amazing manifestation drive out the affection of the world and inflame the heart with heavenly love. "What else can the consideration of a compassion so great and undeserved, of a love so free and in such wise proved, of a condescension so unexpected, of a gentleness so unconquerable, of a sweetness so amazing—what, I say, can the diligent consideration of these things do but deliver utterly from every evil passion the soul of him that considers them and hate it unto them in sorrow, exceedingly affecting it, and make it despise in comparison with them whatsoever can be desired only in their despoit?" (Bern. *De Dilig. Deo*). "There is no book so efficacious towards the instructing of a man in all his virtue and in abhorrence of all sin as the Passion of the Son of God" (Juan de Avila). "Fix your eyes on your Crucified Lord, and everything will seem easy to you" (Santa Teresa).

Vv. 6-8. The Threefold Testimony to the Incarnation. "This is He that came through water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood. And it is the Spirit that testifieth, because the Spirit is the Truth. Because three are they that
testify—the Spirit and the water and the blood, and the three are for the one end."

St. John has said that faith in the Incarnation makes the commandments easy, and now the question arises: How can we be assured that the Incarnation is a fact? He adds a threefold attestation: the Spirit, the water and the blood. His meaning is clear when it is understood that he has the Cerinthian heresy (see Intro. pp. 248 f.) in view and states his doctrine in opposition to it. Cerinthus distinguished between Jesus and the Christ! The divine Christ descended upon the human Jesus at the Baptism, i.e., He "came through water," and left him at the Crucifixion, i.e., He did not "come through blood." Thus redemption was excluded; all that was needed was spiritual illumination. In opposition to this St. John declares that the Eternal God was incarnate in Jesus and was manifested in the entire course of His human life, not only at His Baptism, which was His consecration to His ministry of redemption, but at His Death, which was the consummation of His infinite Sacrifice: "through water and blood, not in the water only but in the water and in the blood".

Ver. 6. οὗτος, i.e., this Jesus who is the Son of God, the Messiah whom the prophets foretold and who "came" in the fulness of the time. οἱ λόγοι, not οἱ ληπτομένοι. His Advent no longer an unfulfilled hope but an historic event. διὸ, of the pathway of His Advent. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, "Jesus Christ," one person in opposition to the Cerinthian "dissolution" (ἀρπαγή) of Jesus and Christ (see note on iv. 3). εἰς: He not only “came through” but continued "in the water and in the blood," i.e., His ministry comprehended both the Baptism of the Spirit and the Sacrifice for sin. Perhaps, however, the prepositions are interchangeable; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 4-8; Heb. ix. 12, 25.

διὰ θεότητος: Jesus called Himself "the Truth" (John xiv. 6), and the Spirit came in His room, His alter ego (vv. 16-18).
Vv. 9-12. Our attitude to the Threefold Testimony. "If we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God (God's testimony or God's record) is greater, because this is the testimony of God—what He hath testified concerning His Son. He that believeth in the Son of God hath the testimony in himself. He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the testimony which God hath testified concerning His Son. And this is the testimony, that God gave us eternal life; and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life." 

Ver. 9. According to the Jewish law threefold testimony was valid (Deut. xix. 15; cf. Matt. xviii. 16; John viii. 17-18). Read (as in ii. 20) εἰς μεριμνήν καί ὁ διά τινος ἡ δοκίμασιν. The variant εἰς is a marginal gloss indicating the relative (ἕν, εἰς), not the conjunction (καί). The latter is incapable of satisfactory explanation. The alternatives are: (1) "Because the testimony of God is this—the fact that He hath testified, which is meaningless and involves an abrupt variation in the use of εἰς. (2) "Because this is the testimony of God, because, I say, He hath testified," which is intolerable. The Apostle appeals here to his readers to be as reasonable with God as with their fellow men. Cf. Pascal: "Would the heir to an estate on finding the title-deeds say, 'Perhaps they are false? and would he neglect to examine them?"

Ver. 10. A subtle and profound analysis of the exercise of soul which issues in assured faith. Three stages: (1) Believe God's testimony (credere Deo), accept His testimony concerning His Son, i.e., not simply His testimony at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 17) but the historic manifestation of God in Christ, the Incarnation. God speaks not by words but by acts, and to set aside His supreme act, and all the forces which it has set in operation is to "make Him a liar" by treating His historic testimony as unworthy of credit. (2) "Believe in the Son of God." (πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, credere in Filium Dei) make the believing self-surrender which is the reasonable and inevitable consequence of contemplating the Incarnation and recognizing the wonder of it. (3) The Inward Testimony (ἡ μαρτυρία ἐν αὐτῷ, testimony in seipso). "Feciisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te" (Aug.). The love of Jesus satisfies the deepest need of our nature. When He is welcomed, the soul rises up and greets Him as "all its salvation and all its desire," and the testimony is no longer external in history but an inward experience (cf. note on iv. 9: εἰς ψυχήν), and therefore indubitable. These three stages are, according to the metaphor of Rev. iii. 20, (1) hearing the Saviour's voice, (2) opening the door, (3) communion.

Ver. 11. The Testimony of the Incarnation. Cf. i. 2. Ἀπέκρισεν, "gave," aorist referring to a definite historic act, the Incarnation.

Ver. 12. μὲν with the participle does not necessarily make the case hypothetical (cf. note on ii. 4). St. John would have
13. Ταύτα ἔγραψα ὡμίν τοῖς πιστεύοντις εἰς τὸ δόμα τοῦ ισχίος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ινα εἴδητε ὅτι ἦν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, καὶ ίνα πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ δόμα τοῦ ισχίος τοῦ Θεοῦ. 14. Καὶ αὕτη ἡ παροιμία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν, διότι εὰν τις αἰτίμαθεν κατὰ τὸ θελήμα αὐτοῦ, ἄκοιμη ἡμῖν. 15. καὶ εἰναίδεις δὲ ἄκοιμη ἡμῖν, δ ἀπό αὐτοῦ όμολογείσθω, συνεργάζεσθαι τὸ αὐτήματα καὶ ἱνάξηκαν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ. 16. Εἰπών τις τοῖς οὖν αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτάνοντα ἀμαρτάνους μὴ πρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔφη τῷ θεῷ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτίας ἀμαρτάνεται. 

only too many actual instances before him in those days of doctrinal unsettlement. 

Vv. 13-21. The Epistle is finished, and the Apostle now speaks his closing words. "These things I wrote to you that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even to you that believe in the name of the Son of God. And this is the boldness which we have toward Him, that if we request anything according to His will, He hearkeneth to us. ... and Life Eternal. Little children, guard yourselves from the idols." Ver. 13. The purpose for which St. John wrote his Gospel was that we might believe in the Incarnation, and so have Eternal Life (xx. 31); the purpose of the Epistle is not merely that we may have Eternal Life by believing but that we may know that we have it. The Gospel exhibits the Son of God, the Epistle commends Him. It is a supplement to the Gospel, a personal application and appeal. ἔγραφα, "I wrote," looking back on the accomplished task. εἶδήτα, "know," not γνώσθητα, "get to know". Full and present assurance. 

Ver. 14. παροιμία, see note on ii. 28. As distinguished from αἰτεῖν the middle αἰτεῖσθαι is to pray earnestly as with a personal interest (see Mayor's note on James iv. 3). The distinction does not appear here, since αἰτεῖν αἰτήσεσθαι (cognate accusative) is a colourless periphrasis for αἰτεῖσθαι. A large assurance: our prayers always heard, never unanswered. Observe two limitations: (1) κατὰ τὸ θελήμα αὐτοῦ, which does not mean that we should first ascertain His will and then pray, but that we should pray with the proviso, express or implicit, "If it be Thy will." Matt. xxvi. 30 is the model prayer. (2) The promise is not "He granteth it" but "He hearkeneth to us." He answers in His own way. 

Ver. 15. An amplification of the second limitation. "We have our request;" not always as we pray but as we would pray were we wiser. God gives not what we ask but what we really need. Cf. Shak., Ant. and Cleop. I. ii.:— "We, ignorant of ourselves, Beg often our own harms, which the wise powers Deny us for our good; so find we profit, By losing of our prayers." 

Prayer is not dictation to God but αὐτοπροσέλθεις τοῦ πρὸς Θεόν καὶ αἰτήσετε τὰς προσημεῖστας παρὰ Θεῷ (Joan. Damasc. De Fid. Orthod., iii. 24). Clem. Alex.: "Non absolute dixit quod petierimus sed quod oportet petere." 

Ver. 16. After the grand assurance
that prayer is always heard, never unanswered, the Apostle specifies one kind of prayer, viz. Intercession, in the particular case of a “brother,” i.e. a fellow-believer, who has sinned. Prayer will avail for his restoration, with one reservation—that his sin be “not unto death.” The reference is to those who had been led astray by the heresy, moral and intellectual, which had invaded the churches of Asia Minor (see Intro. pp. 248 f.). They had closed their ears to the voice of Con-science and their eyes to the light of the Truth, and they were exposed to the operation of that law of Degeneration which obtains in the physical, moral, intellectual, and spiritual domains. E.g., a bodily faculty, if neglected, atrophies (cf. note on ii. 11). So in the moral domain disregard of truth destroys veracity. Acts make habits, habits character. So also in the intellectual domain. Cf. Darwin to Sir J. D. Hooker, June 17, 1868: “I am glad you were at the Messiah, it is the one thing that I should like to hear again, but I daresay I should find my soul too dull to appreciate it as in old days; and then I should feel very flat, for it is a horrid bore to feel as I constantly do, that I am a withered leaf for every subject except Science.” And so in the spiritual domain. There are two ways of killing the soul: (1) The benumbing and hardening practice of disregarding spiritual appeals and stifling spiritual impulses. Cf. Reliq. Baxter, I. i. 29: “Bridgnorth had made me resolve that I would never go among a People that had been hardened in unprofitableness under an awakening Ministry; but either to such as had never had any convincing Preacher, or to such as had profited by him.” (2) A decisive apostasy, a deliberate rejection. This was the case of those heretics. They had abjured Christ and followed Antichrist. This is what Jesus calls ος ἀπελθανείν (Matt. xii. 31-32 = Mark iii. 28-30). It inflicts a mortal wound on the man’s spiritual nature. He can never be forgiven because he can never repent. He is “in the grip of an eternal sin (ἀκολουθοῦν διαμαρτύρεται)” (Heb. vi. 4-6). This is “unto death.” Observe how tenderly St. John speaks: There is a fearful possibility of a man putting himself beyond the hope of restoration; but we can never tell when he has crossed the bound-ary. If we were sure that it was a case of “unto death,” then we should forbear praying; but, since we can never be sure, we should always keep on praying. So long as a man is capable of repentance, he has not sinned unto death. The “Quamduo enim veniam supplicante ac discipulis” (St. Chrys.) means that the door of mercy is never closed. The former avoids an abrupt change of sub-ject, and the attribution to the intercessor of what God does through him is paralleled by James v. 20.

Ver. 17. A gentle warning. “Princi-piis obsta.” Also a reassurance. “You have sinned, but not necessarily ‘unto death.’”

Vv. 18-20. The Certainties of Christian Faith. St. John has been speaking of a dark mystery, and now he turns from it: “Do not brood over it. Think rather of the splendid certainties and rejoice in them.”

Ver. 18. Our Security through the Guardianship of Christ. ὁς ἀπελθανείν, see note on iii. 6. The child of God may fall into sin, but he does not continue in it; he is not under its dominion. Why? Because, though he has a malignant foe, he has also a vigilant Guardian. ὁ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, I.e., Christ. Cf. Symb. Nic.: Κύριον ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Ἱην τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός. As distinguished from γεγεννη-μένος the aor. γεγεννῆθη refers to the “Eternal Generation.” The rendering “he that is begotten of God (the regen-erate man) keepeth himself (ἐστειλάθη), qui genitus est ex Deo, servat se ipsum (Calv.), is doubly objectionable: (1) It
ignores the distinction between perf. and aor.; (2) there is no comfort in the thought that we are in our own keeping; our security is not our grip on Christ but His grip on us. Calvin feels this: "Quod Dei proprium est, ad nos transferat. Nam si quisque nostrum salutis sue sit custos, miserum erit præsidium". Vulg. has *generatio* Dei, perhaps representing a variant *génymos* του Θεοῦ. *ταρεί*, see note on ii. 3. δέσσασαι, stronger than "toucheth," rather "graspest, "layeth hold of". A reference to Ps. cv. (LXX civ.). 15: μὴ ἐγκλυθή τῶν χριστών μου, *Nolite tangere christos meos* (Vulg.).

Ver. 19. Our Security in God's Embrace. ὅ κόσμος: "Non creatura sed seculares nomines et secundum concupiscentias viventem" (Clem. Alex.). See note on ii. 15. τῷ ποιμαντῇ, masc. as in prev. vers. καὶ, in antithesis to οὐχ δέσσασαι. On the child of God the Evil One does not so much as lay his hand, the world lies in his arms. On the other hand, the child of God lies in God's arms. Cf. Deut. xxxiii. 27. Penn, *Fruits of Solitude*: "If our Hairs fall not to the Ground, less do we or our Substance without God's Providence. Nor can we fall below the arms of God, how lowsoever it be we fall."

Ver. 20. The Assurance and Guarantee of it all—the fact of the Incarnation (ὅπις ὁ Υἱὸς του Θεοῦ ἦν), an overwhelming demonstration of God's interest in us and His concern for our highest good. Not simply a historic fact but an abiding operation—not "came (ὓλθα)," but "hath come and hath given us". Our faith is not a matter of intellectual theory but of personal and growing acquaintance with God through the enlightenment of Christ's Spirit. τῶν ἀληθινῶν, "the real" as opposed to the false God of the heretics. See note on ii. 8. ἐν τῷ ἀληθείᾳ, as the world is ἐν τῷ ποιμάντῃ.

Ver. 21. Πιτολίω, καταδίκη vos a simulacris (Vulg.). The exhortation arises naturally. "This"—this God revealed and made near and sure in Christ—"is the True God and Life Eternal. Cleave to Him, and do not take to do with false Gods: guard yourselves from the idols." St. John is thinking, not of the heathen worship of Ephesus—Artemis and her Temple, but of the heretical substitutes for the Christian conception of God. τεκνία gives a tone of tenderness to the exhortation. *φυλάσσων* is used of "guarding" a flock (Luke ii. 8), a deposit or trust (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14), a prisoner (Acts xii. 4). *φυλάσσων*, "watch from within"; *τερωθή* (see note on ii. 3), "watch from without". Thus, when a city is besieged, the garrison *φυλάσσων*, the besiegers *τερωθήν*. The heart is a citadel, and it must be guarded against insidious assailants from without. Not *φυλάσσων*, "be on your guard," but *φυλάσετε*, aor. marking a crisis. The Cerinthian heresy was a desperate assault demanding a decisive repulse.
ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ. 1

1 John i; 1.  "Ο ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία 2 καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὗς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ  b ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐγενόκτοις 2 τὴν ἀληθείαν, 2. ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ 2 ἐν ἡμῖν,  b 1 John xvii. καὶ δ ἡμῶν ἐστιν εἰς τῶν αἰωνίων. 3. ἐστιν 4 μεθ' ἡμῶν 5  χάρις,

1: i i. 17. 2: i Peter. 4: i John ii. 14. 24. 37. 9. 1: Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2. 1: John xvii. 2: 1 John xvi. 3: 1 Peter iv. 11. 4: 1 John iv. 17. 1: Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.

1 ἡμῶν Β; ἡμῶν Β, Β; επιστολὴ ἡμῶν Β, Ρ, 96; ἡμῶν καθολικὴ δεύτερα 95; ἡμῶν επιστολὴ καθολικὴ Β, Κ, 101, 106; τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου ἡμῶν τοῦ θεολόγου επιστολὴ δεύτερα L; τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀγίου ἡμῶν τοῦ θεολόγου επιστολὴ δεύτερα 95; επιστολὴ δεύτερα ἡμῶν τοῦ εἰς στήθος 4.

2 τῇ εκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ 72; εκλεκτῇ τῇ κυρίᾳ 31; εκλεκτῇ τῇ κυρίᾳ Α.  3: Κυρίᾳ Syr., Tisch.; 'Εκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ WH (marg.).  4: μεθ' ημῶν Β, K, L, Β, Syr., Sah., Aeth., εἰς χάριν Α.

The Second Epistle. Vv. 1-3. The Address. “The Elder to elect Kyria and her children, whom I love in Truth, and not I alone but all those that have got to know the Truth, because of the Truth that abideth in us; and with us it shall be for ever. Yea, there shall be with us grace, mercy, peace from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father in Truth and love.”

Ver. 1. d πρεσβύτερος, see Introd. pp. 255 ff. ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία, see Introd. pp. 254 f. οὐδὲ, constructio κατὰ σύνων, because τὰ τέκνα were or included sons, not “weil an Gemeinglieder gedacht ist” (Holtzmann). ἐγὼ: according to the Greek idiom, when a man speaks of himself in the third person, he passes immediately to the first. Cf. Plat. Euthyphr. 5 A: οὐδὲ τὰ ἐν διάφοροι εὐθύφρον τῶν πολλῶν αὐτῶν, εἰ μὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα ἄρθρωσις εἰς βίους. Soph. Aj., 864-65. The construction is found in loose English; cf. Thackeray, Barry Lyndon, chap. xviii.: "I was a man who never deserved that so much prosperity should fall to my share." ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (see note on 1 John i. 8) defines the Elder’s love for Kyria as fellowship in Christian knowledge and faith, in view perhaps of heathen accusations of licentiousness. His affection for her and her family was not merely personal; it was inspired by her devotion to the common cause and was shared by all the Christians in his extensive διασπορά. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 18: οὗ ὁ πάνω ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πάσης τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν, “the Truth just mentioned”.

Ver. 2. μεθ' ημῶν, not merely apprehended by the intellect but welcomed by the heart. μεθ' ἡμῶν, nobiscum, bei uns, as our guest and companion.

Ver. 3. ἐστιν μεθ' ἡμῶν, not a wish (1 Peter i. 2; 2 Peter i. 2) but a confident assurance. χάρις, the well-spring in the heart of God; θλος, its outpourings; εὐλογία, its blessed effect. They are evangelical blessings: (1) not merely “from God” but “from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father” who has interpreted Him and brought Him near, made Him accessible; (2) not merely “in Truth,” enlightening the intellect, but “in love,” engaging the heart.
4-6. ἸΩΑΝΟΥ β

Ως, εἰρήνη παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, καὶ παρὰ Κυρίου. Ἐν Χριστῷ τοῦ οὐ τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἁγίᾳ.

4. Ἐξάρην Ἀλάντα: εἰρήνη ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου, ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς ἐντολήν ἔλαβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. 5. καὶ νῦν ἐφέυρε τά, κυρία, ὡς ἐντολήν γραφόμενον σοι καὶ ἀλλὰ ἡν ἐγώ ἐπὶ ἀρχής, ὅταν ἄναγκωμεν ἀλλήλους. 6. καὶ εἰς ἀρχήν ἡ ἁγίᾳ, ἐν περιπατώμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. 

7. ὁ ἱδρυματίας, ὑπὲρ τῶν τεκνῶν, ἐν πάσῃ ἁγίᾳ κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ εἰς ἀρχήν, ὅταν ἥν ἐφέυρε τά, καὶ νῦν ἐντολὴν γραφόμενον τῷ πατρῷ.

1 Κυρίων ΒΚΛΠ, Syrph, Cop., Arm.; om. AB, several minusc., Syrbo, Vg. (a Christo fesm), Aeth., add.  
2 ἀληθείᾳ.  
3 Κυρίων.  
4 γραφῶν several minusc., Aeth., Arm.; γραφῶν ΒΚΛΠ, Vg., add.  
5 γραφῶν καὶ ἐντολής ΒΚΛΠ, WH, Nest.; καὶ ἐντολής ΒΚΛΠ, Μ Α, Tisch.  
6 ἐγώ ἐπὶ ἀρχής, ὅταν ἄναγκωμεν ΒΚΛΠ; ἐγώ ἐπὶ ἀρχής ΒΚΛΠ, edd.  
7 αὐτήν ἐστίν Εἰς ἁγίαν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ εἰς ἀρχήν, ὅταν ἥν ἐφέυρε τά, καὶ νῦν ἐντολὴν γραφόμενον τῷ πατρῷ.

Observe the high tribute which the Elder pays to Kyria: (1) he testifies to the esteem in which she is held; (2) he recognises her as a fellow-worker as though she were a fellow-apostle—the three-fold "us," not "you"; (3) he is about to speak of the danger from heretical teaching, but he has no fear of her being led astray: "You and I are secure from the deceiver. The Truth abideth in us; with us it shall be for ever; yes, there shall be with us grace, mercy, peace." 

Ver. 4. The Occasion of the Epistle. 

"I was exceedingly glad because I have found some of thy children walking in Truth, even as we received commandment from the Father." 

Ἀφάνης, of a glad surprise (cf. Mark xiv. 11). He had been too often disappointed in lads like these (see Introd., p. 14). They had profited by the nurture of their godly home, the best equipment for the battle of life. "No man should ever leave money to his children. It is a curse to them. What we should do for our children, if we would do them the best service we can, is to give them the best training we can procure for them, and then turn them loose in the world without a sixpence to fend for themselves" (Cecil John Rhodes. Ἐρήμα, "I have found."). He sits down at once and writes to Kyria. How glad she would be that her lads, far away in the great city were true to their early faith! ἐκ τῶν τέκνων, "some of thy children" (a tenderer word than "sons," ζυγοῦς), "members of thy family," not implying that others had done ill; the lads who had come to Ephesus. περιπατοῦσας, καὶ ἀμβλατωταὶ in veritate, die in der Wahrheit wandeln, "ordering their lives according to the precepts of the Gospel". 

See note on 1 John i. 6. 

Vv. 5-6. The Comprehensive Commandment. "And now I ask thee, Kyria, not as writing a new commandment to thee but the one which we had from the beginning, that we love one another. And this is love—that we walk according to His commandments; this is the commandment, even as ye heard from the beginning—that we should walk in love," 

These counsels are just a summary of the doctrines expounded at large in the first Epistle. There is here a sort of reasoning in a circle: The commandment is Love; Love is walking according to His commandments; His commandments are summed up in one—Love. 

Ver. 5. ἔκ τῶν τέκνων, "from the beginning of our Christian life": See note on 1 John ii. 7. 

Ver. 6. ἡ ἁγία, "the love just referred to". περιπτατοῦσας, κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, regulating our lives by their requirements; περιπτατοῦσας ἐν θρησκείᾳ (ver. 4), keeping within the limits of the Christian revelation and not straying beyond them—not προδέχοντας (ver. 5). αὐτῆς, i.e., "love," not "the commandment" (Vulg.: Hoc est mandatum, ut . . . in eo ambuletis). περιπτατοῦσας ἐν ἁγίᾳ is synonymous with περιπτατοῦσας ἐν θρησκείᾳ, since Love is Truth in practice. Cf. the story of R. Hillel: A mocking Gentile promised to become a proselyte if he would teach him the whole Law while he stood on one foot—a gibe at the multitudinous precepts, reckoned at 613. "What is hateful to thyself," said the Rabbi, "do not to thy neighbour. This is the whole Law; the rest is commentary." Yalk. Chad., ix. 2: "qui justum cibat frusto,
Vv. 7-8. A Warning against Heretical Teaching. "Because many deceivers went forth into the world—even they that confess not Jesus as Christ coming in flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist. Look to yourselves, that ye may not lose what we wrought, but receive a full wage."

Ver. 7. φρονεῖ σέ: "I ask you to obey the old commandment because seducers are at work". ἐξήλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, see note on 1 John iv. 1. "The deceivers", a definite and well-known sect. See note on 1 John ii. 4. ἐπιλύθηται (1 John iv. 2) of the Advent, ἐπώνυμον of the continuous manifestation of the incarnate Christ. Cf. John i. 14, where ἐπιλύθηται corresponds to ἐπιλύθηται and ἐπισκέψεων in ἐπέρατον ἐπέρας.

Ver. 8. μισθὸς, cf. Matt. xxv. 8; James v. 4. St. John here addresses not only Kyria but her family and "the Church in her house". He views them as his fellow-workers in the Lord's vineyard: "We have worked together (εὐγενέσθα) see that you do not forfeit the reward of your labour. Get a full wage. Be not like workmen who toward the close of the day fall off, doing their work badly or losing time, and get less than a full day's pay." ἄπλασθεντες... ἐπώνυμα... ἐπώνυμα... ἐπώνυμα: "We have been fellow-workers thus far, and I mean to be faithful to the last; see that you also be so". Their danger lay in taking up with false teaching and losing the comfort of the Gospel in its simplicity and fulness.

Ver. 9. Progress in Theological Thought. "Every one that progresseth and abideth not in the teaching of the Christ hath not God; he that abideth in the teaching—this man hath both the Father and the Son." εἰς τὸν τελείου; the Cerinthians (see Intro. pp. 248 f.) boasted of their enlightenment. They were "progressives," "advanced thinkers." τῇ διδακῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the teaching which recognises Jesus as the Christ (see note on 1 John iv. 1-2), i.e. the Messiah, the Saviour. θέντο ἐὰν ἔχετε, i.e. according to His true nature as the Father manifested in the Son (οικὶ τοῦ πατέρα καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ). It is necessary not merely to believe in God but to believe in Him "through Christ" (1 Peter i. 21).

St. John does not here condemn theological progress, which is a necessity of living and growing faith. A doctrine is a statement of Christian experience, and since there is always more in Christ than we have ever experienced, our doctrines can never be adequate or final. Theology is to God's revelation in Grace as Science is to His revelation in Nature; and just as Science is always discovering more of the wonders of the First Creation, so Theology is always entering more deeply into the glory of the New Creation and appropriating more of the treasures which are hidden in Christ. Even the inspired Apostles did not comprehend all His fulness. Each saw only so much as was revealed to him, and declared only so...
much as he saw. Each approached the
infinite wonder along the lines of his temperament and experience. St. John
saw in it a revelation of Eternal Life; St.
Paul the Reconciliation of sinners to God,
the satisfaction of humanity's long desire and
the completion of its long discipline
under the Law; the author of the Epistle
to the Hebrews the rending of the Veil
and the opening of free Access to God.
St. John does not condemn theological
progress; he defines its limits: "abide
in the teaching of the Christ". (1) We
must never break with the past; the new
truth is always an outgrowth of the old.
A theology which is simply old is dead;
a theology which is simply new is false
(cf. Matt. xiii. 52). (2) We must main-
tain "the teaching of the Christ". Jesus
is the Saviour, and no interpretation of
Christianity is true which eliminates
Redemption or obscures the glory of
the Cross.

V. 10-11. Treatment of Heretical
Teachers. "If any one cometh unto you
and bringeth not this teaching, receive
him not into your house, and bid him not
defarewell. For he that biddeth him fare-
well hath fellowship with his works, his
evil works."

Ver. 10. φέρει, not "endureth" (cf.
Rom. ix. 22; Heb. xii. 20), but "bring-
euth" as a precious boon (cf. Rev. xxi. 24,
26). εἰς οἶκον (cf. Mark ii. 1; iii. 15),
su Hause; "to church," "to town,
"to market," "to bed." See Moulton's
Winer, pp. 148 ff. καίας, like ace, alreas,
was used of both the salutation at meet-
ing and the farewell at parting. The
former is its prevailing use in N.T., but
here, as in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, the latter.
"Zum Abschied, wenn der Abgewesene
weiter ziehen muss" (Holtzmann).

Ver. 11. κοινωνεί, cf. 1 John i. 3. An
unholy κοινωνία. τοῖς ἐργ. αὐτ. τοῖς
ποιν., cf. 1 John i. 2: τὴν γονὴν τὴν
αδελφον. The adjective is an emphatic
afterthought.

This counsel recalls the story of St.
John's behaviour to Cerinthus (see Intro.
p. 249), and it was cited by Irenæus (I.
ix. 3) as inculcating intolerance of here-
tics. If so, it is certainly an unChristian
counsel, contrary to the spirit and teach-
ing of our Lord (cf. Mark ix. 36-39;
12. Πολλά ἐχεῖς ὑμᾶς γράφειν, οὐκ ἦσοντι ήγεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς διὰ χάρτου καὶ μαλακοῦ, ἀλλὰ διὰ χειρός μαθεῖν τις πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμῶν πρὸς σῶμα λαλῆσαι, ἵνα ἡ χειρὰ τοῦν μιᾷ τῇ πεπληρωμένῃ. 13. ἀνοίξαται σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς εκλεκτῆς. ἀμήν.

Ver. 12. Explanation of the brevity of the letter. ὑμῶν, i.e., Κυρία, her children, and the church in her house. γράφειν connected ἐκ νοοῦ with ἠχον and ἔβουλθήσαν. χάρτης, a sheet of papyrus, like those exhumed at Oxyrhynchus (see Deissmann, New Light on the New Test., pp. 12 ff.), the common material for letter-writing. μαλακόν, atramentum; in N. T. only here, 3 John 13, 2 Cor. iii. 3. γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς (cf. John x. 35; Acts x. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3, xvi. 10): he was planning a visitation (see Introd. p. 247). σῶμα πρὸς σῶμα, "mouth answering mouth"; cf. LXX. Num. xii. 8; Jer. xxxii. (xxix.), 4.

Why would he not write all that was in his mind? It was a deliberate decision: he took pen in hand: this is the force of ὑμῶν ἔβουλθήσαν. His heart was full, and writing was a poor medium of communication (Beng.: "Ipsas scribendi opera non juvat semper cor affecta sacro plenum"); he was an old man, and writing was fatiguing to him (Plummer).

The reason is deeper. The "many things" which he had in his mind, were hard things like his warning against intercourse with heretics, and he would not write them at a distance but would wait till he was on the spot and had personal knowledge. It is easy to lay down general principles, but their application to particular cases is a delicate task, demanding knowledge, sympathy, charity. (1) The sight of people's faces appeals to one's heart and softens one's speech. (2) When one meets with people and talks with them, one's judgment of them and their opinions is often modified. Writing from Ephesus, St. John might have condemned a teacher in a neighbouring town whose teaching he knew only by report; but perhaps, if he met the man and heard what he had to say, he might discover that there was nothing amiss, at all events nothing which called for excommunication. Dr. Dale of Birmingham was at first inclined to look with disfavour on Mr. Moody. He went to hear him, and his opinion was altered. He regarded him ever after with profound respect, and considered that he had a right to preach the Gospel, "because he could never speak of a lost soul without tears in his eyes". St. John shrank from hasty condemnation that there might be no after-regret—
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THE THIRD EPISTLE.

Vv. 1-4. Address and Commendation. "The Elder to Gaius the beloved, whom I love in Truth. Beloved, in all respects I pray that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth. For I was exceedingly glad when brethren would come and testify to thy Truth, even as thou walkest in Truth. A greater gladness than this I have not—that I should hear of my children walking in the Truth."

Ver. 1. S PRESTIPOB, see Introd. pp. 257 ff. ENW, see note on 2 John 1. EN OLYIHEI'Q, see note on 2 John 1.

Ver. 2. Cf. Law, Ser. Call, chap. vii.: "Flavia would be a miracle of piety, if she was but half as careful of her soul as she is of her body. The rising of a pimple on her face, the sting of a gnat, will make her keep her room for two or three days, and she thinks they are very saucy people that do not take care of themselves in time." Penn, Fruits of Soltude: "He is curious to wash, dress and perfume his Body, but careless of his Soul. The one shall have many Hours, the other not so many Minutes." 2fAIWVON PANTON, DE OMNIBUS, with EUOCTOUSTAI KAI OYNAIVEIN, not PRE OMNIBUS, "above all things". The latter use is epic (e.g., Hom. Il. i. 287: 2fAIWVON EMMAI ALLON), and prosperity and health were not the simma bona in the Apostle's estimation. "euodoutai", "prosper" in worldly matters. Trouble tests character. "A good knight is best known in battle, and a Christian in the time of trouble and adversity"; and Gaius had stood the test. The hostility of Diotrephes, probably a well-to-do member of the Church, had lessened his maintenance (euodoutai) and affected his health (OYNAIVEIN), yet St. John has only admiration for the spirit he has manifested and commendation for the part he has played.

Ver. 3. EUROHTAI, see note on 2 John 4.

suam judicet: quid evenire credis qui ingenia educaverunt, et quae tenera fomaverunt adulta subito vident?" Ev. sec. Heb. (quoted by Jerome on Eph. v. 4): "Et numquam, inquit (Dominus), ieri siuis cum fratre cum vestrum videntem in caritate, meconfer, a double compar.; cf. διακυβερνητης (Eph. iii. 8); our "lesser"; Germ. mehrere. τούτων: this use of the plur. (τούτων) rather than the sing. (τούτου) is common. See Moulton's Win. p. 201. i. e., epexegetical of τούτων. Cf. Luke i. 43 and see note on 1 John iii. 11. τίκνα implies that Gaius was a convert of St. John. Cf. marg. note.

Vv. 5-8. The Duty of Entertaining Itinerant Preachers. "Beloved, it is a work of faith that thou art doing in thy treatment of the brethren, strangers withal. They testified to thy love before the Church; and thou wilt do well in speeding them on their way worthily of God. For it was for the sake of the Name that they went forth, taking nothing from the Gentiles. We therefore are bound to undertake for such, that we may prove fellow-workers with the Truth."

A company of reisende Brüder had returned to Ephesus, and in reporting of their mission at a meeting of the Church had made special mention of the hospitality of Gaius. The Apostle commends him and bids him continue his good offices.

Ver. 4. The adjective πιστός is either act., "believing" (cf. John xx. 27), or passive, "worthy to be believed," "trustworthy" (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 2). It is passive here, and it is well explained by Ευμενιος as equivalent to ἔξων πιστοῦ ἀνθρώπος. The peculiarity is that, by a sort of hypallage, the adjective is transferred from the subjective to the objective. Transitive: "Thou makest whatever thou workest on the brethren a believing act, a work of faith." It was not mere hospitality but a religious service. Westcott's rendering: "thou makest sure whatsoever thou doest" gives πιστός an unexampled and indeed impossible meaning. ποιεῖ, aor. of habitual and constant hospitality; ἔργα, aor. of each particular act. καὶ τούτο, "and that to"; more commonly καὶ ταῦτα (cf. Heb. xii. 12).

Ver. 6. On the anarthrous ἐκκλησία, see note on 2 John 10. Κακών ποιήσεις has the sense of "please" in the Oxyrhynchus Papryri; e. g., 300, 3-6: ἐκκλησία σου διά τοῦ καπνίσματος Ταύρου τοῦ πανάνω, περὶ σοι κακῶν ποιήσεις ἀντιτίθενται μοι ὧν ἐκκλησίαν, "sent you the bread-basket by the cameleer Taurinus; please let me have word again that you got it," προστέθησα: when a Rabbi visited a town, it was customary on his departure to escort him on his way (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., on Matt. v. 41). The gracious usage was observed in the primitive Church, and it appears to have included the furnishing of provision for the journey (cf. Tit. iii. 13). Cf. Hom. Od. xv. 74: χρη δεῖνον παρασυνη φιλάνθρωπον ἐπιτυμένον, "welcome the coming, speed the parting guest", ἐξως τοῦ Θεοῦ, "in a manner worthy of God," i. e. (1) "Since they are God's representatives (John xiii. 20), weil ihr Evangelistenwerk Gottes Werk ist (Holtzm.), treat them as you would treat God"; (2) "Since you are God's representatives, treat them as God would treat them."

Ver. 7. τοῦ ὄνοματος, sc. of Jesus (cf. Acts v. 40, 41). There is perhaps a reference to this verse in Ignat. ad Eph. vii. 1: εἰδώλαι γάρ τινες δόλως τονὴρ τὸ ὄνομα περιφράζειν, ἀλλὰ τινὰ πρατέστωντες ἀνδρεία Θεοῦ. Cf. iii. 1: ἔβεβηλεν ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι. ἔβεβηλαν, sc. from Ephesus, the seat of the Apostle and therefore the headquarters of the Church in Asia Minor. Cf. Intro. p. 247. "Perhaps see note on 1 John ii. 4. Winer (Moulton's Winer, p. 463, note 1) draws a distinction, perhaps too fine, between λαμβάνειν ταφά τινας and λαμβάνειν ἀπό τινος.
The former would have been used here had the Gentiles “preferred” an acknowledgment; the latter implies action. The missionaries might have accepted maintenance (Matt. x. 10), but like St. Paul they waived their right, “that they might cause no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ” (1 Cor. ix.).

Ver. 8. ἡμέεις, emphatic in contrast to the Gentiles. ὀφεῖλεν, of moral obligation. See note on 1 John ii. 6. ἑνταλματίζεται, “receive hospitably” (cf. ἐνδόθεται), “take under one’s protection”. Observe the Wortspiel—λαμβάνετε, ὑπολαμβάνετε. συνεργοὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: a division of labour. If we cannot preach the Gospel ourselves, we may help others to do it. William Carey, comparing his missionary enterprise to the exploration of a mine, said: “... do not let the mine be full of men who have no business of their own, but who themselves receive the brethren and them that would he preventeth and casteth out of the Church.”

Ver. 9-10. Churlishness of Diotrephes. “I wrote something to the Church, but Diotrephes, who loveth pre-eminence over them, doth not receive us. Therefore, if I come, I shall call to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating about us with evil words; and, not content therewith, neither doth he receive the brethren and them that would he preventeth and casteth out of the Church.”

“Der Zweck des 3. Briefes liegt in der Empfehlung der Gastfreundschaft gegen wandernde Glaubensboten” (Holtzm.).

Ver. 9. ἐγραψά τι, a brief letter of commendation, συνετελεί αὐτῷ τῆς ἀληθείας (2 Cor. iii. 1), introducing and authorising a company of itinerant brethren, probably those referred to in v. 5. φιλοτρωτείνης, “love to be first, to be chief” (ἐνακλογόμον). The noun is φιλοτροτείνης and the adj. φιλοτρωτος (Polyb., Plut.). τρόφευναι (2 John 9) and φιλοτρωτείναι denote two temperws which disturbed the Christian life of Asia Minor—intellectual arrogance and personal aggrandisement. αὐτὸς ὀφείλει κατὰ σύνοντος τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, “doth not receive me in the person of my delegates” (cf. Matt. x. 40), i.e., “disowneth my authority”.

Ver. 10. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: the aged Apostle with his failing strength can only “hope” (cf. ver. 14) to undertake the journey. ἐνσωματίζεται αὐτὸς τὰ ἔργα, not “remind him of his works” (contrast the “work” of Gaius in ver. 5), but “bring his works to remembrance,” by reciting them at a meeting of the Church. St. John does not threaten excommunication or any sort of discipline, but simply that he will state the facts and let them speak for themselves. A terrible reckoning, like that of the Day of Judgment (cf. Rev. xx. 12)—to hear a recital of all one’s passionate speeches and incon siderate actions. Contrast St. Paul’s threats (1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. xi. 11, xiii. 1-3). St. John deserved to be called “the Apostle of Love”. φιλωρεῖν (nugari, verschwatsen), of foolish chattering. Suid.: φιλώροις Φιλόφοως καὶ λάρνοις καὶ μάθαις λόγοις. The chatter of Diotrephes was not only foolish but malevolent (λόγοις πονηροῖς). μὴ ἀπεικονίζεται, see note on 1 John ii. 4. οὖν...καὶ, cf. John iv. ii. καλεῖ, ἐκβάλλει, pres. implying not that he actually did it but that he tried to do it. ἐκβάλλει, here not of literal ejection (cf. John ii. 15 = Matt. xxi. 12 = Mark xi. 15) but of excommunication from the fellowship of the congregation.

Ver. 11, 12. Testimony to Demetrius. “Beloved, do not imitate what is bad but what is good. He that doeth what is good is of God; he that doeth what is bad hath not seen God. To Demetrius testimony hath been borne by all and by the Truth itself; yea, and we testify, and thou knowest that our testimony is true.”
Ver. 11. A warning against evil example. The pres. participles ἐγαθοτοῖς, κακοτοῖς denote continuance in and practice of good or bad. See note on 1 John iii. 6. ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "a child of God" (cf. 1 John iii. 10). Observe the gentleness of the Apostle: the natural antithesis of ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ would be ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου (1 John iii. 8), but he says ὁ πρὸς τον Θεον.

Ver. 12. Application of the warning against evil example: Do not imitate Diotrephes, but imitate Demetrius. Demetrius was probably the bearer (Überbringer) of the epistle. There is no reason for identifying him with Demetrius the silversmith of Ephesus (Acts xix. 24). B. Weiss (Einleitung), supporting the ecclesiastical interpretation of 2 John (see Intro. p. 254) and finding a reference to it in 3 John 9, regards Demetrius as the recipient (Empfänger) of the former—a member of the Church and a striking contrast to his fellow-member Diotrephes. But evidently he was a stranger to Gaius and needed introduction and commendation. St. John gives him a threefold testimony: (1) that of the whole community at Ephesus (ἐν πᾶντι); (2) that of "the Truth" (see note on 1 John i. 8): he fulfilled the requirements of the Gospel and exemplified its saving power; (3) that of the Apostle and his colleagues at Ephesus (ἡμεῖς): he has long been honoured by his community as an embodiment of the Truth (μεταρρυθμημένος), and the Apostle testifies this when he is going among strangers ignorant of his past (μαρτυροῦμεν). καλ ...

Ver. 13. ὑγρήσας, aor. of the complete composition in the Apostle's mind; ὑγράφω, pres. of the process of putting it on paper. καλάμος (in full καλάμῳ γράφων), a reed-pen, as distinguished from ὑγραφέαν, a sharp-pointed stilus for writing on waxed tablets. Plutarch (Dem., 29, 3) says that Demosthenes, when meditating and writing, was accustomed to bite his καλάμος.

Ver. 15. ἐφησίου, ἀποκρίνεται (Jud. vi. 23, xix. 20), συντάγμα, those at Ephesus; τοὺς ἄγαμους, those with Gaius. St. John knew all "by name," and would have named them had space permitted. He had the true shepherd's heart (cf. John x. 3, the only other place where καὶ ὄνομα occurs in N.T.). Ignat., ad Smyrn., xiii. 2: ἀποκρίνεσθαι Ἀλλήν, τὸ νεκρὸν μοι ὄνομα, καὶ Δώνον, τὸν διώσκορόν καὶ εὐτέκον, καὶ πάντας καὶ ὄνομα.
THE GENERAL EPISTLE

OF

JUDE.
INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

Relation of the Second Epistle of Peter to the Epistle of Jude.¹

The general resemblance between the two Epistles will be apparent from the marginal references to my text. I propose here to compare them throughout, stating the reasons which have led me to believe that the epistle of Jude was known to the author of 2 Peter, not vice versa.²

To begin with, both style themselves servants of Jesus Christ and address themselves to those who in some way belong to God and to Jesus Christ, desiring that peace might be multiplied upon them. We notice here certain differences occasioned by the difference of the writers. J. marks his identity by naming his brother James; P. claims apostleship. J. adds the prayer for mercy and love to that for peace; P. who is about to speak more fully of love immediately, omits it here, and changes θεός into the wider χάρις. J. defines his readers as “the called who have been beloved by God the Father and kept safe in Jesus Christ”; P. defers the notion of “calling” to the third and tenth verses, and dwells here on God’s free gift of faith (τοῖς λογοῖς τιμῶν) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remarkable phrases (1) that, through the justice of our God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, this faith is (2) equally privileged with that of the writer (whether we are to regard him as representing the Apostles, or the Jews, as seems to me more probable), and he emphasises this equality of Jew and Gentile by the unique use of his own double name, the Hebrew “Symeon” added to the Greek “Peter,” suggesting that his sympathies embrace both. We may compare with this the friendly reference to St. Paul in iii. 15, and the association of Silvanus with the writer in 1 Peter.

¹ For the justification of the readings and interpretations adopted in the following chapters, see critical and explanatory notes.
² In what follows P. stands for 2 Peter, J. for Jude.
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After this greeting J. turns at once to the immediate occasion for his letter. He had been preparing, he says, to write on the subject which is of highest interest to all Christians, viz., salvation,1 when news reached him of a new danger threatening the Church, against which he felt bound to warn his readers. It seems hardly possible to suppose that this note of alarm could have come to him through P., who writes in a much more leisurely way, not feeling it necessary at once to plunge into controversy and supply his readers with weapons for the defence of the faith. In fact the latter begins with the very subject which J. had felt himself obliged to omit, or at least to postpone to the end of his Epistle (ver. 20), viz. the doctrine of salvation. Thus we seem to lose sight of J. until the beginning of the second chapter of P., but we shall see that in the intervening passage of P. there is frequent recurrence to thoughts which are found in the former epistle.

After speaking generally of the blessings in store for man through the goodness of God, P. goes on (i. 5) to speak of the corresponding duty on man's part. We are to use every effort to build up the Christian life in its seven-fold completeness on the rock of faith. Towards the end of J. we find words which may very possibly have suggested to P. this idea of the seven ascending tiers rising on the foundation of faith and culminating in love (J. ver. 20), ἐποικοδομοῦτες λόγῳ τῇ ἁγιότητι ὑμῶν πίστει... ταύτως εἰς ἀγάπην θεοῦ τηρήσατε. The phrase ἐποικοδομοῦσαι of P. i. 5 occurs also in J. ver. 3. The mention of ἁπάντες in P. i. 3, 6, 7 may be due to the prevalence of ἁπάντες so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (i. 8-11) dwell on the importance of the cultivation of these virtues or graces. "Their continued growth will tend to make us not unfruitful (cf. J. ver. 12) in regard to that knowledge of God, out of which they grow. Their absence causes blindness, or at least limits us to narrow earthly views, and makes us forgetful of the baptismal cleansing from the sins of our old life. Remember that it is not enough simply to have been baptised. We have to make sure the calling and election of which baptism was the seal. If you are diligent in doing this, you will never stumble, but will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Here too we find connecting links with the later verses of J. "Eternal life" is the goal in J. ver. 21, "the eternal kingdom," in P. i. 11. The οὐ μὴ πραίτητε and the πληρώσετε ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of P. remind us of J.'s summing up in ver. 24, "God our Saviour is able to keep us without

1The word κοινὴ here may have suggested to P. his phrase ἱστήμεν ὠφίγν.
stumbling and to set us before His glory without blemish in exceeding joy”.

P. continues (i. 12-15), “I know that you are established in this truth, but it will be always my care to remind you of it, as I am indeed bound to do, whilst I continue in this earthly habitation. Even after I leave it, as our Lord Jesus Christ has warned me that I must soon do, I hope to bequeath to you a legacy which will enable you to make mention of these things after my departure.” We have here an echo of J. ver. 5, “I desire to put you in remembrance, though ye know all things,” i.e., as it is explained afterwards, though you are familiar with the examples of judgment contained in the O.T., including the punishment of the angels who sinned. P. addressing Gentiles, who could hardly be expected to be familiar with a narrative resting mainly on Jewish tradition, gives the phrase a more fitting application in reference to the general moral and religious teaching which precedes.

The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second chapter of P. In both, this section begins with a short Introduction (J. ver. 4, P. ii. 1-3), describing in general terms the innovators against whom the readers are warned. They steal into the Church, they deny the only Master (διατάχων), their lives are impure, the verdict of heaven has long been pronounced against them. To this P. prefixets a clause to connect the new subject with that of the preceding chapter. The gift of prophecy was liable to misuse under the old dispensation (of which he presently quotes Balaam as an example, cf. P. ii. 15, 16, and J. ver. 11). Corresponding to this in the new dispensation will be the abuse of teaching (cf. James iii. 1-12); and these false teachers will introduce destructive heresies and bring on themselves swift destruction. [The word ἀπόλεια does not occur in J., but in the next verse he says that the Lord ὁ δικαιοῦς ἔφεσ τούτοις ἀπόλεσαι.] P. adds the Pauline epithet ἄγοραστας. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. cxix. 30) will be evil spoken of (Isa. lii. 5). He speaks of their covetousness (cf. J. ver. 11 on Balaam) and of their glozing words. While J. denounces τὰ πάλιν προγεγραμμένα τοῦ τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (where the reference in τοῦτο is obscure), P. has the fine phrase οίς τὸ κρίμα ὁδόν ἄργει καὶ η ἀπόλεια αὐτῶν τοῦ μαθήματος. On the other hand we lose J.’s τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χώραν μετατίθεντας εἰς ἀσκήσεις, for which perhaps ἡ λειψια τούτων ὠφελεί τῆς φθορᾶς (P. ii. 19) was intended as an equivalent, cf. Gal. v. 13, ἐν ἡ λειψιᾳ ἐκλήσθητε μόνον μὴ τὴν ἡλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμήν τῇ σαρκί.
Then follow (J. vv. 5-7) three examples of judgment taken from the O.T.: Israel in the Wilderness, the offending angels, the sin of Sodom, which are repeated in P. ii. 4-9, except that the Deluge takes the place of the punishment of Israel. Why was this change made? Probably because the destruction of the world by water and the destruction of Sodom by fire were recognised types of Divine vengeance (Lk. xvii. 26-29), and also because P. is about to speak of the Deluge below (iii. 5-7) to show that there is nothing incredible in the destruction of the existing universe by fire. Moreover he had already referred to the case of Israel (εν τῷ λαῷ) in comparing the false prophets of the O.T. with the false teachers of the N.T. Perhaps, too, he wished to keep the chronological order in his three examples. It has been suggested in the note on τὰ ἔστιν προφήται that, in speaking of the destruction of Israel after their falling back into unbelief, J. may have had in his mind the question of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. There is perhaps a similar reference in P. i. 9, λέγειν λαβέν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πολέων αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν as well as in P. ii. 20. With regard to P.’s triplet, it is to be noticed that it is given in a far more animated form than that of J., being used as a protasis to an apodosis applying the same principles to the persons addressed, εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεός ὁ κυκλοστὸς κ.τ.λ. Of the angels P. says merely that they sinned, J. dwells on their pristine dignity, and follows the book of Enoch in making their sin to consist partly in the fall from their high estate, and partly in their going after σαρκίς ἐπάθει, as the men of Sodom did afterwards τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν τρόπων τούτων, J. ver. 7. If P. had J. before him, these omissions are natural; if J. wrote after P., he would scarcely have gone out of his way to insert particulars so derogatory to the angelic nature. As to their punishment, they are reserved, in both epistles, for judgment under darkness in chains.

It is interesting to compare what is said in the two Epistles about the two missionaries of the antediluvian world. In J. ver. 14 Enoch, the seventh from Adam, appears simply as the denouncer of vengeance to come: in P. Noah is a preacher of righteousness and he is the eighth saved. In my edition of 2 Peter I have suggested that the writer may have intended a mystical opposition between the two numbers; and, I think, this is confirmed by the way in which the number 8 is introduced in 1 P. iii. 20 (καθαρτον) εἰς ἡν ὁλίγον, τοῦτον ἐστιν ἐκτὸς ψυχῆς, διακόσιον δι’ ἐνότος. The ark is here regarded as a symbol of the Church. What was the writer’s motive in adding that it contained only a few, and further that these few, on being reckoned up, were found to amount to 8? Must he not have in-
tended to signify that, while the visible Church consisted of a mere "remnant," a "little flock," yet these few represented all who share the Resurrection of Christ, "the general assembly and church of the first-born," which would be continually recruited not only from the living, but also from the dead by the ever-present, ever-active Spirit of Christ (1 P. iii. 19)? In the account of Sodom P. (ii. 6) differs from J. in laying stress on Lot's protest against surrounding wickedness, and on the mercy shown towards him, just as he had done before in regard to Noah (hereby illustrating the duty of the faithful under the present stress); and the moral he draws from the two stories is that "God knows how to deliver the godly from trial, as well as to keep the wicked under chastisement for the day of judgment". P. alone gives details as to the destruction of Sodom (τεφέρασα καταστροφή κατεργασάσθαι), while J. speaks of its present state as a warning to future ages. As regards this warning P.'s ἐπιθετημα μελλόνων ἀσκήσεων is better expressed than J.'s rather confused πρόκειται δείγμα πυρὸς αληθίνου δίκης ἄντεχουσαι. In ver. 8 J. turns to the libertines and declares that they are guilty of like sins with these sinners of the old world: they defile the flesh, make light of authority and rail at "glories" (as the men of Sodom did towards the angels), and this they do because they are still buried in a carnal sleep (cf. Eph. v. 14). These men (ver. 10, οὕτως ὡδε) rail at things beyond their ken, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction. P. (ii. 10) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went δικίων σαρκών ἐπεραίωσιν (for which he substitutes δικίων σαρκῶν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις μακρομακραντέοις) with J.'s condemnation of the libertines as despising authority, and predicates both characteristics of the wicked, whom God keeps under chastisement for the day of judgment. Then turning to the libertines he exclaims against them as "headstrong and shameless (τολμηται, cf. ἐτολμηται, J. ver. 9) men that shrink not from railing at glories" (ii. 10). In ii. 12 he goes on, as J. does in ver. 10, with a οὕτως ὡδε, "these are like brute beasts". Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s διὰ φυσικῆς ἐπιστασεως, ἐν τούτῳ φθείρονται by the periphrasis γεγενημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἀλοιπον καὶ φθοράν καὶ ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρὴσονται. That is, while J. simply states that the libertines are destroyed through

1 For the connexion between the darkened heart which refuses to know God, and the indulgence in the vilest lusts, see Rom. i. 21-28.

2 It will be noticed that, while J. couples κυρώτητα and δέος as belonging to the same category, P. only names the abstract word κυρώτητα here, and introduces δέος later on as a concrete example.
their indulgence in their animal instincts, P. draws out the comparison to the brute beasts, "which are born mere creatures of instinct, with a view to capture and slaughter," and then adds that the libertines will share their fate, since they mock at that higher world which is beyond their ken. Here there can be no doubt that P.'s language is far more obscure than that of J. Even J. is not quite clear. The true antithesis would have been "they rail at what transcends the senses, they admire what appeals to the senses and appetites" (and yet these are the causes of their ruin). Is it possible that P., writing with an imperfect recollection of J., understood ἐν τούτοις θείρονταί to mean "perish among them," i.e., among the brutes?

We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. vv. 8 and 10, P. ii. 10 and 12. In J. it runs: "Michael, the archangel, when he was disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, did not venture to bring a judgment of railing, but said, 'the Lord rebuke thee!'": in P. "whereas angels, though greater in power and might, do not venture to bring against them a railing judgment before the Lord". The former is a little difficult, but with the help of the Assumptio Mosis we can understand that, if the chief of the archangels abstained from using any contemptuous expression against Satan, and contented himself with making his appeal to God, much more should frail and sinful mortals abstain from slighting language about the powers of the invisible world. What, however, is to be made of P.? Standing by itself, it is merely a riddle, for which the answer is to be found in J. That is to say, P. wrote with J.'s sentence in his mind, but for some reason or other chose to eliminate the points essential for its intelligibility. What was his reason? The same, I think, which led him to omit the details as to the fall of the angels, which are mainly derived from the Book of Enoch, in ii. 4, and the reference to the preaching of Enoch below. He objects, that is, to make use of these apocryphal writings, and generalises the story by dropping the proper names and by twice changing a singular into a plural (ἅγγελος, αὐτῶν). So, too, a vague παρὰ κυρίῳ takes the place of ἐπηρμῆσαι σοι Κύριος, and the vagueness is increased by the use of the indeterminate αὐτῶν and by the omission of the object of the comparative μείζονες. In fact the sentence is meaningless except to one who was already acquainted with its parallel in J., though it may perhaps be true, as Dr. Bigg suggests, that P. felt himself justified in his generalisation by the remembrance of an obscure passage in the Book of Enoch.

I go on to J. ver. 11, "Woe to them, for they have followed in
the steps of Cain, and been carried away in the error of Balaam for gain, and lost themselves in the rebellion of Korah. These are sunken rocks in your love-feasts, where they join your feast without any feeling of religious reverence, caring only for their own enjoyment. They are clouds without water, scudding before the wind; trees without fruit in the fruit-bearing season, twice dead, torn up by the roots; raging waves foaming out their own shame; wandering stars for which the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever." This passage corresponds to P. ii. 13-17, but, in the latter, the order is considerably altered and there are various additions and omissions. Balaam (who is also prominent in the Apocalypse ii. 14) is the only one of the old heresarchs referred to, but his story is given at more length in ii. 15 16: "They (the libertines) have wandered from the straight path, following the path of Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness and was convicted of his error by the dumb ass, which spoke with human voice and stayed the prophet's madness". Here P. clutches the comparison made before (ii. 1) between the false prophet of the O.T. and the false teacher of the N.T., and brings out again the motive of covetousness (see above ii. 3 and ii. 15). Has he any special reason for introducing the story of the ass rebuking the prophet? We may compare other passages in which God is represented as choosing the foolish things of this world to confound the wise (1 Cor. i. 27, Ps. viii. 2), or in which men are called upon to learn a lesson from animals, as Isa. i. 3, Jer. viii. 7, Prov. vi. 6, Job xii. 7. Possibly P. may be thinking of the scorn entertained for simple believers by those who called themselves Gnostics (see below ii. 18).

J. ver. 12 appears with some remarkable alterations in P. ii. 13, ἡρόλοι καὶ μάμων ἀγμήθων ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευκομόμενοι ὄν. Here ἡρόλοι and ἀπάταις are substituted for σπλάθες and ἄγήθαις in J. Some editors read ἄγηθαις with B, but the addition of αὐτῶν suits much better with ἀπάταις. J. speaks of ἄγηθαις ὄν. It was natural of course that the wolves should seek to find their way into the sheep-folds; but can we suppose that the faithful would enter the love feasts of the libertines? Moreover the change of an original ἄγηθαις to ἀπάταις by a copyist is hardly conceivable, while the reverse change to suit J. is most natural. But how are we to account for the disappearance of the important—we might almost call it the indispensable word—ἀγηθῇ? In my edition of 2 P., p. cxcv., I have suggested that ἄγηθην was the original reading, instead of ἄγηθῃ, in the earlier part of this verse (ἀγηθῃ ἄγηθαι τὴν ἐν ἰμέρᾳ τριήμερη); where my explanatory note shows how hard it is to make a satis-
factory distinction between Ἰδονήν and τρυφήν. On the other hand ἀγάπην gives exactly the sense required "thinking that revelling in the daytime makes an ἀγάπη,” as may be seen from the quotations from Clement given in the passage referred to (cf. too Rom. xiii. 13). I account for Ἰδονήν by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on τρυφήν. The word ἀγάπη is often joined with τρυφή, as shown in the explanatory note, and it is wanted here to explain how the libertines managed to gain admission to the love-feasts of the Church. We have next to ask why σπίλας should have been changed to σπλών. The former word is a daring metaphor even among the metaphors which accompany it in J., but quite out of place here, and P. substitutes for it the similar sounding σπλώς found in Eph. v. 27, of which the derivatives δαπλος and σπλών occur elsewhere in P. and J. Are we to suppose that P. intentionally replaced J.’s words by others of similar sound, in order not to startle people who were already familiar with them? or was it the unconscious action of the mind, calling up similar sounds, as in rhyming or alliteration? The latter seems to me the more probable explanation.

P. returns to J.’s metaphors in ii. 17, where he splits up τεθηκε ἰδονήν ἅμα ἅμαν παραφέρομαι into two, πηγὴ ἅμα ἅμαν and ὀμωλος ὑπὸ ὁλοκλώσας ἀναπαύειν, perhaps because he regarded J.’s expression as superfluous, and also because he thus provides distinct pictures of present disappointment (the well) and future uncertainty (the cloud). He omits the fruitless trees, the stormy waves and wandering stars as unsuited to his purpose, but inappropriately appends to his last metaphor, the clause in which J. describes the doom of the wandering stars, οἷς ἦ σὰρξ τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. Of course the gender shows that P. intends this clause to apply to the persons whom he has just figuratively described, as it is indeed applied by J. himself in ver. 6, but it loses the aptness which it has in J. ver. 13, and thus supplies another convincing proof of the priority of J. How could the latter have had the patience to gather the scattered fragments out of P. in order to form the splendid cluster of figures in vv. 12, 13? We have still to consider the insertion in P. (ii. 13), ἀδικομένοι μισθόν ἀδικίας, which commences the loose series of participles ending in ii. 15. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls J. ver. 11, τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ βαλλάμ μισθοὶ ἄφθονοι, and is repeated again in ii. 15; but ἀδικομένοι is difficult. Apparently P. intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to J.’s οἰκί: the libertines are miserable, because they are, as they think, “robbed of (or ‘ robbed as ’) the reward of their iniquity”. The following participles gave a striking and powerful description of the evil influence which these men exercise over
unstable souls, ἀδικλήδες ἡγοῦτοι μετοδές μοιχαλίδος καὶ καταπαράτων ἀμαρνίας, δειλαίοινες ψυχὰς ἀττρήκτως (cf. γεγενημένα εἰς ἄλονσιν, ii. 12), καρδίαν γεγενημένην πλούσιοις ἡγοῦτοι, κατάρας τέκνα. Perhaps P. may intend this partly to take the place of J.'s fine figure κύματα ἡγίας τῆς ἄλονσιν αἰσχύνας.

In vv. 14, 15 J. gives the prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, which simply announces the future judgment on impious deeds and words. To this P. makes no direct reference, but, as I have before suggested, it may have been one reason for speaking of Noah as the eighth. In ver. 16 (perhaps taken from the Assumption of Moses) J. goes on to describe the libertines as “murmuring and discontented, walking after their own lusts, whose mouth λαλεῖ ὀπέρογκα, and who flatter others for the sake of advantage”. To the same effect P. (ii. 18) speaks of them as uttering ὀπέρογκα ματαιώτητος, by which they seduce through the lusts of the flesh those who were just escaping from heathen error. In ii. 19-22 P. is mostly independent of J., but I have already noticed that ἀλευρέαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι may be an echo of J. ver. 4, χάριτα μεταπεθάνετε εἰς σωλήνας. He continues, εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, words which recall what he had said in i. 4, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, . . . διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, and goes on to give an impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which he borrows from J. ver. 3, ὅπωστρέψῃ ἐκ τῆς παραδοσείς αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, concluding with the proverb of the dog and the sow returning to their foulness after being cleansed from it.

In the third chapter of P. we go back again to J. The readers are addressed as ἄγαπτοι in P. iii. 1 as in J. ver. 17. In both, they are bidden to remember the words of the Apostles, warning them against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts. To this P. adds (iii. 1, 2) “This is the second letter I am writing to you, and in both I stir up your sincere mind by calling on you to remember the command of the Lord and Saviour spoken by your Apostles”. Since in i. 16, he had used the phrase ἐγινείραζαν ὃμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρουσίαν, it would seem that P. must himself be included among “your Apostles”. He further bids them “remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets,” recurring in this to what he had said in i. 19. What are we to understand by the allusion to a previous letter? Our first thought is naturally of 1 P. But is there anything in it which would answer to the description here given? Many have denied this, because they thought that the contents of the prophecy, as given in J. ver. 18, were
included in P.'s reference to an earlier Epistle. J. there says, ὅτι ἠλευθ. ὑμᾶς ἔκχω ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου ἐκαίτει ἐκπαίδευτα ἐκπαίδευσαν ἐκ νουςκοτες, which he had previously used in i. 20, not to introduce a particular prophecy, but to lay down how prophecy was to be understood. The reference to a former letter is therefore restricted by P. to iii. 2, bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. i. 10-12, we shall find an exact correspondence to what is stated here. The words τῶν προφητῶν ἀδελφῶν (J. ver. 17, P. iii. 2) remind us of J. ver. 4, εἰ πᾶλιν προγεγραμμένα εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the prophecy of Enoch) and of P. ii. 3, ὅπε τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαίδευσε οὐκ ἄργα. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic ἐν ἐπαγγελματίᾳ, which may be compared with ἐν τῇ μόρφῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπαράγονται of ii. 12, and with the reiterated ἀσεβείας of J. ver. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευμένου of J. vv. 16 and 18.

In iii. 4, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure ver. 19, ὅτι τῶν ἀποκάλυψε τὰς ψυχὰς πνεύμα, μὴ ἐκπαίδευσαν, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the ἐκπαίδευτα consisted. They said that the promise of the coming of Christ (to which P. had borne witness in i. 16) remained unfulfilled, and that the world was not liable to the catastrophic changes predicted as accompaniments of the final judgment. There is a little awkwardness in P.'s wording, ἀλλ' ἔρχεσται κτῶσις following ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκόμησιν, but it is a very natural blending of two objections. I cannot think that if J. had known this verse, which gives so much point to the preceding prophecy, he would have refrained from inserting it. P. gives a double answer in iii. 5-10: (a) as the world was created out of water by the word of God, so, owing to the same word, it was destroyed through water, and will be destroyed again by fire on the day of judgment (cf. Jude vv. 6, 7, P. ii. 3, 4, 9); (b) God is not limited to days and years. If He waits, it is from His long-suffering patience, because He desires that all should repent and be saved. We may compare this with P.'s use of the O.T. types of judgment to point out proofs of mercy in the case of Noah and Lot (ii. 5, 7), in contrast with the severer tone of J. vv. 5-7. In iii. 10

1 Reading &v, for which see my edition of 2 P.
P. bids his readers make a practical use of the knowledge that the Lord is about to come unexpectedly. "Do not be blind to the symptoms of the breaking up of the frame of nature (perhaps a reference to volcanic eruptions and earthquakes). Make ready for the coming of the day of God by the practice of holiness and piety. Look forward to the fulfilment of the promise of the reign of righteousness in a new earth and heaven."

At this point J. and P. again come together in J. ver. 20 and P. iii. 14, both commencing a new section with ἀγαπητοί. J.'s exhortation to his readers "to build themselves up on their most holy faith and keep themselves in love" has been already used by P., as we have seen, in i. 5-7. His reference to the Spirit's help in prayer may be compared with P. i. 20 on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in ver. 21, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ θεὸν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ἀείνον is taken up in the προσδεχόμενοι of P. iii. 12 and προσδεχόμεν of iii. 13, and again in iii. 14, while the goal εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν in P. i. 11. P. inserts ἀπίστιος καὶ ἁμαρτωλός (cf. 1 P. i. 19) from J.'s ἁμαρτωλος in ver. 24, and in contrast to his own ὁμολογοῦντες in ii. 13, and to J.'s ἐποίησαν ἡμᾶς in ver. 23. ἐν ἐρήμῳ looks back to J. ver. 2 and P. i. 2. While in vv. 22, 23 we have J.'s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (iii. 15) to the more hopeful view of iii. 9, and claims for it the inspired support of Paul. "Yet Paul's letters, wise and good as they are, offer some difficulties, which have been misunderstood and perverted, like the rest of the Bible, by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." The word αὐτηρία in iii. 15 reminds us that J. had originally intended to write περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (ver. 3) and that his purpose is apparently carried out to a certain extent in these last verses from 20 onwards. In ver. 24 J. begins an Ascription partly borrowed from St. Paul, addressed "to Him who is able to keep His people free from stumbling (cf. P. i. 10) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy" (cf. P. i. 11). P. bids his readers, "knowing these things beforehand (see above i. 12, iii. 2) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the error (J. ver. 11, P. ii. 18) of the wicked (P. ii. 7, cf. J. ver. 23, λέγεται ἐν φόβῳ), and so fall from their own steadfastness" (cf. P. i. 12, ii. 14, iii. 16). J.'s ἐν ἀγαλλίασει soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the πλούσιος ἑπιχορηγηθήσεται of i. 11. P. continues his exhortation in iii. 18, ἀδελφέτε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, for which

1 For the justification of this rendering see explanatory notes in my edition of ἂ P.
we may compare χάρις πληροφορία in i. 2 and ταῦτα πληροφορία in i. 8, also J. ver. 4. The Ascription in P. is much simpler than that in J., being addressed to our Saviour Jesus Christ, while J.'s is addressed μόνη ηεὶς σωτήρ ἡμῶν διὰ Πηνοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. P. has δόξα only, while J. has the full liturgical form, δόξα, μεγαλωσία, κράτος, καὶ ἐξουσία. P. has καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας αἰώνιας, while J. has πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰώνας, concluding with ἄμην, which is omitted in P. by W.H. after Cod. B. Cf. A. J. Wilson, *f. of Theol. Stud.* vol. viii. 75 on Emphasis in N.T.

To sum up: What do we find to be the main points in which the two Epistles agree, what the points in which they differ? Both agree in making faith, which is itself the gift of God (P. i. 1, λαχανιν πίστιν), the foundation of the Christian life (J. vv. 3, 20, P. i. 1, 5): both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. ver. 1, P. i. 3, 10). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. ver. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, P. i. 9), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. i. 10), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. ver. 20, P. i. 5-7), to keep ourselves in the love of God by praying with the help of the Holy Spirit (J. ver. 20), looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (which shall be fully revealed) in the life eternal (J. ver. 21). God our Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to present us before His glory unblemished in joy (J. vv. 24, 25). P. does not expressly mention prayer, and he lays more stress on personal effort than J. in the words “give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in His sight” iii. 14, “beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace” iii. 17, 18. So in i. 5-8 he bids his readers add all diligence to supply “in your faith energy, in your energy knowledge,” etc., and goes on in ver. 10 to say “if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied to you the entrance into the eternal kingdom”. At the same time he ascribes to the divine power “all that pertains to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us by the manifestation of His own goodness”. That manifestation has been to us the guarantee of most blessed promises, through which we are enabled to become partakers of the divine nature (P. i. 3, 4).

The broad distinction between the two Epistles may be said to be that, while J. is throughout occupied with the denunciation of evil-doers, except in vv. 1-3 and 20-25, P.'s denunciations are mainly confined to a portion of chapter ii., and that the latter dwells more upon the mercy of God as shown even in his punishments.
The conclusion I have drawn from the above comparison of the two Epistles as to the priority of J., is confirmed by the general opinion of modern critics, as by Neander, Credner, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Harnack, Bernhard Weiss, Abbott, Farrar, Salmon, above all by Dr. Chase in his excellent article on the "Second Epistle of St. Peter" in Hastings' D. of B. It is true some of the best authorities speak very doubtfully both of this priority and of the authenticity of 2 P. Thus Döllinger, who, in his First Age of the Church, had maintained the priority of 2 P., wrote to Dr. Plummer in the year 1879 that he could no longer hold this opinion (Plummer's St. James and St. Jude 1891, p. 400). See also Plummer's St. Jude, p. 268: "While admitting that the case is by no means proved, we may be content to retain the priority, as well as the authenticity of 2 Peter, as at least the best working hypothesis". And Hort is quoted by Dr. Sanday (Inspiration, p. 347) as saying that "If he were asked he should say that the balance of argument was against the epistle; and the moment he had done so he should begin to think that he might be wrong". On the other hand three of the most recent critics, Spitta in his Commentary on the two Epistles, 1885, Dr. Bigg in his International Critical Commentary, ed. 2, 1902, and the veteran Zahn in his Einleitung in das N.T., ed. 3, 1906, have no hesitation in maintaining the priority and authenticity of 2 P. I proceed to consider the arguments which have been adduced by them or by others in favour of that view.  

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

(2) Jude seems to acknowledge his obligations to Peter in ver. 4 ο οι πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα . . . τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι and in vv. 17, 18 μησθήτη τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οτι λέγων ὅμων ἐκ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἐστοῖται ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἐστίν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.'s i. 3 ἐν ὃμιν ἐστοί τευθυπασκόλω . . . τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτῶν δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκκαλαὶ οὐκ ἄργος, the latter to P. iii. 2, 3 μηθύμαμα τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινομένος ὅτι διελύουσαν ἐν ἐφεξάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐμπαίκται κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι. 

1 I agree with Dr. Bigg that it is superfluous to consider theories which suppose 2 P. to be made up of two independent epistles. Its unity, as shown in the earlier part of this chapter, forces itself on the mind of any careful reader.
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(3) The priority of P. is confirmed by the prevailing use of the future tense in regard to the innovators, whereas J. uses the past or the present; cf. P. ii. 1 ἐντεῦθεν, παραεισέβουσιν, ii. 2 ἐπικαλουθήσονται, βλασφημηθήσεται, ii. 3 ἐπικαλουθήσεται, with J. ver. 4 παρεισέβησαν, ver. 8 μιᾶς οὖσιν, ver. 10 βλασφημοῦσιν and the aorists in ver. 11.

Dealing with these objections in order, we may concede that, if both Epistles are genuine, we should rather have expected the borrowing to be on the side of the more obscure. Yet the probability is not one that can be pressed. Milton and Handel borrowed from men much inferior to themselves; Isaiah borrows from Micah, and 1 P. from James. If on the other hand we find reason to believe that 2 P. was not written by the Apostle, the objection only amounts to this, that, though St. Peter himself had borrowed from James in 1 P., an admirer of St. Peter could not have borrowed from Jude in 2 P.

With regard to obj. (2), I have pointed out in my note that the word πᾶλαι in J. ver. 4 cannot refer to P., but must be understood of the prophecy of Enoch, quoted in J. ver. 15, in which the word ἀσάβεις (which sums up the judgment in ver. 4), occurs no less than four times (if we include the cognate verb and abstract noun). I have also pointed out that J. in ver. 17 refers not to any one writer, but to the oral teaching of the Apostles, and that P. in iii. 2 does not profess to utter any new prophecy, but simply adds to what Jude had said, that the teaching of the Apostles rested upon the authority of Christ, and that it was in agreement with the teaching of the prophets. As regards obj. (3), the difference of tense, P. is not consistent in his use of the future. We have the pres. in ii. 10 τρέμουσιν, ii. 17 εἰσὶν, ii. 18 δελέασθε, iii. 5 λαθδέω, from which we should conclude that the innovators had already begun their work, if not among those to whom he writes, yet among other churches, to which J. may have addressed himself. If the former Epistle is a product of the second century, the writer may have used the future tense to give it verisimilitude, while falling at times into the present from inadvertence.

(4) Spitta asks why, if P. is borrowing from J., he makes no reference to him, as he does to Paul? It might be enough to ask in reply, “Why, if J. borrows from P., does he make no definite acknowledgment of the fact”? But we have a parallel case, though no doubt on a smaller scale, in the unacknowledged borrowings from the Epistle of James in 1 Peter, on which see the Introduction to my edition of James, pp. xcvii to cii. The reason however for the mention of Paul in 2 P. is quite distinct from the acknowledgment of a debt. The libertines claimed his authority in behalf of their own views (cf. J. ver. 4), and it was necessary for P. to protest against this.
It would be endless to go into a minute examination of the parallel passages which have been cited to prove the priority of P. I have said all that I think need be said about them in the earlier part of this chapter and in the explanatory notes of my edition of 2 P. The impression which they leave on my mind is that in J. we have the first thought, in P. the second thought; that we can generally see a reason why P. should have altered J., but very rarely a reason why what we read in P. should have been altered to what we find in J. P. is more reflective, J. more spontaneous.
CHAPTER II.

The Epistle of Jude, Author, Style, Authenticity, Circumstances of Writing.—The name Judas (Ἰωάννας) was naturally in very common use among the Jews at the time of the Christian era. It was dear to them as having been borne not only by the Eponymos of their tribe, but also by their great champion Judas the Maccabee. Two among the Twelve bore this name, Judas Iscariot, and the Judas not Iscariot (Jn. xiv. 22), who is also called Judas son of James (ὁ Ἰακώβου; Lk. vi. 16, Acts i. 13) and Thaddæus (Mt. ix. 3, Mk. iii. 18, where some MSS. add ᾿Αμβραῖος). Besides these we meet with a Judas among the Brethren of the Lord (Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3), Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37), Judas surnamed Barsabbas (Acts xv. 22), Judas of Damascus (Acts ix. 11). It is therefore not surprising that the writer should have added a note of identification, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφὸς ὦ Ἰακώβου. The most famous James in the middle of the first century was the head of the Church at Jerusalem and brother of the Lord, who also begins his epistle by styling himself simply δοῦλος (Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Hence it seems probable that the addition was made, not merely for the purpose of identification, but, like the addition of ἀδελφὸς ὦ in Tit. i. 1, as giving a reason why his words should be received with respect, since he was brother of James and therefore one of the Brethren of the Lord. In my Introduction to the Epistle of St. James (pp. i-xlvii), I have endeavoured to show that the Brethren of the Lord were sons of Joseph and Mary, that they did not join the Church till after the Crucifixion, and that none of them was included among the Twelve.1

Other facts which we learn from the N.T. are (1) that Jude was probably either the youngest or the youngest but one of the Brethren of the Lord, as he is mentioned last among them in Mt. xiii. 55 ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννας καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰουδας, and last but one in Mk. vi. 3 ἀδελφὸς ὦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννας καὶ Ἰουδας καὶ Σίμωνος; (2) that the Brethren of the Lord (of course exclusive of James, who

1See ver. 17, where the writer appears to distinguish between the Apostles and himself.
remained stationary at Jerusalem) were engaged in missionary journeys like St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 5), but that they differed from him in the fact that they were married and were accompanied by their wives, and also, as we may suppose from Gal. ii. 9, Mt. x. 23, that their ministrations were mainly directed to the Jews. In my edition of James (p. cxv) I have argued that his Epistle was addressed to Jews of the eastern Diaspora and it seems not improbable that Jude, writing many years after his brother’s death, may have wished to supply his place by addressing to the same circle of readers the warnings which he felt bound to utter under the perilous circumstances of the new age. His cousin Symeon, the son of his uncle Clopas, had succeeded to the bishopric of Jerusalem (Eus., H.E., iii., 22, iv., 22, quoted in my edition of James pp. viii fol.), and is said to have been crucified a.d. 107 at the age of 120 1 (cf. Hegesippus ap. Euseb., H.E., iii., 32, ἀντὶ τούτων τῶν αἰρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσιν τινὲς Συμεὼνος . . . ὃς ἀντὶ Δαβίδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ. καὶ οὐτως μαρτυρεὶ ἑτῶν ἐν ἐκατόν εἰκοσιν ἐπὶ Τραίανος Καὶσαρος καὶ ἑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ).

Eusebius (H.E., iii., 19) quotes again from Hegesippus an interesting story of the grandsons of Judas, “who were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose fears had been excited by the report he heard of them as descendants of David, and akin to the Messiah. When they were brought before him, he quickly ascertained that they were poor men, and that the kingdom they looked forward to was not of this world, and accordingly dismissed them as men of no importance, and ceased from his persecution of the Church. When they returned home, they received special honours, as having witnessed to the truth, and also as being kinsmen of the Lord. They lived till the time of Trajan.”

In my Introduction to St. James I have pointed out that his Epistle bears marked traces of some characteristics which are found in the Lord Himself. I propose to call attention here to some resemblances and differences between the Epistles of the two brothers.

A. (1) Among the former we may note the tone of undoubting and unquestioned authority which pervades the two Epistles, combined with the personal humility of the writers. They do not arrogate to themselves that relationship which constituted the ground of the reverence with which they were regarded by their fellow-believers. They are simply servants of Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, to whose coming, as the righteous Judge, they look forward, whose power still manifests itself in works of mercy (James i. 1, ii. 1, v. 8, 9, 14); of Jesus Christ, who keeps His people safe to the end, through whom

1 More probably under 95.
they hope for eternal life, to deny whom is the climax of impiety, in
whom the Father is glorified for ever (Jude vv. 1, 4, 21, 25). They are
Sharers of a common salvation (Jude ver. 3), they need forgiveness of
sin like other men (James iii. 2).

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

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

(3) For moral strictness and stern severity in rebuking sin, the
whole of this short Epistle may be compared with such passages as
James ii. 19, iii. 15, iv. 1-v. 6. For noble and weighty expression we
may compare vv. 20, 21, ὅμεις ἡ, ἅγιοτος, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτῶς τῇ
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... The appealing ἀγαπητῷ, which is thrice found in St. James, is also thrice repeated in Jude. The warning against Respect of Persons is found in James ii. 1-9 and in Jude ver. 16: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James i. 13, iv. 1, v. 9, in Jude vv. 15, 16; that against the misuse of the tongue in James iii. 1-10, in Jude ver. 16: the charge to labour for the salvation of others in James v. 19, 20, in Jude vv. 22, 23.

For special details of the style of St. Jude see my larger edition, pp. xxi-lxvi: one point which may be noticed here is his fondness for triplets. Thus in ver. 2 we find ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη. In ver. 4 "the men who were designed for this judgment" are described as ἀνσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μεταηθάντες εἰς ἄσθληκαν, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἄρνομένων. In vv. 3-7 three examples of punishment are adduced, Israel in the wilderness, the angels who sinned, the overthrow of Sodom. In ver. 8 the libertines, σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ αδετούσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. [In vv. 9, 10 we have two couplets οὐκ ἐτάλησαν—ἀλλὰ εἶπαν: δοξα μὲν οὐκ ὁδικαίως—βλασφημοῦσιν, δόξα δὲ—φθείρονται.] In ver. 11 we return to the triplet, Cain, Balaam, Korah. [In vv. 12, 13 we have a quintet of metaphors, hidden rocks, rainless clouds, dead trees, turbid waves, falling stars. In ver. 15 again two couplets ποιήσαι κρίσιν—ἐλέγξαι, περὶ πάντων δὲ ἁσβηθῆσαι—δὲ ἀδικῆσαι.] In ver. 16 we return to the triplet πορευόμενοι—λαλοῦντες (disguised in the form καὶ τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ ἐπιφόρως)—θαυμάζουσες. So in ver. 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. Ver. 18 does not admit of subdivision. Ver. 19 has the triplet ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. Vv. 20 and 21 have a double triplet, ἐποικοδομοῦντες—προσευχόμενοι—προσδεχόμενοι and πνεῦμα ἁγίων—Θεὸς—Ἡσυχίας Χριστῶς. Ver. 22 has the marked triplet οὐς μὲν—οὐς δὲ—οὐς δὲ. Ver. 24 has a couplet, φυλάζας—στῆσαι. Ver. 25 has a quartet δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, ἐξουσία, followed by the triplet πρὸ παντῶν τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, thus closing with a septet. Compare the stress laid on the fact that Enoch was seventh from Adam, ver. 14.

There are some traces of the triplet in St. James, as in i. 14, ἰκαστὸς πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας—ἐστι η ἐπιθυμία τιτᾶτε ἀμαρτίαν, ὡς ἀμαρτία ἀποκάλεσθαι θάνατον, ver. 19 ἢ ἐστιν δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκούει, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὅργην, ii. 23 ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραάμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἔλογῳ ἀνέπαυσεν ἐλεητήθη, καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη, iii. 6, ἢ γλώσσα...
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Perhaps we may find a septet in the beautiful description of heavenly wisdom (iii. 17) πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή, ἐπειτα εἰρημική, ἐπεικής, εὐπειθής, μεσθη ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδίκαρπος, ἀνυπόκριτος. But the distinctive mark of St. James’s style is “paronomasia” passing at times into such a climax as we find in i. 14, 15 quoted above and in i. 3, 4, τὸ δοκίμον ὅμων τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονή, ἢ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἐργον τέλειον ἔχειν, ἢ ἐκ τέλειον. See pp. ccxxii f. of my edition.

Another characteristic which may be noted is the love of forcible antithesis as in J. ver. 10, δόσα μὲν οὐκ ὁδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, δόσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἁλὸγα ξώα ἐπιστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. As regards vocabulary, the most striking resemblance is the occurrence of ψυχικός as opposed to πνευματικός, of which the earliest biblical example is in James iii. 15, but this had been adopted by Paul (1 Cor. ii. 10 foll.) before it was made use of by Jude.

B. (1) The differences between the two Epistles are hardly less marked: Jude evidently belongs to a much later period of Christian development. James, as I have endeavoured to show in the Introduction to his Epistle, wrote about the year 45 A.D. before any of the other canonical books was in existence, and his theological position is that of the early Church described in the opening chapters of the Acts. Jude is familiar with the writings of St. Paul. He is familiar with the terms σωτήρ and σωτηρία (vv. 3 and 25): in vv. 20, 21 he brings together the three Persons of the Trinity; he addresses those to whom he writes in Pauline language as κλητοί (ver. 1) and ἄγιοι (ver. 3), and uses forms of ascription and doxology closely resembling those which occur in St. Peter and St. Paul. Their “most holy faith” is a “tradition once delivered to the saints” (vv. 4, 20): they are bidden to “remember the words of the Apostles, how they told them that in the last time there should come scoffers” (vv. 17, 18). The error which he combats appears to be a misgrowth of St. Paul’s teaching in regard to a salvation of free grace, “not of works, lest any man should boast” (ver. 4). Many of the features which he distinguishes are such as we find delineated in St. Paul’s farewell to the Ephesian Church, and in some of his Epistles, especially those to Titus and Timothy.

(2) Another difference might seem to be Jude’s repeated references to Pseudepigrapha such as the book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses (on which see the next chapter) and his readiness to give credence to fanciful legends such as the fall of the Watchers, and the contention for the body of Moses. Credulity of this kind seems to
be far apart from the strong practical sense of James. Yet there are signs that the latter was not unacquainted with rabbinical traditions. Spitta even goes so far as to trace most of his teaching to pre-Christian sources. I have argued against this view in ch. vii. 2 of my Introduction to his Epistle; but my notes on i.8 (διψυχος) and iv. 8, 9 ἀγνίσατε καρδίας, διψυχοι, ταλαιπωρήσατε, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 ἡ γραφὴ αὐτῆς, ἐπει δὲς λέγει Ταλαιπωροὶ εἰσὶν οἱ διψυχοὶ and identified by Lightfoot and Spitta with Eldad and Modad (on which see Herm., Vis., ii., 3), by Hilgenfeld with the Assumption of Moses. The phrase in iv. 14, ἀτμίς γὰρ ὑπὲρ πρὸς ἄλλον φανομένη, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι ἀτμίς ἀπὸ κύθρας, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the Assumption of Moses. The phrase κόσμος ἀθυμίας in James iii. 6 is found in Enoch xlvi. 7. The Testaments of the Patriarchs, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as Sim. 5 ὡράκα ἐν χαρακτηρὶ γραφῆς ἔννοιας, Levi 10 βίβλος ἔννοιας τοῦ δικαίου, ib. 14, ἔγων ἀπὸ γραφῆς ἔννοιας ὅπως ἐπὶ τέλει ἀνασβησῇτε, ib. 16, ὕβα 18, Benj. 9, Zab. 3, Neph. 4. ἐν γραφῇ ἄνεκ ἔννοιας ὅπως ἐπὶ . . . ποιήσετε κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν ζωδόμων), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on James iv. 7 ἀντίστητο τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύγεται ἀφ’ υμῶν. The words which immediately precede (ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει υμῖν) are not unlike another quotation which occurs in Herm. Vis. ii. 3, ἐγὼς Θεὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφόμενοις, ὅς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδάτ καὶ Ἡλώδατ τοῖς προφητεύσαντι ἐν τῇ ἐφήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. James has also been credited with a knowledge of the Sibylline writings on the ground of the phrase ἐνθατοπόρου which occurs in iii. 8 and also in Sib. Prooem. 71.

εἰσὶ θεὸς μερίσεων δηλητορεὶς <οὐτοὶ> ἅβούλων,
τῶν δὲ κακὸς στόματος χεῖται θανατηφόρος ἰδ.

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

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

---

1 The quotation, as given more fully in Clem. Rom. ii. xi, contains the somewhat rare word ἀκαταστασία, which is also used by James iii. 16.

2 MS. ἔλῃτορες. Geffcken reads ἔλῃτορὶς.
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than edifying, with the exception of the beginning and end (vv. 1, 2 and 20-25). This is no doubt to be explained by what is stated of the purport of the letter in ver. 3. It was called out by a sudden emergency, to guard against an immediate pressing danger, and was substituted for a treatise περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας which Jude had hoped to send (ver. 3), and which would probably have been more in the tone and spirit of vv. 20 f.

The Epistle of Jude was recognised as canonical in the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (Westcott on the Canon, p. 566), with which agree Jerome (Westcott, p. 580) and Augustine (De Doctr. Christiana, ii. 12). Jerome, however (De vir. ill. iv.), mentions that, owing to the use made of the apocryphal Enoch, the epistle of Jude a plerisque reicitur. So Eusebius H.E. ii. 23, "Not many old writers have mentioned the Epistle of James, nor yet the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the seven so-called Catholic Epistles, though we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most churches." Ib. iii. 25, "Among the controverted books, which are nevertheless well known and recognised by most, we class the Epistle circulated under the name of James and that of Jude." Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386 A.D.) acknowledged both Jude and 2 P. In Asia Minor both Jude and 2 P. were recognised as canonical by Gregory Naz. (d. c. 391). In Alexandria Didymus (d. 394) wrote comments on the Catholic Epistles, especially defending Jude from the attacks made upon him as having made use of apocryphal books. Athanasius (d. 373) in his list of the books of the N.T. "agrees exactly with our own Canon" (Westcott, p. 520). Origen (In Matt. x. 17) says of Jude ἐγραφεν ἐπιστολήν, ἀληθινῆς μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἔρωμάνων λόγων. In the same treatise (xvii. 30) he quotes Jude 6, adding words which signify that it was not universally received, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱούθα πρόσωπό τις ἐπιστολήν. Clement of Alexandria commented on Jude in his Hypotyposes (Eus. H.E. vi. 14)—the comment is still extant in the Latin translation—and quotes him by name (Paed. iii. 44, 45) with commendation, διδασκαλικῶτα ἐκτίθεται τὰς εἰλήφας τῶν κρυφλῶν. He quotes him again Strom. iii. 11, and, without naming him, in Strom. vi. 65. Tertullian (De Cult. Fem. 3) says "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet". It appears in the Muratorian Canon (c. 170 A.D.), "Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duae in catholicis habentur". Theophilius of Antioch (ad Autol. ii. 15) seems to allude to Jude 13 in the words quoted in my note on that verse. Athenagoras (c. 180) speaks (§ 24, p. 130 Otto) of the fallen angels in a manner which suggests acquaintance with
Jude ver. 6, ἄγγελος τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν. (Of the angels some) ἔμειναν ἐφ' οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν καὶ διέταξεν ὁ θεὸς, οἱ δὲ ἐνυφάρισαν καὶ τῇ τῆς ὁδοῖας ὑποστάσει καὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ, and he adds that he asserts this on the authority of the prophets, which may perhaps refer both to Enoch and Jude. The form of salutation in Jude 2 ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεί is found in Mart. Polyc. Inscr. and Polyc. ad Phil. The earliest reference however to Jude is probably to be found in 2 Pet., which, as we have seen in the preceding Chapter I., is largely copied from him. There appears also to be an allusion to it in Didache ii. 7, οἀ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ οὐς μὲν ἐλέγχεις, περὶ δὲ δὲν προειρήκατ, οὗς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις, cf. Jude 22. Jude’s epistle was included in the Old Latin Version, but not in the Peshitto.

The most important passage in Jude bearing upon the circumstances of its composition is ver. 17, where the readers are bidden to call to mind the words formerly spoken to them by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (which would fit in with the suggestion that it was addressed to the Syrian churches) δι' ἔλεουν ὦμην Ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ ἔσονται ἐμπαίκται, the latter words showing that these communications of the Apostles had now ceased, either by their death or by their removal from Jerusalem. Jude recognises that “the last time,” of which they had preached, had now arrived. The long retrospect which these words imply agrees with the far-away note of ver. 3, παρακαλὴν ἐπαγνωζοῦσα τῇ ἄπαξ παραθέσει τῶν ἄγιων πίστει, as contrasted with such passages as Luke iv. 21 σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὐτή, though we must not forget that the idea of a Christian tradition is familiar to St. Paul, and that there are other examples in the N.T. of the objective use of πίστεσ.

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

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

The Hebrew original of the book of Enoch 1 is now lost. It was translated into Greek, of which only a few fragments remain, and this was again translated into Ethiopic, probably about 600 A.D. A copy of the last was found in Abyssinia in 1773 by Bruce, the famous traveller, and an English version was published by Abp. Laurence in 1821, followed by the Ethiopic text in 1838. The composite nature of the book is generally recognised. The latest editor, R. H. Charles, who is my authority for what follows, divides it into five sections and recognises many interpolations in these. He considers that the larger portion of the book was written not later than 160 B.C., and that no part is more recent than the Christian era. It exercised an important influence on Jewish and Christian literature during the centuries which followed being used by the author of the Assumption of Moses (written about the Christian era), also by the writers of the Book of Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Fourth Book of Ezra, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Mr. Charles traces its influence in the N.T. not merely in the epistles of St. Jude and the two epistles of St. Peter, but above all, in the Apocalypse; also in the Acts, and the epistle to the Hebrews, in some of the epistles of St. Paul, and in the Gospels. It is quoted three times (twice as Scripture) in the Epistle of Barnabas, is referred to, though not named, in Justin and Athenagoras, is cited by Irenæus, iv. 16. 2: "Enoch... cum esset homo, legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis judicii Dei, quoniam angeli

---

1 On which see Schürer, Hist. of Jewish People, vol. iii. pp. 54-73.
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quidem deciderunt in terram in judicium” (En. xlv. 7). Tertullian quotes it as Scripture, calling Enoch the oldest of the prophets (Idol. xv., Apol. xxii.). He allows that its canonicity was denied by some, “quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur,” and also because it was thought that, if it were a genuine writing of Enoch, it must have perished in the Deluge. He considers, however, that it should be received, because of its witness to Christ, and because it has the testimony of the Apostle Jude. It is twice quoted in Clement’s Ecl. Proph. (Dind. iii. pp. 456, 474) as well as in Strom. iii. 9. Origen speaks doubtfully of the authority of Enoch: cf. C. Celsum, v. 54, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὖν πάντις φέρεται ὡς θεία τὰ ἑπιγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία, and In Iohannem, vi. 25, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἰ τῷ βιβλίῳ παραδεχόμεθα ὡς ἀγίον τὸ βιβλίον, also In Num. Hom. xxviii. 2, De Princ. i. 3. 3. Hilary (Comm. in Psalm. cxxxii. 3) writes: “Fertur id, de quo etiam nescio cuius liber extat, quod angeli concupiscientes filias hominum, cum de caelo descenderent, in montem Hermon convenerant”. Jerome says that the doubts entertained as to the epistle of St. Jude arose from his quoting an apocryphal book as an authority (De Vir. Ill. iv), “quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia, a plerisque reicitur”. Cf. also Comm. in Ps. cxxxii. 3 and Comm. in Titum, i. 12. Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv 23. 4) and Chrysostom (Hom. in Gen. vi. 1) speak of the story of the angels and the daughters of men as a baseless fable. Still more severe is the condemnation passed on the book of Enoch with other apocryphal writings in Const. Apost. vi. 16. 2, as φθοροποιᾷ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρᾶ.

Mr. Charles has also edited the Assumption of Moses (1897), which he regards as a composite work made up of two distinct books, the Testament and the Assumption of Moses.1 “The former was written in Hebrew between 7 and 29 a.d., and possibly also the latter. A Greek version of the entire work appeared in the first century a.d. Of this only a few fragments have been preserved. The Greek version was translated into Latin not later than the fifth century” (pp. xiii., xiv.). “The book preserved in the incomplete Latin version, first published by Ceriani in 1861, is in reality a Testament and not an Assumption.” “The editing of the two books in one was probably done in the first century, as St. Jude draws upon both in his epistle” (pp. xlvii and l.). Thus Jude ver. 9² is derived from the

1 Cf. Schürer, pp. 73-83.

² See note on this, and add to the illustrative passages there quoted a scholium printed for the first time in James’ Test. of Abraham, p. 18: ὁ δὲ Βαλοὺς ἀντίκειται θεὸν ἀπάθητον, λέγων ὅτι ἔρωταν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τῆς ἀθλήμας ὑπακούσαν τὸ ἐπιτιμήθη σοι Κύριος, τούτῳ σὺν υἱῷ Κύριος ὁ πάντων τῶν πνευμάτων.
Assumption, Jude 16 from the Testament (p. lxii.). On the latter Charles compares καὶ τὸ στῶμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπόργκα, θαυμάζοντες πρὸς πώς ἀφελίας χάριν with Ass. M. vii. 7, quaedam, vii. 9, et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes et os eorum loquentur ingentia, v. 5, erunt illis temporibus mirantes personas . . . et accipientes munera (MS. acceptiones munerum). He identifies the ἀστέρες of Jude 18 with the homines pestilenctiosi of Ass. M. vii. 3, and calls attention to the frequent recurrence of the word ἀσφείς in the former (vv. 4, 15, 18) and ἀσφαλεῖς in the latter: see vi. 1, facient facientes impietatem, vii. 3, pestilentes et impii, ib. 7, ix. 3, xi. 17.

Again there appears to be a reminiscence of the Testaments of the Patriarchs, where the sin of the Watchers is connected with that of Sodom: cf. Test. Nepht. 3, ἡμῖν καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστέρες οὐκ ἀλλοιωσί τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ξύγη πλανθέντα καὶ ἀφεντα κύριοι ἠλλοιωσάν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ξυγκολούσαντες τείμασαν πλάνης. ἤμείς μὴ οὗτος . . . Ἰη μὴ γένοιτω ὡς Σάδωμα, ἡμῖν ἠθλλαξάν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὄργοις καὶ Ἐγρήγοροι ἠθλλαξάν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὗς κατηρασάτο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, Test. Aser 7, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σάδωμα ἡμῖν ἠγέροικεν τοὺς ἀγέλους κυρίων καὶ ἀπόλεστο ἕως αἰῶνος. There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7 and 13, ἀγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἄφωνον ἀρχὴν . . . ὡς Σάδωμα . . . τῶν ἰμανόν ἀπεκρούσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦντι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας πρόκειναι δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου . . . ἀστέρες πλανῆται.

We have seen how this use of apocryphal books was viewed by the early Christian writers. They were at first disposed to think that a book stamped with the approval of St. Jude must be itself inspired. Later on, the feeling changed: the authority of St. Jude was no longer sufficient to save the apocryphal writing: on the contrary the prejudice against the Apocrypha and its “blasphemous fables” (Chrys. Hom. 22 in Gen.) led many to doubt the authority of St. Jude: see above quotation from Jerome, who argues that the approval of the Apostle need not be supposed to extend to the whole of the book of Enoch, but only to the verses quoted by him. So Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 23, 4): “Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab
Adam negare non possimus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat" (although the book as a whole has been justly excluded from the Canon).

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

The Story of the Fallen Angels.—St. Jude (vv. 5-8) introduces as examples of the divine wrath against those who had sinned after receiving favours from God (1) the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for unbelief after they had been saved from Egypt; (2) the angels who abandoned their original office and habitation, being led away by fleshy lusts, and are now kept in chains under darkness till the day of judgment; (3) the people of Sodom, who inhabited a land like the garden of the Lord (Gen. xiii. 10), who were rescued from Chedorlaomer by Abraham (Gen. xiv. 16, 17), and yet sinned after the fashion of the angels, and are now a warning to all, suffering the punishment of eternal fire. A similar account is given in 2 Pet. ii.4-9 where it is said (1) that God spared not the angels who sinned, but hurled them into Tartarus, to be detained there in chains (or pits) of darkness until the final judgment; (2) that He brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, while he spared Noah; (3) that He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, while he delivered righteous Lot; in all three cases punishing impurity and rebellion.

As is shown in the explanatory notes, this account of the Fall of the Angels is taken directly from the book of Enoch, which is itself an expansion from Jewish and Gentile sources of the strange narrative contained in Gen. vi. 1-4: “It came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the ground and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose. The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them: the same were the mighty men which were of old, the men of renown” (R.V.).
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gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase “sons of God” occurs, Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7, Dan. iii. 25, 28, Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 6. It has been suggested that the phrase μηδ’ ἔκτινοι may be a marginal note having reference to Num. xiii. 33, where the Nephilim are mentioned as a gigantic race, “in whose eyes the spies were as grasshoppers,” inhabiting a part of Canaan at the time of the Exodus. The translation γίγαντες implies not only superhuman size, but also superhuman insolence and impiety. According to Greek mythology they were children of Heaven and Earth, who rose up in insurrection against the Gods and were hurled down to Tartarus or buried beneath the mountains. This resemblance is noted by Josephus in the passage quoted below.

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

The story was variously commented on by later Jewish writers, most of whom supposed that the Nephilim were the offspring of the intercourse between the angels and the daughters of men, and that they were destroyed in the Flood.

The Fall of the Angels is largely treated of in the collection of treatises which goes under the name of the Book of Enoch. The earliest portion of the book is considered by the latest editor, Mr. R. H. Charles, to have been written in the first quarter of the second century B.C. Two hundred of the angels, or watchers, Ἐγγύγγοροι as they are called in the Greek versions of Dan. iv. 13 by Aquila and Symmachus, conspired together under the leadership of Semjaza (elsewhere called Azazel, as in Enoch, chapters viii. and ix.) and descended on Mount Hermon in the days of Jared, father of Enoch (vi.). There they took to themselves human wives whom they instructed in magic and various arts, and begot giants, who afterwards begot the Nephilim: cf. viii., οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἐτέκνωσαν Ναφηλείμ . . . μετὰ δὲ τοῦτα ἠρέμως οἱ γίγαντες κατεσθίεν τὰς σάρκας τὰς ἀνθρώπων (like Polyphemus). Complaint having been made of the sin and misery thus introduced into the world, Raphael is sent down from heaven to bind Azazel hand and foot and shut him up in darkness till the judgment day, when he
will be cast into eternal fire. Gabriel is at the same time sent to slay the giants (x. 9): the watchers will be bound under the hills for seventy generations, and then be confined for ever in the abyss of fire: the spirits of the slain giants become demons. In chap. xix., however, the demons are represented as existing before the fall of the watchers.

The prevailing demonology of the Book of Enoch is thus summed up by Dr. Charles (Enoch, p. 52). The angelic watchers who fell from lusting after the daughters of men have been imprisoned in darkness from the time of their fall. The demons are the spirits which proceeded from the souls of the giants who were their offspring. They work moral ruin on earth without hindrance till the final judgment. Satan is the ruler of a counter kingdom of evil. He led astray the angels and made them his subjects. He also tempted Eve. The Satans can still appear in heaven (as in Job). They tempt to evil, they accuse the fallen, they punish the condemned. In portions however of the Book of Enoch there is no mention of a Satan or Satans, but the angels are led astray by their own chief Azazel, or as he is sometimes called Semjaza (En. ix., x., xiii., liv.). Of the Secrets of Enoch, which is supposed to date from about the Christian era, Dr. Charles says:1 "It is hard to get a consistent view of the demonology of the book: it seems to be as follows: Satan, one of the archangels, seduced the watchers of the fifth heaven into revolt in order to establish a counter kingdom to God. Therefore Satan or the Satans were cast down from heaven and given the air for their habitation. Some however of the Satans or Watchers went down to earth and married the daughters of men." Compare xviii. 3, "These are the Grigori, who with their prince Satanail rejected the holy Lord, and in consequence of these things they are kept in great darkness".

In chap. liv. there appears to be an attempt to connect the two different stories of the Fall: the guilt of the Watchers is said to have consisted in their becoming subject to Satan, who was either identified with the Serpent, as in Apoc. xii. 9, καὶ ἠβλῆθη ὁ ἀρχαῖος ὁ μέγας, ὁ δόξος ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐληφ—ἐβλῆθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλῆθησαν; or else was supposed to have made use of the Serpent as his instrument, as in the Assumption of Moses quoted by Orig. De Princip. iii. 2. 1 (Lomm. vol. xxi. p. 303): "In Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Asc. Mosis (cujuslibellum meminit apostolus Judas) Michael Archangelus cum diabolo disputans de cor-

1 See his note on pp. 36, 37.
pore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evaes”.\(^1\)

The history of the gradual development of the belief in regard to Satan, as exhibited in the Bible, will be found in any of the Dictionaries of the Bible. Beside the attempt to harmonise the two Fall-stories by making Satan the cause of both, an attempt was made to arrive at the same result by ascribing to Satan or the Serpent the same motive which led to the fall of the angels. In Wisdom ii. 24 we read “By the envy of the devil death entered into the world”. This envy is explained in rabbinical writings sometimes as occasioned by the dignity of Adam and his lordship over the creation, but more frequently by Satan’s desire for Eve:\(^2\) cf. 4 Macc. xviii. 8, οὐδὲ ἄνωθεν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἄγα καὶ τὴς παρθένος λυμαύων ἀπάτης ἐφ’εσ. Sometimes again his fall is ascribed to the less ignoble motive of pride, as in the pseudepigraphic Life of Adam: “When God created Adam, He called upon the angels to adore him as His image. . . . Satan however refused, and on being threatened with the wrath of God said that he would exalt his throne above the stars of heaven” (Isa. xiv. 13). In other writings (Life of Adam, Secrets of Enoch) Satan refuses to worship God Himself, “entertaining the impossible idea that he should make his throne higher than the clouds over the earth, and should be equal in rank to [God’s] power”.\(^3\)

There can be little doubt that the story of the punishment of the angels took its colouring from two passages of Isaiah, the fine imaginative description of the mighty king of Babylon, under the figure of the morning star, entering the realm of Hades (ch. xiv.) and what appears to be an account of the punishment of guardian angels for their neglect of the nations committed to their charge (ch. xxiv. 21 f.), “It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison and after many days shall they be visited.”

St. Jude’s allusion to this story is merely parenthetical, to illustrate the law of judgment. He appears not to recognise any con-

\(^1\) Cf. Tennant, *The Fall and Original Sin*, pp. 245, 246.

\(^2\) See Tennant, pp. 152 foll.; Thackeray, *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*, pp. 50 foll.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. p. 165, ii. 753 foll. In the latter passage the rabbis are quoted to the effect that the angels generally were opposed to the creation of man, and that the demons were the offspring of Eve and male spirits, and Adam and female spirits, especially Lilith.

\(^3\) See Tennant, pp. 199, 201, 206.
nection between the Fallen Angels and Satan. The former are suffering imprisonment in darkness till the final judgment: the latter was apparently able to confront the archangel on equal terms, when contending for the body of Moses. So the continued activity and even the authority of Satan and his angels in this world are asserted both in the O.T., as in Job i. 6 and Zech. iii. 1, 2, and in the N.T. as in James iv. 7, 1 P. v. 8, Eph. 6, 11, 12 (we have to stand against the wiles of the devil, ... our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but) πρὸς τὰς ἀρχές, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see Lightfoot on Col. ii. 15. In 2 Cor. iv. 4 Satan is spoken of as the god, in John xii. 31 and xvi. 11 as the prince of this world. He is the tempter and accuser of the brethren, and did not shrink even from assailing the Son of God Himself (Mt. iv. 3).

The above account of the Fall of the Angels was that usually accepted, with slight variations, both among Jews and Christians till towards the close of the fourth century A.D.

Julius Africanus is said to be the only one of the ante-Nicene Fathers who enunciated the view which afterwards prevailed, viz., that "the sons of God were the descendants of Seth, and the daughters of men descendants of Cain".¹ See the quotation in Routh, Rel. Sacr. ii. p. 241, where he also gives the alternative explanation εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ ἀγγέλων τοῦτο τότε, τοὺς περί μαγείας καὶ γητείας ... ἀγαλάκτως συνέναι χρῆ τῶν μετέφρων τοὺς γυναῖκας τῆς γυναῖκος διενεχέναι. Eusebius (Pr. Ev. v. 4, 11, 12) still keeps to the old view and compares the narrative of Gen. 6 to the stories of the Titans and Giants of Greek mythology. So Lactantius, Div. Inst. ii. 14: "Deus ne fraudibus suis diabolus, cui ab initio terrae dederat potestatem, vel corrumperet vel disperderet homines, quod in exordio rerum fecerat, misit angelos ad tutelam cultumque generis humani ... Itaque illos cum hominibus commorantes dominator ille terrae fallacissimus consuetudine ipsa paulatim ad vitia pellexit et mulierum congressibus inquinavit ... sic eos diabolus ex angelis Dei suos fecit satellites," etc. So Sulpicius Severus (Chron. i. 2): "Angeli quibus caelum sedes erat, speciosarum forma virginum capti ... naturae suae originisque degeneres ... matrimoniis se mortalibus miscerunt." Julian, like Celsus, used this belief as a ground for attacking Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply (ix. p. 296) repudiates the belief as altogether unworthy, and injurious to morality, since men plead the angels' sin as excuse for their own, and adopts the interpretation of "sons of God" previously

¹It is also found in the apocryphal Conflict of Adam and Eve of uncertain date, on which see the art. "Adam, Books of," in the D. of Christ. Biog. i. 36 foll.
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given by Africanus. Chrysostom deals at length with the subject in his 22nd homily on Genesis. He calls the old interpretation blasphemous, and holds that it is precluded by the words of Christ, that "in the resurrection men shall be like angels, neither marrying nor given in marriage". Augustine (Civ. Dei, xv. 23) thinks it cannot be denied "Silvanos et Paunos, quos vulgo incubos vocant... mulierum appetisse ac peregisse concubitum... Dei tamen angelos sanctos nullo modo sic labi potuisse crediderim, nec de his dixisse Apostolum Petrum... sed potius de illis qui primum apostatantes a Deo cum diabolo principe suo ceciderunt," unless we are rather to understand this of the children of Seth. A little later Philastrius (Haer. 107) goes so far as to condemn the old opinion as a heresy.

The sympathies of Christians in the present day must assuredly be with those who endeavoured to eliminate from the Scriptures all that might seem to be dishonouring to God and injurious to men. But the methods employed with this view were often such as we could not now accept. For instance, the allegorical method borrowed from the Stoics by Philo, and adopted from him by many of the Fathers, is too subjective and arbitrary to be of any value in getting rid of moral difficulties. We have replaced this now by the historical method, first enunciated by our Lord, when he contrasted the spirit of the Gospel with that of the old Dispensation. There is a continuous growth in the ideal of conduct as set before us in the Bible. Much that was commanded or permitted in the days of Abraham or Moses or David is forbidden to those who have received the fuller light of Christianity. So, what it was found possible for men to believe about God Himself and about the holy angels, is impossible for us now. The words put into the mouth of God in Gen. iii. 22, and in xi. 6, 7, we feel to be inconsistent with any true idea of the power and wisdom and love of God, and only suitable to a very low state of human development. So also for the story of the fall of the angels. But is it a satisfactory explanation of the latter to suppose that "sons of Seth" are meant by "sons of God"? Ryle (Early Narratives of Genesis, 91-95) points out that "there is nothing in the context to suggest this, no sign that the Sethites were distinguished for piety: they are not even exempted from the charge of general wickedness which brought on the Flood". Equally untenable is the Jewish explanation that "sons of God" are the nobles. I think no one who has studied with any care the recent investigations as to the origin of the book of Genesis, of which Driver's Book of Genesis may be taken as a specimen, can doubt that it contains much which is unhistoric, though full of moral and spiritual

1 Cf. Matt. v. 21-48, xix. 8; Luke ix. 54-56.
teaching. The pre-Abrahamic narrative shows many resemblances to the Babylonian records, but in general the motive has been changed and purified. Thus Driver says (p. lxiii.): “It is impossible, if we compare the early narratives of Genesis with the Babylonian narratives, from which in some cases they seem plainly to have been ultimately derived . . . not to perceive the controlling operation of the Spirit of God, which has taught these Hebrew writers . . . to take the primitive traditions of the human race, to purify them from their grossness and their polytheism, and to make them at once the foundation and the explanation of the long history that is to follow.” Of the particular passage in question, however, Driver says (p. 83): “As a rule, the Hebrew narrators stripped off the mythological colouring of the piece of folklore which they record; but in the present instance it is still discernible”.

1 Tennant, 20, 21, 41.
2 For further information on this subject see Suicer’s *Thesaurus* under ἄγγελος, and Ἑρωτοφυλάκιος, Hasting’s *D. of B.* under “Angel,” “Demon,” “Fall,” “Flood”; *Encycl. of B. Lit.* under “Angel,” “Demon,” “Deluge,” “Nephilim,” “Satan”; Maitland’s *Eruvin* (Essays iv.-vi.), where the literal interpretation is defended; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctr.* § 52 and § 132.
CHAPTER V.

Notes on the Text of the Epistle of Jude.—The Epistle of Jude is contained in the uncial NABCKLP. It is omitted in the Peshitto, but included in the later Syriac versions, the Philoxenian and Harkleian, here distinguished as syr* and syr*. In citing the Egyptian versions I have used the notation Boh., now commonly employed, instead of the less distinctive Copt., employed by Tischendorf. The only other point which it may be well to mention is that, as in the Epistle of James, the symbol + is appended in the Critical Notes to signify that the reading in question is found in other authorities besides those previously mentioned. In discussing the readings I start with that of WH.

If we may judge from the number of “primitive errors” suspected by WH in the short Epistle of Jude, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these twenty-five verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels. I notice below some passages where the text presents special difficulties.

Ver. 5. ὁπομνημάτοι δὲ όμιλοι βουλομαί, εἰδότας ἀπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαόν ἐκ γῆς ἀγῶντος σάκος τὸ δεύτερον τούς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσαι.

I quote Tregelles’ notes with additions from Tischendorf in round brackets, only changing the notation of the Egyptian and Syriac versions to prevent confusion, and correcting the citations in accordance with more recent collations.


In point of fact however B reads εἰδότας ὑμᾶς, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzi’s photographic reproduction. Also Dr. Gwynn reports that h and all the MSS. of p give the same reading, though he adds that the pleonastic idiom of the Syriac would lead the translators to supply the pronoun even if wanting in the Greek. The preponderance of authority is therefore

1 See Dr. Gwynn’s Later Syriac Versions, published in 1909.
in favour of this latter reading. The repeated ὃμας emphasises the contrast between the readers ("to remind you, you who know it already") and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated ἄμων of v. 3.

ἐπεζ· ἀντε πάρτα ABCL. 13. 31. Vulg. ἄντε ἐς Ἱ. ἄντε λαδν· (Syr.) Arm. ἄντε ἐς γῆς Ἀλκ. Clem. 280 (and 997) Did. Cassiod. ἐς κύριος σώσας τὸν λαδν ἐς γῆς Ἀλκ. ἐπεζ· ἀντε Sah., ἐς ἐπεζ· κύριος σώσας λαδν αὐτόν Boh. Om. ἐπεζ· Lucif. 28. [ἐπεζ· is so placed in Syrr. as to be connected with σώσας "when he had once saved them," G.]

πάρτα ABCN 13 Vulg. Syr². Boh. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the App. to WH (Sel. Readings, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for πάρτα (cf. 1 John ii. 20) found in Syr²], τοῦτο 31 KL. Sah.


κύριος] NCKL. Syr². Θεος C.² Tol. Syr⁵ Arm. Clem. Lucif. ἰπροις AB 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Aeth. [In App. to WH. (Sel. Readings, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, "apparently OTIK (ἐπεζ· Κύριος), and OTIΠ (ἐπεζ· ἰπροις) for OTIO (ἐπεζ· ἰπροις)."]

γῆς] om. Syr².

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is ὅπομνησαι δὲ ὃμας βουλομαι, εἰδότας ὃμας πάρτα, ἐπεζ· κύριος ἀπαξ λαδν ἐς γῆς Ἀλγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεότερον [τοῦ] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπάλλας. I see no difficulty in πάρτα, which gives a reason for the use of the word ὅπομνησαι, "I need only remind you, because you already know all that I have to say". It was easy for the second ὃμας to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word ἀπαξ might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after εἰδότας: the knowledge of the incidents, which are related in this and the following verses, is not a knowledge for good and all, such as the faith spoken of in ver. 3. On the other hand, ἀπαξ is very appropriate if taken with λαδν σώσας (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for τὸ δεότερον. For the reading πάρτα I see no reason. Can it be assumed that all who are addressed should be familiar with the legends contained in the Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, to which allusion is made in what follows? It is surely much more to the point for the writer to say, as he does again below (ver. 17), that he is only repeating what is generally known, though it need not be known to every individual.

As to Hort's suggestion on the word κύριος, that the original was ἐπεζ· δ (λαδν σώσας), I think the fact of the variants is better explained by Spitta, who considers that the abbreviations Ἐ, Ἐ, Ἐ might easily be confused, if the first letter was faintly written, and that

¹ This is an error: the two best MSS. of ὃ represent πάρτα." G.
the mention of τῶν μόνων δεσπότης καὶ Κύριον Ἰ. Χ. in the preceding
verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer ἤ, a supposition
which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, ἔχεται γὰρ πρὸ τοῦτων
περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἰπή ἐν θεσ κοίτων ὁ μόνος δεσπότης ὁ κύριος Ἰ. Χ., ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωσέως. Spitta himself however
holds that ἤ is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding
passage in 2 Peter ii. 4, ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων ὁ δὲ ἐφείσατο,
and with Clement's paraphrase (*Adumbr. Dind. iii.* p. 482) : "Quoniam
Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps
eos qui non crediderunt perdidit". There is no instance in the New
Testament of the personal name "Jesus" being used of the pre-
existent Messiah, though the official name "Christ" is found in 1
Cor. x. 4, 9, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But
in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully
observed. Thus Justin M. (*Dial.* 120), speaking of the prophecy
in Genesis xlix. 10, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus,
tὸν καὶ τῶν πατέρας ὃμων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγάγοντα, and this use of the
name was confirmed by the idea that the son of Nun was a per-
sonification of Christ (see Justin, *Dial.* 75; Clem. Al. 183; Didymus,
*De Trin.* 1. 19, ἰουδαία καθολικῶς γράφει, ἀπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς λαὸν ἐξ
Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.; Jerome, *C. Jov.* 1. 12; Lact. *Inst.* 4. 17,
"Christi figuram gerebat illa Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur,
Moyseis futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari"). In the ex-
planatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the
article before μὴ did not belong to the original text.

Ver. 12. οὖτοι εἰσίν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὃμων καὶ ἤμελες συνευχοῦμενοι
ἀφόβωσ ἐαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες. The article here is omitted by ΝΚ and
many inferior MSS. with vg. (but not syr. or sah. or boh.), and some
of the patristic quotations. I agree with Dr. Chase in thinking that
it is out of place here, as in ver. 5 above. There is not only the
difficulty of construction (οἱ . . . καὶ οἵμελες), but the very bold assump-
tion that the signification of καὶ οἵμελες will be at once apparent. If we
omit the article, ἀφόβωσ should be attached to συνευχοῦμεν ὡς by Ti. In
syr. it is joined with ποιμαίνοντες.

Ver. 19. οὖτοι εἰσίν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

ἀποδιορίζοντες *add.* εαυτοὺς C vulg. syr. *Om. ΝABKL 13*, etc.

Schott, B. Weiss, and Huther-Kühl suppose the words ψυχικοὶ
πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of
οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες: "welche Unterscheidungen machen, sc. zwischen
Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Un-
terscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten
umkehrt”. This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, or τὰ σχίσματα ποιούντες; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (παρεισβολὴν, ver. 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (ver. 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word ἀποδιορίζων could bear this sense. ἀπορίζω is used in Luke vi. 22 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικὸς in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators (and should we not then have expected the contrast ψυχικὸς, πνευματικὸς?), still we cannot use the same word over again to express Jude’s “drastic” retort. This difficulty would be removed if we supposed the loss of a line to the following effect after ἀποδιορίζωνes:—

ψυχικὸς ὁμᾶς (ὀς τοὺς πιστοὺς) λέγοντες, δύτει αὐτοῖ
ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἐξοντες.

The opposition of ψυχικὸς to πνευματικὸς is familiar in the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist. The Church is carnal, the sect spiritual. So the Valentinians distinguished their own adherents as pneumatici from the ψυχικοὶ who composed the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James iii. 15), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. xv. 44), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. ii. 14 f.) ψυχικὸς ἀνθρώπος of δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μικρὰ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστὶν . . . ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα. The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (ver. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μεταπέθετες ἐλὸς ἀσθένεια), professing a knowledge of the βαθύ τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. ii. 10), though it was really a knowledge only of τὰ βάθη τοῦ Σατάν (Apos. ii. 24), and claiming to be the true δυνατοὶ and πνευματικοὶ, as denying dead works and setting the spirit above the letter. This explains the subsequent misrepresentation of St. Paul as a heresiarch in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.

Vv. 22, 23. (Text of Tischendorf and Tregelles) καὶ ὅσα μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινόμενοσ, ὅσα δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρνάγωντες, ὅσα δὲ ἔλεγήτα ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιλαμβανον χιτῶνα. (Text of WH. and
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Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore. Ar* Et quosdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos. Ar* Et signate quosdam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) et salvate quosdam territioine, ab ripite eos ex igne. Aeth. quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est (Aeth* propter peccatum eorum), et est qui et servabitur ex igne et rapiant eum, et est qui servabitur timore et poenitentia. Arm. Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et quosdam salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore judicando (?) indicando). Cassiodor. 142 Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aesterni ignis eripient, nonnullis misereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execratione refugiant. Mr. Horner states that vv. 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows: καὶ οἷς μὲν ἔλεγχετε διαικρινομένους, οἷς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς (al. om. τοῦ), οἷς δὲ ἔλεατε (al. ψετε) ἐν φόβῳ. Commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, κακεῖνος δὲ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδιδόταται ὁμίλι—τούτῳ γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διαικρινομένου—ἐλέγχετε, τούτῳ φανεροὺς τοῖς πάσι τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν· εἰτε δὲ πρὸς ἵππων ἄφορόν, μὴ ἀπεξείηθη, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῆς ἀγάπης ὡμίλει προσλαμβάνεσθε, σώζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἱππολημένου αὐτῶς πυρὸς· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἰλείν αὐτοῦκαὶ μετὰ φόβου.

In all these it will be observed that three classes are distinguished as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A, οἷς μὲν ἔλεγχετε διαικρινομένους, οἷς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οἷς δὲ ἔλεατε ἐν φόβῳ, and ἔλεατε διαικρινομένους, οἷς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οἷς
INTRODUCTION

We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in Can. Apost. vi. 4 (οὐ μισημεία τάτα ἄθρωπου, ἀλλὰ) οὖς μὲν ἄγημεν, οὖς δὲ ἔλημεν, περὶ δὲ προσεβεβή (οὖς δὲ ἄγημεν ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ), which occurs also, with the omission of the cause οὖς δὲ ἔλημεν in the Didaché ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: SyrP. Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, miseremini super eis in timore, representing καὶ οὔς μὲν ἐλεάτε ἄρπάζετε, diakrionoméνους δὲ ἔλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ. SyrP, et hos quidem misere-


St. Jude’s predilection for triplets, as in vv. 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in vv. 5-7, and of sin in v. 11, is prima facie favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and Ν to represent the original, consisting of three members, a b c, we find B complete in a and c, but confused as to b. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὔς μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἔλεάτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὔς δὲ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἔλεάτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, "Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear". It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἔλεάτε was written in error for ἄγημεν and οὔς omitted in error after diakrionoméνους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of SyrP. and Clem. Str. 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in a and b, but insert a phrase from c in b. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplication of ἔλεάτε in a and c (as in Ν) caused the omission of

1The paraphrase continues, id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doteatis ut semet ipso libaret. (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be inserted after rapientes.) Odientes, inquit, eam, quae carnalis est, maculatam tunicam; animae videlicet tunica macula (read maculata) est, spiritus concupiscientiis pollutus carnalibus.
the second ἀλέγχει, and therefore of the second ὁς ἡ. The reading ἀλεκρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἀποδίωτος, and seemed, to those were not aware of the difference in the meaning of the active and middle of ἀλεκρίνω, to supply a very appropriate thought, viz., that discrimination must be used; treatment should differ in different cases.

The real difficulty however of the triple division is to arrive at a clear demarcation between the classes alluded to. "The triple division," says Hort (App. p. 107), "gives no satisfactory sense"; and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühler that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: "Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur ἀλέγχει zu üben ist, aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind"; while the majority take Reiche’s view of a climax: “a dubitabantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur”. My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of ἀλεγχεῖ, any more than the Pharisees condemned by our Lord, as long as they persisted in their hostility to the truth. The admonition here given by St. Jude seems to be the same as that contained in the final verses of the Epistle written by his brother long before: εἶν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτῶν, γινώσκει ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέφων ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ σώσῃ ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, ἀλεκρινόμενοι, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James i. 6), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John xvi. 8, 9, Ἰδέαστε περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὧν οὐ πιστεύσως εἰς ἐμν). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul’s judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. v. 5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.
IOYDA ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

1. 'ΙΟΥΔΑΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῦτος ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἑαυτόν.

Vv. 1, 2.—Salutation. Jude a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those who have received the divine calling, beloved of the Father, kept safe in Jesus Christ. May mercy, peace, and love be richly poured out upon you!

1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. The same phrase is used by St. James in the inscription to his epistle, also by St. Paul in Rom. and Phil. In 1 Pet. the phrase is used διὰ ἀπόστσιος, in 2 Pet. διὰ ἐκόνησιος, ἀπόστσιος ἢ ἐκόνησιος. It is, I think, a mistake to translate δοῦλος by the word "slave," the modern connotation of which is so different from that of the Greek word (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 5). There is no opposition between δοῦλος and ἐκόνησιος in the Christian's willing service. It only becomes a δοῦλος in the opposed sense, when he ceases to love what is commanded and feels it as an external yoke.

ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου. Cf. Tit. i. 1, δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστσιος δὲ ἡμών. See Introduction on the Author.

τοῦτος ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγανημένος καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένων κλητὸς. On the readings see Introduction on the text. The easier reading of some MSS., ἡγανημένος for ἡγανημένοι, is probably derived from 1 Cor. i. 2, ἡγανημένοι ἐν Θεῷ. 'I. There is no precise parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ ἐν γενεσίᾳ or for Χριστῷ τετηρημένῳ. The proposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ: they are incorporated in Him as the branches in the vine, as the living stones in the spiritual temple, as the members in the body of which He is the head. So here, "beloved as members of Christ, reflecting back his glorious image." Lightfoot, commenting on Col. iii. 12, ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐγνώκα τινὰ ἁγανημένον, says that in the N.T. the last word "seems to be used always of the objects of God's love," but it is diffic
Israelites, or bodies of Israelites, to perform certain functions for Israel.

3. Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσιν στοιχεῖοι πανομοίων γράφειν ὁμία περὶ τῆς

1 ἡγασμένοις ΛΒ Ν; ἡγασμένοις KLP.
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νεφελής ἤγασμένοις καὶ ἤγας Χριστῷ τετραγμένος κλητοῖς.

2. Ἡπειρός ὁμίν καὶ εἰρήκη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεῖν.

3. Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσιν στοιχεῖοι πανομοίων γράφειν ὁμία περὶ τῆς

1 ἡγασμένοις ΛΒ Ν; ἡγασμένοις KLP.

Israelites, or bodies of Israelites, to perform certain functions for Israel.

. . . The calling and the choosing imply each other, the calling being the outward expression of the antecedent choosing, the act by which it begins to take effect. Both words emphatically mark the present state of the persons addressed as being due to the free agency of God. . . . In Deuteronomy (iv. 37) the choosing, but God is ascribed to His own love of Israel: the ground of it lay in Himself, not in Israel. . . . As is the election of the ruler or priest within Israel for the sake of Israel, such is the election of Israel for the sake of the whole human race. Such also, still more clearly and emphatically, is the election of the new Israel.” For a similar use of the word “call” in Isaiah, cf. ch. xlviii. 12, xliii.

1, 7. The chief distinction between the “calling” of the old and of the new dispensation is that the former is rather expressive of dignity (“called by the name of God”), the latter of invitation; but the former appears also in the N.T. in such phrases as James ii. 7, τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα, τὸ ἐπικλήθη ἐφ᾽ ὄρας, and 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὡς ἔδωκεν ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλεὺς λαράτημα . . . λάμπεις εἰς περιτοίχην. The reason for St. Jude’s here characterising the called as beloved and kept, is because he has in his mind others who had been called, but had gone astray and incurred the wrath of God.

Ver. 2. For the Salutation see my note on χάριν, James i. 1, and Hort’s excellent note on 1 Pet. i. 2, χάριν . . . πληθυνθεῖν. We find ἡγασμός and ἐγγύτητα joined in Gal. vi. 16, and with the addition of χάριν in 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, 2 John 3. The mercy of God is the ground of peace, which is perfected in the feeling of God’s love towards them. The verb πληθυνθεῖν occurs in the Salutation both of 1 Peter and 2 Peter and in Dan. vi. 25 (in the letter of Darius), ἐγγύτα ὡς πληθυνθεῖν, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 12. ἡγασμός σὲ δὲ τὸ κύριον πλησίασε καὶ πε- ριστεῖται τῇ ἀγάπῃ σε ἀλλήλῳ.

‘Αγάπη (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. ὁ χάρις τ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in Eph. εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀνά Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. X. Cf. 1 John iii. 1, ἅπε τοπατηζ γάτην διέκειν ὡμίς ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶν, where Westcott’s n. is “The Divine love is infused into them, so that it is their own, and becomes in them the source of a divine life (Rom. xiii. 10).” In virtue of this gift they are inspired with a love which is like the love of God, and by this they truly claim the title of children of God as partakers in His nature, 1 John iv. 7, 19.” The same salutation is used in the letter of the Smyrnaeans (c. 156 A.D.) giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, ἡγασμός καὶ ἐγγύτητα Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. X. πληθυνθεῖν. The thought of ἡγασμός and ἀγάπη recurs again in ver. 21.

Vv. 3, 4.—Reasons for Writing. He had been intending to write to them on that which is the common interest of all Christians, salvation through Christ, but was compelled to abandon his intention by news which had reached him of a special danger threatening the Gospel once for all delivered to the Church. His duty now was to stir up the faithful to defend their faith against insidious assaults, long ago foretold in ancient prophecy, of impious men who should change the doctrine of God’s free grace into an excuse for licentiousness, and deny the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Ver. 3. Ἀγαπητοῖ occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 Pet. iii. 1, 8, 14, 17, 1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 12 and James. It is common in the Epistles of John and of Paul, sometimes with μοι attached, as in 1 Cor. x. 14, Phil. ii. 12, and is often joined to ἀδελφοὶ, especially in James. The ἀγάπη of ver. 2 leads on to the ἁγασμός of 1 John iv. 7, 19. They are themselves ἁγασμένοι because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

* For this see the Introduction on Early Heresies.
3. ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

κοινής ἡμῶν 1 σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ὑπογράψει 2 ὅμως παρακαλῶν ἐπαγγελματίαν τῇ ἑπαξ παραδοσείς τῶν ἁγίων πίστει.

1 κοινὴς ἡμῶν] κ. ημῶν ὁμ. ομ. ημῶν KLP +; σωτηρίας] add. καὶ [οὐχὶ Ν.]

γράψει] γράφει Ν.

ποιεῖται. Plato, Euthyd. 304 e. περὶ ὁσίων ἀνέκδοικτά ἀκοῦσσαι τουλάχιστον. Jude was busy on another subject, when he received the news of a fresh danger to the Church, which he felt it his duty to meet at once. Whether he lived to carry out his earlier design, and whether it was of the nature of a treatise or of an epistle, we know not. It is noteworthy that there is a similar allusion in 2 Peter iii. 1 to an earlier letter now lost. Compare Barn. iv. 9, τολλὰ δὲ θέλων γράφειν . . . γράφειν οὐστονδίασεν. κοινής σωτηρίας. Cf. Tit. i. 4, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν. Ign. Eph. i., ὑπερ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἀνέκδοικτον καὶ ἐκπίθων with Lightfoot’s note, n., Jos. Ant. 10. i. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) ὑπερ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας. Bede explains as follows: “omnia electorum communis est salus, fides, et dilectio Christi.” Jude puts on one side the address he was preparing on the main principles of Christianity (probably we may take vv. 20 and 21 as a sample of what this would have been) and turns to the special evil which was then threatening the Church.

ἀνάγκην ὑπογράψεις. Cf. Luke xiv. 16, ἐκατον ἀνάγκην ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, Heb. vii. 27, αὐτός, also Plut. Cat. Mi. 24, ἀνάγκην ὑπογράψεις ἐκείνων ἀκοῦσσαι τῆς μαρτυρίας. There is a similar combination of γράφειν and γράφαται in 3 John 13. The aor. γράφαται, contrasted with the preceding pres. γράφειν, implies that the new epistle had to be written at once and could not be prepared for at leisure, like the one he had previously contemplated. It was no welcome task: "necessity was laid upon him".

ἐπαγγελματίαν τῇ ἑπαξ παραδοσείς τῶν ἁγίων πίστει. "To contend for the faith," almost equivalent to the ἀνάγκην περὶ τῆς ἀθλήσεως in Sir. iv. 28, see p. 61 f. τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστεις. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers, as by Clem. Al. Strom. vii. where we read of ἡ ἀθλήσεις παραδόσεις (p. 845), ἡ ἀκολουθιαστικὴ π. (p. 890), ἡ πίστις (p. 896), ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν (p. 900), τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν (p. 901), and even in the N.T. as in 1 Cor. xi. 2, κάθως παράδοσα ἡμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. 2 Thess. ii. 15, ἡ τῆς παραδόσεις φύλαξ. For an account of the gradual formation of the Creed, see A.E. Burn’s Introduction to the Creeds, ch. ii., 1899, and compare the comment in my larger edition, p. 61 f.

τοῖς ἁγίοις. Used generally of Christians who were consecrated and called to be holy, as in 1 Cor. i. 2, Phil. i. 1, where see Lightfoot. The word contains an appeal to the brethren to stand fast against the teaching and practice of the Libertines.
4. Nature of the Threatened Danger. It is stealthy; it is serious enough to have been predicted long ago; its characteristic is impiety, showing itself in the antinomian misuse of the Gospel of God’s free grace, and in the denial of God and Christ.

Ver. 4. He does not state that the first danger precluded the supposition that the second epistle of Peter can be referred to. The allusion is to the book of Enoch quoted in vv. 14, 15. In ver. 18 below the same warning is said to have been given by the Apostles. The phrase of proy is in apposition to τινες δυτροι, cf. Gal. i. 7 with Lightfoot’s n., Luke xvii. 9, ἐξεχώρεται δι’ αὐτὸς τοὺς ποιμένας ἢ συναδροί. For proy, cf. Rom. xv. 4, δεδιόταται τῷ φρεατείᾳ τῆς ἡμετέρου ἐνδεικνυμον ἄγραφον. The word is intended to show that they are already doomed to punishment as enemies of God. As such they are to be shunned by the faithful, but not to be feared, because dangerous as they may seem, they cannot alter the Divine purpose.

Dr. Chase compares Hirt’s interesting note on 1 Peter ii. 8, εἶναι καὶ κατάθηναι. By “this” Spitta understands “that judgment which I am now about to declare,” i.e., the condemnation contained in the word ἀδελφεία used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that οὗτος usually refers to what precedes, and he would take τοῦτο here (with Hofmann) as referring to παρεισθέντος. Better than this logical reference to some preceding or succeeding word is, I think, Bengel’s explanation “the now impending judgment,” Apostolo iam quasi cere nelle fana.

ἀδελφεία. This word may be almost said to give the keynote to the Epistle (cf. v. 15, 18) as it does to the Book of Enoch.

τῆς Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες ἐς ἀδελφείαν. With this we may compare 1 Peter ii. 16, μὴ διὰ ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχωμεν τῆς καταλύματος τῆς ἐλευθερίας. 2 Peter ii. 19, ἐλευθερία ἐπαγγελλόμενος. iii. 16, ἐν τῷ τοῦτο τῷ ἐν τῇ ἀδελφείᾳ συμβαλλόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀδόλεσίαν. Rom. iii. 1, 2, 5-8 (If man is justified by free grace and not by works, then works are unnecessary), id. vi. 1, 15, viii. 21, 1 Cor. vi. 12, xx. 33 f., John viii. 32-36, Gal. v. 3, ὡς ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐλήφθη· μόνον μὴ τὴν

* Zahn, it is true, following Schott and others, argues in favour of this reference, holding that ταῖα may be equivalent to “lately”; and the word is of course very elastic in meaning; but unless the contrast makes it clear that the reference is to a recent past, I think we are bound to assign to the word its usual force, especially here, where it stands first, giving the tone as it were to what follows, and is further confirmed and explained by ἐβδομάς ἀπὸ Ἀδαμ in ver. 14.
this connexion without thinking of the one Master in heaven. Again μόνος is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in John v. 44, θεὸς ἵνα ἐγείρῃ καὶ κατακλυσθῇ τὸν θάνατον. In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality ... cf. Polyb. xxxvii. 2. ... the one Master in heaven. Again μόνος is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in John v. 44, θεὸς ἵνα ἐγείρῃ καὶ κατακλυσθῇ τὸν θάνατον. In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality ...
word, as in Tit. i. 16; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 John ii. 22, where Westcott notes that a common gnostic theory was that "the Aeon Christ" descended upon the man Jesus at His baptism and left Him before His passion. Those who held such a doctrine denied . . . the union of the divine and human in one Person . . . and this denial involves the loss of the Father, not only because the ideas of sonship and fatherhood are correlative, but because . . . it is only in the Son that we have the [full] revelation of God as Father." The phrase τον μόνον θεοτόκον might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (Haer. vii. 33, x. 21) οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου θεοῦ τοῦ κόσμου γεγονέναι ἡθελον ΔΑΛ’ ὑπὸ δυνάμεως τινος ἀγγελικῆς, and Irenæus Haer. i. 26. See Introduction on Early Heresies in the large edition.

Vv. 5-13. Illustrations of Sin and Judgment Derived from History and from Nature. The judgment impending on these men is borne witness to by well-known facts of the past, and may be illustrated from the phenomena of nature. God showed His mercy in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, but that was no guarantee against their destruction in the wilderness when they again sinned by unbelief. The angels were blessed beyond all other creatures, but when they proved unfaithful to their trust they were imprisoned in darkness, awaiting there the judgment of the great day. The men of Sodom (lived in a land of great fertility, they had received some knowledge of God through the presence and teaching of Lot, they had been lately rescued from captivity by Abraham, yet they) followed the sinful example of the angels, and their land is still a prey to the fire, bearing witness to the eternal punishment of sin. In spite of these warnings the heretics, who are now finding their way into the Church, persist in their wild hallucinations, giving themselves up to the lusts of the flesh, despising authority, and railing at angelic dignities. They might have been taught better by the example of the archangel Michael, of whom we are told that, when disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, he uttered no word of railing, but made his appeal to God. These men however rail at that which is beyond their knowledge, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction, following in the wake of impious Cain, of covetous Balaam, and rebellious Korah. When they take part in your love-feasts they cause the shipwreck of the weak by their wantonness and irreverence. In greatness of profession and smallness of performance they resemble clouds driven by the wind which give no rain; or trees in autumn on which one looks in vain for fruit, and which are only useful for fuel. By their confident speaking and brazen assurance they seem to carry all before them; yet like the waves bursting on the shore, the deposit they leave is only their own shame. Or we might compare them to meteors which shine for a moment and are then extinguished for ever.

Ver. 5. ὑπομνῆσαι δι' ὅμοιος χολωμαῖς, εὐθέως ὑμᾶς πάντα.* Cf. 2 Pet. i. 12, διὸ μελλήσω ὑμᾶς ὅπως υπομνημάκρος καλεῖ预先 ὑπομνῆσαι, id. 13, διεξεθώ ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, id. iii. 2, διεξεθώ ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει τῇ εἰλικρίνῃ διάνοιᾳ, Rom. xv. 14, πέπεμβα δι' ἐν καὶ οὕτως μετοίκησε ἀνεπάνω τῆς γνώσεως . . . τολμηροτέρος δι' ἐγραφής ἵππακοντα μέρους ὑπὸ ἐναποκαλυμμένων ὕματος. The word εὐθέως justifies ὑπομνῆσαι: they only need to be reminded of truths already known, so that it is unnecessary to write at length. The repeated ὑμᾶς contrasts the readers with the libertines of the former verse. The words in themselves might be taken ironically of persons professing (like the Corinthians) to "know all things," but
the broad distinction maintained throughout the epistle between ἡμεῖς and οἱ ἄλλοι (the Libertines) forbids such an interpretation. If we read ἐστιν ὑμῶν with some MSS., it suggests something of anxiety and upbraiding, which may be compared with the tone of St. Paul in writing to the Galatians. See, however, the following note for the position of ἐστιν. Instead of τῶν some MSS. have τοῦτο. The former finds some support in Enoch i. 2, "I heard everything from the angels," xxv. 2, "I should like to know about everything," Secrets of En. xl. 1, 2, "I know all things and have written all things in the books," lxii. 2 (quoted by Chase in Dict. of the Bible). It should probably be understood of all that follows, including the historical allusions, implying that those addressed were familiar not only with the O.T. but with rabbinical traditions: so Estius "omnia de quibus volo vos commonere." Bede's note is "omnia vide licet arcaná fidei scientes et non opus habentes recentia quasi sanctiora a novis audire magistri ..." In what follows he takes ἐστιν with σῶσας, "ita clamantes ad se de afflictione Aegypti primo salvavit humiles, ut secundo murmurantes contra se in eremo prosternerent superbo ... Meminerimus illum sic per aquas baptismi salvare credentes, ut etiam post baptismum humilem in nobis requirat vitam."

ὁ Κύριος ἐστις ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀγίασε ἡμῶν τοῦ δεσπότης [τοῦ] μὴ πιστεύοντες ἀπέλλασαν. For text, see Introduction on Readings. Clement in his Adumbrations gives the paraphrase "Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit." The ὑμῶν has given rise to much discussion. According to the reading I have adopted, it contrasts the preceding σώσας with the following ἀπέλλασαν. The deliverance from Egypt was the creation of a people once for all, but yet it was followed by the destruction of the unbelieving portion of the people, i.e. by all but Caleb and Joshua (Num. xiv. 27, 37). So in 1 Cor. x. we have the privileges of Israel allowed, and yet all was in vain because of their unbelief. There seems less force in the connection of ἐστις with ἠλύσας: ἤπιος would have been more suitable. For the opposition to τοῦ δεσπότης, cf. Heb. ix. 28, ἡ Χριστός ἐστάσει προσέκοψεν εἰς τὸ τούτων ἀνεγερθέν ἀμαρτίας ἐκ δεσπότου χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας ὄφθησεν, Theoph. Autol. ii. 26, ἧτα τὸ μὲν ἄνω ἕπεκαὶ πεπληρωμένον δε ἐπέθη, τὸ δὲ δεσπότου μᾶλλον ἐπηρεάσεται μετὰ τὴν ... κρίσιν, Liban. ap. Wettst. ἤπιος δὲ ἐστις ἁρκεῖ γελώτα φιλεῖν, δεσπότου δὲ σωκτόν.

I am inclined to think that the article before μὴ is an intrusion, as it seems to be before ἐν in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take δεσπότης with μὴ πιστεύοντες, getting the sense: "In the 1st case of unbelief (in Egypt) * salvation followed; in the 2nd (in the wilderness) destruction," lit. "when they, a second time failed to believe, He destroyed them." If this was the original reading, it is easy to understand the insertion of τῶν as facilitating the plural construction after λαὸς. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. x. 26, ἐκκοινος ἀμαρτανόντων ἤμων μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀλήθειας οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίαν ἀπολέσεται θυσία, and the belief, apparently based upon it, in the early Church as to sin after baptism.

Ver. 6. ἤγγικα τοῦ τοῦτο μὴ ἀπελλάσας τῶν ἡμῶν ἄρχην ... ἀπελλάσας τῶν κρίσεων. Cf. Clem. Al. Adumbr. "Angelos qui non servaverunt proprium principatum, scilicet quem acceperunt secundum promissionem." This of course supplies an even more striking instance of the possibility of falling away from grace, cf. Bede, "Quis angelis peccantibus non perperit, nec hominibus parcer superstientibus, sed et hos quoque cum suum principatum non servaverint, quo per gratiam adoptionis filii Dei effecti sunt, sed reliquerint suum domicilium, id est, Ecclesiae unitatem ... damnabit". On the Fall of the Angels see Introduction and the parallel passages in 2 Pet. ii. 4, and in Enoch, chapters 6-10.

ἄρχην.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. xi. 21 of the chief butler: here perhaps of the office of Watcher, though Spitta takes it more generally of the sovereignty belonging to their abode in heaven =τῶν ἄνω κληρῶν in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term ἄρχην is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. vi. 12. Cf. Enoch xii. 4, of the Watchers (angels)
who have abandoned the high heavens and the holy eternal place and defiled themselves with women, id. xv. 3. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. i. p. 268), 
they must have been elected in the days of the Israelites, and that they 
are the elect ones who are to be saved, but in a different way. So Just. M. Apol. ii. 5, or the angels parabiote, that is, the an
edes of gnomic helplessness with Otto's n.

Apokaluptetai tis The oin epoptetron. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 2, and the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For epoptetron, cf. Enoch xv. 7 (the message of Enoch to the Watchers) "the spiritual have their dwelling in heaven"... η κατοίκησις αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ γαῖ." Chae.]

eis krites megálēs ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς οὐκ ἔφε σε ζημίαν τετήρησεν. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 4, σκότος ἡμέρας παραπότασις, id. ii. 9, δίδωσις εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσιν καλαποτάσιον τηρεῖν, id. iii. 7, τρεῖρες εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσιν... τῶν ἱκτίων οἰκτικῶν, Joel ii. 31, ο ἀνῶσης μεταστροφής εἰς κοσμο... ἐπὶ ἐλθέτω τῆς ἡμέρας ἱκτίου τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἐνθάνατος, Apoc. vi. 17, ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας μεγάλης τῆς ὥρας αὐτῶν, id. xvi. 14, συναγαγείς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Enoch x. 5, ἐπεκλιθείος αὐτοῖς (Azazel) σκότος, καὶ οἰκτικότερος ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αὐγόν, x. 12, οἰκτικὸν αὐτῶν... μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσιν αὐτῶν, id. xxii. 11 (Gr. in Charles' App. C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσιν, id. liv. 6, note on xiv. 1. So ἡμέρας τοῦ κυρίου 1 Cor. i. 8, 2 Pet. iii. 10 al., δικαιῶν ἡ ἡμέρα 2 Th. i. 10. On ἐπικράτεια see Ec. liv. 3-5, "I saw how they made iron chains of immeasurable weight, and I asked for whom they were prepared, and he said unto me 'These are prepared for the hosts of Azazel'." Cf. Bånami skótes (Wisd. xvii. 2) of the plague of darkness.

díllous. The chains are called "everlasting," but they are only used for a temporary purpose, to keep them for the final judgment. It seems to be here synonymous with alóchos in ver. 7. So too in the only other passages in which it occurs in the Bible, Wisdom vii. 26, ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας οὐκ ἔσχην ἡμέραν, and Rom. i. 20, ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῶν ἄνωθεν καὶ θελήθη... Ver. 7. ὡς Ἑβραίοι καὶ Ἰουδαίοι καὶ οἱ πρὸς αὐτάς πόλεις, τὸν ἱδρόν τρόπον τοῦτον εἰποντεύουσαι καὶ ἀπεδοθοῦσαν αὐτῶν.
2 τρόπον τούτου ἸΑΒΚ; τούτου τρόπον ΚΛ.
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σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, πρόκειται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσα.

8. Ομοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπναζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαίνοντος,

πρόκειται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσα. Cf. Enoch lxvii. 12, “this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty,” 2 Pet. ii. 6, ὑπόδειγμα μελ- λόντων ἀδιστίως τεθεικός, 1 Cor. x. 6, τίποτε ἐγνώσθη, Heb. iv. 11 ἦν μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τὸ ὑπόδειγμα πέτος τῆς ἐπικαθήσεως. The present aspect of the Lacus Asphalithes was a conspicuous image of the lake of fire and brimstone prepared for Satan and his followers, Apoc. xix. 20, xx. 10, xxi. 8. It is questioned whether πυρὸς is governed by δείγμα or δίκην. If by δίκην, then the burning of Sodom is itself spoken of as still going on (eternal), and this is in accordance with Jewish belief as recorded in Wisd. x. 7 (πῦρ παρετέλθη) ἦν ὁ μαρτωλός τῆς πυροβολῆς καταπληθύνων καθότι κρίσεως, Philo (De Abr. M. ii. xxii.), μέχρι νῦν κατείλετο, τὸ γὰρ κεραυ- 

νοῦς πῦρ ἀλυσάμενος ἢ ἡμεται ὑπόθεκτα. ἔσται δὲ σαφεῖτά τα δράματα, τοῦ γὰρ συμβαθμένος πάθους σημαίνει ὅτι τὸ ἀνδιαβόλον ὄν κατοικεῖ καὶ καταλαύων θεὸν, ib. V. 

Mops. M. ii. p. 143. Some disallow this sense of ἀλυσάμενος and think that it can only be used of hell-fire, as in 4 Macc. xii. 12 (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor), τωιελείται σε ἡ θεία δίκη τιμωτηρίᾳ καὶ ἀλυσάμενος πῦρ, καὶ βάθους εἰς βρον τῶν ἀλώνια οὐκ ἀντίστοιχον σε. For an examination of the word see Jukes, Restitution of all Things, p. 67 n. and cf. Jer. xxiii. 39, 40, Ezek. xvi. 53, 55 (on the restoration of Sodom), xlvi. 1-12 (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. x. 5 and 12, where the ἀλώνια of the former verse is equivalent to seventy generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where ἄλος ἀλώνια is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of δείγμα is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with πυρὸς in the sense of “an example or type of eternal fire,” which would escape the difficulty connected with ἀλώνια, but leaves δίκην ὑπέχουσα (for which cf. Xen. Mem. ii. 1, 8, 2, Macc. iv. 48) a somewhat otiose appendage. In the book of Enoch (lxvii. 4 foll.) the angels who sinned are said to be imprisoned in a burning valley (Hinnom, ch. 27) in which there was a great swelling of waters, accompanied by a smell of sulphur; and “that valley of the angels burned continually under the earth” . Charles notes on this that “the Gehenna valley here includes the adjacent country down to the Dead Sea. A subterranean fire was believed to exist under the Gehenna valley.”

Ver. 8. ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι. Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

ἐνυπναζόμενοι σάρκα μαίνοντος. Compare Acts ii. 17 (a quotation from Joel ii. 28), οἱ πρεσβυτέροι ὅμως ἐνυπναζόμενοι ἐνυπναζόμενοι, of those that see visions: and so Spitta (holding that Jude copied from 2 Peter), would render it here, prefixing the article to make it correspond with the ψευδοροφήμοναι and ψευδοδιάσταλος of 2 Peter ii. 1. Those who take the opposite view (viz. that 2 Peter was copied from Jude) will see nothing to justify the article. The word is used by Isa. lvi. 10 in connexion with the words οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἐιδότες (see ver. 10 below), ἐνυπναζόμενοι, κοίτην 

φυλάσσων ποσειδέας, which Delitzsch explains “instead of watching and praying to see divine revelations for the benefit of the people, they are lovers of ease, talkers in their sleep.

Bengel explains “Hominum mere naturalium iudices graphic admodum descripta est. Somnium multa videre, audire, etc. sibi videtur.” And so Chase, “they live in an unreal world of their own inflated imaginations,” comparing the conjectural reading of Col. ii. 18, ἄρα καταβατεῖτε. This accords with ver. 10: in their delusion and their blindness they take the real for the unreal, and the unreal for the real. The verb is used both in the active and middle by Aristotle, Somm. i. 1, πόσερον συμβαῖνει 

καὶ τοῖς καθεδούντοις ἐνυπναζόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὅσιν μηκέτι οὖσαιν; Probl. 30, 14, 2, ὁ ἐν τῷ καθεδοῦντι ἐνυπναζόμενοι λογαριάζει τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καὶ δον ἄρημα, ἐνυπναζόμενοι, cf. Artem. Onir. i, 1. Some interpret of polluting dreams (cf. Lev. 15); but the word ἐνυπναζόμενοι is evidently intended to have a larger scope, covering not merely 

μαίνουνται ἀλλ' ἀντιευθυνοῦσιν. We must also interpret ἀλώνια here by the δισλήμαννα of ver. 4, the ἐπικαθήσεως and σάρκος ἑτέρας of ver. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. i. 15, τοῖς
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mentioned offenders. For the former we may refer to ver. 4, the κύριοι ἠμῶν ἄρτος, for the latter to the contempt shown by the Israelites towards the commandments of God. So the desertion of their appointed station and abide by the angels showed their disregard for the divine ordinance, and the behaviour of the men of Sodom combined with the vilest lusts an impious reverence towards God's representatives, the angels (Gen. xix. 5). Cf. Joseph. Ant. i. 11. 4, εἰς αὐτοὺς ἑκάστους καὶ τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὰ ἄγγελα τοῦ θεοῦ, and Test. Aser. 7, where the sin of Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μὴ γίνεσθαι ὡς ἡμῖν γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἄγγελοις κυρίοις καὶ ἀπελθεῖν ὧς αὐτοῖς.Δέξατε δὲ ἄρα διενεργημένον. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 10, τολμήτω καὶ ἀδίκως ἄρξατε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν μέλλων ὑπερθέντων. The only other passage in the N.T. in which the plural occurs is 1 Peter i. 12, where the sense is different. Dr. Biggs compares Exod. xv. 11, τίς ὁμοίως σοι ἐν θεῷ, κύριε; τίς ὁμοίως σοι ἢ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν ἢ θαυμαστὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Clement's interpretation of this and the preceding clause is as follows: (Adumbr. 1008) "dominacionem sperunt, hoc est solum dominum qui vere dominus ester, Jesus Christus . . . majestatem blasphemant, hoc est angelos". The word δέξατε in the singular is used for the Shekinah, see my note on James ii. 1. This suggests that Clement may be right in supposing the plural to be used for the angel, who are, as it were, separate rays of that glory. Compare Philo's use of the name ἄγιος for the angels as contrasted with the divine ἄγιος. In Philo, Monarch. ii. p. 18 the divine δέξατε, is said to consist of the host of angels, δέξατε σας ἐν εἰρήνῃ νομίζει ταῖς σε φυσιοφορούσαι δυνάμεις. See Test. Jud. 25, Κύριος σοι ἐλάχιστος τὸν Λαοῦ, ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προφήτου ἐμ, αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς βοήθει τῶν Σωμάτων, also Luke ix. 26, where it is said that the Son of Man will come in His own glory and in the glory of the Father and of the holy angels."* Ewald, Hist. Isr. tr. vol. viii. p. 142, explains ἐν κυρίῳ of the true Deity, whom they practically deny

* There is much said of the glory of the angels in Asc. Isaiah, pp. 47, 49 f. ed. Charles.
by their dual God; as the angels, whom they blaspheme by supposing that they had created the world in opposition to the will of the true God, whereas Michael himself submitted everything to Him. This last clause would then be an appendage to the preceding, with special reference to the case of the Sodomites (cf. John xiii. 20). There may also be some allusion to the teaching or practice of the libertines. If we compare the mysterious reference in 1 Cor. xi. 10, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ δαίμων ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχει εἰς τὴν κεφαλήν διὰ τούτων ἄγγγλων, which is explained by Tertullian (De Virg. Vel. 7) as spoken of the fallen angels mentioned by Jude, "proper angels, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excitisse ob concupiscen- tionem feminam," we might suppose the blasphemis, of which the libertines were guilty, to consist in a denial or non-recognition of the presence of good angels in their worship, or of the possibility of their own becoming κοινωνοί δαίμων; or they may have scoffed at the warnings against the assaults of the devil, or even at the very idea of "spiritual wickedness in high places". So understood, it prepares us for the strange story of the next verse.

Ver. 9. o ἵλαρη ὁ ἄρχαγγελος. The term ἄρχ. occurs in the N.T. only here and in 1 Thess. iv. 16. The names of seven archangels are given in Enoch. The story here narrated is taken from the apocryphal Assumptio Moses, as we learn from Clem. Adumbr. in Ep. Judae, and Orig. De Princ. iii. 2. x. Didymus (In Epist. Judae Enarratio) says that some doubted the canonicity of the Epistle because of this quotation from an apocryphal book. In Cramer's Catena on this passage (p. 163) we read τελευταίους ἐν τῷ δρεὶ Μωϋσεος, ὁ Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταξὺ τὸ σῶμα, εἶναι τὸ δίαβολον κατὰ τὸν Μωϋσεος βλασφημοῦντος καὶ φονεύον ἀναγεννησάντος διὰ τὸ πατέσαι τὸν Αὐγούστον, οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ τὴν κατ᾽ αὐτὸν βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος. Ἐπιστομεῖται συν ὁ Θεός, πρὸς τὸν δίαβολον ἐφή. Charles in his edition of the Assumption thus summarizes the fragments dealing with the funeral of Moses: (1) Michael is commissioned to bury Moses, (2) Satan opposes his burial on two grounds: (a) he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins, "I he Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's spirit which created the world and all mankind." (b) He brings the charge of murder against Moses (the answer to this is wanting). The story is based upon Deut. xxxiv. 6 (R.V.), "he buried him (mg. he was buried) in the valley ... but no man kneweth of his sepulchre unto this day". Compare the vain search for Elijah (2 Kings ii. 16, 17). Further details in Josephus (Ant. iv. 8, 48), νέφοις αὐθεντικοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ στάτοις ἀδίκηται κατὰ τίνος φάραγγος. γέγραφη δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ιεραῖς βιβλίοις ταυτάτω, διότι μὴ ἐν ὑποβάθμισιν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἁρετίας πρὸς τὰ δίκαια αὐτῶν ἀναγκάζεται τελευτήν ἄνθρωπον λαμβάνειν, Philo i. p. 165, and Clem. Al. (Str. vi. § 132, p. 807) where it is said that Caleb and Joshua witnessed the assumption of Moses to heaven, while his body was buried in the clefts of the mountain. See comment in the larger edition, pp. 74-76.

βιακρίνομαι. Here used in the sense of "disputing," as in Jer. xv. 10, ἀνάβα σίματι πάρος τῇ γῇ. Joel iii. 2, Acts xi. 2. See my note on James i. 6 and below ver. 22. 

βιαλέγετο. Cf. Mark ix. 34, πρὸς ἐλλήμενον διηλέξοντας τὰς μέλης. οὐκ ἐπεισόδισαν κρίνειν ἐπιεικεῖς βλασφημίας. I take βλασφημίας to be gen. qualitatis, expressed by the adjective βλασφημοῦντος in 2 Peter: see below on ver. 18. James i. 25, ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλαμψομνής, ii. 4 κρατῶν διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν, iii. 6, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδίκημα, also 2 Peter ii. 1, αἰρετὴς ἀπωλείας, ii. 10, ἐπιθυμεὶς μασχοῦ. For ἐπιεικεῖς see Plat. Legg. ix. 856 προ- δόταις αἰτῶν ἐπιφάνειν, id. 943, τιμωρῶν ἐφιλ. The word occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Rom. iii. 5. Field (On Translation of N.T. p. 244) compares Acts xxv. 18 οἱ κατηγοροῦντες ὑθελόμενοι αἰτῶν ἐφαρμὸν ἐν ἑνῷ ὑπενναγόντων, Diod. xvi. 20, δικήν ἐπινικγόνις κατὰ τῶν Σπάρτατων, id. xx. 10, κρίσεις ἄδικους ἐπιφάνειται, xx. 62, φοβηθεὶς τῶν ἐπι- φανείων κρίσεως, tom. x. p. 171 ed. Bip. ἐπιθυμείμενον κρίνειν περὶ ὑβρίσεως, and
translates “durst not bring against him an accusation of blasphemy”; but surely that is just what he does in appealing to God. Besides such a statement would be altogether beside the point. The verse is introduced to show the guilt attached to speaking evil of dignities, i.e. of angels. If Michael abstained from speaking evil even of a fallen angel, this is appropriate; not so, if he simply abstained from charging the devil with speaking evil of Moses.

κρίσις, like κρίνω, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, cf. Lycurg. 31 where οἱ συνοφρυνόντες are distinguished from τῶν δικαίων τάς κρίσιςς ἐντυπώμεμεν.

ἐπιτιμηται στὶς Κύριος. These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (iii. 1-10) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words ἐπιτιμήσας Κύριος σοι, διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσας Κύριος σοι, δ ἐπιλεύθησαν τὴν ἱεροσυλήμη. They were no doubt inserted as appropriate by the author of the Ass. Mos. in his account of the controversy at the grave of Moses. We may compare Matt. xvii. 18, ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Ver. 10. οὐδὲ δὲ δόει μὲν ὁ εἰδεῖν ἀκαμάκημον. The libertines do the contrary of what we are told of the respect shown by the angel even towards Satan: they speak evil of that spiritual world, those spiritual beings, of which they know nothing, cf. 2 Peter ii. 12. The common verb βλαφήμειν shows that the ἐνδεικτική μορφή of ver. 8 is identical with δοκεῖ οὐκ εἰδεῖν here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7-16, a passage linked with our epistle by the distinction between the ἀκαμάκημον and the πνευματικός, and by the words λαλοῦσαν Θεοῦ σοιφαί, ὃν ὀδηγεῖ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου ἐγκοντεύς καὶ γὰρ ἑγόρασσαν οὐκ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τῇ ἐνδείκτικῇ ἐκπροσώπῳ. See too John viii. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 4, τίττατον μηδέν ἐπιστάμενος. For the form ἑπιστάμενος see my ed. of St. James, p. clxxxiii.

δὲ δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἠγάματα ἑπιστάμενον. This stands for σάρκα in ver. 8 and is explained by ἀπεκλίνονται in ver. 4, ἑκορονέομαι in ver. 7,}

1 κυριος ὁ θεος ἡ.
and of love, cf. 1 John iii. 23. Euthym. Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, and so did others. Cain and Korah are said to have been objects of special reverence with a section of the Ophite heresy, which appears to have been a development of the Nicolaitans (Epphan. Pan. i. 3, 37. cf. Ophiis, οἰκοπότες τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ ἐπισκόπων). They held that the Creator was evil, that the serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epphan. i. 38. x. οἱ Καιτῶν φαν τῶν Καί τῇ τῇ ἐπισκόπῳ θεότητα θεοτητάς ἐπικόπων καὶ τῆς ἐπικόπων καὶ ἐπικόπων, and boast themselves to be of Cain, and of the Sons of Korah, and of Korah, see too Iren. i. 51. Clem. Str. vii. § 108.)

τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ εξεξέφυμεν. Every word in this clause is open to question. The passive of ἔκξυμεν, to pour out, is used to express either the outward sweeping movement of a great crowd, or the surrender to an overpowering motive on the part of an individual. effusus sunt. as in Str. xxvii. 20. ἔκξυμεν τῆς ἐπικόριας (Text. Reub. i. πορνεία ἐν ἐπικόρια Clem. Al. Str. ii. p. 491. ἔκς ἁπαθείας, τράχεια δική ἐκχυμίτες καὶ κυττανόοις, Plut. V. Anti. 21, εἰς τὸν ἁπαθεῖας καὶ ἀκλέποντος βίον ἐκξυμένος. Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with μισθοῦ, which implies cool self-interest.

That covetousness, ἀλοχονία, was a common motive with false teachers is often implied or asserted by St. Paul and St. Peter in the passages quoted below: and this, we know, was the case with Balaam; but would it be correct to say either of him or of his followers, here condemned by St. Jude, that they ran greedily into (or "in") error for reward? Perhaps we should understand it rather of a headstrong will breaking down all obstacles, refusing to listen to reason, or vacilli (as in Apoc. ii. 14) who held the teaching of Balaam, to be vacilli (as in Apoc. ii. 14) who held the teaching of Balaam, see Ramsay, Expositor for 1904, p. 409, and July, pp. 43-60. On the other hand, Jude continually charges them with moral laxity, and we may suppose that this was combined with claims to prophetic power, and with the covetousness which is often ascribed to the false teachers of the early Church, as in Thess. ii. 3 f., where perhaps in burning incense in honour of the Emperor, see Ramsay, Expositor for 1904, p. 409, and July, pp. 43-60. On the other hand, Jude continually charges them with moral laxity, and we may suppose that this was combined with claims to prophetic power, and with the covetousness which is often ascribed to the false teachers of the early Church, as in Thess. ii. 3 f., where
Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was one of plenary efficacy for the great results obtained, in Tim. iii. 8, 9, and see on Keph. for the gen. The same spirit of self-sufficiency and self-righteousness appears in the parallel passages of 2 Peter (in which see n.), has two remarkable divergences from the text here, reading πάντας for ἅγιας and σπείρα for σπείρας. There has been much discussion as to the meaning of the latter word. It is agreed that it is generally used of a rock in or by the sea, and many of the lexicographers understand it of a hidden rock, ὕψιλον ὑτέρα, see Thomas Mag., σπείρας, ’Αντικόν ὕψιλον ὑτέρα, Ἑλληνίστης. The compound ἀντιπολέμωτος, ad. for the gen. (ex. v. 16), added to the μικρότατον τῆς πίστεως τῆς καθαρής συνειδήσεως, Tit. i. 7, 11 διεσκέστεσα μή τις κείρον χάριν, ἡ Peter ὑπὲρ τοῦ ντερισμοῦ, ἡ Cor. vii. 23, τιμὴν ἄφροδιτην.

On the whole I understand the passage thus: Balaam went wrong because he allowed himself to hanker after gain and so lost his communion with God. He not only went wrong himself, but he abused his great influence and his reputation as a prophet, to lead astray the Israelites by drawing them away from the holy worship of Jehovah to the impure worship of Baal Peor. So these false teachers use their prophetic gifts for purposes of self-aggrandisement, and endeavour to make their services attractive by excluding from religion all that is strenuous and difficult, and opening the door to every kind of indulgence. See the notes and comments on the parallel passages of 2 Peter in my edition of that Epistle.

The Antilogs of Korah. For Korah's sin see Num. xvi. 1 f. and compare, for the same rebellious spirit in the Christian Church, 3 John, 9, 10 (of Diotrephes). Tit. i. 10, 11, εἰς τόλμην ἀναπτάτσαι . . . οὐ δει τίτοτομεῖν, ib. i. 16; ib. iii. 10, 11, 1 Tim. i. 20 (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenaeus and Alexander) ὡς τοῦ Ἐσταβ διὰ ταλαντών μὴ βλασφημίων, ib. vi. 3-6, 2 Tim. ii. 16-18, ὅ λάγος αὐτῶν ὑπὸ γεγραμμένος νομιμὸς, ὅ ἐν εἴληθεν Ἰακώβα καὶ Φίλιππος, οἴκεις πρὸ τῆς ἀνάλυσις πυρός, ib. ii. 25, iv. 14, where the opposition of Alexander the coppersmith is noted; but especially iii. 1-9, which presents a close parallel to our passage, referring to a similar resistance to Moses in the case of the apocryphal Jannes and Jambres. For Antilogs see Heb. xii. 3, ἀναλογίας τοῦ τοιούτου ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ εἰς ἄνωθεν ἄντιλογια. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Num. xx. 13 al. and (in relation to Korah) in Prov. vii. 9 al. ὑποτεθεὶς δὲ ἐνάρευσαν ὁ Θεός τοῖς Δαβίδι, Κορᾷ, καὶ Ἀβιφάρ, καὶ ἔδειξεν ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέστη αὐτοὺς διὰ την ἀντιλογίαν αὐτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these examples. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ὑποτεθεῖσαν δὲ, that of Balaam the gentle prophet by ἔγειρθαι πλάθος, that of the Levite Korah by ἀντιλογίαν. Ver. 12. οὕτω εἴσην [οὐ] ἐν τοῖς ἁγίασι ὑπὸ πολλῶν σπείρας συνεκκυμνημένοι. Dr. Chase quotes Zech. i. 10 f., Apoc. xii. 14, Enoch xiii. 3, Secrets of Enoch, vii. 3 xiii. 3, xix. 3, etc., for the phrase οὕτω εἴσην, adding that it was probably adopted by St. Jude from apocalyptic writings, for which he clearly had a special liking. On the early history of the Agape, see my Appendix C to Clem. Al. Strom. vii. The parallel passage in 2 Peter (in which see n.) has two remarkable divergences from the text here, reading πάντας for ἅγιας and σπείρα for σπείρας. There has been much discussion as to the meaning of the former word. It is agreed that it is generally used of a rock in or by the sea, and many of the lexicographers understand it of a hidden rock, ὕψιλον ὑτέρα, see Thomas Mag., σπείρας, 'Αντικόν ὕψιλον ὑτέρα, Ἑλληνίστης. The compound ἀντιπολεμώτος, ad. for the gen. See Plut. Mor. 101 b, εἰς σπείρας, which Wytt. translates "tranquilitas maris caecam rupe tegentis," ib. 476 a, Oecumenius on this passage, al σπείρας τοῖς πλεονίων ὑλῆριον, ἀντιδομωτίαν ἐνεπηρείμασιν (v. 8-10), and ἐξαφάνισας, διὸ πολλοί σπείρας, ἀναστὰς αὐτῶν τοὺς διὰ τῶν ψυχῶν. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31, ἐκλάσθη προσκεκάσθη ἐν τοῖς ἄνδρας αἰφνίδιοι σπείραι καταστράφησι. The compound κατασπείρας joined with the parallel case
of ὀμήν justifies, I think, this sense of στιλάδες, which is rejected by most of the later commentators. Cf. also the use of νασον in 1 Tim. i. 19. Scopulius is used in a similar metaphorical sense, see Cic. in Pis. 41 where Piso and Gabinius are called "geminae voragines scopulique republicae". Others take στιλάδες in the very rare sense of "spots," or "stains," like σπλάθει in 2 Peter. The only example of this sense seems to be in Orph. Lith. 614, but Hesych. gives the interpretation στιλάδες, μεμισσομένα. I agree with Bp. Wordsworth and Dr. Chase in thinking that the metaphor of the sunken rocks is more in harmony with the context.

How are we to account for the gender in στιλάδες συνενθωμένα;? Are we to suppose the gender of στιλάδες was changed or forgotten in late Greek (cf. Winer, pp. 25, 38, 73, 76)? If so, the forgetfulness seems to have been confined to this author. Or is this a constructio ad sensum, the feminine being changed to masculine because it is metaphorically used of men (Winer, pp. 171, 648, 660, 672), cf. Apcos. xi. 4, στιλάδες καί τίῳ δάκρυ νασον καί δύο λέχνης καί δύο ἄνω τού κυρίου ἁπτόντες καί Β' reading παραφέρειν below? Or may we take στιλάδες as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to συνενθωμένοι? The last seems the best explanation though I cannot recall any exact parallel. An easier remedy would be to omit the article (with K and many versions), as suggested by Dr. Chase in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, ii. p. 799b, translating: "these are sunken rocks in your love-feasts while they feast with you".

συνενθωμένοι. Is used in the parallel passage of 2 Peter with a dat. as in Luc. Philos. 4, Jos. Ant. iv. 8, 7.

* Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. Od. iii. 298, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς γε τοῦ στιλάδος εἰσακύματα, where, he says, the στιλάδες are identical with λυσύναι τα ταῖς ἐλαττήριοι των 293; and Anthol. xi. 390, φασὶ δὲ καὶ ρητοὶ ἀκανθάνειον χειρέως τοὺς ὀμάδο εἴρρα τῶν φανερῶν στιλάδων. In both of these I think the word refers to the breakers at the bottom of the cliffs: in the latter it is said that hidden rocks are more dangerous than visible reefs. Compare Diod. iii. 43, δρομί τε ταύτη ταρακείται κατὰ μέν την κορυφήν τῶν πέτρων ἐντομολόγοι ζύγον καὶ τοὺς ὑψίστας κατατιθέμενα, ὡς δὲ τῶν ὁμάδο στιλάδων ὀξίας καὶ τυντίος ἐνδαλατόν.
rise and set in order, each in its season, and transgress not against their appointed order. . . . I observed and saw how in winter all the trees seem as though they were withered and shed all their leaves. . . . And again I observed the days of summer . . . how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit. . . . And behold how the seas and the rivers accomplish their task. But as for you, ye have not continued steadfast; and the law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled . . . and have slanderously spoken proud and hard words (below ver. 15, περί πᾶντων τῶν σκληρῶν δὲ κλάσας καὶ αὐτοῦ) with your impure mouths against his greatness." For the metaphor cf. Eph. iv. 14. In the parallel passage of 2 Peter the first figure is broken into two, παρενεπθηκτή νομιμότατος εἰσαγάγας. Perhaps the writer may have thought that there was an undue multiplication of causes; if the clouds were waterless, it was needless to add that they were driven past by the wind. We find the same comparison in Prov. xxi. 14: "As clouds and wind without rain, so is he that boasteth himself of his gifts falsely". [The LXX is less like our text, suggesting that Jude was acquainted with the original Hebrew. C.] For the use of ἀνόμλων see my note on James iii. 4.

ἀόρατα φιλοτιμώμενα ἐκάρτα. φιλοτιμώμενα is an adjective derived from τὸ φιλοτιμώμενον, which is itself, I think, best explained as φιλοτιμώμενον (cf. φιλοτιμοῦσας ἡμᾶς), meaning the concluding portion of the ἐπάρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of αἰών, connected with ὀπό, ὀπός, and ἀρα = "the later prime". We find ἔρα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer, with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ἦν ἔραν. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of ἐπάρα, of which Ἰδελερ says that "it originally indicated, not a season separate from and following after the summer, but the hottest part of the summer itself, so that Sirius, whose heliacal rising took place (in the age of Homer) about the middle of July, is described as ἀντῆρ ὀπόμινα II. v. 5). In early times it would seem that the Greeks, like the Germans (Tac. Germ. 26), recognised only three seasons—winter, spring, summer, and that the last was indifferently named ἀριστοφυφός or ἀντῆρα: compare Arist. Aes. 790, πρώτα μὲν ἄρα ἀντῆρα φιλοτιμώμενα ἡμᾶς ἄριστος, χειμάτως, ἀντῆρα, with Aesch. Prom. 453, ἢ δὲ κατὰ αὐτὸν ἄριστον χειμάτως τέκμαρ ὀυτὸν ἄνθομάσων ἄριστον ὀυτὸ καρπίμα τὸ νῦν γεβαίνον. But though ἀντῆρα was thus used strictly for the dog-days, when the fruit ripened, it was also vaguely used for the unnamed period which ensued up to the commencement of winter. Thus Hesiod (Op. 674) μεῖναι μείναι τινάν τε τίνι καὶ ἀντίφυτον δρῶσο καὶ χειμών ἀντίτα: and ἀντῆρα appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of Euripides, quoted by Plutarch (Mor. 1028 P), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and ἀντῆρα:—

φιλατρὶς τ' ἀντῆρας διπλώνουσι ἄριστος τ' ἔρας (where the epithet φιλατρὶς deserves notice).

It is said that the author of the treatise De Diastis (c. 420 B.C.), which goes under the name of Hippocrates, was the first to introduce a definite term (φιλοτιμώμενον or μετόπωρον) for the new season, the word ἀντῆρα being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on II. v. 5, ἀντῆρα ἔρα μεταξὺ κακοῦ ἄριστον καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὴν μετόπωρον. And so we find it used by Aristotle (Meteor. ii. 5), αἱ ἄρα ἐκλείστη ἀντερός μὲν καὶ μετόπωρον μελίττα, ἄρα καὶ τῆς ἀντέρας, χειμώνας ἐν ὀλύσης, and by Theophrastus (περὶ Σημαίων, 44), ἄρα τὸ καὶ τὸ ἄριστο πυρὸς γίγνεται, ἄρα ἀντέρα γίγνεται καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον πυρηνήν.

There is a good deal of inconsistency about the exact limits of the seasons, as is natural enough when we remember that they were first distinguished for purposes of agriculture and navigation, as we see in Hesiod's Works and Days. Each season brings its own proper work, and the farmer or merchant is reminded of the return of the season by various signs, the rising and setting of stars, especially of the Pleiades and Arcturus, the sun’s passage through the signs of.
the zodiac, the reappearance of the birds, etc. A more strictly accurate division was made by the astronomers, who distinguished between the various kinds of rising and setting of the stars, and divided the year into four equal parts by the solstices and equinoxes. In the year 46 B.C. Julius Caesar introduced his revised calendar, which assigned definite dates to the different seasons. Thus spring begins a.d. vii. id. Feb. (Feb. 7), summer a.d. vii. id. Mai. (May 9), autumn a.d. iii. id. Sext. (Aug. 11), winter a.d. iv. id. Nov. (Nov. 10).

To turn now to the commentators, I may take Trench as representing their view in his Authorised Version, p. 156, ed. 2, where he says, "The φυτοντωρων is the late autumn, which succeeds the ένστωρα (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name περ επο γιναιτωρα, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits. . . . The deceivers of whom St. Jude speaks are likened to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone."

I have stated above what I hold to be the origin of the word φυτοντωρων. Trench’s explanation is ambiguous and unsuited to the facts of the case, as will be seen from the criticisms in Lightfoot’s Fresh Revision, p. 135: “In the phrase ‘autumn-trees without fruit’ there appears to be a reference to the parable of the fig-tree. . . . At all events the mention of the season when fruit might be expected is significant.” He adds in a note, “Strange to say, the earliest versions all rendered φυτοντωρων correctly.” Tyndale’s instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression, ‘Trees with out fru it at gading (gathering) time,’ i.e. at the season when fruit was looked for. I cannot agree with Archbishop Trench, who maintains that ‘Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation,’ and himself explains φυτοντωρων έκαρπα as ‘mutually completing one another, without leaves, without fruit.’ Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has ‘hervest trees with out fru yt,’ and the Rheims version ‘trees of autumn unfruitful’. The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives ‘corrupt trees and without frute’. . . . The Bishops’ Bible strangely combines both renderings, ‘trees withered (φυτοντωρα) at fruite gathering (σαρα) and without fruite,’ which is explained in the margin, ‘Trees withered in autumn when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke word importeth’.

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

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

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

Schneckenburger explains, “He who is not born again is dead in his sins (Col. ii. 13), he who has apostatised is twice dead,” cf. Apoc. xxi. 8, Heb. vi. 4-8, 2 Peter ii. 20-22. So the trees may be called doubly dead, when they are not only sapless, but are torn up by the root, which would have caused the death even of a living tree.

Ver. 13. κυματα έγρια θαλας εταφριζοντα τας έκαρπας ιερον των αισχυνας. Cf. Cic. Ad Herenn. iv. 55, σπρακα εκε ου σελυ. The two former illustrations, the reefs and the clouds, refer to the specious professions of the libertines and the mischief they caused; the third, the dead trees, brings out also their own miserable condition; the fourth and fifth give a very fine description of their lawlessness and shamelessness, and their eventual fate. The phrase έγρια κυματα is found in Wisdom xiv. 1. The rare word άφτρος is used of the sea in Moschus v. 5. It refers to the seaweed and other refuse borne on the crest of the waves and thrown up on the beach, to which are
compared the overflowings of ungodliness (Ps. xvii. 4), the lanctic καὶ πε-πυτακα ὁποιος condemned by James i. 21, where see my note. The libertines foam out their own shame by their swelling words (ver. 16), while they turn the grace of God into a cloak for their licentiousness (ver. 4). We may compare Phil. iii. 19, ἐδέξατο ἐν τῇ αληθείᾳ αὐτῶν.

Δηλόρεα πλανητα. This is borrowed from Enoch (chapters xiii., xiv.) where it is said that some of the stars become lightnings and cannot part with their new form, ib. 80, "In the days of the sinners, many chiefs of the stars will err, and will alter their orbits and tasks, ib. 86, where the fall of the angels is described as the falling of stars, ib. 88, "he seized the first star which had fallen from heaven and bound it in an abyss; now that abyss was narrow and deep and horrible and dark . . . and they took all the great stars and bound them hand and foot, and laid them in an abyss," ib. xc. 24, "and judgment was held first upon the stars, and they were judged and found guilty and were cast into an abyss of fire "; also xvii. 14 f.

It would seem from these passages, which Jude certainly had before him, that πλανητα cannot here have its usual application, the prophecy of Enoch was repudiated by all the ancient astronomers from Plato downwards. Cf. Cic. N. D. ii. 51, "maxime sunt admirabiles motus earum quinque stellarum quae falsa vocantur errantes. Nihil enim errat quod in omni aeternitate conservat motus constantes et ratos," with the passages quoted in my notes on that book.

Some commentators take it as applying to comets; perhaps the quotations from Enoch 44 and 80 fit better with shooting-stars, Δηλορεα διστονες (Arist. Meteor. i. 4, 7) which seem to rush 'from their sphere into darkness; compare Hermes Trismegistus ap. Stob. Ecl. i. 478, ἠκτίστων τῆς σελήνης ἑπών άρτηρες φεατρού ἄργοι . . . οὐκ οἷς ἡμεῖς δρομῶν διαλογίσαντος, τῶν φωνῶν θρόαν ἠχούσες τοῖς ἄρτηροι τῶν ἐν τῷ γένει ἐξω, ἐντὸς τοῦ οὐράνιον γέγεντα, ἐν ταῖς μνήμονα φθαρρ. For the close relationship supposed by the Jews to exist between the stars and the angels, see my note on James i. 17, φωταν. In this passage, however, the subject of the comparison is men, who profess to give light and guidance, as the pole-star does to mariners (ὅς φωτίσῃς ἐν κόσμῳ, Phil. ii. 15), but who are only blind leaders of the blind, centres and propagators of πλανητα (ver. 11), destined to be swallowed up in everlasting darkness. Cf. Apoc. vi. 13, viii. 10, i. 12, x. 1, xii. 4, ὁ δὲ ζῷον τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνα τεθηρνεῖ. See the parallel in 2 Pet. ii. 17, and above ver. 6.

Vv. 14-16.—The Prophecy of Enoch.

The ancient prophecy, to which reference has been already made, was intended for these men as well as for the prophet's own contemporaries, where he says "The Lord appeared, encompassed by myriads of his holy ones, to execute justice upon all and to convict all the ungodly concerning all their ungodly works, and concerning all the hard things spoken against Him by ungodly sinners." (Like them) these men are murmurers, complaining of their lot, slaves to their own carnal lusts, while they utter presumptuous words against God, and seek to ingratiate themselves with men for the sake of gain.

Ver. 14. ἐπροφητεύοντο δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐβδόμους ἀπὸ 'Αδάμ Ἔνοχ. "It was for these also (as well as for his own contemporaries) that the prophecy of Enoch was intended, far as he is removed from our time, being actually the sixth (by Hebrew calculation, seventh) descendant from Adam." For Enoch compare the allusions in Sir. xlv. 16, xlix. 14, Heb. xi. 5, Charles, Introduction to Book of Enoch.

The prophecy is contained in En. i. 9 (Greek in Charles, A. P. C. p. 327), ὅτα ἐρχεται σὺν τοῖς (? τοῖς) μεταφέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσω τοὺς ἀσεβείες καὶ ἱλαζει τὰς σάρκα περὶ πάντων. <τῶν> ἐργὰν αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ ἔκβασιν κατ' αὐτῶν ἀμ- ατωλοί ἀσεβείες. The phrase ἐβ-δομοι ἀπὸ 'Αδάμ is also found in En. ix. 8, "My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam," ib. xxiii. 3. "And Enoch began to recount from the books and speak: I was born the seventh in the
first week, while judgment and righteousness still tarried; and after the first there will arise in the second week great wickedness," where Charles refers to Jubilees. 7. The genealogical order, as given in Gen. v. 4-20, is (1) Adam, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan, (5) Mahalaleel, (6) Jared, (7) Enoch. It is probably the sacredness of the number 7 which led the Jewish writers to lay stress upon it in Enoch's case.

Ver. 14. ἢ δὴ κύριος ἐν ἀγίας μυραίνει τοῦ 1 αὐτοῦ, 15. ποιήσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἀληθεύσει πάντας τοὺς ἁγιασμένους 2 περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἁγιασμένων αὐτῶν 3 ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν 4 ἐν ἀληθείᾳ κατ' αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἁγιασμός. 16. Οὕτω εἰς

1 ἀγίαις μυράλησον μυράλησον αὐτοῖς αὐγέλον Ν ἁγ. ἁγ. ἁμ. + .
2 ποιήσαι τοὺς ἁγιασμένους add. ἀνών. TL. (incuria ?); παραψάλμων Ν, ἁγ. sah.
3 ἁγιασμός αὐτων om. Ν ἁγ. +; [ἅγιασμος] ἁγιασμός Treg.
4 σκληροί add. λόγων Ν, TL.
IOUDA EPISTOLH

κατά τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν τοσοῦτον. Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3 and ii. 10, below ver. 18, and see my notes on James iv. 1, 2. Plumptre notes "The temper of self-indulgence recognising not God's will, but man's desires, as the law of action, is precisely that which issues in weariness and despair. . . .

τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ἀλλαὶ ὑπόρευσα. See Enoch v. 4, quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch chi. 3, "ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness," Ps. xii. 4, Ps. lxixii. 8, Dan. vii. 8, στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα and Ps. ii. 20 cf. the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James iii. 5 foll. In classical writers ὑπόρευσα is generally used of great or even excessive size, in later writers it is also used of "big" words, arrogant speech and demeanour, see Alford's note on 2 Pet. ii. 18 and Plut. Mor. 1110 b (Socrates), τὴν ἐμπροσθενίαν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν νῦσθων δία λόγου καὶ τῶν ὑπερβολῶν καὶ ὑπερήφανων κατατομῶν καὶ μεγαλείψεων, i.e. 7 a, where ἡ ἡθεραία καὶ παραπράγγειος λέξις is styled ὑπόρευσα in contrast with λογικὴ λέξις, Plut. Vitae 505 b, τὸ βασιλεῖον τὸ φρόνημα τραγικοῦ καὶ ὑπέρων ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις ἐστίν καὶ ἐγνώσει. It is found in 2 Peter ii. 18 and in Dan. xi. 36, 6 βασιλεῖα ὑπερβολή

τὰ μεγάλα καὶ μεγαλείψεων ὑπερήφανον. The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. xix. 15, ὡς ἡ ὑπερβολή πρὸσωπῶν, Job xiii. 10, see my note on James ii. 1, μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίᾳ ἔχστι τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. X., and cf. 1 Tim. iii. 8, quoted above on ver. 11. As the fear of God drives out the fear of man, so defiance of God tends to put man in His place, as the chief source of good or evil to his fellows. For the anacoluthon (τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ—θαυμάζεται) compare Col. ii. 2, ἐν παραλαμβάνοντι, καὶ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν συμβαθοῦντοι εἰς ἐπινοήθη, where a similar periphrasis (καὶ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν = ὑπερβολή) is followed by a constructio ad sensum, also Winer, p. 716. Perhaps the intrusion of the finite clause into a participial series may be accounted for by a reminiscence of Ps. xvii. 10, τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ἐλάλησαν ὑπερήφανοι, or Ps. cxxxiv. 8, 11, where a similar phrase occurs.

Vv. 17-19.—The Faithful are hidden to call to mind the warnings of the Apostles. The Apostles warned you repeatedly that in the last time there would arise mockers led away by their own carnal lusts. It is these that are now breaking up the unity of the Church by their invidious distinctions, men of un sanctified minds, who have not the Spirit of God. See Introduction on the Early Heresies in the larger edition.

Ver. 17. Ὑπομνηματίζονται ἡμῶν τοὺς ὁμότατους τῶν προερχομένων ἐπὶ τῶν ἐποικίων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18. ὅτι

γογγυσταῖ, μεμφίσματος, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορεύματος, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπόρευσα, θαυμάζεται πρόσωπων ὑπερήφανον, or Ps. cxlvii. 8, 11, where a similar phrase occurs.

Ver. 18. ἂν ἴσχατον χρόνον ὑσταθῇ ἡμεῖς. The parallel in 2 Peter iii. 3 is ἰσακεκύρωτον ἐν ἱεραρχίᾳ τῶν ἡμῶν ἐν ἵματι καὶ ἐμπλοκή ὑπερήφανον, where see note on the use of the article with ἰσχατος, etc. For ἴσακεκύρωτον, cf. Arist. Pol. iv. 3, ἰσακεκύρωτον τοῖς ἴσχαλεσι χρόνοις.

The prophecy of this mocking, as a mark of the future trials of the Church, has not come down to us. An example of it in the very beginning of the Church is given in Acts ii. 13, ἦσαν χλευαζόμενοι ἰδίως ἐν ἱεραρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων. In the O.T. we have such examples as 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 (the summing up of the attitude of the Jews towards the prophet) ἂν μισηθήσεται τὸς ἰσχαλεύοντος αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντος τοὺς λέγοντος αὐτοῦ καὶ μυαλαῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβόμενας αὐτοῦ, Jer. xx. 8, ἐνεγκύμων ἱεραρχίας ἐν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν χριστιανοῖς, καὶ ἐν ἱεραρχίᾳ ἐν ἱεραρχίᾳ, ἐν τοίς ἰσχαλεύοντος αὐτῶν. Cf. also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Matt. x. 25 f., ἐν τῶν ἐκκλησιάσεων τῆς Βαβylon ἐκκλείσσετον, τῶν μάλιον κ.τ.λ. In 2.
Peter the purport of this mockery is explained to be the unfulfilled promise of the Parusia. Here we must gather its meaning from the account already given of the libertines. If they turned the grace of God into licentiousness, they would naturally mock at the narrowness and want of enlightenment of those who took a strict and literal view of the divine commandments: if they made light of authority and treated spiritual things with irreverence, if they foamed out their own shame and uttered proud and impious words, if they denied God and Christ, they would naturally laugh at the idea of a judgment to come. On the form of this and its cognates, see note on 2 Peter.

τῶν ἀσωμένων. I am rather disposed to take τῶν ἀσωμένων here as a subjective genitive, "lusts belonging to, or arising from their impurities," cf. Rom. i. 28, καθὼς οὐκ ἔσκακασα τον θεον ἠκούν ἐν εὐγνώμονει, περιβολήν αὐτοῦ διὸς εἴε ἐκεῖνον νοῦν. The position of the genitive is peculiar, and probably intended to give additional stress. We may compare it with James ii. 1, μη ἐν προσωπο-λογίας ἔχετε τὴν πάθην τοῦ κυρίου θημὸν ἡγούμενον ἁμαρτωλόν, τῇ δόξῃ, where some connect τῇ δόξῃ with κυρίου in a qualitative sense.

Ver. 19. οὖντο εἰς αἱ ἀποκαλομένοις. "These are they that make invidious distinctions." See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀποκαλομένοις is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle, Pol. iv. 43, διότι ὅποιον προ-ρημένον λαμβάνει ἐθνός, προτόν ἂν ἀποκαλο-μένον ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πάντως ἠμοίων ("as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common") and, I believe, in every other passage in which it is known to occur: see Maximus Confessor, ii. p. 103 D, τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν ἠμοίως ἐν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ γνωμικὸν ἀποκαλομένον, translated "natural in so (Christo) constituted voluntate, arbitrarum dispunxit," ib. p. 131 c, ὅς ἀ- λόγος ἢν αὐτοῦ, μόνον τὸ ἐμπεσθε, ἀλλ' οὗ τὸ φυσικὸν ἀποκαλομένον θέλημα, "quod disserat hoc solum spectare ut libidinosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a Salvatore eliminaret," Severus de Clyst. xxxii., xxxv., ών ταύτα τὰ συμ-πάθεια ἡπὶ παρόντα ἀποδοξίαν τὴν ἄργακην νόσον ἐν τῇ φωνερομοιοῦν. The simple διορίζεσθαι is found in Lev. xx. 24, εδώρατο νόμος ἢν ἕκαν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐδώκα "I separated you from the nations," Job xxxv. 11; so διορίζεσθαι Matt. xxv. 32, ἄφηντέν τὸ πρόβατα ἄντω τῶν ἡρῴων, Acts xix. 9 (Paul left the synagogue) καὶ ἀφορίσασθαι τοῦ μαθητά, 2 Cor. vi. 17, ἦλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, Luke vi. 22 (of excommunication) ὅταν ἀφορίσασθαι πᾶσαν, Gal. ii. 12 (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) ὡς ὁ συνελήφθη καὶ ἀφο-ρίζον ἐκ εἰς τοιαύταις. 

ψυχικός. Used of worldly wisdom in James iii. 15, where see note, distinguished from τηματικός in z Cor. ii. 13-15, xv. 44, cf. the teaching of the Naassenes (ap. Hippol. p. 164) εἰς τοὺς οἶκος θεοῦ σεκλείπεται ἀκάθαρτος οὐδεὶς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται τηματικός.

τνείμα μὴ ἔχοντες. The subjective negative may be explained as describing a class (such as have not) rather than as stating a fact in particular persons; but the use of μὴ is much more widely extended in late than in classical Greek, cf. such phrases as ἐκεῖ μὴ, διότι μὴ. It is simplest to understand τνείμα here of the Holy Spirit, cf. Rom. viii. 9, ὅτι, οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ ἐν τούτῳ ἐν τούτῳ, εἰπτε τνείμα θεοῦ ὁλικῇ ἐν ἰδιόν, in Cor. ii. 13, xv. 40, in John iii. 24, iv. 13, and the contrast in ver. 20, ἐν τούτῳ ἡγεῖται ἄγνωστως προσκυνήμουν. Others, e.g. Plumptre, prefer the explanation that "the false teachers were so absorbed in their lower sensuous nature that they no longer possessed, in any real sense of the word,
that element in man's compound being, which is itself spiritual, and capable therefore of communion with the Divine Spirit.

vv. 20-23. The Final Charge to the Faithful.—Use all diligence to escape this danger. Make the most of the privileges vouchsafed to you. Build yourselves up on the foundation of your most holy faith by prayer in the Spirit. Do not rest satisfied with the belief that God loves you, but keep yourselves in His love, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ which leads us to eternal life. And do your best to help those who are in danger of falling away by pointing out their errors and giving the reasons of your own belief; and by snatching from the fire of temptation those who are in imminent jeopardy. Even where there is most to fear, let your compassion and your prayers go forth toward the sinner, while you shrink from the pollution of his sin.

Ver. 20. ὅμαις δὲ, ἀγαπητοί. Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17. ἐποιοδομοῦντες ἑαυτούς τῇ ἁγιώτητι ὦν πίστις. For the spiritual temple, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 3-5; Col. i. 23; Eph. ii. 20-22, ἐποιεοδομοῦντες ὑμᾶς τῷ θερμῷ τῶν ἁπάτων καὶ προφητῶν, δότως ἐνορμο-μαιλὸν αὐτοῦ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ., i Cor. iii. 9-17, a passage which the writer may have had in his mind here and in ver. 23. Dr. Bigg compares Polyc. Phil. iii. 10, ὅ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐκκαθήθη σοι ἐν τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ἀπεκτέων ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἱλατησίας. Add Clem. Strom. v. p. 644, ὁ κοίμησις πάσης καθῆκεν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ σώματι σαρκούς. Usually Christ is spoken as the foundation or corner-stone of the Church, and we should probably assign an objective sense to τῆς πίστεως here, as in ver. 3 above (ταγμαθείης τῆς πίστεως). Otherwise it might be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation with the spiritual realities (Heb. xi. 1, πίστες ὑπομνών ὑπόστασιν, πραγμάτων ἑκατον ὁδεγοὺς τῶν διδασκαλίας), that is, the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see note on 2 Pet. i. 5, and which leads to eternal life (1 Pet. i. 5, and 9, κοιμάζομαι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὦν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν). The faith is here called "most holy," because it comes to us from God, and reveals God to us, and because it is by its means that man is made righteous, and enabled to overcome the world (1 John v. 4, 5). Cf. 1 Pet. v. 9, ὁ ἀνθρωπός σου τῆς πίστεως.

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι. These words, contrasted with πνεύμα.

Ver. 21. ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τήρησατε. In ver. 1 the passive is used: those who are addressed are described as kept and beloved (cf. ver. 24, τῷ ἐμπρόσθεν φυλάξαοι): here the active is used and emphasised by the unusual order of words; each is to keep himself in the love of God, cf. James, i. 27. τούτων ἀναφέρονται, Phil. ii. 12, τῶν ἵππων κατεργάσεως: Θεὸς γὰρ ἕστω ὁ ἐνεργεῖν ἐν ὦν. Again in ver. 2 the writer invokes the divine love and mercy on those to whom he writes: here they are bidden to take steps to secure these. Compare Rom. v. 5, ὁ ἐμπέπτωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκαθήθη σοι ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὦν τῷ ἄγγελῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ἰωάνν. ix. 18, ὃ ἐν τῷ ἐνεργεῖν ὀνειδιστεῖται. The aor. imper. is expressive of urgency, see note on ἐγγίστο, in James i. 2.

προσευχόμενοι τῷ Θεῷ. Cf Tit. ii. 13, προσευχόμενοι τῷ μακαρίῳ ἁλίθῳ καὶ ὑποφάνεις τῆς δόξης του Θεοῦ καὶ σωτηρίου ὦν 'I. X., and 2 Pet. iii. 12, 13, 14. The same word is used of the Jews who were looking for the promised Messiah at the time of His first coming, Mark xv. 43, Luke ii. 25, 38.

ἐν ἀγάπῃ καί ἀλόγον. Some connect this closely with the imperative τήρησατε, but it seems to me to follow more natu-
23. ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ

22. Καὶ ὅσι μὴν ἔλεγχετε 1 διακρίνομενοις. 23. οὗτοί δὲ πουδίσετε ἐάν πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, ὅσι δὲ 

1 ἔλεγχετε AC vulg. boh. arm. +; ἔλεγχετε ΝΒΓ; ἔλεγχετε KLP +.
2 διακρίνομενοι ΝΑΒ; διακρίνομενοι KLP.
3 ο(ec) ΝACKLP; om. B. 4 σωτείς ΝΑΒ; εν φθορ εστε KLP.

rally on the nearer phrase, τῷ τὸ λεία: cf. 1 Pet. i. 37, ἐπιλογῆτο ὁ Θεός ... ὃς τὸν αὐτὸν λείαν ἀναγκαίησε Ἰωάννην καὶ ἐπὶ ἑορτὰς ἐν τῷ σαρκικῷ αὐτοῦ τοῦ θρόνου ... ἐφορομένοις εἰς συνεργάζεσθαι ἐν καρπῷ ἐκχύνεται. Ver. 22. οὔτέ μὴν ἔλεγχετε διακρίνομενοις. On the reading see the Introduction. For the form ὁ μὲν instead of δὲ μὲν, cf. Matt. xiii. 8, xiii. 5, Luke xxiii. 33, Acts xxvii. 44, Rom. xiv. 5, 1 Cor. vii. 7, xi. 21, 2 Cor. ii. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 20, not used in Heb., and 1 and 2 Pet., James or John. The doubled οὐ may be found in Matt. xii. 33, ἵνα δὲ προσεύχητε, ὅποιος δὲ ὀλοκληρωθήσετε, id. xiv. 15, ὃ μὲν οὐκ εὖ πάντες τάλαντα, ὅτι οὐκ εὖ, ὃ οὐκ εὖ. The use is condemned as a solecism by Thomas Magister and by Lucian, Solosc. 1, but is common in late Greek from the time of Aristotle, cf. Sturz. Dialec. pp. 105 f. On the word ἔλεγχος (here wrongly translated "strafe", in the sense of excommunication, by R ampfl), see Cons. Apost. vii. 5, 6, ἔλεγχος ἡ ἐλέγχος τῶν ἐλέγχων σου, and Hare's excellent note L in his Mission of the Comforter, where he argues that the conviction wrought by the Spirit is a conviction unto salvation, rather than unto condemnation; and quotes Luecke as saying that "ἐλέγχοι always implies the refutation, the overcoming of an error, a wrong, by the truth and right. When this is brought before our conscience through the ἔλεγχος, there arises a feeling of sin, which is always painful: thus every ἔλεγχος is a chastening, a punishment." Compare Grotte's life-like account of the Socratic Elenchus in his Hist. of Greece.

This verse seems to be referred to in Cav. Apost. vi. 4, ὁ μὴ διεστεράσας μὲν ἐλέγχος, ἀλλ' ὅσι μὴν ἔλεγχος, πέρι ὅποι ἐπερεύχομαι, ὅποι δὲ ἐγκατέστης ἐν πάντωσιν σωτείς, which is also found in the Didache ii. 7, with the omission of ὅσι δὲ ἔλεγχος. Cf. John xvi. 8, ἔλεγχος ἔλεγχος τῶν κόσμων πέρι ἐμπερὶ καὶ πέρι δικαιοσύνης καὶ πέρι ἐρημίας, ἤν ἡ εὐθυμία ἐν πάντωσιν τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος (the effect of the prophets' teaching on an unbeliever), Tit. i. 13, ἔλεγχος ἀμοιβῶς ἀμοιβῶς ἐν ἑπιστευμὸν ἐν τῷ πάθει, ἵδ. i. 9, τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἔλεγχος, 2 Tim. iv. 2 (the charge to Timothy) ἔλεγχος, παραδοκείαν ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ, ἀποκαίριαν, ἵδ. iii. 19, δυνατον ἐν πάσῃ ἕλεγχος καὶ ποιμαντιν. Eph. v. 13, τῷ δὲ πάντα ἐλέγχόμενα τῇ τοῦ φωτὸς φανερώτα. There is a tone of greater severity in the τοῦτος κρίνων καὶ ἔλεγχος τῆς 15οῦ, but even there we need not suppose that the preacher is hopeless of good being effected. The point is of importance in deciding the mutual relations of the three cases here considered.

διακρίνομενοι. We should have expected a nominative here to correspond with ἄρπάζομενοι and μετατέθεται in the following clauses, and so the text has διακρίνομενοι, wrongly translated in A.V., as if it were the active διακρίνοντες, "making a difference". This gives such a good sense that some commentators (e.g. Stier) have been willing to condone the bad Greek. It would have been better to alter the reading at once. Keeping the reading of the best MSS., we may either take the accusative as complementary to ἔλεγχος (as we find in Plato, Theaet. 171 B, ἔλεγχος ἀποροῦτα, Xen. Mem. 1, 7, 2, ἔλεγχονται γελόιοι δν, Jelf. § 681), or simply as descriptive of the condition of the persons referred to. There is also a question as to the meaning we should assign to διακρίνομενοι. Is it to be understood in the same sense as in James i. 6, ii. 4? In that case we might translate "convict them of their want of faith," taking the participle as complementary to the verb; or "reprove them because of their doubts." It seems more probable, however, that the meaning here is "convince them when they dispute with you," which we may compare with: 1 Pet. iii. 15, διότι δὲ πρὸς ἀναλογίαν παρακατατάσσω τῷ αὐτῶν ἡμῶν λόγον ... ἀλλὰ μετὰ πρὸς ἀναλογίαν καὶ φῶς (cf. εν φθορ below). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of διακρίνομενοι being the same as that in ver. 9, τῷ διαβάλει διακρ., and in Soc. E.H. v. 5, ὃ δὲ εἰσε ὁμοιόμονας καὶ χαίρει πρὸς ἀλλού διακρίνοντο. Ver. 23. σωτές. Here again a word
which is strictly applicable to God is transferred to him whom God uses as His instrument. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11 and notes on v. 12. See also above, especially James v. 20. ἐὰν ἐπιστρέφησθαι ἀμαρτήσῃ ἐκ πλάνης ἰδίου αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ δαναίον.

The expression is borrowed from Amos iv. 11, κατέστρεφθη ὡς καθὼς κατέστρεφεν θεὸς ζώδεμα καὶ γόμαρρα, καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς δαλὸς ἀμαρτανόμον ἐκ πυροῦ, καὶ ὑδάτα ἐπιστρέφησι πρὸς μέ, λέγει Κύριος, and Zech. iii. 3, ὡς Ἵλαριος ἁλὰ δαλὸς ἀμαρτανόμον ἐκ πυροῦ. Both passages have further connexions with our epistle, the former from the reference to Sodom (see above ver. 7), the latter as following immediately on the words, ἐπιστρέφων σοι Κύριος quoted in ver. 9, and preceding a reference to filthy garments (see note below). In it the High Priest Joshua is a representative of Israel, saved like a brand from the captivity, which was the punishment of national sin. The image of fire is naturally suggested by the allusion to the punishment of Sodom in the passage of Amos, and of Korah (see above ver. 7) described in Num. xvi. 35, Ps. civ. 18, ἐξελθὼν πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλὸς κατέφλεξεν ἀμαρτανόμον. The writer may also have had in mind St. Paul's description of the building erected on the One Foundation (see above ver. 20), which, he says, will be tried by fire, 1 Cor. iii. 13-15, εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον, ὅποιον ἔστω, τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσαι... εἰ τῶν τὸ ἔργον κατακαίνησατο, ζημιώθησατο, αὐτὸς δὲ σωζόμενος, οὕτως δὲ ὃς ἔστω πῦρος. Such an one may be spoken of as "a brand snatched from the fire," not however as here, saved from the fire of temptation, but as saved through the agency of God's purgatorial fire, whether in this or in a future life. 

Phil. ii. 12, 1 Pet. i. 17, iii. 15. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in ἅρμα and ἅρμα in late Greek see Janarius, § 850. § 854, Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read ἅρμα in Prov. xxii. 26, and ἅρμα to Rom. ix. 16, but ἅρμα in Rom. ix. 18. μισοῦτε καὶ τὸν ἄντρο τῆς σκότους ἀνεκληρίκου ψυχῆς. While it is the duty of the Christian to pity and pray for the sinner, he must beware of loathing all that bears traces of the sin. The form of expression seems borrowed from such passages as Isa. xxx. 23, Lev. xv. 17, perhaps too from Zech. iii. 4, ἤνευον ἵνα ἀνεκληρίκου ἴματα βινυπα. Cf. Apoc. iii. 4, οὐκ ἐδιώκατο τα ἴματα αὐτῶν, and Apoc. Pauli quoted by Spitta, χίτων μου οὐκ ἑρέμωδη. The derivatives of στίλος are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of στίλος in Biblical Greek are James iii. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα... ἡ στίλον ἔδωκεν τῷ σοίμα καὶ Wisd. xv. 4, εἶδος στίλον χρώματι δηληγράφοντος. Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26, ἐν προφυτῇ πανδεισοῦτα τοῖς αὐτοπαθεῖνα τοῖς ἀντικαιναθένα, μήπω δὲ αὐτοῖς ὡς Θεὸς μαντήσαι εἰς ἐπιγνώσεις ἕλεγχας, καὶ ἰκανηγήσων ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος.

Vv. 24, 25. Final Benediction and Ascription. I have bidden you to keep yourselves in the love of God; I have warned you against all impurity and impiety. But do not think that you can attain to the one, or guard yourselves from the other, in your own strength. You must receive power from above; and that it may be so, I offer up my prayer to Him, who alone is able to keep you from stumbling, and to present you before the throne of His glory, pure and spotless in exceeding joy. To Him, the only God and Saviour, belong glory, greatness, might, and authority throughout all ages.

Ver. 24. ἤν ἐστιν ἀνεκληρίκος ἵματος ἀνεκληρίκου. Apparently a reminis-
censure of Rom. xvi. 25 f., τῇ δὲ ἀνε-μέχρι πάντων οὐκ ἔστησεν... μόνες σοφοὶ Θεοὶ διὰ θρόνους Χριστοῦ, ἡ δὲ δόξα τῶν αἰωνίων τῶν αἰωνίων. Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. iii. 20, commences τῇ δὲ ἐναρμονίᾳ. The reading ἔμαθα is confirmed by the evidence of A and B, which was unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading αὐτοῦ, found in KP and some inferior MSS.

αὐτοῦ. Occurs in 3 Macc. vi. 39, μεγαλοδέξῳ ἐκπάνος τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν διώκων δυνάμεως ἀνταίστατο αὐτοῦ ἔμαθα: used here only in the N.T. The verb τάσης has the same figurative sense, James ii. 10, iii. 2, ἐν ἐνεργοῖς σεῖς ποιήσω, 2 Pet. i. 10, ταύτα ποιώντες οὐ πάντως υπερήφανοι τοις αὐτοῖς.

ὁ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ... ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ισραήλ σωτήρ, ib. ver. 27, Sir. ii. 1, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ σωτήρα μου, Philo, Conclus. Ling. § 20, i. p. 418 fin., τῇ δὲ ἀνδρῶ... πρὸς τὸν μόνον σωτήρα Θεὸν ἐκ-βοήσαί (τις); cf. Luke i. 47, ἐγκαλίσα-σθεν τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτηρίῳ μου, elsewhere in N.T. only in Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, ἱνα Χριστότητος... ἐπέβαλε τοῦ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν Θεοῦ... κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ Θεοὶ ἐσώμεν ἡμᾶς ἐδοξάσαι... πνευματίκος ἄγιος σὺ ἐξελέγχῃ... ἡμᾶς πλουτίως διὰ 'I. X. τοῦ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. i. 1, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ι. Χ. κατ' Αʹ οὕτως θεοῦ σωτηρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ Χ. 'I. ib. ii. 3, iv. 10. The later writers of the N.T. seem to have felt it needful to insist upon the unity of God, and the saving will of the Father, in opposition to antinomian attacks on the Law.

οὖν ὑπερήφανος. It seems best to take διὰ with δέω, and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11, ἐν πάσι δέολεται ὁ Θεός διὰ 'I. X. ἤτοιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰω-νας.

δόξα. The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, cf. 2 Pet. αὐτῷ δόξα, Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Gal. i. 5, Luke ii. 16, δέω τῷ θεῷ θεῷ. In 1 Peter iv. 11 it is inserted, ἤτοιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, and, as we find no case in which δότω is inserted, and the indicative is more subject to ellipsis than the imperative, it might seem that we should supply "is" here; but the R. V. gives "be," and there are similar phrases expressive of a wish or prayer, as the very common χέρις μου καὶ στήθος ἀπὸ θεοῦ παρέχω, where we must supply ἔτοιμον or γένοιτο.

For the position and genuineness of this doxology see the Introduction and notes in Sanday and Headlam's commentary, and the dissertations by Lightfoot and Hort in the former's Biblical Essays, pp. 287-374.
De Wette maintained that the following words referring to already existing fact, were incompatible with a prayer; but it is sufficient that the prayer has regard mainly to the present and future: the past only comes in to give it a fuller, more joyful tone, reminding us of the eternity of God, as in the psalmist's words, "I said it is my own infirmity, but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High," and the close of our own doxology "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." I do not see, however, that we need exclude either interpretation. The writer may exult in that which he believes to be already fact in the eternal world, and yet pray for its more perfect realisation in time, as in the Lord's Prayer, γεγονεν το δειλημα του ως εν σωραν και εν γη. The omission of the verb allows of either or both views in varying proportion. θεος by itself is the commonest of all ascriptions. It is joined with τιμη in 1 Tim. i. 17 and elsewhere, as here with μεγαλουσα. It is joined with κρατος in 1 Pet. iv. 11, ν. 11, Apoc. i. 6. Fuller ascriptions are found in Apoc. iv. 11, δεξος ει, δ κυριος . . . λαβειν την δοει και την τιμην και την δωσιν, ν. 13, τη καταθηματιν την αληθην . . . τη ευλογια και τη τιμη και δοει και το κρατος εις τους αλωνες των ανων, vii. 12, ε ευλογια και δοει και ε ευλογια και τη τιμη και δωσιν και ε ευλογια και τη γη της θεου. Just before (ver. 10) we have the remarkable ascription η συνεργα στην θεω κυριων. Compare with this the ascription of David (1 Chron. xxix. 11), στο κυριο μεγαλουσαν και δωσιν και τα καθημερα και τη κατα τη ευλογια, δει τη σωματω των εν οραν και εν γη δεσοβαζειν. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man, see Rom. ii. 10, δοει δε και τημη και ευλογια επαντη το αγνηλον δε εργαζομενον το αγνηλον. An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 59. 2, α χριστου του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου μετα παντων παντειτων των κειμενων υπο του θεου και δε αυτου.

* For a full account of the early doxologies, see Chase on the Lord's Prayer (Tests and Studies, i. 3, p. 68 foll.). He states that the common doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer (σου λοιπον η βασιλεια και δωσιν και δοει εις τους αλωνες "appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms," and "was added to the Prayer in the 'Syrian' text of St. Matthew's Gospel").
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ST. JOHN THE DIVINE.
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Longsuffering toward us here is the Most High:
He hath shown us that which is to be,
And hath not hidden from us what befalleth at the end.

For the youth of the world is over,
Long since hath the strength of creation failed,
And the advent of the times is at hand.

The pitcher is nigh to the cistern,
The ship to the haven,
The caravan to the city,
And life to its consummation.

—The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (lxxxv. 8, 10), A.D. 70-100.
INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The Text.—The exceptionally corrupt state of the Textus Receptus in the Apocalypse is due to the fact that for this book Erasmus (to whose text it goes back) had access to only a single cursive (numbered 1) of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Even that was inferior and incomplete. The MSS. which have become available since his day are neither ample nor faultless. Throughout the five uncials (two of which, i.e., C and P, are defective palimpsests), over 1600 variants have been counted—excluding merely orthographical differences—in the 400 verses of the book; this proportion is considerably higher than in the Catholic epistles, for example, where 432 verses only yield about 1100 variants. The earliest uncial goes back to the fourth century (N); A and C, the most weighty, to the fifth; Q to the eighth; and P to the ninth. Of these, N, A, Q are complete, while the Apocalypse in Q is bound up with the writings of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa—"one of many instances in which the Apocalypse was bound up with ordinary theological treatises instead of with the other N.T. writings" (Gregory i. 121). C lacks i. 1, iii. 19-v. 14, vii. 14-17, viii. 5-ix. 16, x. 10-xi. 3, xiv. 13-xviii. 2, xix. 5-end. P is defective in xvi. 12-xvii. 1; xix. 21-xx. 9, xxii. 6-end.

N, A, C reflect a fairly uniform text, which seems to have been influenced by an older uncorrected text allied to that underlying the Vulgate. Hence, as N in the Apocalypse, owing to its eccentric element, is not of exceptional value by itself (though supported by the cursives 95 and 36), AC vg. form an important group of witnesses, to which the minuscule 95 (like 68 and 38) and Syr. seem allied. The relation of P and Q is less obvious. Their differences (they agree

1 Relatively high among the secondary documents, but woefully inferior to the uncials. On the performance of Erasmus, see Delitzsch's Handschrifte Funde, i. (1861), pp. 17 f., with A. Biudau's essay on the Erasmus editions of the N.T. in Bardenhewer's Biblische Studien, vii. 5.

2 To avoid confusion with the B of Codex Vaticanus, it is better to cite this codex Vaticanus as Q (so, after Tregelles, Weiss, Haussleiter, Bousset, Swete) than as B (Tisch.) or B (WH, Simcox).
only in about fifty cases against ΝΑC) point either to two recensions of some older original (Bousset) or to a text based again upon some older revised text (Weiss). Q approximates rather to the cursives in text. But its archetype usually tallies with ΝΑC, and is allied somehow to the text behind the so-called “Coptic”\(^1\) version (cf. Goussen’s “Theolog. Studia, fasciculus I.”: Apoc. S. Johannis apostoli versio sahidica, 1895, pp. iv.-vii.), like a small group of cursives (Bousset’s Q rel.). In no one MS, or group of MSS. is a neutral or fairly accurate text preserved. This is mainly due to the interval which elapsed before the Apocalypse became generally canonical, particularly in the East; its text was less carefully guarded during this period than any other portion of the N.T., and even by the time that the ΝΑC text (or texts) came into being, the book had not secured its canonisation throughout the Eastern churches. In addition to this, the grammatical irregularities and anomalies\(^2\) which studded its pages tempted many a scribe to correct and to conform the text. Systematic emendation of this kind must have begun very early (Weiss, pp. 144 f.).

This paucity and conflict of uncial evidence lends additional weight to the versions and patristic citations, especially as they reflect a text or texts which cannot be taken to be identical with, and yet must be older than, those underlying the MSS. Often, indeed, the versions themselves reproduce some of the most patent errors in the MSS., while the patristic texts are sometimes too

\(^1\) In the textual notes = Sah. (i.e., Sahidic): a further fragment is edited by J. Clédat in Revue de l’Orient Chrétien (1899), pp. 263-279. Gregory (pp. 546-547) throws both this and the later Bohairic or Memphitic version (= me.) back into the second century, but this is probably too early a date. All the extant fragments of the former are printed in Delaporte’s Fragments Sahidiques du N.T. (Paris, 1906). For the latter, cf. Leipoldt in Church Quart. Rev., 1906, pp. 292 f.

\(^2\) These are not invariably Hebraisms, as Viteau and the older grammarians argue, but it is almost uncritical at the opposite extreme to rule out Hebraisms entirely. The Apocalypse is so saturated with the original text and the Greek version of the O.T., that there is more likelihood here than elsewhere in the N.T. of a grammatical solecism being due, directly or indirectly, to the influence of Semitic idiom. Even though a parallel instance can be adduced in some cases from the papyri or the \(\text{κωφίς}\) elsewhere (cf. Helbing, p. iv.), this merely suggests a possible origin for the phrase in question. Besides, the Apocalypse is a piece of literary art. Where its eccentricities are not due to ignorance of Greek or to reminiscences of Hebrew idiom, they are deliberate violations of grammar and syntax in the interests of rhetoric or faith. That Greek was spoken in these Asiatic townships, although native dialects lingered in the country, is shown by L. Mitteis in his Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen d. röm. Kaiserreiches (1891), pp. 23 f.
insecure to admit of reliable inferences being drawn from their contents (cf. Bebb in Studia Biblica, ii. 195-240). Yet, even with these drawbacks, one need not despair of utilising either. Thus the Latin versions¹ and patristic citations—which are of special moment, since the Apocalypse was never absent from the Latin N.T., and since the fourth century version did not affect it seriously—reveal a fairly distinctive Greek text behind the type of African text preserved by Cyprian (third century, citations in his Testimonia), Primasius, the sixth century African commentator, and the fragmentary Fleury palimpsest (sixth or seventh century).³ Critical opinion is still unsettled upon the precise connexion of this text with the uncialis, or even with the citations of Latin fathers like Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine, to say nothing of Ticonius, Beatus (eighth century), Haymo (ninth century) and Cassiodorus (sixth century). Thus it is quite uncertain whether the idiosyncrasies of Tertullian's quotations reflect a private recension (so Haussleiter) or some ecclesiastical version, if they are not made directly from the Greek (cf. Nestle’s Einführung, 94, 227 f., B. Tr. 119-20). Nevertheless, it is in this direction that the most promising outlook of textual criticism upon the Apocalypse lies. It has unique aid in the Latin versions. The greater respect shown by the ecclesiastical West to the Apocalypse must have conspired upon the whole to give its text a better chance of preservation than in the East. Certainly, the fragments of the so-called African text carry us back to a Greek text of the Apocalypse which was current in the middle of the third century, prior to the origin of any extant uncial, while the evidence of Dr. Gwynn's Syriac text comes only second in importance. The Greek citations of Clem. Alex. and Origen also echo a text which hardly corresponds to that of any of the uncials; but, where the latter writer agrees with N, some early Alexandrian text may probably be discerned, which might be termed Western. His citations have also affinities with the text of S (cf. Gwynn, pp. lv. f.). As for the more important of the cursives, so far as they have been collated (cf. Gregory, i. 316-326, Scrivener's Introd., 1894, i. 321-326), they seem mainly to corroborate other lines

¹ Dr. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge Texts and Studies, i. 2, pp. 73, 97 f.), followed by Dr. Salmon (Introd. to N.T., pp. 567 f.), even argues from the Ep. Lugd., (Eus., H. E., v. 1) that the Gallican churches must have had a Latin version of the N.T. (including the Apocalypse) by the middle of the second century, akin to the African old Latin.

of evidence. In the dearth of better witnesses, their place is occasionally more serious than some editors would allow; but no attempt at grouping them can be pronounced successful (about sixty contain the commentary of Andreas), and it is merely in the wake of earlier and heavier authorities that most of the minuscules can, as a rule, be employed with any safety.

In the main, however, there is a fair consensus of editors (cf. W.H., ii., 260 f.) for the bulk of the text as printed in the following pages. Exigencies of space have obliged the present editor to omit nearly all the textual material which he had amassed, and the only variants noted, as a rule, are those of direct significance for the expositor. Once or twice a variant has some intrinsic interest of a special kind, or the reading has had to be justified, but the textual notes do not profess to provide anything like a complete textual conspectus. Thus there is no discussion upon the gloss of Σ on iv. 8, upon the curious Syriac rendering of vii. 13 (as if μέτοχος οὐκ οἴρον), or upon the interpolation at xi. 1. All that one has been able to do is to furnish the reader with as accurate a text as possible for that elucidation of the religious ideas of the book which it is the primary object of the Expositor's Greek Testament to facilitate.

**SPECIAL ABBREVIATIONS (cf. others in vol. ii. 754-756, iii. 33-36, 413).**

And. = comm. of Andreas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (fifth or sixth century), author of first Greek edit. (Διδασκάλιον τῆς Ἀποκάλυψης). Cf. von Soden's die Schriften des N.T., i. 1, 472-475, 702 f., and Delitzsch's Hands. Funde, ii. (1862), pp. 29 f.

Areth. = comm. of Arethas, his successor (in 10th cent. ?), allied to Q (Delitzsch) as And. to A upon the whole.


Bs. = Bousset's "Textkritische Studien zum N.T." (Texte u. Untersuchungen, xi. 4, 1-44), 1894.

edd. = consensus or large majority of editors: so min. (minuscules), MSS. (manuscripts), and vss. (versions).

1 Extant in these forms: And⊂= codex August., 12th cent. (14th, Gregory), Andc = codex Coisl. (10th cent.), Andθυ = codex Bavarius (16th cent.), Andπαλ = codex Palatinus (15th cent.). The newly discovered commentary of Oecumenius (6th cent., cf. Diekamp in Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akad., 1907, 1046 f.), as yet unedited, may take the primary object from Andreas.
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gig. = codex gigas Holmiensis (13th cent.), witness either to old Latin text or to "late European" type (Hort).


S. = Syriac Philoxenian recension (6th cent.), ed. Gwynn (1897); reflects a Greek text, which is mixed, but is in the main (lxi. f.) allied to the normal uncial text, and is especially close to C and Origen (lv. f.). Cf. Gregory, ii. 507, 509.

Spec. = pseudo-August. Speculum (8th or 9th cent.).

Syr. = Harkleian recension (represented by about eight considerable MSS.): posterior and inferior to S.

Tic. = "comm. in Apoc. homiliis octodecim comprehensus" of Tyconius the Donatist (end of 4th cent.).

vg. = vulgate (Jerome's version, 4th cent.), best preserved in codices Am. (= Amiatinus, 8th cent.), and Fuld. (= Fuldensis, 6th cent.), Harl. (= Harleianus, 9th cent.), and Tol. (= Tolestanus, 8th cent.).

Vic. = comm. of Victorinus, bishop of Pettau in Pannonia (end of 3rd cent.).


§ 2. Analysis.—The Apocalypse of John, which is thrown into epistolary form, is a slender book with a large design. After the title (i. 1-3) and prologue (i. 4-8) in which the prophet puts himself into relation with seven churches of Western Asia Minor, he proceeds to describe the vision of Jesus Christ (i. 9 f.) which furnished him with his commission to write. The immediate outcome of the vision is a series of charges addressed to these churches (ii.-iii.). Like the

1 The phrase ἀναφορά (=imperial, cf. Deissmann's Licht vom Osten, 258 f.) ἡμέρα (i. 10) denotes the Christian Sunday, not the day of judgment to which he was transported (so Wetstein, Weyland, Selwyn, Hort, Russell's Parousia, 371, 372, and Deissmann in E. Bi., 2815). The day of the Lord is only twice used in the Apoc. (vi. 14, xvi. 14), and there in a special eschatological connexion and in its normal grammatical form. In the Apocalypse it means the day of judgment, whereas in i. 10 the words imply revelation, and the Apocalypse is not a mere revelation of the judgment-day. Besides, ἀναφορά must go here with ἡμέρα as in iv. 2, otherwise it would have a verb of transport (so xvii. 3, xxi. 10).

2 These are addressed to tiny communities in the cities, not to the churches as being in any sense the cities. The character and history of the Christian community are by no means to be identified with those of the city; we have no reason to assume that the local Christians, who were ardently awaiting a citizenship from heaven,
author of the 50th Psalm, he tries to rouse God's people to the seriousness of their own position, before he enters into any predictions regarding the course of the outside world. The scene then changes to the celestial court (iv.-v.), where God appears enthroned in his presence-chamber over the universe, with Jesus installed as the divine revealer of providence in the immediate future. The description of the heavenly penetralia forms a series of weird Oriental arabesques, but the nucleus is drawn from the tradition of the later post-exilic prophets (especially Ezekiel). According to one phase of this tradition, the climax of things was to be heralded by physical and political disturbances; a regular crescendo of disasters was imminent on the edge and eve of the world's annihilation. Hence the next series of visions is full of material and military troubles, delineated partly in supernatural colours which are borrowed from the fanciful astro-theology of eschatological tradition. From this point onwards the sword of the Lord is either an inch or two out of its scabbard, or showering blows upon his adversaries. In the prophet's own metaphor, before the contents of the Book of Doom (in the hands of Jesus Christ) can be read, its seven seals must be broken, and at the opening of each (vi.-vii.) some fresh woe is chronicled.¹ The woe heralded by the seventh seal drifts over, however, into another series of fearful catastrophes which are introduced by seven trumpet blasts (viii.-ix.), and it is only on their completion that the way is now clear for the introduction of the protagonists in the last conflict upon earth. These protagonists are the messiah of God, i.e., Jesus

¹The longing of the martyred souls in vi. 9-11 ("lignes toutes divines, qui suf- front éternellement à la consolation de l'âme qui souffre pour sa foi ou sa vertu," Renan, 463), recalls the function of the Erinnys in Greek religion, the Erinnys being primarily "the outraged soul of the dead man crying for vengeance" (cf. J. E. Harrison, Prolegomena to Study of Greek Religion, p. 214). Only, the souls in the Apocalypse are passive; they do not actively pursue their revenge upon the living. The point of the vision is in part to reiterate the deterministic conviction that God has his own way and time; he is neither to be hurried by the importunity of his own people nor thwarted by the apparent triumph of his enemies.
Christ, and the messiah of Satan, i.e., the Roman empire in the person of its emperor with his blasphemous claim to divine honours upon earth. The series of tableaux which depict their entrance on the scene indicates that the prophet has now reached the heart and centre of his subject. But at this point his method alters, and the thread of purpose is less patent. Hitherto the Book of Doom, with its seven seals, has sufficed for the artistic and rather artificial presentation of his oracles. Now that the seventh seal is broken, the Book, ex hypothesi, is opened; we expect the secrets of divine judgment to be unbared. Instead of describing what follows as the contents of this book, however, the prophet relates how he absorbed another and a smaller volume (x.), containing the sum and substance of the final oracles which bear on the world's fate.\(^1\) He then proceeds, in terms of current and consecrated mythological traditions, to portray the two witnesses (xi.) who herald the advent of the divine messiah (xii.) himself, in the latter days. Messiah's rival, the dragon or Satan, is next introduced, together with the dragon's commission of the Roman empire and emperor (xiii.) as the supreme foe of God's people. Here is the crisis of the world! And surely it is a nodus dignus vindice; God must shortly and sternly interfere. The imperial power, with its demand for worship, is confronted by a sturdy nucleus of Christians who will neither palter nor falter in their refusal to give divine honours to the emperor. Characteristically, the prophet breaks off to paint, in proleptic and realistic fashion, the final bliss of these loyal saints (xiv.), and the corresponding tortures reserved by God for the enemy and his deluded adherents. But at this point, just as the closing doom might be expected to crash down upon the world, the kaleidoscope of the visions again alters rather abruptly. The element of fantasy

---

\(^1\) The distinctive and Jewish characteristics of the following oracles (xi.-xiv., xvii. f.) suggest, as Sabatier was almost the first to see, that the contents of this Βεθλεμων are to be found here; so Weyland (a Jewish Neronic source in x.-xi. 13, xii.-xiii., xiv. 6-11, xv. 2-4, xvi. 13, 14, 16, xix. 11-21, xx.-xxii. 8), Spitta (a Jewish source, c. 63 B.C., in most of x.-xi., xiv. 14 f., xv. 1-8, xvi. 1-12, 17, 21, xvii. 1-6, xviii., xix. 1-8, xxi. 9-27, xxii. 1-3, 15), Pfleiderer (Jewish source, Neronic and Vespasianic, in most of xi.-xiv., xvii.-xix.), and J. Weiss (Jewish source, Neronic, in xi. 1-13, xii. 1-6, 14-17, xiii. 1-7, xv.-xix., xxi. 4-27). But the first editor has worked over the contents of the Βεθλεμων so thoroughly that it is impossible to be sure that it ever was a literary unity. The probability is that xi.-xiii. at least reproduce fragments from it; the evidence hardly warrants us in postulating the incorporation of any coherent source. After chap. x. the symmetry of the Apocalypse is impaired by rapid and bewildering alterations of standpoint to which no satisfactory clue can be found.
becomes still more lurid and ornate. The world of men and nature is drenched by a fresh series of chastisements (xv.-xvi.), which prove unavailing; no repentance follows (xvi. 11, 21), and the climax of history is eventually reached through a succession of mortal penalties inflicted upon the city and empire of Rome (the vices of the empire being ascribed to the city, on the O.T. view which identified capital and kingdom, cf. Nah. iii. 1 f.), the votaries of the imperial cultus, and the devil himself (xvii.-xx). To the mind of an early Christian (cf. Tert., Scap., 2)¹ it was inconceivable that the world could long survive the downfall of the Roman empire. "And when Rome falls, the world." All that the prophet sees beyond that ruin is the destruction of the rebels employed by God to crush the capital; then—thanks to the survival of an O.T. idea, quickened by later tradition—a desperate recrudescence (xx. 7 f.) of the devil. His defeat ushers in the general resurrection and the judgment. Earth and sky flee from the face of God, but men cannot fly. They must stand their trial. Then follows the advent of a new heaven and earth (xxi.-xxii.) for the acquitted and innocent, with the descent of the new Jerusalem and the final bliss of God and of his loyal people.

The cycles of seven (ii.-iii., vi. f., viii. f., xv.-xvi.) apparently formed the nucleus of the book, as the author conceived it, the seals representing the certainty, the trumpets the promulgation, and the bowls the actual execution of the doom. They may have been composed at different times and re-arranged in their present order, like the books of the Aeneid, but, as they stand, they are closely welded together. The introductory Christophany leads up to ii.-iii., while these chapters again anticipate the visions of iv.-v., which are independently linked to i. (cf. i. 4 = iv. 5, v. 6; i. 5, 6 = v. 9). Chapters vi.-ix. are interwoven, and, although the last cycle of seven (xv.-xvi.) seems abruptly introduced, it is really prepared for by x. (see notes). Like the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse has been edited, possibly after the author's death, by the local Johannine circle in Asia Minor (e.g., i. 1-3, xxii. 18 f.); one or two cases of transposition by copyists also occur (cf. notes on xvi. 15, xviii. 14, xix. 9, xx. 14-xxii. 6 f.), and glosses may be suspected occasionally (e.g., i. 18, iii. 8, ix. 9, xvii. 5; see § 8). But substantially it bears the marks of composition by a single pen; the blend of original writing and editorial re-setting does not impair the impression of a literary unity. This may be seen from the following analysis or outline:—

¹ The author of the Daniel-Apocalypse similarly believed that the resurrection of loyal Jews would follow the downfall of Antiochus Epiphanes (xii. 2, 13).
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j. 9-20. A vision of Jesus the messiah, introducing

ii.-iii. Seven letters to Asiatic churches:—
   (1) Ephesus.
   (2) Smyrna.
   (3) Pergamos.
   (4) Thyatira.
   (5) Sardis.
   (6) Philadelphia.
   (7) Laodicea.

iv.-v. A vision of heaven: the throne of God, the Lamb, the book of Doom or Destiny, introducing the plagues of the

vi. Seven seals:—
   (1) The white horse.
   (2) " red "
   (3) " black "
   (4) " pale "
   (5) " souls of the slain.
   (6) " earthquake and eclipse, etc.

vii 1-8.

vii. 9-17.

viii. 1. (7) " silence or pause.

viii. 2-5. A vision of heaven: an episode of angels, introducing

viii. 6-ix. 21. Seven trumpet blasts for
   (1) earth.
   (2) sea.
   (3) streams: the star Wormwood.
   (4) an eclipse.
   (5) a woe of locusts.
   (6) a woe of Parthian cavalry.

x.


xi. 14-19. (7) voices and visions in heaven, introducing

xii. A vision of (a) the dragon or Satan as the anti-Christ; a war in heaven.

xiii. 1-10. (b) the Beast or Imperial power

xiii. 11-18. (c) the false prophet or Imperial priesthood.

xiv. 1-5.

xiv. 6-20.

xv. A vision of heaven: the triumph of the redeemed, introducing

xvi. Seven bowls with plagues for
   (1) earth.
   (2) sea.
   (3) waters.
   (4) the sun.

Intermezzo:

the sealing of the redeemed on earth.

Silence or pause.

the bliss of the redeemed in heaven.

Intermezzo:

episode of angels and a booklet.

episode of the apocalypse of the two-witnesses.

Intermezzo:

the bliss of the redeemed in heaven.

Intermezzo:

episode of angels and doom on earth.
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(5) the realm of the Beast.
(6) the Euphrates: an Eastern invasion.
(7) the air: a storm, introducing
A vision of Doom upon
xvii. (a) The realm of the Beast, or Rome, at the hands of the Beast and his allies.

(a) The realm of the Beast, or Rome, at the hands of the Beast and his allies.

A song of doom on earth:

xviii. (b) The Beast and his allies, and the false prophet.

A vision of the new heaven and earth:

xx. 11-xxi. 8. The judgment of the dead.
xxi. 9-xxii. 5. The descent of the new Jerusalem.
xxii. 6-21. Epilogue.

§ 3. Literary Structure.—This general unity of conception as well as of style is a unity of purpose, however, rather than of design. Once we descend into details another series of features emerges into view. Even upon the hypothesis that it was written by one author, it cannot have been the product of a single vision, much less composed or dictated under one impulse. Furthermore, in consequence of a certain kind is one of the psychological phenomena of visions; a change comes over the spirit even of religious dreams, as they drift through the mind of the seer. But more than this is required to account for incongruities and differences of climate, as e.g., in xxi. 1, 2, 19 and xxii. 22, xi. 8 and xviii. 24, the various descriptions of the second advent (i. 7, xiv. 14 f., xix. 11 f.), of the judgment (xx. 11 f., xxii. 12), or of heaven (vii. 11 f., xv. 2, xix. 7 f., xxi. 1 f., xxii. 1-5, etc.), the isolated allusions to Michael, Gog and Magog, the four angels of vii. 1-4, the carnage of xiv. 20, etc., the unrelated predictions which are left side by side, the amount of repetition, the episodical and conflicting passages of vii. 1-8, 9-17, x., xi. 1-13, xiv. 1-5, 6-13, 14-20, xix. 11 f., etc. Such phenomena are too vital and numerous to be explained upon the same principle as the contradictions and discrepancies which are to be found in many great works of ancient

1 "It is of the nature of an epic poem describing what a Christian Homer might describe as 'the good news of the accomplishment of the righteousness and wrath of God'" (Abbott, p. 75). Cf. Rom. i. 16-18, Apoc. vii. 17, x. 7, xi. 17, 18. The dramatic hypothesis, favoured by a series of students from Milton to Archbishop Benson, is worked out elaborately by Palmer and Eichhorn. The latter, after the prelude (iv. i.-viii. 5), finds the first act in viii. 6-xii. 17 (overthrow of Jerusalem in three scenes), the second in xii. 18-xx. 10 (downfall of paganism), and the third in xx. 11-xxii. 5 (the new Jerusalem). But all such schemes are artificial.
literature, or even as the free play of a poetic mind; they denote
in several cases planes of religious feeling and atmospheres of histori-
cal outlook which differ not simply from their context but from one
another. This feature of the book’s structure, together with the
absence or comparative absence of distinctively Christian traits
from certain sections, the iteration of ideas, the differences of
Christological climate, the repetitions and interruptions, and the
awkward transitions at one point after another, has given rise to the
whole analytic movement of literary criticism upon the Apocalypse.
The earlier phases are surveyed by A. Hirscht (Die Apocalypse u.
ihre neueste Kritik, 1895), Dr. Barton (Amer. Journ. Theol., 1898,
776-801), and the present writer (Hist. New Testament, 1901, 677-
689); for the later literature, see Dr. A. Meyer’s articles in the
Theologische Rundschau (1907, 128 f., 182 f.), and an article by the
present writer in the Expositor for March, 1909. The legitimacy of
this method is denied by Dr. William Milligan (Discussions on theApo-
calypse, 1893, pp. 27-74), Zahn in his Einleitung in das N.T. (§§ 72-75),
and Dr. M. Kohlhofer (Die Einheit der Apocalypse, 1902), amongst
others, but, although both attack and defence have too often proceeded
upon the false assumption that the Apocalypse contains a balanced
series of historical and theological propositions, or that it can be
treated with the ingenuity of a Dante critic, the storm of hypotheses
has at least succeeded in laying bare certain strata in the book, as
well as a teleological arrangement of them in their present position.
The Apocalypse is neither a literary conglomerate nor a mechanical
compilation of earlier shreds and patches. There is sufficient evi-
dence of homogeneity in style and uniformity in treatment to indicate
that one mind has been at the shaping of its oracles in their extant
guise (cf. G. H. Gilbert in Biblical World, 1895, 29-35, 114-123, and
Gallois in Revue Biblique, 1894, 357-374). But the prophet has
worked occasionally as an editor of earlier sources or traditions, as
well as an original composer. These leaflets or traditions are stones
quarried from foreign soils; it is no longer possible¹ to ascertain
with any great certainty when or how or even why they were
gathered. The main point is to determine approximately the object
of the watch-tower which the apocalyptist built by means of them,
and the direction of his outlook. In some cases it is probable that,
alone as a poet and a practical religious seer, he was indifferent to

¹ The state of the extant literature leaves our knowledge of early eschatological
tradition full of gaps. It is less exhilarating but more critical to mark the extent of
the gaps than to attempt to fill them up or to bridge them with more or less airy
guesswork.
their origin, and in every case the important thing is to learn not
the original date or shape of a source, or the particular mythological
matrix of a tradition, but the new sense attached to it by the pro-
phet himself and the precise object to which he adapted it. This
consciousness of a purpose is the least obscure and the most Chris-
tian feature of the Apocalypse. Strictly speaking, it is an apoca-
lypse not of John but of Jesus as the Christ\(^1\) (i. 1), and it is the
triumphant adoration of Christ which gives an inner clue to the
choice and treatment of the various messianic categories. Where
the problems of structure arise, and where source-criticism of some
kind\(^2\) is necessary, in order to account satisfactorily for the literary
and psychological data—is in the juxtaposition of disparate materials
(cf. notes on vii., x., xi., xii., xiii., xiv., xvii., xviii., xix.).

The results reached in the following commentary outline a theory
of the Apocalypse, in its literary aspect, which falls under (a) the
incorporation hypothesis. According to this view, the Apocalypse is
substantially a unity, due to one hand, but incorporating several
older fragments of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin. So Weizsäcker
(ii. 173 f.), Sabatier (Les origines littéraires et la composition de
l'Apocalypse, 1888: Jewish fragments in xi. 1-13, xii., xiii., xiv. 6-20,
xvi. 13-14, 16, xvii. 1-xix. 2, xix. 11-xx. 10, xxi. 9-xxii. 5), Schön
(L'origine de l'Apocalypse, 1887: Jewish fragments in xi. 1-13, xii.
1-9, 13-17, xviii. [except ver. 20]), Boussen, Jülicher (Einleitung in das
N. T., § 22), C. A. Scott, F. C. Porter, A. C. McGiffert (History of

\(^1\) The anti-Jewish note of the Apocalypse is as distinct as, though less loud than,
the anti-Roman. Cf. notes, e.g., on i. 6, 19 f., ii. 9, iii. 7-10, v. 9, 10, x. 7, xi. 19,
xxi. 22, xxii. 18. The Christian church was the new and true Israel, and thus
served herself heir to great traditions and to high destinies which were only inferior
to her own in that they formed a lower slope on the same hill. One of the minor
effects (which differentiates the Apocalypse from the Fourth Gospel) of this concep-
tion is that Christians are not invited by John to love God or Christ; the temper
of their vocation is defined in Jewish terms as a reverent fear of God (cf. xi. 18, xiv. 7,
xv. 4, xix. 5). Another is the avoidance of ἵλαγος as a collective term for the
church and the ignoring of ἵλαγος, δικάγος, ἰπἱβύτερος, etc.—for the twenty-
four celestial ἰπἱβύτερος, of course, have nothing whatever to do with the officials
of the same name.

\(^2\) English criticisms of Völter's first essays by Warfield (Presbyterian Review.
1884, 228-265), and A. Robertson (Critical Review, Jan., 1895), of Vischer and
Sabatier by Salmon (Intro. N. T., pp. 232 f.), of Vischer and of Völter's earlier
theory by Simcox (pp. 213 f.), and of Vischer by Thomson (Books which influenced
Our Lord, pp. 461 f.). Northcote once told Hazlitt that he believed the Waverley
novels were written by several hands, on account of their inequalities. "Some parts
are careless, others straggling; it is only when there is an opening for effect that
the master-hand comes in." There are several criticisms of the Apocalypse which,
with their quasi-reasons, recall this perverse and hapless verdict of a clever man.
Apostolic Age, pp. 633 f.), A. Meyer (Theol. Rundschau, 1907, pp. 132 f.), Abbott, Baljon, Wrede (Entstehung der Schriften des N. T., 103, 104), Schmiedel and Calmes. Pfleiderer’s two Jewish fragments lie in xi.-xiv., xvii.-xviii., and in xxi. 10-xxii. 5. Those who are unwilling to admit the use of any Jewish sources fall back, as a rule, upon (b) the revision hypothesis of an Apocalypse which has been re-edited and brought up to date. This is represented best by Erbes (Die Offenbarung des Johannes, 1891), who regards the original work as Johannine (before A.D. 70, incorporating one fragment of a Caligula apocalypse = xii.-xiii.), with editorial additions (Domitianic) in i. 1-3, 20, vii. 4-8, 13-17, ix. 12, xi. 14, xiiii. 12, 14, xiv. 4, 8-9a, xv. 1, 5-xix. 4, xix. 9b-xx. 10, xxi. 5-xxii. 2 (18-19?). Similarly, but very elaborately, Briggs (Messiah of Apostles, pp. 285 f.) discovers a fourfold process of editing, or rather of materials successively gathering round an original nucleus, while Dr. Barth, in his recent Einleitung in d. N. T. (1908, pp. 250-276) goes to the opposite extreme of simplicity by conjecturing (partly along the lines followed by Grotius) that John simply revised, under Domitian, an earlier apocalypse of his own (written under Nero). Either (a) or (b) is preferable to the overprecision and disintegration of (c), the compilation hypothesis, according to which two or more large sources, fairly complete in themselves, have been pieced together by a redactor or redactors. So Weyland (Omwerkings-en compilatie-hypothesen, etc., 1888: two Jewish sources, with Christian editorial additions (c. A.D. 100) in i. 1-9, 11, 18, 20, ii.-iii., v. 6-14 (vi. 1, 16), ix. 18, x. 7, xi. 8b, 19, xii. 11, 17c, xiv. 1-5, xv. 1, 6-8, xvi. 1-12, 15, 17a, 21, xvii. 14, xix. 7-10, 13b, xxii. 7a, 12, 13, 16-21), K. Kohler (E. J., x. 390-396: two Jewish sources, one from seventh decade, the other slightly later = x. 2-xi. 13, xiiii. 1-xxiii. 10, xiv. 6 f.), Ménégoz (Annales de bibliog. Théol., 1888, 41-45; two Jewish sources), Bruston (Études sur Daniel et l’Apocalypse, 1908, summarising his earlier studies: two Hebrew apocalypses, one Neronic = x. 1, 2, 8-11, xi. 1-13, 19a, xiiii. 1, xiv. 4-end, xv. 2-4, xvi. 13-16, 19b, xvii.-xix. 3, xix. 11-xx.; the other c. A.D. 100 = i. 4 f., ii.-iii., iv.-ix., x. 1, 2b-7, xi. 14-19, xiv. 2-3, 12, 13, xiv. 4-10, xxi. 1-8, xxii. 6-13, 16, 17, 20, 21), Spitta (Offenbarung des Johannes, 1898: two Jewish sources, one b.c. 63 and one c. A.D. 40, with a Christian apocalypse by John Mark c. A.D. 60), Schmidt (Anmerkungen, etc., 1891: three Jewish sources, iv. 1-vii. 8, viii. 2-xi. 15 [except x. 1-xi. 13], xiiii. 1-xxii. 5), Bugène de Faye (Les Apocalypses Juives, 1892, pp. 171 f.: two Jewish apocalypses, one from Caligula’s reign in vii. 1-8, viii. 2-ix. 21, x. 1a, 2b-7, xi. 14-15a, 19, xiiii. 11, etc.; another = A.D. 69-70),
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J. Weiss (die Offenbarung des Johannes, 1904: two sources, one Christian [A.D. 65-70] = i. 4-6, 9-19, ii.-iii., iv.-vi., vii., ix., xii. 7-12, xiii. 11-18, xiv. 1-5, 14-20, xx. 1-15, xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-5; one Jewish, c. A.D. 70), etc. Upon similar lines O. Holtzmann (in Stade's Gesch. Israel, ii. 658 f.) detected two Jewish sources, one imbedded in the other, the earlier from Caligula's period (xiiii, xiv. 6 f.), the later from Nero's. The coast of reality almost disappears from view in Völter's latest theory (die Offenbarung Johannis, neu untersucht u. erklärt, 1904), which is a combination of (b) and (c); it postulates an apocalypse of John Mark (c. A.D. 65) and an apocalypse of Cerinthus (c. A.D. 70 = x. 1-11, xvii. 1-13, xi. 1-16, xv. 5, 6, 8, xvi. 1-21, xix. 11-xxii. 6), both edited under Trajan and under Hadrian. Least successful of all, perhaps, in dealing with the complex literary and traditional data, is (d) the Jewish and Christian hypothesis, which is really a simplified variant of (b); e.g., Vischer (Texte u. Untersuchungen, ii. 3, 1886, 2nd ed. 1895) finds the groundwork of the apocalypse to be an Aramaic Jewish writing (mainly) from A.D. 65-70, which was translated, re-set, and edited by a Christian (in the "Lamb"-passages, with i.-iii., v. 9-14, vii. 9-17, xii. 11, xiii. 9-10, xiv. 1-5, 12, 13, xvi. 15, xvii. 14, xix. 9, 10, 11, 13, xx. 4-6, xxxi. 5-8, xxii. 6-21, etc.). Similarly Harnack (ibid.), Martineau (Seat of Authority, 217-227), and independently, an anonymous writer in the Zeitschrift für alt. Wiss. 1887, 167-171, as well as Dr. S. Davidson (Introd. to N. T., ii., pp. 126-233: the Apocalypse an Aramaic Jewish work translated, with additions and interpolations). Von Soden's theory (Early Christian Literature, pp. 338 f.), which finds in viii. 1-xxii. 5 of the Johannine Apocalypse under Domitian, a Jewish apocalypse written between May and August of A.D. 70, lies, like C. Rauch's (Offenbarung des Johannes, 1894: Jewish composite nucleus, worked up by Christian editor) between (d) and (b).

The unsatisfactory result of many of these hypotheses is due to the use of inadequate criteria or to the inadequate use of right criteria. The distinction of Jewish and Christian elements is particularly hazardous in a book which deals with eschatology, where no Christian could work without drawing upon Jewish traditions. And these were neither stereotyped nor homogeneous. A given passage in the Apocalypse may not be couched in Christian language, but this does not necessarily prove that it was not written by a Christian; we know far too little about Jewish Christianity in the first century to be sure, apart from certain fundamental beliefs about Jesus, how far it diverged from cognate Jewish conceptions. A failure to appreciate either the poetic freedom of the Apocalypticist or the
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characteristic phenomena of apocalyptic writing in general has also
turned some literary analysts into theorists of the narrowest partis.
But such extravagances do not invalidate the legitimacy of the
method in question; without some application of it, the phenomena
of the book present a hopeless literary and psychological enigma,
and it may fairly be concluded as well as argued that this apocalypse,
like most others of its class, is composite to some degree.

§ 4. Characteristic Features.—In spirit as well as in form the
Apocalypse of John has affinities to the apocalyptic literature of the
later Judaism. An apocalypse was the word for a crisis, and for
a crisis which bordered on the end. Whenever such epochs of dire
emergency recurrent, the faith of Israel rose in poignant hope that
by breasting this wave of suffering they would soon be past the
worst, and lie safe out of the swing of the sea. Since the exile,
Israel’s foe had been some foreign power, whose policy threatened
the religious conscience and whose annihilation was eagerly awaited
by the faithful. Apocalypses frankly doomed the State and the world
alike; they maintained an irreconcilable and pessimistic attitude
towards both. Hence their speculation upon empires and emperors.
Hence their constant appeal for courage, based on a conviction that
God would intervene ere long in the political sphere to inaugurate a
reign of the saints on earth. For the apocalypse was a programme
of the immediate future on earth, or of a new earth, as well as a
brilliant panorama of celestial mysteries vouchsafed to men in dreams
or visions. Its subject was invariably & ðai γεροκαρα ἐν ῥέξει. Apo-
calyptical always spread its gorgeous pinions in the dusk of the national
fortunes, but it strained to the near dawn of relief.

Our concern, however, is with the genius rather than with the
genius of John’s Apocalypse. It rises above its class quantum lenta
solent inter uiburna cupressi. The uiburna are not to be ignored,
indeed. Their order is the general order of the Apocalypse, and when
the latter is approached from the side of the early Christian literature,
it seems often to include material of little or no specific Christian value.
There is a certain foreign air and shape about its foliage. But when it
is approached through the tangled underwoods of apocalyptic writings
in general, with their frigid speculations upon cosmic details, their

---

1 For the characteristics of apocalyptic literature, and for the relation of apoca-
lypse to prophecy, cf. §§ 6-19 of Lücke’s epoch-making Versuch einer vollständigen
Einleitung in die Offenbarung Joh. und in die gesammte apok. Literatur (sec. ed.
1822); English summaries and surveys by Dr. Torrey (E. J. i. 669-675); L. Hassé in
Inaugural Lectures (Manchester, 1905, 126-159); Dr. Driver (“Daniel,” 1900, pp.
1xxxvi. f.); Dr. A. C. Zenos in Dict. of Christ and Gospels, i. 79-94; and Dr. R. H.
Charles (E. Bi. 213-250, also 1338-1392 on Eschatology).
wearisome and fantastic calculations, their tasteless and repulsive elements, and the turgid rhetoric which frequently submerges their really fine conceptions, the Apocalypse of John reveals itself as a superior plant. Its very omissions are significant. There is no allusion, e.g., to the prevalent category of the two aons, or to the return of the ten tribes, or to the contemporary Jewish wail over the cessation of sacrifice after A.D. 70 (e.g. in Apoc. Bar. x. 10), or to the martyrs' death as expiatory (cf. 2 Macc. vii. 37 f., 4 Macc. vi. 29, xvii-21, etc.), or to any intercession of the prophet on behalf of the church (cf. 4 Esdras viii.). There is no cosmogony, no self-satisfied comparison of God's people with pagans, no reference to the law1 (in contrast to the contemporary glorification, e.g., in 4 Esdras iii.-ix., Apoc. Bar. xv.-lxix. [cf. Charles' note on xv. 5], where it rivals even the messiah as a medium of fellowship and a nucleus of future bliss). There are no parables (as in 4th Esdras) or allegories; above all, there are no querulous complaints from the living. Carlyle describes the Girondist pamphlets as far too full of long-drawn out ejaculations, "Woe is me, and cursed be ye!" Even 4 Esdras, for all its noble pathos, partakes of this self-pity and fury; it is half-anger and half-agony. But the Apocalypse of John usually breathes another air, mitigating upon the whole the brusque temper of its class. Though the oppression which makes a wise man mad may also make a good man sad, for all the feelings of exasperation and indignation stirred by the empire, the prophet John has not yielded to any pessimism about the cause of God. He never attempts to justify the ways of God, like his Jewish contemporaries, or to explain how the devil gave his power to the beast. His faith in Jesus as the messiah inspires a simple hope which enables him to remain unintimidated by the last threats and terrors of a foe whose end is near. The quarrel with Rome, e.g., is God's affair. His people have merely to stand still and witness their enemy's rout.

It is this faith, this Christian consciousness, with its moral steadiness, which differentiates John's Apocalypse from the other members of its class. To write an apocalypse meant, like the composition of a drama or a sonnet, conformity to certain literary rules or standards as well as approximation to a certain spirit and temper. It justified, if it did not necessitate, the use of earlier fragments, which were only partially intelligible, since the agony of their hour had long passed by. Apocalyptic modified and adapted such sources to the needs of a later generation. There was a sequacity about apocalyptic

1 This is all the more remarkable as contemporary Christians were being led, for ethical reasons, to view their religion more and more from a nomistic standpoint.
An author in this province could not start de novo; not merely had conventional designs or traditions to be followed, but earlier products were commonly treasured and reset. John followed this method, but his regulative principle was unique, and one fascination of his Apocalypse lies in the fact that we have here a Christian prophet half-mastering and half-mastered by the literary exigencies of apocalyptic, uttering his convictions in strange and hardly relevant terms which had hitherto been appropriated to alien ends. His vision of Jesus came to him through an atmosphere of truculent and fantastic messianism, which was scarcely lucid at all points and which tended to refract if not to blur the newer light; yet the Christian messianic belief generally managed to overpower the inadequate, archaic, and incongruous categories of tradition, through which it had often to pass. It is this juxtaposition which helps to explain the occasional awkwardness and artificiality in the symbolism of the Apocalypse. No doubt the author himself, whether as editor or composer, is partly responsible for this. A certain stiffness of structure pervades the book. There is a lack of sustained interest, and at several points the dove-tailing is defective, while, by a favourite Semitic device, repetition (cf. Augustine, Civ. Dei, xx. 17) is made to serve the purpose of emphasis. But such inconsistencies and inequalities are mainly due to the fact that the writer's Christian consciousness repeatedly tends to break through forms too narrow for its fulness. Probably the materials at the author's disposal would have been better arranged, had this been anything less than the presentation of a living Redeemer in heaven as the messiah of God's people upon earth. The mere fact that the messiah had lived, involved a readjustment of messianic categories; the further fact that he had suffered and risen meant that many had to be reshaped. There are things in the Apocalypse which show a careful study of earlier prophetic scriptures and rabbinic traditions; but there are

---

1 This applies to traditions (S. C. 252 f.) as well as to literature (Selwyn, 59 f.). A political and religious crisis promoted the resetting of older eschatological traditions and the resumption of such elements from the common fund or circle of apocalyptic teaching as had acquired special impressiveness (S. C. 221 f.). The different interpretations of Jeremiah's prediction about the 70 years by the authors of Daniel and En. lxxxix. 59 f., are a case in point.

2 One of the clearest instances of this may be found in the angelus interpres (cf. note on i. 1), which also illustrates, by the way, the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. The Fourth Gospel scrupulously avoids connecting angels with Jesus. The only allusion to them, during his life-time, is the popular mistake (xii. 29 f.) which misinterpreted God's voice to him as if it had been an angel's voice. The Apocalypse, on the other hand, swarms with angels.
other things which could only have been taught and learned within
the school of Jesus Christ, and these are really the telling sentences
throughout the book.

At the same time it must be remembered that some of the very
features which have lost much if not all of their significance for
later ages, ornate and cryptic expressions, allusions to coeval hopes
and superstitions, grotesque fantasies and glowing creations of an
oriental imagination, the employment of current ideas about anti-
christ, calculations of the immediate future, and the use of a re-
ligious or semi-mythical terminology which was evidently familiar
to some Asiatic Christians in the first century—these more or less
ephemeral elements combined to drive home the message of the
book. They signify to us the toll which had to be paid to contem-
porary exigencies; without them the book could not have made
its way at all into the conscience and imagination of its audi-
ence. The momentum of its message lay, however, in the deep
sincerity and lofty outlook of the prophet himself, and this broke
out occasionally in passages of unexampled splendour and dignity.
Sublimity, as a contemporary critic of literary style observed
(Pseudo-Longinus, περὶ δύναμις), has always a moral basis; it is, he
declared, the echo of a great soul (μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀρχηγὸς)—or, we
might add, of a great soul exercised upon a great issue. The same
critic makes another remark, which is apposite to a passage like
ch. xviii. of the Apocalypse. One avenue to sublimity, he notes, lies
through imitation of and devotion to great writers of an earlier age:
"Εστι δὲ οὗ κλοπὴ τὸ πράγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν εἰδῶν ἡ πλασμάτων ἡ
δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. This canon throws a ray of light upon
the special psychological problem of the Apocalypse's relation to
its O.T. and extra-canonical models. Some great writers in every
period of literature are only to be understood in the light of a
long series of predecessors, and the prophet John is one of these. His
apocalypse in one aspect is the final and brilliant flash of the red
light which had gleamed from Amos down to the Maccabees. His
affinities in point of form, treatment, and general aim are with the
line of literary prophets who, from Ezekiel to the authors of Daniel,
4th Esdras, and Baruch, applied themselves to the statement and
restatement of apocalyptic eschatology. John's Apocalypse is
flecked with allusions to Ezekiel, Zechariah, and above all Daniel.

1 In two aspects John resembles his prototype Zechariah: (a) in the employ-
ment of an intricate symbolism, which makes it difficult to be sure where intuition
ends and literary decoration begins, (b) in the use of schematism to explain provi-
dence. For the latter, cf. Giesebrecht's Die Berufsgabung der alttest. Propheten
But his use of Daniel especially is more than that of a *littérature* reproducing impressive and poetic conceptions from the study of a classic. For all the artistic and even artificial literary shape of the book, we should weigh it in the wrong scales were we to estimate it as the work of an author who simply drew upon such earlier models for his own later purposes. As contemporary rabbis not only pondered over passages like the Egyptian plagues, the prophecy of Gog and Magog, and the opening vision of Ezekiel, but even had ecstatic visions of heaven granted them (*cf.* R. J., 350, 379), so the prophet John was not a mere literary artist or a student of prophecy or an editor of earlier fragments. He was that, but he was more. Two features of his book differentiate him from such a class of writers; (a) he was a prophet in his own way, and (b) his consciousness had been so powerfully affected by the post-exilic Judaism, as well as by contemporary beliefs, that it is not possible to derive his conceptions exclusively from those of the canonical Old Testament.¹

These two features partially coalesce. As a prophet, no less than as a student of the prophetic and apocryphal scriptures, John believed that the predictions of Daniel were at last on the point of being fulfilled. This was the assurance which dominated his whole treatment of the O.T. in general. It explains how he appropriated and applied time-honoured messianic predictions which he considered relevant to Jesus the true messiah, and it also serves to account psychologically for the form of several visions (*e.g.*, that of ch. i.), which imply a mind already brooding over some of these passages. A well-known instance of this suggestion of visions occurs in Tertullian's *De anima*, ix.: "Est hodie soror apud nos revelationum charismata sortita, quas in ecclesia inter dominica sollemnia per

¹ The author knows the Hebrew original as well as the LXX (or, at any rate, some of his sources do), but the LXX quotations, or rather references (*Swete, pp. cxxxv.-cxlvi.* and reminiscences—for no formula of citation occurs—occasionally *cf.* i. 7, ix. 20, x. 6, xii. 7, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xx. 4, 11) mark a deliberate divergence, not unexampled in the N.T., towards what was apparently a pre-Christian Greek version of the Hebrew, approximating to the version of Theodotion (particularly in Daniel). They thus anticipate the later preference of writers like Origen for the Theodotionic Daniel (*cf.* Salmon's *Intro. to N.T.*, pp. 547 f., and *Swete's Intro. to the O.T. in Greek*, pp. 46 f.), or else they prove that he was translating directly from the Hebrew text (*so e.g.* in i. 6, xi. 4 ?, xiv. 8, 18). For instances of composite O.T. reminiscences *cf.* Selwyn, pp. 62-64.
ecstasini spiritupatitur; conuersatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum Domino, et uidet et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda dinoiscit, et medicinas desiderantibus submittit. Iam vero prout scripturae leguntur aut psalmi canuntur aut allocationes proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiae visionibus subministrantur". When John's soul is stirred to creative vision or prediction, it is usually something he has heard or read in Daniel or Ezekiel which is moving on the face of the waters. But the form taken by some of the oracles cannot be explained simply from the sacred scriptures, and it is therefore necessary to define separately and more precisely each of the features which have been just mentioned, even though the former necessarily involves the latter.

(a) The mind of a prophet like John is, in Wordsworth's phrase, "a feeling intellect," which instinctively embodies ideas in symbols. Thought rises before it in pictorial shape. Symbols are idea and picture at once; they embody beliefs and are also realities of a kind. Conceptions clothe themselves in vivid representations which are effective either on account of their traditional associations or from the aptness of their contemporary allusions, though it is often difficult for a modern reader to fathom their origin in the writer's mind or to estimate the precise relation between the figurative element and the definite idea which that element is intended to enshrine. The difficulty is doubled when, as in the present case, we have occasionally to deal with an ecstatic experience. The material to be interpreted includes the reflective working of the prophet's mind upon a previous mental condition, the literary presentment (with some expansions, rearrangement and embellishment) of what he remembers to have seen in the exalted moments of rapture, together with the impressions produced by these upon his later consciousness. The Apocalypse is not a continuous vision. In parts, it is not a vision at all. There are rhapsodies in it, but it is not a rhapsody. Occasionally the prophet speaks as a counsellor, or writes as an editor of earlier fragments, or calculates the future in terms of traditional eschatology. The very elaboration with which the details and design of the book are worked out precludes any idea of it as a mere transcript of visions written when the seer's memory was fresh, even though some phrases were set down as reflective or editorial glosses. At the same time, the nucleus and the origin of the book are inexplicable apart from the presupposition of

1On this power of the poetic Eastern imagination, at certain stages of culture, to fill sensuous forms with a higher content, see some admirable remarks in Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, i. 287 ff.
a definite religious experience which assumed in part the form of a
trance or rapture. Vision here, as elsewhere, in apocalyptic litera-
ture is occasionally the literary form of allegory and tradition; but
not always. The psychological problem is to explain the relation
between this inner consciousness of inspiration and the curious
imaginative forms in which the prophet seemed to think it needful
to embody his Christian conceptions. He employs a large number
of suggestive figures and metaphors, drawn from the Old Testament
and elsewhere, in spite of their literal inadequacy; these phantas-
magoria it is impossible to regard as mere symbols, but on the other
hand they are hardly to be taken literally in the case of John any
more than that of the later prophets of Judaism (cf. Riehm's Mes-
sianic Prophecy, pp. 228 f.) from whom he borrowed many of them.
Often the best way to explain them is to let them appeal to the
religious imagination, since it is in this way that they are likely to
disclose any permanent truth of which they may be at once the
vesture and the vehicle. But whatever they are, they are suggestive,
not dogmatic; they are poetic coefficients rather than logical defini-
tions of the author's faith.

The comparative independence with which, like the psalmists (cf.
Cheyne's Origin of the Psalter, pp. 285, 286), he occasionally em-
joys "anthropomorphic, or, let us say at once, mythic expressions,
is a consequence of the sense of religious security which animates"
him. These expressions helped out his Christian consciousness by
their vivid realism and their time-honoured associations in the circles
for which he wrote. He could embody in them some deeper truths
of his own faith. In this weird world of fantasy, peopled by a rich
Oriental imagination with spectral shapes and uncouth figures,¹
where angels flit, eagles and altars speak, and monsters rise from
sea and land—in a world of this kind many Asiatic Christians of that
age evidently were at home, and there the prophet's message had
to find them. Often the point of an allusion lies in some half-
forgotten contemporary belief; the terms of it may be superstitious
enough, but the aim is predominantly spiritual. An apt illustration
of this procedure in the sphere of popular religion is afforded by
Luther's well-known use of the superstition about the wood of the
cross. "The cross of Christ," he writes in one of his letters, "is
parted throughout all the world, and every one meets with his
portion. Do not you therefore reject it, but rather accept it as the

¹ Even grotesque symbols of an Oriental cast would appeal to Hellenic readers
who were familiar, e.g., with the "Ἀρτεμὶς τολῆματος of Ephesus, on whose statue
winged bulls and rams appear (cf. Apoc. iv. 5 f.).
most holy relic, to be kept, not in a gold or silver chest, but in a golden heart, that is, a heart imbued with gentle charity." Here we have a Christian message couched poetically and effectively in terms of a familiar superstition which neither Luther nor his readers any longer shared. A similar explanation may fairly be applied now and then to John's poetic use of the superstitions about amulets, talismans, secret names, and the like, although it is often a fair question: how far his language is faded metaphor, and whether he did not sincerely attach himself to some of the current beliefs which underprop his imagery. Otherwise we must allow that details are often used for their poetical impressiveness, which depends on the power of starting old associations and of suggesting dim, mysterious beliefs.

His relation to history is equally free. Nothing could well be more jejuné than to suppose that he is covertly conveying political information to his readers, or laboriously spelling out the course of providence from the politics, warfare, and meteorology of his age. History does not move in neat systems of seven, and even apocalyptic prophecy—for all its artificial dogmas and tendency to produce an impression by means of prediction—forms no calendar of exact events to come, much less any chronicle of recent happenings. It is the dogmatic programme which is uppermost in apocalyptic. The seer, by virtue of his inherited ideas, knew how external events must move; his schematism was more to him than anything else, and this accounts for the large haggadic element in such writings (cf. Baldensperger, 100, 117 f.). But John's prophetic impulse in the revelation of Jesus to his spirit overbore the tendency to rest the weight of his message on exact disclosures of the future. "For the mass of his audience," George Eliot says of Savonarola (Romola, ch. xxv.), "all the pregnancy of his preaching lay in his strong assertion of supernatural claims, in his denunciatory visions, in the false certitude which gave his sermons the interest of a political bulletin." John's forecasts, such as they were, did not aim, at any rate, at the gratification of curiosity, and even his dogmatic programme was little more than a traditional form of expressing his absolute certainty that the God of Jesus Christ would conquer evil.

(b) As a product of Asiatic Christianity towards the close of the first century, no less than as a member of a literary class which was usually heterogeneous in eschatology, the Apocalypse further reflects the religious syncretism which prevailed especially in Phrygia and

1 Thus in ii.-iii., especially, Christians are promised a real initiation into the privileges of the Divine cult after death, instead of the pagan cults which they abjure.
the surrounding districts. The visions of the book are frequently put in terms of local and contemporary religion. Even the contour of what are apparently Old Testament reminiscences is occasionally modified by the collateral foreign tendencies which permeated post-exilic Judaism, especially along apocalyptic lines (cf. Cheyne’s *Bible Problems*, 70 f.). Thus (a) the Babylonian background of several conceptions is now recognised on all hands (see notes on i. 4, 20, iv. 7, 8, v. 6, vi. 1 f., xiii. 11, xiv. 6, xix. 7, 16, xxii. 1-2, 18, xxii. 1, 16). The gnosticism of Asia Minor during the second century reveals the survival and adaptation of more than one feature which was ultimately due to Babylonian mythology or astro-theology, and the previous developments of Judaism had already assimilated ideas from the older speculations of the Babylonians. (b) Along with this, traits corresponding to analogous conceptions in Egyptian religion are fairly common (see notes on i. 8, ii. 7, 11, 17, 26 f., iv. 3, 9, v. 13, vii. 16, xii., xiv. 5, xv. 6, xxii. 4, 16). This is hardly surprising, as Egyptian prophecy probably affected Hebrew prophecy (cf. Wilcken in *Hermes*, 1905, 544 f.), as the relations between Asia Minor and Egypt were close, and as the latter country was the natural home of eschatology. (c) The Hellenic traits, though fewer and fainter, are not inconspicuous (cf. notes on ii. 17, iv. 11, vii. 9, 16, viii. 5, ix. 11, xii., xv. 6, xx. 8 f.), but specifically Orphic features (cf. Maas, *Orpheus*, 1895, pp. 250-261) are scarcely recognisable. (d) The Zoroastrian

---

1 Especially behind xii. (cf. Calmes, *Rev. Biblique*, 1903, 52-68, and Jeremias, pp. 34 f.). But cosmological traits or traditions from Babylonia will not explain the entire form of this oracle (cf. Cheyne’s *Bible Problems*, 195-207, and Kohlhofer, pp. 72 f.), and even elsewhere they break down. Thus it is extremely questionable if the Babylonians had any conception of the millennium or of the resurrection of the dead; the accusing function of the devil is absent from Babylonian theology, as are the features of xiii. 11-17; and the Babylonian origin of the heavenly temple seems to be highly doubtful (cf. Prof. G. B. Gray in *Expos.*, 1908, May-June).

2 The same writer Thera, i., pp. 237 f.) fostered the later Imperial cultus of Rome. Some further Egyptian parallels are collected by Miss A. Grenfell in *The Monist* (1906), 179-200.

3 The English reader may consult Prof. Moulton’s article on “Zoroastrianism” in *Hastings’ Dict. B.*, vol. iv., E. Bi. iv. 5428-5442, Lightfoot’s *Colossians*, pp. 385 f.), and Renan (pp. 470 f.). I have stated and discussed the general evidence in *H. y.*, 1903-1904. The best investigations are in the *Jahrb. für protest. Theologie*, by Hübschmann (1879, pp. 203-245) and Brandt (1892, pp. 405 f., 575 f.) respectively. Cf. also Böklen and Stave (§ 10).
influence is strongly marked, though not so strongly as Völter, in his latest volume (pp. 29 f., 63 f., 86 f., 116 f.), would make out. This, like that of Babylonia, reaches back not simply to the indirect channel of the post-exilic Judaism, but apparently to an almost direct relationship. In Zoroastrian angelology and eschatology alone, for example, does anything adequate correspond to the sort of conceptions which in their present shape are peculiar, or almost peculiar, to the Apocalypse: *viz.* (i.) the binding or noosing of the fiend (xx. 1 f., cf. *S. B. E.*, v. 19), (ii.) the blasting of the third part of the earth (viii. 7 f., cf. *S. B. E.*, v. 164, where the climax of the evil spirit's work is that "he took as much as one-third of the base of the sky in a downward direction, into a confined and captive state"), (iii.) the seven spirits of God (i. 4, cf. *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, i. 384-385, and *S. B. E.*, iv. pp. lxxi. f.), (iv.) the guardian *fravashi* of the churches (see note on i. 20—quite an Avestan touch), (v.) the recrudescence of evil genii before the consummation (xx. 7 f., cf. Stave, pp. 227 f.), (vi.) the emphasis on the millennium-period, and (vii.) the renewal of the universe. See, further, notes on i. 13, ii. 5, iv. 3, vii. 17, xi. 5 f., xiv. 17 f., xvi. 13, 20. Upon the other hand, no distinct references to Mithraism (as, e.g., against Barns in *Expos.*, iii. 220 f.: Titan, the number of the Beast = Mithra as sun-god) can be detected, while the Buddhistic or Indian parallels are scanty and as a rule remote.

Nothing is more deceptive than such coincidences between primitive religions. *Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem.* They may simply be due in certain cases to analogous but independent movements of the religious feeling in different quarters. Here as elsewhere inferences have to be drawn with extreme caution, yet there is good reason to believe that a number of the special traditions and paraphernalia used in the Apocalypse owed part of their form, if not of their content, to ideas which were current in Jewish and pagan circles during the first century in Asia Minor. The coincidences with Oriental religious conceptions (cf., e.g., J. Brandis in *Hermes*, 1867, pp. 259-284) are too numerous and too striking to be dismissed in every case as accidental. Even when the cord is Christian, it may be spun out of several variegated threads, though it is often diffic-

1 Plutarch (*De Iside*, 46 f.), in describing the Zoroastrian doctrines of the Magi as these were known to Romans and Greeks of the first century A.D., closes by sketching the final doom of Ahriman, when the earth lies smooth under a single ruler and a single language, and "at the end Hades shall fail and men be happy" (Apoc. xx. 6-14). Similarly, the fierce doom of Apoc. xix. 17-18, where birds are summoned to eat the flesh of messiah's victims, is probably a reflex of the supreme penalty inflicted on the carcases of those who resist Mazdeism, *viz.*, that they be devoured by birds of prey (*S. B. E.*, iv. 27, 131).
cult and sometimes impossible to determine where the threads were
drawn from. Clemen’s Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen
Testaments (1909) is a convenient handbook to the whole subject of
these highways and byways of the apocalyptic fairy-land.

§ 5. The Nero-redivivus Myth.—The most central of these co-
efficients, drawn from a mixture of supernatural and political legends,
is the belief in the return of a Nero-antichrist from the underworld.

The massacre of A.D. 64 had invested Nero with such peculiar
infamy for the early Christians, that it is not surprising to find
Satan’s chief agent in the final attack upon God’s kingdom depicted
by the prophet John as an infernal Nero, issuing from the under-
world to head a coalition of the East against Rome and then against
the Christ. Both the Jewish and the Christian literature of this
period show traces of the successive phases of the Nero-redivivus
anticipation (Suet. Nero, 47).1 The legend sprang up on Roman
soil. People could hardly credit the tyrant’s death, so sudden and
secret had been its circumstances. A curious mixture of relief and
regret prevailed after the removal of the last member of the Julian
dynasty at the age of thirty-two. For some time, indeed, a more or
less sincere belief (Tacit., Hist. ii. 8, 9) prevailed, that he could not
have died, but must be lying hidden somewhere in the East. This
idea was suggested by his friendly relations with Parthia, and per-
haps corroborated by the wide-spread notion, which he had encour-
aged in his own life-time, that he would reign over the East from
Jerusalem, or that Rome was to be supplanted by an Eastern empire
persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri eo ipso tem-
pore fore ut ualesceret Oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur;
cf. Joseph. Bell. vi. 5, 4). On the strength of this superstition,
edicts were actually issued in Nero’s name, ‘quasi uiuentis et breui
magnio inimicorum malo reuersuri’ (Suet. Nero, 57). The East
was disturbed by pretenders, who exploited this superstition. One

1 In Sib. iv. 119 f. the great king (i.e., Nero) flies away wounded across the
Euphrates into Parthian territory, while in Sib. iv. 137-139 (after 80 A.D.) the
eruption of Vesuvius is taken as a portent of Nero’s immediate return from the East
with a huge retinue to wreak vengeance on Rome. In another of these Asiatic
oracles (v. 143-147, dating 72-74 A.D.) the flight of the detested and unpopular
Nero from Babylon (i.e., Rome) to the Parthians is described. He reaches the
kingdom of the Medes and Persians, to return in the last days (361 f.) for a bloody con-
quest of the earth (κοσμομανής πόλεμος). Cf. Geffcken’s studies “Zur älteren
The presence of the Nero-myth in the Apocalypse seems to have been first re-dis-
covered by a Spanish Jesuit, Juan Mariana, who commented on the book in 1619.
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appeared shortly (Tac. Hist. ii., 8-9) after Nero’s death; another (Terentius Maximus) came forward in 80 A.D., who bore a physical resemblance to the emperor, and was only surrendered by the Parthians to Domitian after some years of power; a third emerged in 88 A.D. (Suet. Nero, 57). This created disaffection, especially in the Eastern provinces (Tacit. Hist. i. 2: “mota prope etiam Parthorium arma falsi Neronis ludibrio”), where revolutionary hopes and dislike of the existing régime were only too easily excited. Even under Trajan, Nero was believed by some to be still alive somewhere (Dio Chrysost. Orat., xxii.), but by that time the illusion had been broken for most people, or rather it had been transmuted into the shuddering belief that Nero would return from the under-world. The political expectation thus became semi-supernatural or transcendental.¹ In certain Jewish and early Christian circles towards the close of the first century, particularly throughout Asia Minor, Nero-redivivus became fused with the other weird figures of Beliar and the antichrist. To some of the Romans Domitian was another Nero. To the Christians who shared John’s view, Nero was to come again in another form. The Apocalypse passes over the Beliar-myth of a Satanic accuser who thwarts and seduces God’s people (cf. Introd. to 2 Thessalonians); incidentally, it assigns this function to the dragon, Satan (xii. 10). But it follows one cycle of Jewish tradition in associating antichrist with some political or foreign persecuting power (Antiochus Epiphanes, Daniel; Pompey = dragon, Ps. Sol. ii. 29; head of Roman Empire, Apoc. Bar., xxxix.-xl.). The dragon Satan delegates his authority on earth to the Roman empire and emperor. The supreme enemy on earth, however, is the weird, spectral figure of this reventant Nero, who reappears in history (A. C. pp. 184 f.; cf. for contemporary Jewish evidence, Dr. L. Ginzberg in E. J., i. 625-627 on Nero as the devil-antichrist). Thus it is that the saga is doubled, not in xiii. 1-10, 11-18, so much as in xvii., and this doubling seems to be anticipated even in xi. 7 (compare xiii. 1 f.). The seduction of the Jews by antichrist proper (xi. 7 f.) is subordinated by the prophet John to the seduction of the pagan nations (xiii.-xiv., xvi.-xviii.), the latter being regarded as a far more ominous sign of the end. On the other hand, Nero-redivivus is employed, quite in Old Testament fashion, as the unconscious instrument of the divine vengeance upon Rome-Babylon; then he falls as a just victim to God’s wrath.

¹ On the apocalypse as a means of transition from political to transcendental messianism, see Dr. Shailer Mathews’ scholarly pages (pp. 25 f.) in his Messianic Hope in the New Testament (1906).
The eschatological portent of Nero-redivivus, however, was bound up with the pressing claim of the Roman emperors to be worshipped as divine, and it was the latter peril which formed at once the occasion and the theme of John’s Apocalypse.

§ 6. The Imperial Cultus.—Over two centuries earlier the great exemplar of apocalyptic literature had been issued in order to nerve the faithful who were persecuted for refusing to admit the presumptuous divine claims of Antiochus Epiphanes. The Apocalypse of John is a latter-day pamphlet thrown up by a similar crisis. The prophet believed that the old conflict had now revived in its final form; Daniel’s predictions were on the way to be fulfilled at last in an age when the Roman emperor insisted upon being worshipped as the august lord and god of men!

Since the days of Augustus, the emperor had been viewed as the guardian and genius of the empire, responsible for its welfare and consequently worthy of its veneration. It was a convenient method of concentrating and expressing loyalty, to acknowledge him as entitled to the prestige of a certain sanctity, even during his lifetime. There were no monarchical traditions available to strengthen the sense of imperial patriotism, and it was a politic step of the emperor to permit a certain adoration to gather round his official figure, an adoration which was generally the outcome of gratitude to the dead and deference to the living ruler for his θεοφανεία (cf. Rushforth’s Latin Historical Inscriptions, pp. 46 f., and A. J. H. Greenidge’s Roman Public Life, pp. 440, 444, with Gwatkin’s article in Hasting’s D.B., iv., pp. 293-295). The imperial cultus in this aspect was instinctive rather than deliberate, developing out of certain germs within the ancient mind, such as the blend of religion and patriotism among the Persians, the custom of hero-worship (especially prevalent in the Ionian islands, e.g., at Thera, cf. CIG, 2467—2473, Usener’s Göttnernamen, 1896, pp. 249-250), and the worship of the Ptolemies which shocked the pious Plutarch. Its primary aim was to foster patriotism by presenting a symbol of

1 For the Latin germs of Caesar-worship, prior to Augustus, see Mr. E. Fiddes in Historical Essays (Manchester), 1902, pp. 1-15. Many heroes were πάρεξθεν θεοί, associated with specific gods in a cult as σύννεφοι or σύνθερμοι of the gods (cf. E. Kornemann’s essay “Zur Gesch. der antiken Herrscherkulte” in Beiträge zur alten Gesch., i. 51 f.); e.g., the later Attalidae at Pergamum had statues in the temple dedicated to them as divine (pp. 85 f.). The shrinking of the Christian conscience from this deification or apotheosis reveals the significance of the divine honours paid to Jesus in the Apocalypse. The position assigned him by Christian faith was no result of apotheosis.
the solidarity and unity of the empire. Its political convenience, however, lent it increasing momentum. Gradually, on the worship of the Lares Augusti in Italy and the capital (Rushforth, pp. 59 f.) and on the association of the imperial cultus with that of dea Roma (to whom a temple had been erected at Smyrna as far back as 195 B.C.), the new canonisation rose to its height, never jealous of local cults, but thriving by means of its adaptability to the religious syncretism of the age. It was the religious sanction of the new imperialism. It had temples, sacrifices, choirs (as at Smyrna), and even a priesthood (the sodales Augustales) of its own.

For obvious reasons the cult flourished luxuriantly in the provinces, particularly in Asia Minor, where the emperor was often regarded as an incarnation of the local god or named before him. Distance lent enchantment to the provincial view of the emperor. Any sordid traits or idiosyncrasies retired into the background before the adoration felt for the divinity which hedged this unseen, powerful figure, who was hailed with a mixture of servility and real gratitude as “the Saviour,” “the Peace,” “the αἰτωρ” of the world, or as the lord of men (κύριος, dominus; cf. Kattenbusch, ii. pp. 612 f.). Asia Minor became a hotbed of the cultus. The mere recognition of an abstract empire with its authority providentially vested in the emperor passed often into a religious adulation of the latter, as θεός (cf. Thieme’s Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander u. das N.T., pp. 28 f.). The annual festival or diet of the nine Asiatic townships, which served as an organ of government throughout the province, readily coalesced with an annual festival in honour of the reigning


2 With the title of Jesus (ἡ ἄρχη τῆς πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ), in Apoc. iii. 14, contrast the servile language of the decree issued (c. 9 B.C.) by the Asiatic κοινόν, fixing New Year’s Day as the emperor’s birthday: ἦν τῇ τῶν πάνων ἄρχῃ οὖν Βασίλειον δὲ εἶναι ὑπολαλθόμενον (τούτῳ αὐτῷ ἄρχῃν τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ζωῆς γενόμενον). Cf. Dittenberger’s Orientis Graeci Inscription. Selectae, 458.
emperor (Mommsen, Provinces, i., 344 f.). The Asiarchs probably organised and pushed the new religion, even more than the local magistrates (cf. xiii. 11 f.). At any rate the cultus, attaching itself like mistletoe to institutions and local rites alike, shot up profusely; polytheism found little trouble in admitting the emperor to a place beside the gods, and occasionally, as in the case of Augustus and Apollo, or of Domitian and Zeus, “the emperor was represented as the deity incarnate in human form” (C. B. P. i. 53 f.). The islands also shared in this cult, as they had previously shared in the worship of the Ptolemies. At Thera, for example, a pagan altar has been found which was dedicated “to the almighty Caesar, the son of God” (contrast Apoc., ii. 18). This divi filius title was one of the most common and least conventional of what John called βλασφημίας δόματα.

The inevitable clash between this cult and the sensitive monotheism of Judaism was struck during the latter years of the insane madcap, Caligula (39-41 A.D.). His pretensions to divinity would have been ridiculous, if they had not been dangerous. But he deified himself in literal earnest by means of incense, gestures, and clothing (cf. Joseph. Antiqu. xviii. 7-8, xix. 1-2; Suet. Calig. 22); and the climax of his insults to Judaism—the proposed erection of his statue in the temple at Jerusalem—was only averted by the prudent temporising of Petronius and the murder of the emperor himself. Under Claudius matters righted themselves. Still, the shock of the crisis (cf. Eus. H. E. ii. 5-6) left a deep impression on the conscience of the Jews. It revived the worst memories of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the dread remained, as Tacitus allows, that some other emperor might attempt what Caligula had failed in (cf. Spitta 490 f.). Echoes of this are to be heard possibly in 2 Thess. and the synoptic apocalypse as well in Apoc. xiii., which (according to many critics) is based upon a source either Christian (Erbes 19 f., Bruston, Briggs) or Jewish (Spitta, Pfeiderer, de Faye, O. Holtzmann, Rauch adding xvi. 13-14, 16), dating from this period. On this view, the general tenor

1 Otherwise, xii. 18-xiii. 7 is held to contain a Jewish fragment (Kohler, J. Weiss), concluded in xix. 11-21, which dates from 70 A.D. Similarly Schmidt, Weyland, Wellhausen, and others (Neronic). “Caligula”, in Hebrew (Gaskulgas = רווקא) as in Greek (ΓΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΓΑΠ) is equivalent by gematria to 616, the variant to which Irenæus objected (cf. on xiii. 18); but so is KAICAP ΘΕΟC (Deissmann: Licht vom Osten, 199 f.) as well as the shortened form of “Nero Caesar”. For a discussion of the Beast’s number, see the recent symposium by Clemen, Corsen, Bruston, and Vischer in Freuchen’s Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wiss. 1901-1904.
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of the oracle required only a few alterations to render it applicable to the later situation, when Nero and Domitian had become for Christians what Caligula had been for the Jews half a century earlier. The arguments for this literary hypothesis, however, are not oxen strong enough to pull the plough (cf. notes on xiii.).

Hitherto Christians had been out of the fray. Even Nero's massacre of them was a freak of personal violence, justified by their reputation for hostility to the State, and apparently prompted by Jewish malevolence. It had nothing whatever to do with the imperial cultus. The latter was not seriously enforced until the second part of Domitian's reign. Like Caligula, formerly and Diocletian afterwards, this emperor (cf. Schoener, in Acta Semin. Philologici Erlang. 1881, pp. 476 f.) laid claim to the title of dominus et deus, and though his claim was not official, it was none the less serious. Hence, while he proved a "second Nero" to the Christians no less than to his own restive subjects, the former had special reasons for remembering the reign of terror,

"When Vespasian's brutal son
Cleared Rome of what most shamed him."

The strict and harsh enforcement of the poll-tax (Suet. Domit. 12) pressed heavily upon the Jews, indeed, but otherwise they were generally undisturbed, since normally, under the semi-tolerant policy of the empire, they were not obliged to erect or worship statues of the emperor (Joseph. Apion. ii. 6). They sacrificed for him, not to him. As a national religion, Judaism had its own rights like the rest. But Christianity was not a religio licita, and the Nazarene faith, by the sheer force of its principles and the success of its contemporary propaganda, had soon to face the exercise of the law against illicit cults (especially when these refused the test of swearing by the emperor's genius). The very differentiation of Christianity from Judaism, which had become increasingly plain ever since Nero's outburst, deprived the

1 The bisellium, a splendid double throne, was assigned as a divine honour to Caligula alone after Caesar. Contrast Apoc. xxii. 1.

2 They suffered under Domitian not for their personal faith but for the success of their propaganda in making proselytes; cf. S. Gsell's Essai sur le Règne de l'Empereur Domitien, pp. 313 f.

3 The most recent discussion is by Klette in Die Christen-Katastrophe unter Nero (1907; cf. the present writer's review in H. J., 1908, 704-707). Renan's coloured pages (pp. 124 f.) and Hausrath's graphic outline (Hist. of N.T. Times. The Apostles iv. 168 f.) must be checked by the statements of Ramsay (Church in Roman Empire ch. xi.) and of Mr. B. W. Henderson in his Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero (1903).
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former of its right to the shelter of the imperial aegis and rendered it liable to the religious and patriotic tax of the Caesar-worship which Domitian's claim now emphasised. The growth of the new faith and the deepening need of the imperial cultus as a national bond of loyalty made a collision between the church and the State inevitable; and, although no literary record exists of the opening movement in the campaign, the correspondence of Trajan and Pliny is now recognised pretty generally to presuppose an earlier stage in the policy of the empire towards Christianity—a stage most probably associated with the later years of Domitian (cf. Neumann’s der Röm. Staat u. die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian, 1890, i. pp. 7 f. 11-15). Then the conflict became more than sporadic (οἱ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ Δομιτιανοῦ διωγμοί, Mart. Ign. 1). Domitian not only permitted but encouraged and enforced the payment of divine honours to himself; compliance with the rites of the Caesar cultus was made the convenient test of loyalty for Christians who had hitherto been arraigned for the most part upon criminal charges (flagitia cohaerentia nomini) such as anarchy; confession of the Name of Christ now involved a refusal to give the emperor the name of deus or divus, and, as John put it, all who refused to worship the image of the beast or to be marked by his name were liable to death. The religious recusant was naturally suspected of dése majesté. When his religious susceptibilities were outraged by the quasi-deification of the emperor, his protest was viewed as a veiled pretext for rebellion, as well as an assertion of ἀθεὸς or sacrilege (cf. for Domitian’s reign, Lightfoot’s Clem. Rom. i. pp. 104-115). But whether obstinatio or ἀθεὸς or maiestas, the crime was visited with the same penalties.

This conflict of loyalties is the business of the Apocalypse. At

1 The connexion of the Apocalypse with this Domitianic phase is also worked out by A. Matthaei (Preussische Jahrb. 1905, 402-479) from the Roman standpoint. He argues (477 f.) that the first ὄρθαδος of ch. xiii. is the imperial cultus itself, while the second symbolises the provincial authorities especially in Asia Minor. Ramsay (Seven Letters, p. 97) partly agrees with the latter identification, taking the ὄρθαδος of xiii. 11 f. to mean “the Province of Asia in its double aspect of civil and religious administration,” but the probability (see notes) is that the writer is thinking of the Asiatic priests of the imperial cultus, who may have played a part like that of the Buddhist and Taoist priests during the Boxer rising in China, or like that of the officials of the Russian Church in the recent campaign against the Milkist sectaries. It is noticeable that there is no Christian antithesis, in the way of priesthood, to Satan’s embodiment in the priesthood of the imperial cultus (xiii. 11 f.), whereas the latter in the sense of false prophet is implicitly contrasted with the true prophetic order of Christianity, as are the official ὄψεως of the cultus at Pergamos and elsewhere with the singers of hymns to God and Jesus in the Apocalypse.
the first shock of persecution in Asia Minor over the principle of the imperial cultus, John grasped with moral power the truth that this was not a local skirmish but a matter of life or death to the church. The issue between ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ and ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ was to be neither compromised nor confused; the worship of the emperor, even as a form of patriotism, and the adoration of Jesus as the Christ of God were incompatible. The State did not realise this until afterwards, when the dimensions and irrepressible vigour of the Christian movement revealed it as a menace to the older civilisation of the empire. As yet the Nazarene faith was little more than one of the numerous Oriental weeds which had to be rooted out as immoral, anti-social, and unpatriotic; it was mainly notable for its tenacity of life. The State did not dream as yet of regarding these atheists and anarchists as a rival power. It was contemptuous rather than distrustful of the new faith. That this sect within a sect, or rather this struggling offshoot of the Jewish superstition, would outlive the empire which treated it as the legions treated the daisies on their line of march, must have seemed then the infatuation of a narrow-minded fanatic. History, by justifying this expectation, has proved that it was more than a magnificent reach of the religious instinct, that it was in fact what men have agreed to label rather than define as "inspired". It is true that the messianic and apocalyptic traditions, with which the prophet worked, tended to foreshorten his view of the campaign. The host of martyrs were not crowded into a brief interval, and the triumph of the church over the empire came in a very different way from what the prophet or any of his contemporaries imagined. But the Apocalypse penetrated to the heart of the issue. The resolve which it knit and the hope which it kindled were substantially the faith which nerved the later church, from Ignatius and Polycarp onwards. What "faithfulness to death" (cf. ii. 10) involved may be illustrated from the normal procedure of the pro-consul in Bithynia, where Pliny, as he tells us, had people brought before him who were accused, sometimes anonymously and sometimes erroneously, of being Christians. They included persons of both sexes, all ages, and varying health. After being thrice warned, those who still adhered to their confession of faith were, in consequence of the cognitio or preliminary investigation, either imprisoned and killed (if provincials, cf. Apoc. ii. 13) or deported to Rome (if Roman citizens, cf. Apoc. xvii. 6, Ignatius, etc.). Others, however, were not so loyal to their Lord. When an

1 There were the Μαθηταί and Άγγελοι, e.g., of Apoc. xxi. 8. Cowardice was particularly dangerous on account of its infectious nature. For the bad example of the
opportunity of recantation was offered, some denied any recent connexion with Christianity, telling the proconsul that they had been (some twenty years ago, i.e., c. 93 A.D., the period of the Apocalypse), but no longer were, Christians. Some also had no objection to offer incense before the image of the emperor or to curse publicly the name of Christ. This was the criterion applied to the suspect, and it was largely due to the propagation of such resolute ideas as are expounded in the Apocalypse that Christians were kept loyal to their faith, and that, without a tear in their eye or a sword in their hand, they were able eventually to change the face of the world by enforcing the recognition of their claims at the hands of the empire. Like the conventicles of the Scottish Covenanters, the primitive Christian churches were accused of immorality and sedition, but, unlike them, they succeeded by passive resistance pure and simple. The Apocalypse is a call to arms, but the arms are only patience and loyalty to conviction.

It is unnecessary to assume that any widespread persecution under Domitian, or indeed any “persecution” in the later and technical sense of the term, was before the prophet’s mind, in order to account for the language and spirit of the Apocalypse. John himself had only been banished or imprisoned, like some of his friends (ii. 10, Clem. Rom. ix. and cf. on i. 9). But from the position of matters he already argued the worst. The few cases of repressive interference and of martyrdom in Asia Minor (and elsewhere)
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were enough to warn him of the storm rolling up the sky, though as yet only one or two drops had actually fallen. Eusebius probably exaggerates when he speaks of ‘many others’ along with Clemens and Domitilla (iii. 18), and the period of terror was admittedly short (H. E., xx. 9-11, cf. Tert. Apol. 5), but the crisis was sufficiently acute to open John’s mind to the issues at stake. It is this sense of the irreconcilable antagonism between the imperial cultus and Christianity, not any specific number of martyrs, which accounts for the origin of the Apocalypse during the latter years of Domitian. A cursory glance will show that its language presupposes a situation more definite and serious than any covered by earlier references to persecution for The Name or My Name, which in all likelihood, as 1 Peter indicates, obtained more or less generally after the crisis of 64 A.D. in Rome. John sees another name set up against the name of Christ, and he stamps it as the essence of blasphemy to recognise any such title. What Christians were summoned by him to do was to say ‘No’. Their positive confession of the Christian name resolved itself practically into a refusal to admit the legitimacy of the emperor’s divine names.

This power of penetrating to the eternal issues underneath the conflict of the day is one note of the true prophet, and in touching the Apocalypse we touch the living soul of Asiatic Christendom. The book comes forward as a work of prophecy (cf. notes on i. 1, 3; xi. 18; xviii. 20, 24; xxii. 6-7, etc.). As such it is designed for the instruction and encouragement of the Christian society (1 Cor. xiv. 3 f.). It fulfils this design by means of visions depicting (a) the approach and certainty of the Christ’s return, (b) the warnings and comfort of God for the churches during the interval, and (c) the bliss and terror of the world to come. Ordinaril the revelation takes the form of rapture or vision. This, again, may pass into an address in which the prophet leaves the rôle of seer for that of spiritual adviser. Or, rhapsody may become a song, reflecting the antiphonal outbursts of melody (E. Bi. 2138-2140, 3242) in the congregation (cf. the responsive Amen in v. 14, vii. 12, the Trisagion in iv. 8, and the Hallelujah in xix. 1 f.) which were based in part upon earlier Jewish psalms of the synagogue (as Pliny found in Bithynia: “carmen Christo quasi deo dicere secum inuicem”). Finally, the prophet may work along the lines of traditional apocalyptic oracles which were more or less familiar to his hearers, just as the author of Daniel took Jeremiah’s seventy weeks as one of his texts. All these varieties are represented in the Apocalypse of John. But, whatever rôle he assumes, the seer or speaker is pre-eminently a
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prophet, and the Christian prophet is ranked beside Moses and the angles as the servant of God κατ' έξωτον. The order of prophets is second only to the apostles.

If it is the vocation of the prophet to reveal and emphasise the faith, it is the corresponding duty of the martyr to be loyal at all costs to that faith in the killing times. Hence the martyr or confessor is, next to the prophet, the most prominent figure in the landscape of the Apocalypse. One of the tests proposed (most unfairly) by an anti-Montanist in the second century as a criterion of Montanist prophecy was its capacity for producing martyrs. Did it inspire a faith equal to the stress of persecution? Was the religion it fostered strenuous enough to provoke persecution? The crisis of the imperial cultus under Domitian seemed to John at any rate to demand an attitude of passive resistance on the part of Christians which involved the risk of death. Neither rebellion nor suicide was to be contemplated as a means of escape, and flight was out of the question. Whither could one flee from the Caesar? The Christian must be prepared to be faithful unto death, and if there is any distinction among Christians drawn by the prophet's mind it lies not between Jewish and Gentile Christians, but between the martyrs on the one hand and the rank and file of the church upon the other. The martyr is primus inter pares; an exceptional place and space is assigned him for his persistent fidelity. At the same time the extravagant prerogatives of the martyrs and the confessors in later Christian belief lie outside the purview of the Apocalypse. The prophet's homage to them is partly due to the exceptional circumstances of the "killing" time, and the permanent element underlying it is the truth (witnessed by Zoroastrianism in its own way, cf. Encycl. Rel. and Ethics, i. 210) that history is neither caprice nor blind fate, but a moral order in which sacrifice for the sake of Christ and loyalty to God are not water spilt upon the ground—a moral order, too, whose end is bound up with the person of Jesus Christ as Lord and Redeemer. It was perhaps inevitable that the expression of this great religious conception should, by its very emphasis, lead to some exaggeration. The flood-tide which submerges some truths isolates others in a position of abnormal prominence. Thus the Apocalypse, which is a tract for the bad times of persecution, views the philosophy of history as catastrophe rather

1 With xiii. 9-10 compare the Jewish high-priest's prayer on the day of atonement (Jer. Jom. v. 42 c.), that "neither this day nor through this year may any captivity come upon us . . . And as for Thy people Israel, let no enemy exalt himself against them."
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than as growth; the virtues of asceticism and even celibacy (cf. on xiv. 4) acquire unwonted prominence; sensuous aspects of the messianic reign tend to predominate; the impulse of propaganda is checked by the sombre and fore-shortened view of the world which the presentiment of approaching judgment fostered; religion tends to be bound up with a hatred and fear of the civil power;¹ and God is a dazzling, silent, enthroned figure of majesty, who has men warned and wounded, not (as in the fourth gospel) a Father who is in direct touch with his children upon earth. The passion for moral retribution regards material and political convulsions more and more as the proper dynamic of providence. To John's eyes, the cause of affairs in the empire of his day was running straight to the edge of a precipice. He saw in history not any πάντα ἐληλουσμένα but the justice and irony of providence abroad, and his puritanic temper expressed itself in a mixture of spiritual resignation with an imperious and vindictive expectation:—

Rome shall perish! write that word
In the blood that she has spilt.

This expectation is only a heightened form of the traditional belief (cf. 4th Esd. xii. 11 f., Apoc. Bar. iv. 4-5) that the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision was the Roman empire, which was to be overthrown at the advent of messiah's reign. Josephus prudently evades this interpretation, though he is well aware of it. His business, he protests, is not to explain the future (Antiq. x. 10. 4). But the interpretation was widespread in apocalyptic circles, and a Christian had special reasons for sharing it. John expresses it with characteristic vigour. He will encourage no fifth-monarchy tendencies among Christians in Asia Minor, but he has no word of showing loyalty to the empire as distinguished from worshipping the emperor. He makes no attempt, such as Agrippa made before Caligula (Leg. ad Gaium, 36), to disprove the charge of treason, and no considerations of patriotism qualify his threats of doom against the Roman empire.²

¹ It cannot be too strongly insisted that the tone of the Apocalypse here was neither normal nor final. Indeed the subsequent history of the church bears out this verdict. The Asiatic idiosyncrasies of its eschatology, and above all of its relation to the State are thrown into relief against the "loyalist" tone of a contemporary Roman writing like that of Clemens Romanus. The moderation of this fine epistle is attributed by Lightfoot (Clem. Rom., i. pp. 27 f. 60 f. 382 f.) to the fact that its author and bearers were connected with the imperial household.

² Dr. Selwyn actually conjectures (pp. 124 f.) that the prophet was banished for having written the seditious oracles of iv.-xxii., and that when he re-edited the work (adding i.-iii.) during Galba's reign it was only the strong anti-Neronic feeling at Ephesus which saved him from capital punishment as a traitor (pp. 214 f.).
§ 7. The Date.—When the motive of the Apocalypse is thus found in the pressure upon the Christian conscience exerted by Domitian's emphasis of the imperial cultus, especially as that was felt in Asia Minor, any earlier date for the book becomes almost impossible (cf. Mommsen's Provinces of Rom. Empire, ii. 175 f.). The traditional alternative, i.e., the reign of Claudius, is absurd. The Neronic date (i.e., soon after Nero's death) exerts most of its fascination on those who cling to too rigid a view of the book's unity, which prevents them from looking past passages like xi. 1 f. and xvii. 9 f. But (a) the phase of the Nero-redivivus myth which is represented in the Apocalypse cannot be earlier than at least the latter part of Vespasian's reign; (b) the church of Smyrna, as we know from Polycarp (ad Phil. xi.) was not founded by 64 A.D., and it is impossible to crush the development implied in ii. 8-11 into a few years; (c) the conception of the new Jerusalem implies a post-70 date (cf. notes on xxi.-xxii.); (d) no worship of the emperor, adequate to explain the data of the Apocalypse, was enforced under Nero; and (e) the allusions to the martyrs (ii. 13, and especially vi. 10-11—the How long? of the Neronic victims, and their subsequent comrades in martyrdom) surely presuppose a much longer period than three or four years. For recent English statements of the Neronic date, see Selwyn (pp. 215 f.) and Mr. B. W. Henderson (op. cit. pp. 439 f.). The Vespasianic date (cf. V. Bartlet, Apostolic Age, 388-408; Scott, 48-56), which has rather a better case in the internal evidence of the book, is ruled out of court by (d). The lack of any traditional reference to persecution under this emperor would not indeed be a decisive argument by itself; it is only by the letters of Pliny that we happen to know anything of the troubles experienced by Asiatic Christians under Trajan, and a similar outburst under Vespasian might have passed unnoticed by Christian or pagan writers. But this is unlikely.¹ In any case, Vespasian did not take his inherited and official divinity seriously. Christians had a temporary and comparative immunity under him, and "so rapidly did their influence grow that they even made converts in the imperial family itself" (cf. Lightfoot, Clem. Rom. ii. 507). Parts of the Apocalypse, taken singly (e.g., in xiii.), might be referred to Vespasian's reign, but unlike Domitian, he does not seem to have interfered with Oriental

¹ An even stronger term might be used, in view of the researches by critics like Matthaei, Gsell, Neumann and Ramsay. The extreme unlikelihood of the Apocalypse being elicited by anything during the reigns of Titus or Vespasian is also recognised by Linsenmayer in his Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat (1905), pp. 66 f.
Thus, since the general intensity of John's language about martyrdom cannot be explained altogether as either a reminiscence of the Neronic outburst or as a prophetic anticipation of what was to be expected at the hands of the world-power during the latter days—for some concrete occasion is necessary to account for the prophet's standpoint—the most probable solution is that Christians were being persecuted here and there in Asia Minor for what Domitian (as Neumann and others rightly point out) regarded as a cardinal offence, viz., the refusal to acknowledge him as the divine head of the empire. The religious development of the churches is often held to presuppose a considerable length of time, but this argument must be used with caution. Worldliness and error and uncharitable feelings did not require decades to spring up in the primitive churches of Asia Minor and elsewhere. No great stress can be laid on this feature. Still, the character of the heresies described in ii.-iii. certainly presupposes an acquaintance with incipient gnosticism which requires a later period than 70 a.d. for its development.

The one passage (apart from vi. 6, where see note) which appears to be a water-mark of the date is unfortunately ambiguous (see notes on xvii.), as it contains an earlier Vespasianic source. But in xvii. 10-11 so much at least seems clear. The numbers are literal, not symbolical. The reckoning probably begins with Augustus as the first emperor; the three usurpers (Galba, Otho and Vitellius) are passed over (cf. Suet. Ves. 1 : rebellione trium principum et caede incertum diu et quasi uagum imperium suscept firmauitque tandem gens Flavia), as was only natural to a provincial, who would be specially apt to regard their struggle as a brief nightmare. The sixth and reigning emperor (δέ εἰς ἑτέρωπ) is Vespasian (69-79 a.d.), with whom the Flavian dynasty took up the imperial succession, after Nero's death, which ended the Julian dynasty, had well-nigh broken up the empire (cf. xiii. 3 f.). Vespasian's successor (Titus, 79-81 a.d.) is to have a very brief reign. As a matter of fact it only lasted for a couple of years. After him, the deluge! Nero-redivivus (τὸ θνητον), incorporating the full Satanic power of the empire, who had already reigned on earth (δ ἡν) but who meanwhile was

1 This might be (a) a uaticinium ex eventu, or (b) an eschatological inference (a writer, composing under the sixth emperor of a series which was only to number seven, would naturally argue that, as the end was near, the seventh emperor could not have long to reign), or (c) a reflection of the widespread feeling (cf. Schiller's Gesch. d. Röm. Kaiserzeit, i. 520) that the poor health of Titus would not permit him to reign for very long.
invisible (καὶ ὁκε ἐστιν) was to reappear from the abyss, only to be crushed finally (καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει). In its present form the oracle announces that the downfall of the empire is to be heralded by the reappearance after Titus of one belonging to the seven emperors (ἐκ τῶν ἐπτά ἐστιν) who, on the traditional scheme of the heads, were to see the rise and ruin of the State. Here a literary problem of some nicety emerges, for, while ver. 10 implies the reign of Vespasian, ver. 11 points to an eighth emperor (evidently Domitian). The solution is either that the writer of both throws himself back in thought into Vespasian's age, representing history under the form of apocalyptic prophecy, or that ver. 11 (Domitian recalling and playing the part of Nero) represents a later addition, inserted in order to bring the source up to date. In either case the final standpoint is Domitianic, however, and this tallies with the general evidence of the rest of the book.

It also tallies with second-century tradition. In describing the persecution of Christians by Domitian, that worthy successor of Nero, Eusebius (H. E. iii.18) quotes the following words from Irenaeus on the name of Antichrist: εἶ δὲ ἔνακαρθὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦναμα αὐτοῦ, ἐκ' ἐκείνου ἐν ἑρρῇ θα τοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἔρωμάτος. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχέδιόν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τῆς τάξεως τῆς Δαμιανικῆς ἀρχῆς. The attempts to turn the force of this passage by supposing that Irenaeus confounded Domitian's actual reign with his temporary regency in 70 A.D., or by referring ἑωράθη to the seer instead of to the vision, are ingenious but quite unconvincing. The tradition must be taken as it stands. Originally, as πρὸς τῷ τάξει

1 "To me it seems that there are two distinct notes of time in the passage, and that we are almost compelled to suppose that what was written at one date has been adapted to another" (Dr. Sanday in Journ. Theol. Studies, viii. 492).

2 This kind of elusive, enigmatic reckoning is illustrated by the Jewish Domitianic apocalypse in 4 Esd. iii.-xiv. and by Barn. iv. In the former, the Roman empire is an eagle with three heads (i.e. the Flavian dynasty: Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian), the first of which rules the earth oppressively, the second of which is devoured by the third (alluding to the belief that Domitian had made away with his brother), while the third is to be challenged and vanquished by messiah (a parallel to John's prediction). The Christian writing, in order to prove the nearness of the end, quotes Dan. vii. 7-8 and 24 for the purpose of showing that from the beast (i.e. the Roman empire) ten horns were to spring (i.e. the Caesars from Julius to Vespasian or Domitian) and from them a little horn by way of excrescence (ταφανοθήν, i.e. Nero antichrist) which will abase three of the great horns (i.e. the Flavian dynasty) Similarly Daniel's addition of the 11th horn to the traditional 10 illustrates John's apocalyptic revision of the 7 heads. The only σοφία of the Apocalypse is the knack of solving puzzles in this province of religious arithmetic (xiii. 18, xvii. 9).
suggests, it was more precise and extended. It was held by Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, and Victorinus, possibly even by Hegesippus at an earlier date, if Dr. Lawlor is correct in his argument (Journ. Theol. Studies, viii. 436 f.) that the statements of Busebius (H. E. iii. 11-20) were borrowed from that writer's Hypomnemata; indeed, no other early tradition has anything like the same support or plausibility. Irenaeus, of course, is no great authority by himself on matters chronological, but he is reporting here what there was no obvious motive for inventing. The internal and the external evidence thus converge upon the latter part of the reign of Domitian as the period of the book’s composition or publication. Little more than half a century later, one of its first commentators, bishop Melito of Sardis, protested to Marcus Aurelius that “of all the emperors it was Nero and Domitian alone who, at the instigation of certain slanderous persons,” assailed the Christian church (so Lact. De Morte Persec. 3). Whether Melito knew this independently of the Apocalypse or not, we need have very little hesitation (cf. Stephan Gsell’s Essai sur le règne de l’Empereur Domitien, 1894, pp. 307 f.) in collating this persecution with the book in question.

§ 8. The Author.—The settlement of the date clears up the problem of the authorship to this extent, that it confirms the disjunctive canon of Dionysius (cf. Lücke, §§ 39-42; Simcox xxiii. f. xxxiii. f.), Origen’s thoughtful pupil, who saw, upon grounds of internal evidence, that it was impossible for the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to have come from the same pen. Were the Apocalypse dated earlier, it could be supposed that John had matured during the interval, since twenty or twenty-five years’ residence in a Greek city might be conjectured to have improved his style and widened his outlook. But when the Apocalypse has to be dated in the same decade as the Fourth Gospel, the hypothesis of a single author collapses. While the data of vocabulary, style, and thought suggest that both writings originated in a school or circle of Asiatic Christians, they differentiate the one book from the other unambiguously.1

Hardly any writing in the New Testament loses so little, or gains so much, by translation as the Apocalypse, for almost any version

1 Recent, though rather extreme, statements are to be found in J. Réville’s Le Quatr. Évangile (1901), pp. 26-47, 333 f. in Selwyn (pp. 81 f. 114 f., 222 f., 258 f., the Fourth Gospel = a correction not only of the synoptists but of the Apocalypse), and in Schmiedel’s article (E. B. ii. ii. 2515-2518). As Alford admits, “the Greek of the Gospel and Epistle is not that of the Apocalypse in a maturer state".
serves to obliterate most of the exceptionally numerous and glaring irregularities of its syntax. But one drawback of this advantage is that the distinctive characteristics of the book are less vividly felt; the further one goes from the original, the less visible are those idiosyncrasies of conception, style, and construction which mark off the Apocalypse from the rest of the early Christian literature and notably from the Fourth Gospel. The psychological difference by itself should not be pressed too far. One has only to recollect men like Samuel Rutherford and Keble, to understand how vindictiveness to religious opponents is compatible with a sweet and even devout spiritual tone in certain natures. But the disjunctive canon in the present case proceeds from a wider induction. Thus e.g. the well-known resemblances of the Lamb and the Logos are both specious and secondary. The former (τά ἀρετῶν Ἀποκ.; ἐν τῷ θεῷ Ἡσυχία, Ἀποκ.; ἐν τῷ θεῷ, Στίχων) does not exist in the original, nor is it peculiar to the Johannine literature. The latter again (ἐν λόγῳ τῷ θεῷ, Ἀποκ.; ἐν λόγῳ, Στίχων) is verbal (cf. note on xix. 13); the two ideas are adapted from totally different soils in pre-Christian Judaism and for alien ends. Some closer analogies, such as (a) the relation of God, Christ, and the believer (cf. on ii. 27, iii. 19 f.), (b) the use of the partitive ἐκ, ἐν, δικαίωμα (of revelation), etc., (c) the explanation of Hebrew terms, (d) formulas like μετὰ τοῦτο, and (e) phrases about witnessing or keeping God's word (commandments), do not necessarily imply more than a common milieu of thought and expression such as contemporary writers belonging to the same school might naturally employ. A common religious dialect often produces similar instances of corresponding or coincident expression in different authors of the same period. On the other hand, the Apocalypse has a vocabulary of its own, whose peculiarities are not to be explained simply from the subject matter; e.g. δοῦλοι θεὼν (in explicit contrast to Joh. xv. 15), λατρείας, σοφισίμης, παντοκράτερ, πίστες, ὑπομνή, etc. besides cases of the multiplied genitive (xiv. 8, etc.). It ignores many favourite and even characteristic terms of the Fourth evangelist, e.g. αὐθεν, ἄδεια, ἀθέτης, ἀρνίον, ἀπεκρίθη κ. α. ἄγνωστος, ἀφίναι τάς ἀμαρτίας, θεώναι, Ἰησοῦς, καθώς, μετὰ τοῦτο, πάντως, παρρησία, πάντως, ὑπομνή, χάρα, ἀποκάλυψη (cf. on xxii. 7) asking (ἐρωτάω) God, ἀδιάβολος or ἄδιάβολος (of the devil), to be of God or to be born of God, love to God or Christ, ὑπερ with genitive, ἀρνί, ὑπό (accus.), μέτωπος, etc., etc. Even where the Apocalypse uses certain terms or ideas of the Fourth Gospel, it is in a different sense; e.g. ἀλώνιος (only in xiv. 6, never with ἱλαστήριον), light and the world (physically not spiritually), ἀξίων (never substantival),
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*διώτος* (only once), *ὁ* of logical appeal¹ (not of historical transition), ἰεροσολυμή not ἵεροσόλυμα, πιστά (never transitive, and in special sense cf. on ii. 7), judgment (outward and dramatic, not inward), the Spirit (wholly prophetic, in contrast to the inward Comforter of the Gospel), σημαίνειν, ὑπάγειν, etc. Furthermore, the Fourth Gospel ignores, often deliberately, a large number of words or phrases used not only by the Apocalypse (once at least) but by the earlier synoptic Gospels; e.g. ἀραγνόσκω (of Scriptures), ἀποδίδωμι, ἀπόστολος, ἀρπαν, ἀφοιρέω, βασανίζειν, βδελυγμα, βήβλος, γοητήρ, γρηγορεῖν, γνη (wife), δαμίαν, διάδρομος, διαθήκη, δίκαιος (of men), δῶρον, δύνη (= Gentiles), εἰκόν, εἰλοικόν, ἐνδύομαι, ἐπίτα, ἐπιθύμησις, ἐσχατος, ἐσώθην (ἐσώθην), ἐναγγελίων (cf. on xiv. 6), ἐφήκοντα, ἐχθρός, ἠλιος, θρόνος, ἰσχυς, ἰσχυρός, κληρονομεῖν, κληρίς, κηρύσσειν, ἀπτύπωσις, λιμός, λοιπός, λυχνία, μακρόθεν, μαρτύριον, μάρτυς, μηδείς, μετέρω, μεταφέρω, μεταφέρων, νεφέλη, δῖλος, ὄμην, ὀδούς, οὐά, οὐς (contrast John xviii. 10, 26), πάσχει, πατάσσει, περί (accus.), πέτα, πίστες, πλοῦτος (τοιος), ποτίζειν, πάλεμος, προσβάτερος, προσευχή, πρόσωπον, πάθος, βίας, σωμάτων, σελήνη, σκηνή, σοφία, σταυρός, σφόδρα, υψηλός, φυλακή, φευγωφρήτης, and χήρα. The Apocalypse also substitutes ἑρχοσ for ἀληθὲς, and uses phrases like δίκαιος with ἱνα. for δίκαιος with ἴνα. The eschatological differences of conception, which are too patent to require comment or to admit of harmonising, corroborate the impression made by this argument from words. Such features, linguistic and mental (cf. e.g. on i. 4, ii. 7, iii. 21, vii. 15), are not due to literary versatility, nor to an imaginary growth in the same writer's vocabulary and soul, nor even to a common editorial revision. The argument from solecisms (cf. § 1) and regular irregularities of style, from the special vocabulary, and above all from the realistic type of religious feeling, may be cumulative, but it is none the less able to support the contention that whilst the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse must have sprung from the same circle of Asiatic Christianity, they could not have been written by the same person within a few years of each other; the divergences of eschatology, angelology, and Christology—which represent the crucial points of comparison between the two books—are almost as clearly cut in Apoc. i.-iii., where the Apocalypse is least apocalyptic, as in the later oracles. In general, it would not be irrelevant to apply to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse the terms used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to characterise the works of Herodotus and Thucydides respectively; the one is radiant (ιλαρών), the other is awe-inspiring (φοβερών).

¹ This is particularly significant, since, as the Apocalypse “is largely made up of narrative, we might have expected narrative ὁ in abundance if it had been written by the hand that wrote the Fourth Gospel” (Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, p. 479).
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While the author of the Apocalypse cannot have been the author of the Fourth Gospel, his personality is partially disclosed by the internal evidence of the book, which shows that it was the work of a Jewish Christian prophet called John (i. 1, 9, etc.) who was in close touch with the Asiatic churches. It is a προφήτεια, and as such it is ranked by the first Christian writer of the second century who definitely mentions it (cf. Justin's Dial., 81, 82). It was intended to be read aloud in the worship of those Christian congregations, primarily but not exclusively, to which its opening messages were addressed. In reality it is a sort of catholic epistle as it stands (cf. ii. 7, etc., xxii. 16, 21), an open letter or manifesto to the churches. The authority claimed by John is that of a prophet, not of an apostle. The seven Asiatic communities may have lain within his circuit or diocese, but the data of Apoc. ii.-iii. do not suggest any specifically concrete relations between the prophet and the churches. He does not seem to have founded any of them, nor does he promise to re-visit them. Upon the other hand, John claims no special relation to Jesus Christ, and there is no distinct evidence that he had been an eye-witness of Jesus the messiah upon earth. None of the visions implies any such personal intimacy; indeed that of i. 9 f. tells against it, for the apocalyptic categories which dominate the opening vision are not such as might be expected from one who had been among the Galilean disciples. It may be replied that an apocalypse is not a gospel, and that in an apocalypse it was the qualities of a προφήτης which would naturally be prominent. But this only raises the further psychological problem: how should a primitive disciple adopt such categories? The reference in xviii. 20 does not absolutely exclude the possibility of John having been an apostle, for ἀπόστολος is here employed in its wider sense, and in any case the addition of προφήτης shows that this προφήτης might have equally well referred objectively to the class or order to which he

1 Passages like i. 3, ii. 7, etc., xiii. 9, 18, xxii. 7, reflect this ecclesiastical use, while the explanatory comments in iv. 5 (ἐλευθερίας... ἀγίου), v. 6 (οὐκ ἔσοντο... γῆν), v. 8 (ἐσοβίζω... ἀγίας), xviii. 24, xix. 8 (τὸ γὰρ... ἀγίων), xix. 10 (ἡ γὰρ... προφήτης), xix. 13 (καὶ καλλιγράφω... ἀγίου), xx. 14 (οὗτος... παρίσταται), sound often like prose glosses which in some cases may have been inserted by the author himself or a general editor, but in others were probably due to the interpretative reading in the churches. A partial analogy is furnished by the influence of the players on the text of Shakespeare's plays.

2 The see never says, 'I saw the Lord Jesus, or, Behold, the Lord Jesus. Contrast Acts vii. 55, 56, etc. "Jesus speaks through His Spirit under various forms or without any form, and is never beheld in the form He wore in Galilee." (Abbott, p. 214). Cf. Prof. A. S. Peake, in Mansfield College Essays (1909), pp. 89-106.
belonged. The unique allusion in xxi. 14 to the twelve apostles of the Lamb, however, has an objective and retrospective tinge, which, though it does not absolutely rule out apostolic authorship, points in that direction. It is not a subtle anti-Pauline touch, for even Paul did not number himself among the twelve (1 Cor. xv. 5), but when it is collated with such discrepancies as that between xi. 1-2 and Mk. xiii. 2 (cf. also iii. 21 with Mk. x. 37-40) or that between Ac. i. 6-8 and the apocalyptic calculations of the end (see further, on iii. 21, vii. 1-3, 14, ix. 15) the result is a cumulative argument in favour of some primitive Christian who sat looser to the synoptic tradition than a disciple such as the son of Zebedee would have done. During last century the apostolic authorship of the book, in conjunction with the Neronic date, was urged by Baur (cf. Church Hist. of First Three Centuries, i. 84 f., 153 f.) and his school, on the double ground that it represented a type of narrow Jewish Christianity in the apostolic church, and that it contained an overt polemic against the apostle Paul. Neither of these arguments is seaworthy at the present day, although the anti-Pauline reference becomes a much more serious question, when the Nero or Galba date is chosen, than some recent defenders of the latter hypothesis appear to realise. The Apocalypse has the Pauline teaching behind it (cf. iii. 14, xxii. 17), but it neither reproduces any of the Pauline idiosyncrasies nor opposes Paul personally. It goes back to the popular Jewish Christianity of the primitive churches, whose "theology" consisted primarily in a belief that Jesus, the true messiah, had secured the forgiveness of sins for his people and would return presently to establish the divine basileia. The writer ignores any problem of the law or of the resurrection of the body. Echoes of the synoptic tradition are audible enough, particularly of its Lucan form, and one feature of the teaching of Jesus is preserved carefully, viz., the belief in the catastrophic advent of the basileia; but no evidence is available to prove a literary filiation between it and any of the synoptic gospels.\footnote{So far as the local colour is not derived from O.T. traditions, it may be ascribed, as, e.g., by Mr. Theodore Bent (Nineteenth Century, 1888, 813-881, cf. also Historical New Testament, p. 688) to a personal acquaintance with Palestine and Asia Minor (see on iv. 2, vi. 12 f., viii. 8 f., ix. 16, 18, xxii. 2). Thus, e.g., the references to the appearance or the disappearance (cf. the case of Chryse near Lemnos, told by Pausanias, viii. 33-4) of islands reflect the insular situation of Patmos, from which several of the Aegean islands were at least visible (Tozer: Islands of the Aegean, pp. 178-95), as well as the volcano of Santorin. The crater of some Mediterranean volcano may have lent special point to the lake of fire and brimstone. But John's imagination is stronger than his susceptibility to his environment, though}
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Who was this John? Was he some otherwise unknown figure (Δλλον για τῶν ἑν Ἀσία γενομένων, Dionysius) in the primitive church of Asia Minor (so e.g., J. Reville, F. C. Porter, Jülicher)? This is possible, for the name was common enough. But, if it is felt that the work must be connected with a more authoritative personality, tradition offers us the choice of three figures. (a) That of John Mark (so e.g., Hitzig, Weisse, and Hausrath), whom Dionysius of Alexandria mentions in this connection but only to set aside on the score of his un-Asiatic career, need not be seriously discussed, though Beza favoured his claims ("quod si liceret ex stylo conjecturam facere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim qui et ipse Johannes dictus est"). The real alternative lies between (b) John the son of Zebedee, and (c) John the presbyter, both of whom have strong traditional claims. The latter is not to be emended out of existence by any manipulation of the text of Papias, and we have no reason to regard the one as the doppelgänger of the other. Whether Busebius was right in arguing from that text or from other evidence that Papias was one of his hearers, John ὁ πρεσβύτερος was an important Christian disciple; his authority was so great that he could be called ὁ πρεσβύτερος without any further designation. There is strong and early support for (b) in tradition, but the internal evidence, as we have seen, is at best neutral and in certain lights unfavourable. It is impossible here to analyse that tradition in its bearings upon the Apocalypse, but it may be said that there were special reasons which contributed to its popularity (cf. § 9). Internal evidence weighed less with the early church than other considerations. The wavering position of the Apocalypse required nothing short of apostolic sanction to keep it within the canon, and indeed apostolic authorship came more and more to be tantamount to inspiration. Under these circumstances it was not easy for any theory or tradition of unapostolic authorship to keep its footing. Mr. Conybeare puts this succinctly (The Armenian Text of Revelation, pp. 161 f.): "Between 350 and 450 Greek texts of Revelation were rare in the Eastern half of the empire. The best minds of the Greek Church, men such as Busebius Pamphili and Dionysius of Alexandria, denied its Johannine authorship. Living in an age when

sometimes it is not fanciful to trace a special significance in some conventional phrase, e.g., the boom of the Mediterranean in i. 15, or in vi. 15-16—an allusion to the Sipylus range, north of the Gulf of Smyrna, where cisterns and holes cut in the rocks afforded temporary shelter to the population during the frequent panics caused by earthquakes on the coast (cf. Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Phrygia, Eng. tr., 1892, pp. 61-62).
old Greek was still the language of every-day life, they were too conscious of the contrasts of style which separate it from the Fourth gospel to accept the view that a single author wrote both. Having to accept John the apostle as author of one or the other, they decided in favour of the gospel. In the West, on the other hand, where both documents circulated only in a Latin dress, men were unconscious of these contrasts of style, and so found no difficulty in accepting both as writings of the apostle John." Hence, taking the Apocalypse by itself on the one hand and the tradition of John the presbyter on the other, we find both converging on the conclusion that, even if John the apostle did survive till the end of the first century in Asia Minor, it was not he but his namesake who wrote the Johannine Apocalypse. \[\text{καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ ἐν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνοσθέντων (Acts ii. 17),}\] under the influence of the prophetic spirit. In this case, the term πρεσβύτερος (as in 2 John ver. 3, and 3 John ver. 1) is the Christian term of honour and authority (cf. Deissmann, 154 f., 233 f.), not the Jewish term \[1\] for a member of the Sanhedrin (πρεσβύτης). Occasionally, as in the case of John, the presbyter must have had prophetic gifts; the fragments preserved by Irenæus from the tradition of the Asiatic presbyters point unmistakably to prophetic and even chiliastic tendencies, though they are more sensuous than in the corresponding features in the Apocalypse. John was also a μαθητής τοῦ κυρίου in the wider sense of the term. He was one of the most important authorities who were in touch with apostolic tradition, and it is easier to credit him with the rabbinic erudition and apocalyptic lore of the Apocalypse than one who was ἀγράμματος καὶ ἱδρώτης (Acts iv. 13).

A further possibility (recognised by Erasmus) lies in the direction of pseudonymity. Apocalypses were almost invariably pseudonymous, and it is held by some (e.g., S. Davidson, Weizsäcker, Wernle, Forbes, and Bacon in Expositor, 1907, 233 f.), that the presumption is in favour of John's Apocalypse also belonging to the pseudepigrapha. This would be rendered more probable, were it taken to include fragments or traditions which were really due to John Mark (Spitta, Völter), John the son of Zebedee (Erbes, Bruston), or John the presbyter (J. Weiss, so differently Bousset and Schmiedel). But it does not follow that an early Christian apocalypse must necessarily be pseudonymous. Hermas is not. Besides, one raison d'être for pseudonymity is absent, viz., the consciousness that the prophetic

1So Selwyn (127 f.), holding that the author of the Apocalypse retained his earlier Jewish title. But it is prosaic to see that semi-circular court reflected in iv. 2 f., or to find evidence of special legal knowledge in v. 1 and xii. 10.
spirit was no longer present in the church. The amount of antedated prediction in the Apocalypse (i.e., in xiii. xvii.), too, is barely adequate, of itself, to support this theory. And it may be argued that a pseudonymous writer would probably have been more explicit upon the apostolic authority of John, i.e., if John the apostle was the John under whose name he issued the Apocalypse. The case for the latter form of the hypothesis would be strengthened, of course, if it could be shown, as many critics have recently attempted to prove, that the tradition of John's early martyrdom is reliable. In any case the ardent and even vindictive spirit of the Apocalypse is not to be connected necessarily with Luke ix. 55. Such a passionate, unpatriotic temper would be as much due to the apocalyptic traditions and to the local exigencies of the period as to any personal idiosyncracy, and if John retained this feeling till the end of the century, or even till the seventh or eighth decade, he must have profited very little by the lesson which Jesus had read him long ago. When he is connected with the tradition or authorship of the Fourth gospel, the supposition that he was responsible for the attitude of the Apocalypse becomes doubly, trebly difficult.

To sum up. The Apocalypse was a product of the "Johannine" school or circle in Asia Minor, towards the close of the first century. Beyond the disjunctive canon that it was not composed by the author of the Fourth Gospel, but that it may have been written by the presbyter whose name appears in the address of 2 and 3 John, we can hardly go, in our comparison of the Johannine writings. The data of tradition are unfortunately ambiguous and contradictory, but, whether or not the son of Zebedee resided in Asia Minor, the presbyter John seems on the whole to suit the requirements of the Apocalypse better than any other contemporary figure, and, unless we are content with Castellio and others to share the pious reticence of Dionysius (διό μὲν οὖν ἰωάννης ὁ πρόετωρ γράφων, αὐτῷ λέγοντες πρώτητον ὅτι οὗτος ὁ πρόετωρ, ἄκηλον), the balance of probability is in favour either of pseudonymity or of the hypothesis that the prophet John who composed the Apocalypse was the presbyter John of early Christian tradition (so after Dionysius, from various standpoint,1 Eichhorn, Wittichen, De Wette, Mangold, Credner, Bleek, Ewald, Keim, Havet, Düsseldieck, Selwyn, Erbes, O. Holtzmann, Harnack, Kohler, Von Soden, Heinrici (Das Urchristenthum, 1902, 126 f.), and Von Dobschütz (Probleme d. apost. Zeitalters, 1904, 91 f.).

1 Grotius: "Credo autem presbytero, apostoli discipulo, custoditum hunc librum; inde factum, ut eius esse opus a quibusdam per errorem crederetur". Loisy (Le
§ 9. The Reception of the Apocalypse.— No immediate traces of the Apocalypse (cf. Zahn's Geschichte des N. T. Kanons, i., pp. 201 f., and Leipoldt's Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons, i., pp. 32 f., 58 f., etc.), are to be found in early Christian literature; the two or three apparent allusions in Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, and Hermas, imply nothing but common oral tradition or the independent use of the O.T., if not of apocryphal sources. Ignatius, however, seems to have known it (see on iii. 12, xxi. 3); certainly Papias and Justin did. Melito of Sardis (c. 170 A.D.) wrote a commentary upon it, while Apollo- lonius and Theophilus of Antioch were acquainted with it; so were theValentinians, and of course the chiliasts. Irenæus and the Ep. Lugd. attest its circulation in southern Gaul (c. 177 A.D.). Clement also read it in Alexandria as a sacred scripture. The evidence of the martyrdoms and of Tertullian proves that in Africa, as well as in southern Gaul and Egypt, it was widely circulated before the close of the second century, and the Muratorian canon witnesses to its authority in Rome. But it did not escape sharp criticism (τι με ἄφελεὶ τῇ ἀποκάλυψις ἱωάνου, λέγουσα μοι περὶ ἐπτὰ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐπτὰ σαλπίγγων;) and even repudiation not only from Marcion, with his antipathy to the O.T., but from the anti-Montanists, alike in Asia Minor and in Rome,1 who disliked the sensuous elements in its prophecies and repudiated ecstasy as a form of true prophecy. The predilection for Hellenistic eschatology also helped to throw it into disfavour, as compared with, e.g., The Apocalypse of Peter, which even the Muratorian canon ranks alongside of it. Another feature which probably told against its popularity was its unpatriotic attitude to the empire. When prayers were offered in the churches for the emperor, and when the empire had come to be viewed, as Paul had taught, in the

1 The controversy between Hippolytus and Gaius the Roman presbyter, in the beginning of the third century, shows that the latter, like the Alogi, possibly ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus (cf. Schwartz's essay, Ueber den Tod d. Söhne Zebedaei, 1904, pp. 33-45). Hippolytus feels that Caius has gone too far in his wholesale repudiation of the Apocalypse along with its Montanist exploiters. One of the objections urged by the Alogi was that there was no church at Thyatira, and consequently that John was no true prophet, which probably means that the local church had become Montanist (cf. Corssen in Texte u. Unters., xv. 1, 52-56), and therefore had ceased to exist as a church, from the standpoint of catholic Christianity. For the most part, as Dionysius says, they went through every chapter of the book, with a keen scent for its Oriental phantasy (ἀγωγάτων τέ καὶ ἀναλλόγων ἀποφαίνοντο).
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light of a providential bulwark, it is not surprising that John's Apocalypse had a hard struggle to retain its place in the canon, and that except in times of sore persecution it did not appeal to the majority of Christians. The result was that before very long the only means of preserving it for ecclesiastical edification was to allegorise it freely. This naturally threw the interpretation of the book quite out of focus, so that the fortunes of the Apocalypse really form a chapter in the history of the canon or of the church (cf. Lücke, §§ 30-36, 50-59). But even prior to, or independent of, the allegorical interpretation, the book had vitality. It is paradoxical to claim that the apocalypses of the early church, including that of John, were the first Christian scriptures to be canonised, owing to their prophetic origin, which ranked them with the O.T. Their place in the series of prophetic writings is obvious, but the treatise de aleatoribus, from which the main evidence for this theory is drawn, is of too uncertain a date to be used safely in this connexion. Still, the Apocalypse did retain its vogue in many circles of the early church, especially throughout the west. Often this was due to a vague and correct instinct for John's great religious message in spite of its archaic paraphernalia and its fantastic elements (cf. Renan, 479, 480). Yet even its literal prophecies still maintained an appeal of their own. It was the chiliasm of the book, not its unfulfilled predictions, which proved a difficulty. The prediction which went soonest out of date (i.e., xvii. 8-11) seems to have occasioned as little trouble to the church as the Sibylline oracles or the similar passages of the O.T. prophets. The Apocalypse evidently was not final any more than normal.† Besides, against the failure of its historical programme to correspond with the subsequent trend of history, must be set the fact that the number of the Beast could be interpreted as Trajan, Hadrian, or Marcus Aurelius, that the expectation of a Nero-antichrist lingered down to the fifth century in certain corners of the popular religious mind, that Gog and Magog were repeatedly expected in the form of savage hordes (Huns, Goths, etc.), and that the dread (cf. Lightfoot's Ignatius, i., 644 f.) of a Parthian invasion did not become obsolete till the third century. In several respects the book could still be taken reasonably as a prediction of near events. Thus, by the time that Constantine's policy had antiquated the Apocalypse's view of

† Cf. A. B. Davidson on this point in Hastings, D.B., i. 736, 737, iv. 126.

‡ Though "it was during the continuance of the Flavian dynasty that the expectation was at white heat," yet it "lingered on for many centuries" (Lightfoot, Clem. Rom., ii., pp. 511, 512).
the Roman State, the position of the book was fairly secure. New systems of interpretation, allegorical (e.g., that of Tyconius) and semi-historical, were devised to vindicate its rights as a scripture of the church, and these were the more cordially welcomed, as the book itself was enigmatic and in parts ambiguous. All sense of its original object had faded from the uncritical mind of the church. Dogmatic prepossessions underlay its rejection as well as its reception; it was exposed to extravagant censure and extravagant praise, but the growing belief in its apostolic origin helped to save it, like Hebrews, from ultimate exclusion or depreciation. In the case of the one book as of the other, the instinct which determined the judgment of the councils and the churches was sounder than the political reasons which they adduced. *Nostra res agitur*, they felt. The authentic note of loyalty to Jesus Christ at all costs was audible enough to prevail with them over their antipathy to the crashing discords of Christian apocalyptic.¹

§ 10. Literature, etc.—In addition to abbreviations which are already noted (page 284), or which are obvious enough, the following may be mentioned:—

Abbott = E. A. Abbott's *Notes on N. T. Criticism* (1907), pp. 75 f., 175 f.
AC = Bousset's *Der Antichrist* (Eng. Tr. by Keane, 1896).
Baldensperger = sec. ed. (1892) of Baldensperger's *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*.
Blass = *Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch* (2nd ed. 1902; Eng. Tr. 1905).
C.B.P. = W. M. Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. i. part i. (1895), part ii. (1897).
Dalman = Dalman's *Worte Jesu* (Eng. Tr. *The Words of Jesus*).
Dieterich = A. Dieterich's *Nekyia* (1893).

¹ "If a great man interprets a national crisis so as to bring home to the nation its true ideals and destination, he remains a true prophet even if his forecast was mistaken. Without the critical situation it is probable that the great man could never have brought so much truth to such powerful expression. So an eschatology is not to be judged by a simple rule of agreement with facts, but rather by its fitness under the circumstances to quicken faith in God, to stir the conscience and put men's wills under the domination of ideal motives, to give a living sense of God and eternity" (F. C. Porter, *Messages of the Apoc. Writers*, p. 73).
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*E.B.D.*—“The Egyptian Book of the Dead” (ed. E. Wallis Budge; the translation, 1898).

*E.Bi.* = *The Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

*E.J.* = *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* (1901 ff.).


Friedländer = *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms* (1888, 6th ed.), by L. Friedländer.

Gfrörer = Gfrörer’s *das Jahrhundert des Heils* (1838).

Grill = J. Grill’s *Untersuch. über die Entstehung d. vierten Evglns* (1902).

Grotius = Grotius’s *Annotationes*, viii. 234 f. (1839 ed.).

Helbing = R. Helbing’s *Grammatik der Septuaginta* (1907).


Jastrow = Prof. Morris Jastrow’s *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).


Lueken = Lueken’s *Michael* (1898).


Pfleiderer = *das Urchristentum* (1902), vol. ii., pp. 281 f.

*P.W.* = Pauly’s *Real-Encycl. der class. Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. Wissowa, 1894 f.).

Renan = Renan’s *L’antéchrist* (1871).

R.J. = Bousset’s *die Religion des Judentums im neuesten Zeitalter* (1903; the references are to the first edition).

R.S. = W. Robertson Smith’s *Religion of the Semites*.


Thumb = *Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter d. Hellenismus* (1901).
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Titius = Dr. A. Titius: die vulgäre Anschauung von d. Seligkeit im Urchristentum (1900).
Volz = P. Volz: Jüdische Eschatologie (1903).
Weinel = Weinel's die Wirkungen des Geistes u. der Geister im nachap. Zeitalter (1899).
Weizsäcker = The Apostolic Age (Eng. Tr., 1894-1895).

In order to save space, most of the citations from the O.T. and the N.T. have been relegated to the margin; often the substance of a note has been crushed into a handful of such references. It has been impossible to give any register of opinion or history of interpretation, and I have abstained from furnishing such grammatical, philological, or geographical information as may be found in any concordance, grammar, or dictionary of the Bible. For fuller details on questions of introduction I must refer the reader to the relevant sections in my forthcoming Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.


German edd.—De Wette (1848), Bleek (Eng. tr. 1875), Düster-
dieck (1887), B. Weiss (2nd ed. 1902), J. Weiss (die Schriften des N. T., 1907), Bousset, and H. J. Holtzmann (Hand-Commentar, 3rd. ed., 1908). Schmiedel's Volksbuch (1906) is included in the English edition of his Johannine Writings (1908). There is a competent Dutch commentary by J. M. S. Baljon (Utrecht, 1908); besides French works by Havet (Le Christ et ses origines, iv. 314-344), Reuss (Paris, 1878), A. Crampon (Tournai, 1904), and Th. Calmes (Paris, 1905), with the last-named scholar's pamphlet, L'Apoc. devant la tradition et devant la critique (1907). Baljon's critical introduction is given in his Geschiedenis van de Boeken des nieuwen Verbonds (1901), 241-265.

Of the commentaries which preceded Alford, almost the only English works which retain any critical value are those of Moses Stuart (Andover, 1845: on the lines of Lücke) and Trench (Commentary on the Epp. to the Seven Churches, 1861, sixth edition, 1897).

Since the present commentary was drafted, six years ago, a number of monographs, including some of those just mentioned, have been issued. I have occasionally inserted references to them in the text, for the sake of convenience and completeness, but, for the sake of independence, the notes have otherwise been left untouched.
APOKALYPΣΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ. 1

I. 1. "ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἠν ἐκθέτες αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς σα. 2 έδειξα τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰσιν (article absent as from Sc. 3) καὶ ἐσήμανεν (article absent as from Sc. 3).

1 Om. with WH, etc. (edd.), from the title the τοῦ θεολογοῦ of Q and (with expansions) many cursives, which was a description of the apostle John in the fourth century as the author of the fourth gospel, and applied to him here as the exponent of divine oracles (θεολογος = προφήτης, Philo, de Vit. Mos., ii. 11; Luc., Alex., 19, 22) or as the herald of God (cf. Chrys., Orat., 36). Inscriptions show that θεολογοι were sacred officials in Pergamum, Ephesus, Smyrna, etc. (Deissm., 231-232, Licht von Osten, 252 ff.), who were frequently υμνωδοι as well.


Chapter I.—Vv. 1-3. The superscription. Ἰωάννης is the ecclesiastical title (distinguishing it from the apocalypse of Peter, or of Paul, etc.) of what professes in reality to be an Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (subjective genitive), i.e., a disclosure of the divine μνηστηρία (Dan. ii. 19, 22, 28, Theod.) in the immediate future (ταῖς εἰσίς) which has been communicated (ἐκθέτες, cf. on iii. 9) by God to Jesus (cf. v. 7) and which in turn is transmitted by Jesus (Gal. i. 12) to John as a member of the prophetic order.

Ver. 1. θυατήρ, in specific sense of x. 7, xi. 18, after Dan. ix. 6, 10; Zech. i. 6, and Amos iii. 7 (ἀποκάλυψη παρέδωκεν τοῖς δούλους αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφήτας). Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is used only in i. 1-5 (xxii. 21?), Lord Ἰησοῦς only in xxii. 20, Lord (i.e., Jesus) only in xi. 8 and xiv. 13; elsewhere either Ἰησοῦς (xx. 4, 6) αὐτοῦ (xi. 15, xii. 10) or (as in Hebrews) the simple Ἰησοῦς. έκθέτες σα. 2 ἔδειξεν κ.τ.λ. (from Dan. ii. 28-29), either object of ἐκθέτες (Vit. ii. 229) or more probably in opposition to ἐκθέτες, ἐν ταῖς εἰσίς = "soon" (as in Clem. Rom. xxii. 5 and the instructive logion of Luke xviii. 8). This is the hinge and staple of the book. When the advent of Jesus is hailed as a relief, it is no consolation to say that the relief will come suddenly; sudden or not, it must come soon (x. 7), if it is to be of any service. The keynote of the Apocalypse is the cheering assurance that upon God's part there is no reluctance or delay; His people have not long to wait now. καὶ ἐσήμανεν (so of what is future and momentous, Ezek. xxxiii. 3, Acts xi. 26, etc.: Heracleitus on the Delphic oracle, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγγελου τοῦ κράτους ἀναστήσει ἀνάλογοι ἀποστέλλει (from seventh heaven, in Asc. Isa. vi. 13), a loose Heb. idiom for "he (i.e., Jesus here and in xxii. 16, God in xxii. 6) sent and signified it ". διὰ (as in Asc. Isa. xi. 30, etc.) τοῦ ἄγγελου αὐτοῦ (cf. Test. Jos. vi. 6). Jesus is the medium of all revelation, but ἀποκάλυψη is further conceived of as transmitted through the angelus interpres, a familiar and important figure in rabbinic (cf. E. F. i. 592, 593) and apocalyptic tradition (see reff. and on Acts vii. 30), who stands here between Jesus and the prophet as a sort of double of the former. Like Hermas (Mand. xi. 9), the post-exilic tradition required the executive function of this angel, in order to (a) satisfy the yearning for some means of divine communication, and (b) at the same time to maintain reverence for the divine glory (Baldensperger, 48 f.). But John's Christian consciousness here and elsewhere is
too large for the traditional and artificial forms of its expression. Unless this angel is identified with that of x. 1 f., he plays only a scanty and tardy rôle (xvii. 1 f., xxi. 5 f.) in the series of visions; the prophet's sense of direct experience (e.g., in i. 9 f.) bursts through the cumbrous category of an intermediate agent between himself and Christ. It is by a conventional form of religious symbolism prevalent in this genre of literature, that Jesus, like Yahweh in Ezekiel (cf. x. 1, 3, xliii. 2), is represented both as addressing the prophet directly and as instructing him indirectly. The latter mode of expression (cf. Milton's Uriel and 4 Esd. iv. 1) was due to a hypothesising tendency which was not confined to Judaism. As Plutarch points out (cf. below on viii. 5 and xv. 9), the daemons in Hellenic religion are a middle term between the divine and the human; they prevent the former from being disturbed or contaminated by direct intercourse with men, and they also act as interpreters who communicate the divine will to men (cf. De Iside 25; Oakesmith's Religion of Plutarch, pp. 121 f., 163 f.). Wherever the reaction against materialism prevailed, especially in the popular religion of the empire, and belief in daemons or spirits as intermediate agents gave expression to the conviction that human weakness could not come into direct touch with the divine glory (cf. Friedlander, iii. 430 f.; Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, 245 f.).

Ver. 2. ἐμαρτ. (epistol. aor., cf. Phlm. 19, cf. further Thuc. i. 1 ζυγώγραψε, λόγ. τ. θ., like τις ἔα, τῆς [LXX λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, e.g., Jer. i. 2], a collective term for God's discourses to men [τοῦ λόγου, 3], or as here for some specific revelation more exactly defined in δείκνυν, all that was seen or even heard (Amos i. 2) in visions being described by this generic term. The double expression the word of God and the testimony borne by Jesus Christ (xxii. 16, 20; cf. xix. 10) is an amplified phrase for the gospel. The subject upon which Jesus assures men of truth is the revelation of God's mind and heart, and the gospel is that utterance of God—that expression of His purpose—which Jesus unfolds and attests. The book itself is the record of John's evidence; he testifies to Christ, and Christ testifies of the future as a divine plan. For the revelation of God, in the specific form of prophecy, requires a further medium between Jesus and the ordinary Christian; hence the rôle of the prophets. On the prophetic commission to write, cf. Act. i. 6-8 and i. 2, παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τῆς προφητείας ὁ αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν, κ.τ.λ. The primitive sense of μαρτ. (= oral confession and proclamation of Jesus by his adherents) thus expands into a literary sense (as here) and into the more sombre meaning of martyrdom (ii. 13, John xviii. 37-39, xix. 19; cf. Lightfoot on Clem. Rom. v.). It is significant that the λόγος τ. θ. of Judaism was not adequate to the Christian consciousness without the μαρτυρία Ι.σου.
of its predictions, instead of losing heart and faith (Luke xviii. 8). Cf. Hipp. De Antich. 2 and En. civ. 12, “books will be given to the righteous and the wise to become a cause of joy and uprightness and much wisdom”. The content of the Apocalypse is not merely prediction; moral counsel and religious instruction are the primary burden of its pages. The bliss of the obedient and attentive, however, is bound up with the certainty that the crisis at which the predictions of the book are to be realised is imminent; they have not to wait long for the fulfilment of their hopes. This, with the assurance of God’s interest and intervention, represented the ethical content of early Christian prediction, which would have been otherwise a mere satisfaction of curiosity; see on ver. 19.

[Note on i. 1-3. If this inscription (absent from no MS.) is due to the author, it must have been added (so Bruston, Jülicher, Hirch, Holtzm., Ba.) like the προφητεύουσα of Thucydides, after he had finished the book as a whole. But possibly it was inserted by the later hand of an editor or redactor (Völter, Erbes, Briggs, Hilg., Forbes, Wellhausen, J. Weiss, Simcox = elders of Ephesus, John xx. 24) rather than of a copyist (Spitta, Sabatier, Schön), who reproduced the Johannine style of the Apocalypse proper. At the same time, the change from the third to the first person (ver. 9) is unexampled (cf. Jer. i. 1-3, x. 4-9; Ezek. i. 1-4; Enoch repeatedly), and forms no sure proof of an original text overlaid with editorial touches; nor is there a certain sententious objectivity (cf. Herod. i. 1, ii. 23, etc.) unnatural at the commencement of a book, when the writer has occasion to introduce himself. The real introduction begins at ver. 4 (cf. xxii. 21.).]

Vv. 4-8. The prologue.

Ver. 4. τοῖς προφητεύουσας καὶ τῷ προφητεύταις τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα. h Cf. xxii. 10.


The Tois must refer proleptically to ver. 11; for other churches existed and flourished in proconsular Asia at this time, e.g., at Troas, Magnesia, Hierapolis and Colossae, with which the prophet must have been familiar. These seven are selected by him for some special reason which it is no longer possible to disinter (see above, Introd., § 2). ἄνωθεν θεός, κ.τ.λ., a quaint and deliberate violation of grammar (Win. § 10, 1c.; Moul. i. 9) in order to preserve the immutability and absoluteness of the divine name from declension, though it falls under the rule that in N.T. and LXX parenthetic and accessory clauses tend to assume an independent construction. The divine title is a paraphrase probably suggested by rabbinic language (e.g., Targum Jonath. apud Deut. xxii. 39, ego ille, qui est et qui fuit et qui erit); the idea would be quite familiar to Hellenic readers from similar expressions, e.g., in the song of doves at Dodona (Zeus θεός, Zeus ἱερος, Zeus ἄνωθεν) or in the titles of Asclepius and Athene. Simon Magus is said to have designated himself also as διάτοτος, διά τοῦτος, ὅ δὲ ἀποκάλεσαν, and the shrine of Minerva (=Iasn) at Sais bore the inscription, I am all that hath been and is and shall be: my veil no mortal yet hath raised (Plut. de Iside, 9), the latter part eclipsed by the comforting Christian assurance here. ἐν, another deliberate anomaly (finite verb for participle) due to dogmatic reasons; no past participle of ἐστι existed, and γεγονότος was obviously misleading. διὰ προφητευμάτων, to correspond with the keynote of the book, struck loudly in ver. 7. In and with his messiah, Jesus, God himself comes; ἐρχόμενος (the present) acquires, partly through the meaning of the verb, a future significance. For the emphasis and priority of θεός in this description of God, see the famous passage in Aug. Confess. ix. 10. τὰ προφητεύματα: a puzzling conception whose roots have been traced in various directions to (a) an erroneous but not unnatural interpretation of Isa. xii. 2-3, found in the Targ. Jonath. (as in En. lix. 11, sevenfold spirit of virtues) and shared by Justin (Dial. 87, cf. Cohort. ad Graec., c. 32, διὰ τοῦτο οἱ λεπτοὶ προ φη τεύμα τοι πρὸ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ προφητεύμα τοῦ ἐν τῷ και τῆς προφητεύμα τῶν προφητεύματος χρῆσθαι φῶς), or—more probably—to the later Jewish
The notion (b) of the seven holy angels (Tobit xii. 15; cf. Grösser, i. 360 L) which reappears in early Christianity (cf. Clem. Al. ii. 24-25, 27-28, 35, ἡ πόλις ἐν τοῖς ἑβάτοις ἀγίστοις ἐν τοῖς ἑβατοίς ἀγίστοις, modified from (c) a still earlier Babylonian conception, behind (b), of the seven spirits of the sky—the sun, the moon, and the five planets. The latter is not unknown to Jewish literature before 100 a.d. (cf. Jub. ii. 2 f.; Berachoth, 32, b), corresponding to the Persian Amasiasm (Yaash., xix. 19, 20, S. B. E. xxxi. 145) and reflected in “the seven first white ones” or angelic retinue of the Lord in Enoch xc. 21 f. (Cheyne, Orig. Ps. 281-2, 327 f., 334 f.; Stave, 216 f.; Luken, 32 f.; R. F. 319). Whether the prophet and his readers were conscious of this derivation or not, the conception is stereotyped and designed to express in archaic terms the supreme majesty of God before whose throne (i.e., obedient and ready for any commission, cf. v. 6) these mighty beings live. They are not named or divided in the Apocalypse, but the objection to taking the expression in the sense of (a) denoting, as in Philo (where, e.g., διὰ τῆς Μακεδονίας εὑρεν or κατὰ τῆς ἑλλησπόντου νῆσος is a characteristic symbol of the divine Logos), the sevenfold and complete energy of the Spirit in semi-poetic fashion, is the obvious fact that this is out of line with the trinity of the apocalypse, which is alluded to that of Luke ix. 26; 1 Tim. v. 21; Just. Mart. Apol. i. 6. The Spirit in the Apocalypse, as in Jude, 2 Peter and the pastoral epistles, is wholly prophetic. It has not the content of the Spirit in Paul or in the Fourth Gospel. Since the writer intends to enlarge upon the person of Jesus, or because the seven spirits stood next to the deity in the traditional mise-en-scene, he makes them precede Christ in order.

The λέοντας...κατά τοῦ ΠΩ, min., vg., Me., Aeth., Areth. (so Bg., Trench, West, de W., Balj., Sp., Ba., Burgon: Corruption in Trad. Text, 59-60; for constr. cf. Deissm., 227) is a corruption of λέωντας εκ (NAC, 1, etc., Syr., Arm., Ande., Fr., edd., cf. xx. 7), probably due to misconception of Heb. use of ev (WH), and to the association of the two ideas (cf. Iren. iv. 27, 1: qui abdit et emundat eum hominem qui peccato fuerat obstrictus, and Plato's Cratylus, 405 B δ αυτονομια καὶ εν τοις τοις καινων).
καὶ ἑωράσων, the harsh anacolouthon breaks up the participial construction. ἤμας, emphatic. "We Christians are now the chosen people. In us the Dianetic prophecy of a reign of the saints is fulfilled and is to be fulfilled." This is a typical Dianetic or Aramaic note. Persecution (cf. 1 Peter ii. 5) deepened the sense of continuity in the early Christians, who felt driven back on the truth of election and divine protection; they were the true successors of all noble sufferers in Israel who had gone before (cf. the argument of Heb. xi. 32—xii. 2). In the Apocalypse the Christian church is invariably the true Israel, including all who believe in Christ, irrespective of birth and nationality. God reigns over them, and they reign, or will reign, over the world. In fact, Christians now and here are what Israel hoped to become, πάντες, priest-princes of God, and this position has been won for them by a messiah whom the Jews had rejected, and whom all non-Christians will have to acknowledge as sovereign. According to rabbinic tradition, the messianic age would restore to Israel the priestly standing which it had lost by its worship of the golden calf; and by the first commandment (Mechilta on Exod. xx. 2), "slaves became kings". There may also be an implicit anti-Roman allusion. We Christians, harried and despised, are a community with a great history and a greater hope. Our connection with Christ makes us truly imperial. The adoration of Christ, which vibrates in this doxology (cf. Expos. 3, 302-307), is one of the most impressive features of the book. The prophet feels that the one hope for the loyalists of God in this period of trial is to be conscious that they owe everything to the redeeming love of Jesus. Faithfulness depends on faith, and faith is rallied by the grasp not of itself but of its object. Mysterious explanations of history follow, but it is passionate devotion to Jesus, and not any skill in exploring prophecy, which proves the supreme moral heroism in the churches. Jesus sacrificed himself for us; αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα. From this inward trust and wonder, which leap up at the sight of Jesus and his grace, the loyalty of Christians flows.

This enthusiasm for Jesus naturally carries the prophet's mind forward (7, 8) to the time when the Lord's majesty will flash out on mankind. He resumesthe line of thought interrupted by the doxology of 5b-6.

Ver. 7. A reminiscence and adaptation of Dan. vii. 13 (Theod.) and Zech. xii. 10-14. The substitution of ἀσκετήριανεως (so John xix. 37, Justin's Apol. i. 52, Dial. xxxii., cf. lxii., cxviii., adding εἰς) for καταχωρήσατο (LXX mistranslation in this passage, though not elsewhere, of ὑποδοχῆς) —shows that the original text was used (though Lücke and Ewald hold that ἦς was the LXX reading till Origen), and that it was interpreted in some (Johannine? Abbott, Diatessarica, 1259-1262, 2317) circles as a prophecy of the crucifixion. Only, the reference is no longer to repentance (Zech.), but, by a turn of characteristic severity, to remorse and judgment. There is a remarkable parallel in Matt. xxiv. 30, where patristic tradition (cf. A. C. 233-36) early recognised ἐν σομαίνῃ τ. v. 4, the cross itself, made visible on the day of judgment. The first of the three signs preceding Christ's advent in the clouds, acc. to Dial. xvi. 6 (cf. Zech. ii. 13 LXX), is σομαίνῃ ἐνεργά-
The advent of the Christ, which marks the end of the age, is brought about by God, who overrules (παντοκράτωρ always of God in Apocalypse, otherwise the first part of the title might have suggested Christ) even the anomalies and contradictions of history for this providential climax. By the opening of the second century παντοκράτωρ had become the first title of God in the Roman creed; the Apocalypse, indifferent to the former epithet, reproduces the latter owing to its Hebraic sympathies. ἐγὼ εἰμί: Coleridge used to declare that one chief defect in Spinoza was that the Jewish philosopher started with It is instead of with ἐγώ τῷ σώματι,}\footnote{iii.22, an address to Asiatic Christendom (as represented by seven churches) which in high prophetic and oracular style rallies Christians to their genuine oracle of revelation in Jesus and his prophetic spirit. At a time when local oracles (for the famous one of Apollo near Miletus, see Friedländer, iii.}
Besides those in Greece and Syria and Egypt, were eagerly frequented, it was of moment to lay stress on what had superseded all such media for the faithful. Cf. Minuc. Felix, Oct. 7, "pleni et mixti deo utes futura praecerput, dant cautela perculis, morbis medelam, spem afflicitis, operam miseris, solacium calamitatibus, laboribus leuamentum".

1. q-20, introductory vision.

Ver. 9. The personality of the seer is made prominent in apocalyptic literature, to locate or guarantee any visions which are to follow. Here the authority with which this prophet is to speak is conditioned by his kinship of Christian experience with the churches and his special revelation from God. διαθέσει (cf. vi. 11, xii. 10): for its pagan use as = fellow-member of the same (religious) society, cf. C. F. P. i. 96 f., and Dittenberger's Ἑπιλογία Ἱνσρ. Græc. 474, 10 (διαθέσει ὁς κοιναὶ ποιῆσαι). θλίψις, put first as the absorbing fact of their experience, and as a link of sympathy between writer and readers; καὶ βασιλεῖα, the outcome of θλίψις in the messianic order: distress no end in itself; καὶ θυμομογια, patient endurance the moral condition of participation in θλίψις and βασιλεία, by which one is nerved to endure the presence of the former without breaking down, and to bear the temporary delay of the latter without impatience. While μάρτυρις is the absence of resentment at wrong, θυμομογια not giving way under trials. See Barn. ii., "the aids of our faith are fear and patience, long-suffering and self-control are our allies"; also Tertullian's famous aphorism, "ubi Deus, ibi et almae eius, patientia sciictect". — ἐν Ηττσω (a Pauline conception, only repeated in Apocalypse at xiv. 13), either with all three substantives or merely (cf. 2 Thess. iii. 5) with θυμομογια. In any case ὑπ' is closely linked to ἐν 't; such patience, as exemplified in Jesus, and inspired by him, was the cardinal virtue of the Apocalypse and its age. In the early Christian literature of this period "we cannot name anything upon which blessedness is so frequently made to rest, as upon the exercise of patient endurance" (Titius, 143). ένεναντιο [sfn] ἐν ("I found myself in"): implying that when he wrote he was no longer there, not by flowing waters (as frequently, e.g., En. xiii. 7), but in the small, treeless, scantily populated island of Patmos, one of the Sporades, whither criminals were banished sometimes by the Roman authorities (Plin. Hist. Nat. iv. 12, 23). Relegatio to an island was not an infrequent form of punishment for better-class offenders or suspected under the black régime of Domitian, as under Diocletian for Christians (cf. Introd. § 6). No details are given, but probably it meant hard labour in the quarries, and was inflicted by the pro-consul of Asia Minor. Why John was only banished, we do not know. As "the word of God and the witness of Jesus" are not qualified by any phrase such as δόξα Μισσίν (ver. 2, and thereby identified with the present Apocalypse), the words indicate as elsewhere (cf. θλίσσα, κ.τ.λ., ref.): the occasion of his presence in Patmos, i.e., his loyalty to the gospel (cf. θλίσσα), rather than the object of his visit. The latter could hardly be evangelising (Spitta), for Patmos was insignificant and desolate, nor, in face of the use of δόξα, can the phrase mean "for the purpose of receiving this revelation" (Bleek, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Hausbach, B. Weiss, Baljon, etc.). Either he had voluntarily withdrawn from the mainland to escape the stress of persecution (which scarcely harmonises with the context or the general temper of the book) or for solitary communion (cf. Ezek. i. 1-3), or, as is more likely, his removal was a punishment (cf. Abbott, 11-10). The latter view is corroborated by tradition (cf. Zahn, § 64, note 7), which, although later and neither uniform nor wholly credible, is strong enough to be taken as independent evidence. It can hardly be explained away as a mere elaboration of the present passage (so, e.g., Reuss, Bleek, Bousset); the allusion to μάρτυρις is too slight to have been suggested by the darker sense of martyrdom, and it is far-fetched to argue that the tradition was due to a desire to glorify John with a martyrdom. Unless, therefore, the reference is a piece of literary fiction (in which case it would probably have been
elaborated) it must be supposed to be vague simply because the matter was perfectly familiar to the circle for whom the book was written. It is to those exercised in prudence, temperance, and virtue that (according to Philo, *de incorrupt. mundi*, § 1, *cf.* Plutarch’s discussion in *defect. orac.* 38 f.) God vouchsafes visions, but John introduces his personal experience in order to establish relations between himself and his readers rather than to indicate the conditions of his theophany.

Ver. 10. Ecstasy or spiritual rapture, the supreme characteristic of prophets in *Did. xi. 7* (where the unpardonable sin is to criticise a prophet ἀλαλοῦν ἐν πνεύματι, was not an uncommon experience in early Christianity, which was profoundly conscious of living in the long-looked for messianic age (*Acts ii. 17 f.*, *cf.* Eph. iii. 5), when such phenomena were to be a matter of course. Throughout the Apocalypse (xxi. 5, etc.) John first sees, then writes; the two are not simultaneous. While the Apocalypse is thus the record of a vision (*ἰδρασις*, ix. 17), the usual accompaniments of a vision—i.e., prayer and fasting—are significantly absent from the description of this inaugural scene, which is reticent and simple as compared, e.g., with a passage like *Asc. Isd.* iv. 10-16. It is possible, however, that the prophet was engaged in prayer when the trance or vision overtook him (like Peter, *Acts x. 9-11*, *cf.* Ign. ad Polyc. ii. 2, ὅποι ὅποι ἔρημος ἕφε, ὅποι οὐκ ἀκολουθήσῃ), since the day of weekly Christian worship is specially mentioned on which, though separated from the churches (was there one at Patmos?), he probably was wrapt in meditations (on the resurrection of Christ) appropriate to the hour. The *Imperial* or Lord’s day, first mentioned here in early Christian literature (so *Did. xiv.*, Gosp. Peter 11, etc.) contains an implicit allusion to the ethnic custom, prevalent in Asia Minor, of designating the first day of the month (or week?) as Παρασκευή in honour of the emperor’s birthday (see Thieme’s *Inschr. Maenander*, 1906, 15, and Deissmann in *E.Bi.* 2813 f.). Christians, too, have their imperial day (*cf.* Intro. § 2), to celebrate the birthday of their heavenly king. With his mind absorbed in the thought of the exalted Jesus and stored with O.T. messianic conceptions from Daniel and Ezekiel, the prophet had the following ecstasy in which the thoughts of Jesus and of the church already present to his mind are fused into one vision. He recalls in spirit the usual church-service with its praises, prayers, sudden voices, and silences. (*Compare Ign. Magn. ix. εἰ ὁ θεός ὁ θεός, *cf.* Acts xxii. 17, contrast *Rev.* in *sine Acta* xii. 11.

Ver. 11. Euph. or spiritual rapture, the supreme characteristic of prophets in *Did. xi. 7* (where the unpardonable sin is to criticise a prophet ἀλαλοῦν ἐν πνεύματι, was not an uncommon experience in early Christianity, which was profoundly conscious of living in the long-looked for messianic age (*Acts ii. 17 f.*, *cf.* Eph. iii. 5), when such phenomena were to be a matter of course. Throughout the Apocalypse (xxi. 5, etc.) John first sees, then writes; the two are not simultaneous. While the Apocalypse is thus the record of a vision (*ἰδρασις*, ix. 17), the usual accompaniments of a vision—i.e., prayer and fasting—are significantly absent from the description of this inaugural scene, which is reticent and simple as compared, e.g., with a passage like *Asc. Isd.* iv. 10-16. It is possible, however, that the prophet was engaged in prayer when the trance or vision overtook him (like Peter, *Acts x. 9-11*, *cf.* Ign. ad Polyc. ii. 2, ὅποι ὅποι ἔρημος ἕφε, ὅποι οὐκ ἀκολουθήσῃ), since the day of weekly Christian worship is specially mentioned on which, though separated from the churches (was there one at Patmos?), he probably was wrapt in meditations (on the resurrection of Christ) appropriate to the hour. The *Imperial* or Lord’s day, first mentioned here in early Christian literature (so *Did. xiv.*, Gosp. Peter 11, etc.) contains an implicit allusion to the ethnic custom, prevalent in Asia Minor, of designating the first day of the month (or week?) as Παρασκευή in honour of the emperor’s birthday (see Thieme’s *Inschr. Maenander*, 1906, 15, and Deissmann in *E.Bi.* 2813 f.). Christians, too, have their imperial day (*cf.* Intro. § 2), to celebrate the birthday of their heavenly king. With his mind absorbed in the thought of the exalted Jesus and stored with O.T. messianic conceptions from Daniel and Ezekiel, the prophet had the following ecstasy in which the thoughts of Jesus and of the church already present to his mind are fused into one vision. He recalls in spirit the usual church-service with its praises, prayers, sudden voices, and silences. (*Compare Ign. Magn. ix. εἰ ὁ θεός ὁ θεός, *cf.* Acts xxii. 17, contrast *Rev.* in *sine Acta* xii. 11.

Ver. 10. Ecstasy or spiritual rapture, the supreme characteristic of prophets in *Did. xi. 7* (where the unpardonable sin is to criticise a prophet ἀλαλοῦν ἐν πνεύματι, was not an uncommon experience in early Christianity, which was profoundly conscious of living in the long-looked for messianic age (*Acts ii. 17 f.*, *cf.* Eph. iii. 5), when such phenomena were to be a matter of course. Throughout the Apocalypse (xxi. 5, etc.) John first sees, then writes; the two are not simultaneous. While the Apocalypse is thus the record of a vision (*ἰδρασις*, ix. 17), the usual accompaniments of a vision—i.e., prayer and fasting—are significantly absent from the description of this inaugural scene, which is reticent and simple as compared, e.g., with a passage like *Asc. Isd.* iv. 10-16. It is possible, however, that the prophet was engaged in prayer when the trance or vision overtook him (like Peter, *Acts x. 9-11*, *cf.* Ign. ad Polyc. ii. 2, ὅποι ὅποι ἔρημος ἕφε, ὅποι οὐκ ἀκολουθήσῃ), since the day of weekly Christian worship is specially mentioned on which, though separated from the churches (was there one at Patmos?), he probably was wrapt in meditations (on the resurrection of Christ) appropriate to the hour. The *Imperial* or Lord’s day, first mentioned here in early Christian literature (so *Did. xiv.*, Gosp. Peter 11, etc.) contains an implicit allusion to the ethnic custom, prevalent in Asia Minor, of designating the first day of the month (or week?) as Παρασκευή in honour of the emperor’s birthday (see Thieme’s *Inschr. Maenander*, 1906, 15, and Deissmann in *E.Bi.* 2813 f.). Christians, too, have their imperial day (*cf.* Intro. § 2), to celebrate the birthday of their heavenly king. With his mind absorbed in the thought of the exalted Jesus and stored with O.T. messianic conceptions from Daniel and Ezekiel, the prophet had the following ecstasy in which the thoughts of Jesus and of the church already present to his mind are fused into one vision. He recalls in spirit the usual church-service with its praises, prayers, sudden voices, and silences. (*Compare Ign. Magn. ix. εἰ ὁ θεός ὁ θεός, *cf.* Acts xxii. 17, contrast *Rev.* in *sine Acta* xii. 11.

Ver. 10. Ecstasy or spiritual rapture, the supreme characteristic of prophets in *Did. xi. 7* (where the unpardonable sin is to criticise a prophet ἀλαλοῦν ἐν πνεύματι, was not an uncommon experience in early Christianity, which was profoundly conscious of living in the long-looked for messianic age (*Acts ii. 17 f.*, *cf.* Eph. iii. 5), when such phenomena were to be a matter of course. Throughout the Apocalypse (xxi. 5, etc.) John first sees, then writes; the two are not simultaneous. While the Apocalypse is thus the record of a vision (*ἰδρασις*, ix. 17), the usual accompaniments of a vision—i.e., prayer and fasting—are significantly absent from the description of this inaugural scene, which is reticent and simple as compared, e.g., with a passage like *Asc. Isd.* iv. 10-16. It is possible, however, that the prophet was engaged in prayer when the trance or vision overtook him (like Peter, *Acts x. 9-11*, *cf.* Ign. ad Polyc. ii. 2, ὅποι ὅποι ἔρημος ἕφε, ὅποι οὐκ ἀκολουθήσῃ), since the day of weekly Christian worship is specially mentioned on which, though separated from the churches (was there one at Patmos?), he probably was wrapt in meditations (on the resurrection of Christ) appropriate to the hour. The *Imperial* or Lord’s day, first mentioned here in early Christian literature (so *Did. xiv.*, Gosp. Peter 11, etc.) contains an implicit allusion to the ethnic custom, prevalent in Asia Minor, of designating the first day of the month (or week?) as Παρασκευή in honour of the emperor’s birthday (see Thieme’s *Inschr. Maenander*, 1906, 15, and Deissmann in *E.Bi.* 2813 f.). Christians, too, have their imperial day (*cf.* Intro. § 2), to celebrate the birthday of their heavenly king. With his mind absorbed in the thought of the exalted Jesus and stored with O.T. messianic conceptions from Daniel and Ezekiel, the prophet had the following ecstasy in which the thoughts of Jesus and of the church already present to his mind are fused into one vision. He recalls in spirit the usual church-service with its praises, prayers, sudden voices, and silences. (*Compare Ign. Magn. ix. εἰ ὁ θεός ὁ θεός, *cf.* Acts xxii. 17, contrast *Rev.* in *sine Acta* xii. 11.}
nature as conceived by the popular religion of contemporary Phrygia, viz., (a) prophetic power, (b) healing and purifying power, and (c) divine authority (symbolised by the axe): C. B. P., ii. 357.

Ver. 11. γραφήν (cf. Herm.Vis. II. iv. 3); this emphasis put upon the commission to compose and circulate what he sees in the vision, is due to the author's claim of canonical authority and reflects a time when a literary work of this nature still required some guarantee, although at an earlier date smaller oracles had been written and accepted (e.g., that which determined the flight of the early Christians to Pella, Eus. H. E., iii. 5, 3). John's rôle, however, is passive in two senses of the term. He seldom acts or journeys in his vision, whereas Jewish apocalypses are full of the movements of their seers; nor does his vision lead to any practical course of action, for—unlike most of the O.T. prophets—he is not conscious of any commission to preach or to reform the world. The prophet is an author. His experience is to be no luxury but a diffused benefit; and as in Tob. xii. 20 ("and now . . . write in a book all that has taken place") and 4 Esd. xii. 37 ("therefore write in a book all thou hast seen, and thou shalt teach," etc.), the prophet is careful to explain that composition is no mere literary enterprise but due to a divine behest. The cities are enumerated from Ephesus northwards to Smyrna (forty miles) and Pergamos (fifty miles north of Smyrna), then across for forty miles S.E. to Thyatira, down to Sardis, Philadelphia (thirty miles S.E. of Sardis), and Laodicea (forty miles S.E. of Philadelphia). Cf. on ver. 4 and Introd. § 2. Except Pergamos and Laodicea, the churches lay within Lydia (though the writer employs the imperial term for the larger province) which was at that period a by-word for voluptuous civilisation.

Ver. 12. The seven golden lamp-stands are cressets representing the seven churches (20), the sevenfold lamp-stand of the Jewish temple (cf. S. C. 295-90) having been for long used as a symbol (Zech. iv. 2, 10). The function of the churches is to embody and express the light of the divine presence upon earth, so high is the prophet's conception of the communities (cf. on ii. 4, 5); their duty is to keep the light burning and bright, otherwise the reason for their existence disappears (ii. 5). Consequently the primary activity of Jesus in providence and revelation bears upon the purity of those societies through which his influence is to reach mankind, just as his connexion with them on the other hand assures them of One in heaven to whom out of difficulties here they can appeal with confidence.

Ver. 13. The churches are inseparable from their head and centre Jesus, who moves among the cressets of his temple with the dignity and authority of a high priest. The anarthrous ἄν άρι. is the human appearance of the celestial mes-
siah, as in En. xlvii. 1-6 (where the Son of man accompanies God, who, as the Head of Days, had a head “white as wool”) and Asc. Isa. xi. 1. The difficult ἐμφάνισθαι is to be explained (with Vit. ii. 127, 223, 227) as ἦσ (ii. 18, vi. 14, ix. 7, 8, xii. 11) or ἰδον, “something like,” a loose reproduction of the Heb. (“un être semblable à nous, un homme”). The whole passage illustrates the writer’s habit of describing an object or person by heaping up qualities without strict regard to natural or grammatical collocation.  γενήθητε (sc. χιτών or ἰδιώτα), a long robe reaching to the feet, was an oriental mark of dignity (cf. on i. 7, and Ezek. ix. 2, 11, LXX), denoting high rank or office such as that of Parthian kings or of the Jewish high priest who wore a purple one. High girding (with a belt?) was another mark of lofty position, usually reserved for Jewish priests, though the Iranians frequently appealed to their deities as “high-girt” (i.e., ready for action=cf. Yashit xv. 54, 57, “Vaya of the golden girdle, high-girded, swift moving, as powerful in sovereignty as any absolute sovereign in the world”). The golden buckle or φίόνα was part of the insignia of royalty and its ἰδιώτα (x Macc. x. 8, 9, xi. 58). The author thus mixes royal and sacerdotal colours on his palette to heighten the majesty of Christ’s appearance. New, golden (as in Iranian eschatology), shining, white—are the usual adjectives which he employs throughout the book for the transcendent bliss of the life beyond and its heavenly tenants; “golden” had been used already in Greek as a synonym for precious, excellent, divine.

Ver. 14. ἰδον; another conventional simile for celestial beings. ἰδον, αἰτίς, a pleonastic expression; either = “his head, i.e. his hair,” or “his forehead and his hair”; scarcely a hendiadys for “the hair of the head” (Bengel). Jewish tradition rationalised the white hairs into a proof of God’s activity as a wise old teacher (Chag. 14, cf. Prov. xx. 27 f.), and the Daniel-vision might suggest the same paradox between the divine energy and this apparent sign of weakness. But such traits are probably poetical, not allegorical, in John’s vision; they body forth his conception of Jesus as divine. In Egyptian theology a similar trait belongs to Ani after beatiﬁcation. The whole conception of the messiah in the Apocalypses resembles that outlined in Enoch (Similitudes, xxxviii.-lxxi.), where he also possesses pre-existence as Son of man (xlviii.) sits on his throne of glory (xlviii. 3) for judgment, rules all men (lxii. 6), and slays the wicked with the word of his mouth (lxii. 2); but this particular transference to the messiah (i. 14, 17, 18, ii. 8, xliii. 12, 13), of what is in Daniel predicated of God as the world-judge, seems to form a specifically N.T. idea, unmediated even in Enoch (xlii. 1), although the association of priestly and judicial attributes with those of royalty was easy for an Oriental (it is predicated of the messiah by Jonathan ben Usiel on Zech. iv. 12, 13). ὤτοι πυρός, like Slav. En. i. 5, from Dan. x. 6; cf. Suet. August. 79, “oculos habuit claros et nitidos, quibus etiam existimari voluit inesse quidam diuinum uigilior; gaudebatque si quis sibi acerius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis uultum submitteret”. Divine beauty was generally manifested (Verg. Aen. v. 647 f.) in glowing eyes (insight and indignation), the countenance and the voice; here also (ver. 15) in feet to crush all opposition. The messiah is not crowned, however (cf. later, xix. 12). ἰερόν; some hard (as yet unidentified) metal which gleamed after smelting. The most probable meaning of this obscure hybrid term is that suggested by Suidas: χαλκολιβάνου - ἵδον ἰδιώτα τιμίωτερον χρυσοί, ἀπὸ δὲ τὸ ἕλεκτρον ἀλλότρον χρυσῶν μεταγενόμενον ἰερόν καὶ λιθεῖς (ἐλ. actually occurring in LXX, Ezek. i. 27).
The reference then is to amber or to some composition like brass or (copper) bronze; only, it contains gold (cf. vulg. = aurichal-cum, a valuable and gleaming metal). Abbott (201) sees a corruption of some phrase like χαλκὸς ἐν κλαδίμαχον, while others suggest χαλκός and ἰάθα (i.e., glowing white brass). Hausleiter would assign inadequate grounds omit ὁ ἐκ κ. κ. χρυσ. (219-24).

Ver. 16. The care and control exercised by Christ over the churches only come forward after the suggestions of majesty and authority (13-15) which followed the initial idea of Christ's central position (ἐν μέσῳ) among the churches. Cf. v. 6 (ἐν μέσῳ) for another reference to Christ's central authority—ἐκκλησία, κ.τ.λ. For the astrological background of this figure, cf. Jeremias 24 ff. The traditional symbol, of which an interpretation is given later (ver. 20), probably referred to the seven planets rather than to the Pleiades or any other constellation. If the description is to be visualised, the seven stars may be pictured as lying on Christ's palm in the form of the stars in the constellation of Ursa Major— ῥομφαία, κ.τ.λ. By a vivid objectifying of the divine word (corresponding to that, e.g., in Isa. ix. 8 f., ix. 4, and suggested by the tongue-shaped appearance of the short Roman sword or dagger), the figure of the sharp sword issuing from the mouth is applied (in Ps. Sol. xvii. 27, 39, as here) to the messiah, as in Jewish literature to God (Ps. cxlix. 6, etc.) and to wisdom (Sap. xviii. 15), elsewhere to the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Heb. iv. 12, cf. Apoc. xix. 13-15): Christ's power of reproof and punishment is to be directed against the church (ii. 12 f.) as well as against the world of heathen opposition (xiv. 21, where the trait is artistically more appropriate). As a nimbus or coronata radiata sometimes crowned the emperor ("image des rayons lumineux qu'il lance sur le monde," Beurlier, so the face of Christ (ὁ χρύσος as in John xi. 44, cf. below, x. 1) is aptly termed, as in the usual description of angelic visitants (reff.), bright as suns and bright as the light intercepted by mist or clouds. This is the climax of the delineation.

Ver. 17. ἀκρώτητα κ.τ.λ., the stereotyped behaviour (cf. Num. xxiv. 4) in such apocalyptic trances (Weinel, 129, 182, R. F. 375 f.; for the terror of spiritual experience cf. Schiller's lines: "Schrecklich ist es Deiner Wahrheit|Sterbliches Gefäß zu seyn") and of Jesus, however, does here what Michael (En. lxix. 3) or some other friendly angel does in most Jewish apocalypses. There is no dialogue between the prophet and Christ, as there is afterwards between him and the celestial beings—μη χαρά. The triple reassurance is (1) that the mysterious, overwhelming Figure reveals his character, experience and authority, instead of proving an alien unearthly visitant; (2) the vision has a practical object ("write," 19) bearing upon human life, and (3) consequently the mysteries are not left as baffling enigmas. All the early Christian revelations which are self-contained, presuppose the risen Christ as their source; the Apocalypse of Peter, being fragmentary, is hardly
an exception to the rule. The present vision presents him as superhuman, messianic, militant and divine. But the writer is characteristically indifferent to the artistic error of making Christ's right hand at once hold seven stars and be laid on the seer (16, 17). Cf. the fine application of the following passage by Milton in his Remonstrant Defence. The whole description answers to what is termed, in modern psychology, a "photism".

Ver. 18. Not "it is I, the first and the last" (which would require ἦν ἐμί before μὴ φθείροντας, but "I am, etc." The eternal life of the exalted Christ is a comfort both in method and result; ἐγενήμενον νεκρὸς (not ἔστι; really dead), his experience assuring men of sympathy and understanding; καὶ Ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ., his victory and authority over death— an assurance of his power to rescue his own people from the grim prison of the underworld (Hades, cf. 3 Macc. v. 50, the intermediate abode of the dead, being as usual personified in connexion with death). A background for this conception lies in the primitive idea of Janus, originally an Italian sungod, as the key-holder (cf. Ovid's Fasti, i. 129, 130, Hor. Carm. Sec. 9, 10) who opens and closes the day (sun = deus clauiger), rather than in Mithraism which only knew keys of heaven, or in Mandæan religion (Cheyne's Bible Problems, 102-106). The key was a natural Oriental symbol for authority and power (cf. in this book, iii. 7, ix. 1, xx. 1). Jewish belief (see Gfrörer, i. 377-378) assigned three keys or four exclusively to God ("quos neque angelo neque seraphino committit"); these included, according to different views, "clavis sepulchorum," "clavis utiae," "clavis resurrectionis mortuorum". To ascribe this divine prerogative to Jesus as the divine Hero who had mastered death is, therefore, another notable feature in the high Christology of this book. For the whole conception see E. B. D. ch. ixv. (fifth century B.C.)? "I am Yesterday and To-day and To-morrow . . . I am the Lord of the men who are raised again; the Lord who cometh forth from out of the darkness. It is based on the theophany of the Ancient of Days in Dan. vii. 14 f. (yet cf. x. 5, 6), who bestows on the ideal Israel (ἐν θekte ἀνεφοίτω) dominion. John changes this into a Christophany, like the later Jewish tradition which saw in θέλει ἀνεφοίτω a personal, divine messiah. When one remembers the actual position of affairs, the confident faith of such passages is seen to have been little short of magnificent. To this Christian prophet, spokesman of a mere ripple upon a single wave of dissent in the broad ocean of paganism, history and experience find unity and meaning nowhere but in the person of a blameless Galilean peasant who had perished as a criminal in Jerusalem. So would such early Christian expectations appear to an outsider. He would be staggered by the extraordinary claims advanced on behalf of its God by this diminutive sect, perhaps more than staggered by the prophecy that imperial authority over the visible and invisible worlds lay ultimately in the hands of this deity, whose power was not limited to his own adherents.—Christophanies were commissions either to practical service (Acts x. 19, etc.), or, as here, so composition.

Ver. 19. οὕτως, at the command of him who has authority over the world and the future (resuming ver. 11, now that the paralysing fear of ver. 17 has been removed). Like the author of 4th Esdras, this prophet is far more interested in history than in the chronological speculations which engrossed many of the older apocalypticists. The sense of γράφων
the foregoing vision which had to be set in a new light, partly because they afford a clue to all that follows (especially the opening section, ii. i, 5). The seven-branched lamp-stand was a familiar symbol, frequently carved on the lintel of a synagogue. Along with the silver trumpets and other spoils of the temple it now lay in the temple of Peace at Rome. The fanciful symbolism, by which the cressets shining on earth are represented — in another aspect — as heavenly bodies, corresponds to Paul's fine paradox about the Christian life of the saints lying hidden with Christ in God; even unsatisfactory churches, like those at Sardis and Laodicea, are not yet cast away. Note also that the light and presence of God now shine in the Christian churches, while the ancestral Jewish light is extinguished (4 Esd. x. 22): "The light of our lamp-stand is put out". It is curious that in Assyrian representations the candelabrum is frequently indistinguishable from the sacred seven-branched tree crowned with a star (R. S. 488); Josephus expressly declares (Ant. iii. 6, 7, 7, 7) that the seven lamps on the stand signified the seven planets, and that the twelve loaves on the shew-bread table signified the signs of the zodiac (Bel. v. 5, 5), while Philo had already allegorised the lamp-stand (= seven planets) in quis haeres, § xiv. This current association of the Λῆψες with the planets is bound up with the astral conception of the angels of the churches (ἄγγελοι = "angels" as elsewhere in Apocalypse), who are the heavenly representatives and counterparts or patron angels of the churches, each of the latter, like the elements (e.g., water xvi. 5, fire xiv. 18; see further in Balderasperger, 106, and Gfrörer, i. 368 f.), the wind (vii. 1), and the nether abyss (ix. 11), having its presiding heavenly spirit. The conception (E. E. v. i. 593, 594) reaches back to post-exilic speculation, in which Greece, Persia and Judæa had each an influential and responsible angelic prince (Dan. x. 13, 20-21, xii. 1), and especially to the Iranian notion of fravashis or semi-ideal prototypes of an earthly personality.
The variant τοις (AC, Pr., τοις 36, cf. Wa., 64-65) for the τοις (τοις εκκλησίας Εφεσον = S) of ΝQ, Αρμ., Άνδ., Arth. is preferred by Lach., Tr., Naber, WH (336-337), Sw., Sw., and Hort (38-40): for χρυσοῦ (ΝQ, etc., Ti., WH, Bb.) Lach., Tr., Wa., Sw. (after AC) substitute χρυσοῦ (cf. Helbing, 84 f).

(here, a community), associated with reminiscences of the Babylonian idea that certain stars were assigned to certain lands, whose folk and fortunes were bound up with their heavenly representatives (cf. Rawlinson’s Cuneif. Inscrip. West. Asia Minor, ii. 49, iii. 54, 59, etc.). Afterwards (cf. Tobit) individuals were assigned a guardian spirit. This belief (Gfrörer, i. 374 f.) passed into early Christianity (Matt. xviii. 10, Acts xii. 15, where see note), but naturally it never flourished, owing to Christ’s direct and spiritual revelation of God’s fatherly providence. The association of stars and angels is one of the earliest developments in Semitic folklore, and its poetic possibilities lent themselves effectively as here to further religious applications; e.g., Enoch (i. 18) had long ago represented seven stars, “like spirits,” in the place of fiery punishment for disobedience to God’s commands. As Dr. Kohler points out (E. J. i. 582-97), the determining factors of Jewish angelology were the ideas of “the celestial throne with its ministering angels, and the cosmos with its evil forces to be subdued by superior angelic forces,” which corresponds to the punitive and protective roles of angels in the Johannine Apocalypse. But in the latter they are neither described at length nor exalted. They are simply commissioned by God to execute his orders or instruct the seer. The supreme concern of God is with the earth and man; angels are but the middle term of this relationship, at most, the fellow-servants of the saints whose interests they promote (see below on xix. 9, 10, xxi. 8, 9). Christians, unlike the Iranians (e.g. Bund. xxx. 23, etc.), offer no praises to them; they reserve their adoration for God and Christ. However graphic and weird, the delineation of demons and angels in this book is not grotesque and crude in the sense that most early Jewish and Christian descriptions may be said to deserve these epithets. Here the guardian spirit who is responsible for a church’s welfare, would, roughly speaking, be identified with itself; his oversight and its existence being correlative terms. Hence there is a sense in which the allied conception of ἄγγελος is true, namely, that the ἄγγελος is the personified spirit or genius or heavenly counterpart of the church, the church being regarded as an ideal individual (so Andr., Arth., Wetst., Bleek, Lucke, Erbes, Beyschlag, Swete, etc.) who possesses a sort of Egyptian Αα or double. By himself, however, this view lies open to the objection that it explains one symbol by another and hardly does justice to the naive poetry of the conception. The notion of guardian angels was widespread in the early church (Hermas, Justin, Clem. Alex., Origen, etc.), independently of this passage. Statius (Silv. i. 241) says that Domitian “posuit sua sidera” (i.e., of his family) in the heaven, when he raised a temple to the Flavians—a contemporary parallel upon a lower level of feeling, but indicating a similar view of the heavenly counterpart (cf. Ramsay, Seven Letters, 68 f.). The Apocalypse, though presupposing the exercise of discipline and the practice of reading, prayer, and praise within the Christian communities, entirely ignores officials of any kind; and the following homilies are directly concerned with the churches (ii. 17, εκκλησίας, not the angels), their different members (cf. ii. 24) and their respective situations. Hence the poetic idealism of the ἄγγελος soon fades, when the writer’s practical sense is brought to bear. As the scene of revelation is ἐν οὐρανῷ and its author the heavenly Christ, the writer is instructed to address not τοῖς ἄγγελοις (e.g., ἐν Εφεσῳ), but their patron spirit or guardian angel. The point of the address is that the revelation of Jesus is directly conveyed through the spoken and written words of the prophets, as the latter are controlled by his Spirit.

CHAPTER II. 1-CHAPTER III. 20. The
seven open letters or pastorals (in the modern and ecclesiastical sense of the term) are appeals for vigour and vigilance which reflect a mind in which imaginative, even mystic fervour was accompanied by shrewd penetration into the existing state of morals and religion in the Asiatic communities. Their disorders and difficulties do not escape the notice of the prophet. He will neither spare nor despair of the churches. He speaks in the name of a Lord who knows not only who are his, but what they are. One who is keenly alive to their plight and struggles (οaddir, ii. 1, etc.) alike against inward corruption and the external pressure of the Empire, one to whom their obscure provincial conflict is a matter of infinite moment.

Ver. 1. The political and commercial primacy of Ephesus, conjoined with its prestige as a centre for the Imperial cultus which flourished beside the local cult of Diana, lent it ecumenical importance in the Eastern Empire. Christianity had for about half a century already made it a sphere and centre, and its position was enormously enhanced after the crisis of 70 A.D. in Palestine, when Asia Minor became one of the foci of the new faith (cf. von Dobschütz, pp. 100 f.). The description of the speaker is carried on from i. 12, 16, 20, with κρατάων for ἐργαζόμενον (the church is neither to be plucked nor to be dropped from his hand) and the addition of περιτατός to οὖν μετὰ (activity and universal watchfulness, cf. Abbott, pp. 196 f.), touches which make the sketch more definite, but which are too slight to be pressed into any significance, unless one supposes a subtle general contrast between the ideal of the churches—"a star shining by its own inherent light"—and their actual condition upon earth which, like the lamp, requires constant replenishing and care, if its light is not to flicker or fade.

Ver. 2. οἴδα: nothing escapes his notice, neither the good (2-3, 6) nor the bad (4, 5) qualities. ἐργαζόμενον = the general course and moral conduct of life, exemplified more especially in its active and passive sides, as exertion and endurance, by κόσμος and ὑστομονή, which are knit together by the final σου as expository of ἔργα. The κόσμος, or hard work, is further specified in the text of ver. 2 (the church's vigorous dealing with impostors), while the ὑστομονή is developed in ver. 3. For a parallel, verbal rather than real, see 1 Thess. i. 3. Here duty follows privilege (ver. 1), and communion with Christ involves practical energy and enterprise on earth. The remarkable prominence of ἔργα in this book corresponds to its O.T. conception of the fear of God which, as a religious principle, manifests itself effectively in works.

The phrase has nothing to do with the special sense in which Paul had employed it during a bygone controversy. 'Works here are the result of an inner relation to God (xii. 11).—Patient endurance (5, 3, 7) wins everything and triumphs over opposition, as in the case of the Maccabean martyrs (4 Macc. i. 11) who are lauded for their courage, καὶ τῇ ὑστομονῇ τοὺς τάραντος τῷ υπομονή.—βαστάσας, the weak are a burden to be borne (Gal. vi. 2): the false, an encumbrance to be thrown off. Patience towards the former is a note of strength: towards the latter, it is a sign of weakness. The prophet is thoroughly in sympathy (cf. 2 John 10, 11) with the sharp scrutiny exercised at Ephesus over soi-disant missionaries; he gladly recognises the moral vigour and shrewdness which made the local church impatient of itinerant evangelists whose character and methods would not stand scrutiny. Pretensions, greed and indolence were the chief sins of this class, but the prophet does not enter into details. He is content to welcome the fact that uncomplaining endurance of wrong and hardship has not evaporated the power of detecting impostors and of evincing moral antipathy to them, upon the principle that ὑστομονή, as Clem. Alex. finely explained (Strom. ii. 18), is the knowledge of what is to be endured and of what is not. The literature of this
period (i.e., 1 John ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 5 f.), may penetrate the very opposition to such error. During any prolonged strain put upon human nature, especially in a small society driven jealously to maintain its purity, temper is prone to make inroads on affection and forbearance; it was inevitable also that opportunities for this should be given in early Christianity, where party-leaders tended to exaggerate either the liberal or the puritan element in the gospel. When Apollonius of Tyana visited Ephesus, one of the first topics he raised was the duty of unselfish charity (Vit. Apoll. iv. 3). The historical reference here is probably to the temporary decline of the Ephesian church after Paul’s departure (see Acts xx. 29 f., etc.). Its revival took place under the ministry of the Johannine circle, who—carrying on the spirit of Paulinism with independent vigour—made it the most prominent centre of Christianity in the East. With vv. 2-4, compare Fliny, H. N. ii. 18: “deus est mortali iuuae mortalem, et haec ad aeternam gloriam uiuam”; also Pirke Aboth, ii. 15, where R. Jehoshua, a contemporary Jewish sage, says: “an evil eye [i.e., envy, niggardliness], and the evil nature, and hatred of mankind put a man out of the world” (cf. 1 John iii. 15). This emphasis upon brotherly love as the dominant characteristic of the church and the supreme test of genuine faith, is early Christian, however, rather than specifically Johannine (see the account of the young aristocratic martyr Vettius Epagathus, Ep. Lugd.). The purity which is not peaceable cannot be adequate to the demands of Jesus, and nowhere did this need reinforcement more than in the townships of Asia Minor, where factiousness and division constantly spoiled their guilds and mutual relations.

Ver. 5. From what a height. Contrast Cice. ad Attic. iv. 17: “non
To realise that a decline has taken place, or to admit a lapse, is the first step and stimulus to amendment (see the fine passage in Bunyan's preface to *Grace Abounding*, and the "Hymn of the Soul," 44, 45, in *Acts of Thomas*). Once this is brought home to the mind (μυημονες, a prolonged effort), repentance quick and sharp (μετανοησον, aor.) will follow, issuing in a return to the first level of excellence (και τα πρωτα μετανοησον, i.e., to the initial charity (2 John 6, 8; love shown), deeds. The way to regain this warmth of affection is neither by working up spasmodic emotion nor by theorising about it (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* ii. 4), but by doing its duties. ("The two paracletes of man are repentance and good works," Sanhed. 32). It is taken for granted that man possesses the power of turning and returning; the relation of Christ's redeeming death to the forgiveness of sins throughout the Christian life, although implied, is never explicitly argued (as in Hebrews) by this writer. The present (επτησ) emphasises the nearness of the approach, while the future (κυρ.) denotes a result to follow from it. σωθεither a dat. incommodi or (more probably) a local dat. (rare in classical literature, cf. Aesch. *Pr.* V. 360) with "the sense of motion to a place" (Simcox, *Lang. N.* T. 81), if not an incorrect reproduction of Heb. of (as Matt. xxi. 5, Blass). Cf. *Journ. Theol. St.* iii. 516. *κυρηθεις γ. κ.α.,* ("efficiam ut ecclesia esse desinas," Areth.); not degradation but destruction is the threat, brotherly love being the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*. So, in a remarkable parallel from Paul (Phil. ii. 14-16), quarrelsomeness forfeits the privileges of Christ's care and service, since the function of being *φωτισας εν κομμα*, λογιον ενηντηνες depends upon concord and charity in the church (ταυτα πολεμου χωρις γογγυσμων και διαλογισμων). A slackened sense of the obligation to mutual love formed the cardinal sin at Ephesus; to repent of this was the condition of continued existence as a church; utility or extinction is the alternative held out to her. The nature of the visitation is left unexplained; the threat is vague, but probably eschatological. The *Apostle*, however, knows nothing of the Jewish idea that Israel's repentance would bring the advent of messiah (cf. Schürer's *Hist.* II. ii. 163, 164), as though the transgressions of the people hindered his appearance.

Ver. 6. The message ends with a tardy echo of 2 b. The prophet admits that one redeeming feature in the church is the detestation of the N. Not all the spirit of animosity at Ephesus is amiss. When directed, as moral antipathy, against these detestable Nikolaitans (corresponding to the Greek quality of μεθουσώμενος), it is a healthy feature of their Christian consciousness. The Nikolaitans have been identified by patristic tradition, from Irenæus downwards, with the followers of the proselyte Nikolaos (Acts vi. 5, where see note), who is alleged, especially by Tertullian and Epiphanius, to have lapsed into antinomian license, as the result of an overstrained asceticism, and to have given his name to a sect which practised religious sensuality in the days before Cerinthus. The tenets of the latter are in fact declared by Irenæus to have been anticipated by the Nicolaiteans, who represented the spirit of libertinism which, like the opposite extreme of legalism at an earlier period, threatened the church's moral health. But if the comment of Vict. were reliable, that the N. principle was merely *ut dehiscat excrecens et manducari posset et ut quicumque forniciatus esset octauo die facem acipere*, the representation of John would become vigorously polemical rather than historically accurate. The tradition of the N.'s origin may of course be simply due to the play of later imagination upon the present narrative taken with the isolated reference to Nikolaos in Acts vi.

6. On the other hand it was not in the interest of later tradition to propagate ideas derogatory to the character of an apostolic Christian; indeed, as early as Clem. *Alex.* (*Strom.* ii. 20, iii. 4; *Cist. Const.* Ap. vi. 8), a disposition (shared by Vict.) to clear his character is evident. Whatever was the precise relation of the sect to Nikolaos, whether some tenet of his was exploited immorally or whether he was himself a dangerously lax teacher, there is no reason to doubt the original connexion of the party with him. Its accommodating principles are luminously indicated by the comment of Hippolytus
and the phrase attributed to Clem. Alex. (παρακρήταια τῷ σαρκὶ δει), a hint which is confirmed, if the Nikolaïtans here and in ver. 15 are identified with the Balaamites (βαλαάμ, in popular etymology, a rough Greek equivalent for בָּלָאָם, peribolus, yet popular). This symbolic interpretation has prevailed from the beginning of the eighteenth century (so Ewald, Hengstenberg, Duit., Schürer, Julicher, Bousset). The original party-name was probably interpreted by opponents in this derogatory sense. It was thus turned into a covert censure upon men who were either positively immoral or liberally indifferent to scruples (on food, clothes, marriage, and the like) which this puritan prophet regarded as vital to the preservation of genuine Christianity in a pagan city. A contemporary parallel of moral laxity is quoted from Derrégen, Hist. de la Palastine (1867), p. 363. If Nikolaos was really an ascetic himself, the abuse of his principles is quite intelligible, as well as their popularity with people of inferior character. Pushed to an extreme, asceticism confines ethical perfection to the spirit. As the flesh has no part in the divine life, it may be regarded either as a foe to be constantly thwarted or as something morally indifferent. In the latter case, the practical inference of sensual indulgence is obvious, the argument being that the lofty spirit cannot be soiled by such indulgence any more than the sun is polluted by shining on a dunghill.

Ver. 7. A stringent demand for attention (κατακλίσεις, ὃσα ψυχῆς: Clem. Alex.) to the utterances of prophets who were inspired by the Spirit (of prophecy, cf. on xix. 10). These are as usual are ejaculatory, positive and brief—εἰσαχ. scattered local communities, and not a Catholic organisation, being the conception of the Apocalyptic, as is use in their public worship that this book is written (i. 3). It is a subordinate and literary question whether the seer means in such phrases as this to designate himself (Weinelt, 84 Λ.) liturgically as the speaker, or whether (as the synoptic parallels suggest) they form an integral part of the whole managing. In any case the prophet represents himself simply as the medium for receiving and recording (cf. i. 19) these oracles of the Spirit (cf. xiv. 13, xix. 9, xx. 17). Unlike other writers such as Paul and the authors of Hebrew and i. John, he occupies a passive role, throwing his personal rebuke and counsels into the form Thus saith the Spirit: but this really denotes the confidence felt by the prophet in his own inspiration and authority. The Spirit here, though less definitely than in Hermas, is identified with Jesus speaking through his prophets: it represents sudden counsels and semi-oracular utterances (cf. on i. 10), not a continuous power in the normal moral life of the saints in general. The seven promises denote security of immortal life (positively as here and ver. 28 or negatively as ver. 11), privilege (personal, ver. 17, or official, ver. 27), honour (iii. 5, 21), or increased intimacy (iii. 12). As usual, (cf. i Cor. ii. 9.), the higher Christian γνῶσις is connected with eschatology. Observe the singling out for encouragement and praise of each soldier in the host of the loyal. The effect resembles that produced by Pericles in his panegyric over the Athenians who had fallen in the Peloponnesian war: "together they gave up their lives, yet individually they won this deathless praise" (Thuc. ii. 43, 2). νικῶν (a quasi-perfect), in Herm. Mand. xii. 2, 4 2, 5, 2, 4, 6, 2, 4, 4 (over-sin and devil), might have its usual Jehannine sense, the struggle being obedience in face of the seductions and hardships which beset people aiming to keep the divine commandments (cf. on John xvi. 33). For a special application of the term, see xv. 2. But behind the general usage lies the combination of "to be pure or just" and "to conquer or triumph" in the Hebrew גֵּדֵק and the Syriac sekhā. Furthermore, νικῶν throughout is equivalent to the Egyptian eschatological term "victorious," applied to those who passed successfully through life's temptations and the judgment after death. Its generic sense is illustrated by 4 Esd. vii. 12: "here is the intent of the battle to be fought by man born upon earth: if he be overcome, he shall suffer as thou hast said; but if he conquer, he shall receive the things of which I speak" (i.e., paradise and its glories). The Essenes,
7-8. 

According to Josephus (Ant. xviii, 1, 5), the soul was immortal, and the imagery of the metaphor is drawn from Jewish eschatology which anticipated the reversal of the doom incurred in Eden; cf. Test. Levi, 18, and the garden of paradise, with fruit-trees, Wilcken's Griech. Ostraká, i. 157) is one of the intermediate abodes, possibly (as in Slav. En. viii, 1, and Paul) the third heaven where the favoured saints live after death in seclusion and bliss, So Iren. v. 5. 1 (abode of translated) and v. 36, 1-2, where heaven is for the Christians of the hundredfold fruit, paradise for the sixty-fold, and the heavenly city for the thirty-fold (a very ancient Christian tradition). The tree of life blooms in most of the apocalypses (cf. on xxii. 2). Philo had already allegorised it into θεοφιλεία δ΄ τῆς τελείας ἀρχής χαρακτῆρ. But the allusion corresponds to the general eschatological principle (borrowed from Babylonia, where cosmological myths passed into eschatological) that the end was to be a transcendentally fine renovation of the original state (Barn. vi. 8). μον a deliberate addition to the O.T. phrase; Christ's relation to God guarantees his promise of such a privilege (iii. 12). God's gift (Rom. vi. 23) is Christ's gift. He is in no fair promise like Antigonus II, whom men dubbed εὐσεβής for his large and unfulfilled undertakings (Plut. Coriol. xi.).

Vv. 8-11. The message (shortest of the seven) to the Christians in Smyrna, "one of the first stars in the brilliant belt of the cities of Asia Minor" (Mommsen), a wealthy and privileged seaport, and like Sardis a constant rival of Ephesus for the title of primacy, which properly belonged to Pergamos, the real capital of the province. It is probably owing to the petty jealousies of these urban communities that the prophet refrains from speaking of one to the other (as Paul did, with his churches), by way of example. Ver. 8. The title from i. 17-18, with special reference to ver. 10 and its situation, also to the promise of ver. 11. The Smyrnite Christians, in peril of death, are addressed and encouraged by One who himself has died—and risen to life. He is familiar (ver. 9) with the rough brake and briars through which faith must struggle to win its career, and his familiarity is as usual put forward as the first element of encouragement. The other notes of help are (i.) the unapproachable wealth of a devoted life, (ii.) the justice of their claim in spite of their opponents' prestige and pretensions, (iii.) the providential limit assigned to their trial, and (iv.) its ample reward, besides the fact that Christ does not conceal from them the worst.—προσδ. Contrast R. Jochanan's aphorism: "Whosoever fulfils the Torah in poverty will at length fulfil it in wealth; and whosoever neglects the Torah in wealth, will at length neglect it in poverty" (Picr Aboth, iv. 13). The subsequent allusion to Jews acquires fresh point from comparison with Chagigah, 98) another contemporary rabbi's comment on Isa. xlvi. 10: "this means that the Holy One sought for all good qualities to give to Israel, and found only poverty."—ivv. 1-8. Does the prophet resent (see on this, von Dobschütz, Texte u. Unters. xi. 1. 35 f.) the Jewish claim to the title of God's people, declaring in so many words (as Matt. xxii. 43), that Judaism, so far as it is genuine, is now inside the church, and that the Jewish nation has forfeited its privilege and is now a pseudo-church (Harnack, H. D. i. 177-179)? If the passage does not breathe this common antipathy, the calmunies may be supposed to have taken the form of taunts upon the Christian delusion of believing that a Palestinian peasant and criminal was messiah, or of slanderers upon Christian morals and mo-
Ver. 10. μη διαφεβεῖν τοῦτον. "Thou orderest us to endure, not to love, trials. A man may love to endure, but he does not love what he endures." (Aug. Conf. x. 28). Ill-treatment, as well as misrepresentation, is traced back to a diabolic source, in the common early Christian manner (Weinel, 13 L). The Imperial authorities, though often intrigued by the Jews, had the sole power of inflicting imprisonment, in this case for a refusal to worship the emperor's image; the prophet here predicts an imminent persecution of this kind (compare Acts ix. 16, and above Introdt. § 6) lasting for a short and limited time (ςαρακτικός, see ref., originally due to the rough Semitic division of a month into decades). The local intensity of feeling upon the Imperial cultus may be gathered from the fact that in 23 A.D. Smyrna had secured from Tiberius and the senate, after keen competition, the coveted distinction of possessing the second temple decreed by the province to the Imperial cultus. Hence the struggle anticipated here is desperate (ςαρακτικός); martyrdom is no remote contingency. Compare Ep. Lugd., where the martyr-crisis is taken as an anticipation of the final persecution (cf. Apoc. iii. 10, xiii. 7-15): "with all his might the adversary assailed us, giving us a hint of what his unbridled advent would be like at the end"; the martyrs "endured nobly all the assaults heaped on them by the mob. They were shouted at, struck, haled about, robbed, stoned, imprisoned; in fact they suffered all that an infuriated mob likes to inflict on enemies and opponents."—Then follows a commandment with promise: γίνον (not γίνεται), "show thyself" throughout all degrees of trial and in any emergency. It is more than doubtful if this is a subtle local allusion to the loyalty and local patriotism upon which Sardis prided her-

1 For μυθος (ξP, etc., vg., Syr., Aeth., Andebav, Areth., Cypr., Pr., Ti., Sx., Be.) Lach., Al., Dist., Tr., WH, Wa., Bj., Sw. read the easier and less probable μη (ACQ, 8, 38, 49, Arm, Andal).
self and which she had urged as her plea to Tiberius (Tacit. Ann. iv. 56). On the honours subsequently paid to martyrs in Smyrna, cf. Mart. Polyb. xvii. του ἁγίου Ματθαίου, τοῦ δὲ μάρτυρας ὁ μάρτυρας καὶ μιμίτης τοῦ κυρίου ἀγάπης (also Euseb. H. E. iv. 15, 45, 47), with the contemporary cry of 4 Esd. viii. 27: "Look not at the deeds of the impious but at those who have kept Thy covenants amid affliction" (i.e., the martyrs), also the subsequent Christian honour paid by Hermas (Vis. iii. 1, 2), who reserves the right hand of God for the martyrs who have "suffered for the sake of the Name," enduring "stripes, imprisonments, great afflictions, crosses, wild beasts". For καὶ with fut. after imperative, see Eph. v. 14, James iv. 7.—στίχος. ζ. Life, the reward assigned in ver. 7 to the triumph of faith is here bestowed upon the loyalty of faith. To hold one's ground is, under certain circumstances, as trying and creditable as it is under others to win positive successes. The metaphor of στίχος, with its royal, sacerdotal, and festal (Cant. iii. 1, Isa. xxxviii. 1, Herm. Sim. viii. 2) associations, would call up civic and athletic honours to the local Christians, the latter owing to the famous games at Smyrna, the former from the fact that στίχος frequently occurs also in inscriptions as = public honour for distinguished service (paid, e.g., to Demosthenes and Zeno), whilst the yearly appointment of a priest at Eumeneia to the temple of Zeno was termed παράληπσις τοῦ στίχον (C. B. P. ii. 358). Compare, with the δίκαιος of iii. 4, the sentence in Ep. Lugd. upon the martyrs: ἠγορασά τοὺς γυναικινδύνους δόλης στίχοιν ὑποτρέποντας ἰδίως καὶ μεγάλως ναυμακτώνας, ἀνταλλάξας τῶν μέγας τῆς ἁθροσκίας στίχον, and the Greek phrase for noble deeds, δίκαιος στίχος (Plut. Peric. 28). Ver. 11. αὐτής (emphatic): no true Christian, much less one who died a martyr's death, need fear anything beyond the pang of the first death. The second death of condemnation in the lake of fire leaves the faithful scathless, no matter how others may suffer from the ancient outlook (especially the Egyptian) upon the dark interval between death and heaven. Cf. the sketch of Ani, seated on his throne and robbed in white, holding sceptre and staff, and crying: "I am not held to be a person of no account, and violence shall not be done me. I am thy son, O Great One, and I have seen the hidden things that belong to thee. I am crowned king of the gods, and shall not die a second time in the underworld" (E. B. D. 99). If a Christian keep himself loyal till death, the prophet here guarantees that Christ will keep him safe after death. After the promise of ver. 10 however, this sounds like an anticlimax. The general tenor of the message indicates that John was rather more cordial and sympathetic to the Smyrniothe church than to the Ephesian.

Vv. 12-17. The message to Pergamos, the Benares or Lourdes of the province. Ver. 12. The title is apt in view of ver. 16.

Ver. 13. Two features in the local situation menaced Christianity. Pergamos, besides forming a legal centre for the district (ad eam conuenient Thyatiriensi aliaeque inhonorae ciuitates, Plin. v. 33), was an old centre of emperor-worship in Asia Minor; in 29 b.c. a temple had been erected to the divine Augustus and the goddess Roma, and a special priesthood had been formed (ἱερου ὅσιον Πέργαμου καὶ θεᾶς Ρώμης). Another feature, shocking to early Christian feeling, was the local cult of Asclepius (cf. Zahn, § 73, note 2), whose favourite symbol (e.g., on coins) was a serpent ("the god of Pergamos, Mart. ix. 17); so Pausan. Cor. 27, (iii. 402), καθήμεν δὲ τοῖς θρόνοις βασιλείας κρατών, τὴν δὲ ἔτεραν τῶν χειρῶν...
As an alternative to taking Antipas as indeclinable, WH (after Lachm.) suggest the genit. Antipas (final C taken up from following O); so Nestle, Zahn, Schmiedel, Bj., Sw. With οὐς or ως (before Antipas, so Ws., Bs.), supply either existit (Haym) or occasus est (Quastst., 102, 2950). The antipas of S. might suggest a significant appellation rather than any personal noun (Gwynn).

In addition to these fashionable cults, a magnificent throne-like altar to Zeus Soter towered on the Acropolis (Faus. ii. 73, 75, iii. 556, 557) commemorating the defeat of the barbarian Gauls by Attalus two centuries earlier, and decorated by a famous frieze of the gods warring against the giants (the latter, a brood of vigorous opponents, having often human bodies and serpentine tails, cf. below, ix. 19).

No wonder Pergamos was called "a throne of Satan" by early Christians who revoluted against the splendid and insidious paganism of a place where politics and religion were firm allies. Least of all at this cathedral centre of the Imperial cultus could dissent be tolerated. The Asiarch, e.g., who condemns Polykarp is the local high priest of the altar, and the animus against Caesar-adoration which pervades the Apocalypse easily accounts for the last phrase δὲ τ. τ., particularly as the symbol of the serpent in the Asclepius cult would come vividly home to pious Jewish Christians in the church, as a reminder of Satan (e.g., xii. 9 and passim). The priesthood of this cult, "a vast college, believed to be in possession of certain precious medical secrets," came "nearest, perhaps, of all the institutions of the pagan world, to the Christian priesthood," its rites being "administered in a full conviction of the religiousness, the refined and sacred happiness, of a life spent in the relieving of pain" (Pater, Marius the Epicurean, i. 30; see Ueber's Gotternamen, 1896, pp. 147 f., 350, and Dill's Roman Soc. from Nero to M. A. d. 459 f.). ἀργινος, κτλ., "And the magistrate pressed him hard, saying, 'Swear the oath [by the genius of Caesar] and I will release thee; curse the Christ.'" But Polykarp replied, 'For eighty-six years I have served him, and he has never injured me. How then can I blaspheme my King, who has saved me?"' (Mart. Polyc. ix., Jewish analogies magnificent throne-like altar to Zeus in 2 Mace. viii. 4, Ass. Mos. viii. etc.). Some definite outburst of persecution at Pergamos is in the writer's mind (ἄργινος). To disown or abjure faith in Jesus, saying Κύριος Καίσαρ, implies here as in the gospels the moral fault of cowardice, elsewhere (e.g. x. John, Jud. 4, 2 Peter i. 2) erroneous doctrine. The circumstances and surroundings of the local church are taken into account, as usual, in the prophet's estimate; they either claim some allowance to be made, or reflect additional credit and lustre on the particular community. ὁ μάρτυς, κτλ. He is faithful who retains his faith. Antipas (= 'Ἀντίπατρος, Jos. Ant. xiv. i. 3; the name occurs in a third century inscription of Pergamos, Deissm. 187), is mentioned by Tertullian (adv. Gnost. scorp. 12); otherwise he is unknown. His Acts appear to have been read by Andreeas and Arethas, and, according to Simon Metaphrastes, he was an old, intrepid bishop of Pergamos whose prestige drew upon him the honour of being burned to death in a brazen bull during Domitian's reign. The sober truth is probably that he formed the first prominent victim in the local church, possibly in Asia Minor, to the demands of the Imperial cultus. Carpus, Papyrus, and Agathonike, the other martyrs of Pergamos named by Eusebius (H. E., iv. 15, 48), died at a later period. On the whole verse see Ep. Lugd., "then did the holy martyrs endure indescribable torture, Satan eagerly striving to make them utter τι των βλασφήμων". The textual variants arose from a failure to see that Antipas (or -as) was a genitive and that mártys was in characteristic irregular apposition to it. The name is neither a personification nor typical.
affect the main body of the church, whose fault is not sympathy but indifference. This carelessness arose probably from contempt or fear rather than through ignorance.—καί (in the midst of loyalty and martyrdom). κρατών (not τὸ ἁγιόν μου, but) lax principles worthy of a Balaam, the note of a pupil of Balaam being (according to Pirke Aboth, v. 19), an evil eye, a proud spirit, and a sensual soul. Contemporary opponents of Gnostic tendencies evidently found it an effective weapon to employ ἐν τῷ analogies or identifications such as this or the similar ones in 2 Tim. iii. 8, Jud. xxi. In the Hexateuch (JE = Num. xxv. 1-5, P = Num. xxv. 6-18, xxxi. 8-16, Josh. xiii. 22) Balaam is represented as a magician who prompts the Moabitish women to seduce the Israelites into foreign worship and its attendant sensualism; but in the subsequent Jewish Midrash (followed here) his advice is given to Balak (Joseph. Ant. iv. 6, 6; cf. iv. 6, 11 for Zimri, and Philo's Vit. Mós. i. 48-54), and the sorcerer comes to be regarded as the prototype of all corrupt teachers and magicians (for this sombre reputation, see E. J. ii. 467), as of this party at Pergamos who held—to John's indignation—that it was legitimate for a Christian to buy food in the open market, which had already been consecrated to an idol. This problem, which had occurred years before in a sharp form at Corinth, was certain to cause embarrassment and trouble in a city like Pergamos, or indeed in any pagan town, where entertainments had a tendency towards obscenity. It is a curious instance of how at certain periods a scurvy may assume the rank of a principle, and of how the ethical inexpediency of some practices lies in their associations rather than in their essential elements. Such questions of religious conscience in the East were frequently connected with food; for the association of the latter with sexual vice, see the notes on Acts xv. 20 (also 1 Cor. x. 4, 8, in its context). The literal sense is preferable, although the usage of the Apocalypse makes the metaphorical sense of πωτρία possible, as a general description of pagan religions viewed under the aspect of unfaithfulness to the true God (cf. John viii. 41, Philo de migr. Abr. § 12). For the connexion between certain forms of popular religion in Phrygia and prostitution, see C. B. P., i. 94 f. Such burning questions arose from the nature of the early Christian society, which never aspired to form a ghetto, and consequently, in a pagan township, had to face many nice problems with regard to the prudence and limits of conformity or the need of nonconformity (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 16, 17). In social and trading pursuits the individual Christian met and mingled with fellow-citizens outside his own religious circle, and these relationships started serious points of ethical principle (Dobischitz, 26 f., 188 f.). The line was drawn, but not always at the same place; and naturally laxity lay on the borders of enlightenment.

Ver. 15. αὐτός κ.τ.λ. Are the N. put parallel to, or identified with, the Balaamites? The latter becomes more probable when the symbolical sense of N. and B. (see above, on ver. 6, and Kalisch's Bible Studies, i. 23) is adopted. In this event a single class of errorists is in view; they are instigating and seducing the local Christians much as Balaam managed (by means of Balak, in rabbinic tradition, cf. the slight play on βαλαάν) to get the Israelites enticed to ruin (Sanh. 105 a). Josephus explains that Balaam showed Balak how to win a victory over the Israelites (ὡς τινὰ τινὸς ἐκτός τῶν κατ᾽ αὐτόν ἐρωτηθηκέναι) by enticing them to lust, and such a symbolic allusion is quite in the manner of the Apocalypse. The Niko-laitans, who probably resembled Cerin-thus or Carpokrates in their tenets, are no better than a Balaam. And the Jewish dictum was (Sanh. 106 b) that whenever one discovered anything bad in Balaam's life, one should preach about it.

Ver. 16. The church as a whole must repent of her too tolerant attitude to these errorists, but the threatened visitation is directed against the errorists themselves in the shape of some physical malady or mortal sickness, according to the current belief in early Christianity
Ver. 17. The reward for those who deny themselves pagan pleasures in this world is (as in ver. 26) participation in the privileges (Pereq Meir 5), reserved for God's people in the latter days (here = a victor's banquet, Gen. xiv. 18), not as hitherto (7, 11) simply participation in eternal life. The imagery is again rabbinic (2 Macc. ii. 4-6, Apor. Bar. vi. 7-9). Previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, Isaiah or the prophet Jeremiah was supposed to have hidden the ark of the covenant (cf. on xi. 19) with its sacred contents, including the pot of manna. At the appearance of the messiah, this was to be once more disclosed (cf. Mechila on Exod. xvi. 25, etc.). It is significant how the writer as usual claims for his messiah, Jesus, the cherished privileges and rights to which contemporary Judaism clung as its monopoly, and further how he assumes that all the past glories of O. T. religion upon earth—as well as all the coming bliss, which in one sense meant the transcendent restoration of these glories—were secured in heaven for the followers of Jesus alone (vii. 17, xxi. 2, etc.). See Apor. Bar. xxix. 8, where "the treasury of manna will again descend from on high," at the messianic period, that the saints may eat of it; the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, follows Philo (quis rer. div. 39, leg. allegor. iii. 59, 61, etc.) in using manna as a type of the soul's nourishment in the present age. There does not seem to be any allusion to the rabbinical legend underlying Sap. xvi. 20.—The strange association of manna and white stones, though possibly a reminiscence of the rabbinic notion preserved in Joma 8 (cadedant Israelitis una cum manna lapides pretiosi), cannot be explained apart from the popular superstitions regarding amulets which colour the metaphor. White stones represented variously to the ancient mind aquittal, admission to a feast (texta hospitalis), good fortune, and the like. But the point here is their connexion with the new name. This alludes to the mysterious power attached in the ancient mind to amulets, stones (cf. E. F. i. 546-550, where vignettes are given; also Dieterich's Mithras-Liturgie, 31 f.) marked with secret and divine names (Jeremias, 79-80, Pfeil. Early Christ. Conc. of Christ, 112 f.), the possession of which was supposed to enable the bearer to pass closed gates, foil evil spirits, and enter the presence of the deity. If the new name (cf. Heinmüller's Im Namen Jesu, 128 f.), is thus regarded as that of Jesus—the irresistible, invincible name above every name—the promise then offers safe entrance through all perils into the inner bliss and feast of God; the true Christian has a charmed life. But when the new name is taken to apply to the individual, as seems more likely here, another line of interpretation is required, and the origin of the phrase (though tinged still with this amulet-conception of a stone, the more potent as it was hidden somewhere on the person, cf. Prov. xvii. 8, etc.), is best approached from a passage like Epic. i. 19, where the philosopher is trying to dissuade a man from undertaking the duties of priesthood in the Imperial cultus at Nikopolis. What good will it do him
After death, to have his name used to mark his year of office in public documents? "My name will remain," replies the man. "Write it on a stone and it will remain," is the retort of Epictetus—a plainly a colloquial expression for permanence. This would fit in with the Apocryphal saying excellently (see Schol. on Pind. Olymp. vii. 159). Still more apposite, however, is an ancient ceremony of initiation (as among the aborigines of New South Wales: Trumbull, Blood-Covenants, 1887, pp. 335-337), by which each person, on the close of his novitiate, received a new name from the tribe and at the same time a white stone or quartz crystal. The latter was considered to be a divine gift, and held specially sacred, never to be surrendered or even shown. These boons formed part of the religious covenant which marked the entrance of a man into the closest relation with the deity of his tribe and also into the full enjoyment of manhood's privileges. Hence, if we suppose some such popular rite behind the language here, the idea is apt: the victor's reward is the enjoyment of mature and intimate life with his God (στὸν Ἐωτόρ). For the symbolism of a name as evidence of personal identity (and inferentially of a new name as proof of a renovated, enduring nature), see E.B.D. 75: "May my name be given to me in the Great House, and may I remember my name in the House of Fire. . . . If any god whatsoever should advance to me, let me be able to proclaim his name forthwith" (the latter clause illustrating Apoc. iii. 12). The significance attached by the Egyptian religion especially to the ῥευ or name was due to the belief that its loss meant the extinction of a man's existence. The idea in the prophet's mind is little more than that developed, e.g., in Mrs. Browning's sonnet, "Comfort": "Speak low to me, my Saviour, low and sweet. From out the hallelujahs sweet and low, Lest I should fear and fall, and miss Thee," etc. As the succeeding chapters are full of the state and splendour of heaven, with royal majesty predominating, the prophet finds place here for the more intimate and individual aspect of the future life, depicting God in touch with the single soul (cf. xiv. 1). In addition to this, he conveys the idea that outside the Christian experience no one can really know what God is or what He gives; the redeemed and victorious alone can understand what it means to belong to God and to be rewarded by him.—Wünsch has recently pointed out (Excav. in Palestine, 1898-1900, p. 186) that, as in Egypt the sacred paper (γραφής ἡ ιεραιά) was used for solemn appeals to the gods (Brit. Mus. Papyr., xlvi. 308), "in like manner, doubtless, in Palestine, limestone had some superstitious significance, but of what special kind we do not know. Perhaps it is in this connexion that in Apoc. ii. 17 'he that overcometh' is to receive "a white stone" inscribed with a "new" spell, evidently as an "amulet". There may also be a further local allusion to the ψηφος and names which were supposed to be received by votaries of Asclepius as they lay in a trance or dream (Aristides, i. 352, 520). For the initiation-custom, cf. Spence and Gillen's Native Tribes of Central Australia, pp. 139-140, where the secret, individual name is described as given only to those who are "capable of self-restraint" and above levity of conduct. Clem. Alex. (Strom. i. 23) preserves a Jewish tradition that Moses got three names—Joachim, Moses, and Melch (i.e., king), the last-mentioned ἀνθρώπῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, ἐν φασιν ὑπερμάνθων. Vv. 18-29. The longest message of the seven is to a church in the least important of the cities (judged from the historical standpoint) Thyatira, a township of Northern Lydia, the holy city of Apollo Tyrimnaios, adjacent to the high road between Perg. and Sardis. It soon became a centre of Montanism. Ver. 18. χαλαλαβ. Some local allusion to the bronze-work for which Thyatira was famous, Son of God (cf. Kattenbusch ii. 563 f.) is practically an equivalent for messiah (Luke iv. 41), or for the superhuman personality of Jesus as divinely commissioned (cf. Grill,
For φλογα (ACP, etc., Lach., Al., WH, Wa., Sw.) read the harder φλοξ (N 12, am., fuld., Pr., Ti., Bu., Bj., ac. σύμνω). The well-attested σων after γυναίκα (AQ, min., Syr., Areth., Pr., etc., so Grot., Al., Zahn, and J. Weiss) may have arisen from the repeated σων previously, or from 1 Kings xix.-xx. But any such allusion to the wife of the local bishop is untenable, and to retain it as "thy woman" (Ramsay, Seven Letters, 347) is harsh in the extreme. It is to be omitted with NCP, min., gr., vg., Me., Arm., Aeth., Tert.

1 For a SXova (ACQP, etc., Lach., Al., WH, Wa., Sw.) read the harder φλοξ (N 12, am., fuld., Pr., Ti., Bu., Bj., ac. σύμνω).

* The well-attested σων after γυναίκα (AQ, min., Syr., Areth., Pr., etc., so Grot., Al., Zahn, and J. Weiss) may have arisen from the repeated σων previously, or from 1 Kings xix.-xx. But any such allusion to the wife of the local bishop is untenable, and to retain it as "thy woman" (Ramsay, Seven Letters, 347) is harsh in the extreme. It is to be omitted with NCP, min., gr., vg., Me., Arm., Aeth., Tert.

Ver. 19. Instead of being retrograde like Ephesus, Thyatira has steadily progressed in the works of Christianity. The sole flaw noted (see Ramsay's discussions in D. B. iv. 738 f., Seven Letters, 338 f.) is an undue laxity shown to certain members (not, as at Pergamos, a mere minority) who, under the sway (cf. Zahn, § 73, n. 7) of an influential woman, refused to separate themselves from the (ἐπρασσάτω) local guilds where moral interests, though not ostensibly defied, were often seriously compromised. The prophet takes up a puritan attitude, corroborated by that of the leading church of the district (ii. 6); he demands in the name of Christ that such inconsistent members should withdraw—a severe and costly step to take, amid the social ties and interests of an Asiatic city, where social clubs were a recognised feature of civic life and appealed forcibly to several natural instincts, especially when backed by the approval of an oracular and impressive leader in the local church.

Ver. 20. Women (cf. Acts xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 5, and the later Ammia in Philadelphia: Eus. H. E. v. 17. 2) occasionally prophesied in the early church, and false prophetesses were as likely to exist as false prophets. This "Jezebel of a woman, alleging herself to be a prophetess," seems to have been some influential female (as the definite imagery of vv. 21-23 indicates); her lax principles or tendencies made for a connexion with foreign and compromising associations which evidently exerted a dangerous charm upon some weaker Christians in the city. The moral issue corresponds to that produced by the Nikolaitan party at Pergamos (et al. φαγεῖν, πορνεῖν), but the serious nature of the heresy at Thyatira appears from the fact that it was not simply propagated within the church but also notorious (ver. 23) and long-continued (ver. 24), thanks to obstinance among the Ahab's and adherents of this prominent woman (ver. 21). They prided themselves on their enlightened liberalism (ver. 24). The definiteness of her personality, the fact of her situation within a Christian church which had jurisdiction over her, and the association of her practices with those of the Nikolaitans, who were members of the church, render it impossible to identify this liberine influence of J. with a foreign institution such as the famous shrine of the Chaldean Sibyl at Thyatira (Schützer: Theol. Abhandlungen, pp. 39 f., a theory suggested by Blakesley, in Smith's DBJ), or with the wife of the local Asiarch (Selwyn, 123). Besides it was not the cults but the trade-guilds that formed the problem at Thyatira. Jastrow points out (p. 267) that for some occult reason female sorcerers were preferred to men among the Babylonians; "the witch appears more frequently than the male sorcerer.", Hillel (Pirke Aboth, ii. 8; see Dr. C. Taylor's note) had already de-
The immorality was flagrant; more flagrant still was the obstinate persistence in it, despite admonitions and forbearance (cf. Eccles. viii. 17; Bar. Ap. xxi. 20; 2 Peter iii. 9). This allusion to an abuse of God’s patience and to a warning given already (hardly in some writing like Jud. 2 Peter, Spitta) is left quite indefinite; it was probably familiar enough to the first readers of the book. Interests and old associations had proved hitherto too strong for this prophetic counsel to be followed. Membership of a trade-guild, although it necessarily involved the recognition of some pagan deity and often led to orgies, “was a most important matter for every tradesman or artisan; it aided his business, and brought, him many advantages socially” (Ramsay).

Ver. 22. κλίμακα (bed, not a couch of revelry) aegritudinis non amoris; disease or sickness (cf. for the phrase, 1 Macc. i, 5) the punishment of error, especially of error accompanied by licentiousness. The inscriptions from Asia Minor abound with instances of the popular belief that impurity, moral and even physical, was punished by disease or disaster to oneself, one’s property, one’s children. Sickness might even go the length of death (1 Cor. xi. 29-30). The prophet, however, seems to avoid calling Jesus or God σωτήρ or σάκκος, a term appropriated by the popular religions of Phrygia and lavished on many deities as healers and helpers (C. B. P. i. 262 f.).—σέβης, men and women who imitate her licentiousness, θλ., physical distress, illness.—μετανοήσαν, the fut. indic., expresses rather more probability than subj. with ἐν μή (cf. Blass, § 65, 5). For tense of δόλλω see Zech. viii. 7, LXX, etc.

Ver. 23. τέκνα, literally, perhaps with an indirect allusion to the killing of Ahab’s seventy sons. ἀποκτ. θ. (Hebraism), “I will utterly slay”; see on vi. 8. If any particular form of death is meant, it may be pestilence (the inscriptions often mention fever), which represented to an Oriental mind the punishment of God on man’s unfaithfulness. The curious difference between the treatment of the μακαρία and the τέκνα is due to the fact that (cf. Dan. vi. 24), a parent’s sin was visited upon his family, both in Jewish and in contemporary pagan belief (cf. the Phrygian inscription, cited by Mayor on Jas. v. 12, κατηράμενος ἕτως αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ). Yet even when both classes are allegorised into active coadjutors and deluded victims, the relative punishment looks unequal.

John, unlike Ezekiel (xiii. 17-23), holds that the victims of the false prophetess are willing and responsible for their position.—πάσαι αἱ ἐκκ., the judgment was to be as notorious as evidently the scandal had been. The idea recalls one of Ezekiel’s favourite conceptions.—γυς κ.τ.λ. “I know the abysses,” and “discerner of hearts and searcher of the reins” were old Egyptian titles for divine beings. This intimate knowledge of man (cf. 16 c) pierces below superficial appear-
ANCES, e.g., connexion with the church, prophetic zeal, and plausible excuses. As in Jer. xvii. 10, xx. 12 (cf. Ps. Sol. viii. 8), the divine acquaintance with man’s real, secret life forms the basis of unerring and impartial judgment; while, as in Jer. iv. 16, 17 (cf. Acts iv. 1 f., 1 Tim. i. 20, 1 Cor. v. 4, etc.) the prophetic denunciation or imprecation has a direct effect upon the person denounced (cf. von Dobschütz, 270 f.). The former would be a fairly novel idea to men of those accustomed to the Roman religio, which was “one of observance, sacrifice, and outward act, that in no way searched the heart of the worshipper—a system of rules which covered the circumstances of Roman life” (H. O. Taylor, Ancient Ideals, i. 417, 418).

Ver. 24. To know “the depths” of the divine being and counsel was a characteristic claim of the Ophites and the later Gnostics; cf. Iren. adv. Haer. ii. 22, 1 (qui profunda bythi adinuenisse se dicunt; cf. 3), and Tertullian’s sarcastic description (adv. Valentin. 1), “Eleusinia Ualen- tiniana fecerunt lenocinio, sancta silentio magnio, sola taciturnitate coelestia. Si bona fide quæris, concreto uultu, suspens-supercillo Altissim. 19, 15, 1 (cf. xi. 561-580), with a plain allusion to the Jerusalem concordat of the early church which is recommended tacitly as a safe, wise rule of conduct. In the case of the μαθὴ τοῦ σατάνα, ignorance isbias. John is totally unsympathetic to the local liberals. He does not combat the theoretical principles at the root of their movement. Like the prophets who wrote Jude and 2 Peter, he attacks instead of arguing, quite content to judge it by its moral fruits of libertinism. He bitterly declares that such occasional results are the deliberate object of the party. The strange collocation of this error with the habit of partaking of sacrificial food is probably due to the prophet’s stern conviction that the latter, with its friendly and liberal attitude to pagan customs, fostered the former, in the case of people who took an ultra-spiritual view of Paul’s principle of Christian freedom.
24—28. III. I. 

APOKALYPSE IΩANNΟΥ

κράτησατε, ἀκούστε ἀκριβῶς. 26. Καὶ ὁ ὄνομα καὶ ὁ ἱματιότης τόλμωσε τὰ ἐργά μου, διότι ἂν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱδρυμάτων. 27. καὶ ΠΟΜΑΝΤΕΙΤΙΣΟΝ ἐπὶ τὰ σκίτα τὰ κεραμικὰ ἦσαν δύο τοῦ πατρὸς μου. 28. Καὶ διότι ἴδε ὁ τόν ἄστέρα τὸν πρώτον. 29. ἦσεν ὁ ἤδεικνυότατος τό πνεῦμα λέγει τάς ἐκκλησίας.

"III. I. Καὶ τῇ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Ἐν Σάρδας ἐκκλησίας γράφειν εἰς Ἀνατολήν." 30. Resuming nom. absol.

v Cf. Mic. v. 5, Isa. x. 24-26. w xii. 5, xiv. 15. cf. Bar. iv. 25. x Cf. John xiv. 6f., etc. y Double promise here only (exc. iii. 12).

Ver. 26. Triumph here consists in unflagging attention to the duties of a Christian vocation. The ἑργά are (xiv. 12, xix. 8) the normal duties of this calling, viewed as the outcome of a personal relation to Jesus; they are "his," as commanded by him and executed in his strength. The general idea of this and the following verse is that the only irresistible force is the force of a life which is able to resist seduction and compromise, because it holds to faith and purity. The promise of reward, preceding (as in iii. 5, 12, 21) the appeal for attention, is couched in terms of messianic conquest (from Ps. ii. 8, 9). In a more or less figurative form, the rule of the saints, a cherished hope of Jewish eschatology, had its own attraction for some circles of early Christianity (see on v. 10 and i Cor. vi. 3; and for ἄρωμα, the well-known flail wielded by Horus, the Egyptian god of requital or warfare): evidently it appealed to their eagerness for a righting of present wrongs and a reversal of the immoral sway of captain ill over captive good. The ἐξουσία αὐτῶν τῶν ἱδρυμάτων (by which they are not governed but shivered in irreparable ruin; cf. Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xix. 11) is defined with ferocious detail in 27; the whole description is modelled on a traditionally messianic application of (LXX) Ps. ii. 8, 9. For the shepherd’s staff as a royal sceptre see E. Bi. 4317. ὡς καγό κ.τ.λ., God, Christ, and the individual Christian as in iii. 21 (John xvii. 16-22). "Ille id est aliquam similitudinem, non paritatem significat" (Rosenmüller). John xxi. 15-17 is not "a deliberate correction of this terrible sentence" (Selwyn, 195), but the mature expression of Christian solicitude in a different province, from which messianic incongruities have been wholly purged.

Ver. 28. To "grant the morning-star" (a characteristically loose usage of ἀκατάστασις) means, not to invest him with its glory, nor to give him possession of Christ himself, but (so Bleek, after Victor) to make the dawn of salvation or of life eternal shine on him after his darkest afflictions. The victor shares in the divine life (with its punitive government) and honour above, or rather in the new messianic era of Jesus himself (see note on xxii. 16, where by a further application the metaphor is directly connected with Jesus). Staunch adherence to the truth on the part of leaders and confessors is similarly rewarded in Dan. xii. 3, En. civ. ii. Semitic folklore found some mystic connexion between the countless brilliant stars in heaven and the departed faithful, who became immortal (4 Esd. vii. [97]), and the sense here might be that the loyal Christian was sure of shining like a star in immortality; cf. Ign. ad Rom. ii. 2, καθὼς τὸ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῶν κόσμων πρὸς Θεόν, ἵνα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντελθῇ (and passage cited on i. 10). But xxii. 16 (cf. Job iii. 9) tells against this, as does Ign. ibid. vi. 2 (speaking of his martyrdom) ἀστή με κάθοδον φῶς λαβεῖν ἐκαραγεγένετοί τοῖς ἐνθρώποις ἐγόμαιξα. The collocation of the morning star and the judicial authority over the nations may have been suggested to the prophet’s mind (cf. 14, 20) by the prophecy, read in a messianic sense, of Num. xvi. 17. The sequence and the Christian spirit of the whole promise are certainly improved if we omit 27 a with Selwyn (194) and Jacoby (Neuest. Ethik, 1899, p. 446) and Wellhausen (with 23-28 a), since the doubled promise and the later use of the metaphor do not justify any suspicion of 28 as a gloss (so Könnecke, p. 34). But it is as likely that the author himself (cf. xvii. 14) added this co-operation with the vindictive messiah (cf. xii. 5, xiv. 15), as that an early copyist was responsible for the insertion.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-6. The message to Sardis. The title of the speaker (drawn from i. 4, 16, 20), as general as
in the similar letter to Ephesus, has no special bearing on the subsequent address, unless an antithesis be implied between the plenitude of the divine spirit and the deadness of the church which had lapsed from its pristine vitality, just as the township of S. had by this time declined from its old historical prestige—is modified by the recognition of better elements not yet too far gone in decay to be recovered (2) and of a godly nucleus of members. The metaphor is paralleled by a Jewish estimate of orthodoxy (Kidd. 71 b) which dubbed Mesene as "dead," Media as "ill," Elymais as "in extremis," and the strict inhabitants of the Ghettos between the Tigris and the Euphrates as "healthy".

Ver. 2. "quasi paucos nominatos, i.e., bonos quinominatedignisunt" (cf. the use of ἐνδούματα ὑγρὰ = persons or individuals, in Clem. Rom. and Ignat.). διάλ. (cf. Fragment of Uncanonical Gospel, Oxyrhyn. 2 cent. A.D., line 16 μεμυθμένον ἐπίτροπον, κ.τ.λ.) the suffled garment an emblem of moral stains, including but not identical with that of προσφέρον (xiv. 4, cf. Sir. xxi. 1, 2). The language reflects that of the votive inscriptions in Asia Minor, where soiled clothes disqualified the worshipper and dishonoured the god. Moral purity qualifies for spiritual communion (note the dramatic contrast of this ἄξιοι [cf. on ii. 16] with that of xvi. 6); the apocalyptic beatitude is: blessed are the pure in life, for they shall join God (see on xiv. 14, xix. 8). Note here only in the seven messages an eschatological promise unintroduced by the phrase δέκατον, although ver. 5 really repeats the same idea. οὖσαο="as being victor" (i.e., accordingly). The idea of heavenly raiment is distinctively Persian (Brandt, 575, 580; Lüken, 122), but permeates Jewish eschatology from Enoch

1 In Eph. v. 14.

2 For γένος (ACP, etc., Areth., Al., Ws., Bz., Sw., Bz.) Lach. Ti. Tr. WH (marg.) read the correct γένος with HQ, vg., Aeth., Syr., Ande, Pr.,

3 in the local church no less than sins of mere omission. Sardis and Laodicea, which apparently were the only members of this group troubled by outside persecution or inward dross, were the least satisfactory of all the seven. εἰς τό ὄνομα τῆς γεροντικῆς, although the need is so desperate (cf. below on xvi. 15). The sudden and signal visitation of punishment threatened in the following words (for ὅραρ in acc. cf. Moul. i. 63, Abbott's Diat. 2013) is left vaguely impressive. It may be that (as in Jude 4, 18, and 2 Peter) local libertinism meant a slackening of belief in the second Advent.

4. διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἀνδρίαν κατασκευάζεται, until God's wisdom shall have formed the agent. It is the efficient cause of the building up (κατασκευάζεται) of the agent b. For ἀνδρίαν (ACP, etc., Areth., Al., Ws., Bz., Sw., Bz.) Lach. Ti. Tr. WH (marg.) read the correct ἀνδρία with Ν, vg., Aeth., Syr., Ande, Pr.,

5. Plused, the only ante-patristic testimony to the earlier date of St. Paul's prophecy. But Matthew supplies the relation of the latter to the former, avowing the literal fulfilment of the words of the apostle in himself. He refers to the prophetic Antichristian age (Matt. xvii. 22), and from there to the parousia of the antitype (Matt. xxiv. 43).

6. The mode of speech in the passage is remarkable, and may be compared with the verse just preceding. The time of the parousia is determined by the act of repentance and faith which is to precede it. This is a characteristic feature of the Johannine exposition. It is the distinctive feature of the Johannine method of interpretation. It is the distinctive feature of the Johannine method of interpretation. It is the distinctive feature of the Johannine method of interpretation. It is the distinctive feature of the Johannine method of interpretation.
(xiii. 15, 16, the elect clothed after the resurrection in eternal "garments of glory") down to Slav. En. xxii. 8; 4 Eisd. ii. 39, 45 (cf. Herm. Sim. viii. 2) and Asc. Isa. iv. 16 (garments = spiritual bodies in which the saints are vested at the last day, stored up in seventh heaven; cf. vii. 26, ix. 24 f., 303, 430, with stolas multas et chronos et coronas jaecantes). περιβαλλεται κ.τ.λ., like Joshua (Zech. iii. 3 f.); or (as others suggest) like priests acquired before the Sanhedrin, who were robed in white. In the Apoc., as in En. lxxxv-xxc., white is the colour of righteousness, associated with innocence (and joy? Eccles. ix. 8), just as black with evil. In Apoc. Pet. 5, the dwellers in Paradise are clothed in ἐνθάμα γόνων φωτιών, whilst the angels who (ver. 6) chastise the wicked are robed in black. All such metaphors reflect the primitive notion that clothing somehow could form almost a part of a man's personality, corresponding to his identity and character (E. Bi. 1140, 1141), rather than the Roman custom of assuming a white toga virilis to mark entrance upon manhood's privileges ("uitae liberioris iter," Ovid).—τῆς βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς, this favourite symbol of the Apocalypse which goes back even to pre-exilic Judaism (Isa. iv. 3, cf. Exod. xxxii. 32 f., etc.; for the Babylonian background, cf. Jeremias, 69 f.), had through the influence of Dan. (xii. 1) a great vogue in apocalyptic dreams as an apt image no longer of a share in the temporal felicity of God's reign but of personal salvation. For a name to be erased from the book of life (one's deeds not corresponding, upon scrutiny, to one's position; cf. xx. 12, Jub. xxxvi. 10) meant condemnation, or exclusion from the heavenly kingdom. To have one's name retained ("and never will I blot out," etc.) on the list of heavenly citizens was by this time a current metaphor for eternal fellowship with God and his people, and (by a natural inference drawn in xiii. 8) for predestination, the belief in which formed then as always a vivid inspiration in distress and conflict. For the erasure of names from the civic register, consequent upon their owner's condemnation, cf. Dio Chrys. xxxi. 336 ε, δι' θημοσία τινα δη των πολιτών ἀπόθαναν εν ἀδικήματι, πρότερον το δνομα αὐτοὺ τελειωτάτα; Xen. Hell. ii. 3, 51, and Arist. Pac. 1180. Also Dittenbee's Syllace inscript. Grac. 4398 (iv. b.c.) δι' θ' ἐν βάθει, μη ἐν φράτρι ἄνευσθαι, ἀνάλυπτο το δνομα αὐτοῦ τελειωτά τελειωτα, Orients Graci Insel. Sel. 218 (iii. b.c.) ἀνάλυπταις το δνομα το ἔθειον. The special comfort of this verse is intelligible when one reads the prayer offered in contemporary Jewish worship (cf. Shmone-Esreh xii. Palest. recension): "for apostates let there be no hope, may the kingdom of the haughty quickly collapse in our days, and may the Nazarenes and the Minim suddenly perish, may they be blotted out of the book of Life and not enrolled along with the righteous".

The message to Sardis, the most vehement of the seven, has some interesting resemblances to that addressed to Ephesus; cf. ii. 1 = iii. 1, ii. 5 (ἀνωτέρως = iii. 3, 5 (visitation) = iii. 5, ii. 6 = iii. 4). The hope described in ver. 5 is burlesqued by Lucian (Peregr. xl.) who describes his pseudo-Christian hero as seen after death περιπατώταν ἐν λευκῇ ὑπόθετι, φανέρων, κοινῆς τῇ ὀσμημένῳ. The metaphorical references to raiment gain point in view of the local trade in woollen goods and dyed stuffs. Vv. 7-13. The message to Philadelphia. Ver. 7. ἐν Φ. Less than twenty years later an equally favourable account of the local church was given by Ignatius (ad Phil. 3, 5, 10). ἰδιος κ.τ.λ., Jesus is a messiah indeed, one deserving that honoured name and realising its meaning. The favourite Johannine term ἄληθινος (= "true," in the wider sense
of "genuine," opposed to unreal rather than to untruthful, cf. Justin's Dial. cxvi., Athen. vi. 253 c: no pseudo-messiah, as local Jews asserted, cf. 8 c and 9) is here grouped with ἐγέωs (i.e., not merely = legitimately messianic as in John x. 36, Clem. Rom. xxiii. 5, but freed from creaturely weakness and imperfection, his nature in intimate touch with the divine fulness, Issel: der Begriff der Heiligkeit im N.T., 1887, pp. 70, 110, R.J. 305), as in iii. 14, xix. 1, xxi. 6, xxi. 2 with πιστός, and in xv. 3, xvi. 7, xiv. 2 with δικαιος. Slightly otherwise, Apoc. Bar. lvii. 7: "He is true, so that he shall do you good and not evil," and below at xvi. 7 (though this sense might suit here also, as an amplification of ἐγέωs). κλαίνει κ.τ.λ. (based on Isa. xxii. 22) the messiah, as Davidic scion, possesses the absolute power of admission to and exclusion from the divine realm. This part of the title (cf. Job xii. 14, έτις κλαίεται κατά άνθρωπων τις ἄνοιξε:;) alludes to what immediately follows as well as to the arrogant claim mentioned in ver. 9. Christ alone, the heavenly κλείστηκεν, has the right to excommunicate. Compare Savonarola's brave reply to the bishop of Vasona who had pronounced his sentence of degradation (separo te ab ecclesia militante atque triumphante):— Militante, non triumphante: hoc enim iustum non est.

Ver. 8. οίδα... ὑπερασπισθαντες... is, in the case of Smyrna implying unqualified approbation. The reward of this steadfastness (8 c, 10) is threefold: (a) security in their relation to God (8 b), through the love of Christ for them (9); (b) ultimate triumph over their foes (9), and (c) deliverance in the final crisis (10). The open door, here as in Paul (for the ethnic use of the term on sepultures cf. C. B. P., ii. 395) is usually taken to denote facilities for preaching and advancing the faith among outsiders, in which case the sense would be that the extension of the gospel depends upon, as it forms a high reward of, open confession and a decided stand for Christ. But in view of a passage written by Ignatius to this very church. (ad Philad. 3, where Christ himself is termed θέα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἃς άντέχεται τοίς παραρχαῖς, prophets, apostles, καί ἐκκλησία), and of Clem. Rom. xlviii. (where the gate of righteousness is described as open in Christ), the phrase is better connected with Christ himself, not with any good opening for Christian activity. He makes access to God through himself sure; despite trials and temptations (vv. 8, 9, 10) his church's standing is guaranteed by his authority (as in John x. 7, 9, Christ ή θόρα τῶν προσβάτων). θόρα here is the open heart of God for man; in ver. 20, man's open heart for God. Jesus, then, equipped with the O.T. attributes of divine authority, assures the church how futile are such excommunications as the Jews were levelling against them. The latter have nothing to do with the conditions of the kingdom. Faith in Jesus constitutes a relation to God which cannot either be impaired or rivalled. Only, the perseverance of the saints is needed; an assured position with God depends not merely on Christ's will and power but on Christian loyalty as the coefficient of grace. The church at P. is not blamed for the slenderness of her equipment, which evidently is due to causes outside her control. She is praised for having made good use of the slight resources she possessed (cf. Mark xiv. 8). Otherwise, though less well, a full stop might be placed after αὐτήν, and δι'... τὸ δονομα μου, taken as the reason for the promise ἰδοὺ... σε, just as in ver. 10 δι'... μου is followed by ἀκούσα... γινεστε—αὐτήν, pleonastic use of pron. after relative, a Semitic idiom with Greek affinities (Vit. ii. 138, Thumb 128, Blass § 30, 4) confined to Apoc. (exc. cit. fr. LXX.
Acts xv. 17) in N.T. In Enoch (xxxviii. 2, and passion) to deny the Lord of Spirits is the capital crime, as opposed to "believing in his name.

Ver. 9. διό (parit. gen., the construction being dropped and resumed in a rather harsh anacolouthon, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.). The absence of διό before λέγει does not prevent it from being interpreted as in apposition to οὐ νοεῖς rather than as directly dependent on διό. On the forms of οὐδεμισ in Apocalypses see Jannaris' Hist. Gk. Gramm. 996, 51; the wide usage of the verb is carried on through the LXX from the equally extended employment of the Hebrew equivalent in the later stages of O.T. literature. The Jewish synagogue is denounced as Satanic, owing to its persecuting habits (Satan being regarded as the final source of persecution as of error, cf. above ver. 8 and on ii. 9). Ignatius corroborates the malign activity of Jews at Philadelphia, who were in the habit of molesting the church (ad Philad. 6); he also refers them to the malicious cunning of Satan. Apparently Judaizing tendencies were rife among Christians of Gentile birth at Philadelphia. As in writing to Smyrna, the prophet therefore claimed the ancestral title "Jew" for the Christian church. Faith in Christ, not mere nationality, constituted true Judaism; the succession had passed to Christianity. The prominence assigned to this phase of polemic is characteristic of the period, though already pressed by Paul (in Rom. ix. 6-7, ii. 28-29). The supercilious contempt of these churchmen for all Christian dissenters from Judaism was to be changed one day into humble respect. The former would find out their grievous mistake when it was too late. καὶ προσκύνησαν, κ.τ.λ., in the spirit and realistic language of post-exilic Judaism (see ref.), denoting abject submission and homage before the glory of the church in the future messianic reign (slightly otherwise in 1 Cor. xiv. 25). What they fondly expected from the Gentiles, they were themselves to render to Christians—such would be the grim irony of providence. Compare with what follows, the earlier expectation of Jub. i. 25: "and they shall all be called children of the living God, and every angel and spirit will know, yea they will know that these are my children, and that I love them". καὶ γνώσων, κ.τ.λ., still Isalianic in coloring (from xlii. 4, xlix. 23). Christ's love to his church (ἡ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ) will be proved by her triumphant survival of perils. Her final position, when the conditions of earth are reversed, will throw light upon the divine affection which underlay her previous perseverance, and which meantime is a secret save to those who experience it. The promise of dominion over the Jews here corresponds to that of authority over the Gentiles in ii. 26, 27, except that the latter is definitely eschatological. The Jews tardily awaken to the privileges of the church as to the claims of Jesus (see on i. 7). Probably they scoffed at the claim of the Philadelphian Christians to be objects of the true God's love. The answer is that faith in Jesus means a revelation of Divine love (the revelation of it), apart from which no Christian life can be accounted for.

Ver. 10. The position of μοι shows that it belongs not to τὴν λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς as a whole, but to ὑπομονῆς (2 Thess. iii. 5). The precise sense therefore is not "my word about patience" (i.e., my counsel of patience as the supreme virtue of these latter days, so Weiss, Bousset, etc.), but "the word, or the preaching, of that patience which refers to me" (i.e., the patient endurance with which, amid present trials, Christ is to be served; so Alford, Spitta, Holtzm.).
See Ps. xxxviii. (xxxix.), 8: καὶ γὰρ τὸν ἡμῶν μου; ἀρχὴ δὲ φύσεως; The second reason for praising the Philadelphia Christians is their loyal patience under persecution, as well as the loyal confession of Christ (ver. 8) which had possibly brought on that persecution. καθώς κ.τ.λ. ("I in turn"; cf. similar connection in John xvii. 6-8), a reproduction of the saying preserved in Luke xxi. 36. The imminent period τὸ μέλλον refers to the broken days which, in eschatological schemes, were to herald messiah's return. Later on, this period is specifically defined as a time of seduction to imperial worship (cf. xiii. 14-17, vii. 2, with Dan. xii. 1, LXX.). The Philadelphia Christians will not only triumph over the contempt and intrigues of their Jewish foes but also over the wider pagan trial (which is also a temptation), inasmuch as their devotion, already manifested in face of Jewish malice, will serve to carry them through the storm of Roman persecution. The reward of loyalty is in fact fresh power to be loyal on a higher level: "the wages of going on, and ever to be". This seems better than to take the world-wide trial as the final attempt (viii. 13, xi. 10, etc.) to induce repentance in men or to punish them, from which the P. Christians (cf. vii. 1-8, and Ps. Sol. xiii. 4-10, xv. 6, 7) would be exempt; but it is impossible from the grammar and difficult from the sense, to decide whether τῆρειν ἐκ means successful endurance (pregnant sense as in John xvii. 15) or absolute immunity (cf. 2 Peter ii. 9), safe emergence from the trial or escape from it entirely (thanks to the timely advent of Christ, ver. 11). Note the fine double sense of τῆρειν: unspiring devotion is spared at least some forms of distress and disturbance. It is like Luther's paradox that when a man learns to say with Christ, "The cross, the cross," there is no cross. Rabbinic piety (Sanh. 98 b) expected exemption from the tribulation of the latter days only for those who were absorbed in good works and in sacred studies.

Ver. 12. "You have not long to wait and suffer now"; a fresh motive for tenacity of purpose. Compare with what follows the tradition of R. Simon (in Tract. Shabb. bab. 88 a) that on the occasion of Exod. xxiv. 7, the Israelites were each crowned with two crowns by 600,000 angels—one when they said we will do the other when they said we will be obedient; but on the occasion of Exod. xxxiii. 6 these crowns were snatched off by 1,200,000 devils. In the last day, at the messianic age, God restores these crowns (according to Isa. xxxiv. 10). The sense is not altered if ἐν ... σω (like Luke xii. 20) is taken as a vivid form of the passive "lest thou be deprived of thy crown" (cf. Col. ii. 18 with 2 Tim. iv. 8), forfeiting it through misconduct.

Ver. 12. The reward of steadfastness here is a stable relation to God and absolute (trebly verified) assurance of eternal life, permanence ἐν τῷ ναῷ (verbally inconsistent with xxi. 22) τοῦ Θεοῦ μου (four times in this verse). From Strabo (xii. 868 B, η τε Φιλαδελφεία ... οὐδὲ τῶν τοίχων ἐχεῖ πιστότατο, ἀλλὰ καθ᾽ ἄλλων τρόπων ταῦτα σαλέυονται καὶ διδάσκονται: xiii. 32 B, τόλμε ἐμαυείσθησης τῶν τοίχων ἡμῶν τοῦ θείου οἱ τοίχοι δυστάμοναι, καὶ ἄλλως ἄλλο μέρος τῆς πόλεως κακοτάτων, κ.τ.λ.) we learn that the city was liable to frequent and severe earthquakes, one of which had produced such ruin a while ago (Tac. Ann. ii. 47) that the citizens had to be exempted from Imperial taxation and assisted to repair their buildings. These local circumstances (cf. Juv. vi. 111; Dio Cass. lxvii. 25; Renan, 335) lend colour to this promise, which would also appeal to citizens of a city whose numerous festivals and temples are said to have won for it the sobriquet of "a miniature Athens" (E. Bì. 3692). The promise is alluded to in Ep. Lugd., where God's grace is said to have "delivered the weak and set them up as στόλους ἱδραύλους"
able by means of their patience to stand all angry onset of the evil one," and Attalus of Pergamos is termed a σταύρος και ἡμαλήμα of the local Christians. Permanent communion with God is further expressed in terms of the widespread ethnic belief that to be ignorant of a god's name meant inability to worship him, whereas to know that name implied the power of entering into fellowship with him. "Just as writing a name on temple-walls puts the owner of the name in continual union with the deity of the temple, so for early man the knowledge, invocation and vain repetition of the deity's name constitutes in itself an actual, if mystic, union with the deity named (Jevons' *Introduct. Hist. Religion*, 1896, p. 245; cf. Jastrow, p. 173). Thus γράψεις, κ.τ.λ., inscriptions upon pillars being a common feature of Oriental architecture, cf. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 266, names on pillars; also Reitzenstein's *Poimandres*, 20. The provincial priest of the Imperial cultus erected his statue in the temple at the close of his year's official reign, inscribing on it his own name and his father's, his place of birth and year of office. Hence some of the mysterious imagery of this verse, applied to Christians as priests of God in the next world. This is more probable than to suspect an allusion to what was written on the high priest's forehead (Exod. xxvii. 36, cf. Apoc. vii. 3, xiv. 1, xvii. 5, xxii. 4). Pillars were also, of course, sculptured now and then in human shape. For the first (a) of the three names, cf. *Baba Bathra*, 75, 2: R. Samuel ait R. Johanan dixisse tres appellari nomine Dei, justos (Isa. xliii. 7), Messiam (Jer. xxiii. 6), Hieroölyema (Ezek. xlviii. 35); also Targ. Jerus. on Exod. xxviii. 30, quiesqu memoriillud nomen sanctum [i.e., παρεγράμμα-των] in hora necessitatis, eripitur, et occulta reteguntur. Where a name was equivalent in one sense to personality and character, to have a divine name conferred on one or revealed to one was equivalent to being endowed with divine power. The divine "hidden name" (*Asc. Isa*. i. 7 Jewish: "as the Lord liveth whose name has not been sent into this world," cf. vii. 7) was (according to En. lxxvi. 14 f.) known to Michael, and had talismanic power over demons. Perhaps an allusion to this also underlies the apocalyptic promise, the talismanic metaphor implying that God grants to the victorious Christian inviolable safety against evil spirits (cf. Rom. viii. 38, 39). The second (b) name denotes (cf. Isa. li. 5, Ezek. lxxxviii. 35) that the bearer belongs not merely to God but to the heavenly city and society of God. Since rabbinic speculation was sure that Abraham had the privilege of knowing the mysterious new name for Jerusalem in the next world, John claims this for the average and honest Christian. On the connexion between the divine name and the temple, see 3 Macc. ii. 9, 14, Judith xi. 8, etc. The third (c) "my own new name" (xix. 12) is reflected in *Asc. Isa*. ix. 5 (the Son of God, et nomen eius non putes audire donum de carne exibus); it denotes some esoteric, incomunicable, pre-existent (LXX of Ps. lxxii. 17, En. lix. 26, cf. R. *f*. 249, 344) title, the knowledge of which meant power to invoke and obtain help from its bearer. The whole imagery (as in ii. 17, xix. 12) is drawn from the primitive superstition that God's name, like a man's name, must be kept secret, lest if known it might be used to the disadvantage of the bearer (Frazer's *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. i. 443 f.). The close tie between the name and the personality in ancient life lent the former a secret virtue. Especially in Egyptian and in Roman belief, to learn a god's name meant to share his power, and often "the art of the magician consisted in obtaining from the gods a revelation of their sacred names". The point made by the prophet here is that the Christian God bestows freely upon his people the privilege of invoking his aid successfully, and of entering into his secret nature; also, perhaps, of security in the mysterious future across death. See the famous ch. cxxv. of *E. B. D.* where the successive doors will not allow Nu to pass till he tells them their names (cf. chapters cxxi. f.). Ignatius tells the Philadelphians (obviously referring to this passage, *ad Phil.* 6) that people unsound upon the truth of
Jesus Christ are to him στίχαλα καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ὡς οἰς γέγραπτει μόνον ὁφάρμα \( \Delta νύρασσων \). The \( \Delta κούο \) is emphatic. In the survival of P. during the later conquests which left the other six towns of the Apocalypse more or less ruined, Gibbon (ch. lxiv.) irrelevantly finds "a pleasing example that the paths of honour and safety may sometimes be the same".

Vv. 14-22. The message for Laodicea, where a church existed by 60 A.D. (Col. iv. 10).

Ver. 14. Jesus is the Amen because he guarantees the truth of any statement, and the execution of any promise made by himself. He is consequently the faithful and true witness, whose counsel and rebuke (18, 19) however surprising and unwelcome, are therefore to be laid to heart as authoritative. A faithful witness is one who can be trusted never to misrepresent his message, by exaggeration or suppression, (\( \Delta ληθὺν \) practically = \( \Delta ληθὴς \) as often, since a real witness is naturally a truthful and competent one) his veracity extending not only to his character but to the contents of his message. In point of sincerity and unerring insight (as opposed to "false" in both senses of the term), Jesus is the supreme moral critic; the church is the supreme object of his criticism. He is also absolutely trustworthy, and therefore his promises are to be believed (vv. 20, 21), or rather God's promises are assured and realised to men through him (cf. w. \( \kappa ι \) \( \alpha \) in 2 Macc. ii. 11). Compare the fine Assyrian hymn of Ishtar (Jastrow, p. 343): "Fear not! the mind which speaks to thee comes with speech from me, withholding nothing. . . Is there any utterance of mine that I addressed to thee, upon which thou couldn't not rely?" (also, Eurip. Ion 1537). The resemblance of \( \Lambda ρχή \) κ.τ.λ. to a passage in Colossians is noteworthy as occurring in an open letter to the neighbouring church of Laodicea (Philonic passages in Grill, pp. 106-110). Here the phrase denotes "the active source or principle of God's universe or creation" (\( \Lambda ρχή \), as in Greek philosophy and Jewish wisdom-literature, = allia or origin), which is practically Paul's idea and that of John i. 3 ("the Logos idea without the name Logos," Besschlag). This title of "incipient cause" implies a position of priority to everything created; he is the first in the sense that he is neither creator (a prerogative of God in the Apocalypse), nor created, but creative. It forms the most explicit allusion to the pre-existence of Jesus in the Apocalypse, where he is usually regarded as a divine being whose heavenly power and position are the outcome of his earthly suffering and resurrection. He describes to himself (not at xii. 5, as Baldensperger, 85, thinks) that pre-existence which, in more or less vital forms, had been predicated both of the Messiah in Jewish apocalyptic (cf. En. xlviii.). This pre-existence of messiah is an extension of the principle of determinism; God foreordained the salvation itself as well as its historical hour. See the Egyptian hymn: "He is the primeval one, and existed when as yet nothing existed; whatever is, He made it after He was. He is the father of beginnings. . . . God is the truth, He lives by Truth, He lives upon Truth, He is the king of Truth." The evidence for the pre-existence of messiah in Jewish-Christian literature is examined by Dr. G. A. Barton, Journ. Bibl. Lit. 1902, pp. 78-91. Cf. Introd. § 6.

Ver. 15. The moral nausea roused by tepid religion. It is best to be warm, and energetic; but even a frank repudiation of religion is at least somewhat more promising from an ethical standpoint (Arist. Ntk. Eth. vii. 2-10) than a half-and-half attachment, complacently oblivious of any shortcoming. The outsider may be convinced and won over; there is hope of him, for he is under no illusion as to his real relation to the faith. But what can be done with people who are nominal Christians, unable to recognise that they need repentance and that Jesus is really outside their lives (ver. 20)? Cf. Dante's Inferno, iii. 30 f. For such homely metaphors and their effectiveness, compare the criticism of Longinus in peri \( \ψοφος \)
Ver. 16. The divine disgust at lukewarm religion. Christ, says the prophet, is sick of the lukewarm: as the purpose (μαλλον) of rejection does not exclude the possibility of a change upon the part of the church which shall render the execution of the purpose needless, advice to repent immediately follows upon the threat. The latter is unconditional only in form. Exclusion from God's life forms one side of the penalty, humiliating exposure before men the other (18).

Ver. 17. Priding herself not merely on the fact but (as is implied) on the means by which it had been secured (πίστ., personal skill, merit) and finally on the independent self-reliant position thus attained: a profuse certificate of merit, self-assigned. To conceit and self-deception the prophet wrathfully ascribes the religious indifference at Laodicea. "No one," says Philo (Praem. p. 649, Mang.), "is enriched by secular things, even though he possessed all the mines in the world; the witless are all paupers." The reference is to spiritual possessions and advantages. It is irrelevant to connect the saying with the material wealth and resources of Laodicea, as exemplified in the fact that it was rebuilt by its citizens after the earthquake in 60-61 A.D., without help from the imperial authorities (Tacit. Ann. xiv. 27).


1 oödeivos (νεφος, 1, Areth, etc.) is a correction of the difficult and original oödein ("like nil opus est," Simcox: cf. Epict. iii. 7) AC, 12, Andöv, edd.

(xxxi.): "Sometimes a plain expression like this tells more forcibly than elegant language; being drawn from common life, it is at once recognised, whilst its very familiarity renders it all the more moving." The spirit of the verse resembles that which pervaded Christ's denunciation of the religious authorities in his day for their ὑπάτης, and his more hopeful expectations with regard to the harlots and taxgatherers (Ecce Homo, ch. xiii.); the former condition of religious life was to Jesus a sickening feature in the situation. Just as spiritual death, in the case of the Sardis Christians, meant a lost vitality, so in the case of Laodicea lukewarmness implies that a condition of religious warmth once existed. "He who was never fervent can never be lukewarm." In his analysis of this state (Growth in Holiness, ch. xxv.), Faber points out not only that its correlative is a serene unconcern and unconcern (cf. ver. 17 b), but that one symptom is a complacent attention to what has been achieved (cf. 17 a) rather than sensibility to what is left undone, with "a quiet intentional appreciation of other things over God" (cf. ver. 20), which is all the more mischievous that it is not open wickedness.

Ver. 15. The divined disgust at lukewarm religion. Christ, says the prophet, is sick of the lukewarm: as the purpose (μαλλον) of rejection does not exclude the possibility of a change upon the part of the church which shall render the execution of the purpose needless, advice to repent immediately follows upon the threat. The latter is unconditional only in form. Exclusion from God's life forms one side of the penalty, humiliating exposure before men the other. Exclusion from God's life forms one side of the penalty, humiliating exposure before men the other.
dialect of the local situation. ἀγαθός
in the poor man’s market (Isa. i. 1, cf. Matt. vi. 19, 20), significant words as addressed to the financial centre of the district. “From me,” is emphatic; the real life is due to man’s relation with Christ, not to independent efforts upon his own part. Local Christians needed to be made sensitive to their need of Christ; in Laodicea evidently, as in Bunyan’s Mansoul, Mr. Desires-awake dwelt in a very mean cottage. “Refined” is genuine and fresh, as opposed to counterfeit and traditional (cf. Plato, Rep. iii. 413 e, 416 e). For παίδεια wrought upon the people of God by a divine Davidic king whose words are πατηρωμένα ὑπὲρ χρυσοῦ τίμιον, see Ps. Sol. xvii. 47, 48.— ἰδιότης. Laodicea was a famous manufacturing centre, whose trade largely consisted of tunics and cloth for garments. The allusion is (cf. below, on ver. 20 and xvi. 15) to careless Christians caught off their guard by the suddenness of the second advent. κολλύφων or κολλύφων (cf. the account of a blind soldier’s cure by a god [Aesculapius?] who bade him κολλύφων συντριπτάω, Dittenberger’s Syll. Inscript. Graec. 807, 15 f.), an eye-salve for tender eyes: an allusion to the “Phrygian powder” used by oculists of the famous medical school at Laodicea (C. B. P. i. 52). To the Christian Jesus supplies that enlightenment which the Jews found in the law (Ps. xix. 8); “urba legis corona sunt capitis, collyrium oculis” (Tract. Siphra fol. 143, 2); “urba legis corona sunt capitis, torques collo, collyrium oculis” (Vajikra R., fol. 156, 1). True self-knowledge can be gained only by the help of Christ, i.e., in the present case mediated by Christian prophecy. Like Victor., Lightfoot (Colossians, p. 44) interprets this allusion by the light of Eph. i. 8, Col. i. 27, as a rebuke to the vaunted intellectual resources of the Church; but there is no need thus to narrow the reference. It is to be observed that John does not threaten Laodicea with the loss of material wealth (cf. Pirke Aboth, cited above on ii. 9) in order to have her spiritual life revived.

1 For ἐγχρισιν (P. t., 92 marg., 96, etc.) read ἐγκρισιν (infin. not imper; the technical term; ἐν. λεγ. in N.T.) with ΠΑΣ, etc., v.g., Pr., And., edd.
ever," Faber), but on the fact that this warning was their last chance.

Ver. 20. The language recalls Cant. v. 2 (φωτί) ἀδελφίδοι μου κρούνε ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν. - ἀνοίξον με, for contemporary evidence of the allegorical use of Canticles; see Gunkel's note on 4 Esdras. v. 20 f. and Baederker's Aggeus, d. xii. (auctoritates, i. 109, 285 f. 425, etc.) interpreted in the eschatological sense (γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγένεται ἄνωθεν τῶν ἁρών) Mark xiii. 29. Matt. xxiv. 33) of the logion in Luke xii. 35-38 upon the servants watching for their Lord, ἵνα ἁλώτον καὶ προώνιστος εὐθύς άνοίξον αὐτῷ (whereupon, as here, he grants them intimate fellowship with himself and takes the lead in the matter). To eat with a person meant, for an Oriental, close confidence and affection. Hence future bliss (cf. En. lxxii. 14) was regularly conceived to be a feast (cf. Dalman i. § 1, C. 4 a and Volz 331), or, as in Luke xxii. 29, 30 and here (cf. ver. 21), feasting and authority. This tells against the otherwise attractive hypothesis that the words refer rather to a present repentance on the part of the church or of some individuals in it (so e.g. de Wette, Alfr., Weiss, Simcox, Scott), as Christ sought to be no longer an outsider but a welcome inmate of the heart (cf. Ruskin's Sesame and Lilies, § 95). The context (cf. 18 and 21), a comparison of xvi. 15 (which may even have originally lain close to iii. 20), and the words of Jas. v. 9 (Ἰδοὺ δὲ κρίνει τὰς θυράς ἡμῶν) corroborate the eschatological interpretation (so e.g. Dümsterdieck, Pfleid., Bouset, Forbes, Baljon, Swete, Holtzmann), which makes this the last call of Christ to the church when he arrives on the last day, though here Christ stands at the door not as a judge but as a friend. Hence no reference is made to the fate of those who will not attend to him.

In ii. 5 and 16, ἄγγελος σοι need not perhaps be eschatological, since the coming is conditional and special, but ἄγγελος by itself (iii. 11) and ἄγγελος (i. 25) must be, while iii. 3 probably is also, in view of the context and the chief-simile. The imminent threat of iii. 16 is thus balanced by the urgency of iii. 20. For the eschatological ἐσχάτος cf. i. 7, xvi. 15, xxi. 3, xii. 7, 12. φωτίς, implying that the voice is well-known. To pay attention to it, in spite of self-engrossment and distraction, is one proof of the moral alertness (ἐξῆλθεν) which means repentance. For the metaphorical contrast (reflecting the eternal paradox of grace), the enthroned Christ of 21 and the appearing Christ of 20, cf. the remarkable passage in Gen. ix. 6 f., 10 f., where wisdom shares God's throne and descends to toil among men; also Seneca's Ep. xli. (quemadmodum radii solis contingunt quidem terram, sed ibi sunt unde mittuntur; sic animus magnus et sacer consertatur quidem nobiscum, sed haeret origini suae [Apol. v. 6]: illinc pendet, illuc spectat ac nititur, nostris tanguam melior interest). By self-restraint, moderation, and patience, with regard to possessions, a man will be some day a worthy partner of the divine feast, says Epictetus (Enchir. xv.): "but if you touch none of the dishes set before you and actually scorn them, τότε οὐ μόνον δεινοὶ συμπόσται θεῶν ἄλλα καὶ συναρκεῖς."

Ver. 21. ἄγγελος κ.τ.λ. To share Christ's royal power and judicial dignity is a reward proffered in the gospels, but Jesus there (cf. Mark x. 40) disclaimed this prerogative. God's throne is Christ's, as in xxii. 1. νικᾶς = the moral purity and sensitiveness (cf. 18 and on ii. 7) which succeeds in responding to the divine appeal. The schema of God, Christ, and the individual Christian (cf. on ii. 27) is characteristically Johannine (cf. John xv. 9 f., xvii. 19 f., xx. 21), though here as in ver. 20 (contrast John xiv. 23) the eschatological emphasis makes the parallel one of diction rather than of thought.

The scope and warmth of the promises
to Laodicea seem rather out of place in view of the church's poor religion, but here as elsewhere the prophet is writing as much for the churches in general as for the particular community. He speaks ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. This consideration, together with the close sequence of thought in 19-21 forbids any attempt to delete 20, 21 as a later editorial addition (Wellhausen) or to regard 20 (21) as an epilogue to the seven letters (Vitringa, Alford, Ramsay) rather than as an integral part of the Laodicene epistle. Such a detachment would be a gratuitous breach of symmetry. But, while these closing sentences are not a sort of climax which gathers up the menaces of ii.-iii., ver. 21 (with its throne-reference) anticipates the following visions (iv.-v.).

To the prophet the real value and significance of Christ's life were focussed in his sacrificial death and in the rights and privileges which he secured thereby for those on whose behalf he had suffered and triumphed. This idea, already suggested in i. 5, 6, 17, 18, forms the central theme of the next oracle. The ἐκκλησίαι now pass out of sight till the visions are over. During the latter it is the ἡγίατοi who are usually in evidence, until the collective term πόλις is employed in the final vision (cf. iii. 12). John knows nothing of any catholic ἐκκλησίαι. To him the ἐκκλησίαι are so many local communities who share a common faith and expect a common destiny; they are, as Kattenbusch observes, colonies of heaven, and heaven is their mother-country. Partly owing to O.T. associations, partly perhaps on account of the feeling that an ἐκκλησία (in the popular Greek sense of the term) implied a city, John eschews this term. He also ignores the authority of any officials; the religious situation depends upon the prophets, who are in direct touch with God and through whom the Spirit of God controls and guides the saints. Their words are God's words; they can speak and write with an authority which enables them to say, Thus saith the Spirit. Only, while in the contemporary literature of Christianity the prophetic outlook embraces either the need of organisation in order to meet the case of churches which are scattered over a wide area and exposed to the vagaries of unauthorised leaders (Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius), or contention among the office-bearers themselves (a sure sign of the end, Asc. Isa. iii. 20 f.), John's apocalypse stands severely apart from either interest.

Note on i. 9-iii. 22. We have no data to show whether the seven letters or addresses ever existed in separate form, or whether they were written before or after the rest of the visions. All evidence for such hypotheses consists of quasi-reasons or precarious hypotheses based on some a priori theory of the book's composition. The great probability is that they never had any rôle of their own apart from this book, but were written for their present position. As the Roman emperors addressed letters to the Asiatic cities or corporations (the inscriptions mention at least six to Ephesus, seven to Pergamos, three to Smyrna, etc.), so Jesus, the true Lord of the Asiatic churches, is represented as sending communications to them (cf. Deissmann's Licht vom Osten, pp. 274 f.). The dicit or λέγει with which the Imperial messages open corresponds to the more biblical τάδε λέγει of ii. 1, etc.

Each of the apocalyptic communications follows a fairly general scheme, although in the latter four the appeal for attention follows (instead of preceding) the mystic promise, while the imperative repenti occurs only in the first, third, fifth, and seventh, the other churches receiving praise rather than censure. This artificial or symmetrical arrangement, which may be traced in or read into other details, is as characteristic of the whole apocalypse as is the style which—when the difference of topic is taken into account—cannot be said to exhibit peculiarities of diction, syntax, or vocabulary sufficient to justify the relegation of the seven letters to a separate source. Even if written by another hand or originally composed as a separate piece, they must have been worked over so thoroughly by the final editor and fitted so aptly into the general scheme of the whole Apocalypse (cf. e.g. ii. 7 = xxii. 2, 14, 19; ii. 11 = xx. 16; ii. 17 = xix. 12; ii. 26 = xx. 4; ii. 28 = xxii. 16; iii. 5 = vii. 9, 13; i. 5 = xiii. 8, xx. 15; iii. 12 = xxi. 10, xxii. 14; iii. 21 = iv. 4; iii. 20 = xix. 9; etc.), that it is no longer possible to dis-
entangle them (or their nucleus). The special traits in the conception of Christ are mainly due to the fact that the writer is dealing here almost exclusively with the inner relation of Jesus to the churches. They are seldom, if ever, more realistic or closer to the messianic categories of the age than is elsewhere the case throughout the apocalypse; and if the marjoram of Judaism or (as we might more correctly say) of human nature is not wholly transmuted into the honey of Christian charity—which is scarcely surprising under the circumstances—yet the moral and mental stature of the writer appears when he is set beside so powerful a counsellor in some respects as the later Ignatius. Here John is at his full height. He combines moral discipline and moral enthusiasm in his injunctions. He sees the central things and urges them upon the churches, with a singular power of tenderness and sarcasm, insight and foresight, vehemence and reproach, undaunted faithfulness in rebuke and a generous readiness to mark what he thinks are the merits as well as the failings and perils of the communities. The needs of the latter appear to have been twofold. One, of which they were fully conscious, was outward. The other, to which they were not entirely alive, was inward. The former is met by an assurance that the stress of persecution in the present and in the immediate future was under God’s control, unavoidable and yet endurable. The latter is met by the answer of discipline and careful correction; the demand for purity and loyalty in view of secret errors and vices is reiterated with a keen sagacity. In every case, the motives of fear, shame, noblesse oblige, and the like, are crowned by an appeal to spiritual ambition and longing, the closing note of each epistle thus striking the keynote of what follows throughout the whole Apocalypse. In form, as well as in content, the seven letters are the most definitely Christian part of the book.

The scene now changes. Christ in authority over his churches, and the churches with their angels, pass away; a fresh and ampler tableau of the vision opens (cf. on L. 19), ushering in the future (vi. xxii.), which—as disclosed by God through Christ (i. 1)—is prefaced by a solemn exhibition of God’s supremacy and Christ’s indispensable position in revelation. In Apoc. Bar. xxiv. 2 the seer is told that on the day of judgment he and his companions are to see “the long-suffering of the Most High which has been throughout all generations, who has been long-suffering towards all those born that sin and are righteous.” He then seeks an answer to the question, “But what will happen to our enemies I know not, and when Thou wilt visit Thy works (i.e., for judgment)?” This is precisely the course of thought (first inner mercies and then outward judgments) in Apoc. ii.-iii. and iv. f.; although in the former John sees in this life already God’s great patience towards his people. The prophet is now admitted to the heavenly conclave where (by an adaptation of the rabbinic notion) God reveals, or at least prepares, his purposes before executing them. Chapter iv. and chapter v. are counterparts; in the former God the Creator, with his praise from heavenly beings, is the central figure: in the latter the interest is focussed upon Christ the redeemer, with his praise from the human and natural creation as well. Chapter v. further leads over into the first series of events (the seven seals, vi.-viii. ) which herald the dénouement. Henceforth Jesus is represented as the Lamb, acting but never speaking, until in the epilogue (xxii. 6-21) the author reverts to the Christological standpoint of i.-iii. Neither this nor any other feature, however, is sufficient to prove that iv.-v. represent a Jewish source edited by a Christian; the whole piece is Christian and homogeneous (Sabatier, Schön, Bousset, Pfeiferer, Wellhausen). Chapter iv. is a preliminary description of the heavenly court: God’s ruddy throne with a green nimbus being sur-rounded by a senate of ἀγγέλων ἄγγελων and mysterious θάνατος. Seven torches burn before the throne, beside a crystal ocean, while from it issue flashes and peals accompanied by a ceaseless liturgy of adoration from the ἀγγέλων ἄγγελων and the θανάτος, who worship with a rhythmic emotion of awe.

Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. μετά... έδεικνύω introducing as usual in an independent clause (instead of a simple accus., Vit. ii.
The λαγωνικα of ἩΠ, i, 92 marg., Areth., etc. is a correction of orig. λαγων in ἩΑΟQ, etc., Ande, edd. [an awkward constr. ad sensum = ἐξειλαμβανείται; cf. Vit. i. 204 f.]

8 f., 31, 173, 174, to which he reverts in ver. 4) some fresh and weighty revelation; lesser phases are heralded by the simpler καὶ εἶδον. The phrase indicates a pause, which of course may have covered days as well as hours in the original experience of the seer, if we assume that his visions came in the order in which they are recorded. He is no longer in the island but up at the gates of heaven. In his trance, a heavenly voice comes after he has seen—not heaven opened (the usual apocalyptic and ecstatic symbol, e.g., Acts x. 11 = a vision, xi. 5, Ezek. i. 1, Matt. iii. 16, Ap. Bar. xxii. 3) but—a door set open (ready, opened) in the vault of the mysterious upper world which formed God’s house. Then follows the rapture (which in i. 9 precedes the voice). The whole vision is composed by a man familiar with O.T. prophecy, in Semitic style: short clauses linked by the monotonous καὶ, with little or no attempt made at elaboration of any kind. Traits from the theophany of God as a monarch, surrounded by a triple circle (cf. the triple circle surrounding Ahuramazda), are blended with traits drawn from the theophany in nature. The ordinary Jewish conception (Gfrörer, i. 365 f.) tended to regard God as the royal priest, to whom angels rendered ceaseless levitical praise and service (cf. Apoc. iv.-v.), or as a glorified rabbi whose angels act as interpreters of the heavenly mysteries for man (cf. Apoc. x. and apocalyptic literature in general with its angelic cicerones). In the seven heavens of Chagiga, 12b, the third is the place where “the millstones grind manna for the righteous” (Ps. lxxviii. 23, 24, cf. Apoc. ii. 17), whilst in the fourth are the heavenly Jerusalem (cf. Apoc. xxii. 10) and the temple (Apoc. xv. 5) and the altar (Apoc. viii. 3 f.) where the great prince Michael offers an offering, but in the fifth the ministering angels, who sing God’s praise by night, are silent by day to let Israel’s adoration rise to the Most High (see on ver. 8). ἀναβας ὤς (cf. the common phrase, ἀναβασθεὶς ἐν τοῖς ὀφράσιν, of penetration into heavenly mysteries), from Exod. xix. 16, 24, φωτισθεὶς τῆς σφαλμάτως ἓκα μέγα . . . ἐπῆν ἐκ ὀποῖος Κύριος . . . ἀνάθηκε. As in the O.T. the revelation is vouchsafed spontaneously, whereas in Iranian theology (e.g., in the Vendidad) “it is the wish of man, not the will of God, that is the first cause of the revelation” (Darmesteter, S. B. E. iv. p. lxxxv.). The seer does not enter the door till he is called; to know the divine will is the outcome of revelation, not of inquiry or speculative curiosity (similar idea in 1 Cor. ii. 1 g f.). Enoch (xiv. 9 f.) also does not enter the palace of God with its fire-encircled walls, but sees through the open portals “a high throne, καὶ τὸ εἴδος αὐτοῦ ὡς τοκτάλλουν . . . καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ἄναρπερ . . . and from underneath the great throne came streams of flaming fire so that I could not look thereon. And the great Glory sat thereon and his raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than any snow.” He is finally called by God to approach but not to enter. Cf. Ap. Bar. ii. 11, Test. Levi. v., “and the angel opened unto me the gates of heaven, and I saw the holy One, the Most High, seated on the throne.”

Ver. 2. A fresh wave of ecstasy catches up the seer. ἀπαλαμβάνεις . . . πνεύματα, repeating i. 10, not because the author had forgotten his previous statement, and still less because a new source begins here (Vischer), but simply because every successive phase of this Spirit-consciousness, every new access of ecstasy, was considered to be the result of a fresh inspiration; so the O.T. prophets (e.g., Ezek. xi. i καὶ ἀνάβησθε μετὰ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ., followed by ver. 5 καὶ ἐστών ἐν πνεύμα τούτῳ, ii. 2 and iii. 24; cf. Enoch xiv. 9 καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐν τῷ δράστῃ μου . . . σινθητικάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, followed by ver. 14 ἐλθοῦν ἐν τῷ δ. μ. καὶ ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ., lxxi. i and 5, etc.). The primitive
Christian conception of the Spirit was that of a sudden and repeated transport rather than a continuous experience (Acts iv. 8, 31, etc.), particularly in the region of ecstasy. The royal presence is depicted in this theophany by means of similes and metaphors (partly rabbinic) which originally were suggested in part by the marvellous atmospheric colouring of an Eastern sky during storm or sunset; several had been for long traditional and fanciful modes of expressing the divine transcendence (e.g., En. xiv. 18 f. the divine glory like crystal, etc.) which dominates the Apocalypse. God is a silent, enthroned (cf. 1 Kings xxii. 19 etc.), eternal Figure, hidden by the very excess of light, keeping ward and watch over his people, but never directly interfering in their affairs till the judgment, when mankind appears before his throne for doom and recompense. This reluctance to name or describe God, so characteristic of the later Judaism, was allied to the feeling which mediated his action upon the world through angels or through his Christ (see on i. 1 and xv. 8). For the tendency to describe God and heaven in priestly terms, cf. Gfröer, i. 276 f. The whole of the present passage is illustrated by *Pirke Œliser*, iv.: “majestas sancti beneficienti est in medio quattuor classium angelicarum. Ipsa insidet throno excelsa elevatis, qui formam eum usque in aere, figura autem gloriae eius est sicut color Chasional, juxta uerba prophetae (Ezek. i. 27) . . . atque oculi per totum orbem discurrent. Sagittae eius sunt ignis et grando; a dextra eius uita est, a sinistra mors, sceptrum ignitum in manu eius. Expansum est ante eum uelum, et septem angelii qui prius creati sunt, fumantur ei ante uelum . . . infra thronum gloriae eius est sicut lapis saphiri.”

*Ver. 3.* The sources of the general conception lie far back in passages like Isa. vi. 1 f., Ezek. i. 26 f., Dan. vii. 9 f., Enoch xxxix., xl., xlvii., mediated by rabbinical interpretations. But it should be noted that in the palace-temple of Hatra, the Parthian capital, one well-known frieze contained a row of figures including the griffin, the eagle, the human face, the head of an ox, and an emblem on the cornice apparently representing the sun. With a sublime restraint, the author leaves the royal presence undefined, though he is more definite and explicit on the whole than (say) Ezekiel. The latter’s advance in this respect upon his predecessors was explained by the rabbis (cf. Straneæa’s *Chagiga*, p. 73) as a needful counteractive to the Jewish belief that visions were impossible outside Canaan, and as a help to men of the captivity who needed “special details to support them in their trials” (cf. above, i. 9 f.). The σφάδων, a flesh-coloured, semi-transparent, often golden or reddish gem, answers to our red jasper or cornelian, so-called perhaps from Sardis, whence the stone was originally exported. δυνατός, adj. only here with two terminations. “The striking simile δύμα τοῦ θρόνου δύνατον recalls the portrait statues of Roman emperors and others, in which the raiment is worked out in hard-coloured stones—a fashion introduced in the last years of the republic from Ptolemaic Egypt” (Myres, *E. Bi.*, 4812).—ιρίς. The nimbus or halo round the throne is green, σφ. (cf. Deiss. 267) being malachite or more probably an emerald (xxi. 19), to which the ancients attributed a talismanic power of warding off evil spirits. “Thou hast made heaven and earth bright with thy rays of pure emerald light” (bymn to Ra, *E. B. B.*, 8). The rabbis (Chagiga, 16 a) discouraged any study of the rainbow, as it symbolised the glory of God. As the symbol of God’s covenant, it may be here a foil to the forbidding awe of ver. 5 a (which develops 3 a, as 5 b develops 3 b-4); “Deus in judicis semper meminit foederis sui” (Grotius). But, like the parabolic details of Jesus, these traits are mainly descriptive. The association of jasper, sardius, and emerald is a genuinely Hellenic touch: cf. *Phædo*, 110, where Plato describes the real earth under the heavens of paradise as a place where in perfection lie such things as exist here but in fragmentary beauty—for example, the pebbles esteemed here, σφάδια τοι και ιάδωμα και φυδί-βων. Flinders Petrie, taking σφ. as rock-crystal, argues that the rainbow here is of the prismatic colour which a hexagonal prism of that colourless stone would throw (Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 620).
IV.

4. Καὶ κυριλεῖ τον θρόνον: after θρόνον seems a correction of (ana-coluthon) θρόνον ἡ Α, 34, 35, Andc, etc. (Lach., Ti., WH marg., Bj., Sw., Wa.).

Ver. 4. This verse breaks the continuous description of 3 and 5; it is evidently an original touch of the writer introduced into the more or less traditional scenery of the eternal court where "all the sanctities of heaven stood thick as stars" (cf. v. 11). The conception of twenty-four πρεσβύτεροι royally (i. 6) enthroned as divine assessors, with all the insignia of state, reaches back in part to a post-exilic apocalyptic (Isa. xxiv. 23, βασιλεῖαι κύρων ἐν θόν καὶ ψευδοσυμλή καὶ ἰνών τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται), in part to the historic gerousia. But their attire (golden crowns, white robes) and functions are royal rather than judicial or sacerdotal. They are heavenly beings, angelic figures corresponding to the θρόνος of Col. i. 16 (cf. Isa. lxiii. 9 οὗ πρεσβύτεροι εὐθὶ ἐγγελοῖ). The significance of the doubled 12 has been found in the twelve patriarchs or tribes + the twelve apostles (Andr., Areth., Vict., Alford, Weiss, etc.), in Jewish and Gentile Christianity (Bleek, de Wette, Weissacker, Swete), or in the twenty-four classes of the para-exilic priests with their "elders" (Schäfer, H. 7. P. i. 216 f., so from Vitringa to Ewald, Hilg., Renan, Spitta, Wellh., Erbes, Briggs). But the notion of the church as a fusion or combination of the old and the new covenants is alien to primitive Christianity, and the "elders" are not the ideal or celestial representatives of the church at all. They pertain to the heavenly court, as in the traditional mise-en-scène of the later Judaism, which had appropriated this and other imaginative suggestions of the heavenly court (Schrader,5 pp. 454 f.), or judicial council from the Babylonian astro-theology, where μέτα τῶν ζωτικῶν κύκλων were ranged four-and-twenty stars, half to the north, and half to the south, of which the visible are reckoned as belonging to the living, the invisible to the dead, ὡς δικαιῶ τῶν δικοῦ προσαναθέως (Diod. Sic. ii. 31, quoted by Gunkel in S. C. 302-308, who rightly finds in the same soil roots of other symbols in this passage, such as the four ζυγα and the seven λαμπάδες). In Slav. En. iv. 1, immediately after "the very great sea" in the first heaven is mentioned (cf. Apoc. iv. 6), Enoch is shown "the elders and the rulers of the orders of the stars;" so in Judicium Petri, εἴκοσι γὰρ καὶ παραδότη εἰς πρεσβύτεροι, twelve on the right hand of God and twelve on the left, as in Acta Perpet.

The twenty-four star-deities of the Babylonian heaven had thus become adoring and subordinate angelic beings (cf. ἡμῶν, ver. 11) in the apocalyptic world of the later Judaism, and our author retains this Oriental trait, together with the seven torches, the halo, etc., in order to body forth poetically his conception of the divine majesty (so, after Gunkel, Jeremias, and Bousset, Bruston, J. Weiss, Scott, Forbes, Porter). A partial anticipation of this feature, as well as of some others, in the Apocalypse occurs not only in the "sacred council" of Doushara, the Nabatean deity (cf. Cook's North Semit. Inscr., pp. 221 f., 443 f.), but in Egyptian mythology, as, e.g., in the following inscription from the tomb of Unas (5th dynasty, 3500 B.C.) "His place is at the side of God, in the most holy place; he himself becomes divine (neter), and an angel of God; he himself is triumphant. He sits on the great throne by the side of God [Apoc. iii. 21]. He is clothed with the finest raiment of those who sit on the throne of living right and truth. He hungers not, nor thirsts, nor is sad, for he eats daily the bread of Ra, and drinks what He drinks daily, and his bread also is that which is spoken of by Seb, and that which comes forth from the mouth of the gods [Apoc. vii. 16, 17, xxi. 4]. Not only does he eat and drink of their food, but he wears the apparel they wear—the white linen and sandals, and he is clothed in white . . . and these great and never-failing
5. Kai ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐκπορεύεται δαστραπαί καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔστω ἡ λαμπάδες πυρὸς καὶ φωναὶ ἐπάνω τοῦ θρόνου [ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τὴν κυρίαν τοῦ θεοῦ].


Kai ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα ζώα

1 Either ἀ εἰσὶν (MkP, 28, 56, Syr., Ti., WH, Sw., Bj.) or ἀ εἰσὶν (A, Lach., We., Ba.) is to be read for ἀ εἰσὶν (Q, etc., S., Areth.).

2 Künnecke (Emendationen zu Stellen N.T., 34) and Ba. (?) om. καὶ κενὸν τοῦ θρόνου ὡς γράφωσιν καὶ καὶ μενεῖν ὡς αὐτὸν ὡς τὸν θρόνον as the mistranslation of θύρα τῆς ἑτερογένειας (= and the throne was in the midst of it, i.e., of the glassy sea). For τεσσάρα see fifth and in ver. 8 read τεσσάρα (A, ed.), as generally throughout Apoc. (a καιρικό-καταδρομή, possibly Ionian, Helbing, 5-6, Thumb, 72), though "the papyri would seem to supply decisive evidence for τεσσάρα as the first century form" (Class. Review, 1901, p. 33, cf. 1904, p. 107).

gods give unto him of the Tree of Life [Apoc. ii. 7] of which they themselves do eat, that he likewise may live."

Ver. 5. The impression of awe is heightened by traits from the primitive Semitic theophany which, especially in judgment, was commonly associated with a thunderstorm (φωναῖ τοῦ θρόνου) as a gloss (so min., Me., Harl., Arm., Tic.), while Bruston takes καὶ κενῶς τοῦ θρόνου καὶ καὶ μενεῖν as the mistranslation of θύρα τῆς ἑτερογένειας (= and the throne was in the midst of it, i.e., of the glassy sea). For τεσσάρα here and in ver. 8 read τεσσάρα (A, ed.), as generally throughout Apoc. (a καιρικό form, possibly Ionian, Helbing, 5-6, Thumb, 72), though "the papyri would seem to supply decisive evidence for τεσσάρα as the first century form" (Class. Review, 1901, p. 33, cf. 1904, p. 107).

The combination of fire and crystal (ver. 6, see also xv. 2) goes back originally to Exod. xxv. 9, 10, 17, and Ezek. i. 22, 27, mediated by passages like En. xiv. 9, 17, xvi. 21-23; while the groundwork of the symbol answers to the seven Persian councilors (Ezra vii. 14, Esth. i. 14) who formed the immediate circle of the monarch, a counterpart of the divine Amshaspands, as well as to the sacred fire of Ormuzd, which (on Zoroastrian principles) was to be kept constantly burning. Seven burning altars, evidently representing a planetary symbolism, also occur in the cult of Mithra, while in the imageless temple of Melcarth at Gadess fires always burned upon the altar, tended by white-robed priests.—5 κενὸς reads like an editorial comment or a liturgical gloss; the περιβάλλοντος, e.g., are undefined.

Ver. 6. For a sea in heaven, cf. above (on ver. 4). In Test. Patr. Levi. 2 the sea lies within the second (first) heaven ὕπωρ κρεμαλέων ἀνάμεσον τοῦ κόσμου, and in the Egyptian paradise the triumphant soul goes to "the great lake in the Fields of Peace," where the gods dwell. The description, "a sea of glass, like crystal" (i.e., transparent, ancient glass being coarse and often semi-opaque, and δαλας being primarily-transparent, not vitreous) borrowed partly from archaic tradition (coloured by Egyptian and Assyrian ideas), is intended to portray the ether, clear and calm, shimmering and motionless. Rabbinic fancy compared the shining floor of the temple to crystal,
and the hot eastern sky is likened (in Job xxxvii. 18) to a molten mirror, dry and burnished. Heaven is a sort of glorified temple (1 Kings vii. 23, the sea in the Solomon temple being copied from the oblong or round tank which represented the ocean at every Babylonian temple, while the earth was symbolised by the adjoining zikkurat), and the crystal firmament is a sort of sea. In Slav. En. iii. 1-3 the seer observes, in the first heaven, the ether, and then "a very great sea, greater than the earthly sea".  

Note also that when they worship (9), the προφήτης, προφήτης, a traditional and poetical trait of the heavenly court. — τῶν ἱεροτ. τελευτ. — τεταρτάκος, cf. Slav. En. xxiv. 13, 14. The posture of the θεὸς may be visualised from a comparison of the Alhambra Court of the Lions.

Ver. 7. μόσχος, "an ox or steer" (as LXX). The four animals are freely compounded out of the classical figures of Ezekiel's cherubim and the seraphim in Isa. vi. : the latter supply the six wings apiece. This function of ceaseless praise (8-9) is taken from Enoch ixi. 10 f., where the cherubim and seraphim are also associated but not identified with the angelic host (though in xi. the cherubim are equivalent to the four archangels); for a possible Babylonian astral background, cf. Zimmern in Schrader, 626-632, and Clemen's Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. T. (1909), pp. 74 f. Behind them lie the signs of the Zodiac (the bull, the archer, the lion and the eagle, as a constellation of the North ; so, e.g., Gunkel, Bruston, etc.). The analogous figures of the four funereal genii before the Egyptian throne represent the four points of the compass.

Ver. 8. A description of the sounds and songs of heaven follows the picture of its sights.— γέμων, either with τά τ. τ. (ἐχων for once a real participle) or an asyndeton (if ἐχων here, as elsewhere in the Apocalypse, must be supplied with a copula). κυν. κ. 4. = "round their bodies and on the inside" (i.e., underneath their wings). For the ceaseless praise, which resembles that of Nin-ib, the Assyrian deity, cf. on ver. 7 and ver. xi. also Enoch xxxix. 12 (the trisagion sung by the sleepless ones, i.e., angels), Slav. En. xvii., and Test. Levi 3 (where endless praise is the function of denizens in the fourth heaven). The first line of the hymn is Isaianic, the second (δ ἕως κ. τ. λ.) is characteristic of the Apocalypse. In En. xii. 7 the sun and moon in their orbits "give thanks and praise and rest not; for to them their thanksgiving is rest". In the Apocalypse, however, the phenomena of nature are generally the objects or the scourges of the divine
9. καὶ ὁταν ἡ δόξα τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῶν ἐκ προφητικῶν ἑταίρων, αὐτῷ πάντες ἐφευραίοιται τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θόρυβῷ, τῷ ᾽Ιωάννῳ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνια τοὺς αἰώνιαν, τοῦ τῆς τιμῆς τῶν αἰώνων, τῶν αἰώνων, 

10. οἱ εἰκονεῖς τῶν σώματος πάντων τῶν καθήμενων ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, καὶ προσκυνήσων τῷ ξύνι εἰς τοὺς αἰώνια τοὺς αἰώνιαν, τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ ἐκτὸς τῶν στεφάνων αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, λέγοντες,

11. "Αμήν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐνῶσεως καὶ τῆς τιμῆς· καὶ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῆς δόξας·

II. "Αμήν ταύτα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῆς δόξας·

Ver. 9. The frequentative meaning of δόξαν (see the note) comes from the sense rather than from the grammar of the passage. "Whenever," etc. (i.e., throughout the course of this book, v. 8 f., xi. 16 f., xiv. 4) is "a sort of stage-direction" (Simcox). It would be harsh to take the words as a proleptic allusion to the single occurrence at xi. 15 f. (J. Weiss). To give or ascribe δόξα to God is reverently to acknowledge his supreme authority, either spontaneously and gladly (as here and xix. 7, where "honour" becomes almost "praise") or under stress of punishment (xi. 13, xiv. 7, xvi. 9) and fear of judgment. The addition of τιμῆς in doxologies amplifies the idea, by slightly emphasising the expression of that veneration and awe felt inwardly by those who recognise his δόξα. To fear God or to be his servants is thus equivalent upon the part of men to an attitude of pious submission and homage. To "give thanks" is hardly co-ordinate with δόξα, but follows from it as a corollary (cf. Ps. xcvi.-xcviii.). Such worship is the due of the living God (vii. 2, x. 6, xv. 7), whereas to eat "meat sacrificed to idols is to worship dead gods" (Did. vi. 3, cf. Apc. ii. 14, 20). The Apocalypse, however, never dwells on the danger of idolatry within the Christian church; its attention is almost absorbed by the supreme idolatry of the Emperor, which is silently contrasted in this and in other passages with the genuine Imperial worship of the Christian church. "He who sits on the throne" (a title of Osiris in E. B. D.) is the only true recipient of worship. Cf. the hymn to "Ra when he rose up": "Those who are in thy following sing unto thee with joy and bow down their forehead to the earth when they meet thee, thou lord of heaven and earth, thou king of Right and Truth, thou creator of eternity".

Ver. 10. To cast a crown before the throne was a token that the wearer disclaimed independence; an Oriental (Parthian) token of respect for royalty (refl.). Cf. Spenser's Hymn of Heavenly Beautie (1415455) and the pretty fancy in Slav. En. xiv. 2 where the sun's crown is taken from him as he passes through the fourth heaven (before God) and given to God.

Ver. 11. An implicit refutation of the dualistic idea, developed by Cerinthus, the traditional opponent of John in Asia Minor, that creation was the work of some angel or power separate from God (Iren. i. 26, iv. 32, Hippol. Haer. vii. 33, x. 1). The enthusiastic assent of the προσκυνήσων to the adoration of the Creator is expressed in word as well as in action. σε emphatic=the usual apocalyptic (R. J., 295, 296) emphasis on creation as a proof of God's power in
providence and claims on mankind (e.g. 4 Esd. iii. 4, “thou didst fashion the earth, and that thyself alone”). That God the redeemer is God the creator, forms one of the O.T. ideas which acquire special weight in the Apocalypse. Despite the contradictions of experience and the apparent triumph of Satan, the apocalypses of the age never gave way to dualism. Their firm hope was that the world, ideally God’s, would become actually his when messiah’s work was done; hence, as here, the assertion of his complete power over nature and nations. “Because thou didst will it (σον emphatic) they existed and were created” (act and process of creation). As an answer to polytheism this cardinal belief in God the creator came presently to the front in the second century creeds and apologies. But the idea here is different alike from contemporary Jewish and from subsequent Christian speculation, the former holding that creation was for the sake of Israel (cf. 4 Esd. vi. 55, vii. 11, ix. 13, Apoc. Bar. xiv. 18, 19, xv. 7, Ass. Mos. i. 12, etc., a favourite rabbinic belief), the latter convinced that it was for the sake of the Christian church (cf. Hermes V. ii. 4). Nor is there any evident trace of the finer idea (En. iii.-v, Clem. Rom. xx., etc.) which contrasted the irregularities and impurity of men with the order and obedience of the universe. The conception of the holy ones rendering ceaseless praise in heaven would be familiar to early Christians in touch with Hellenic ideas and associations; e.g., Hekateus of Abdera, in his sketch of the ideal pious folk, compares them to the priests of Apollo, διὰ τὸ τὸν θεὸν τούτον καθ’ ήμερὰν ὅτι αὐτῶν ἡμετέρας μετ’ ἕβοι παραχώρησε (Dieterich 36 f., cf. Apoc. Pet. 19-20). Test. Levi 3 in bi τῷ μετ’ αὐτῶν ελθὼν κ. ἔσωσε τοῖς ἑν τῷ θεῷ προσφέρονται.

Chapter V.—Ver. 1. The central idea of this sealed roll or doomsday book lying open on the divine hand (cf. Blau, Studien zur alt-kelt. Buchwesen, 36 f., E. J. Goodspeed, 5. Journ. Bibl. Lit. 1903, 70-74) is reproduced from Ezekiel (ii. 9 f.) but independently developed in order to depict the truth that even these magnificent angelic figures of the divine court are unequal to the task of revelation. Jesus is needed. For God, a motionless, silent, majestic figure, does not come directly into touch with men either in revelation or in providence. He operates through his messiah, whose vicarious sacrifice throws all angels into the shade (cf. the thought of Phil. ii. 5-11). For the ancient association of a many-horned lamb with divination, cf. the fragmentary Egyptian text edited by Krall (Vom König Bokhoris, Innsbruck, 1898) and the reference to Suidas (cited in my Hist. Neuer Testament. p. 587). ηθναῖον, which here (as in 1. 11, xii. 18) might mean “letter” or “epistle” (cf. Birt’s Ant. Buchwesen, 20, 21), apparently represents the book of doom or destiny as a papyrus-roll (i.e. an ἀποκαλυπτικόν, cf. Juv. i. 6) which is so full of matter that the writing has flowed from the inside over to the exterior, as is evident when the sheet is rolled up. Here as elsewhere the pictorial details are not to be pressed; but we may visualise the conception by supposing that all the seals along the outer edge must be broken before the content of the roll can be unfolded, and that each heralds some penultimate disaster (so 4 Esd. vi. 20). There is no proof that each seal meant a progressive disclosure of the contents, in which case we should have to imagine not a roll but a codex in book form, each seal securing one or two of the leaves (Spitta). Zahn (followed by Nestle, J. Weiss, and Bruston) im-
proves upon this theory by taking δεκ with κατάσφαιρον, and thus eliminating any idea of the διαδοθένθανεν: it simply rests on (ἐν) the right hand, as a book does, instead of being held ἐν the right hand, as a roll would be. But ἐν τ. ἁ. is a characteristic irregularity of grammar; to describe a sealed book as "written within" is tautological; ἀναφέρεται could be used of a codex as well as of a roll; and ἄνων may probably have preceded γενόμενον if it had been intended by itself to qualify the participle. A Roman will, when written, had to be sealed seven times in order to authenticate it, and some have argued (e.g. Hicks, Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the N. T. 157, 158, Zahn, Selwyn, Kohler, J. Weiss) that this explains the symbolism here: the διαδοθέν is the testament assuring the inheritance reserved by God for the saints. The coincidence is interesting. But the sacred number in this connexion does not require any extra-Semitic explanation and the horrors of the seal-visions are more appropriate to a book of Doom. Besides, the Apoc. offers no support otherwise to this interpretation, for the sole allusion to πᾶντα γεγονότα is quite incidental (cf. on xxi. 7). The sealing is really a Daniéllic touch, added to denote the mystery and obscurity of the future (not of the past, En. lxxix-xc.). On the writer's further use of the symbol of the book of Doom, cf. below on ch. x. 16-19. The silence following the opening of the last seal certainly does not represent the contents of the book (= the promised Sabbath-rest, Zahn). This would be a jejune anti-climax. Possibly the cosmic tragedies that follow that seal are intended to be taken as the writing in question. The διαδοθέν is therefore the divine course and counsel of providence in the latter days (ἡ ἑκάστορατος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρεται μνήμη, Areth.). Only, while an angel read all the divine policy to Daniel (Dan. x. 21), the Christian prophet feels that Jesus alone is the true interpreter and authority, and that the divine purpose can only be revealed or realised through his perfect spiritual equipment (iii. i, v. 6, cf. i. 5, ii. 27, iii. 21, xvii. 14, etc.)

Ver. 2. The κατὰ δὲτὰ ἀναφέρεται is either epexegetical or the mark of a hysterical phrase (cf. the awkward ὡς ἐλεύθερα of 3-4, unless look here means to look into the contents). The cry is a challenge rather than an appeal.

Ver. 3. ἢνακάρα, the under-world of departed spirits or of daemons. Not even angels in τῷ υπερασπίζεται (cf. Mark xiii. 32) can discharge this function; their rôle in the Apocalypse is prominent but limited. Gunkel prefers to think of a magical background to the whole symbolism; the book defies the necromancy of the universe, but yields to the superior power of "the new god, the lord of the book". For the mythological basis of the idea of an opened heavenly book cf. Winckler (Alt-orient. Forsch. ii. 386) and Brandis (Hermes, 1867, 283). The triple division of the universe was originally Babylonian but it had long ago become a popular religious idea, (cf. Phil. ii. 10).

Ver. 4. A naïve expression of disappointment, the expectation of iv. 1 being apparently thwarted. The sense of consolation and triumph is so strong in this book that no tears are shed in self-pity. The prophet only weeps at the apparent check to revelation.

Ver. 5. ἀναφέρεται ... ὡς ἀναφέρεται, cf. Dittenberger's Sylloge Inscr. Graec. 790 (first century) τὰς ὁ. ἀναφέρεται. Christ's success is due to his legitimate messianic authority as a Davidic scion (ματ. = shoot or sprout on main stem, cf. Sibyll. iii. 396); the Davidic descent of Jesus was a tenet of certain circles in primitive Christianity (Dalman i. § 12). Possibly there is an allusion to the original bearing of the O.T. passage:—Jesus irresistible and courageous, yet in origin humble. In 4 Esdr. xii. 31, 32 the messiah's rebuke to the Roman empire is thus described: leonem quem uidi sunt silva exiguilantem mugientem et loquentem ad aquilam et arguentem eam iniquitatis ... hic est unctus, quem reseruavit altissimus in finem [dierum, qui dicitur
ex semine David). ἡμμα, in sense of ‘shoot’ occurs with μῆλα in Isa. xi. 1 (cf. 10; Ezek. xix. 11, 12, 14); hence the combination with the idea of ‘sceptre’ (ἰάκον) (cf. ii. 27) in a messianic connotation (cf. on xxii. 16). The enigma of the world’s history lies with Christ, to be solved and to be controlled. Jewish eschatology (En. xiv. 3, xlix. 1) had already proclaimed the revealing power of might, who is ‘mighty in all the secrets of righteousness . . . and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden’. John claims that Jesus is the legitimate messiah, whose power to unfold God’s redeeming purpose rests upon his victorious inauguration of that purpose. The victory of Christ in v. 5 ff. follows dramatically upon the allusion in iii. 21, but it is to press the sequence too far when this scene is taken to represent his arrival in heaven ‘just after the accomplishment of his victory’ (Briggs).

Ver. 6. Christ, crucified and risen, is in the centre. To him all things bow and sing. It is prosaic to attempt any local definition, as though the author had some architectural plan in his mind (ἡμα = ‘half-way up the throne’, or by repetition = ‘between’, cf. Gen. i. 7), or to wonder how so prominent a figure had hitherto escaped his notice. Plainly the ἀγέλος did not originally belong to the mise-en-scène of iv., though the symbol may have none the less had an astral origin (= Ram, in Persian zodiac). The prophet brilliantly suggests, what was a commonplace of early Christianity, that the royal authority of Jesus was due to his suffering for men, but the framework of the sketch is drawn from messianic dogmas which tended to make Christ here a figure rather than a personality.— ἀγέλος (like θυργος, diminutive only in form) is not taken from Jer. xi. 19 f. (LXX) by a writer who placed it in juxtaposition with ‘lion’ owing to the resemblance of sound between Ἰησοῦς and aries (so variably Havet and Selwyn, 204-208), nor substituted (Visher, Rauch) for the ‘lion’ of the original Jewish source, but probably applied (cf. Hort on 1 Peter i. 19) to Jesus from the messianic interpretation of Isa. xvi. 1 or lii. 7, though the allusions elsewhere to the Exodus (xxv. 2 ff) and the Johannine predilection for the paschal Lamb suggest that the latter was also in the prophet’s mind. The collocation of lion and lamb is not harder than that of lion and root (ver. 5), and such an editor as Visher and others postulate would not have left ‘lion’ in ver. 5 unchanged. Christ is erect and living (cf. xiv. 1 and Abbott’s Joh. Vocabulary, 1725), δὲ ἀγέλας (as could be seen from the wound on the throat), yet endowed with complete power (ἐδώκα, Oriental symbol of force, cf. refl. and the rams’ horns of the Egyptian sun-god) and knowledge. For ἀγέλος and ἀγέλας, cf. Abbott, 210 f. In Enoch lixxix. 44 f. (Gk.) David is ἄγαρ prior to his coronation and Solomon ‘a little sheep’ (i.e., a lamb).— ἀγέλας κ.τ.λ., the function ascribed by Plutarch (de defect. orac. 13) to daemons as the spies and scouts of God on earth. The naive symbolism is borrowed from the organisation of an ancient realm, whose ruler had to secure constant and accurate information regarding the various provinces under his control. News (as the Tel-el-Amarna correspondence vividly shows) was essential to an Oriental monarch. The representation of Osiris in Egyptian mythology consisted of an eye and a sceptre (cf. Apoc. ii. 27), denoting foresight and force (Plut. de Iside, 51), while the ‘eyes’ and ‘ears’ of a Parthian monarch were officials or officers who kept him informed of all that transpired throughout the country. Else
where the seven spirits are identified with seven torches, but John is more concerned to express from time to time his religious ideas than to preserve any homogeneity of symbolism (seven eyes similarly varied in Zech. cf. ref. It). The inconsistency cannot, in a writing of this nature, be taken as evidence of interpolation or of divergent sources, though it may be an editorial gloss. An analogous idea underlies Plutarch's explanation of the "travelling" power of Isis (Iside, 60), for which he adduces the old Greek etymology (= knowledge and movement, 

where this on pre-

Christian messianism, or of contemporary cults on this element of Christian symbolism, can be made out from the extant evidence. In any case, it would merely supply the form for expressing a reality of the Christian experience.

Ver. 7. A realistic symbol of the idea conveyed in John iii. 35, xii. 49, etc.

Ver. 8. A thrill of satisfaction over Christ's ability. "It is the manner of God thus to endear mercy to us, as he endeared a wife to Adam. He first brought all creatures to him, that he might first see that there was not a helper meet for him among them." (Goodwin).

John lays dramatic emphasis on Jesus only. ἔνων. τ. &c. (as before God himself, xiv. 9).—γ. 6., cf. Soph. Oed. Tyr. 4, πόλις οὐκ οἷον μὴ θυμίαματον γείρει.

An essential feature in the rites of Roman sacrifice was music played on tibicines; the patera, a shallow saucer or ladle with a long handle attached, was also employed to pour wine on the altar. Harps held by living creatures who had no hands but only wings, and the collocation of a harp played by a person who is at the same time holding a bowl, are traits which warn us against prosaically visualising such visions. Hisracht compares the adoration of Rameses II. before the sun-god, the monarch's left hand holding his offering, his right grasping a sceptre and scourge. The fragrant smoke of incense rising from the hand of a worshipper or from an altar in the primitive cultus (cf. Ezek. viii. 2) to lose itself in upper air, became a natural symbol for prayer breathed from earth to heaven; see Philo's τὸ καθαράτατον τῷ θάνατον, πνεῦμα λογικὸν.—αι...ἀγίων, probably an editorial gloss like xiii. 8 b, suggested by the verbal parallel in viii. 3 (so, e.g., Spitta, Völter, Briggs, Jülicher, J. Weiss, Wellhausen, etc.). Contrast with this verse (and ver. 4) the description of the enthusiastic seamen and passengers who "candidati, coronatique, et tura libantes," praised and blessed Augustus in the bay of Puteoli as "He by whom we live, and sail secure, and
enjoy our freedom and fortunes” (Suet. Vit. Aug. 98).

The scene or stage of the apocalyptic drama is occupied by an angelic and heavenly chorus, who upon this solemn and grand occasion give their plaudite or acclamation of glory to the Lord. The future which God rules is revealed by him through Christ; and this moves enthusiastic gratitude, till the universe rings from side to side with praise.

Ver. 9. ἐπὶ τὴν παλαντίαν (cf. note on 1.5) = the buying of slaves, cf. Dittenberger’s Orientis Gr. Inscript. Selectae, 338f.

Ver. 10. An allusion not so much to the idea of xx. 4, where the literal sway of the saints (= life eternal, in substance) is confined to a certain section of them, or to xxii. 5 (on the new earth, cf. xxii. 1), as to i. 26. Compare the primitive patristic notion, reflected, e.g., by Vict. on i. 15: adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius, quoniam ubi illi primum steterunt et ecclesiam confirmauerunt, i.e., in Iudæa, ibi omnes sancti conuentur sunt et dominum suum adoratur. The whole verse sets aside implicitly such a Jewish pretension as of Philo, who (de Abraham. 19) hailed Israel as the people δὲ μοι βοktion τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντως ἀνθρώπων γένους ἐξομολογήσων καὶ προφητείαν λαλήσω.

Ver. 11. This outer circle of myriads (the following χιλιάδες is an anti-climax) of angelic retainers—a favourite trait in the later Jewish pageants of heaven—does not address praise directly to the Lamb.


Ver. 12. For similar arrangements in Jewish doxologies, see Gröfner, ii. 145-8; and, for ἰός-τρ. ἄρα, ἄρος, see Dan. ii. 37 (LXX). The groups together the seven words of the panegyric; honour and glory and praise are due to one whose victorious death has won him the power of bestowing incalculable riches on his people and of unriddling the future, against all opposition (Weiss). The refrain of δοξ. is heard in xi. 17, and ἄρος had been already associated with “wealth” and “power” (Eph. i. 18 f.) or “wisdom” (2 Cor. iii. 7 f.; iv. 4, etc.) in Christ (contrast Isa. liii. 2 LXX). The act of taking the book (ver. 7) suggests the general authority and prestige of the Lamb, which is acknowledged in this doxology. The order in 12, 13 is the same as in Ps. ciii. 20-22, where the angels are followed by creation in the worship. When God’s creatures and servants magnify, praise, and bless him, yielding themselves to his dominion, and acknowledging that to him all the strength and wealth and wisdom of life rightly belong, God is honoured. Christ was glorified by God (cf. Acts iii. 13, Rom. vi. 4, John xvii. 1) at the resurrection, when God’s power raised him to eternal life; he is glorified by men in their homage and submission to him as the sole medium of redemption and revelation.

Ver. 13. From the whole creation a third doxology rises, catching up the last word (τέλος) of the preceding, and addressed—as in the primitive and distinctive confessions of early Christianity (e.g., John xvii. 3, i Tim. ii. 5) to God and Jesus alike (vii. 10). In this chorus of praise (i. 6), by a sweep of the poet’s imagination, even departed spirits and sea-monsters (κατό τ. θαλ., rather than seafaring men) join—“even all that is in” earth and sea and heaven (cf. the title of the sun in the Rosetta inscription of 196 B.C., μέγας βασιλεύς τῶν τε ἄνω κ. τ. κάτω χωρῶν). Sacrifice is on the throne of the universe; by dying for men, Jesus has won the heart and confidence of the world. Thus the praise of God the creator (ch. iv.) and the praise of Jesus the redeemer (ch. v.) blend in one final song, whose closing words indicate that the latter’s prestige was not confined to a passing phase of history. The crime for which the messiah de-thrones the rulers (in Enoch xlvii.) is just “because they do not praise and extol him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them, ... because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits”. In the papyrus of Ani (E. B. D. 3) Rā is worshipped by the gods “who dwell in the heights and who dwell in the depths”; whilst Isis and Osiris, as possessing supreme power, received honour “in the regions under the earth and in those above ground” (Plut. de Isid. 27). Compare the fine rabbinic saying of Rabbi Pinchas and R. Jochanan on Ps. c. 3: “though all offerings cease in the future, the offering of praise alone shall not cease; though all prayers cease, thanksgiving alone shall not cease”. 
Ver. 14. The prologue is brought to a splendid close by "amen" from the four ζεύς, who have the last as they had the first word (iv. 8), followed by silent adoration from the προσβής τεσσαρῶν. As in the liturgical practice of early Christian assemblies, so in the celestial court, the solemn chant of praise to God is succeeded by the "amen" ("ad simulitudinem tonitru... amen rebeat," Jerome); Q. Areth., etc. Alfr., bring this out by reading here τὸ ἀμήν. By prefacing the struggle on earth (vi. f.) with a vision of the brilliant authority and awe of heaven (iv., v.), the prophet suggests that all the movements of men on earth, as well as the physical catastrophes which overtake them, are first fore-shadowed in heaven (the underlying principle of astrology, cf. Jeremias, 84, f.) and consequently have a providential meaning. In iv., v. the writer takes his readers behind the scenes; the whole succeeding tide of events is shown to flow from the will of God as creator of the universe, whose executive authority is delegated to Jesus the redeemer of his people. This tide breaks in two cycles of seven ωάκια, the seventh (viii. 1) of the first series (vi. 1-vii. 17) issuing in a fresh cycle (viii. 2-xi. 19) instead of forming itself (as we should expect) the climax of these preliminary catastrophes in nature and humanity, disasters which were interpreted (R. Ἑρ. 237-239) as the premonitory outbursts of an angry deity ready to visit the earth with final punishment. Observe that throughout the Apocalypse wind and fire are among God's scourges handled by angels in order to punish the earth and the waters, according to the conception preserved in Apol. Arist. 2: "Moreover, the wind is obedient to God, and fire to the angels; the waters also to the daemons, and earth to the sons of men." (Ante-Nicene Library, ix. 257 f.) The visitation is divinely complete, sevenfold like Ezekiel's oracles against the nations (xxv.-xxxii.). Apoc. vi.-ix. has, for its staple, little more than a poetic elaboration of Mark xiii. 8 (cf. 24, 25), international complications due to the scuffling and strife of peoples, and physical disasters as a fit setting for them. The vision of the seven seals opened (vi. i-viii. 2): i. 1, 2, a Parthian invasion.

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. The command or invitation ἔρχεται is not addressed to Christ (as xxii. 17. 20). If addressed to the seer, it is abbreviated from the ordinary rabbinic phrase (omnia et uide) used to excite attention and introduce the explanation of any mystery. The immediate sequel (omitted only in ver. 4), καὶ ἐβασά, does not, however, forbid the reference of ἔρχεται to the mounted figures; hearing the summons, John looked to see its meaning and result. The panorama of these four dragon's ("ad significandum iter properum cum potentia") is partly sketched from Semitic folk-lore, where apparitions of horsemen (cf. 2 Macc. iii. 25, etc.: "the Beduins always granted me that none living had seen the angel visions... the meleikas are seen in the air like horsemen, tilting to and fro," Doughty, Arab. Deserta, i. 449) have been a frequent omen of the end (cf. Jos. Bell. vi. 5; Sib. Or. iii. 796), partly reproduced from (Persian elements in) Zech. i. 7 f., vi. 1-8, in order to bring out the disasters (cf. Jer. xiv. 12, xxii. 7) prior to the last day. The direct sources of vi. and ix. lie in Lev. xxvi. 19-26; Ezek. xxxii. 27, xxxiv. 28 f., and Sir. xxxix. 20, 30 ("fire and hail and famine and ἁγείροντες, all these are created for vengeance; teeth of wild beasts and scorpions and serpents and a sword taking vengeance on the impious to destroy them"). An astral background, in connection with the seven tables of destiny in Babylonian mythology, each of which was dedicated to a planet of a special colour, has been conjectured by Renan (472); cf. Chwolson's Die Szabier, iii. 658, 671, 676 f. For other efforts to associate these horsemen with the winds or the planets, see Jeremias (pp. 24 f.) and M. W. Müller in Zeit. f. d. neutest.
Wiss. (1907), 290-316. But the proofs are fanciful and vague, though they converge upon the view that the colours of the steeds at least had originally some planetary significance. The series, as usual, is divided into the first four and the second three members. The general contents of vi. 1-8 denote various but not successive phases of woe (only too familiar to inhabitants of the Eastern provinces) which were to befal the empire and the East during the military convulsions of the final strife between Rome and Parthia. The "primum omen," for John as for Vergil, is a white horse, ridden by an archer.

Ver. 2. White = royal and victorious colour, cf. the white horse of the Persian kings (Philostr. Vit. Ap. i.). The triumphant figure of the mounted bowman is by no means to be identified with that of the Christian messiah or of the gospel. It would be extremely harsh and confusing to represent the messiah as at once the Lamb opening the seal and a figure independently at work. The initial period of the gospel was not one of irresistible triumph, and matters have become too acute for John to share the belief voiced in Mark xiii. 10. Besides, the messiah could hardly be described as preceding the signs of his own advent, nor would he be on the same plane as the following figures. The vision is a tacit antithesis, not an anticipation, of xix. 11 f.; the triumph of the world which opens the drama is rounded off by an infinitely grander triumph won by Christ.—καὶ ἤλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον κ. k. r. k. L. John was too open-eyed to ignore the fact that other forces, besides the Christian gospel, had a success of their own on earth. What is this force? Not the Roman Empire, as if the four steeds represented the first four emperors (so, variously, Renan, Spitta, Weizsäcker), but a raid of the Parthians (so most edd. from Vitringa to Erbes, Völter, Holtzmann, Boussot, Bruston, Ramsay, Scott), which represented war in its most dreaded form for inhabitants of the Eastern provinces. There is no need to find any definite reference to the raid of Vonones (Wetstein) or of Vologeses who invaded Syria in 61-63 a.d. The simple point of the vision is that the Parthians would be commissioned to make a successful foray, carrying all before them. The bow was the famous and dreaded weapon of these oriental cavalry; Νικηφόρος was a title of Seleucus, and νικήτης of the Persian satrap. One plausible hypothesis (developed by Erbes) refers the basis of the seal-vision to (a) the triumphs of Augustus and Tiberius, (b) the bloody feuds in Palestine under Caligula, (c) the famine in Syria under Claudius (Ac. xi.), (d) the subsequent pestilence, (e) the Neronic martyrs, and (f) the agitations of the empire under Galba, etc. (for portents cf. Plin. Ep. vi. 16, 20; Tacit. Hist. i. 4). But a similar collocation of portents is found in the reign of Titus; and apart from the misinterpretation of the first seal, it is arbitrary and jejune to suppose that this prophet's splendid, free reading of providence was laboriously spelt out from details of more or less recent history.

Vv. 3, 4. The second seal opened: A swordsman representing (red = martial colour) war and bloodshed, "is permitted to make men slay one another". The allusion to the merciless weapon (Plut. de Iside, 11) of the sword as Rome's national arm thus places the Parthian and Roman empires side by side (ἢ τὰς γῆς generally, not Judaea in particular), but the vision of war is also connected directly with the two following visions of famine (5, 6) and mortality (from pestilence, 7, 8). The seven punishments drawn up by rabbinic theology (Pirke Aboth, v. 11 f.) were: three kinds of famine, pestilence, noisome beasts, and captivity or exile.

Vv. 5, 6. The third seal opened = famine.

Ver. 5. The spectral figure of Hunger...
holds a balance or pair of scales (λειτιτάς = the beam, see ref.) for measuring bread by weight, to personify (ver. 6) bad times, when provisions became cruelly expensive. One χοίρος of wheat, the usual rations of a working man for a day, is to cost twelve times its normal price, while the labourer’s daily pay will not command more than an eighth of the ordinary twenty-four measures of the coarser barley. Grain is not to disappear entirely from the earth, otherwise there would be no famine. But food-stuffs are to be extremely scanty and therefore dear (cf. Lev. xxvi. 26; Ezek. iv. 16). These hard times are aggravated (καί adversative) by the immunity of oil and wine, which are, comparatively speaking, luxuries. One exasperating feature of the age would be the sight of wine and oil flowing, while grain trickled slowly into the grasp of the famishing. The best explanation of this realistic exception is to regard it as a water-mark of the Domitianic date (for details see the present writer’s study in Expos. Oct. 1908, 359-360). In 92 a.d. Domitian had made a futile attempt to injure the cultivation of the vine in the provinces, which led to widespread agitation throughout Ionia. His edict had soon to be withdrawn, but not till it had roused fear and anger. Hence the words hurt not the wine have the force of a local allusion to what was fresh in his readers’ minds. The point of the saying lies in the recent events which had stirred Smyrna and the surrounding townships, and which provided the seer with a bit of colour for his palette as he painted the final terror.

It is as if he grimly said: “Have no fears for your vines! There will be no Domitian to hurt them. Comfort yourselves with that. Only, it will be small comfort to have your liquid luxuries spared and your grain reduced almost to starvation point.” Or, the prophet’s meaning might be that the exemption of the vine would only pander to drunkenness and its attendant ills. The addition of τὸ θανάτον is probably an artistic embodiment, introduced in order to fill out the sketch. The cultivation of the olive accompanied that of the vine, and the olive meant smooth times. It is no era of peace; far from that, the prophet implies. But the olive, “the darling of Peace” (as Vergil calls it), flourishes unchecked, so mocking and ayry are the latter days. For δικαίω = “injure” (a country), see ref., vii. 2, and Dittenber-ger’s Sylloge Inscri. Graec. 557. This Domitianic reference of vi. 6 was first worked out by S. Reinach (Revision Archæolog. 1901, 350 f.) and has been accepted by Harnack, Heinrich, Bousset, J. Weiss, Abbott, Holtzmann, Baljon, and others. There is no allusion to Jos. Bell. v. 13, 6, or to the sparing of gardens during the siege of Jerusalem (S. Krauss, in Preuschen’s Zeitschrift, 1909, 81-89).

Vv. 7, 8. The fourth seal opened: pestilence and mortality.

Ver. 8. χιλιάρχου, pale or livid as a corpse.—ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, for the ordinary ἐν’ αὐτῷ, a grammatical variation which has no special significance. In this Durersquise vignette the spectre of Hades, bracketed here as elsewhere with Death, accompanies the latter to secure his booty.
of victims. So Nergal, the Babylonian Pluto, is not content with ruling the regions of the dead but appears as an active personification of violent destruction, especially pestilence and war, inflicting his wounds on large masses rather than on individuals (Jastrow, 66, 67). A similar duality of conception, local and personal, obtained in Semitic and Hellenic mythology (cf. e.g., ix. 11); only, Death is not here personified as an angel (with Jewish theology, cf. Eisenmenger's Eindeutges Jud. i. 854 f., 862 f.). As the chief partner in this grim league, he is given destructive power over a certain quarter of the earth (cf. colloquially); his agents are the usual apocalyptic scourges (cf. Ezek. xiv. 21, Ps. Sol. xiii. 2 f., with Plut. Isis, 47 for the Iranian expectation of loanes καὶ λιμᾶς as inflictions of Ahriman) against which the Jewish evening prayer was directed ("keep far from us the enemy, the pestilence, the sword, famine and affliction"). War, followed by famine which bred pestilence, was familiar in Palestine (Jos. Antiq. xv. 9) during the first century A.D. Indeed throughout the ancient world war and pestilence were closely associated, while wild beasts multiplied and preyed on human life, as the land was left untilled. In Test. Naphth. 8, etc., Beliar is the captain of wild beasts. Note that the prophet sees only the commissions, not the actual deeds, of these four dragons: not until vi. 12 f. does anything happen. The first four seals are simply arranged on the rabbinic principle (Sohar Gen. fol. 91), "quodcumque in terrâ est, id etiam in coelo est, et nulla res tam exigua est in mundo quae non ab aliâ similâ quae in coelo est dependat". The four plagues (a Babylonian idea) are adapted from Ezek. xiv. 12 f. Contemporary disasters which may have lent vividness to the sketch are collected by Renan (pp. 323 f.).

Vv. 9-11. The fifth seal opened.

Ver. 9. The scene changes from earth to heaven, which appears as a replica of the earthly temple with its altar of burnt offering. As the blood of sacrifices flowed at the base of the altar (xvi. 7), the blood representing the life, the symbolism is obvious. It was mediated by rabbinic ideas of the souls of the just (e.g., of Moses) resting under the divine throne of glory; cf. R. Akiba's saying, "quicumque sepelitur in terra Israël, perinde est ac si sepeliretur sub altari: quicumque autem sepelitur sub altari, perinde est ac si sepeliretur sub throno gloriae" (Pirke Aboth, 26). The omission of ἰσθήμων after μ. may suggest that the phrase is intended to include not so much the heroic Jews who fell in the defence of their temple against Rome (Weyland) as pre-Christian Jewish martyrs (cf. Heb. xi. 39, 40) who are raised to the level of the Christian church, and also those Jews who had been martyred for refusing to worship the emperor (cf. vii. 9, xvii. 6, and Jos. B. J. vii. 10, 1). But the primary thought of the Christian prophet is for Rome's latest victims in the Neronian persecution and the recent enforcement of the cultus under Domitian. The general idea is derived from Zech. i. 12, Ps. Ixxix. 10, and En. xxii. 5 ("and I saw the spirits of the children of men who were dead, and their voice penetrated to the heaven and complained," from the first division of Sheol).

Ver. 10. Like Clem. Rom., John is fond of ὅσιος as implying the divine might and majesty (3 Macc. iii. 29, v. 28). This severe and awe-inspiring conception (cf. Philo, quis rer. div. haer. 6) means that God will vindicate his holiness, which had been outraged by the murder of the θεόοι for whom he is responsible. In contemporary pagan religions throughout Asia Minor, the punishment of wrong-doing is often conceived in the same way, viz., as the answer to the sufferer's appeal (cf. Intro. § 2), not simply as a spontaneous act of divine retribution. "How long wilt thou refrain from charging and avenging our blood upon (κακοὶ as in Ι Sam. xxiv. 13, Ps. xlii. 1) those who dwell on the earth" (i.e., pagans)? The bleeding heart of primitive Christendom stands up and cries, "I
have suffered". For ἐκδίκαίων ἁμα cf. Dittenberger's Sylloge Inscription. Graec. 816 (1 cent. a.d.) in ἐξείλθη τὸ ἁμα τὸ ἀναλυτον, etc.; for ἐκδ. ἁμα (= ἁμα) of vengeance, cf. Luke xviii. 3-8 (κω), a close parallel in thought, though this pathetic, impatient thirst for blood-revenge, which has "the full drift of Ps. xciv. below it" (Selwyn) is inferior not only to 1 Peter ii. 23 but to the synoptic wail. The Jewish atmosphere is unmistakable (cf. 2 Macc. vii. 36; also Deissmann's Licht vom Osten, 312 ff.), but this does not mean that the passage was necessarily written by a Jew. In that case we should have expected some allusion to the vicarious, atoning power of the martyrs' death (R. F. 181). The prophet evidently anticipated further persecution, since he wrote on the verge of the end precipitated by the Domitianic policy (cf. on ii. 13). Such persecution follows natural disturbances, as in the synoptic apocalypse (Matt. xxiv. 6-7, 21 ff.), but the outline of the fifth seal is taken from Enoch, where (xlii.) the prayer and blood of the martyred saints "rise from the earth before the Lord of Spirits," while the angels rejoice that such blood has not been shed in vain. In En. xxvii. 3-5 the prayer of the righteous for vengeance overtakes their persecutors on the day of judgment with woeful issues (xxciii. 3, 16). "Persist in your cry for judgment, and it shall appear unto you; for all your tribulation will be visited on the rulers, and on all their helpers, and on those who plundered you" (civ. 3, cf. xxii. 6, 7, where Abel's spirit complains of Cain).— κατ. κ.τ.λ. always in Apocalypse opposed to the saints, almost as "the world" to "the pious" in modern phraseology. This usage is largely paralleled by that of the Noahic interpolations in Enoch (see Charles on xxxvii. 5), where the phrase has either unfavourable or neutral associations. ἀκούει here (as John xxvii. 11 = Did. x. 3, παντάκοινος Clem. Rom. xxxv. 3, lviii. 1) applied by a comparatively rare usage (2 Peter i. 15 and Apocalypse iv. 8 being dependent on O.T.) to God, whose intense holiness must be in antagonism to the evil and contradictions of the world (Titius, 9-11).

Ver. 11. The white robe assigned each (Blass, § 32, 4) of these martyr-spirits as a pledge of future and final glory (vii. 9) and a consoling proof that no judgment awaited them (xx. 4-6), is a favourite gift in the Jewish heaven (cf. Enoch xxii. 15 ff., and Asc. Isa. ix. 24 f.). The intermediate state was a much debated question in apocalyptic literature, and early Christian thought fluctuates between the idea of a provisional degree of bliss (as here and, e.g., Clem. Rom. i. 3, "those who by God's grace have been perfected in love possess the place of the pious, and they shall be manifested at the visitation of God's kingdom") and a distinct, full entrance into heavenly privileges—especially, though neither uniformly nor exclusively, reserved for martyrs (Clem. Rom. v., Polyk. ad Phil. ix. 2, Heb. xii. 23, etc.): cf. Titius, 44-46. A cognate idea is reproduced in Asc. Isa. ix. 5 f., where in the seventh heaven Abel, Enoch, and the Jewish saints appear all clothed "in the garments of the upper world" (i.e., in their resurrection-bodies) but not yet in full possession of their privileges, not yet seated on their thrones or wearing their crowns of glory. These are not theirs, till Christ descends to earth and ascends to heaven again.—"And they were told to rest (or wait quietly) for a little while yet," as they had been doing till the successive shocks of providence stirred them to an outburst of eager and reproachful anticipation. To rest implies to cease crying for vengeance (cf. iv. 8). Größer (ii. 50) cites a rabbinic tradition that the messiah would not come until all souls in Πρώτης (an intermediate resting-place of the departed?) were clothed with bodies. οὕτως κ.τ.λ., this is closely and curiously reproduced, not so much from ideas preserved in the contemporary Apoc. Bar. xxiii. 4, 5 (where the end of the world comes when the destined number of human beings is completed) as from the religious tradition also used in Clem. Rom. ii., ix., Justin (Apol. i. 45), and the contemporary 4th Esdras (iv. 38 f., quoniam in statera ponderaui
saecula et mensura mensuravit tempora et non commouit nec excitat, usque dum impleatur praedicta mensura...quando impletus fuerit numeros similiu obiis) which thinks not of mankind but of the righteous (cf. Apoc. Bar. xxx. 2, and Heb. xi. 40). The atmosphere of this belief goes back to the first century B.C., as in Enoch (xlii., cf. ix. xiii.) "and the hearts of the holy were filled with joy that the number of righteousness had drawn nigh, and the prayer of the righteous was heard, and the blood of the righteous required, before the Lord of Spirits" (cf. below, ch. xi. 15 f.). The thought is repeated in Ep. Lugd. from this passage ("day by day those who were worthy were seized, filling up their number, so that all the zealous people and those through whom our affairs here had been especially established, were collected out of both churches"). It had been already developed otherwise in 4th Esdras iv. 35 f., where the seer's impatience for the end is rebuked and God's greater eagerness asserted. "Did not the souls of the righteous question thus in their chambers, saying, 'How long are we still to stay here? et quando nuni et fructus aeeae mercedes nostrae? And the archangel Jeremiel answered them and said, 'When the number of your fellows is complete.'" Substituting martyrs for the righteous, the author of our Apocalypse has exploited the idea thus familiar to him as a devout Jew; his first four visions come mainly through Zechariah; for the next he adapts this later post-exilic notion. The Neronic victims and their fellows occupied in his mind the place filled by the early Jewish saints in the reverent regard of contemporay Jews. As Renan notices (317 f.),

this thirst for vengeance was in the air after Nero's death, shared even by Romans; one legend (Suet. Nero, xlviii., Dio Cass. liii. 28) told how, as Nero fled to his last retreat, during a thunderpeal the souls of his victims burst from the earth and flung themselves upon him.—As the safety of the physical universe rested on the safety of the righteous, according to the Jewish notion, so any massacres of the latter at once affected the stability of the world. Hence the sequence of vv. 11 and 12 f. There is no hint that these physical aberrations were temporary. Yet the following catastrophes (vii. f.) plainly presuppose a universe in its original and normal condition. It depends upon the theory adopted of the book whether this point merely to such discrepancies as are not unfamiliar in literature (especially imaginative literature), or to recapitulation, or to the presence of different sources.

Vv. 12-17. The sixth seal opened (cf. Crashaw's To the Name of Jesus, 220-234).

Vv. 12-14. The earthquake (refl.), darkening of sun by atmospheric disturbances, (Verg. Georg. i. 463 f., Lucan i. 75 f., 522 f. Compare Ass. Mos. x. 4 f.: et tremebit terra. Usque ad fines suas concutietur...sol non dab it lumen et in tenebras convocet se, etc.; for Babylonian background cf. Schrader, 392 f.), reddening of the full moon as in a total eclipse (cf. reff.), the dropping of stars, the removal of the sky, and the displacement of mountain and island (En. i. 6, see below on xiv. 20) are all more or less stereotyped features of the physical situation in apocalyptic eschatology, where naturally (cf. Jos. Bell. iv. 4, 5) agonies and distortions of the uni-
verse precedes some divine punishment of
men (Verg. Georg. i. 365 f.).
Vv. 15-17. Note the sevenfold description
of the effect produced on humanity (xix. 18, cf. xiii. 16), the Roman χίλιαρχοι (= tribuni), the riches and rank of men (or, a dramatic touch = defiant authority, like Mrs. Browning’s Lucifer: “strength to behold him and not worship him, Strength to be in the universe and yet Neither God nor God’s servant”; see especially Ps. Sol. xv. 3, 4), the distinction of slaves and free as a pagan, never as an internal Christian, division; also the painting of the panic from O.T. models (refl.). Those who are now the objects of dread, cower and fly to the crags and caves—a common sanctuary in Syria (cf. Introd. § 8). Mr. Doughty describes a meteoric shock in Arabia thus: “a thunder-din resounded marvellously through the waste mountain above us; it seemed as if this world went to wrack. . . . The most in the mejjia were of opinion that a ‘star’ had fallen” (Ar. Des. i. 462, 463). The Hosean citation (cf. Jer. viii. 3) here, as in Luke, gives powerful expression to the dread felt by an evil conscience; even the swift agony of being crushed to death is preferable to being left face to face with the indignation of an outraged God. To stand (cf. Luke xxii. 36) is to face quietly the judgment of God (1 John ii. 28), which is impossible except after a life which has resolutely stood its ground (Eph. vi. 13) amid reaction and served God (Apoc. vi. 10, 11). The panic of kings, etc., is taken from the description of the judgment in Enoch lix.-lxxiii., where before the throne of messiah “the mighty and the kings” in despairing terror seek repentance in vain; “and one portion of them will look on the other, and they will be terrified, and their countenance will fall, and pain will seize them,” at the sight of messiah. In Apoc. Bar. xxv.

1 The παρούσα prefixed to γνωρίς by S. smooths out the constr. of παρούσα.

also the approach of the end is heralded by stuper of heart and despair among the inhabitants of the earth, while a similar stress falls (in Sap. vi. 9-9) on kings, etc., and (in En. xxxii. 1-13, generally) on the earth’s rulers. There is no need to suspect καλ . . . ἄρπαν (16) as an editorial gloss (Vischer, Spitta, Weyland, de Paye, Voltz, Pfeiderer, von Soden, Rauch, J. Weiss, Briggs); it may be a characteristic touch designed to point the O.T. citation (for ἄρπαν in 17 or in xxii. 3 cf. 1 Thes. iii. 11, 2 Th. ii. 16, 17), rather than a scribal or editorial insertion in what was originally a Jewish source.

The great day of God’s wrath has come, but the action is interrupted by an entre-actes in vii., where as in x. 1-xx. 13, the author introduces an intermezzo between the sixth and the seventh members of the series. A change comes over the spirit of his dream. But although this oracle is isolated by form and content from its context, it is a consoling rhapsody or rapture designed to relieve the tension by lifting the eyes of the faithful over the foam and rocks of the rapids on which they were toasting to the calm, sunlit pool of bliss which awaited them beyond. They get this glimpse before the seventh seal is opened with its fresh cycle of horrors. The parenthesis consists of two heterogeneous visions, one (x-8) on earth and one (9-17) in heaven. The former (and indeed the whole section, cf. the δυστέρας of 9) is an explicit answer to the query of vi. 17, τὰς δύστερας ὁμοιώματα; it is an enigmatic fragment of apocalyptic tradition, which originally predicted (cf. Ezek. ix. 1 f.) God’s safeguarding of a certain number of Jews, prior to some catastrophe of judgment (“Cry havoc, and let slip the winds of war!”) upon the wicked. The chapter is not a literary unit with editorial touches (Weyland, Erbes, Bruston, Rauch), nor is
9-17 a continuation of vi. (Spitta). Vv. 1-8 are a Jewish fragment incorporated by the author, who writes 9-17 himself (so, e.g., Vischer, Pfeiderer, Schmidt, Porter, Bousset, von Soden, Scott, Wellhausen). The fact that a selection, and not the whole, of the Jews are preserved, does not (in view of 9 Edras) prove that a Jewish Christian (Völker, J. Weis) must have written it. The scenery is not organic to John's proper outlook. After ver. 8 he shows no further interest in it. The winds are never loosed. The sealing itself is not described. The sealed are not seen. An apparent allusion to this remnant does occur (xiv. 1), but it is remote; John makes nothing of it; and the detached, special character of vii. 1-8 becomes plainer the further we go into the other visions. The sealed are exempted merely from the plague of the winds, not from martyrdom or persecution (of which there is no word here); one plague indeed has power to wound, though not to kill, them (ix. 4, 5). The collocation of the fragment with what precedes is probably due in part to certain similarities like the allusions to the wind (vi. 13), numbering (vi. 13), and the seals (vi. 1 f.). The real problem is, how far did John take this passage literally? This raises the question of the relationship between 1-8 and 9-17; either (a) both are different forms of the same belief, or (b) two different classes of people are meant. In the former event (a) John applies the Jewish oracle of 1-8 to the real Jews, i.e., the Christians, who as a pious remnant are to be kept secure amid the cosmic whirl and crash of the latter days (vi. 12-17, cf. iii. 10 and the connexion of Nahum i. 5, 6, and 7). The terror passes and lo! the saints are seen safe on the other side (9-17). This interpretation of Christians as the real Israel or twelve tribes is favoured not only by early Christian thought (cf. I Peter i. 1, Jas. i. 1, Herm. Sim. ix. 17), but by the practice of John himself (e.g., xviii. 4). Here as elsewhere he takes the particularist language of his source in a free symbolic fashion; only, while the archaic scenery of 1-8 suffices for a description of the safeguarded on earth, he depicts their beatified state (9-17) in bolder terms. The deeper Christian content of his vision implies not deliverance from death but deliverance through death. His saints are not survivors but martyrs. Hence the contrast between 1-8 and 9-17 is one of language rather than of temper, and the innumerable multitude of the latter, instead of being a supplement to the 144,000, are the latter viewed after their martyr-death under a definitely Christian light. The O.T. imagery of 1-8 mainly brings out the fact that the true Israel (Gal. vi. 16) is known and numbered by God; not one is lost. The alternative theory (b) holds that in taking over this fragment and adding another vision John meant Jewish Christians by the 144,000. The latter identifications (so, e.g., Prim., Vicht., Hausrath, Vischer, Spitta, Hirsch, Forbes, Bousset) is less probable, however, in view of the general tenor of the Apocalypse (cf. Introd. § 6), for the usual passages cited as proof (cf. notes on xiv. 1 f., xxii. 12 and 24) are irrelevant, and while John prized the martyrs it is incredible that 9-17 was meant to prove that martyrdom was required to admit Gentile Christians even to a second grade among the elect (Weisszäcker, Pfeiderer). A Jewish Christian prophet might indeed, out of patriotic pride, regard the nucleus of God's kingdom as composed of faithful Jews, without being particularist in his sympathies. Paul himself once held this nationalist view (Rom. ix.-xi.), but it is doubtful if it represented his final position, and in any case the general conception of the Apocalypse (where Christians are the true Jews, and where particularist language is used metaphorically, just because literally it was obsolete) tells on the whole in favour of the view that 9-17 represents 1-8 read in the light of v. 9 (so, e.g., de Wette, Bruston,
Porter, Wellhausen, and Hoennicke: *das Judenthumschristentum*, 194 ff.). Only, the general description of redeemed Christians in v. 9 is specifically applied in vii. 14 to the *candidatus mariyrum exercitus*. Here as elsewhere John apparently conceives the final trial to be so searching and extensive that Christians will all be martyrs or confessors. The wonderful beauty of 9-17, whose truth rises above its original setting, requires no comment. It is renewed Renan (479, 480), after criticizing "le contour mesquin" of the Apocalypse in general, to rejoice in the book's "symbolical expression of the cardinal principle that God is, but above all that He shall be. No doubt Paul put it better when he summed up the final goal of the universe in these words, *that God may be all in all*. But for a long while yet men will require a God who dwells with them, sympathises with their trials, is mindful of their struggles, and *wipes away every tear from their eyes*.

Chapter VII.—Ver. 1. As on the synoptic scheme (Matt. xxiv. 31), physical convulsions and human terrors are followed by a pause during which the saints are secured. It is impossible and irrelevant to determine whether the winds' blast and the sealing were already conjoined in the fragment or oral traditions which lay before this editor, or whether their combination is due to his own scheme. They reflect the tradition underlying the synoptic apocalypse (Mark xii. 24-27, etc., cf. Apoc. vi. 12-vii. 3), but here the safeguarding of the elect comes before, instead of after, the advent, and the four winds are agents of destruction instead of mere geographical points; besides, the role of Messiah is omitted altogether. It is assumed not merely that these angels are the spirits of the four winds (Zech. vi. 5, and repeatedly in Enoch, e.g., lxix. 22, "the spirits of the waters and of the winds and of all zephyrs"), but that some onset of the winds is imminent (ver. 2, cf. En. xviii. 22), as part of the horrors of the last catastrophe (for punitive winds, see Sir. xxxix. 28). Stray hints proving the existence of such a tradition (cf. Dan. vii. 2) have been collected (cf. S. C. 332 f.; A. C. 246, 247) e.g., from Sibyll. viii. 203 f., etc., where a hurricane is to sweep the earth previous to the resurrection of the dead (trees being here singled out as most exposed to a storm's ravages). If such allusions are not mere echoes of the present passage, they would appear to indicate a runlet of eschatological tradition flowing behind more important ideas. Or are the saints like trees of God (Ps. Sol. xiv. 2, 3) never to be uprooted by a wind or onset of foes (ibid. viii. 6, xvii. 13)? It is no longer possible to be sure. En. xviii. 1 f. by a semi-Babylonian touch, the four winds are identified with the four pillars of the heaven and the foundations of the earth; in Apoc. Bar. vi. 4, 5, four angels with lamps are restrained by another angel from lighting them (cf. also E. B. 5303). There seems to be no allusion to the notion of a blast (from the east) as a form of mortal fate (e.g., Oed. Col. 1659, 1660; Iliad, vi. 345 f.); on the contrary, the idea goes back to Zech. vi. 8 (LXX), whence the prophet had already developed vi. 1-8. As xiv. 1 f. roughly answers to vii. 9 f., so the appearance of wild beasts out of the agitated sea of the nations (in Dan. vii. 1-8) corresponds to the sequence of Apoc. vii. 1-4, and xiii. 1 f.

The earth is a rectangular plane or disc on which John looks down from heaven's dome resting on it, to observe (ver. 2) a fifth angel "ascending" from the sun-rising (the east as the source of light, cf. on xvi. 20, the site of paradise, the sphere of divine activity?). θάνατος, here (as in xv. 7; cf. Heb. x. 31) in O.T. sense (cf. Deut. xxxii. 39 f.; Ezek. xx. 23; Jer. x. 10, etc.) of vitality to succour and to punish, God's "life" being manifested in his effective preservation of the saints and chastisement of their enemies or of the world in general. He lives and keeps alive. Here, as in the parent passage, Ezek. ix. 4-6 (cf. Exod. xii. 13 f. and the "Egyptian" character of the plagues in chap. viii.), the true δολαι of God are distinguished by a mark denoting God's ownership. Before the crisis good and evil must be discriminated (Spitta, 50 f.). Cf. Ps. Sol. xv. 6 f. on the immunity of the righteous, ἠτι τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δικαίωσις τοῦ σωτηρίας, λίμως καὶ δολαι καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐμπρός ἐν δικαιίων: where-
as these plagues hunt down the wicked, This royal, sacred sign, which in Ezekiel is the cross or Tau as the symbol of life and is here probably authenticates the bearers as God's property (cf. Herod. ii. 113, vii. 233) and places them beyond risk of loss. It identifies them with his worship and also (cf. on ii. 17) serves to protect them as an amulet against harm (see Deissm. 351, 352 on φυλακτήρα as protective marks and amulets). In Test. Sol. (tr. Conybeare, Jew. Quart. Rev. 1899, p. 34) an evil spirit declares he will be destroyed by the Saviour "whose number "(στοιχεῖον), if anyone shall write it on his forehead, he will defeat me". Mr. Doughty also describes (Ar. Des. i. 171) a false Christ in Syria who declared he had God's name sculptured between his eyebrows; i.e. the wrinkles resembled the Arabic hieroglyph for Allah. For the religious significance of such tattooing as a mark of divine ownership see R. S. 316; and, for the connection of vi. 12 f. and vii. 1 f., the basal passage in Dan. xi. 40, 44, xii. 1. The parallel device of Anti-christ later on (xiii. 16, etc.) shows that this sealing is something special, baptism or the possession of the Spirit (as in Paul) as the guarantee of destined bliss. A contemporary expression of the idea occurs in Clem. Rom. lix., ix.: "We will ask that the Creator of all things preserve intact to the end the appointed number of his elect throughout all the world, etc.". As Apoc. vi. 8 and 12 ε. are free reproductions, with a special application, of the ideas underlying Mark xiii. 7, 8, 24, 25, so Apoc. vii. 1 f. is an imaginative sketch on the lines of Mark xiii. 27. The Apocalypse, however, has no room for the false messiahs of Mark xiii. 6, 22, etc. (cf. on Apoc. xiii. 1 f.) as a peril. See further 4 Esd. vi. 5, "If thy number be written above thy foreheads, thou shalt not perish in the day of destruction, but shalt be delivered". But the Apocalypse like Philo, stands severely apart from the current Stoic notion, adopted in Sib. iv. 172 f.; a Peter, etc., of a destruction of the world by means of a final confagration.

Ver. 4. After a pause, in which the sealing is supposed to have taken place, the writer hears that the number of the sealed is the stereotyped 144,000, twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel (a "thousand" being the primitive subdivision of a clan or tribe, like the English shire into "hundreds"). The enumeration of these tribes (5-8) contains two peculiarities, (a) the substitution of Joseph for Ephraim, a variation to which we have no clue, and (b) the omission of Dan. The latter reflects the growing disrepute into which Dan fell, it either stands last (e.g. in P.; Josh. xix. 40 f.; Jud. i. 34) or drops out entirely, while it is curiously connected in the ἀλμαται (whilst at the deluge of fire) seruatis sunt iusti in arca lignea iussu dei. But the Apocalypse like Philo, stands severely apart from the current Stoic notion, adopted in Sib. iv. 172 f.; a Peter, etc., of a destruction of the world by means of a final confagration.
5. ἐκ φολῆς ιοῦδα δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφαγμένοι·
ἐκ φολῆς Ρουβῆν δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Γάλα δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
6. ἐκ φολῆς Ασηρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Νεφθαλεία δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Μανασσή δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
7. ἐκ φολῆς Σιμεών δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Λευεί δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Ἰσσαχάρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
8. ἐκ φολῆς Ζαβουλών δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Ἰωσήφ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φολῆς Βεναμίν δώδεκα χιλιάδες· ὑσφαγμένοι·
9. META ταῦτα εἶδον ὄχλον πολῶν, ἐν αἵρεσιν οὐδεὶς
ὁ ἐπόνοος ἥπως καὶ φολῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ ὀγνοσῶν·
ἔστωτες ἐνόπτων τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνόπτων τοῦ ἀριστού, περιμεθέλη-

1. Ἡ σωματεία τῇ Θεῷ ἡμῶν τῇ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῇ
τοῦ ἀριστού.
2. Ἡ σωματεία τῇ Θεῷ ἡμῶν τῇ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῇ
τοῦ ἀριστού.

Ver. 9. ἐκ φ. κ. χ. φ. curious and irregular change from singular to plural. ἐστωτές = erect, confident, triumphant. For the white robes, see on vi. 11 (the number of the martyrs being now completed). Certain religious processions in Asia Minor consisted of boys robed in white and bearing crowns of leafy boughs (Deissm. 368 f.); and in some Asiatic inscriptions viēs is associated with the palm branch, which in one case is placed alongside of the meta or goal (C. B. P. ii. 496). The carrying of palm-branches was a sign of festal joy in the Greek and Roman (= victory at the games Liv. x. 47, Verg. Aen. v. 109), as well as in the Jewish world (1 Macc. xii. 51; 2 Macc. x. 7), accompanied by the wearing of wreaths of green leaves. For the robes, see Liv. xxiv. 10: "Hadriae aram in coelo, speciesque hominum circum eam cum candida ueste visas esse". Here = "scilicet de antichristo triumphales" (Tertullian). For the numberless multitude, see Enoch xxxix. 6, where "the righteous and the elect shall be for ever and ever without number before the messiah, in the mansions of bliss; white raiment and crowns of palm in Herm. Sim. viii. 2-4.

Ver. 10. "Salvation" (or, if ἀνάστασις is used, the salvation we enjoy) be ascribed "to our God and to the Lamb". The subordinate nature of the seven spirits (i. 4, iv. 5) is shown by the fact that no praise is offered to them throughout the Apocalypse, although in Iranian theology (Bund. xxx. 23): "all men become of one voice and praise aloud Ahuramazd and the archangels in the renovated universe". Vv. 11-12. The angels standing around, once again adore God, catching up the previous praise with "Amen," and uttering a sevenfold ascription of praise upon their own behalf, closed with another
The article is repeated before each substitute, as in v. 13. The divine wisdom is shown in the means devised by the divine power to redeem (v. 12) and deliver (vii. 14) men, in straits where no human prudence could prevail. See Clem. Rom. i.x and Ps. Sol. xvii. 25.

Ver. 13. "And one of the elders addressed me, saying," for similar openings of a dialogue, see Jer. i. xi, Zech. iv. 2. Perhaps, like Dante (Parad. iv. 10-12), John although silent showed desire painted on his face. The form of inquiry resembles Homer's ος πόθεν εἶς ἄνδρα; πόθον τοῦ πολίσων, or Vergil's qui genus? unde domo?, more closely still the similar sentences which recur in Hermas. See throughout, Zech. iv. 1, 6, and Asc. Isa. ix. 25, 26 (and I said to the angel "For whom are these robes and thrones and crowns reserved?"

And he said to me: "They shall be missed by many who believe the words of him of whom I told thee [i.e., Antichrist]; also xi. 40, uos autem uitigat in sancto spiritu ut recipiantis talem uestram et thrones et coronas gloriae in caelo iacentes. It is the origin and character, not the number, of the company which interests the prophet.

Vers. 14. κύριος μου ("Sir") the respectful address of an inferior to his superior in age or station, the προσβητέρος being conceived as angelic beings (as in Dan. x. 17, 19, 4 Esd. iv. 3, etc.)—"Thou knowest" (and I fain would know also). The great distress is plainly the period of persecution and martyrdom (vi. 11) predicted (e.g., Matt. xxiv. 21, from Dan.xii.1) to herald the final catastrophe. It is still expected by Hermas (Vis. ii. 2, 7, iv. 2, 5, 3, 6); but he less religiously attributes the white garments (i.e., purity of soul) to the virtues. As the crisis with its outcome of faith and loyalty in all nations (ver. 9) is to be world-wide, this passage seems to imply, although in a characteristically vague and incidental fashion (cf. v. 9, xiv. 6, etc.), the idea of Mark xiii. 10. But the situation of the Apocalypse is so acute, that mission operations are at a standstill. Instead of the gospel invading and pervading the pagan world, the latter has closed in upon the churches with threatening power, and in the brief interval before the end practically nothing can be looked for except the preservation of the faithful. Those "who come out of the great distress" are further described as having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; which portrays their character and conduct and at the same time explains the secret of their triumphant endurance. "Mehr gedacht als geschaut ist das Bild" (J. Weiss). The great thing is not to emerge from trial, but to emerge from it with unimpaired faith and conscience. And thus is possible, not to man's unaided efforts, but to the sacrificial power of Christ, the experience of which forms the last line of defence in the struggle. The confessors and martyrs owed their moral purity to what they obtained through the sacrifice of Jesus. But moral purity became in this case something more intense (as the context and the emphatic language of this verse imply) than the normal Christian experience of forgiveness and holiness. By a turn of thought which is developed later by Ignatius and Tertullian (Scorpi. xii. sordes quidem martyris, ultimae abluuntur, maculae uero martyrio candidantur), it is suggested that in their martyrdom (cf. Dan. xii. 10) these saints were able to make the redeeming power of Jesus peculiarly their own; the nature of their cruel sufferings identified them especially with their Lord. It is noticeable that the mystic union of the individual Christian with Christ mainly comes for-
ward in the Apocalypse (cf. xiv. 13) when the martyrs and confessors are mentioned, as if the writer held that such an experience alone could yield the deepest consciousness of communion with One who was conceived essentially as a Lamb who had been slain, a faithful witness, etc. (cf. Titius, 216, 217). On the high respect for martyrs, of which this forms an early trace, see Weinel, 142-144. At the same time it is to the blood of the Lamb, not to their own blood, that they owe their bliss and triumph; redemption, not martyrdom, is the essential basis of their deliverance. People might be redeemed without becoming martyrs; as, for example, either recreant Christians or those who happened to die a natural death. But no one could be a martyr without having the strength of redemption behind him.

Ver. 15. Ritual as well as pastoral traits from the O.T. fill out the conception of this final bliss with its favoured position (ἀγίας τῶν ὅριων). Note the singular tenderness of the oxymoron—he that sitteth on the throne (the majestic almighty God) shall overspread them with a presence of brooding, intimate care; followed by σῶμασι he here (as opposed to ii. 27) in its literal sense of tender shepherding on the part of Jesus. The messiah as shepherd was an ancient and familiar conception. This verse is partly adapted from Enoch xiv. 4-6. Unlike John i. 14, it reflects a Christian fulfilment of the Jewish anticipation (cf. xiii. 6, xxi. 3; Zech. ii. 10 f.; Sir. xxiv. 8 f.) that the Shekinah would return in the era of final bliss.

Ver. 16. οἴδα μὴ with both fut. indicative and subjunctive (= ii. 11), in emphatic assertions. For the absence of scorching as a trait of the Hellenic Utopia, cf. Dieterich, 31-33. If καίμα corresponds here to the sense of the Isaianic equivalent καίμων, the reference is to the scorching sirocco. So the Egyptian dead yearned for a cooling breeze in the next world—"Let me be placed by the edge of the water with my face to the north, that the breeze may caress me, and my heart be refreshed from its sorrows." (see Maspero, Dawn of Civil, p. 113.)

Ver. 17. ὅμης goes with ὅμημεν ("living waters") though prefixed for emphasis, like σαραυέταις in i Peter iii. 21 (cf. xvi. 3 πῶς πάντα ἀμην ὅμης); a favourite Johannine idea. In Enoch xlii, xlviii, the fountains contain wisdom which is drunk by all the thirsty, though in the centre there is also "a fountain of righteousness which was inexhaustible"; elsewhere in the division of Sheol assigned to the spirits of the righteous there is "a bright spring of the water of life" (xxii. 9) in accordance with the Pythagorean belief that the dead suffered from thirst in the underworld (Luke xvi. 24, cf. Dieterich, 97 f.). In the familiar vignette of ancient Egyptian eschatology, the deceased kneels before Osiris who pours out to him the water of life (the motto being that the soul may live); cf. Renouf's "Hibb. Lect.," p. 141, and for "living" waters as divine, R. S. 127. In the ideal
realm of the good Shepherd-King Yima, Iranian belief saw neither hunger nor thirst for the faithful, and found no place for death (cf. Apoc. xxi. 4) or falsehood (Apoc. xxi. 8) of any kind (passages and parallels in Böcklen, 133 f.). — 6ήρωποσ, a touch of local colour for Asiatic Christians, since sheep and shepherds were a common feature in the Lycos valley (C. B. P. i. 40-42); but the heaven of the Apocalypse is, in Semitic fashion, pastoral or civic, with touches of Babylonian splendour, unlike some later apocalypses, e.g., that of Peter (15 f.) where the Hellenic conception of God’s garden in the next world predominates (Disterich, 19 f.). — Briggs explains the variants σημερον των αγγελων (xvi. 15) and σημερον των δΕσποτων (xvi. 14) and και των δεσποτων (xvii. 17) as variant translations of μετ’ αυτων; but, like ετ’ α των αγγελων (xvii. 15), ετ’ α των μετ’ αυτων (vii. 3), etc., these are probably nothing more than rhetorical variations. Unlike the synoptic tradition (e.g., Matt. ii. 6) and the fourth Gospel (x. 1, 18), the Apocalypse confines Christ’s shepherding to the future life (see also ii. 26, 27). In Isa. iii. 6, 7, the wayward roving habits of sheep express the temper of God’s people, whilst the patient submissiveness of a lamb in sacrifice denotes the function of God’s servant; in the Apocalypse, the latter (not the former) occurs. The saints are God’s flock in heaven, not on earth (contrast x Peter ii. 25, v. 2 f.).

Whatever elements have been employed in the following series (viii.-xi.) of trumpet-visions, no adequate data exist to prove that John has edited a Jewish or Jewish-Christian source here any more than in vi. The vision, which forms the result of the breaking of the seventh seal (viii. 1, 2), opens, after a prelude (2-5), in vii. 6 and does not close till xi. 19 (cf. viii. 5).

Chapter VIII.— Ver. 1. The opening of the seventh seal is followed by half an hour’s silence in heaven: “he opened” looks back to vi. 12, the absence of subject showing that vii. is a parenthesis foreign to the seal-series in its original shape. Probably this series, like each of the others, was originally a separate oracle upon the latter days. When woven by the author into his large work, they suffered a literary treatment which has interrupted but not altogether obliterated their original form and sequence. The book of destiny is now open; what follows (viii. 6 f.) is the course of the future, which naturally corresponds at some points to the predictions already sketched prophetically in chap. vi. A brief interval, not of exhaustion but of expectation, of breathless suspense (a pause in the ecstasy, LXX of Dan. iv. 16), ushered in a preliminary series of judicial plagues heralded by seven trumpet-blasts (viii. 2-ix. 19). Half an hour (ἡμιωριον, cf. Win. § 5, 22 a for form) may have been an ominous period; Josephus (B. Γ. vi. 5, § 3) describes a portent at the siege of Jerusalem which consisted of a bright light shining at twilight for half an hour, and the collocation of silence with reverence is illustrated by the LXX version (ειδανεαδεσδε) of Zech. xii. 13 and Zeph. i. 7 f. The following trumpet-series has been woven into the frame of the work by the device of making it take the place of the climax which (after vi. 17, vii. 1, 2) one would naturally expect to occur at this point. When the dénouement should take place, nothing happens; the judgment is adjourned.

Ver. 2. “The seven angels who stand before God” are introduced as familiar figures (cf. Luke 36 f., R. Γ. 319 f.); they belonged to pre-Christian Judaism (Tobit xii. 15, “I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One”), and are associated with trumpets (1 Thess. iv. 16). According to the Targ. on 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13 when Manasseh prayed, all the angels who superintend the entrance of prayers went and closed every approach, to prevent his petition reaching heaven; in Hag. 13 6 the prayers of the righteous are offered by Sandalphon (cf. Longfellow’s Sandalphon, and contrast Heb. vii. 25).
The variants 8qov and 8w are corrections of the original 8wv (NMAC, 1, edd.) — 

1 The septet of distinguished angels belongs to the circle of ideas behind i. 4, iv. 5, v. 6; but the author as usual prefers vividness and variety to homogeneity. He uses them for minatory purposes, assigning to “another angel” their characteristic function (ver. 3) in Jewish tradition. The alteration of figure at this point is deliberate. The certainty of divine decrees is suggested by the figure of seals; but now that the prophet is describing the promulgation of the actual events presented in the book of Doom, he, like the author of 4 Esdras (? cf. Lat. of v. 4), employs the figure of angels with trumpets of hostile summons and shattering alarm. The final series (xv.-xvi.), in which these decrees are executed, is aptly described under the figure of bowls or vials drenching the earth with their bitter contents (cf. Bovon, Nov. Test. Théol. ii. 50). The trumpet, as a signal for war, is naturally associated with scenes of judgment (refl.). “Power, whether spiritual or physical, is the meaning of the trumpet, and so, well used by Handel in his approaches to the Deity” (E. Fitzgerald’s Letters, i. 92). Trumpet to lip, the angels now stand ready. They are set in motion by a significant interlude (3-5).

Ver. 3. Between royalty and ritual the scenery of the Apocalypse fluctuates. It is assumed (as at vi. 9), after vii. 15 perhaps, that heaven is a temple, although this is not expressly stated till xi. 19; nor is it homogeneous with the throne-description in chap. iv. λαβάνων (“incense,” &w. λεγ. Ν.Τ.) is used by mistake for the classical λαβάνων (LXX, wp(e)cov or φθόγγος) = “censer,” as already in an inscription of the second century B.C. (Dittenberger’s Syll. Inscript. Graec. 588 186) λαβάνως is employed by confusion for “frankincense”.

Golden censers (x Macc. i. 22) and golden bowls (φαλαξίαι) were among the furniture of the temple (1 Esd. ii. 13). On prayers as an offering, see Acts x. 4. The symbolism is borrowed from the temple-rational; when the saucer of incense had been emptied over the burning coals placed on the altar of incense, the people bowed in prayer, as the fragrant cloud of smoke rose up. Wellhausen’s deletion of 3 b, 4 as a gloss is therefore unnecessary. John is consoling the church (cf. on vi. 10) by the assurance that their prayers for the coming of the kingdom are not breathed in vain.

Ver. 4. As an agent of God, the angel is commissioned to ratify with Divine approval the petitions of the saints for the end; this involves retribution on the impenitent and hostile world. The prophet is sure such aspirations are in harmony with God’s will.

Ver. 5. The censer, having offered incense to heaven, is now used to hurl fire upon the earth (adopted from Ezek. x. 2-7; cf. Lev. xvi. 12). At the close of the trumpets (xi. 19) and the bowls (xvi. 18), physical disturbances here accompany the manifestation of God’s wrath and judgment. In answer to the prayers and longings of the saints (Renan, 393), God at last visits the impenitent pagan world with a series of catastrophes (viii., ix., cf. ix. 4), which herald the end and also give (though in vain, ix. 20, 21) an opportunity for repentance.

Note on viii. 3-5. This episode (in dumb show) of angel and incense, though apparently isolated, is an overture for the serial of judgments, of which the successive trumpet-blasts are precursors. The prayers of all the saints, which, like those of the martyrs in vi. 10, crave punishment upon God’s enemies through-
out the earth, are supported and reinforced by the ministry of this angel, and answered at once by the succession of incidents beginning with ver. 5. This object of Christian prayers, i.e., the final crisis, when Christ returns to crush his enemies and inaugurate his reign, pervaded early Christianity as a whole. At special periods of intolerable persecution, it assumed under the stress of antagonism as here a more sensuous and plastic form than the ordinary consciousness of the church would have been usually disposed to cherish; yet the common prayer of the church in any case was for the speedy end of the world (λαθέντα γάρ και παραλαθόντων κόσμος οὕτως, Did. x.). In Apoc. Mos. (tr. Conybeare, *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, 1895, 216-235) xxxiii., when the angels intercede for Adam at his ascension to heaven, they take golden censers and offer incense; whereupon smoke overshadows the very firmament. The intercession of angels on behalf of the saints, a result of their function as guardians, goes back to post-exilic Judaism with its inarticulated conception of the angels as helpful to mankind (Job v. 1. xxxii. 23; Zech. i. 12); subsequently the idea developed into a belief that the prayers of the pious won special efficacy as they were presented to God by angels such as Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, or the seven archangels (cf. Tobit, loc. cit.; Slav. En. vii. 5; En. ix. 2-11, xv. 2, xl. 6, xlvii. 2, xcix. 3, 16, civ. 1). In Christianity this rôle was naturally absorbed by Christ, who alone ratified and inspired his people's supplications. But the old belief evidently lingered in pious circles of Jewish Christianity (cf. Test. Lev. 3. 5), side by side with a complete acceptance of Christ's heavenly function. The latter did not immediately or universally wither up such survivals of the older faith; popular religion tended then as now to be wider at several points than its theoretical principles (as in Origen, *Cis.* v. 4; and Tertull. *de Orat.* xii.). Plato, in *Sympos.,* 202 E., makes the δειμονες present men's prayers and offerings to the gods, and mediate the latter's commands and recompense to men (cf. Philo, *de Somniiis,* i. 22, and on i. 1). See further xvii. 1, xxii. 9, for a similar state of matters in primitive Christianity with regard to the corresponding function of Jewish angels as intermediaries of revelation.

Ver. 6 f. The fresh series of disasters does not advance matters any further than the previous seal-series. Both lead up to the final catastrophe, and as upon the edge of it melt into a further development which practically goes over the same ground once more. This reflects of course literary artifice, not any successive or continuous scheme of events; it is iterative not historically chronological. It is doubtful if the prophet intended to suggest the idea which occurs to a modern mind, viz., that such apparent cycles seem to recur in history. At certain epochs everything seems to be working up to some mighty climax for which men look in dread or hope, and yet the world rights itself for another epoch; the dénouement fades for the time being into the far horizon; the powers of evil gather themselves afresh in other forms. Neither here nor in the previous seven cycles can the astrological reference (to the colours and characteristics of the planets, *cf. Exp. Ti.* xx. 426-427) be worked out with any plausibility.

Vv. 6-12. *The first four trumpets.*

Ver. 6. In the scheme of the trumpet-visions, as of the seal-visions, the first four are differentiated from the next three; the fifth and sixth in both cases stand by themselves and are separated by a considerable interlude from the closing seventh. It is remarkable that even the final trumpet of xi. 15 f. does not correspond to the loud trumpet-blast which according to Jewish and early Christian tradition, was to awaken the dead to resurrection or to rally the saints (Matt. xxiv. 31) at the close of the world. The Apocalypse knows nothing of this fea-
ture, nor of the tradition (preserved by R. Akiba) that the process of the resurrection would be accompanied by seven trumpet-peals from God. The first four trumpets set in motion forces of ruin that fall on natural objects; in Sap. v. 17-23 (xvi. 17-24) the world of nature is used directly by God to punish men. The closing three concern human life, i.e., the godless inhabitants of the earth. The general idea is that of the Jewish tradition (see on xv. 2) which prefaced the second great redemption by disasters analogous to those preceding the first: cf. e.g., Sohar Exod. 4 b, tempore quo se resealabit rex Messias, faciet Deus omnia ista miracula, prodigia et divinae virtutis opera coram Israele, quae fecit olim in Aegypto, quemadmodum scriptum est Mic. vii. 15; also Jalkut Sim. i. 56 b, Targ. Jon. on Zech. x. 11, etc. The disasters remind one and then of the Egyptian plagues (cf. Jos. Ant. li. 14-21; also Amos iv. 4 f., Isa. ix. 7 f.). The first four visit earth, sea, waters, and the sky. Hail-showers were a traditional scourge and weapon of the divine armoury; on their association with thunderstorms see G. A. Smith's Hist. Geog. 64, 65.

Ver. 7. Hail and fire, as in the fourth Egyptian plague, but with the added O.T. horror (see reff.) of a shower of blood instead of rain (see Chag. 12 b, where the sixth heaven is the storehouse of hail, storm, and noxious vapours, enclosed within gates of fire; and specially Sibyll. v. 377, τῷ γαρ ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν . . . βρέθη . . . τῷ καὶ ἐλαιῳ. For similar atmospheric phenomena, see on vi. 8, 12. Portents of this abnormal nature are recorded for the seventh decade of the first century by Roman historians, but there is no need to see specific historical allusions in prophecy upon this grand scale.

The sight of atmospheric fire always signified to the ancients the approach of various disasters, especially when stars fell. Wetstein cites Bara Messia, 59, 1; dixit R. Eliezer, percussus est mundus, tertia nempe pars olearium, tertia parasitici, et tertia hordei. The third is a primitive Semitic (Babylonian: Jastrow, 107 f.) division, which has its roots also in Iranian religion (Yasht, xiii. 3, Yasna, xi. 7, etc.), where the tripartite division of earth, derived originally from the threefold division of earth, atmosphere, and universe, is older than the sevenfold.—δείνων, see Schol. (τὰ δείνημα διστάοντο) on Thuc. ii. 19 καθαρομένοι ἐξηγήσων . . . τοῖς ναόις. Pausan. ii. 356 (cf. iv. 166 f.) mentions among the phenomena attending earthquakes heavy rain or prolonged drought, the discolouring of the sun's disc, etc.; "springs mostly dry up. Sudden gusts sometimes sweep over the country, blowing the trees down. At times, too, the sky is shot with sheets of flame. Stars are seen of an aspect never known before, and strike consternation into all beholders."

Vv. 8, 9. A fiery mass, huge as a mountain, is flung into the sea—a description which would recall the fiery volcanic bombs familiar to inhabitants of the Egean. The catastrophe includes, as in the first Egyptian plague, the turning of water into blood and the destruction of marine animals (4 Esd. v. 7, Verg. Georg. iii. 541 f.), besides havoc among the shipping. Volcanic phenomena (cf. Introd. § 8) in the Egean archipelago (e.g., at Thera) are in the background of this description, and of others throughout the book; features such as the disturbance of islands and the mainland, showers of stones, earthquakes, the sun obscured by a black mist of ashes, and the moon reddened by volcanic dust, were the natural consequences of eruption in some submarine volcano, and Thera—adjoining.
7—13. ἈΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ

10. Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος ἴδον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀστήρ μέγας καλεμένος ὡς λαμπάς, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν πυράμον ἐπὶ τὰς ἀστέρας τῶν δάντων. Εἶτα καὶ τὸ ὅμοιο τοῦ ἄστρος λέγεται ὁ Ἀφωνος καὶ ἑγώντο τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἄστρων καὶ πολλοὶ ἐτέρας ἀστέρων ἐπέθανον ἐκ τῶν ἀστερῶν, ὅπερ ἐπικράθησαν. Ἔπειτα, ἐπέρθησαν καὶ ἅπας οἱ ἄστροι τῶν ἑλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ὅπως καὶ ἡ ἔμπροσθέν τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν. 

12. Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος ἴδον καὶ ἅπας οἱ ἄστροι τῶν ἑλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ὅπως καὶ ἡ ἔμπροσθέν τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ τρίτου αὐτῶν.

13. Καὶ ἐδὼ, καὶ ἦκα δύσης ἄστροι ἕνα πετομένον ἐν καταστροφῇ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῶν λοιμῶν φυκιῶν τῆς σαλαγγίας τῶν τριῶν ἄγγελων τῶν μελλόντων σαλαγγίων.

h Imitated in 4 Esd. xv. 14-15. 1 xii. 12. k Cf. ver. 11; = and Matt. xviii. 7.


Patmos—was in a state of more or less severe eruption during the first century. All this suggested the hideous colours in which the final catastrophe was painted by the imagination of pious contemporaries. In the eruption of 1573, the sea round Thera was tinted for twenty miles round, and even when the submarine volcano is quiescent, "the sea in the immediate vicinity of the cone is of a brilliant orange colour, from the action of oxide of iron". In 1707 a large rock suddenly appeared in the sea, during the eruption, and owing to noxious vapours "all fish in the harbour died". 

Vv. 10, 11. The third part of all drinking waters is poisoned by a huge, noxious, toxic-like meteor shooting down from the sky (Vergil's "de coelo lapasa per umbras stella facem ducens multa cum luce concurrat," Aen. ii. 653, 694). Wormwood, a bitter drug typical of divine punishment, was apparently supposed to be a mortal poison; thus Pliny (H. N. ii. 232) ascribes the bitterness of Lake Sannaus (Anava) in the Lycos valley to the circa nascente apsintio. But this feature of the vision is taken from Iranian or Mandaeen eschatology (Brandt, 584 f.), where among the signs of the end are famine, wars, a star falling from heaven and making the sea red (cf. Apoc. xvi. 3), and a cyclone with a dust-storm. Cf. 4 Esd. v. 9, et in dulcisibus aquis saeae inueniuntur. Rivers and fountains were associated in the ethnic mind (cf. Neh. ii. 13) with supernatural spirits and curative properties; hence upon them this stern prophet of monotheism sees the doom of God falling. οὐκέτα σφυραγίζω... εἰς, a Hebraistic constr., common in Apocalypse and in quotations from O.T., but "decidedly rare elsewhere" in N.T. (Simcox). Springs (like those, e.g., near Smyrna) and fountains naturally appeared to the ancient mind somewhat mysterious and separate; their lack of visible connexion with rivers or lakes suggested the idea that they sprang from the subterranean gases, or that they were connected with daemons. Hence their rôle in the final convulsions of nature (4 Esd. vi. 24 unae fontium stabunt, Ass. Mos. x. 8 et fontes aquae deficient). Cf. Rohrbach's Im Lande Fahwehs und Fesu (1901), 30 f.; for their connexion with dragons, R. S., 157, 161 f., and for their bubbling as a mark of sacred energy, ibid. 154 f.

Ver. 12. "So as to darken a third part of them, and (i.e.) to prevent a third of the day from shining (φάνη, or φαινοντα, Win.) and of the night likewise". Daylight is shortened by a third, and the brightness of an Eastern night correspondingly lessened (cf. the Egyptian plague of darkness). The writer either forgets or ignores the fact that he has already cleared the heaven of stars (vi. 13).

Chapter IX.—Vv. 1-12: The fifth trumpet.

Ver. 1. Stars (as σώματα ἐνωμένα) drop from heaven in the form of beasts (Enoch lxxvi. 1 f.) and men (ibid. lxxxvii.) throughout Jewish apocalyptic (cf. ibid. xviii. 16, xxi. 1, 6, xc. 21, 24); even earlier (Judges v. 20, Job xxxviii. 7) they had been personified. On falling stars, associated as evil portents with death or divine displeasure, see Frazer's Golden Bough (2nd ed.), ii. 18 f. From what follows, it is possible that this angelic being who had fallen is conceived as an evil agent (reft.), permitted (ἐδόθη) to exercise malicious power on earth in furtherance of divine judgment. “The pit of the abyss” is the abode of the devil and demons (reft. cf. Aen. viii. 583 f., vii. 243 f.), a subterranean chasm or waste underworld, located sometimes in the midst of the earth (Slav. En. xxvii. 3), and represented here (cf. xx. 1) as covered by a lid or great stone. To judge from xiii. 1, this abyss seems to contain, as in O.T., the flow of waters formerly upon the earth, and now confined (according to Jewish folk-lore) by God's decree and the magical potency of His name (cf. on xx. 4 and ii. 17 also Prayer of Manasseh, “O Lord Almighty... Who hath shut up the deep, and sealed it by thy terrible and glorious name”). A fearsome cavity (“ditis spiraculum”) emitting poisonous exhalations once existed near Hierapolis (Pliny, H. N. ii. 95). Such chasms (throughout Italy, Greece and Asia) seemed, to the superstitious, local inlets into Hades and outlets for infernal air in the shape of mephitic vapours. In Phrygia itself springs of hot vapour and smoke are a feature of the Lyceos valley (C. B. P. i. 2, 3), and the volcanic cone in the harbour of Thera was believed to be such an aperture of hell. Fire belching from this subterranean furnace was a sure portent of the final catastrophe (4 Esd. v. 8); cf. Renan, 330 f., 396, R. S. 127, and Jeremias, 116 f.

Ver. 2. For the following description of this destructive horde of weird locusts, see Joel ii. with Driver's notes and excursus (C. B.) to which add the famous description of a locust-plague in Newman's Callista (ch. xv.). Naturally the sketch is far more idealised than that given by Joel; it often recalls the monstrous associates created by Tiamat out of the primeval abyss (Jastrow, pp. 419 f.); i.e., strong warriors, “great serpents, merciless in attack, sharp of tooth. With poison instead of blood she filled their bodies. Furious vipers she clothed with terror, made them high of stature.”

Vv. 3, 4. The dense smoke resolves itself into a swarm of infernal demons in the form of locusts but rendered more formidable by their additional power of stinging like scorpions. Instead of preying on their natural food (Exod. x. 15), already plagued (viii. 7) they are let loose upon men unmarked by the Divine
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6. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔκειναις δὲ ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοῦ
θάνατος,

καὶ ὥς μὴ εἰρωνεύοντά ἄτοντα,
καὶ ἐπιθυμήσουσιν ἀποθανεῖν,
καὶ φεύγει πόθος ἀντ' ἄτοντι.

7. Και τὰ ὁμοίωματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὄμοια εἰς ἡγομασμένοις
εἰς πόλεμον,


Ver. 5. ταὐτὰρ here, like ἡ τυάτοριν Jan. iv. 7, represents LXX, tr. of μένος in sense of reptile’s bite; the scorpion with its long-fanged tail stings the prey which it has already gripped with its claws (cf. Sen. Hercul. 1218). Scorpions were a natural symbol for vicious and dangerous opponents (cf. Ezek. ii. 6), Luke x. 9), whose attacks were always painful and might be mortal. “The sting is not perilous. . . . The wounded part swells with numbness and aching till the third day, there is not much swelling” (Doughty, Ar. Des. i. 328). But the effects were not always so mild (Arist. H. N. ix. 29).

Ver. 6. The withholding of death, instead of being an alleviation, is really a refinement of torture; so infernal is the pain, that the sufferers crave, but crave in vain, for death (Sibyll. iii. 208: καὶ καλόσωσι καλὸν τὸ θανάν καὶ φεύγετ’ ἀν’ ἄτον). It is singular that suicide is never contemplated, although it was widely prevalent at this period in certain circles of the Empire (see Merivale’s Romans under the Empire, ch. lxiv; Lecky’s Eurip. Morals, i. 212 f.). For its un-Jewish character see Jos. Bell. iii. 8. 5.

Ver. 7. Arabian poets compare locusts in head to the horse, in breast to the lion, in feet to the camel, in body to the snake, in antennae to a girl’s long, waving hair. The resemblance of the head in locusts and in horses has been often noticed (Cassvalia, Italian), and their hard scales resemble plates of equine armour. The rest of the description is partly fanciful (“crowns gleaming like gold,” human faces; yet cf. Pl. H. N. vi. 28, Arabes mitrat di gent, aut innonta crine), partly (vv. 8-9) true to nature (woman’s hair [i.e., abundant and flowing, a well-known trait of the Parthians and Persians], and lion-like teeth, scaly plates on the thorax, and rustling or whirring noises), partly (ver. 10) recapitulatory (= ver. 5; note ἔμοιας ἁρπάζουσι, an abbreviated comparison like Homer’s κοίμει καὶ Ἵμνος ὁ σκότος, partly (ver. 11) imaginative (cf. Prov. xxx. 27). The leader of these demons is the angel of the infernal from which they issue. His name is Abaddon (cf. Exp. Times, xx. 234 f.), a Heb. equivalent for ἀνάμμωσις personified like death and Hades. The final syllable of the name is taken to represent, as in Greek, a personal ending. Hence the LXX rendering ἀνάμμωσις pro-
1. A parenthesis remark of the author. ἐρέχθαι with plur. subj. following is not an irregularity due to Greek Rhetorical style but an instance of the so-called "Hyperbaton" anacolouthon (cf. Moulton. i. 58).

Ver. 12. The golden altar of incense stands before God, as in the original tabernacle and temple; the specially solemn invocation of the angel shows that the Parthian-like invasion constitutes the climax of this series of disasters. ψυχή, as i. 10, x. 4, etc., the "bath qol" (Grorier, i. 253 f., Dalman, viii. 1). Ver. 14. The sixth angel takes part in the action. The Euphrates had been the ideal Eastern boundary of Israel's territory: it now formed the frontier between Rome and her dreaded neighbour, the Parthian Empire (Philo, leg. ad C. § ii.; Verg. Georg. i. 509; Tac. Hist. iv. 51).

Ver. 15. This quartette of angels (= complete ruin, Zech. i. 18 f.) has been kept in readiness, or reserved for this occasion, though they are not to be connected (as by Spitta) with the four moments of time—hour, day, month, and year. Like the use of ἔτη, μῆνις, and Ἀνήρ, this touch of predestined action brings out the strong providential belief running through the Apocalypse. On the rôle of destructive angels in Jewish eschatology cf. Charles on Sir. En. x. 3, and for the astrological basis (En. lxxxi. 10 f.) of this tradition see Fries in Ἐαρὸς.
f. d. klass. Alterth. (1902) 705 f. Probably the author means that the angels set in motion the hordes of cavalry (two hundred million) described in the semi-mythical, semi-historical pageant of the next passage. But he does not directly connect the two, and it is evident that here as at vii. x f., we have "dream-like consequences" (Simcox), or else two fragments of apocalyptic tradition, originally heterogeneous, which are pieced together (at ver. 16). The four angels here do not correspond in function or locality to the four unfettered angels of vii. x; they rather represent some variation of that archaic tradition in which four angels (perhaps angel-princes of the pagan hordes) were represented as bound (like winds?) at the Euphrates—a geographical touch due to the history of contemporary warfare, in which the Parthians played a rôle similar to that of the Huns, the Vikings, or the Moors in later ages. Since the first century B.C. a Parthian invasion of some kind had formed part of the apocalyptic apparatus so that there is no particular need to allegorise the Euphrates into the Tiber or to find the four angels in Ps. lxxviii. 49 (LXX). The bloody and disastrous Parthian campaign of 58-62 (cf. on vi. 2) may account for the heightened colour of the scene, whether the fragment was composed at that period, or (as is most probable) written with it in retrospect. But the entire vision is one powerful imaginative development of a tradition preserved in a Syriac Apocalypse of Ezra (published by Baethgen) which may be based on old Jewish materials: "and a voice was heard, Let those four kings be loosed, who are bound at the great river Euphrates, who are to destroy a third part of men. And they were loosed, and there was a mighty uproar." Could this be reckoned as proof of an independent tradition it would help to illumine the application of the idea in John's Apocalypse, especially if one could accept with Kohler the attractive conjecture of Iselin that θυσία represents a confusion (or variety of reading, cf. 2 Sam. xi. 1) between θυσία (= hosts, as in 2 Macc. iii. 18, etc.) and θύεις (= asebo) in a Hebrew original of Apoc. ix. 15 (Zeits. aus der Schweiz, 1887, 64). The conjecture (Spitta, de Faye, J. Weiss) θύεις (= asebo) is less likely, and θυσία cannot be taken with θυσία (Bruston). Cavalry formed a standing feature of the final terror for the Jewish imagination ever since the Parthians loomed on the political horizon (Ass. Mos. iii. 1). The whole passage was one of those denounced by the Alogi as fantastic and ridiculous (cf. Epiph. Haer. ii. 34). Gais also criticised it as inconsistent with Matt. xxiv. 7.

Ver. 16. The second woe is an irruption of fiendish cavalry.

Ver. 17. Here only the writer refers to his "vision." ξύνεται (horse and rider regarded as one figure: in the Persian heavy cavalry horses as well as men were clad in bright plate) κ.τ.λ., "they wore coats of mail, the colour of fire and jacinth and brimstone," i.e., gleaming red, dark blue, and yellow, unless δακ. (a favourite Oriental military colour) is meant to denote the colour of dull smoke. Plutarch, in his life of Sulla, describes the Medes and Scythians with their πυροπαθείς καὶ φοβερὰν δύσιν (cf. Sir. xvi. 9).—πυρ, κ.τ.λ., like Job's leviation, than, Ovid's bulls (Metam. vii. 104), or Diomedes' horses (Lucret. v. 29, cf. Aen. vii. 281). They are also as destructive as Joel's locusts. The description is a blend of observation and fantastic popular beliefs. Brimstone was a traditional trait of divine wrath among people who "associated the ozonic smell which often so perceptibly accompanies lightning..."
discharges with the presence of sulphur” (E. Bi. 612). The symbolism is coloured by actual Parthian invasions (cf. vi. 1 f.) and by passages like Sap. xi. 18 where God punishes men by sending “unknown, newly-created wild beasts full of rage, breathing out a fiery blast or snorting out noisome smoke or flashing dread sparkles from their eyes.” Mr. Bent recalls the curious superstition of the modern Thersans, who, during the eruptions of last century saw “in the pillars of smoke issuing from their volcano, giants and horsemen and terrible beasts.” Ver. 19. Heads attached to their serpentine tails are an allusion not only to the well-known tactics of the Parthians (cf. Parad. Regained, iii. 323 f.) but to a trait of ancient Greek mythology; on the altar of Zeus at Pergamos (cf. note on ii. 12) the giants who war against the gods are equipped with snakes (instead of limbs) that brandish open jaws. The amphibiaena of ancient mythology was often described as possessing a headed tail (“tanquam parum esse uno ore fundi quenena,” Pliny: H. N. viii. 35).

Vv. 20, 21. The impenitence of the surviving two-thirds of men, who persist in worshipping daemons and idols (Wein. 3, 4). Hellenic superstition (Plut. de defectu orac. 14) attributed to malignant daemons these very plagues of pestilence, war, and famine. Plutarch is always protesting against the excesses of deified powers, and on the other hand is faulting the rationalists and Christians who abjured them entirely.

—σαπενει, either the gods of paganism (LXX) or the evil spirits of contemporary superstition. In Enoch xix. 7, the spirits of the fallen angels assume many forms defile men and shall lead them astray to offer sacrifices to demons as to gods”; cf. xlv. 7 (of the kings and rulers) “their power rests on their riches, and their faith is in the gods which they have made with their hands.” (See Clem. Strom. ii. 5. 39, 40)—ἀργυρῷ, contracted form, as in 2 Tim. ii. 20 (Helbing, pp. 34 f.).—φαρα, here in special sense of magic spells inciting to illicit lust (Artém. v. 73), a prevalent Asiatic vice (cf. Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 31). But in the imprecatory (c. 100 b.c.) inscription of Rhenia (Dittenberger, Syll. Inscript. Graec. ii. pp. 676 f.), punishment is invoked from τῶν κυρίων τῶν πεντεμών (cf. Apoc. xxii. 6) upon those δόλαι φωτισάντων ἄρα φαινομένους the hapless girl. The three vices of the decalogue occur here (as in Matt.) in the Hebrew order, not in that of the LXX (Rom. xiii. 9; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20). Cf. on xxi. 8, and, for the connexion of polytheism and vice, Harnack’s Mission and Exp. of Christianity, i. (1908), pp. 290 f. Repenance here (as in xvi. 9, 11) is primarily a change of religion, but the prophet has evidently little hope of the pagan world. There is no polemic against the Egyptian worship of animals, and, in spite of the Jewish outlook upon the doloris Messiae, the Apocalypse ignores family disturbances and false messiahs as harbingers of the end.—Once more (cf. vii. 1 f.) between the sixth (ix. 13-21) and the seventh (xi. 15-19) members of the series,
a passage (this time of some length) is intercalated (x. i-xi. 13), in which the personality of the seer now re-emerges (on earth, instead of in heaven). The object of x. i-13 is to mark at once a change of literary method and a transition from one topic to another. The passage, which certainly comes from the prophet's own pen (so Sabatier, Schön, and others), looks backward and forward. Now that the preliminaries are over, all is ready for the introduction of the two protagonists (xi.-xiii.), whose conflict forms the closing act of the world's history (xv. i-xx. 10). One of these is Jesus, the divine messiah, who has hitherto (v.-ix.) been depicted as the medium of revelation. Since his rôle now is to be more active, the prophet expressly alters the literary setting of his visions. The subsequent oracles are not represented as the contents of the book of Doom (which is now open, with the breaking of its last seal). Dropping that figure (contrast v. 2 and x. 1) the writer describes himself absorbing another roll of prophecy received from an angel. Evidently he intends to mark a new departure, and to introduce what follows as a fresh start. This new procedure is accompanied by an explicit assurance—intended to whet the reader's interest—that the Apocalypse has now reached the verge of the final catastrophe; the prophet apparently makes this eagerness to reach the goal the reason for omitting a seven-thunders vision (or source) which otherwise he might have been expected to include either at this point or subsequently. It is quite in keeping with the wider outlook and rather more historical atmosphere of xi. i, that a freer and less numerical method pervades these oracles. In short, x. i-xi. 12 is a digression only in form. It serves to introduce not simply the Jewish fragment (xi. i-13)—whose strange contents probably required some express ratification—but the rest of the oracles (xiii. f.), which are thus awkwardly but definitely connected with the foregoing design (through the closing trumpet-vision: x. 7=x. xi. 15 f.).

Chapter X.—Ver. 1. ἦλλον, referring to v. 2, where another strong angel was mentioned, also in connexion with a book. The position of the seer is implied (since viii. 2?) to be no longer in heaven (cf. verses 4 and 8), but on earth, as the gigantic angel of light descends to him. The face and feet are described in stereotyped fashion. In Ezekiel's description of God (i. 28) the appearance of a rainbow surrounds the divine throne, as an element of the theophany in nature. Here also it is an aesthetic detail. Suetonius describes (Vit. Aug. 95) Augustus seeing suddenly "in a clear and bright sky a circle, like a rainbow in heaven, surrounding the sun's disc".

Ver. 2. "And in his (left? cf. ver. 5) hand a small booklet open" (in contrast to the larger closed book of v. 1), after Ezek. ii. 9. This colossal figure, like an Arabian jin, betrades earth and sea. His message is for the broad world.

Ver. 3. Ἀληθὴς (of God in O.T. ref.; of the messiah 4 Esd. xi. 37, xii. 31) μυκαται Theocr. Id. xxvi. 21, μύκης λεγής, properly of cattle="to bellow". ἄληθες κ.τ.λ.="uttered what they had to say" (i.e., spoke articulately), αἷ (the well-known or familiar) βροταλ "of the apocalyptic machinery" (Alford), or a popular piece of apocalyptic prophecy (see below). Cf. the sevenfold voice of
The double augment of ἰμαλλον (ACQ, min., so Lach., Tr., WH, Wa., Swete) is better attested here than in iii. 2, cf. Helbing 71-72.

the Lord in thunder, Ps. xxix. The seven thunders here may be conceived loosely as the echoes of the angel’s voice reverberating through the universe (Spitta, Weis), thunder, throughout the ancient world, being especially venerated as a divine voice or warning.

Ver. 4. To seal or shut up a vision is to keep it secret from mankind, i.e., in the present case (by a sequence of thought which is scarcely logical) to leave it unwritten. In a similar passage (Apoc. Bar. xx. 3) “seal” means to lay up fast in one’s memory (because the realisation is not immediate); but this meaning is suggested by the context, although it might suit the present passage. The seer describes himself as prohibited by a heavenly voice (which reverence leaves as usual undefined, 4 Esd. vi. 17: Dalman viii. 1) from obeying his impulse. No reason is assigned; but the plain sense of the passage is that the author wishes (Weitzs., Schön, Ba., Holtz., Pfleid.) to justify his omission of a seven-thunder source or set of visions circulating in contemporary circles of prophecy (x. 7). In view of the authoritative character of such fragments or traditions John justifies his procedure by the explanation that he felt inspired to do so, and also to substitute other oracles. Thus in the middle, as at the opening and end of his book, he reiterates his prophetic authority. The episode may further indicate that the written contents of the Apocalypse represents merely a part of the author’s actual vision (cf. John xxi. 25), or it may serve to heighten the effect of what is now to be introduced, or it may suggest that while the seer is to write (i. 11), he is to write only what is revealed through the medium of angels. In Slav. En. xxxii. 3, 6 the seer spends thirty days in writing the remarks of his angel-instructor. To hear ἀρρητα ρήματα, δ’ ουκ ἐξεν ἀνθρώπων λαλήσῃ was not incompatible, however, with an ἀποκάλυψις κυρίου (2 Cor. xi. 4), cf. Weis, 162 f. There was an inspiration of restraint as well as an inspiration of impulse. Thus Hermes (Vis. i. 3) listens with wonder to glories of God which he could not remember, “for all the words were awful, such as man cannot bear. The last words, however, I did remember; they were fit for us and mild”. Possibly the seven-thunders source was of a severely punitive character (viii. 5), traversing ground which had been already (vi.-ix.) and was to be again (xv.-xvi.) covered.

Vv. 5-6. Modelling from Dan. xii. 7, the writer describes the angel’s oath (by the living God, as usual in O.T.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 63), with its native gesture (cf. Trumbull’s Threshold-Covenants, 78 f.) and contents. In the ancient world oaths were usually taken in the open-air (Usener, Gärtnermachen, 181), before the all-seeing deities of the upper light. But here, as at iv. 17 and xiv. 7, the eschatological and the creative acts of God (the latter an outcome of His living might, as Sir. xviii. 1, En. v. 1, Acts xiv. 15, etc.) are deliberately conjoined; God’s activity in creation and providence would culminate in judgment. “There shall be no further delay,” or time lost. The interval of vi. 11 (Dan. xii. 7) is over: all is ripe now for the end, ἡ συντελεία καὶ πάντως. The parallels in Slav. En. xxxiii. 2, lxxv. 7, upon the abolition of seasons and periods of time are merely verbal. What engages the writer here is the usual point of importance in apocalyptic literature, viz., “Is it long to the end? Is the future longer than the past” (4 Esd. iv. 44-50)?

Ver. 7. Vav consec. with the Heb.
4—9. **ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΗΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ**

μου ἀγγέλου, ἦταν μᾶλλον σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελεσθή τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐνεγγυτείχαν τοὺς ἐκατούς δοῦλος τοὺς προφήτας".

8. Καὶ ἦν φωνή ἢ ἢκουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πᾶλιν λαλοῦσαν μετ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν, "Τὸ πάντα τὸ βιβλίον ἡ μνήμη τοῦ ἄγγελου τοῦ ἐφευρέτου ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς". 9. Καὶ ἦν ἀπίστη πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, λέγων αὐτῷ

Christianity, Col. i. 26 = Eph. iii. 1-12 = 1 Pet. i. 10-12 = Rom. xvi. 25. s Cf. Gal. iii. 6. 3. as act. vb. only here and xiv. 6 (κερευμα), in N.T.: late Greek usage. t xvi. i. u v. 7: like τὸ χρυστοῦ (iv. 2) an Attic form. v Double augment, Blass, § 13, 7; Win. § 13, 7. w Cf. ix. 5, xi. 12, for form.

1 For βιβλιάριαν (Q, etc., And., Aret.) or βιβλιαριόν (ἲ, etc., Al., Ti., Bs., Bj.) read βιβλιόν AC, 6, 14 (Lach., Tr., WH, Sw., Ws.). The two former readings are corrections.

pf. (LXX = ζαλεί τινι) here by an awkward solecism (cf. on iii. 20) = "Then is (i.e., shall be) finished the secret of God." The final consummation (inaugurated by the advent of messiah, xii.) is to take place not later than the period of the seventh angel's trumpet-blast, which ex hypothesi is imminent. The μυστήριον is plainly, as the context implies, fullof solace and relief to God's people.

συνέτει. The total (exc. xiv. 6) omission of συγγενεῖν and the restricted use of its verb in the Apocalypse may have been due to the fact that such terms had been soiled by ignoble usage in the local Ionian cult of συγγενεῖς (e.g., at Ephesus), with its oracular revelations and fellowship of Evangelides. The Asiatic calendar of Smyrna contained a month called συγγενεῖς.—The connexion between μυστήριον = "secret purpose or counsel" (as here) and μῦς = "symbol, or symbolic representation" (i. 20, xvii. 7) is due to the fact that in the primitive world the former was enigmatically conveyed by means of symbolic-representations in word, picture, or deed. As "every written word was once a μυστήριον," it was natural that the word used for the sign came to be employed for the thing signified (Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, 61). The near approach of the end had been for years a matter of confidence and joy to the Christian prophets—for it is they and not their predecessors who are specially in view. The special and solemn contribution of John's Apocalypse is to identify certain events in the immediate future with the throes out of which the final bliss was to be born. These throes include the downfall of the dragon from heaven, the subsequent climax of the Beast's influence on earth, and the assertion of God's authority over his own and against his foe's adherents (xii.-xiv. 20). The great and glad revelation is God seen in action, with his forces deployed for the final campaign which, with its issues of deliverance and triumph (xv.-xxii.), forms the climax of this book. The apotheosis of the Caesars in their life-time—above all, of Domitian—marked the pitch of human depravity; divine intervention was inevitable.

Up to the end of ch. ix., the Apocalypse is fairly regular and intelligible; thereafter, criticism enters upon an intricate country, of which hardly any survey has yet succeeded in rendering a satisfactory account. The problem begins with ch. x. Although vv. 1-7 complete the preceding oracles by introducing their finale (7 = xi. 14 ff.), while 8-11 connect more immediately with ch. xi., this forms no reason for suspecting that the oracle is composite. Spitta takes 1a, 2a-7 (except 4) as the continuation of ix., followed by xi. 15, 19, while the rest is substantially a prelude to xi. 1-13; Briggs similarly views 1a, 3-7 as the original transition between ix. and xi. 14, 15 a, 19, while x. 1 b-2, 8-11 (a vision of messiah) introduces the new source of xi. 1-13, xii. 18; and Rauch regards x. 1 b, 2 a, 5-7, 4, 9-11 as the opening of xi. 1-13, xii. 1-17, with x. 1 a (substantially) as the preface to xii. 18-xxii., xvi. 13-16. These analyses are unconvincing. The alleged signs of a Hebrew original (e.g., ver. 7, also λήγων μοι and λέγει μοι in vv. 9, 11 = variant versions of לָמֶשׁ) are not decisive.

Ver. 8. ἡ φωνή (cf. ver. 4) left ungrammatically without a predicate, the two participles being irregularly attracted into the case of ἡ (cf. l. 9, iv. 11).

Vv. 9-10. The prophet absorbs the
word of God; in our phrase, he makes it his own or identifies himself with it (Jer. xv. 16). To assimilate this revelation of the divine purpose seems to promise a delightful experience, but the bliss and security of the saints, he soon realises, involve severe trials (cf. xi. 2, xii. 13 f., etc.) for them as well as catastrophes for the world. Hence the feeling of dislocation which his new vocation as a seer. The distasteful experience is put first, in ver. 9, as being the unexpected element in the situation. (The omission of bitterness in LXX of Ezek. iii. 14 renders it unlikely that this additional trait of unpleasant taste is due, as Spitta thinks, to an erroneous combination of Ezek. iii. 2 and 14). The natural order occurs in ver. 10. The only analogous passage in early Christian literature is in the "Martyrdom of Perpetua" (iv. cf. Weinel, 196, 197). Wetstein cites from Theophrantus the description of an Indian shrub ὅδε καρπὸς . . . ἀσθενέως γλυκὸς. οὕτως ἐν τῇ κολώ θητυρῶν ποιεῖ καὶ συναντρίπτει. Before the happy consummation (ver. 7), a bitter prelude is to come, which is the subject of national and political prophecies. In order to underlie his divine commission for this task of punitive prediction, he recalls his inspiration.

Ver. 11. λέγει μοι, an oblique, reverential way of describing the divine impulse, due to Aramaic idiom and common in later Biblical Hebrew (cf. Dalman, i., vii. 11). The series of oracles, thus elaborately inaugurated, is concerned increasingly ("again," in view of iv. 4, 15, vii. 4, 9, viii. 13, ix. 6, 16 f.) with those international movements ("kings = φυλακί, or those in xvii. 10, 12) which a prophet related to the course of the divine kingdom. Strictly speaking, the revelation assimilated in x. 10, 11 opens in xii., but the intervening passage is linked to both (see below). The first part of this passage (xi. 1-2, 3-13) evidently forms part of the βιβλαρίδιον (cf. Introd. § 2). Its enigmatic contents, interrupting the trumpet-visions with edges which do not fit into the context or the rest of the Apocalypse, point to the incorporation of a special and disparate source. Any analysis is more or less hypothetical, but the writer is evidently not moving with absolute freedom. He has his own materials in view, but he reaches it, here as elsewhere (cf. vii. 1 f.) by means of stepping-stones which originally lay in different surroundings. This is widely recognised by critics and editors, who commonly take 1-2 and 3-13 as separate oracles. Each indeed might be the torso of a separate oracle. But, in spite of the different descriptions of Jerusalem, the hypothesis of their original unity has much in its favour. How could so tiny a scrap of papyrus as that required for 1, 2 be preserved? Besides ver. 3 goes with ver. 2 (the prophetic mission as a counterpart to the punishment), the two periods are alike, the strange ἐκδώμα construction occurs in both (here only in Apoc.), and the inversion of object and verb is common to both (2, 5, 6, 9, 10). To discover an oracle of the Zealots in 1, 2 (Wellhausen, Bousset, Baljon, J. Weis) is precarious, for even if we could suppose that these passionate citizens took time to write oracles, they had not a monopoly of belief in the temple's inviolability. The latter belief conflicts with Mark xiii. 1, 2 (Ac. vi. 14); but, while this makes it extremely unlikely that the passage was adopted, or at least composed, by one of the Twelve, it does not necessarily disprove a Jewish origin for the fly-leaf. Patriotism must have often swayed hope, even in face of authoritative logia. Still, a Jewish origin is more probable (so from Vischer and Sabatier to Baljon, Forbes, von Soden, Wellhausen, and J. Weis) in which case 8 εἰς . . . Ἰωάννου, with possibly 9 αὶ and
Chapter XI.—

\[\text{\textit{And I was given a rod like a staff,}}\]

who should preach repentance to the pagan world, but he was occasionally furnished with a companion in Moses (on the basis of Deut. xviii. 15; cf. Mal. iv. 4, 5, the transfiguration-story, and possibly the two radiant saints of Apoc. Pet. 6 f.). The only other serious rival is Enoch, a grand figure in Jewish and early Christian eschatological tradition (for the curious Sir. xiv. 16, cf. E. Bi. 195). Later tradition, indeed, thinking mainly of Elijah and Enoch (Gfrörer ii. 261 f.; A. C. 203, 211), whom antichrist in wrath slays for their witness against him, and whom God (or Michael and Gabriel) resuscitates, suggests a fairly apposite cycle of belief which may reproduce the earlier Jewish expectation out of which the materials of this fragmentary oracle have been drawn. The unique character of this expectation is illustrated, not so much by Anu and Nudimmut, Marduk’s predecessors in the fight against Tiamat, as by the Zoroastrian belief that the temporary triumph of the evil spirit would be followed by the appearance of two reformers or prophets, Hushêdar and Hushêdarmah (S. B. E. xxiii. 195; cf. Hübschmann, 227), who would act each for a millennium on earth as the precursors and heralds of their Lord, the Persian messiah. This belief is much older than the sources in which it occurs, and like several other Zoroastrian traits, it may have fused with the Jewish expectation in question, though the Zoroastrian heralds do not appear simultaneously (cf. \textit{Encycl. Relig. and Ethics}, i. 207). Here at any rate the appearance of the two anonymous and mysterious witnesses precedes the final outburst of evil (xi. 7, xii. f.) and the manifestation of messiah (xi. 15 f., xiv. 14f.)—an idea for which no exact basis can be found in the strictly Jewish eschatology of the period. It may have grown up under the influence of this kindred trait in the adjoining province of Zoroastrian belief, unless the doubling of the witnesses was simply due to the side-influence of the Zechariah-trait (in ver. 4). Wellhausen argues from the singular \textit{πρόειλ} (8, 9) that the two witnesses were a duplication of the original single witness, i.e., Elijah; but the singular is collective, and there is no trace of any conflation with Jonah.

Chapter XI.—Vv. 1, 2. "And I was given a rod (\textit{δέκατος καλάμος}) like a staff,
with the words "(Ἀγνωμονία) by a harsh attraction, cf. LXX of 1 Kings xx. 9. Josh. ii. 2, is left in apposition to the subject implied in 18ον, "Up (or come = ὕψωται) and measure the temple of God and the altar (of burnt-offering, which stood outside the inner shrine) and (sc. number) those who worship there" (i.e., in the inner courts, xiii. 6; for constr. cf. 2 Sam. viii. 3). The outer court (Ezek. x. 5) is left to be left out of account (ἱσός = "omit" or exclude as unworthy of attention), i.e. for it has been abandoned (or, assigned in the divine counsel) to the heathen, and (indeed) they shall trample on the holy city itself (emphatic by position, = Jerusalem) for two and forty months." In Asc. Isa. iv. 12 antichrist's sway lasts for three years, seven months, and twenty-seven days, but three and a half years is the conventional period for the godless persecutor to get the upper hand (cf. xiii. 5, after Daniel's "time, and times, and the dividing of time," i.e., three and a half years, vii. 25, xii. 7). Originally this broken seven as the period of oppression reflected the Babylonian three and a half winter months (S. C. 309 f.; Cheyne's Bible Problems, 111 f.), preceding the festival of Marduk in the vernal equinox, a solstice during which Tiamat reigned supreme. Here it is the stereotyped period of the καιρός τῶν ἰδιῶν (Luke xxii. 24), extending to the advent—σάκκους. To measure is here not a prelude to ruin but a guarantee of preservation and restoration (Zech. ii. 1 f.). Failure to satisfy God's standard or test means calamity for men, but when he surveys their capacities and needs in peril, it implies protection. As the context implies, this is the idea of the present measuring. It is not to be identified prosaically with "orders given to the Roman soldiers, who were encamped in Jerusalem after its destruction, not to set foot in what had been the Holy of Holies" (Mommsen).

Ver. 3. σάκκους, the simple, archaic garb of prophets, especially appropriate to humiliation (refl.). The faithful prophets who withdraw from the local apostasy to the desert in company with Isaiah (Asc. Isa. ii. 9 f.) are also clothed in this black hair-cloth. The voice of the divine speaker here "melts imperceptibly into the narrative of the vision" (Alford, cf. ver. 12). Contemporary Jewish belief (4 Esd. vi. 26) made these "witnesses" (men "who have not tasted death from their birth," i.e., Enoch, Elijah) appear before the final judgment and preach successfully, but the only trace of any analogous feature in rabbinical prophecy seems to be the appearance of Moses and Messiah during the course of the Gog and Magog campaign. The reproduction of this oracle, long after its original period in 70 A.D., would be facilitated by the fact that the visions of Ezekiel and Zechariah, upon which it was modelled, both presupposed the fall of the city and temple in ancient Jerusalem (Abbott, pp. 84-88).

Ver. 4. They are further described in the terms applied by Zechariah to the two most prominent religious figures of his day, except that they are compared to two lampstands, not to one which is seiptiform. The idea is that their autho-
rity and influence are derived from God. As in ver. 7, the function of the two witnesses (cf. Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15) is defined as "prophecy," but no details are given.

Vv. 5, 6. In this description, borrowed from traditional features of Moses and Elijah (whose drought lasted for three and a half years, according to Luke iv. 25; James v. 17), the metaphorical expressions of passages like Jer. v. 14 and Sir. xlviii. 1 are translated into grim reality (see ref.), as in Slav. En. i. 5 and the thaumaturgic practices chronicled by Athen. iv. 129 D and Lucian (Philopseud. 12). These are no meek apostles of the Christian faith. To stop rain was equivalent to a punishment for iniquity (Ps. Sol. xvii. 30-2, En. c. xi, etc.)

Ver. 7. The influence of Hebraic idiom helps to explain (cf. xx. 7-9) the translator's "transition from futures through presents to praeterites" here (Simcox). τηλέων (Burton, 203) indicates no uncertainty. When their work is done, they are massacred—not till then; like their Lord (Luke xiii. 31 f.), they are insured by loyalty to their task. The best comment upon this and the following verses, a description coloured by the famous passage in Sap. ii. 12-iii. 9, is Bunyan's description of the jury in Vanity Fair and their verdict. This beast "from the abyss" is introduced as a familiar figure—an editorial and proleptic reference to the beast "from the abyss" in xvii. 8 or from "the sea" (xiii. i; the abyss and the sea in Rom. x. 7 = Deut. xxx. 13) which was (cf. Encycl. Rel. and Ethics, i. 53 f.) the haunt and home of demons (Luke viii. 31, etc.), unless he is identified with the supernatural fiend and foe of ix. 2, 11. (Bruston heroically gets over the difficulty of the beast's sudden introduction by transferring xi. 1-13 to a place after xix. 1-3). The beast wars with the witnesses (here, as in ix. 9 and xii. 17, Field, on Luke xiv. 31, prefers to take πόλεμον = μάχην, a single combat or battle, as occasionally in LXX [e.g., 3 Kings xxxii. 34] and Lucian), and vanquishes them, yet it is the city (ver. 13) and not he who is punished. The fragmentary character of the source is evident from the fact that we are not told why or how this conflict took place. John presupposed in his readers an acquaintance with the cycle of antichrist traditions according to which the witnesses of God were murdered by the false messiah who, as the abomination of desolation or man of sin, was at feud with all who opposed his worship or disputed his authority.

Ver. 8. God's servants rejected and cast aside, as so much refuse! See Sam, Agonistes, 607-704. The "great city" is Jerusalem, an identification favoured
The text is a page from a scholarly work discussing the theme of Sodom and Gomorrah in the context of ancient Near Eastern history and theology. It references various ancient texts, including the Bible, in both the Old and New Testaments, and other classical and Jewish sources. The author discusses the role of Sodom in the prophetic writings of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the possible influence of Sodom on the development of the New Testament narrative, particularly the reference to the antichrist in Revelation 12. The text also explores the literary and historical context of the Jewish and Christian interpretations of Sodom, including the role of the false Messiah as a potential fulfillment of prophecy. The author notes the debate among scholars regarding the precise meaning of Sodom and its implications for understanding the broader narrative of salvation history.

The text is densely packed with reference to biblical and extrabiblical sources, indicating a meticulous academic approach to the subject matter. The author references specific passages and editions, such as the Revised Standard Version (RSV) and other translations and commentaries, to support their arguments. The text is part of a larger work that likely involves a detailed examination of the theological and historical significance of Sodom in the context of ancient Near Eastern and Christian traditions.
The text is a page from a document and appears to be in Greek, discussing various religious and theological topics. The text is not completely legible, but it seems to be discussing themes related to prophecy, divine judgment, and the nature of God's providence. The text refers to various biblical passages, such as Psalms, Nehemiah, and the Books of Kings and Ezekiel, among others. The content seems to be scholarly, possibly an academic or religious commentary.
XI. An OKAAY*I2 QANNOY

17. "Εγένετο ή " βασιλεία τού " κόσμου τού " Κυρίου ήμών και τού " Χριστού αυτού,
καί " βασιλεύει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

18. Καί οἱ εἰκοσὶ τόπαρα προσβήτεροι οἱ ἐνώπιοι τοῦ θεοῦ
καθήναι· ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν, ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν;

19. Πληρωματίδες σου, "Κύριε ο θεὸς σ παντοκράτερι,
ὅ ὦ θεός καὶ ὁ ἄν
dia εἰληφας τὴν δυναμὴν σου τὴν μεγάλην,
καὶ ἐβασιλεύεσας.

20. Καὶ τὰ θέντα ἀργυρίσθησαν,
καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὁργή σου,
καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν μερών αἰώνια ἐριθαίμαι,
καὶ δοῦναι τοὺς μισθούς τοὺς δούλους σου τοὺς προφῆτας,
καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ διομά σου, τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγαλοῖς,
καὶ διαφθείραι τοὺς διαφθειρότατος τὴν γῆν.

21. Ἐπιστρέψατε σαρκί, ἐρωτήσατε ἧμέραν
ημέρας, τύμπανον τῆς δόξης,
τῆς τραγωδίας τῶν τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θανάτου.

22. "Τοῦτο αὐτὸς ο θεὸς παλαιοῖς ζωήν,
καὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς ψήνει τὸν διαφθειρότατος τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸν διαφθειρότατος τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θανάτου.

23. "Τοῦτο αὐτὴ η μεγαλύτερος βασιλεία τοῦ πολεμιστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν διαφθειρότατος τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τὸ διαφθειρότατος τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θανάτου.

24. "Εγείρετε καὶ συμπληρώσατε τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μεγάλην,
καὶ διαφθείρετε τὰς διαφθειρότατας τῆς γῆς.

25. "Εγείρετε καὶ συμπληρώσατε τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μεγάλην,
καὶ διαφθείρετε τὰς διαφθειρότατας τῆς γῆς.

26. "Εγείρετε καὶ συμπληρώσατε τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μεγάλην,
καὶ διαφθείρετε τὰς διαφθειρότατας τῆς γῆς.
of foreboding which is sounded in xii. 12 before the actual conflict.

Ver. 19 introduces xii. 1-18; all that the prophet can speak of, from his own experience (cf. xii. 1, II, albow), are the two θηρία on earth, but their activity in these latter days is not intelligible except as the result of mysterious movements in heaven. The latter he now outlines (cf. ἔφθας xi. 19, xii. 2, 3. By whom?) in order to comfort Christians by the assurance that the divine conqueror of these θηρία was in readiness to intervene. See Note (c) (contrast xi. 1) nades, presupposed in the scenery of iv.-vi., is now mentioned for the first time; its opening reveals the long lost κύριος τῆς διαθήκης, and is accompanied by the usual storm-theophany, marking a decisive moment. Jewish tradition had for long cherished the belief (cf. on ii. 17) that the restoration of the people (gathered by God, cf. xiv. 1 f.) in the last days would be accompanied by the disclosure of the sacred box or ark (in a cloud; cf. here the lightning and thunder) which, together with the tabernacle and the altar of incense, had been safely concealed in Mount Nebo. So, e.g., Abarnabel (on 1 Sam. iv. 4: hac est arca quam abscindit ante uasi stationem templi nostri et haec arca futuro tempore aduenientem messia nostro manifestabitur). Epiphanius repeats the same rabbinical tradition (καὶ ἐν ἀναστάσεως πρῶτον ἢ κύριος ἀναστήσεως). The underlying idea was that the disappearance of the ark from the holy of holies (Jer. iii. 16; 4 Esd. x. 22; Jos. Bell. v. 5, 5) was a temporary drawback which had to be righted before the final bliss could be consummated. This legend explains the symbolism of the Jewish Christian prophet. The messianic crisis is really at hand! The dawn may be cold and stormy, but it is the dawn of the last day! The spirit and content of the passage are transcendent; it is prosaic to delete ἐν τ. δ. (Spitta, and Cheyne in E. Bi. i. 300) and refer the earthly temple in Jerusalem. Like the author of Hebrews, this writer views heaven under the old ritual categories; besides, the originals of the sacred things were supposed to exist in the heaven of God (Heb. viii. 5).

This overture leads up to two sagas (xii. and xiii.) which explain that the present trouble of Christians was simply a final phase of the long antagonism which had begun in heaven and was soon to be ended on earth. It is the writer's task "not only to announce the future but also (i. 19) to convey a right understanding of that present on which the future depends" (Weiss). Hence the digression or retrospection in xii. 1 f. is only apparent. Hitherto only hints of persecution have been given; now the course, methods, and issues of the campaign are unfolded. The messianic position of Jesus is really the clue to the position of affairs, and it is of the utmost (μεγάλον, ver. 1 = weighty and decisive) moment to have all events focussed in the light of the new situation which that position has created. So much is plain. But that the source (or tradition) with its goddess-mother, persecuting dragon, celestial conflict, and menaced child, did not emanate from the prophet himself is evident alike from its style and contents; these show that while it could be domiciled on Jewish Christian soil it was not autochthonous (cf. Vischer, 19 f.; Gunkel, S. C. 173 f.). The imagery is not native to messianism. It bears traces of adaptation from mythology. Thus, where it would have been apposite to bring in the messiah (ver. 7), Michael's rôle is retained, even by the Christian editor, while the general oriental features of the mother's divine connexion and her flight, the dragon's hostility and temporary rout, and the water-flood, are visible through the Jewish transformation of the myth into a sort of allegory of messiah, persecuted by the evil power which he was destined to conquer. "In reality it is the old story of the conflict between light and darkness, order and disorder, transferred to the latter days, and adapted by spiritualisation... to the wants of faithful Jews" (Cheyne, Bible Problems, 86). While the vision represents the messianic adaptation of a sun-myth, it is uncertain what the particular myth was, and whether the vision represents a Jewish source worked over by the prophet. In the latter case, the Christian redactor's hand is visible perhaps in 4 a and 5 (ὑποστ. τ. θ. αὐτῶν, cf. v. 5), certainly in xi (which, even apart from the Lamb, interrupts the sequence) and 17 c, if not
also in the whole of 10-12. If, in addition to this, the source was originally written in Hebrew, traces of the translator are to be found (so Gunkel, Kohler, and Wellhausen, after Ewald, Bruston, Briggs, and Schmidt) in 2 (οὐσίων τακεῦν, cf. 1 Sam. iv. 19 ὁ Ἱλοῦς) 5 (ὑπὸ καὶ ὦ θεὸς), 6 (ἔνων ... καὶ) δὲν ἑλέσθῃ; 8 (καὶ έκκεν Ι., cf. 14 and on iii. 8), 9 (the old serpent = ὁ ἔφτατος ἡ γῆς, cf. 14 and on iii. 8), possibly 10 (καὶ ἔφτατος ἡ γῆς), and 12 (καὶ έκκεν Ι., cf. Ἰς τόπον τοῦ προστατεύων). But whether the source was written or not, whether (if written) it was in Greek or not, and whether it was Jewish or Jewish-Christian, the clue to the vision lies in the sphere of comparative religion rather than of literary criticism. Its atmosphere has been tinged by the international myth of a new god challenging and deposing an older, or rather of a divine hero or child menaced at birth—a myth which once reflected the dangers run by the seed sown in the dark earth and also the victory of light (or the god of light) over darkness, or of light in the springtime over the dead winter. The Babylonian myth of Marduk, which lacks any analogous tale of Marduk's birth, does not correspond so aptly to this vision (cf. Intro. § 4 b), as does the well-known crude Egyptian myth (Bousses); Isis is a closer parallel than Ishtar, and still closer perhaps at one point is the κουρσορδίας of Hellenic mythology, who was often represented as virgin coelestis. But, if any local phase of the myth is to be assumed as having coloured the messianic tradition used by John, that of Leto would be particularly intelligible to Asiatic readers (cf., e.g., Pfeiderer, Early Christ. Conception of Christ, 56 f., after Dieterich's Abraxas, 117 f.; Maas, Orpheus, 251 f.). The dragon Python vainly persecuted her before the birth of Apollo; but she was caught away to a place of refuge, and her divine child, three days later, returned to slay the monster at Parnassus. This myth of the pregnant and threatened goddess-mother was familiar not only in Delos but throughout the districts, e.g., of Miletus and Magnesia, where the fugitive goddess was honoured on the local coinage. Coins of Hadrian's reign associate the myth with Ephesus (Ἑφέσιον άντων). At Hierapolis, "the story of the life of these divine personages formed the ritual of the Phrygian religion" (C. B. P. i. 93 f.); the birth of a god is associated with Laodicea, one coin representing an infant god in the arms of a woman (Persephone); while in the legend of Rhea, as Ramsay points out (C. B. P. i. 34), Crete and Phrygia are closely allied (cf. also Sib. Orac. v. 130 f.). All this points decisively to the Hellenic form of the myth as the immediate source of the symbolic tradition (so, e.g., J. Weiss, Aben., 99), though here as elsewhere in the Apocalypse the obscurity which surrounds the relations between Jewish or early Christian eschatology and the ethnic environment renders it difficult to determine the process of the latter's undoubted influence on the former. Fortunately, this is a matter of subordinate importance. The essential thing is to ascertain not the soil on which such messianic conceptions grew, but the practical religious object to which the Christian prophet, as editor, has freely and naively applied them. His design is to show that the power of Satan on earth is doomed. Experience indeed witnessed (12-17) to his malice and mischief, but the present outburst of persecution is only the last campaign of a foe whose efforts have been already baffled and are soon to be crushed in the inexorable providence of God. The prophet dramatically uses his source or tradition to introduce Satan as a baffled opponent of the messiah (cf. on xi. 7), who is simply making the most of his time (ver. 12). Mortus est mortem. Once this cardinal aim of the piece is grasped—and the proofs of it are overwhelming—the accessory details fall into their proper place, just as in the interpretation of the parables. In all such products of the poetical and religious imagination, picturesque items, which were necessary to the completeness and impressiveness of the sketch, are not to be invested with primary significance. Besides, in the case of an old story or tradition which had passed through successive phases, it was inevitable that certain traits should lose much if not all of their meaning.
These ancient traits, fragments of an earlier whole, which lack their proper connexion in the present account, and indeed are scarcely intelligible, as they have been wrested from the thought-sequence of the original writer, reveal to the expert the presence of an earlier form of the story" (S. C. p. 6.)

Chapter XII.—The procedure of the writer here is very much the same as in ch. xi. (see above). The oracle of xii. is not an allegorising version of history, nor an exegetical construction of O.T. texts, nor a free composition of the author, but the Christianised reproduction of a Jewish source (possibly from the same period as the basis of xi. 1-13, or at least from the same ββλαδίων, or at any rate a tradition, which described the birth of Messiah in terms borrowed from such cosmological myths as that of the conflict between the sun-god and the dragon of darkness and the deep. The psychological origin of such a Jewish adaptation would be explained if we presupposed a tradition similar to that of the later Talmud (Jer. Berach. fol. 5, 11) which described the messiah as born at Bethlehem and swept away from his mother by a storm-wind, just after the fall of Jerusalem. But this messiah is merely removed, not raised to heaven. And as we have no clear evidence that the stress of 68-70 &d. excited such a messianic hope among the Pharisees, it is hazardous to use this (e.g., Jülicher and Wellhausen still do) to prove that the date of the source is the same as that of xi. 1 f. The structure of the passage is equally ambiguous. a a presupposes something equivalent to ver. 7-9, while 13-16 is an expansion or variant of 6; and yet 13 is the natural sequel to 9 (12). These features have led to a variety of literary reconstructions. Spitta, e.g., takes ver. 6 as the Christian editorial anticipation of 13 f., and finds another Christian touch in ver. 11 (Weyland in 11 and 17 f.). J. Weiss puts 1-6 and 13-17 together, regarding 7-12 as an independent continuation of the third woe (editorial notes in 3, 11, and 17). Wellhausen (Analyse, 18 f) bisects the oracle into two parallel but incomplete variants (A = 1-6, B = 7-9, 13, 14), with 15-17 as an editorial conclusion. Others (e.g., Schönh and Calmes) find a Christian editor only in 10-12 (with 17 c of course), while Weizsäcker regards 13-18 as the expansion of 1-12 (a Jewish-Christian fragment of 64-66 &d.). Some of the incoherencies of the description are due, however, to the alterations necessitated by messianic belief in the circle of such ethnic traditions. The latter made the mother's flight precede the child's birth (as in 4, 5). But, on the messianic scheme, it was the child's birth which roused the full fury of the enemy and turned it into an outburst of baffled revenge upon the mother (6, 13 f.), after the child's escape. Furthermore, this activity of the devil on earth had to be accounted for by his dislodgement from heaven, as a result of the messianic child's elevation to heaven (7 f.). Hence the apparent inconsistencies, the shifting standpoint, and the amount of repetition and confusion are due to the presence of a messianic conception employing terms of earlier and inadequate mythology for its own purposes, rather than to any literary rearrangement such as the transposition of part of the trumpet-visions to 7-12 (Simcox, J. Weiss). The interest of the prophet in this source or tradition, as in that of xi. 1-13, centres in the outburst of the evil power which shows that the end is imminent. There the beast's attack on messiah's heralds is ultimately foiled. Here the dragon's attack on messiah himself is not only defeated but turned into a rout which obliges him to shift the scene of his campaign to a field where his deputies are presently to be annihilated. 

Vv. 1-2. ὑπὸ τῆς ὅλου almost "in the sky" (cf. ver. 4). A Greek touch: cf. Hom. Hliad, ii. 308, ἔτος ἐβάψει μέτα σφηναῖς δράκων ἐπὶ νέμα δαφνίων (i.e. fiery-red). Here as elsewhere mythological traits of the original source are left as impressive and decorative details. The nearest analogy is the Babylonian Damkina, mother of the young god Marduk and "queen of the heavenly tiara" (i.e., the stars, cf. Schrader, pp. 360, 361). For Hebrew applications of the symbolism cf. Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10 and Test. Naph. 5 (καὶ οἴονας ἤν ἀντίτροπος ὡς ἡ σέληνι καὶ ὅπου τοῖς ποδαῖς αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἡλίωσι). The Egyptian Osiris was also wrapped in a flame-coloured robe—the sun being the "body" of deity (Plut. de Iside,
The original figure was that of Israel personified as a pregnant goddess-mother, but it probably represented to the prophet the true Israel or Zion of God (Wernle, 276-288) in which His Christ had been born (cf. John xvi. 21, with John xiv. 30, also En. xx. 37). The idealisation was favoured by the current conceptions of Zion as pre-existent in heaven (cf. xix. 8, xxii. 8, and Apoc. Bar. iv. = swind) and as a mother (4 Esd. ix. 38-39). The prophet views the national history of Israel as a long preparation for the anguish and woe out of which the messiah was to come. "Tantae molis erat Christianam condere gentem" (Grotius). The idea is echoed in Ep. Lugd., where the church is "the virgin mother". The virgin-birth falls into the background here as in the Fourth Goepel, though for different reasons. The messiah of Apoc. xiii is not the son of Mary but simply born in the messianic context, and the description is no more than a transcendental version of what Paul notes in Rom. ix. 4, 5. The editor's interest lies not in the birth of messiah so much as in the consequences of it in heaven and earth. At the same time the analogies discovered between Cerinthus and this passage (by Volter and others) are wholly imaginary (Kohlfhofer, 53 f.).

Ver. 3.  

Vergil's serpents which attack Laocoön have blood-red crests, and Homer's dragon has a blood-red back, but here the trait (cf. above) is reproduced from the red colour of Typhon, the Egyptian dragon who persecuted Osiris (Plut. de Iside, 30-33). The seven heads are taken from the seven-headed hydra or mušmaḫu of Babylonian mythology. The devil's deputy in xiii. 1 (= the composite mušrušu of Babylonia) has the same equipment of horns and heads, but the diadem adorns his horns.

Here, to John's mind at any rate (cf. ver. 9), the dragon is not equivalent to any contemporary pagan power like Pompey (Ps. sol. ii. 29) or the king of Babylon. Ver. 4. The symbolism is a reminiscence of an astrological myth in astrology (cf. the cauda of the constellation Scorpio) and of the primitive view which regarded the dark cloud as a snake enfolding the luminaries of heaven in its hostile coils (Job iii. 8, xxvi. 13, with A. B. Davidson's notes). Thus the Iranians (S. B. E. iv. p. lxxiii., Darmesteter) described the fiend as a serpent or dragon not on the score of craftiness but "because the storm fiend envelops the goddess of light with the coils of the cloud as with a snake's fold". The same play of imagination would interpret eclipses and falling stars, and, when the pious were compared to stars (as in Egyptian theology, Plut. de Iside, 21), it was but a step to the idea of Dan. viii. (cf. Sib. Or. v. 512 f., the battle of the stars), where Antiochus Epiphanes does violence to some devout Israelites who are characterised as stars flung rudely down to earth (i.e., martyred; 1 Macc. i). Originally, this description of the dragon lashing its tail angrily and sweeping down a third of the stars probably referred to the seduction of angels from their heavenly rank (so 8-9) to serve his will (Weisse). But John, in recasting the tradition, may have thought of the Danielean application, i.e., of the devil succeeding in crushing by martyrdom a certain number of God's people. In this event, they would include at least, if they are not to be identified with, the pre-Christian martyrs of Judaism (cf. Heb. xi. 32 f. Matt. xxiii. 35).—στοναν, a conventional posture of the ancient dragon cf. e.g. Flin., H. N. viii. 3, " nec flexu multiplici ut reliquae serpentis cor-
7. As a preliminary to the battle in heaven (Ps. 115:16), the angel Mika'el makes this rare use of the genitive, even more clumsy and irregular than the similar construction in Acts 25 (where see note). The sense is plain, and it may be taken as a parallel for the use of ἐν τῷ ὀφραντι. from syntactical laxity than to conjecture subtle reasons for the blunder or to suggest emendations such as the addition of ἐν τῷ ὀφραντι to τάξιμος (Vit. i. 168), or of ἐν τῷ ὀφραντι before ἐν μ. κ. ἐν ἐν. ἐν, the latter being an irregular nominative, or the alteration of τολμάμβαν of Dust. or the simple omission of τάξιμος. 

Ver. 9. ἔρως and ἐφές are in the LXX interchangeable terms for the Leviathan or sea-monster of mythology, who is here defined as the old serpent (a rabbinical expression, cf. Gfrörer, i. 386-389); so Tiamat, the primaeval rebel, as dragon and serpent (cf. Rohde's Psyche, 371) had been identified in JE's paradise-story with the malicious and envious devil (ap. 22; En. xx. 7; Test. Reub. 5). The opponent of God was the adversary of man (cf. Oesterley's Evol. of Mess. Idea, 176 f.). Two characteristic traits of Satan are blended here: (a) cunning exercised on men to lure them into ruin (λίβαν), cf. 2 Cor. ii. 11, xiii. 3), and (b) eagerness to thwart and slander them before God (ver. 10, cf. En. xl. 7; Zech. iii. i 1). The second is naive and archaic, of course, in a Christian apocalypse.

Ver. 10. καταξίων (καταξίων) is the counterpart to the rabbinic (Lucken 22) title of συνήγορος given to Michael as a sort of Greatheart or advocate and protector of men (En. xi. 9). The Aramaic derivation of the word (Win. § 8. 13) is not absolutely necessary, as the papyri show that it might have sprung up on Greek soil (cf. Thumb, 126; Rademacher,
7—14. APOKALYPSE IOANNOU

"Арті έγένοτο ἡ «σωτηρία και ἡ δύναμις
καὶ ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ 'Ἄρτου

οἷς ἐβλήθη καὶ κατήγραφε τῶν αἰδελβών ἡμῶν,
ἐκατάγον γιὰν ἐπάνω τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ

μυκτῶν.

11. καὶ αὐτῶν ἐνίκηται αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δρόμου,
καὶ ταῦτα τὸ πτώμα τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν,
καὶ εἰκὸν ἡγάπησαν τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῶν δόξα ἐκεῖναν.

12. διὰ τοῦτο ἐφφαίνεσθε ὁ διάφανος καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁμοίων

νοῦντες.

όδιοι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν,
τοῖς κατέβαςς διὰ διάβολος πρὸς θάμα ἐξων θυμὸν μέγαν,
ἐφθασε δὲ ἢ διάλογον καὶ ἐξείλην τούτων ἐκεῖνων.

13. καὶ διὸ ἔδωκεν τὸ δράκων διὸ ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἔδινες τὴν

γυναῖκα 2 ἥτις ἔτεκε τὸν ἄρσενον. 14. καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικῇ
αἱ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ ἀντοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἐρήμον

n xviii. 20, Ps. cxvi. 11; only here (Apoc.) in plural. o viii. 13, cf. Sib. Or. iii. 322. p 33 years (6, 14), cf. xx. 3. q Cf. on i. 7. r viii. 2, xi. 1, etc., cf. Arist. Hist. Nat. x. 1, Hor. Od. iv. 4, 1, 9, Plut. Timol. xxvi. xvi. xvi. xvi. 10, Aesch. Choephe. 229 f., and Dan. vii. 4.

Rhein. Mus. lvii. 148). On the accuser's rôle cf. Sohar Levit. fol. 43 (ille semper stat tanquam delator coram rege Israelis) and the prayer of Jud. i. 20: "let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them to accuse them before thee and to turn them deceitfully from all the paths of righteousness" (where both traits are combined, cf. above on 9).

Ver. 11. This sentence, like ver. 7, suggests that earth's history is the reflex and outcome of transactions in heaven, on the common principle of Jalkut Rhub. (on Exod. xiv. 7): "there was war above (in heaven) and war below (on earth), and sore was the war in heaven". Satan's dislodgment from heaven is another (cf. on xi. 19) sign of messiah's approaching victory (cf. Yasna xxx. 8). What Jesus had already seen in his own victory over demons (Matt. xii. 24 f.; cf. J. Weiss, Predigt Jesu, 28 f., 85 f.), John hails from another standpoint, as inaugurating the messianic age. Vexilla regis prodeunt. How readily the mythological trait could be moralised is evident from a passage like Rom. viii. 33 f., of which Apoc. xii. 11 is a realistic variant. In the background lie conceptions like that of En. xl. 7 where the fourth angel of the Presence is heard "fending all the Satans and forbidding them to appear before the Lord of Spirits to accuse men". Ver. 11 chronologically follows ver. 17, but the author, by a characteristic and dramatic prolepsis, anticipates the triumph of the martyrs and confessors, who refute Satan's calumnies and resist his wiles. In opposition to the contemporary Jewish tradition (Ap. Bar. ii. 2, xiv. 12; 4 Esd. vii. 77, etc.), it is not reliance on works but the consciousness of redemption which enables them to bear witness and to bear the consequences of their witness. This victory on earth depends on Christ's previous defeat of evil in the upper world (Col. ii. 15; cf. above on ii. 10, also xxi. 8) which formed its headquarters.

Ver. 12. εφφαίνεσθε, cf. the Egyptian hymn in honour of Ra, the sun-god: "Ra hath quelled his impious foes, heaven rejoices, earth is delighted"—obel k.p.l. This desperate and last effort of Satan is a common apocalyptic feature (cf. e.g., 4 Esd. xiii. 16 f.; Ap. Bar. xxviii. 3, xlii. 1, lxxv. 5; Mark xiii. 21; Did. xvi.), which John identifies later with the Imperial cultus.

The dragon's pursuit of the woman (13-17) resumes and expands the hint of ver. 6.

Ver. 14. "The two wings of a huge griffon-vulture" (τῶν either generic ar-
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a. ver. 6. e1j tò tòv ósttás, 'đplou trófeita 'ekei kairón kai 'kairódv

Ver. 15. Another mythological metaphor for persecution or persecutors, like "torrents of Belial" (Ps. xviii. 4). As the primeval dragon was frequently a sea-monster, from Tiámáth onwards, his connexion with water (cf. on viii. 10) was a natural development in ancient (cf. Pausan. v. 43 f.) and even Semitic (e.g., Ps. lxiv. 4; Ezek. xxix., xxxii.) literature. The serpent in the river was, for Zoroastrians, a creation of the evil spirit (Vend. i. 3).

Ver. 16. The dragon is unexpectedly baffled by the earth, as the woman's ally, which swallows the persecutors like Korah, Damon, and Abiram (Num. xvi. 30-32). This enigmatic detail has not yet been paralleled from Jewish or early Christian literature, for Protes. 'Yacobi, 22 (cited by Selwyn, 7-9) is even more remote than 4 Esd. xiii. 44. Probably it was retained from the astrological setting of the original myth: Cetus, the aquatic dragon of the southern heavens, which astrologically is a watery region, casts forth the river of Eridanos, which is swallowed up in the zodiac as it flows down the heavens into the underworld.

Ver. 17. The baffled adversary now widens his sphere of operations.—7. an apocalyptic term = the derelict of relictio (cf. on xiii. 1). Ver. 18. "To get her swept away by the stream": w xi. 18 = "waxed wroth". y Cf. 2 John 1, 4, 13; also 1 Pet. i. 1-4, iv. 12 f. z 1 John ii. 3, iii. 28, 24, 1 Cor. vii. 19.
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pectation of Nero’s return from the underworld and the enforcement of the Imperial cultus. For the hypothesis of a Caligula-source in this chapter, cf. Introd § 6.

xii. 18.-xiii. 18: the saga of the woman and the red dragon (a war in heaven) is followed by the saga of the two monsters from sea and land (a war on earth), who, with the dragon, form a triumvirate of evil. First (xii. 18-19) the monster from the sea, i.e., the Roman Empire.

Ver. 18. The scene is the sea-shore, ex hypothesi, of the Mediterranean (Phad.), i.e., the West, the whole passage being modelled on Dan. vii. 2, 3, 7, 8, 19-27, where the stormy sea from which the monsters emerge is the world of nations (cf. 4 Esd. xi. 1: ecece ascendebeat de mari aqua, also xii. 1).

Chapter XIII.—Ver. 1. His ten horns first become visible. The prophet has shifted the diadems from the heads to the horns (thereby altering their number, of necessity), since he wishes to stamp the heads (i.e., the Roman emperors, cf. Sib. Or. iii. 176; Tac. Ann. xv. 47) with the blasphemous names. Hence the ten horns (successive monarchs in the Danielic oracle) are superfluous here, except as an archaic, pictorial detail in the sketch of this polyccephalous brute. Such grotesque, composite monsters were familiar figures in Persian and Babylonian mythology. The blasphemous title of divus, assumed by the emperors since Octavian (Augustus = άνδρον) as a semi-sacred title, implied superhuman claims which shocked the pious feelings of Jews and Christians alike. So did θεός and θεοῦ υἱός which, as the inscriptions prove, were freely applied to the emperors, from Augustus onwards. The imperial system, especially with its demand for imperial worship, appeared the embodiment of irreverence and profane infatuation (ver. 6). This calm usurpation of divine honours was inexplicable except on the supposition (ver. 2) that the empire was a tool or agent of the devil himself. Much had happened since Paul wrote Rom. xiii. 1-6, and even since Asiatic Christians had received the counsel of 1 Peter ii. 13 f.

Ver. 2. The empire gathered up all the obnoxious qualities of Israel’s former oppressors: craft, lust of blood, and vicious energy. Hence the combination of traits from Daniel’s four beasts: general appearance that of a fierce panther, feet like a bear’s (i.e., plantigrade), jaws like a lion’s (of devouring strength)—a Palestinian (Hos. xiii. 7, 8) picture of a perfect beast of prey, raging and ravening, before whom the church, like Dryden’s milk-white Hind, “was often forced to fly, And doom’d to death, though fated not to die.”—καὶ ἵψει κ.τ.λ., connecting the empire with the dragon of xii. and stamping it as Satanic (cf. Luken, 22 f.; Weinel, 11-12), as a weird and wild messiah of the devil on earth.

Ver. 3. The prophet sees in the empire an extraordinary vitality which adds to its fascination. Disasters which would suffice to ruin an ordinary state, leave
Rom. 3:18, 26. And, Acts, Ws., WH marg., Bs.) read το θερμον (CPQ, etc., andc., Areth., etc.). [The acc. is conformed to general usage of το θερμον, see ver. 8, 12, xiv. 9, 11, xx. 4.]

2 Read βλασφημη. A, 12, 28, 34, 35, 47, 79, 87, And., etc. (Lach. Al. Ws.): the idiomatic τιμησα has been early improved by the addition of ο θελε (Q) or τοπο 

Rome as strong as ever, thanks to her marvellous recuperative power. The allusion is not to the murder of Caesar (so e.g., Bruston, Gunkel, Porter), nor to the illness of Caligula (Spitta), but (so Düsterdieck, O. Holtzmann, B. Weiss, etc.) to the terrible convulsions which in 69 A.D. shook the empire to its foundations (Tac. Hist. i. 12). Nero's death, with the bloody interregnum after it, was a wound to the State, from which it only recovered under Vespasian. It fulfilled the tradition of the wounded head (Dan. viii. 8). So 4 Esd. xii. 18 (where the same crisis is noted) "post tempus regni illius [i.e., Nero's] nascentur contentiones non modicae et periclitabitur ut cadat et non cadet tunc, sed iterum constituetur in suum initium"; also Suet. Vesp. i and Joseph. Bell. iv. 11, 5, vii. 4, 2 (Rome unexpectedly rescued from ruin by Vespasian's accession). The vitality of the pagan empire, shown in this power of righting itself after the revolution, only added to its prestige. The infatuation of loyalty, expressing itself in the worship of the emperor as the personal embodiment of the empire, grew worse and worse. A comparison of 3 a with 12 (cf. 18) shows, however, a further allusion, viz., to the Nero redivivus belief (cf. Introd. § 5). This is not developed until xvii., but already the beast is evidently identified in a sense with one of its heads, who is a travesty (3 a = v. 6) of the Lamb, i.e., an antichrist. The context would certainly read quite naturally without 3 a, but it is implied in 12 (and 18), and none of the numerous attempts to analyse the chapter into source and revision is of any weight, in view of the general style and characteristics. These indicate the author's own hand. Even the translation-hypothesis (e.g., Bruston, Gunkel) leads to arbitrary handling. See Introd. § 6.

Ver. 4. All that had transpired—Nero's own death heralding a return, and the collapse of his dynasty proving no fatal blow to the empire—had simply aggrandised the influence of Rome. The Caesar-cult which characterised it was dubbed a worship of Satan by the indignant prophet. The hymn to the incomparable and invincible beast is a parody of O.T. hymns to God. In the following description (vv. 5-8) two traits are blended: insolent blasphemy towards God and almost irresistible powers of seduction over men. Both are adapted from the classical sketch of Antiochus Epiphanes (in Dan. vii. 8, 20, 25, xii. 7), the prototype of that anti-divine force whose climax had been reached, as the prophet believed, in the divine pretensions of the Caesars.

Ver. 5. "Big and blasphemous (or abusive; 2 Peter ii. 11) words." So Apoc. Bar. lxvii. 7: "surget rex Babylonis qui destruxit nunc Sionem et gloriarit super populo et loquetur magna in corde suo coram Altissimo".

Ver. 6. The days of Antiochus (Dan. viii. 10-12) have returned. On the claims
The omission of 70 in ACP, 1, 12, 14, 92, Arm. (soh.), Iren., Andp, Andavav (so Spitta) is due to homoeoteles.

of the emperor, see Introd. §6, and Sib. Or. v. 23, 34 (Nero leząv thv avtov), Asc. Isa. iv. 6-8, x. 13, etc.—tou... σκηνώντας, an exegetic gloss defining σινήγη (cf. xii. 7, 12). The temple in Jerusalem is no longer the scene and object of the beast's blasphemy.

Ver. 7. In Enoch xvi. 7 the rulers and kings “make themselves masters of the stars of heaven [i.e., the righteous], and raise their hands against the Most High”. The beast's world-wide authority goes back to the dragon's commission (a) but ultimately to divine permission (so in 5). There is a providence higher even than the beast.

Ver. 8. Standing on the verge of this crisis (note the change to the future tense), the prophet anticipates the almost universal success of the Caesar-cult (cf. iii. 10). Only the elect will be able to resist its appeal (cf. Matt. xxiv. 25). As in the O.T., the consciousness of predestination is made a moral lever (cf. xvii. 8). The rest of mankind who succumb to the cult are plainly not on the celestial burgess-roll or register. Cf. the instructive second-century gloss on Acts v. 39. As a rule the faithless in life are deceived (a Th. ii. 2-10; Asc. Isa. iv. 7, 8), but here the Imperial cultus occupies the place of the false prophet in Mark xiii. 12, etc.—του... άγνωσίαν, which transfers to Christ the possession of the divine register of citizens in the heavenly state, is usually taken as a scribe's gloss (after xxi. 27 where the position of άγνωσία is less difficult). Elsewhere the book of life appears by itself. In any case, άγνωσία goes with γέρασται, not άγνωσίαν.

Ver. 9. The prophet's nota bene introduces (ver. 10) what is either (a) a demand for patience and non-resistance, or (b) an encouragement to it. (a) "Be patient. If captivity is your destiny from God, accept it. If any one is (destined) for captivity, to captivity he goes (in God's order, άνοιξιν in a future sense). Show your patient faith in God by abstaining from the use of force" (cf. Matt. xxvi. 52). This interpretation (rejecting άνοιξιν or άνοιξιν in 10 a) is preferable to (b) that which reads (or even understands; with B. Weiss) άνοιξιν, άνοιξιν, or άνοιξιν (so some cursive and versions) in 10 a, and thus finds in the words a promise of requital rather than an appeal for endurance. The fate inflicted on Christians will recoil on their persecutors (cf. xiv. 12). Imprisonment or captivity and death were the normal fates of the age for criminals who refused to invoke the emperor's genius (cf. Jos. Bell. iii. 10. 10, vi. 8. 2, Philo: de Placc. 11, leg. ad Gaium, 32). A variation of this meaning would be: use force, and you (Christians) will suffer for it. The whole stanza is written for saints who, like Sigurd, are not born for blemishing.—σάκοι τ. Κ. Τ. Josephus (Bell. iii. 5. 8, etc.) had just given, from prudential motives, a similar warning to Jews against participating in any anti-Roman movement. It was always hard to abuse the Oriental mind of the idea that religious faith must be bound up with fate and fighting. Cf. Introd. §6.
Vv. 11-18: the Imperial alter ego or the second beast, a monster from the land (identified afterwards with the traditional "false prophet," xvi. 13, xix. 20, xx. 10). This mythological figure is not any individual like Simon Magus or Alexander of Abonoteichos or Apollonius of Tyana or Balaam redivivus, but a personification of some order or institution devoted to the interests of the empire on its religious side, i.e., the priests of the Caesar-cult in the provinces and especially (cf. Introd. § 6) in Asia Minor, where the local dignitaries acted through the Diet of Asia in order to superintend and popularise the cult (so Holtzm., Pfeiffer., Charles, Bartlet, Porter, Boussct, Forbes, Swete). The following description brings out the cunning, suavity, and arrogance of this sacerdotal power.

Ver. 11. η τῆς γῆς—the mythological trait is applied geographically to Asia Minor (i.e., the East). Here again the cosmological antithesis has been transformed into a political application. The marine monster cannot exercise dominion over the land except through an intermedial έκ τῆς γῆς. Cf. Apor. Bar. xix. 4, where the two beasts, Leviathan and behemoth, rise from the sea and the land, as in the ancient-Semitic and Babylonian mythology the dry land and the deep were the habitations of the two primeval monsters (En. ix. 7 f., 4 End. vi. 49 f.), who represented the chaos-opponent of heaven. The mild appearance of the beast (ὁμ. ἄρσιν does not mean that he deceived men with the name of the Lamb) is accompanied by a plausible appeal (cf. Weinel, 21 f.). The allusion (ver. 12), borrowed from the older dragon-myth, is to the seductive inducements held out by the Beast to Christians, such as considerations of loyalty, patriotism, self-interest, and the like. These are backed by (ver. 13) miracles, which together with magic are also connected with Nero redivivus in Asc. Isa. iv. 9-11 (cf. A. C. 175 f.). The deceptive influence of miracles was a sure sign of the end, in early Christian literature (cf. the lines of the προφήτης cited by Irenaeus, i. 15, 6). Most Oriental cults practised such tricks fancifully, and constant warnings against them were heard (cf. Weinel 9; Friedländer, iii. 458 f., 521 f.).

Ver. 14. As Beliar sets up "his image before him in every city" (Asc. Isa. iv. 11, after το = "and there will be the power of his miracles in every city and region"), so here the eleκῶν or bust of the emperor as the Neronic antichrist representing the empire (cf. the hint repeated from ver. 12 c) is brought forward along with the statues of the gods to receive offerings of wine and incense
from the citizens. For the naïve identification of such images with the deities they represented see Friedländer, iii. 500 f.— Μέμνων καλεῖτον (Blass § 72, 5). Ver. 15. The statue is made to speak, in order to work on the credulity and awe of the worshippers. The trick was well within the reach of contemporary magic (cf. Valer. Maxim. i. 8. 3-5), and later tradition attributed it to Simon Magus (Clem. Recogn. iii. 47, cf. Clem. Hist. i. 12), while still more curiously, the ceremony was practised by Apollonius of Tyana and Egyptian sorcerers at Caligula's court. Cf. Lucian's άυτόφεος χρησμὸς (Alex. 26).— ἄτοκτανῶσιν, cf. the scutcheon of Captain Pope in Bunyan's Holy War— "the stake, the flame, and the good man in it".

Vv. 16, 17. Detection was inevitable, for the very coins were stamped (Matt. xxii. 19) with the head of the Caesar, the gods, or Rome itself, and the prophet apparently expected that genuine Christians would refuse to sanction idolatry and condone blasphemy by handling such emblems of profanity (cf. Ign. ad Magn. 5. δύο νομίσματα, δύο μεθ' θεοῦ, δύο κόσμων). Only abject, servile devotees of the cultus will stoop to that! Ireneeus has a similar allusion (iv. 30. 2) to those who carried money "cum inscriptione et imagine Caesaris"— μέτεπερον. This highly figurative allusion is to the habit of marking soldiers and slaves with a conspicuous tattoo or brand (cf. Lucian, Dea Syra; 3 Macc. ii. 29, where the Alexandrian Jews are branded with the mark of Dionysius; also on Gal. vi. 17); or, better still, to the religious custom of wearing a god's name as a talisman (cf. Deissmann, 349 f.). The general sense of the prediction is that the faithful will be shut up to the alternative of starving or of coming forward to avow their prohibited faith, so subtly and diabolically does the curse of the emperor pervade all social life. Another solution is to think of the θέραγμα or red stamp, which was essential to all documents of exchange (Deissmann, 240 f.); it consisted of a red seal with the emperor's name or effigy. Ramsay (Seven Letters, pp. 106 f.) takes the whole description as a symbolic and rather sarcastic way of referring to a boycotting demand that every Asiatic Christian should somehow "stamp himself overtly and visibly as loyal, or be disqualified from participation in ordinary social life and trading". Probably the passage is a figurative and unqualified expression for conspicuous loyalty to the Imperial cult. In Ep. Lugd. the devil is said to work against Christ by "excluding us from houses, baths, and markets, and also by forbidding any one of us to appear anywhere".

Ver. 18. "Now for wisdom"—skill to penetrate the secret of the cryptogram.
which would reveal the features of the dread opponent. This cryptic method was a favourite apocalyptic device, due partly to prudential reasons, partly to the desire for impressiveness; Orientals loved symbolic and enigmatic modes of expression in religion (cf. Apoc. Bar. xxviii. 1, 2; Sib. Or. i. 141 f.; Barn. ix. 8, buried by Lucian in Alex. 11). The prophet here drops the rôle of seer for that of hierophant or cabbalist. He invites his readers to count the name or number of the Beast, i.e., to calculate a name whose letters, numerically valued on the fanciful principles of Gematria, would amount to 666. For John and his readers the Beast was primarily the foreign power which opposed the divine kingdom, i.e., in this case, the Roman empire. But the drift of the present oracle is the further identification of the empire with the emperor, or rather (ver. 3) with one emperor in particular. Hence the prophet throws out the hint which will solve his riddle: the number of τοῦ θηρίου is ἄρματος ἄρματον, i.e., of a historic personality. Ἄρματος does not require τινὸς or ἐνὸς before it to bring this out. The only intelligible sense of the words is "a human number," i.e., not a number which is intelligible (for no other kind of number would be worth mentioning) but one which answered to an individual. Hence it is a matter of comparative indifference what the number of the Beast originally meant — TEITAN (so recently Abbott 80 f. = Titus, Teitous), Η ΑΤΕΙΝΗ (ITALIΛΗ), BACILEIA (Clemens), ΑΤΕΙΝΟC. ΡΩΣΙΟΝ (= 616), ΡΩΣΙΟΝ (616), Nimrod (בנרי), or any other (cf. Cheyne's Traditions and Beliefs of Anc. Israel, p. 248). This generic number is expressly identified or equalised by John with the number of an individual, viz., Nero Caesar (ςτρατός), the Greek letters of which yield 666. The defective writing of ράι (without the yod) is not unexampled. Besides, the abbreviated form would gain, at a very slight expense, this telling and symetrical cipher. Furthermore, when the last letter of Nero is dropped, this Latinised spelling brings the total value of the name to 616, the very variant which puzzled Irenæus. Gunkel's proposal ἡλιομετρία (primal chaos = Tiamat) suffers from several flaws; it omits the article, it employs a feminine ending which is not used in adjectives of this type, and "primal" is not a conventional epithet of mystery (cf. G. F. Moore in Journ. Amer. Oriental Society, 1906, 315 f.). Besides, as Gunkel admits, there are no Babylonian parallels to xiii. 11-17. Thus, while the application of the term is obvious, its origin is obscure. The basis of such contrivances (which became popular in Gnostic circles) was twofold: (a) gematria, which, using Greek and Hebrew letters to denote numbers, could often turn a name into a suggestive cipher; (b) isopsephia, which put two words together of the same numerical value (cf. for instances of λαβάνας, Farrar 468 f. and Conybeare). Probably the number of the Beast belonged to tradition. John plays upon it in order to disclose the shuddering climax of his oracle, that the final foe of the saints was Nero redivivus. The particular number 666 was specially apt as a symbol for this anti-divine power, since it formed a vain parody of the sacred number seven (Gfrörer notes further the ominous usage of 18 = 6 + 6 + 6 in Judges iii. 14, x. 8; Jerem. xxxii. 1, lxi. 29; Luke xiii. 1, etc.), always falling short of it. In Sib. Or. i. 324 f. 888 represents Christ, and Origen (on Ezek. iv. 9) remarks, apropos of the present passage, ἡ τινὶν ἄρματος ἄρματον σάλβων σώματον καὶ κατάφερα τοῦ σωτῆρος τῇ ἐκτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἄνθρωπων. Irenæus explains the suitability of the number as "in recapitulationem uniusserae apostasiae eius, quae facta est in sex millibus annorum" (adv. Haer. v. 28, 2). Thus the very number 666 by itself, may have been significant of the anti-divine power. The Neronic application would intensify and concentrate its meaning for John's readers who were initiated. And such calculations, as the Pompeii graffiti prove, were familiar even
The prophet does not stop to elaborate this independent anticipation of xx. 4-6, but hurries on (6 f.) to depict the negative side, viz., the downfall of the enemy. When Caligula first attempted to enforce his worship on the Jews, the pious flung themselves on the ground, "stretching out their throats" in their readiness to die sooner than let their God be profaned (Jos. Bell. ii. 10, 4; Ant. xviii. 8, 3).

John desiderates an equally dauntless temper in Christians, though they could not hope to avert, as the Jews had done, the imperial propaganda of the false prophet (xiii. 16 f.; cf. 2 Thess. ii.). Martyrdom (xiv. 13, cf. xiii. 15) was all that the majority could expect. But loyalty would bring them ultimate triumph. The passage is not simply Christian but from the hand of the prophet himself.

Ver. 1. Instead of the beast, the Lamb; instead of the beast's followers and their mark, the Lamb's followers with the divine name; instead of the pagan earth, mount Zion. The vision is based on an old Jewish apocalyptic tradition, copied by the Christian editor of 4 Esdras (ii. 42) but already present in the Jewish original (xiii. 35: Ipsi [i.e., Messiah] stabit super cacumen montis Sion, 39 et quoniam udiasti eum collegiorem ad se aliam multitudinem pacificam, has sunt decem tribus), which apparently described (cf. Joel ii. 32) a further cycle of the tradition underlying vii. 1-8. The appearance of this manlike messiah on mount Zion was accompanied by the manifestation of the celestial Zion (postponed here till xxi.). Thus, xiv. 1-5 is, in some respects, a companion panel to vii. 9 f., though the retinue of messiah are painted in more definitely Jewish colours. They are distinguished for their testimony borne against the Imperial cultus and the contaminations of the pagan world.

Ver. 3. Who sing the new song? angels or the redeemed? In v. 9 it is chanted not before the living creatures and elders but by them; here it is not originally sung by the redeemed (as in xv. 3 and 4 Esd. ii. 42) but is intelligible to them and to them alone. Their experi-
ence enabled them to enter into its meaning. This privilege is due to (vv. 4-5) their previous character and conduct. This inner circle are ascetics,  

i.e., not merely unmarried or free from sexual vice but celibates (cf. Cheyne, Orig. Psalter, 446; Hoennicke, das Judenthristentum, 1908, 130 f.; Baldensperger, 109; von Dobschütz, 228, 261); cf. 1 Cor. vii. 32. The prevailing Jewish respect for marriage did not check a tendency to celibacy which was by no means confined to the Essenens or Therapeutae. Even Methodius, who allegorizes the seven heads of xii. 3 into the seven deadly sins and the stars of xii. 2 into heretics, takes this phrase literally, in the sense of virginity not simply of purity (so Epiph. Har. xxx. 2); and, although the two are too incidental to bear pressing, it is unmistakable (cf. Introd. § 6). In the popular religion of Phrygia there was a feeling (expressed in the eunuchism, e.g., of the priests at Hierapolis) that one came nearer to the divine life by annihilating the distinction of sex, while in the votive inscriptions of Asia Minor (C. B. P. i. 137) marriage is not recognized as part of the divine or religious life. This atmosphere of local feeling, together with the lax moral conscience of the popular religion, would foster the religious tendency to regard celibates as pre-eminently near to God.—αὐτοὶ θεοῖ: either a historic present to secure vividness (ἀξιολογοῦσιν, syr. S), in which case the allusion is to their earthly loyalty (refr.), or, more probably (in view of ὑποτάσσεται, pres.), a description of their heavenly privilege and position (cf. vii. 17), borrowed from Egyptian religion where the “followers of Horus,” the divine and victorious son of Osiris, were a series of celestial kings who were supposed to have reigned during the earlier dynasties. To be among the “followers of Horus” was an equivalent for immortal life. Cf. E. B. D. 101: “Let me rise up among those who follow the great God; I am the son of Maat, and that which he abominate is the spirit of falsehood [cf. Apoc. xiv. 5]. I am in triumph!”—τῷ δῶρῳ in 3, 4 is equivalent to the partitive ὧν (cf. v. 9).— 

ἀρχηγόι: they form the firstfruits of mankind for God; others are to follow, but these are the ἐλίτρα, they have a prestige all their own. The idea of priority shades into that of superiority, though in a very different way from that of Rom. xi. 16. Dr. Rendel Harris (in Present Day Papers, May, 1901) describes the interest and excitement at Jerusalem during the early days of summer when “the first ripe figs were in the market. When one’s soul desires the vintage or the fruitage of the summer . . . the trees that are a fortnight to the fore are the talk and delight of the town.”—καὶ τ. &., usually taken as a scribe’s gloss. Elsewhere the saints are redeemed by, not for, the Lamb (v. 9).

Ver. 5. ἔμμοι, “unblemished” (a ritual term), possibly contains a sacrificial tinge, like ἀρχηγόι in some of the inscriptions (= gift to deity), cf. Thieme’s Inschriften von Magnesia, 26. These
adherents are redeemed. But in another aspect their qualities of purity and guilelessness form a sweet sacrifice to God. A Christian not only may be redeemed but may sacrifice himself in the interests of the Redeemer. ψυχον. In view of xxi. 8, 27, xxii. 15 it is superfluous to think of the prophets or teachers specially (Weinel, 146-148) in this connexion, although the gifts of utterance and prophecy were particularly associated with asceticism (En. lxxiii., civii., etc.) in the early church of the first century; e.g., "the whole yoke of the Lord" in Did. vi. may refer to celibacy (in which case μακάχω would be equivalent to διαμωσιν here). Cf. the discussion of reasons, in a Babylonian incantation (Zimmern, die Beschworungstafeln Shurpu, 5, 6), why the sufferer was punished. "Has he for 'no' said 'yes', | For 'yes' said 'no'? ... Was he frank in speaking | but false in heart? | Was it 'yes' with his mouth | but 'no' in his heart?" The Assyrian idiom for loyalty is "true speech in the mouth of the people," neither rebellious nor seditious talk.

vv. 6-20: the fearful doom of the impotent pagans is announced in a triple prophet of angels (ver. 6-13), whereupon a proleptic summary of the final judgment on the world follows (ver. 14-20). In 6-13, 12-13 and κατ Τ. Α. (10) are the only specifically Christian touches; but the latter need not even be a scribal gloss, and 6-13 is intelligible as the outburst of a vehement Jewish Christian apocalyptist. The stylistic data do not justify any hypothesis of an edited source. The first angel (6-7) announces (εστίνεις) here, and perhaps also in x. 7, in neutral sense of LXX, 2 Sam. xviii. 19-20; Dio Cass. lxi. 12) to the universe the news that the divine purpose is now to be consummated, but that there is still (cf. xi. 3) a chance to repent (implicit, cf. Mark i. 15). The sterner tone of viii. 13-ix. 21 is due to the fact that men were there accounted as strictly responsible for their idolatry and immorality. Here the nations are regarded as the first instance as having been seduced by Rome into the Imperial cultus (8-9); hence they get a warning and a last opportunity of transferring their allegiance to its rightful object. The near doom of the empire, of which the prophet is convinced even in the hour of his aggrandisement (xiii. 8), is made a motive for urging her beguiled adherents to repent in time and her Christian victims to endure (xiv. 12). The substance of this proclamation is not much of a gospel, and the prophet evidently does not look for much result, if any. Its "pure, natural theism" (Simcox) is paralleled by that of Rom. ii. 5 f.

Ver. 6. πετόμενον: angels begin to fly in the Jewish heaven about the beginning of the first century B.C. (En. lxi. 1)."

Ver. 7. τοίχως ετοιμάτων Κ. Τ. Λ. Since he who has created has the right to judge his creatures, as well as to receive their worship (cf. iv. 11 f., etc.). δομα = the fixed (cf. 15), καιρός the fit, moment for action. Contrast with this summons Lucan's fulsome appeal to Nero (i. 57 f.): "librati pondera coeli Orbe tene medio," etc. The second angel of the trio announces the faults and fall of (ver. 8) Rome as a second Babylon. The prophet quotes from the postexilic oracle appended to Jeremiah (Jer. ii. 7-8). θυμός has probably the double sense carried by the English term "passion." As history proves, the Caesar cult fairly intoxicated people, especially in the East. In Asia Minor it became a perfect passion with many communities. They will find it a different kind of passion, the prophet
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APOKALYPSE IΩANNNOU

14.

καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ ἄνω τῶν ὀφρανῶν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ "θάλασσαν καὶ ἡγιάζας ὅστις."

8. καὶ ἀλλος ἄγγελος δεύτερος ἢ ἥδεσθεν λέγειν,

"Εσπεύξας δ' έσπεύξας Ἡβαβυλών ἢ ἡ μεγάλη "

ἢ ἐκ τοῦ οἴου [τοῦ θυμοῦ] τῆς πορείας αὐτῆς πεντυκέ

πάντα τὰ ἑδή." 9. καὶ ἀλλος ἄγγελος τρίτος ἥδεσθεν αὐτῶν λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, "Ει τις προσκυνεῖ ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα αυτοῦ καὶ

λαμβάνει χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μετέπειτα αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπί τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ, 2

τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οἴου τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κεκραυγοῦν ἀκρατῶ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῆς δρογῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ

βεσανθόθεσται ἐν πυρὶ καὶ "θείων ἐνώπιον ἄγγελων ὅλων" (σον.

viii. 4, 12, 17; with Acts iv. 24, xiv. 15.
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(so xvii. 5), Moul. i. 3; cf. Isa. xxi. 9. e 1 Pet. v. 17. f Dan. iv. 27 (30), Jer. ii. 58. Seductive influence of idolatry (as in xiii. 2, Jer. i. 2). b xiii. 12-17. i gen. as xvii. 3, etc.

be as well as Babylon; cf. on iii. 20. 1 Jer. xxvii. 1-17, 27-29, 33-15, also Ps. xiv. 9, Ps. Sol. vii. 15. See below at xvi. 10. 9. 1 Pet. xii. 3. m cf. Jos. Ant. vii. 6, 1, viii. 9, 8, etc. n Cf. on 13.

35. 6.

§35. 6! Cp.xvii. 2.

grimly writes, drawing on a powerful O.T. figure; the passion of God's hot indignation will be forced down their throats, like a bitter draught (ver. 10). ἔθρος, however, besides translating a Hebrew equivalent for "fury" (Isa. li. 17 f.), is occasionally a LXX rendering for the analogous idea of "venom" or "poison" (ἡμίν or ἦπιον); cf. Job xx. 16), and this would yield a good sense here.

Vv. 9-11. The third angel proclaims that the deliberate adherents of the Imperial cultus are to be held responsible for their actions, and punished accordingly. The object is that these votaries may be "scared into faith by warning of sin's pains". The plea of force (xiii. 12) is no excuse (cf. Matt. x. 28).

Ver. 10. κεκραυγόντων here as in xviii. 6 by oxyymoron = "poured out," the original meaning of "mixed" (with water) being dropped. The torture (depicted from Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10) is inflicted before the holy angels (who evidently sit as assessors at the judgment, En. xviii. 9), ἀλλοι being either an epitaphion ornans or an allusion to xii. 8-9. Normally the prophet refrains from introducing such spectacles of doom (xix. 20, xx. 10-14). "Fire is the divine cruelty of the Semitic religions" (Doughty), but the torment which Judaism designed for fallen angels and apostates is assigned here to the worshippers of the Caesars. The Apocalypse is silent upon agents of torture; they are not the angels, much less the devil (who is himself punished, xx. 10). But, like 4 Esd. vii. [ver. 36] ("the furnace of Gehenna shall be disclosed and over against it the paradise of delights"), John locates the place of torment over against the place of rest. For such grim popular fancies Enoch (xxvii. 2, 3, xlviii. 9, xc. 26, 27) is mainly responsible; there (as in Clem. Hom. xvii.) the tortures proceed under the eyes of the righteous, though (especially in the later fragments, as in John's Apoc.) the moralisation of the idea has advanced, until Gehenna vanishes from the scene of bliss. "It is impossible for us to understand how such a sight could be compatible with heavenly happiness" (Stanton, Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 341; cf. Lecky's European Morals, ii. 225 f.), but the psychological basis of the ghastly expectation can be verified in the cruder types of primitive and modern religion. Most critics delete καὶ ἄγγελων τοῦ ἄγνων ὅλων as another gloss (cf. on ver. 4); the position of Jesus after the angels is not unexampled (cf. i. 4, 5), even if before the holy angels were not
8-13. ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ

[kai ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρίτον].

I. kal ὁ κατός τοῦ ἑβασμαθέων ὥς meto-
adóth περί ἕλιος ἀναβαῖνει καὶ ὁ ἔχων ἀνάπαυσιν

ημέρας καὶ μικτὸν οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θείον καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰ τις λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ ὁμόματος αὐτῶν:] 12. Ὁ δὲ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ.

I. καὶ ἦκοσιος φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ὀραματίων Λεγοῦσθη "Γράφων, ἦττα εἰς τοὺς Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθηκόμενοι αἵτωτες.

Ναὶ, "Λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα. Ἡμᾶς ἀναπαύσονται εἰς τῶν κόσμων αὐτῶν.

"τὰ γὰρ ἑργὰ αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν."

13. καὶ ΚΟΥocardwP|oouc tou oukαγανουομ "Γράφων, ἦττα εἰς τοὺς Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθηκόμενοι αἵτωτες.

Ver. 12. The prospect of this fearful and imminent retaliation is not only a warning to weak-minded Christians but a consolation to the loyal. To be a saint is to obey God and to believe in Jesus at all costs. Contemporary Jews took a similar encouragement: "if ye endure and persevere in his fear, and do not forget him, the times will change over you for good, and ye will see the consolation of Zion." (Apoc. Bar. xiv. 7). John’s words ταῦτα ταῦτα τὰ ἐν τούτοις τὰ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, are an answer to the complaint and claim that God’s commandments were being neglected by every one except the Jews (cf. the plaintive cry of 4 Esd. iii. 33: "I have gone hither and thither through the nations and seen their abundance, though they remember not thy commandments"; 32, "Is there any other nation that knoweth thee save Israel? yet their reward appeareth not, and their labour hath no fruit")

Ver. 13. The approaching climax of retribution upon pagan Rome affects the dead as well as the living. The latter are encouraged to hold on in hope; the former are brought nearer their reward (cf. vi. ii. xi. 18). "Ἀπέφραται goes with μακάριοι (note here and in Clem. Rom. xlvii. the first application of μ. to the dead saints) rather than with ἀποθηκόμενοι, and εἰ ἐν κ. ἀγωγ. (which is timeless, like προσκ. τ. θ. in ver. 11) denotes all who die in the faith, loyal to their Lord, i.e., primarily martyrs and confessors (cf. xiii. 8, 15). They die "in His fellowship, as it were in His arms" (Beyschlag). Like Paul (in 1 Thess. iv. 15), though on different grounds, the writer is contoversing a fear (cf. 4 Esd. xiii. 24) that at the advent of messiah those who survived on earth would have some advantage over those who had already died. "Yea, saith the Spirit"—ratifying what has been said—"I have gone to rest from their labours" (i.e., their Christian activities, not the special form of their death for the faith). So far as the sense is concerned, it matters little whether ης κ. τ. ἅ depends on μακάριοι or ἀποθηκόμενοι. Both constructions are grammatically legitimate, though the former is perhaps closer. The point of the passage (note πνεῦμα and γράφων, as in i.iii., xxii. 6 ff.) is that the bliss of death for a Christian consists not in mere rest from labour but in a rest which brings the reward of labour. While death brings the rest, the reward cannot be given till the final judgment. Consequently the near prospect of the latter is welcome, among other reasons, because it means the long-deferred recompense (xi. 18) for the faithful dead. So far from being forgotten (ii. 2 f., 19, 23, etc.), their ὑπάρχοντα accompany them to judgment and—it is implied—receive their proper reward there (cf. Milton’s fourteenth sonnet). The bliss of the departed therefore depends upon two grounds; their ὑπάρχοντα are not to be overlooked, and the interval of waiting is now (Ἀπέφραται) brief. The fourth degree of bliss in 4 Esd. vii. [95] is that the departed spirits of the just understand the rest which, gathered in their chambers (cf. Apoc. vi. 9-11) they can enjoy now with deep quietness, guarded by angels, as well as the glory.
which still awaits them in the latter days."

John does not share the current pessimistic belief (cf. Apoc. Bar. xi.-xii. 4, Verg. Aen. i. 94 f., with Isr. lvi. 1 f.) that death was preferable to life, in view of the overwhelming miseries of the age. His thought is not that death is happier than life under the circumstances, but that if death came in the line of religious duty it involved no deprivation. The language reflects Gen. ii. 2 (with κατωθύν for ἀπογεύσατο), but while it is true enough, it is hardly apposite, to think of the dead as resting from works (Heb. iv. 9), no more being needed. The passage lies not in the eschatian belief (Brandt, 423 f., Böken, 41) that the soul was escorted by its good deeds to bliss in another world (cf. Maas, Orphus, 217 f.), but in the closer soil of Jewish hope (cf. Bacher's Agada d. Tanaiten, i. 399 f.; Volz 103) as in En. ciii. 2, 3, Apoc. Bar. xiv. 12, 13, and Pirke Aboth vi. 9 (hora discussus hominis non coniunctur sum argentum aut aurum aut lapides pretiosi aut margaritae, sed lex et opera bona). In 4 Esd. vii. 35 (where, at the resurrection of the dead, "the work shall follow and the reward be disclosed") ὁ σωτήρ may be a Hebraism for "recompense" (Ps. cix. 20 ἰδεῖν, cf. 1 Ti. v. 25). Contemporary Jewish eschatology also took a despairing view of the world (cf. 4 Esd. iv. 26-33). But while the dead are pronounced "blessed," e.g., in Apoc. Bar. xi. 7, it is because they have not lived to see the ruins of Jerusalem and the downfall of Israel. Better death than that experience! Death is a blessing compared with the life which falls upon times so out of joint (x. 6 f.). The living may well envy the dead. In John's Apocalypse, on the other hand, the dead are facilitated because they miss nothing by their martyrdom. Yet life is a boon. No plaintive, weary cry of Weltschmerz rises from the pages of this Apocalypse.—ἈΒΙΚΤΩ in the papyri means relief from public duties or the "resting" of land in agriculture (cf. U. Wilcken's Archiv f. Papyrologie, i. pp. 157 f.).

Vv. 14-20, in their present position, are a proleptic and realistic summary of the final judgment, representing as a divine catastrophe what xvi.-xvii. delineate as the outcome of semi-political movements (cf. xviii. after xvii.). The strange picture of messiah (14 f., contrast 1. 10 f., xiv. 11 f.), the absence of any allusion to the Beasts (9-11) or to the imperial cultus, the peculiar angelology, and the generally disparate nature of the scene as compared with the context, point to the isolated character of the episode. The abrupt mention of the city (20) suggests that the tradition belonged to the cycle underlying xi. 1-13 (the city, 13), and several critics (e.g., Spitta, Erbes, Weiland, Volz, Schön, Briggs, Rauch) regard it variously as a finale to the oracles of that chapter. But the connexion is one of tradition rather than of literary unity. The data of style and content leave it uncertain even whether the episode goes back to a source or a tradition, whether it is Jewish (so especially Sabatier, Pfeiderer, and Rauch) or Jewish Christian (Schön, Erbes, Bruton, J. Weiss, etc.), and, if Jewish Christian, whether it was written by the author of the Apocalypse (Weissacker) or not. The least obscure feature is the victory of the messiah over antichrist and his legions (not of an angelic judgment on Israel, J. Weiss) in the vicinity of Jerusalem (cf. xi. 13, xiv. 1 f., and xx. 9) at the end of the world, an expectation of which we have another variant apparently in xix. 11 f. Probably the prophet inserts the episode here in order to restate, in a graphic and archaic, although somewhat incongruous fashion, the final doom of which he has just been speaking and to which he is about to lead up (xv-xx.) through a fresh series of cataclysmes. "If one might venture to wish to discard as an interpolation any part of the attested text of the Apocalypse, it would be this passage. How can it be understood of anything but the final judgment? Yet it comes here as anything but final. . . . The earth goes on just as before" (Simcox). But here, as often elsewhere, the clue lies partly in the vivid inconsequence of dream-pictures, partly in the preacher's desire to impress his hearers, and partly in the poetic, imaginative freedom of his own mind.

Ver. 14. This royal, judicial figure is evidently the messiah (drawn from Dan. vii. 13, which had been already interpreted thus in En. xxxvii.-lxxi. and 4.
14—18.

**APOKALYPSE IOANNOU**

15. *καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος εἶδον ἕκατον θανάτου δέοντος καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης.*

16. *καὶ ἐβάλεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης τῷ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.*

17. *καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος εἶδον τὸ νοῦν τοῦ ὀμοίωμαν εἰς τὸ οὐρανόν.*

18. *καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος εἶδον εἰς τὸν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς ἐρείπων ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός, καὶ ἄφωνης φωνῆς μεγάλης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐχοντι τῷ δρέπανον τῷ δέον λέγων,*

*lightning, fire, etc., in Josh. ii. 9. Here—viii. 5, the angel of fire.*

1. *Before ἔχων Lach., Al., Tr. (marg.), Wa. [WH], [Sw.] add the o of AC, vg., Syr., S.*

**Ead. xiiii.** The crown (omitted in i. 13 f.) was a familiar appurtenance of deity in Phrygia (e.g., of Apollo); for the cloud as the seat of deity, cf. Verg. Aen. ix. 638-640, etc.

*Ver. 15. ἄλλος ἄγγελος,* as in ver. 6. The alternatives are (a) to translate "another, an angel" (Ἄλλος ἄγγελος) which might be the sense of the Greek (cf. Od. i. 132, Clem. Protrept. ix. 87, 3) but is harsh, or (b) to take the figure of ver. 14 as an angel (Porter) and not as the messiah at all (which, in the face of i. 13, is difficult). The subordinate and colourless character of the messiah is certainly puzzling, and tells against the Christian authorship of the passage. Messiah is summoned to his task by an angel, and even his task is followed up by another angel's more decisive interference. He seems an angelic figure (cf. on xix. 17), perhaps primus inter pares among the angels (so En. xvi. 1: "and I saw another being [i.e., the Son of Man] whose countenance had the appearance of a man, and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels"). The conception was inconsistent with John's high Christology, but he may have retained it, like so much else, for its poetic effect, or as part of a time-honoured apocalyptic tradition. That the messiah should receive divine instructions through one of his comrades (Heb. i. 6, 9; cf. Zech. ii. 3, 4) was perhaps not stranger than that he should require an angel in order to communicate with men (i. 1). Φώνη κατ. The double figure of judgment (harvest and vintage) is copied from the poetic parallelism of Joel iii. 13; the independent rendering of Πάνω by τὸ πάνω and ἐβαλεν, and the change of agent from messiah (14-16) to an angel (17-20, so Mark xiii. 39 f.), show that the writer is using the Hebrew of that passage (where God does the reaping).

*Ver. 16. The δρέπανον only here, xiv. 14-19, in Apocalypse; cf. C. B. P. ii. 652 f. for a Phrygian inscription καὶ τὸ δρέπανον ἐκ τῶν ἔκων αὐτοῦ) is represented as a living thing, probably like the δρέπανον πετρυμόν of Zech. v. 1 (Wellhausen). The classical use of reaping to symbolise death and resurrection is too common to need illustration. "The harvest of the earth is ripe and dry," but this ripeness of paganism for judgment (Jer. ii. 33) is re-stated dramatically (17-20) in a parallel O.T. symbol from the wine-press. The angelic misericorde recalls that of viii. 3-5. Unlike the harvest-symbol, the vintage-symbol is worked out vividly (cf. Gen. xlix. 11; Isa. lixii. i. f.).

*Ver. 18. Πυρὸς.* The figure of this angel (=Jehuel in rabbinic tradition, Gfröer, i. 369) has an Iranian tinge. The justice of the punishment is attested by its origin in the purpose of one who corresponded to the Persian Amhaspand (cf. on i. 4). Ashem Vahishtan, who presided over fire and at the same time symbolised the closely allied conceptions of goodness, truth, and right in Zoroastrian mythology (cf. H. J., 1904, 350).
A similar representation of an angel speaking from the fire in connexion with providence occurs in Chag. 14 b.

Ver. 19. The ungrammatical τῶν μέγεν, may be due to the fact that λαός is occasionally masculine (Win. § 8. 10; Helbing, 46), or — by a rough constr. ad sensum — to apposition with τῶν θυμών (understood).

Ver. 20. The heathen are stamped and crushed till their blood gushes out of the wine-press to the height of a horse’s bridle and to the extent of about two hundred miles. This ghastly hyperbole, borrowed partly from Egyptian (wine = the blood of those who fought against the gods) and partly from Jewish eschatology (En. c. 3: “and the horses will walk up to the breast in the blood of sinners, and the chariot will be submerged to its height”), happens to be used later by the Talmud in connexion with the carnage at Bethera (cf. Schlatter’s Die Tage Trajans, p. 37; also Sib. iii. 633 f.; 4 Esd. xv. 35; Sib. Ital. iii. 704). The place is to be a veritable Senlac (sang lac). — ἀπὸ κ. τ. Λ. possibly a round number (see crit. note) compounded out 4 and its multiples (like 144,000 out of 12), to denote completeness (Vict. = per omnes mundi quattuor partes). After the fall of Rome (xiv. 8 f.), the rest of the wild (ex kypotesi impotent, xiv. 6-8) is ripe for the traditional (Dan. ix. 26) judgment. The same sequence is reproduced roughly and on a larger scale in xvii.-xviii. (fall of Rome) and xix.-xx. (doom of other nations). This parallelism and the sense of the Joel passage militate against the attractive idea that xiv. 14-20 is the ingathering of the saints (so Alford, Milligan, Bruston, Briggs, Titius, Gilbert, and Swete). — ἔδωκα κ. τ. Λ. This fearful vengeance is located by Jewish tradition in some valley (of Jehoshaphat = Yah judge) near Jerusalem (Joel), on the mount of Olives (Zecch. xiv. 4), or in Palestine generally (Dan. xi. 45; cf. below on xvi. 16), i.e., as a rule in close proximity to the sacred capital, where the messiah was to set up his kingdom.

After this partial anticipation of the final catastrophe, the Apocalypse returns to a fuller and independent description of its processes (xv. 2-4 = xiv. 1-5, xv. 1, 5-xvi. = xiv. 6-11, 14-20). The panorama of the prelude is once more sevenfold, but this time seven angels (under the control of God, xvi. 9) drench the earth with plagues from seven bowls which are brimming with the divine anger. The vision is a poetical expansion of Lev. xxvi. 21 (προσέχοντων μην υπηληγᾶται ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰ κατὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁμοίας, cf. 18, 24, 28). The plagues, like Habakkuk’s theophany, recall the Egyptian plagues (Exod. vii.-x.), but their description is less impressive than the previous cycles of punishment. Like the seven trumpets (viii. 2-5), they are introduced by a scene in heaven (xv. 2-4); ver. 1 is merely a title or frontispiece to what follows (5 f.), since the angels do not become visible till 5 (cf. viii. 1-2, 6), and do not receive their bowls till 7. This δεοματών (awe-inspiring) σήμαιν is the sequel (ἴλλοι) to that of xii. 1 f., and the plagues are final (τὰ ἔργατάς), in contrast to the trumpet-plagues (ix. 20), as they represent the wrath of God which can no longer be repressed (xvii.-xix. = the working out of these plagues, cf. xvi.)
XV. 1. Kal eisoun allo smeion en t' odran megé kai a

a. thumaotht, ugglaous enta eoxonta planega entr tás elekta, óti b x. 7. 

b. eis a'nyan tê leptadph o' thma t' Teth. 

c. d iv. 6, name scene (cf. vers. 9) substancialy.

2. kal eisoun dé foun an 

bèsstasen 'dalein epimegrin pnu, kal to dikaion ek tou 

kai pous meewntas ek tou ek' thn eknon axou to ek to ' 

kai ek t' eivon a'nyan ek to ek to è a'nyan t' Teth. 

3. kal abousen t' òthn 'Meusdais t' doulu t' Felseeres, 
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12 f., xiv. 19, xvii. 1). Like ch. xvi., to which it forms an overture, xv. is not the revision of a Jewish source (so especially Spitta, Menegoz, and Schmidt) but Christian (Briggs, Erbes) and the work of the Apocalyptist himself (Sabatier, Schon, Bousset, etc.) 

Vv. 2-4. An interlude like xiv. 1 f., which contains the theme of divine judgment (4) and praises from the saints in heaven.


m From Song of Three Child. 4. For sequence of thought, see Jude, 3f.
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most entirely composed of O.T. phrases. Adoration is its theme, stirred by the sense of God's justice. Similarly the famous hymn to Shamash, the Assyrian god of justice, which represents one of the highest reaches in ancient religious literature (Jastrow, pp. 300, 301): "Eternally just in the heavens are thou, / Of faithful judgment towards all the world art thou." Most editors take the phrase καὶ τὴν σήμα τ. ἀσ. as a gloss; but if the song has nothing to do with the Lamb, it is as silent on Moses. Since the whole section comes from the pen of the general author, and since the collocation of the two ἱδαί (equivalent of course to a single hymn) is awkward mainly in appearance, while the omission of the Lamb's Song would leave the section incomplete, it seems better to regard it as original rather than as a scribe's addition like xiv. 10, etc. As in xiv. 1, 3, the Lamb is among his followers, yet not of them.

Ver. 4. God's holiness is the reason why his name must be feared and magnified, especially when its effects are visible in the reverent homage of all nations to God (a hyperbolical statement in view of xvi. 9, etc.) at the sight of his "deeds of judgment" (δικαίωματα = judicial sentences, here of condemnation and penalty) inflicted on the world (cf. Dan. ix. 14 f.). The absolute and unique (note the prophet's insertion of μόνος) reign of Yahweh was a traditional tenet of Mosaicism; indeed for Orientals generally the power which formed their ideal source of righteousness and justice partook necessarily of a monarchic character (R. S. 74 f.). The Semites it appeared that the perfection of their god as a just king formed a ground for his ultimate sovereignty over the nations of the world. The O.T. outlook and the phraseology warn us not to press the poetical language too closely here; otherwise (cf. xiv. 6, 7) it would contradict, e.g., the characteristic idea of the author that the bowl-plagues, instead of producing penitence and submission, ended in defiant blasphemy.—ἐνώπιον σω, here a reverential periphrasis, it being considered in the later O.T. literature, the Targums, and the N.T. (occasionally) more respectful to worship and pray before the royal god than directly to him (Dalman, i. viii. 5). For the whole conception of this dual song see Targ. Jonath. on Isa. xxvi. 1 and Targ. Schir Haschirim i. 1; the latter reckons ten songs altogether, (1) Adam's at his forgiveness, (2) that of Moses and the Israelites at the Red Sea, (3) that of the Israelites, when the spring of water was given them, (4) that of Moses at his death, (5) Joshua's at Gibeon, (6) that of Barak and Deborah, (7) Hannah's, (8) David's, (9) Solomon's, and (10) that which the children of the captivity are to sing when the Lord frees them. It tallies with this expectation that the new song of the Apocalypse (v. 9, xiv. 3) is always a song of Christ's redemption.
5. ἐν τῷ ὁλμῷ αὐτῆς ἢ ναὸς, καὶ ἡ ὁμοιότης τῆς ἔκδοσης τοῦ γάμου τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Εἰς τοὺς ἑξαίτιοι φόνοι καὶ ἁμαρτίαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπέκτεινα τὰ πλήγματα τοὺς ἑξάρτουσιν. Τοῦτο οὖν ἡ ὁμοιότης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἢ ναὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

6. ἀνατέθηκεν ἡ ἐγκύησις τῆς παρθένου Σοφίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν εἰς τοὺς ἥγετα καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς. Τοῦτο τὸν Θεόν ἀνέγινεν σωτήριον καὶ ἀρχιερεῖον, πρὸς τὸν Θεόν καὶ ἀνέγινεν σωτήρ. Τοῦτο τὸν Θεόν ἀνέγι

1 For the λίβαν (λίβανοι λιβανου min., Lat.) of PQ, Syr., S., And., Arm., Arth., etc. (Al., Ws., Ti., B., Bj., Sw.), Lach., Tr., Dist., WH, Sp. read the transcriptional (ΑΙΘΩΝ for ΑΙΛΩΝ) error λίβανος ΑÇ, 38 mg., 48, 90, etc. (from LXX of Ezek. xxviii. 13?—λίβανον being commonly used of flax, not of flaxen garments. Cf. Nestle's Einl., 263).
Chapter XVI.

The Hebraistic (*αιτιον*) of Ν, 36, 39 is preferred here and at xviii. 24 by Tu., Bs., Swete.

Ver. 5. Δικαίως and Δικαιοσύνες are used together of God in hieratic inscriptions of dedication throughout Asia Minor, possibly under Jewish influence. Δικαιοσύνες, often a title of messiah (see on iii. 1 and Beer's note on En. xxxvii. 2), is reserved here for God. Retribution is the outcome of God's intense holiness or majesty (cf. vi. 10, xv. 4) asserting itself on behalf of his people (xv. 3, xiii. 2, cf. iii. 7) and in self-vindicatio.

Ver. 6. The retribution once threatened on Jerusalem and the Jews (Matt. xxiii. 35) is now transferred apparently to Rome, the later antagonist of the faith (cf. on xviii. 24). Once the Roman-made Christian blood run like water. Now, by the irony of providence, they shall find nothing but blood to drink. This moral vengeance (cf. Hawthorne's *House of the Seven Gables*), with its grim equivalence between sin and sin's punishment (xiv. 18, xiii. 10, xvii. 7; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12, etc.) is not pushed, however, into the grotesque and elaborately Dantesque details, e.g., of the Apocalypse of Peter. — ἐγκύκλιος (the verb runs all through this chapter, and this chapter only), cf. Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 816 (1 cent. a.d.) ἔγκυκλιος τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτοῦ κ. θρ., all...
8. καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἐξέχει τὴν φυλάνην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ἥλιον:
καὶ ἐβόθη αὐτῷ καυματίσαι τοὺς ἄθροπους ἐν πυρί. 9. καὶ εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐκκαυματίσθησαν αὐτῷ ἐκκαυματίσθησαν ἄθροποι καὶ ἐκκαυματίσθησαν τὸν ἥλιον τοῦ θεοῦ. 10. καὶ οἱ μετενόησαν ὅτι δεούνα αὐτῷ δόξαν.

Vv. 12-16. To facilitate the invasion of the empire (xvii. 12, 16) by the Parthians (ix. 14 f.) under Nero redivivus (cf. xii. 10), as in 4 Esd. xiii. 43-47 to let the ten tribes return in safety from captivity, the Euphrates is to be dried up in the latter days, like the Jordan before Joshua or the Euphrates itself when Cyrus captured Babylon (Herod. i. 191).

Ver. 9. Failure to honour the true God, a note of the heathen spirit (as in xi. 13, xiv. 7; Rom. i. 28). See Intro., § 6. For the general idea, cf. 2 Clem. ix.: “while we have opportunity of being healed, let us give ourselves over to God the healer, giving him a recompense. And what recompense? Repentance from a sincere heart. . . . Let us give him eternal praise.”

Vv. 10-11. The ninth Egyptian plague of darkness (due to the eclipse, cf. viii. 13?) falls on Rome, aggravating the previous pains of the Romans (ver. 2) and driving them into exasperation and fresh blasphemy instead of repentance. The repetition of ii 8, after 9, is characteristic of Oriental impressiveness (cf. Jer. xxx. 2, xxxi. 1, etc.), but it sums up the effect of the first four plagues.

Vv. 12-16. To facilitate the invasion of the empire (xvii. 12, 16) by the Parthians (ix. 14 f.) under Nero redivivus (cf. xii. 10), as in 4 Esd. xiii. 43-47 to let the ten tribes return in safety from captivity, the Euphrates is to be dried up in the latter days, like the Jordan before Joshua or the Euphrates itself when Cyrus captured Babylon (Herod. i. 191).
The variant προετοιμάζω (Matt., 38, 47, S., Pr.) is preferred by WH (313) and Swete.

1 The variant προετοιμάζω (Matt., 38, 47, S., Pr.) is preferred by WH (313) and Swete.

2 Ap Mayegethos (Matt., min., And., Ar.) is preferred by WH (313) and Swete.
The conventional storm-theophany brings on an exceptionally severe earthquake, which (ver. 10) shatters Jerusalem into three parts and entirely overthrows the pagan cities. Rome's more awful ruin is attributed in xvii. 16 to the invasion of Oriental hordes (cf. xvi. 12); here the allusion to her downfall is proleptic (= xvii. 2, xvii. 6 f.), as a climax to the foregoing catastrophe. Probably the great city is Jerusalem (so e.g., Andr., Bengel, Simcox, B. Weiss, J. Weiss), as in xi. 8. She is distinguished from the Gentile cities as Rome also is singled out from her allies and adherents. Being primarily guilty, Rome-Babylon is reserved for a special fate. The whole passage is enigmatic and obscure. Did the earthquake destroy the inhabitants of Jerusalem? and why? The allusion must be to some form of the tradition underlying xi. 1-13 and xiv. 18-20, or to that of Ezek. xiv. 4, 5. Both earthquakes and invasions had been combined already in the O.T. eschatology (cf. Isa. xiii. 13 f.; Hag. ii. 21 f.); both perils were real at this period; and, in delineating both dangers with a free, poetic imagination, the prophet aims as usual at impressiveness other than at any systematic regularity. For earthquakes in Jerusalem, cf. G. A. Smith's Jerusalem, i. pp. 61 f.—κυπές; neither magnificence nor age wins oblivion for an empire's crimes against the moral order.

Ver. 20. Here, as at vi. 14, the removal of hills tallies with the Iranian belief (shared by later Jewish Christian apocalyptic, cf. Böcken, 131 f.) that mountains as the work of Ahriman would disappear with him (S. B. E. v. 129), leaving the earth in its ideal state of a smooth plane on which mankind could dwell in unity of speech and intercourse, free from barriers. The collocation of mountain and island (so vi. 14) is possibly a relic of the ancient point of view, for which (i.e., for dwellers in the West) these formed the apparent source of the sun's rising, where his light first became visible.

Ver. 21. Even an abnormal hailshower (cf. the fourth Egyptian plague) fails to bring pagans to their senses. ἐκ τῶν τάλαντ, i.e., literally about sixty times the weight of even the enormous hailstones (νεφελής) which Diodorus Siculus (xix. 45) records. In En. lx. 17 the "spirit of the hail is a good angel," i.e., amenable to God's orders.

The obscenity of chapter xvii. springs mainly from the differences of tradition and outlook which are reflected in the canonical text. The threefold interpretation of the Beast as the Imperial power (so xiii.), as Nero redivivus (ver. 8) and as (xi) the eighth king (the two latter being applications of the same idea) is accompanied by a twofold explanation of the seven heads (geographical = 9, historical = 10), and of the woman's support (x, 3, 15). The eschatological tradition of Babylon as the supreme anti-divine world-power is applied to Rome, and this involves the re-interpretation of some details (e.g., 15, 18), while the tradition of the Beast as antichrist is further overlaid by the special tradition of Nero redivivus in that capacity. This dual Beast (as later first recognised; cf. Charles's Ascenso Isaia, pp. lxix.) is not merely the Imperial power (as in xiii. 3) but incarnate
in an Imperial personality of infernal and supernatural character, which attacks not only the Christian messiah (14) but Rome itself (15-17). The latter trait is unmistakably due to the legend of Nero redivivus, apart from which the oracle is unintelligible. Such variations have left traces in the structure of the passage, which point to some process of editorial revision, but it is difficult to disentangle the original source or sources, or even to determine their precise character and period. Ver. 14 is certainly out of place, for the allies of the Beast could not destroy Rome after they themselves had been destroyed by the messiah and his allies. It is thus either proleptic or inserted by the Christian writer in his (Jewish) source (so e.g., Vischer, Charles, Briggs, von Soden). Other traces of this editor might be found in 6 b, 8 (9 a?), and 15, and the Jewish character of the source (so Vischer, Weyland, Schmidt, Sabatier, Ménégoz, etc.), would be confirmed by the absence of any polemic against the Imperial cultus. It would be a Vespasianic oracle, inspired by a passion for revenge on Rome for her cruel, recent treatment of the Jewish people. When the source is regarded as Christian (as e.g., by Erbes, Völter, and Schön), ver. 11 would be an addition inserted under Domitian to bring it up to date (so Harnack, Texte u. Unters. II. iii. 134 f.; Chronologie, 245, 246, followed by Briggs, Gunkel, J. Weiss, etc.; cf. Introd. § 7). But even so, the structure of the passage is involved. Vv. 9-11 are not vision but calculation or exposition (cf. xiii. 18). The words of ver. 15 are never seen (cf. x. 3), and the professed explanation (ver. 7) follows a loose order (beast = 8, heads = 9-11, horns = 12-14, waters = 15, horns again = 16-17, and finally the woman = 18). The reference to the woman, however, is thrown late in order to introduce the following doom-song (cf. kings in 18, xviii. 3, 9, and great in 18, xviii. 2), and a similar motive accounts for the irregular position of 16-17 after 14. Rome's fall, though viewed from different angles, being the main object before the writer's mind at the moment. The defeat of 14 is taken up, in its true position, afterwards (xix. 11-21). Ver. 15 (an echo of xvi. 19 b) is probably thrown in at this point, to contrast dramatically the reference of Rome's supporters against her. Thus, except for 9-11, there are sufficient psychological reasons to account partially for the order and contents of the oracle; but source-criticism is required to clear up the passage, in the more or less extensive theories of one source (edited in 6, 9 a, 14-15, so J. Weiss; or variously in 8, 12-14, with some words in 6, 9, 11, so e.g., Pfeiderer, Baljon, Bouset and Forbes) or even two sources (Jewish, A = 3-4, 6 b-7, 10, B = 18-25, 16 b-17, Wellhausen's Analyse, 26 f.), for which the linguistic idioyncrasies (double use of ἵππος, 3-4, precedence of object over verb 13, 16, 18, of κ, τ, γ, 2, and the construction ἃν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐνιαύτῳ, 8) afford some basis. The main problem is to explain how the various strata of tradition overlap; e.g., in 8, 12 f., the beast is Nero redivivus, an infernal power of evil, whereas in 11 Domitian seems identified with Nero the beast. It is hard to believe that one and the same writer could simultaneously regard Domitian as a second Nero and expect Nero redivivus as a semi-supernatural power. In any case the stress falls on the Beast rather than on the woman, and on the eschatological prediction, not on the historical application. It is a fairly open question whether 8 or 11 is the editorial mortarium super-imposed upon the earlier tradition. Upon the whole, one of the least unsatisfactory solutions is to take 11 as a Domitianic gloss by the Christian editor, who has also added 6 b (if not all of 6) and 14 to a Vespasianic oracle (possibly of Jewish origin) in xvii. 4 f. which anticipated the downfall of persecuting Rome at the hands of Nero redivivus and his Eastern allies. No hypothesis is free from difficulties. But the general Domitianic reference of the Apocalypse and the presence of the Nero redivivus saga must be worked in somehow, and some hypothesis on the above lines seems to do most justice to the literary structure of this chapter as well as to the data of the book in general. It is impossible to determine how far the Christian editor worked over his source. That the difficulties of the oracle arise mainly from the presence of an earlier source (cf. Introd. § 7), which John has revised slightly and brought up to date, is axiomatic, however.
The double object of the oracle is (a), by a re-editing of the tradition of xiii. to represent Rome in her Imperial pride, before describing her downfall, and (b) to define more precisely the final appearance of the last foe. The chapter could readily be spared as isolated (Simcox), but this only proves that the author is again working upon disparate materials which he inherited. The oracle contains (1-6) a vision of the Harlot (by way of foil to xii. 6-9 and especially xxi. 9 f.) and the Beast, with (7-18) an explanation of the vision.

Chapter XVII.—Ver. 1. A fresh vision commences (cf. iv. 1), still punitive (xvi. 1), but with an exchange of angelic cicerones (as Slav. En. xxi.). The Beast which has already (in xiii.) done duty as the empire is now the support of the capital. Rome, personified (so Sib. Or. iii. 46-92, before 80 A.D.) as a feminine figure, rides on a beast of the same colour, like a Bacchante on the panther, or like the Syrian Astarte on a lion.

Ver. 2. Tyre’s commercial intercourse with the nations (Isa. xxiii. 17) and Assyria’s political intrigues, by which her statecraft fascinated and seduced other states (Nah. iii. 4) are both described by the same figure. Local and national cults, as a rule, were left undisturbed by the Romans; and indeed Oriental superstitions often reacted powerfully on Rome itself. But fresh conquests meant the extension of Rome’s intoxicating and godless suzerainty.

Ver. 3. The wilderness was the traditional site of visions, but there may be an allusion here to Isa. xxi. 1 or even to the Roman Campagna (Erbes). The woman in xii. is in the desert to be delivered from the dragon; the woman here is in the desert to be destroyed by the Beast. κόκκινον “crimson or scarlet,” = luxurious and haughty splendour (Mart. ii. 39; Juv. Sat. iii. 283 and xiv. 188 for purple). The Beast which in xiii. bore the names of blasphemy upon its head, now wears them spread over all its body. Baldensperger (15-16) conjectures a similar reference to Rome in En. iii. (seven hills?) here at any rate the author is sketching the Roman Empire in its general magnificence and authority under the Caesars, and the inconsistencies in his description (waters and wilderness, seat on waters, seat on the Beast) are natural to this style of fantastic symbolism. It is curious that no attack is directed against the polytheism of the Empire. Cf. Cebes’ Tabula: “Do you see a woman sitting there with an inviting look, and in her hand a cup? She is called Deceit; by her power she beguiles all who enter life and makes them drink. And what is the draught? Deceit and ignorance.” The mounting of divine figures on corresponding beasts is a Babylonian trait (S. C. 365).

Ver. 4. καιροί goes by an awkward zeugma with μακρύς (collective) and παραγειώσεις; “with ornaments of gold and precious stones and pearls” (like
Ezekiel's doomed prince of Tyre. The harlot in Test. Jud. xiii. 5 was also
depicted as καὶ μαργαρίταις and poured out wine for her
temple. Rome is pronounced luxurious, licentious and
loathsome. Here, as in the contemporary Ead. iii. 2, 29, it is felt to be a
mystery that prosperity and permanence should belong to a state flaunting
its impiety and oppression, not merely enjoying but propagating vice.

Ver. 5. Roman fillae de joie wore a
label with their names thus (Juv. vi.
123). μαυτήριον (which hardly belongs
to the title itself) indicates that the name
is to be taken as a personal term (x. 8), not
literally; "a name written which is a
symbol," or a mysteriously significant
title.—μαυτήριον indicates Rome, the natural
focus of Oriental cults in general, is
charged with fostering all the superstitious
and vicious practices of her sub-
jects.—βασιλεῖα (partly justified by a perusal
of Petronius and Apuleius) is an apt
rebuке if it comes from the prophet of a
religion which one Roman historian
classed among the ατροξία αυτοῦ
which disgraced the capital (Tacit. Ann.
iv. 44).

Ver. 6. Cf. Nahum's "bloody city"
(of Assyrian cruelty to prisoners, iii. 1),
and for the metaphor Cic. Phil. ii. 24,
29, or Suet. Tiberius, 59, or Pliny, N.
iv. 28, "qu з facile intelligatur ebris
manguine cium, et tanto magis
suecit;" also Jos. Bell. v. 8, 2.
When a Jewish source is postulated,
tional origin of the Beast (cf. xi. 7) even in the primitive tradition; the Nero-antichrist, however, introduces the fresh horror of a monster breaking loose even from death. True, he goes to perdition eventually, but not before all except the elect have succumbed to the fascination of his second advent. The Beast of the source here is evidently the antichrist figure of xi. 7 (also a Jewish source) transformed into Nero redivivus. There is less reason to suspect the hand of the Christian editor in 8 (Bousset) than in 9 a (J. Weiss).


Ver. 11. Bruston takes καὶ η λόγον ἐπὶ τῶν ἔττα ἀντίν as a translation of τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς Παλαιστίνης, in the sense that the eighth was more (or greater) than the seven, i.e., realising more fully the ideal of the Beast. But even the case for a Hebrew original clearer than it is, such an interpretation is forced. The verse is really a parenthesis added by John to bring the source up to date. Domitian, the eighth emperor, under whom he writes, is identified with the true Neronic genius of the empire; he is a revival and an embodiment of the persecuting Beast (cf. Eus. H. E. iii. 17, Tert. Apol. 5: portio Neronis de crudecitate, de pallio 4: a sub-Nero) to the Christian prophet, as he proved a second Nero to some of his Roman subjects (cf. Juvenal’s well-known sneer at the calvus Nero). This does not mean that John rationalises Nero redivivus into Domitian, which would throw the rest of the oracle entirely out of focus. Domitian, the eighth emperor, is not explained as the Beast which was and is not and is to come up out of the abyss (ver. 8), but simply as the Beast which was and is not; no allusion is made to his term of power, and the concluding phrase καὶ ἔτος ἐκάθεν is simply the conventional prophecy of doom upon persecutors; it need not be a post-factum reference to D.‘s murder in 96. He belonged to the seven, as he had been closely associated with the Imperial power already (Tac. Hist. iii. 84, iv. 2, 3; cf. Jos. Bell. iv. 11, 4). The enigmatic and curt tone of the verse shows that either from prudence ("some consideration towards the one who is beseeched even a prophet," MommSEN), or more probably from pre-occupation in the grim, ulterior figure of the Neronic antichrist, the prophet does not care to dwell minutely on the emperor’s personality as an incarnate Nero. He does not even allude to the suspicion, voiced by his contemporaries (4 Ess. xi. 12) that Domitian had made away with Titus. His vision is strained, like that of his source, to the final and supernatural conflict; the Satanic messiah, the Beast who is to return from the abyss, bulks most prominently on the horizon. The absorbing interest of the oracle, even in its edited form, is eschatological. John simply puts in a few words, as few as possible, to bring this Vespasianic source up to date, since the death of Titus had not been followed by the appearance of the Nero-antichrist. The latter is still and soon to come however! John thoroughly shares, though he expands and applies, the prediction of his source. The addition he makes to it in ver. 11 must on no account be taken as if it meant the substitution of "Domitian = Nero redivivus" for the supernatural expectation of the latter. There is certainly some awkwardness in the juxtaposition of Domitian as a second Nero and of Nero redivivus, but this was inevitable under the circumstances.

Vv. 12-18: the campaign of Nero and his vassal-kings against Rome, which is slain by an arrow feathered from her own wings.

Vv. 12, 13. This political application of the ten horns probably means either the Parthian satraps of xvi. 12 reckoned
in round numbers, who occupied a royal position in the estimation of the East (so, e.g., Eichhorn, de Wette, Bleek, Bousset, Scott, J. Weiss, Baljon, Wellhausen), or ("chefs d'armée," Havet) the governors of the (senatorial) provinces, holding office for (mênas ἄραν) one year (so Ewald, Hilg., Hausrat, Mommsen, B. Weiss, Hirsch, Briggs, Selwyn, B. W. Henderson ["the number may be derived from Daniel. In any case it is a round number, and the seer did not go round counting the number of the Roman provinces "] ), unless it is to be left as a vague description of the allies (Weisz, Holtzm., Swete). Philo (de leg. ad Caesarum xxxiv) notes the facilities possessed by proconsuls for starting revolutions, especially if they commanded powerful armies such as those stationed on the Euphrates to protect Syria.

Ver. 14. An abrupt and proleptic allusion to xix. 11-21; the Christian messiah is the true King of kings (a side reference to the well-known Parthian title). This is the first time that John brings the Lamb on the scene of earthly action. He now appears at the side, or rather at the head, of his followers in the final crisis, not in a struggle preceding the sack of Rome. He and Satan (as represented by the empire) are the real protagonists. Notice the share assigned to the faithful in this victory (after ii. 26, 27). The war fought on their behalf by the Lamb is their fight also (cf. on xix. 14); its success rests on the divine election and their corresponding loyalty (cf. xii. 11, xiii. 8; a Zoroastrian parallel in Yasaht xiii. 48; the favourite description of the saints in Enoch as "chosen [and] righteous"; and Passio Perpetuae, xxii., "οἱ ορθότατοι μάρτυρες! οἱ οὐχουκοτάτοι εἰς τὸν θρόνον τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσώμασιν," cf. xii. 11, xiii. 8); their fortissimi martyres! o uer uocati et electi in gloriam Domini nostri Jesu Christi ") The redeeming power of Christ, together with the adoration which he alone can rightfully claim, makes his cause more than equal to the empires of the world (cf. the thought of Isa. liii. 12).

Ver. 15. The woman impiously rivals God (κύριος ἡ εὐδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ, Ps. xxix. 3, cf. 10).—ἀδύνατον is substituted for the more common φιλαλη, perhaps with an allusion (after Ezek. xvi. 15, 25, 31) to Rome's imperial rapacity.

Ver. 16. Rome perishes at the hands of Nero and his ruthless allies—a belief loudly echoed in the Talmud. In Sib. Or. iv. 145. 350 f. the East then and thus regains the treasures of which the Oriental provinces had been despoiled.—γυναῖκα ... τῷ, the doom of a Semitic harlot (Ezek. xxii. 45 f., xxviiii. 17, 18). But no details of the disaster are given.

Ver. 17. The remarkable unanimity and obedience of the usurping vassals, which welds them into an avenging instrument, can only be explained on supernatural grounds. A divine overruling controls all political movements (cf. xii. 2, xiii. 5, 7), according to the determin-
ism of apocalyptic tradition (Baldensperger, 58 f.). The irony of the situation is that the tools of providence are destroyed, after they have unconsciously served their purpose (as in Isa. x. 12 f.). The imperial power, hitherto the usual support of Rome, is to prove her deadly foe; John’s stern philosophy is that one partner in this hateful union is employed to ruin the other. Not long before this prophecy appeared, Vitellius and Vespasian in the person of their partisans had ravaged Rome; in the near future Nero’s allies were to fight, like Coriolanus, against their “cankered country, with the spleen of all the under-fiends”.

Ver. 18. The dramatic climax of the oracle: the great harlot is—Rome, domina Roma, the pride and queen of the world! Cf. Spenser’s Ruines of Rome, 360 f. (“Rome was th’ whole world, and all the world was Rome”). For the probable position of xix. 9 b-10 at this point in the original form of the Apocalypse, see below (ad loc.).

After a prelude on the doom of this second and western Babylon (xviii. 1-3) two sublime songs follow: one of triumph in heaven (4-8) one of wailing on earth (9 f.). Both are modelled in semi-strophic style upon the earlier taunt-songs (cf. Intro. § 4) over Tyre and Babylon (cf. also Apoc. Bar. lxxxiii. 3-9). But the severe invective against Rome reveals the shuddering impression which this marble and mistress of the world made upon the conscience of her provincial subjects, Jewish or Christian. They were half fascinated, even as they felt repelled, by the sight of her grandeur. This magnificent doom song (9 f.) like that of Apoc. Bar. xii. (cf. xxxii.), however, celebrates her downfall, partly on grounds which might be justified from contemporary pagan authors (cf. Renan’s Apothese, ch. xvii.). Vv. 24 (note the sudden change from ωνα to οὖν) and 20 (in whole or part) are Christian editorial insertions, (a) either by some scribe or editor after the Apocalypse was completed, or (b) by John himself in an earlier source (Jewish or from his own hand). The presence of a special source is suggested by e.g., the unexampled use of οὐαί (cf. on ver. 16, and Oxyrh. Fragment of Uncan. Gospel, 31), the large number of άλλα γνώματα (see above, διπλάδος 6, διπλάδος, cf. 1 Tim. v. 17, στρεμ. 7 and 9, σιρικές, ἐλεφ.σθήρου, μαρμάρου and ἄθινον in 12, κυν., ἀμωμ. σεμι, ἀθην., κειχάν. [only in xiv. 2] 22, ἐπάρει and λειψάρι, 14) and rare terms, for which the special character of the contents can hardly account. Differences of outlook also emerge; e.g., xviii. 9 f. is out of line with xvii. 17 and xvi. 13 f., xviii. 1-3 (Rome long desolate) hardly tallies with xviii. 9 f. (ruins still smouldering, cf. xix. 3), and the kings of xviii. 9, 10 lament, whereas in xvii. 16 they attack, Rome. These inconsistencies (Schön, Schmiedel) might in part be set down to the free poetic movement of the writer’s imagination, working in dramatic style and oblivious of matter-of-fact incongruities like the sauros qui fest—a just as the lack of any allusion to the Imperial cultus, the Lamb, or the martyrs (exc. 20 and 24) does not necessarily denote a Jewish origin. But the cumulative effect of these features points to 20 and 24 as insertions by John in a Jewish (cf. e.g., the special emphasis on the trader’s point of view, 11-17) Vespasianic source which originally formed a pendant to that underlying xvii. (so variously in detail but agreeing on a source, probably Jewish—Sabatier, Rauch, Spitta, Weyland, Bouset. J. Weiss, Schmidt, Baljon, Pfeil, Wellhausen, von Soden, de Faye, Calmes). The original breathed the indignant spirit of a Jewish apocalypticist against the proud empire which had won a temporary triumph over the city and people of God. John applies it to the Rome which was also responsible for the persecutions. The tone of it
XVIII.

1. Μετὰ ταύτα ἐδῶν ἄλλων ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ, ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην: καὶ ἡ γῆ ἔφωτότθη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

2. καὶ ἔκραξεν ἐν ἴσχυρῷ φωνῇ λέγων,

"Ἐπεσαν ἐπεσε Βαβυλὼν ἢ μεγάλη,

καὶ ἔγένετο κατοικηθήριον δαίμονιν,

καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου,

καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὀρνέου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμισθημένου.

3. ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ὄνου [τοῦ θυμοῦ] τῆς πορείας αὐτῆς πεπέκακαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,

καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐπέτρεψαν,

καὶ οἱ ἐμπροσθὶν τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς "δυσμενὸς τοῦ στρήνους αὐτῆς ἐκλύομένας."

4. καὶ ἠκουσα ἄλλην φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ λέγοντα,

"Εξέλθατε, ἃ "λαὸς μου, ἃς αὐτῆς,

ινα μὴ συγκοινωνήσῃ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῆς,

καὶ ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν αὐτῆς ινα μὴ λάβητε.

5. ἔκλειψαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ἄρχη ὀφρανοῦ,

καὶ ἐμπνεύσαν αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἀδικημάτα αὐτῆς.

has been severely censured, as if it breathed a malignant orgy of revenge. "It does not matter whether Jewish or Christian materials are the ultimate source. He who takes delight in such fancies is no whit better than he who first invented them" (Wernle, p. 370). So far as this is true, it applies to xix. 17-21 (or 14-20) rather than to xviii. But the criticism must be qualified; see note on xviii. 7 and 20. There is smoke in the flame, but a profound sense of moral indignation and retribution overpowers the mere vindictiveness of an unpatriotic fanatic who exults to see his oppressor humiliated.

Chapter XVIII.—1-3: an angelic proclamation of Babylon’s fate (cf. xiv. 8) in terms of Isa. xiii. 19-22, xxiviv. 14 (demons of the desert, the Mazzikin of Jewish demonology, familiar to Babylonian magic). Jer. l. 30, li. 37, Zeph. li. 15, etc. "Be of good cheer, O Jerusalem..." Miserable are the cities which thy children served, miserable is she who received thy sons. For as she rejoiced at thy fall and was glad at thy ruin, so shall she grieve at her own desolation. Yet I shall take away her delight in her great crowds, and her vaunting shall turn to mourning. For fire from the Everlasting shall come upon her for a length of days, and for long shall she be inhabited by demons" (Bar. iv. 30-35). ἐκ κ.τ.λ. "by (cf. ver. 19) the wealth of her wantonness" traders profited; i.e., by the enormous supplies which the capital required to satisfy her demands (στρήνους, -iām from the New comedy and colloquial usage).—ἔβαλα in ver. 1 denotes the flashing brilliance which, according to the primitive collocation of life and light, accompanied the heavenly visitants to earth or the manifestation of a divine presence (xxi. 11, 23, xxii. 5); see the valuable paragraphs in Grill, pp. 259-271.

Vv. 4-8. A song of exulting in heaven, addressed first to the faithful (ver. 4) and then (ver. 6) to the enemies who execute God’s vengeance.

Ver. 4. ἄξιλαθεσ (cf. Apoc. Bar. ii. 1), which in the source referred to the Jewish community at Rome, is an artistic detail, retained like several in ch. xxii., although the historical meaning and application was lost in the new situation. Cf. the opening of Newman’s essay on The Benedictine Censures.

Ver. 5. Plutarch (de sera uindicet.
6. Απέδοτε αὕτη ὠς καὶ αὕτη ἀπέδωκεν, καὶ διπλάσατε τὰ διπλὰ κατὰ τὰ ἐργα αὕτης.

7. Ὑπὸ ὧν ποιήθη ἡ ἐκκράσει, καταστάθη αὕτη διπλῶν.

8. ὅσα ἐβδόμου αὕτην καὶ ἐσπρήνησε, τοσοῦτον δότε αὕτη βασανισμὸν καὶ πένθος.

9. ὁ δὲ τὰ τῇ καρδίᾳ αὕτης λέγει ὅτι 'Καθήμαι βασιλίσσα, καὶ ἥρα ὡς εἰμί καὶ πένθος οὐ μὴ ἰδὼν,' ἢ θάνατος καὶ πένθος καὶ λιμός.

10. καὶ πυρὶ κατακαυθήσεται.

11. ἐστὶ Ἰσχυρὸς Κώριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ κρινάς αὐτὴν.

12. καὶ κλαύσασθαι καὶ κόψωνται ἐν 'αὕτην οἱ βασιλείς τῆς ἡγήσατον, οἱ μὲν ἀὕτης πορεύεσθαις καὶ στρημάσατες, ὅταν βλέπων τὸν

13. )))), is strong upon the solidarity of a city, which is liable to be punished at any time for past offences.—κολλάσαται ("Heaped up to the sky are her sins") in the familiar sense of haerere = to follow close upon, or to cleave, the idea being that the mass of sins actually presses on the roof of heaven. The figure would be different if, as Holtzm. conjectures, κολλ. referred to the gluing together of the leaves composing a roll; the record of Rome's sins would form so immense a volume that when unrolled it would reach the very heavens. "Et ascendit contumelia tua ad altissimum, et superbia tua ad fortem" (4 Esd. xi. 43).

Ver. 6. The foes of Rome (unless ἀνάπεσε κ. τ. λ., is a rhetorical apostrophe) are invited to serve her with the retribution promised to the first Babylon (see ref.).—διπλάσατε, cf. Oxyry. Pap. iii. 520. 'Ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ, κ. τ. λ. Cf. Apoc. Bar. xiii. 8 (to Romans), "Ye who have drunk the strained wine, drink ye also of its dregs, the judgment of the Loffy One who has no respect of persons".

Ver. 7. It is probably at this point that the passage drifts over from the conception of a voice heard (ver. 4) to that of direct utterance on the part of the prophet; unless we are to suppose that the voice speaks till the close of ver. 20 (a similar instance in ch. xi.). Imperial Rome is imperious and insolent; haughty self-confidence is the sin of the second Babylon as of the first (see Isa. xlvii. 5, 7, 8, 15, 17, imitated in this passage). Cf. (bef. 80 A.D.) Sibyll. v. 173, where the impious and doomed city is upbraided for vaunting "I am by myself, and none shall overthrow me". A similar charge of arrogance was brought by Ezekiel against the prince of Tyre (xxviii. 2 f., cf. xxvii., xxviii. throughout with the present passage), and by the Jewish author of Apoc. Bar. xii. 3 against Rome. To the Semitic as to the Hellenic conscience, the fall of a haughty spirit always afforded moral relief. Nothing so shocked the ancient conscience as overweening presumption in a state or an individual, which was certain ultimately to draw down upon itself the crashing anger of heaven.

Ver. 8. This drastic, ample punishment, though executed by subordinates in xvii. 16, 17, is here (as in 5, 20) regarded on its divine side. God is strong, as well as guilty, glorious Rome (ver. 10, cf. on vi. 15); and his strength is manifested in the huge shocks of history, as well as in creation (iv. 11, v. 13); Rome's proud disregard of all that was mutable in human conditions is visited with condign retribution. The prophet sees not a decline and fall but a sudden collapse (10, 16, 19).

Vv. 9-20: the wailing on earth, by kings (9, 10), merchants (at length, 11-16), and seafaring men (17-20), imitated from the finer and more elaborate
passages in Ezek. xxvi.-xxviii, where kings (xxvi. 15-18), traders (very briefly and indirectly, xxvii. 36), and mariners (xxvii. 29-36) are all introduced in the lament over Tyre's downfall. Contrast the joy of the three classes in ver. 20. A triple rhythm pervades (cf. 2, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 19) but does not dominate this grim doom-song, somewhat after the well-known structure of the Semitic elegy. But the three laments are all characteristic. The kings are saddened by the swift overthrow of power (10), and the reverse of fortune; the merchants (11, 16) by the loss of a profitable market, the mariners by the sudden blow inflicted on the shipping trade (ver. 19).

Ver. 12. βοσκάντων (sc. ἱματίων) = "of fine linen"; from βρώσω the delicate and expensive linen (or cotton) made out of Egyptian flax (Luke xvi. 19); στρώματα = "silk," muslin, or gauze, chiefly used for women's attire (Paus. iv. 110 f.); τῶν ἐξὸν δῶνων = "all citron (citrus-)wood," a fragrant, hard, dark brown, expensive material for furniture, exported from N. Africa. Note the extensive range of Roman commerce to supply the needs of luxury (inter alia gustus elementa per omnia quaerunt, Juv. xi. 14; pearls, e.g., from Britain as well as Red Sea), also the various demands in order: ornaments, wearing apparel, furniture, perfumes (for personal and religious use), food, and social requirements. Wets. cites a rabbinic saying: decem partes duitarium sunt in mundo, nouem Romae et una in mundo uniuerso.
two ἰωμάτων is the more specific. Prostitutes, or female slaves, or gladiators, or even grooms and drivers (Iωμάτων καὶ ἱστήμεις) have been more or less convincingly suggested as its meaning. Slave-dealing (Friedländer, iii. 87 f; Dobschütz, 266-269) was a lucrative trade under the empire, with Delos as its centre, and Asiatic youths especially were in large demand as pages, musicians, and court-attendants. Thousands of captives, after the siege of Jerusalem, were sent into slavery by the Roman government; and early Christians at this period (Clem. Rom. iv.), voluntarily went into slavery either as substitutes for others or "that with the price got for themselves they might furnish others with food".

Ver. 17. ἐργάζοντας κ.τ.λ.="whose business is on the sea". The passage reflects the importance of Rome especially for the trade of the Levant. Pliny (H. N. vi. 101, xii. 84) gives the large figures of Oriental imports and their cost, adding sarcastically ταντί νομίζω νομίζω "her costly treasures" (Friedländer, iii. 48-51). The regret of the mariners for the grandeur that was Rome passes rapidly into a sense of commercial loss.

Ver. 20. This verse interrupts the sequence of 19 and 21 in which the ruin of Rome is illustrated by the dramatic action of the angel. The awkward shift from description to an apostrophe, and the evidently Christian tone of the cry, betray an editor's hand. His object is to render explicit the moral reasons why Christians should delight in the downfall of the city. He writes in the same triple rhythm as the source, and his hand is to be seen in the whole verse not simply in
21. καὶ ἤρεν εἰς ἄγγελος ισχυρός λίθον ὡς μύλον μέγαν καὶ
καὶ οἱ μὴ εὐρέθη ἢ ἑτερὸς ἤρεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν λέγειν,

"Οὕτως ἀρμήματι βληθεῖσαι Βαβυλῶν ἢ μεγάλη πόλις,
καὶ οὐ μὴ ακουσθῆ ἐν σοὶ ἢ
tαι ἐκεῖ ἡ λίθος ἡ ἐκείνη ἡ πολίς
cαὶ πᾶς τεχνίτης πάσης τέχνης
καὶ μὴ εὐρέθη ἐν σοὶ ἢ
cαι ἡ μυθιστή ἐν σοὶ ἢ

Kal ol ἀπόστολοι. The voice from heaven is thus made to pass into a clos-
ing apostrophe to heaven and its in-
habitants (cf. xi. 18), imitated from Jer. li. 48 (Feb.). John seems to assume that all had a case against Rome as vic-
tims of her cruelty, probably in the main as martyrs and confessors. "Apostles," omitted in ver. 24, has here (as in ii. 2) its wider sense (otherwise xxi. 14), but it must include Peter and Paul (Zahn, Einleit. § 39, n. 4).—ὅτα
κρατεῖσαι = "for God has judged her with your judgment," i.e., vindicated you (done you justice, given you your due) by exacting vengeance upon her. She who once doomed you is now doomed herself (cf. xvi. 6).—εὐθανάσιος. Cf. En. lixii., where the kings and rulers con-
demned by messiah to eternal torment are to be "a spectacle for the righteous and his elect; they will rejoice over them because the wrath of the Lord of spirits resteth upon them, and his sword is drunk with their blood"; also Isa. xxx. 29, for the call to exult over a fallen oppressor. A Parisian workman, who was looking down at the corpse of Robespierre, was overheard to mutter, with relief, "Oui, il y a un Dieu.

Vv. 21-24: a rhythmical song of doom, introduced by a symbolic action partly imitated from Jer. lii. 63, 64.

Ver. 21. Rome's fall will be irrevoc-
able and sudden and violent, as a power-
ful angel shows dramatically by seizing a huge boulder and flinging it into the sea. Cf. the analogous description of Babylon's collapse in Sib. Or. v. 158, 153, 174. The reiterated emphasis on Roman luxury is notable. Later litera-
ture, as Friedländer observes (iii. 9-17),
tended to a conventional exaggeration of the luxurious civilisation under the Empire; judged by modern standards, at any rate, it was not particularly extra-
travagant. The last phrase, however, is apposite in a source which reflects the age of Nero, since it was under Nero, rather than under Vespasian or Domitian, that Roman luxury during the first century of our era reached its zenith. The oracle breathes the scorn felt by simple provinci-
cials for the capital's wanton splendour, and indeed for the sins of a pleasure-
loving civilisation. But it is religious poetry, not a prose transcript of the con-

Ver. 22. μουσικῶν "minstrels or musicians" (1 Macc. ix. 41); the oc-
currence of the generic term among the specific is certainly awkward and would favour the rendering "singers" (Bengel, Holtzmann) in almost any other book than this. On these musical epithets see Friedländer, iii. 238 f.; the impulses to instrumen-
tial music at Rome during this period came mainly from Alexandria. For coins stamped with Nero as harpist see Suet. Nero, xxv. furia εὐθανάσιος, the daily accompaniment of Oriental

life. The sound of the mill meant habitation, but in the desolation of Rome no more pleasant stir of mirth or business would be heard (Isa. xlvii. 5). The fanatic Jesus, son of Ananus, who howled during the siege of Jerusalem and for four years previously (Jos. Bell. vi. 5, 3) "woe to Jerusalem," denounced upon her "a voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a
voice against Jerusalem and the temple,
23. καὶ φῶς *λύχνου
οὐ μὴ φάνη ἐν σοὶ ἐτὶ,
καὶ φωνὴ τομημάτων καὶ *νύμφης
οὐ μὴ άκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἐτὶ.

14. καὶ ᾧ ἐπάρα σοι τὴς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἑσύχη
ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ,
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ θυραρῳ καὶ τὰ λαμπρὰ
ἀπελευθέρωσαν ἀπὸ σοῦ,
καὶ ὁ θεός ὁ Θεός σοι ἐδόθην.

24. καὶ ἐν ἑδύνη ἀιμα προφητῶν καὶ ἐγίνετο ἐδύνη,
καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐτί τῆς γῆς:

From Ps. cxli. 5, Jer. xvi. 5, Ps. cxlii. 5, Jer. xvi. 7, Ezek. xxvii. 21, Isa. xxvii. 8, Jer. xvi. 10, Nah. iii. 1. 
Only here in Apoc. 
A Post.-Chap. vii. 9-11, Isa. xxvii. 8. 
From Gen. iv. 15, k Jer. xvi. 7, Is. xlv. 12, Nah. iii. 4. 
I xvi. 6; cf. Isa. xxvi. 21, Job xvi. 18. 
m xvi. 8, Ezek. xxvii. 9-11. On sing. here and xvi. 12 (v. 2, Is., etc.), cf. Win. § 27. 46.

"Possibly S. [συνεκτα άντας ταύτας καὶ αὐτα] here preserves the true text, and the rest" [i.e., αὐτα ἐφησοντο = ἈΑCM, ΜΑΣC, etc. ΑΤΑφ στρεφ.] ἂν, ἠμεν ἐφτασον. And, "I have lost the words by homoioteleuton" (Gwynn).—Here between the last εντ and the first εντ of 23 is the original place of ver. 14 (so Beza, Vitringa, Volkmar, Baljon, Weiss, and Könnecke) which got into its canonical position between 13 and 15 owing to the error of some early copyist, whose eye confused νετα εμπορος σων with νετα εμπορος τοντων.

a voice against bridegrooms and brides, and a voice against the whole people".

Ver. 23. Contrast the εὐφηθα of 24 with the εὐφησοντος of ver. 14 which in its canonical position is an erratic boulder. 
Φωνή, primarily in the figurative O.T. sense already noticed (harlotry and magic spells, as in Yasn. ix. 32). But a literal allusion is not to be excluded, in view of the antipathy felt by pious Jews and early Christians to magic and sorcery. As Rome represented the existing authorities under whose aegis these black arts managed to flourish, and as they were generally bound up with religion, it would not be unnatural to charge the Empire with promoting sorcery (Wein. 10). The πλανής, "Commerce, as having regard to purely worldly interests, is called harlotry" [Cheyne on Isa. xxiii. 17]. Sorcery, witchcraft, "formication," and the persecution of the righteous, are all manifestations of the lawlessness practised by Beliar working in men and kings (Asc. Isa. ii. 4, 5).

Ver. 24. Again, as at ver. 20, the change of style (here from an apostrophe to a description) and spirit (xvii. 6) marks an insertion by the final editor, unless the verse originally lay after ver. 3. The triple rhythm corresponds to that of ver. 20. Rome has now succeeded Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 35, etc.) as the arch-enemy of the faithful. The climax of her iniquities is couched in terms of the primitive Semitic idea (Gen. iv. 10) that exposed and discovered blood is a cry for vengeance [2 Macc. viii. 3 f.]; blood violently shed wails till it is appeased by the punishment of the murderers. By a natural hyperbole, Rome is held responsible for the murders, judicial and otherwise, of saints and prophet's and the slain of Israel in general—substituted here for the "apostles" of ver. 20, probably to include the Jews killed in the recent war as well as pre-Christian martyrs like the Maccabees of whom Augustine finely says: nonodium quidem erat moriarus Christus, sed martyres eos facit moriturus Christus (Heb. xii. 1). Rome here is the last and worst exponent of persecution. Her collapse is attributed to their blood drawing down God's utter retribution. "My blood be on the inhabitants of Chaldea, shall Jerusalem say" (Jer. lii. 35, imprecaturing successfully the divine revenge, vv. 36, 49). As Chrysostom called psalm cix. a
prophecy in the shape of a curse, this vehement, sensitive oracle against Rome's insolence and cruelty may be termed a curse in the form of a prophecy. A similar idea underlay the view of certain pious people who, according to Josephus (cf. Eus. H. E. ii. 23, 20-21), considered the fall of Jerusalem, as a retribution for the foul murder of James the Just nearly ten years before.

The doom-song is followed by an outburst of celestial triumph (xix. 1-8) in answer to xviii. 20. The conclusion as well as the commencement of the victory (xii. 12 f.) is hymned in heaven. The stern, exultant anthem, which is morally superior to the devout voice of En. xlvii. 4, forms an overture to the final movement of the Apocalypse, as well as (like vii. 9 f., xiv. 1-5) a relief to the sombre context. 8 b is a prosaic editorial gloss, probably due to the liturgical use of the book, and the last clause of to (ἡ γὰρ . . . προφητείας) might be the same (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 56), as many editors think, were it not for the genuinely Johannine ring of the words. In any case it is an after-thought, probably (so Baljon, Barth, etc.) added by the author himself, in order to bring out here what is brought out in xxii. 9 by the explicit mention of the prophet, since ἡχ. ἡ ἀνωτέρω προφήτας alone would mean Christians in general. The presence of 9 b-10 here, however, is not motivated as at xxii. 8, 9, where it comes in naturally at the finalé of the revelations and after a distinct allusion (xxii. 1) to the revealing angel. Here the angel of the second ἡγεμί (at least) has not been mentioned since xvii. 1, 7, 15, and no reason at all is given for the superstitious impulse to worship. The passage is certainly Johannine, but probably misplaced (like xviii. 14, etc.). Can it have originally lain at the end of xvi., where the hierophant angel is speaking (cf. also xvii. 17, words of God and xix. 9 b)? Such technical dislocations and derangements are common enough in primitive literature (cf. my Historical New Testament, pp. xxix. 676, 690). The passage must have been shifted to its present site either by accident or more probably by a scribe who saw that the similar assurance in xxi. 5, xxi. 6 related primarily to future bliss rather than to judgment; perhaps he also took the first ἡγεμί not as a divine saying (cf. xxi. 5) but as angelic (xxii. 4), cf. i. 10, xi. 19, and note on xxi. 10) and sought to harmonise the same order as in xiv. 13 (command to write, beatitude, asseverance). Otherwise i-10 is a unity as it stands. The change of situation in 1-3, 4-10 does not prove any combination of sources; it is simply another of the consequences and transitions characteristic of the whole book. The marriage-idea of 7, 8 is a prophetic hint which is not developed till later (xxii.), while the supper (ὁ) is only mentioned to be dropped—unless the grim vision of 17-21 (for which cf. Gressmann's Ursprung d. Isr.-jüd. Eschatologie, 136 f.) is meant to be a foil to it (so Sabatier and Schön).

Chapter XIX.—Ver. 1. Here only in N.T. (after the ruin of sinners, as Ps. civ. 35) the liturgical hallelujah of the psalter and synagogue worship occurs. In vv. 1, 3, and 6 it stands as usual first, an invocation = "praise Jah"; but in ver. 4 it is responsive, as in Ps. civ. 35, cxv.-cxvii. (the latter being sung at the passover; cf. Apoc. xix. 7).

Ver. 2. ἐρεθανόν, as the first Babylon had been denounced for her depraving influence by Jeremiah (ili. xxviii. 25, τὸ ἄρος τὸ διαφανεῖς τὸ διαφανεῖς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. The impatient cry of vi. 10 has now been answered. God "has avenged the blood (i.e., the murder) of his servants at her hand (i.e., on her),"
the LXX rendering (e.g., in 2 Kings ix. 7, καὶ ἐκείνης ὑπὸ τῶν δουλῶν Κυρίων ἐκ χειρὸς ἐξαπέβλημεν τοῦ Παλατίνου τοῦ βασιλέα τοῦ Βασιλέως Βασιλέων) = to exact punishment from a murderer. The idea is substantially that of Ps. Sol. iv. 9, viii. 29-31. As ἀληθ. καὶ δικ. are a characteris-
"Εἶναι δὲ ἀφθονεῖ τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ αὐτῆς,
καὶ ἠθέλησεν τὸ αἷμα τῶν θουλῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς."
3. καὶ δεῦτερον ἐν εἰρήκαιν,
"Ἀλληλουία."
καὶ ὁ ἰωάννης ἀναβάλει εἰς τοὺς ἁλώνας τῶν ἁλώνων."
4. καὶ ἔστησαν οἱ προσβέτεροι οἱ ἐκσιών τέσσαρες, καὶ τὰ
tέσσαρα ζῷα, καὶ προσεκίνησαν τὸ θέα τῷ καθημένῳ εἰς τῇ ὥρᾳ τῶν ἱερεῶν
λέγοντες, ἀμήν ἀλληλουία."
5. καὶ ἠφανίζεται ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου
ἐξηλθεὶ λέγοντα,
"Αλειπτε τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν πάντες οἱ θουλοί αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ὁ φοβούμενοι αὐτῶν ὁ μεγάλος καὶ ὁ μεγάλος."
6. καὶ ἠκουσα ὡς φωνὴ ἡ ὄχλος πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴ ὁ ἄνθρωπος
πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴ ἰσχυρῶν λέγοντες, ἀμήν ἀλληλουία.
"οὐ τ掩饰τευτον Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ παντοκράτωρ."

ISA. xxiii. 9-10. cf. Neh. i. 9. m v. 8, 14, on form cf. Helbing, 69-64.
N. v. 13. Isa. vi. 1. 10. 12. 13. From Pa. cvii. 48 (Heb.).
Of Christ (iii. 12, Joh. xix. 17)? q Pr. Jer. xx.
13 (ἀκοινοεῖ άπόφη γραμμ. τ.ήν Ἁλληλου.); a. with dat. only here in N.T. r Pa. 3xxv. 1, xxixvii. 1, xxvii. 43, xxxvii. 20; see above xi. 8, xii. 8, xiv. 2, xiv. 2.
Ezech. i. 24. xii. 15, 17, Pa. xxiii. 24, xxvii. xvi. x. 8.

1 λέγοντας (as iv. 1) Q, min., Andc, Tic. (WH marg., Al., We., B.) [λέγοντας
AP, min., gig., Andc, Fr., Lach., Ti., Tr., WH, Bj., Sw.].

-tically ample expression for "equitable," it is in the context rather than in the
language of the passage (Ritschl, Rechtf.
and Vers. in. ii. 138, 139) that we must
find the thought of God being shown to be the real and righteous Saviour of
the saints by his infliction of punishment on
their persecutors.

Ver. 4. After the long interlude of
judgments on the earth, the προσβέτεροι
and ζῷα (incidentally mentioned in xi.
6. xiv. 3) re-appear upon the scene,
though for the last time, to take part in
the chorus of praise over Rome's ruin.

The cradle-song of the future is the
dirge of Rome. The drama now centres
mainly round the city of God, and the
earlier temple-scenery of the Apocalypse
(iv.-xi. xv. 5-xvii. 17) passes almost wholly
out of sight.—Ἀμήν: the initial (and
primitive) use of ἀμήν, social (e.g., 1
Kings i. 36) as well as liturgical, which
gravely assents to the preceding words of
another speaker.

Ver. 5. The O.T. expression servants
of God implied (R. S. 69 f.) not simply
membership in a community of which
God is king, but special devotion to his
service and worship. It was not associ-
ated with any idea of "slavery to a
divine despot," but was originally con-
fined in the main to royal and priestly
families (cf. i. 5) which had a special in-
terest in primitive religion and which
were near to the god of the tribe or
nation. Hence, in the broader and later
sense of the term, the "servants of
God" are all those who live in pious
fear of him, i.e., yielding him honour
and obedience. John, pre-occupied with
judgment, views the faith of the Lord as
equivalent practically to his fear; unlike
most early Christian writers, who (x
Peter i. 17, 18, etc.) carefully bring for-
ward the complementary element of love.

Lowly confidence rather than warm inti-
macy is this prophet's ideal of the Chris-
tian life towards God. See Did. iii., iv.;
Barn. iv. 11; Herm. Mand. x. 1, xii. 4, 6.

Ver. 6. S ingeniously but awkwardly
punctuates after "Hallelujah," connecting
ἐπιστ. κα.λ., with the subsequent καθώμην.
-βασιλέως κ.α.λ. A sublimated ver-
sion of the old watchword ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΑΥ-
ΤΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΗΜΩΝ which had been
the rallying cry of pious Jews and espe-
cially of the Pharisees (e.g., Ps. Sol. xvii.
1, 2, 38, 51, ii. 34-36, v. 21, 22) during
the conflict with Roman aggression. This
divine epithalamium is the last song of
praise in the Apocalypse. At this point
also the writer reverts for a moment to
the Lamb, absent since xvii. 14 from his pages, and absent again till xxi. 9.

Ver. 7. A proleptic allusion to the triumphant bliss as a marriage between the victorious messiah and his people or the new Jerusalem (cf. Volz, 331). The celebration is primarily eschatological (Weinæl, p. 137; cf. Mechilta on Exod. xix. 17) and is so employed here. The marriage-day of Christ and his church is the day of his second advent. This is the more intimate and tender aspect of the divine beneficence. But, as a traditional feature of the Oriental myth (Jeremia, 45 f.) was the postponement of the deity's wedding until he returned from victory (i.e., after vanquishing the darkness and cold of the winter), the religious application turns first of all to the overthrow of messiah's foes (xix. 11 f.).

Ver. 8. “Yea, she is (has been) permitted to put on” (for διονυστα τω in ix. 5, Mark x. 37), epegegetic of ἡνωμαν ἀνωτην (Isa. lxi. 10). “Uideo hic cultum gravem ut matronæ, non pompaticum quals meretricis antev (xviii. 4) descripsit,” Grot. In the following gloss (see above) the rare use of δικαιοσύνη (= “righteous deeds”) is paralleled by Bar. ii. 19 (τα δικαιοσύνης των πατριων) and by an incidental employment of the singular in this sense by Paul (see on Rom. v. 18). Moral purity and activity, which are the conditions of future and final bliss, are (as in xvi. 4) defined as the outcome of human effort, although of course their existence must be referred to God (διαθεσθαι), and their success to the aid of Christ (loc. cit.); see on i. 4-6. Ignatius similarly (Eph. x.) describes the saints as “robed entirely in the commandments of Christ”. The connexion of thought is the same as that in Matt. xxi. 43, xxi. 2, 11-14. For 8 b see the fontal passage from Sohar (cited by Gfröller, i. 184, 185): traditus est, quod opera bona ab homine hoc in mundo peracta, fiant ipsi uestis pretiosa in mundo illo.

Ver. 9. The saints are the Bride, but—by a confusion inevitable when the two cognate figures, apocalyptic and synoptic (Matt. xxi. 2 f), are combined—they are also the guests at the wedding. (The bliss of the next world is termed “the Banquet” in rabbinic writings, which interpret Exod. xxiv. 11 as though the sight of God were meat and drink to the beholders). Like the Greek φακλα, the church is composed of members who are ideally distinguishable from her, just as in En. xxxviii. 11 the congregation of the righteous is equivalent to the new Jerusalem. With the idea of 7-9, cf. Pirke Aboth, iv. 23: This world is like a vestibule before the world to come; prepare thyself at the vestibule that thou mayest be admitted into the τρικληνον.—ἄληθες. either “real” as opposed to fanciful and delusive revelations, or (if ἄληθες = ἄληθες) “trustworthy words of God” (Dan. ii. 9) emphasizing the previous beatitude (like νεφελη του νεφελα xiv. 15). Originally the words (see above) gravely corroborated all the preceding threats and promises (cf. xvii. 17), despite their occasionally strange and doubtful look. It is a common reiteration in apoc. (cf. reff.), underlining as it were the solemn statements of a given passage. See, e.g., Herm. Vis. iii 4, “that God's name may be glorified, hath this been revealed to thee, for the sake of those who are of doubtful mind, questioning in their hearts whether this is so or not. Tell them it is all true, that there is nothing but truth in it, that all is sure and valid and founded”. In Sanhed. Jerus. Rabbi Joc-
7—ii. ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ

... who hold the testimony of Jesus as possessors of prophetic inspiration. The testimony of Jesus is practically equivalent to Jesus testifying (xxii. 20). It is the self-revelation of Jesus (according to i. 1, due ultimately to God) which moves the Christian prophets. He forms at once the impulse and subject of their utterances (cf. Ignat. Rom. viii.; Eph. vi.). The motive and materials for genuine prophecy consist in a readiness to allow the spirit of Jesus to bring the truth of God before the mind and conscience (cf. iii. 14, 22). The gloss even connects in a certain way with τὸ θεῖον προσκύνησον. Since angelic and human inspiration alike spring from the divine witness of Jesus, therefore God alone, as its ultimate source, deserves the reverence of those whom that inspiration impresses. The prestige of the prophets lies in the fact that any one of them is, as Philo called Abraham, συνβολος τῶν ἑγγένεων. An angel can do no more than bear witness to Jesus. Furthermore, there is an implicit definition of the spirit of prophecy (xi. 7, etc.) in its final phase as a revelation of Jesus Christ. Even the O.T. prophetic books, with which the Apocalypse claims to rank, were inspired by the spirit of the pre-existent Christ (see on i Pet. i. ix.; Barn. v. 6). But now, by an anti-Jewish and even anti-pagan touch, no oracular or prophetic inspiration is allowed to be genuine unless it concerns Jesus who is the Christ. Such is the triumphant definition or rather manifesto of the new Christian prophecy.

Vv. ii-21: a second vision of doom, on the Beast and his allies (in fulfilment of xii. 5). Their fate (17-21) follows a procession of the angelic troops (11-16, contrast ix. 16 f.). The connexion of this and the foregoing volume (7-9) is mediated by the idea that
the marriage of the warrior-messiah (cf. En. ix. 2; 4 Esd. xii. 32, xiii. 38; Apoc. Bar. xxxix., xl. lxx.) cannot take place till he returns from victory (so in the messianic psalm xlv.). Now that the preliminary movements of the enemy (xvii. 16, 17) are over, the holy war of xvii. 14 begins, which is to end in a ghastly Armageddon. This passage and the subsequent oracle of xx. 1-10 reproduce in part a messianic programme according to which the dolores Messiaeae (cf. Klausner: mess. Vorstellung d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaidea, 1904, 47 f., and Charles on Apoc. Bar. xxxvii. 1) are followed by messiah's royal advent on earth (here sketched in part from Samviii. 4-25) to found a kingdom of the just (i.e., Israel) who are raised for this purpose. Israel supplants Rome as the world-power (Bar. xxxix.). Her period of superiority opens with the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, and closes with a crushing defeat of Gog and Magog, who are led by an incarnate villain ("dux ultimus," xl.), but are finally vanquished by the ten tribes who return to take part in this campaign. Death and Satan then are annihilated, and eternal bliss ensues. Like Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 20 f., John modifies this scheme of tradition freely for his own Christian ends. He introduces a realistic expansion of the messianic age into three periods:

(a) a victory of messiah (mounted, like Vishnu, on a white horse for the last battle) and his Ægis (cf. xiv. 20) over the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the world, who—as already noted—turn their attention to the saints after crushing Rome (11-21); 

(b) an undisturbed reign of Christ and his martyrs (xx. 1-6), evidently in Palestine; 

(c) the final defeat of Gog and Magog, with Satan their instigator (xx. 7-10). There is little or nothing specifically Christian in all this section (except xx. 4-6, cf. xix. 13), but the general style betrays the author's own hand, and there is no reason to suppose that a Jewish source in whole or part (so e.g., Vischer, Sabatier, de Faye, Weyland, Spitta, von Soden) underlies it. The sequence of the passages with xvi. 13-16, 18-20 is due to a common cycle of tradition, rather than to any literary source (Schön). It is a homogeneous finalé written by the prophet, in terms of current eschatology, to round off the predictions at which he has already hinted. Moralising traits emerge amidst the realism, but it is impossible to be sure how far the whole passage (i.e., 11-21) was intended to be figurative.

Vv. 11-16. messiah and his troops or retinue: Jesus to the rescue (cf. Samson Agonistes, 1268 f.). The following description of a semi-judicial, semi-military hero is painted from passages like Isa. xii. 3-5 (where messiah, instead of judging by appearances, decides equitably: ἀπέσταλε γῆν τῇ λαῷ τοῦ στρατούς αὐτοῦ: his breath slays the wicked: his loins are gird ἀθανασίαν καὶ ἀληθείαν, the theophany of Hab. iii., and the sanguinary picture of Yahveh returning in triumph from the carnage in Idumea (cf. ver. 13 with Isa. lxiii. 1-6). On the connexion of this celestial Rider with the Rider in 2 Macc. iii., cf. Nestle in Zeits. f. all. Wiss. 1905, pp. 203f. 

Ver. 11. The military function of the messiah is known even to the philosophic Philo, who (de praem. et poen. 15-20) represents him incidentally as καὶ στρατηγός καὶ πολέμων θεός, which victory of messiah over the earthly foes of God's kingdom meant the triumph of the kingdom, according to Jewish and Jewish Christian hopes; but owing to the increased spiritualisation of the latter, this nationalistic tradition was laid side by side with the wider hope of an eternal, universal judgment upon dead and living. The latter was originally independent of the earlier view, which made the culmination of providence for Israel consist in the earthly subjugation of her foes. The prophet John, by dividing God's foes into the two classes of Rome and Rome's destroyers, preserves the archaic tradition and also finds room for the Gog and Magog tradition later on.

Ver. 12. ἡ διαδήματα ἀλλὰ, bec. he is king of kings (Ptolemy on entering Antioch put two diadems on his head, that of Egypt and that of Asia, (1 Macc. xi. 13);
καὶ ἐτὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ "διαδήματα" πολλά·

ς ἧνοι ὁ νόμος γεγραμμένος δὲ οὐδέποτε οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς·

13. καὶ "περιβεβλημένος ιμάτιον βεβαμμένον 1 ἀματὶ·

καὶ κέκληται τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ·  "Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ·"

Contrast xii. 3. xiii. 1.

Loosely resuming the construction of ver. 11.

y Cf. on ii. 17. z Dat. cf. Joh. xxii. 8. A. Art. with pred. irreg. after δόμα (as vi. 8, viii. 11, etc.).

1 βεβαμμένον (A.Q, min., Ar., edd.) is preferable to περιβεβλημένον (Hort, Swete)—the conjectural origin of the variants περιπραμμένον (G), περατωμένον, etc.—which is probably a corruption of it or due to ditography with γεγραμμένον.

cf. the ten golden diadems of royalty in ancient Egypt). Once crowned with thorns, Jesus is now invested with more than royal rank (cf. Barn. vii. 9, where Jesus, once accursed, is shown crowned). Eastern monarchs wore such royal insignia when they went into battle (e.g., 2 Sam. i. 10). Jesus has far more than the four (of a good name, of the law, of the high priesthood, of the divine kingdom, Targ. Jerus. on Deut. xxxiv.) 5 or three (omitting the first) which Jewish tradition assigned to Moses (see Pirke Aboth, iv. 13, vi. 5; Joseph. Βαλ. 1. 2, 8, prophetic, priestly, and royal honours).—δόμα κ.τ.λ., cf. Ep. Lugd., "when Attalus was placed on the iron seat and the fumes rose from his burning body, he was asked, 'What name has God?' 'God,' he answered, 'has not a name as man has.'" Contrast δ ὀ δείς κ.τ.λ., with Matt. xi. 27. The earlier words, ιοῦς κ. δαλάς, are a description of the messiah's character and function, rather than a title. At this baptism, which is the only event in the Apocryphon at all corresponding to the second advent (i. 7), the messiah's judicial power is practically restricted to the external work of crushing the last pagan opposition to God's cause on earth; it becomes therefore almost military. The divine commandant of the saints is "faithful and true," as he loyally executes the divine purpose and thus exhibits fidelity to the interests of the faithful. The sense remains unchanged, whether the two adjectives are taken as synonyms, or ἀληθος, assigned its occasional meaning of "real". Even in the latter case, to be real would mean to be trustworthy.

Ver. 13. "Dipped in blood" (i.e., the blood of his foes); from the "crimsoned garments" of Yahveh in Isa. lxiii.; cf. also ver. 15 with "I have trodden the wine-press. . . . Yea, I tread them in mine anger (καταπτύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν θυμῷ μου), and trampled them in my fury," etc. Add Targ. Palest. on Gen. xliv. 11, "How beauteous is the King Messiah! Binding his loins and going forth to war against them that hate him, he will slay kings with princes, and make the rivers red with the blood of their slain, and his hills white with the fat of their mighty ones, his garments will be dipped in blood, and he himself like the juice of the wine-press." The secret name denotes his superiority to all appeals; it indicates; that the awful and punitive vigour of his enterprise made him impervious to the invocations of men. This is no Logos who dwells among men to give light and life; it is a stern, militant, figure of vengeance attacking the rebellious. Hence his name is mysterious; for "the identity, or at least the close connection between a thing and its name, not only makes the utterance of a holy name an invocation which insures the actual presence of the deity invoked, it also makes the holy name too sacred for common use or even for use at all" (Jevons' Introd. Hist. Relig. 361). The passage reflects certain phases of later messianic belief in Judaism, which had been tinged by the Babylonian myth of Marduk, Ea's victorious son, to whom divine authority was entrusted. Marduk's triumph was explained by Babylonian theologians as caused by the transference to him of the divine Name (so Michael, En. lxix. 14). 13 b may be a Johannine gloss upon the unknown name of ver. 12 (cf. Phil. ii. 9, 10), under the influence of passages like Heb. iv. 15, Sap. xviii. ("Thine all-powerful Logos leapt from heaven out of the royal throne, as a stern warrior into the midst of the doomed land, bearing the sharp sword of Thine unfeigned commandment") and Enoch xc. 35 (cf. however Beer, ad loc.).

—ἐξελήνας, perf. of existing state, of the past action of which it is the result being left out of thought" (Burton, 75). If the above explanation of the mysterious name
I. 14. καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά καὶ τὸ στρατεύμα τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκλογεῖται αὐτῷ ἐφ′ ἤτοι λευκός,

15. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται ἡ βοσίνη, γένει, ἡ υδρα τῆς ἐθνῶν ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἐπεζήτη τὰ ἐθνή.

16. καὶ ἤρθε ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὰ προσκύνησεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηνὸν αὐτοῦ δώμα γεγραμμένον,

"ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΩΝ".

be correct, the author's idea was evidently forgotten or ignored by some later editor or copyist of the Johannine school, who inserted this gloss in order to clear up the obscure reference, and at the same time to bring forward the transcendent name widely appropriated by that school for Christ in a pacific and religious sense (so nearly all critical editors). In any case the two conceptions of the Apocalypse and the Fourth gospel have little or nothing in common except the word. But the introduction of this apparently illogical sequence between 12 and 13 might be justified in part by E. B. D. 94, "I am he that cometh forth, advancing, whose name is unknown; I am yesterday, and Seer of millions of years in my name". The application of such titles to Jesus certainly gives the impression that these high, honourable predicates are "not yet joined to his person with any intrinsic and essential unity" (Baur); they are rather due to the feeling that "Christ must have a position adequate to the great expectations concerning the last things, of which he is the chief subject". But their introduction is due to the semi-Christianised messianic conceptions and the divine categories by which the writer is attempting to interpret his experience of Jesus. Backwards and forwards, as pre-existent and future, the redeemer is magnified for the prophet's consciousness.

Ver. 15. ἀντίδοτος—The victory of the messiah is single-handed ("I have trodden the wine-press alone"); cf. on ver. 13, and Sap. xviii. 22, Ps. Sol. xvii. 24-27, where the word of messiah's mouth is the sole weapon of his victory (an Iranian touch as in S. B. E. iv. p. lxxvii. f., the distinguishing excellence of Zoroaster is that his chief weapon is spiritual, i.e., the word or prayer). This fine idea, taken originally from Isaiah, was reproduced, naturally in a more or less realistic shape, by the rabbis who applied it to Moses at Exod. ii. 11 (Glem. Alex. Stro. i. 23), and by apocalypticists (2 Thess. ii. 8; Ap. Bar. xxxvi. f., liii. f.; 4 Esd. x. 60 f. and here) who assigned an active rôle to the messiah in the latter days. The meaning of the sword-symbol is that "the whole counsel of God is accomplished by Jesus as a stern judgment with resistless power" (Baur). Thus the final rout of the devil, anticipated in xii. 12, is carried out (i.) by the overthrow of his subordinate (mentioned in ch. xiii.) here, and then (ii.) by his own defeat (xx. 10), although in finishing the torso of ch. xii. (Bousset) the prophet characteristically has recourse to materials drawn from very different cycles of current messianic tradition.

Ver. 16. "And on his garment and (i.e., even) upon his thigh"; on that part of the robe covering his thigh, he has a title of honour written. Some Greek statues appear to have had a name written thus upon the thigh (Cicero mentions one of Apollo marked in small silver letters, Verr. iv. 43). Messiah, like many of the Assyrian monarchs, bears a double name. King of kings, a Persian (Esch. Foro. 24; Ezra vii. 10) and Parthian title of royalty, which in
17. Kai eidoν ἐνα ἀγγέλου ἐστώτα ἐν τῷ ἁλίῳ καὶ ἐκράζει φωνή o viii. 13; an angel of the sun in Asc. Is. iv. 18.

18. ἵνα ἐστώτα ἄγγελον τός ὀρέως τοίς πετομένοις ἐν μεσοωριανίματίκας, "As the sun approaches the earth, Asc. xlvii. viii. 13; cf. on vi.

19. καὶ εἶδον τοὺς φάγηται σάρκας βασιλέως καὶ σάρκας χιλιάρχων καὶ σάρκας ἱεραρχῶν καὶ σάρκας ἱππών καὶ τῶν καθημένων ἐπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ὕφερνων καὶ δοῦλων καὶ μικρῶν καὶ μεγάλων," ἵνα τῷ ἀδράμεις τῷ ἄγγελῳ τῶν πλευρῶν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἀνήρ.

20. καὶ ἐστώτα τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ σπαρακτά αὐτῶν συνηγμάτα τοὺς πόλεμος μετὰ τοῦ καθημένων ἐπ' αὐτῶν καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σπαρακτά αὐτῶν.

21. ἐπέστρεψαν τον ἅμην τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς κατασκοπής τοῦ χάραγμα τοῦ θρησκεύσαν τοῦ ἄγγελον τοὺς προσκυνόντας τῇ οἰκείῳ αὐτῶ.

Isa. xxx. 33, Dan. vii. 11; cf. Par. Lodi, i. 62-69.

According to a more specific form of the tradition reflected in xiv. 14-20, possibly the ghastly reap of ver. 21 is a dramatic foal to that of ver. 9. At any rate there is a slight confusion in the sketch, due to the presence of heterogeneous conceptions; whilst one tradition made messiah at his coming vanquish all the surviving inhabitants of the earth, who were ex hyposthose hypotheses of God's people (cf. ii. 26, 27, xi. 9 f., xii. 9, xiv. 14 f., xvi. 12, xvi. 17 f.), the prophet at the same time used the special conception of the Nero-antichrist who his allies were mainly Eastern chiefs (ix. 14 f., xvi. 12, xvi. 17 f.), and also shared the O.T. belief in a weird independent outburst from the skirts of the earth (xx. 8). Hence the route of nations here is only apparently final. See on xx. 3. The lake of fire, a place of torment which burns throughout most of the apocalypses (Sibyll. ii. 196-200, 252-253, 286, etc.; Apoc. Pet. 8), was lit first in Enoch. (sec. cent.) where it is the punishment reserved for Azazel on the day of judgment (ix. 6) and for the fallen angels (xxi. 7-10) with their paramours. The prophet prefers this to the alternative conception of a river of fire (Slav. En. x.). The whole passage reflects traditions such as those preserved (cf. Gróßer ii. 233 f.), e.g., in Targ. Jers. on Gen. xlii. 10 and Sohar on Lev.-Exodus (miracula, uariaque et horrenda bella fient mari terraque circa Jerusalem, cum messias reuelabitur), where the beasts of the field feed for one year, and the birds for seven, upon the carcasses of Israel's foes. The supreme penalty
inflicted on the opponents of Zoroastrianism is that their corpses are given over to the corpse-eating birds, i.e., ravens (Vend. iii. 20, ix. 49). Cf. Introd. § 4 b.

The messiah who forms "the central figure of this bloodthirsty scene," written like the preceding out of the presbyter's "savage hatred of Rome" (Selwyn, 83) has a semi-political rather than a transcendent role to play. The normal Christian consciousness (cf. xxii. 12) viewed the return of Jesus as ushering in the final reqult of mankind; but in these special oracles (cf. xvii. 14) where a semi-historical figure is pitted against Christ on earth, the latter is brought down to meet the adversary on his own ground—a development of eschatology which is a resumption of primitive messianic categories in Judaism. The messiah here is consequently a grim, silent, implacable conqueror. There is no tenderness in the Apocalypse save for the pious core of the elect people, nothing of that disquiet of heart with which the sensitiveness of later ages viewed the innumerable dead. Here mankind are naively disposed of in huge masses; their antagonism to the messiah and his people is assumed to have exposed them to ruthless and inexorable doom. Nor do the scenic categories of the tradition leave any room for such a feeling as dictated Plutarch's noble description (De Sera Livnd. 555 E. F.) of the eternal pangs of conscience. Upon the other hand, there is no gloating over the torments of the wicked.

Now that the destructive work of messiah is over, the ground seems clear for his constructive work (cf. Ps. Sol. xvii. 26 f.). But the idiosyncrasies of John's outlook involve a departure from the normal tradition of Judaism and early Christianity at this point. Satan, who survives, as he had preceded, the Roman empire, still remains to be dealt with. The third vision of doom, therefore (xx. 1-10 outlines his final defeat, in two panels: (a) one exhibiting a period of enforced restraint, during which (for 2, 3 and 4-7 are synchronous) messiah and the martyrs enjoy a halcyon time of temporal and temporary bliss, (b) the other sketching (7-10) a desperate but unavailing recrudescence of the devil's power. The oracle is brief and un-coloured. It rounds off the preceding predictions and at the same time paves the way for the magnificent finalé of xxi.-xxii., on which the writer puts forth all his powers. But it is more than usually enigmatic and allusive. "Dans ces derniers chapitres les tableaux qui passent sous nos yeux n'ont plus la fraîcheur vivante de ceux qui ont précédé. L'imagination ayant affaire à des conceptions absolument idéales et sans aucune analogie avec les réalités concrètes de la nature, est naturellement moins sûre d'elle-même, et ne parvient plus aussi facilement à satisfaire celle du lecteur" (Reuss). Ingenious attempts have been made (e.g., by Vischer, Spitta, and Wellhausen) to disentangle a Jewish source from the passage, but real problem is raised and solved on the soil of the variant traditions which John moulded at this point for his own Christian purposes. In the creation-myth the binding of the chaos-dragon or his allies took place at the beginning of the world's history (cf. Prayer of Manass. 2-4). As the dragon came to be moralised into the power of spiritual evil, this temporary restraint (cf. on ver. 2) was transferred to the beginning of the end, by a modification of the primitive view which probably goes back to Iranian theology (cf. Stave, 173 f., Baldr, Voŀter, 120 f., Briggs, etc.). The conception of messiah's reign as preliminary and limited on earth was not unknown to Judaism (Encycl. Relig. Et Ethics, i. 203 f.) or even to primitive Christianity (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 21-28, where Paul develops it differently). But the identification of it with the sabbath of the celestial week (which was originally non-messianic, cf. Slav. En. xxxii. xxxii.) and the association of it with the martyrs is peculiar to John's outlook. A further idiosyncrasy is the connection between the Gog and Magog attack and the final manoeuvre of Satan. The psychological clue to these conceptions probably lies in the prophet's desire to provide a special compensation for the martyrs, prior to the general bliss of the saints. This may have determined his adoption or adaptation of the chiliasm tradition, which also conserved the archaic hope of an earthly
The Iranian view was that Fredun could not kill the serpent, whose slaughter was reserved for Sâme (Bund. xxix. 9). But John abstains from giving any reason for the devil’s reappearance. He simply accepts the tradition and falls back (ver. 3) piously upon the δαι of a mysterious providence. Some enigmatic hints in a late post-exilic apocalypse (Isa. xxiv. 21, 22, the hosts on high and the kings on earth to be shut up in the prison of the pit but—after many days—to be visited, i.e., released), upon which John has already drawn, had been developed by subsequent speculation (cf. the lettering of Azazel, En. x. 4 f., liv. 5 f.) into the dogma of a divine restraint placed for a time upon the evil spirit(s); see S. C. xxvi. f., Charles’ Eschatology, 200 f.—各方面. Strictly speaking, the previous tradition (xix. 18, 21) left no inhabitants on earth at all. Such discrepancies were inevitable in the dovetailing of disparate conceptions, but the solution of the incongruity here probably lies in the interpretation of θόνη as outlying nations on the fringe of the empire (8) who had not shared in the campaign of Nero-antichrist and consequently had survived the doom of the latter and his allies (cf. xviii. 9).

Vv. 4-6. The millennium.

Ver. 4. θρόνος, tribunal—seats for the assessors of the divine judge (as in Dan. vii. 9, 10, 20, of which this is a replica). The unnamed occupants (saints including martyrs?) as in Daniel are allowed to manage the judicial processes (so Dan. vii. 22, where the Ancient of Days to κρίμα δικαίων ἄνω τοῦ οὐρανός) which constituted a large part of Oriental government. But no stress is laid on this incidental remark, and the subjects of
this sway are left undefined; they are evidently not angels (Jewish belief, shared by Paul). Such elements of vagueness suggest that John took over the trait as a detail of the traditional scenery. His real interest is in the martyrs, for whom he reserves (cf. Eus. H. E. vi. 42) the privilege assigned usually by primitive Christianity either to the apostles or to Christians in general. They are allotted the exclusive right of participating in the messianic interregnum.—πένθοςκαὶμέτα, beheaded by the licentiate's axe, the ancient Roman method of executing criminals (cf. Introdc. § 6). Under the empire citizens were usually beheaded by the sword. The archaic phrase lingered on, like our own "execution". Here it is probably no more than a periphrasis for "put to death". Even if καὶ κατέφθασε meant a second division, it must, in the light of xii. 7, xiii. 13, denote martyrs and confessors (who had suffered on the specific charge of refusing to worship the emperor).—χλιώσασθε, tenfold the normal period of human life (Plato, Rep. 615 b), but here the cosmic sabbath which apocalyptic and rabbinic speculation (deriving from Gen. ii. 2 and Ps. xc. 4) placed at the close of creation (cf. Drummond's Jewish Messiah, 316 f.; Bacher's Agada d. Tann. i. 133 f.; E. B. iii. 3095-3097; Encycl. of Religion and Ethics, i. 204 f., 209). John postpones the παλαιωσθήσεται till this period is over (contrast Matt. xix. 28). He says nothing about those who were living when the millennium began, and only precarious inferences can be drawn. Does ver. 6 contain the modest hope that he and other loyal Christians might participate in it? or does the second (καὶ κατέφθασε) class represent (or include) the living loyalists (so, e.g., Simcox, Weiss, Bousset)? The latter interpretation involves an awkward ambiguity in the meaning of πέφην (came to life, and also continued to live), conflicts with οἱ λεγόντες: and ψυχάμαι (4), and is therefore to be set aside, as 5-6 plainly refer to both classes of 4. A third alternative would be to suppose that all Christians were ex hypotæsis dead by the time that the period of xx. 1 f. arrived, the stress of persecution (cf. on xiii. 8 f.) having proved so severe that no loyalist could survive (cf. below, on ver. 11).

Ver. 6. An interpolated explanation of the preceding vision. "Αγιος, if a continuation of μακαρ., must almost be taken in its archaic sense of "belonging to God". The ordinary meaning reduces the phrase to a hysteron proteron, unless the idea is that the bliss consists in holiness (so Vendidad xix. 22, "happy, happy the man who is holy with perfect holiness"). "Blessed and holy," however, was a conventional Jewish term of praise and congratulation (cf. Jub. ii. 23).—δενωρ. διατάγμα κ.τ.λ. According to the Hellenic faith recorded in Plutarch (in his essay on "the face in the moon's orb"), the second death, which gently severs the mind from the soul, is a boon, not a punishment. But John's view reflects the tradition underlying the Iranian belief (Brandt, 586 f., 592) that the righteous were exempt from the second death (defined as in xxi. 8). The clause ἀλλ'... Χριστός refers to the permanent standing (i. 6, v. 10 a) of these risen martyrs not only during but after the millennium; otherwise it would be meaningless, since the danger of the second death (as the penalty inflicted on all who are condemned at the final assizes) does not emerge until the millennium is over. The subsequent clause καὶ ἡθελοῦσι σωτ. κ.τ.λ. is independent, referring back to the special and temporary privilege of the first resurrection and the millennium. For this reason it is precarious to infer from ἐνωρια ἰδρεις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (elsewhere τῷ θεῷ) that the occupation of these saints is the mediation of divine knowledge to the
 whore Satan is temporarily prevented from beguiling. The likelihood is that the phrase simply denotes as elsewhere the bliss of undisturbed access to God and of intimate fellowship. John ignores the current belief that the loyal survivors on earth would be rewarded (cf. Dan. xii. 12; Ps. Sol. xvii. 50, etc.), which is voiced in Asc. Isa. iv. 14-16, but he reproduces independently the cognate view (Asc. Isa. iv. 16 f.) that the saints will come with the Lord with their garments which are (now) stored up in high places in the seventh heaven (cf. Apoc. vi. 11) ... they will descend and be present in this world" (after which the Beloved executes judgment at the resurrection).

He, retains, however, not only the general resurrection (12) but the variant and earlier idea (cf. 4 Esd. vii. 26 f.) of a resurrection (Ps. 46, 4) confined to the saints. He calls this the first resurrection not because the martyrs and confessors who enjoyed it had to undergo a second in the process of their final redemption but because it preceded the only kind of resurrection with which sinners and even ordinary Christians had anything to do (Titus; 37-40; Baldensperger, 74, 79 f.). — and apparently on earth. This would be put beyond doubt were we to take the view of the risen martyrs' occupation which has been set aside above. But, even apart from this, in the light of all relevant tradition and of the context, the earth must be the sphere of the millennium; Christ might of course be conceived to execute his sovereignty from heaven, but, though ver. 9 denotes a different cycle of tradition from 4-6, it is put on the same plane, and the vision of 4 (cf. 1) is evidently this world. But the γή γης would more be in keeping with this context than with that of v. 10, where again the refrain of xxii. 5 (κ. β. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων) would be more appropriate.— χάλια γη. This enigmatic and isolated prediction has led to more unhappy fantasies of speculation and conduct than almost any other passage of the N.T. It stands severely apart from the sensuous expectations of current chiliasm (fertility of soil, longevity, a religious carnival, etc.), but even its earliest interpreters, Papias and Justin, failed to appreciate its reticence, its special object, and its semi-transcendent atmosphere. For its relevance, or rather irrelevance, to the normal Christian outlook, see Denney's Studies in Theology, pp. 231 f., and A. Robertson's Regnum Dei, pp. 113 f. When the millennium or messianic reign was thus abbreviated into a temporary phase of providence in the latter days, the resurrection had to be shifted from its original position prior to the messianic reign; it now became, as here, the sequel to that period.

Vv. 7-10: As Balaam, lord of the pagans, issues from the East to challenge Charlemagne and be crushed, Satan emerges from his prison for a short period (3) after the millennium, musters an enormous army of pagans to besiege the holy capital, but is decisively routed and flung into the lake of fire to share the tortures of his former agents. The tenses shift from future (7-8, 10 b) to aorist (9-10 a) the latter (cf. xi. 11) being possibly due to the influence of Semitic idiom.

Ver. 8. Satan's return to encounter irretrievable defeat upon the scene of his former successes (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅγιου κόσμου Ezek. xxxviii. 8), is an obscure and curious feature, borrowed in part from earlier beliefs in Judaism (Gog and the Parthians both from the dreaded N. E., Ezek. xxxviii. 4), but directly or indirectly from a legend common to Persian and Hellenic eschatology: in the former the evil spirit has a preliminary and a final defeat, while in the latter the Titans emerge from Tartarus only to be conclusively worsted (Rohde, Psyche, 410 f.). No explanation is given of how Satan gets free. In the Iranian eschatology (Brandt, 590 f.) the serpent breaks loose at the call of Angra Mainyod (God's opponent), seduces a part of mankind and persecutes the rest, till he is overcome by the messiah, who then proceeds to raise the dead. But as John identifies the serpent with Satan, such a
the theory was plainly out of the question. At any rate, Satan wins adherents for this fresh attempt from those barbarian hordes who survived the downfall of the Roman empire (xix. 17-21). They are called "Gog and Magog," after the traditional opponents who were to be defeated by the redeemed Israel of the latter days, according to the faith of Judaism (Ezek. xxxviii.-xxxix.). Jerusalem, the navel and centre of the earth (Ezek. xxxviii. 13) as messiah's residence, is besieged; but, like Gog of old, the invaders are consumed by the divine fire, whilst Satan is consigned for ever to the lake of fire, where he lies writhing among his worshippers, as a punishment for seducing men. This is at once a reminiscence of the Iranian eschatology (Häuschmann, 233), where the serpent is hung into molten metal as his final doom, in order to rid earth of his presence, and also a reflection of Enoch liv. (lvii. 7) where the four angels grip the hosts of Azazel on the last day and "cast them into a burning furnace, that the Lord of Spirits may take vengeance on them for leading astray those who dwell on earth ".

Ver. 9. πασιμπάλη, either camp (as in O.T., e.g., Deut. xxiii. 14) or army (Heb. xi. 34), the saints being supposed to lie in a circle or leaguer round the headquarters of the messiah in Jerusalem, which—by an association common in the ancient world (e.g., Nineveh, "the beloved city" of her god Ishtar)—is termed his beloved city. The phrase is an implicit answer (cf. on iii. 9) to the claim of contemporary Judaism which held to the title of "God's beloved" as its monopoly (Apoc. Bar. v. 1, xxi. 21, cf. Sir. xxiv. 11). In the Hebrew Elias-apocalypse of the 3rd century (cf. Buttenwieser, E. 9. i. 681-2), where Gog and Magog also appear after the millennium to besiege Jerusalem, their annihilation is followed by the judgment and the descent of Jerusalem from heaven. This tradition of xx. 4-10 therefore belongs to the cycle from which xi. 13 (xiv. 14-20) was drawn; Jerusalem, freed from her foes and purified within, forms the headquarters of messiah's temporary reign, tenanted not simply by devout worshippers but by martyrs (cf. xiv. 1-5, on mount Zion). Yet only a new and heavenly Jerusalem is finally adequate (xxi. 1); it descends after the last punishment and judgment (xi. 14 f. =xx. 10 f.). Wetsstein cites from the Targ. Jonathan a passage which has suggested elements in this and in the preceding (xv. 17-21) vision: a king rises in the last days from the land of Magog, and omnes populi obedient illum, after their rout by fire whose corpses lie a prey to wild beasts and birds. Then "all the dead of Israel shall live . . . and receive the reward of their works". In the highest spirit of the O.T., however, John rejects the horrible companion thought (En. xxviii. 58, xcv. 10, xcvii. 2) that God gloates over the doom of the damned. An onset of foreign nations upon Jerusalem naturally formed a stereotyped feature in all Jewish expectations of latter-day horrors; here, however, as the city is ipsa facto tenanted by holy citizens, the siege is ineffective (contrast xi. 1 f.). Neither here nor in xix. 21 are the rebellious victims consigned at death to eternal punishment, as are the beast, the false prophet, and Satan. The human tools of the latter die, but they are raised (xx. 11 f.) for judgment (ver. 15), though the result of their trial is a foregone conclusion (xiii. 8, xiv. 9-10). In En. livi., from which this passage borrows, Gog and Magog are represented by the Medes and the Parthians from whom (between 100 and 46 B.C.) a hostile league against Palestine might have been expected by contemporaries. But the destruction of the troopers is there caused by civil dissections. In our Apocalypse the means of destruction is supernatural fire, as in 2 Thees. i. 8, ii. 8, 4 Esd. xii. 33, xiii. 38-39, Ap. Bar. xxviii. 10, Asc. Isa. iv. 18 (where fire issues from the Beloved to consume all the godless); the Parthians also appear some time before the end, in the penultimate stage when the Roman empire and its Nero-antichrist make their last attack. But the prophet is still left with the orthodox eschatological tradition of Gog
and Magog, an episode (consecrated by the Ezekiel-prophecy and later belief) which he feels obliged to work in somehow. Hence his arrangement of Satan's final recrudescence in juxtaposition with the Gog and Magog outburst (cf. on x i. 16, and Klausner's messian. Vorstellungen d. jüd. Volkes im Zeit. d. Tannaiten, pp. 61 f.). The latter, an honoured but by this time awkward survival of archaic eschatology, presented a similar difficulty to the Talmudic theology which variously put it before, or after, the messianic reign (Volz, pp. 175 f.). In his combination of messianic beliefs, John follows the tradition, accepted in Sib. Or. iii. 663 f., which postponed the irruption till after messiah's temporary period of power.

xx. 11-xxii. 5. The connexion of thought depends upon the traditional Jewish scheme outlined, e.g., in Apoc. Bar. xxix-xxxi. (cf. 4 Esd. vii. 29, 30) where the messiah returns in glory to heaven after his reign on earth; the general resurrection follows, accompanied by the judgment. Developing his oracles along these current lines, the prophet now proceeds to depict his culminating vision of the End in three scenes: (i) the world and its judgment (xx. 11-15), (ii) the new heaven and earth (xxi. 1-5), centring round (iii.) the new Jerusalem as the final seat of bliss (xxii. 9-xxii. 5). The last-named phase was associated in eschatology (Sib. Or. v. 246 f., 414 f.) with the return of Nero redivivus and the downfall of Babylon which preceded the sacred city's rise. The destruction of hostile forces, followed by the renovation of the universe, is essentially a Persian dogma (Stave, 180 f.), and is paralleled in the Babylonian mythology, where after the defeat and subjugation of Tiamat in the primeval age creation commences. From this point until xxii. 9 f., Jesus is ignored entirely.

Vv. 11-15. The moral dignity and reticence with which this sublime vision of the last assize is drawn, show how the primitive Christian conscience could rise above its inheritance from Jewish eschatology. The latter spoke more definitely upon the beginning of the end than upon the end itself (cf. Harnack's History of Dogma, i. 174).

Ver. 11. John hints where Isaiah is explicit (vi. 1). Nothing is said about the uselessness of intercession; cf. 4 Esd. vii. [102 115] 33: "and the Most High shall be revealed upon the judgment-seat, and compassion shall pass away, long-suffering shall be withdrawn ". Enoch xx. 20 sets up the throne near Jerusalem, and most apocalypses are spoiled by similarly puerile details. Conclude with xxii. 9 that the tradition in Asc. Isa. iv. 18 where the voice of the Beloved (i.e., messiah) at the close of the millennium rebukes in wrath heaven and earth, the hills and cities, the angels of the sun and moon, "and all things wherein Beliar manifested himself and acted openly in this world ". John's Apocalypse, however, follows (yet cf. xxii. 12) that tradition of Judaism which reserved the judgment for God and not for the messiah (4 Esd. vi. 1-10, vii. 33 f. anti-Christian polemic?) although another conception (En. xlv. 3, lxix. 27 etc.; Ap. Bar. lxxii. 2-6) assigning it to the messiah had naturally found greater favour in certain Christian circles.

Ver. 12. The books opened in God's court contain the deeds of men, whose
fate is determined by the evidence of these “vouchers for the book of life” (Alford); the latter volume forms as it were a register of those predestinated to eternal life (cf. Gfrörer ii. 121 ff., and below on ver. 15). The figure of books containing a record of man’s career was a realistic expression of Jewish belief in moral retribution, which prevailed especially in eschatological literature (e.g., Jubil. xxx.; Enoch. lxxxix.-xc.; Dan. vii. 10, etc.) after the exile. “And in these days I saw the Head of days, when he had seated himself upon the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before him” (Enoch xlvii. 3; cf. Driver’s Daniel, p. 86). It is obvious, from ver. 15, that the resurrection is general (as Dan. vii. 20; 4 Esd. vi. 20, vii. 32; Test. Jud. 25; Test. Benj. 10; Apoc. Bar. 7, etc.; cf. Gfrörer, ii. 277 ff.; and Charles’s Eschatology, 340 ff.), in opposition to the primitive and still prevalent belief which confined it to the righteous (E. Bi. 1390). Hence the books contain not the good deeds alone of the saints (the prevalent Jewish idea, cf. Charles on En. li. 1; Mal. iii. 16; Jub. xxx.; Ps. lvi. 8, etc.), nor bad deeds alone (Isa. lxv. 6; En. lxxxi. 4; cf. En. xc. 20; Apoc. Bar. xxiv. 1) but good and bad deeds alike (as Dan. vii. 10; Asc. Isa. ix. 20 f.). This again tallies with the Iranian faith (Hübenschmann, 220), according to which, at the command of Ormuzd, the righteous and the wicked alike were raised for their recompense. Here the tribunal is a throne, before which the king’s subjects have to answer for their conduct; rebels are punished and the loyal get the reward of good service (cf. xxii. 12, etc.); γεγραμμένος, by whom? Jewish speculation conjectured Raphael as the recording angel (En. xx. 3) or a band of angels (Slav. En. xix. 5); but the Jewish idea of the heavenly tables (Πάλαις τού εἴρημα) is omitted in the Apoc., nor is there the slightest mention of those living at the era of judgment. Did John mean that none would survive (cf. ver. 5)? Or were any survivors to be taken directly to heaven at the coming of Christ, as in Paul’s primitive outlook (see on 1 Th. iv. 16-17)?

Ver. 13. See Pirke Aboth, iv. 32: “Let not thine imagination assure thee that the grave is an asylum” (for, like birth and life and death, judgment is appointed before the King of the kings of kings). “And the earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell therein in silence, and the secret chambers shall deliver up those souls (of the righteous, iv. 35) that were committed unto them,” 4 Esd. vii. 32—reproducing, as here, Enoch i. 1, “and in those days will the earth also give back those who are treasured up within it, and Sheol also will give back that which it has received, and hell will give back that which it owes”. Also En. lix. 5 where the restoration includes “those who have been destroyed by the desert, or devoured by the fish of the sea and by the beasts”. Evidently drowned people are supposed not to be in Hades; they wander about or drift in the ocean (Achill. Tat. v. 313), μηδὲ οἱ θανατώτες καταβαίνειν δὴ καταβαίνειν δὸς. According to the prophet’s conception (cf. xiii. 8, xiv. 9 f.) the fate of pagans must have been a foregone conclusion, when the Imperial cultus was made the test of character; in which case “the scene before the white throne is rather a final statement of judgment than a statement of final judgment” (Gilbert). But the broader allusion to works here shows that the prophet is thinking of the general ethical judgment, which embraced issues wider than the particular historical test of the Emperor-worship.

—ἀποκάλυψις ἑως εἰς τὰ ἐν Τούτῳ, cf. Plutarch’s (de Iside,
14. Kai o ἰάνατος καί o ὕφις εὐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός:

οὗτος o ἰάνατος νεκρός ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός 1

15. καί εἰ τις ὁδὸς εὐρέθη εἰ τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ὧμον γεγραμμένοι,

εὐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός.

1 Om. οὐτος . . . πυρός with eight minn., Me., Arm. (Aug.), Andbav, Fr., Haym. as a marginal gloss [so, e.g., Krüger, (Gött. Gal. Anz., 1897, 31), von Soden, Bousset (?), and Wellhausen (with 124 and 15)], perhaps displaced from its original position after 15, where it would suit the context (Hausseleiter, 212-213), since there is no question of the second death except for human beings. The misplacement was probably due to the attraction of ἰάνατος in 14.

29) derivation of Amenthes, the Egyptian name for Hades, as "that which receives and gives". As in Slav. En. lxv. 6 and the later Iranian Bunéesh (S. B. E. v. 123 f.), the resurrection of the body is not mentioned, though it is probably implied (cf. En. li. 1, lxii. 14 and Matt. xxvii. 52 ff.).

Ver. 14. Death as Sin's ally must be destroyed along with Sin, while Hades, the grim reaper of Death's prey (the intermediaterendezvous for the dead, except for martyrs, cf. vi. 10), naturally ceases to have any function. This was the cherished hope of early Christianity as of Judaism (Isa. xxv. 8). John's idea of the second death is much more realistic and severe than the Hellenic or the Philonic (cf. de Præm. et Poen. § 12, etc.).

Ver. 15. In Enoch (xxxviii. 5, xlviii. 9) the wicked are handed over by God to the saints, before whom they burn like straw in fire and sink like lead in water. The milder spirit of the Christian prophet abstains from making the saints thus punish or witness the punishment of the doomed (cf. on xiv. 10). In Apoc. Pet. 25 the souls of the murdered gaze on the torture of their former persecutors, crying στέφανα, δέκα ταύτα ἐν ἐκπέμπε ταύτα. These features, together with those of torturing angels (Dieterich, 60 f.) and Dantesque gradations of punishment (Dieterich, 265 f.), are conspicuous by their absence from John's Apocalypse. There is a stern simplicity about the whole description, and just enough pictorial detail is given to make the passage morally suggestive. As gehenna, like paradise (4 Esd. iii. 4), was created before the world, according to rabbinic belief (Gruber, ii. 42-46), it naturally survived the collapse of the latter (ver. 11). Contrast with this passage the relentless spirit of 4 Esd. vii. 49 f. ("I will not mourn over the multitude of the perishing . . . they are set on fire and burn hotly and are quenched"). If John betrays no pity for the doomed, he exhibits no callous scorn for their fate. The order of xxi. 13-15 and xxii. 1 f. is the same as in the haggadic pseudo-Philonic De Bubic. Anti-quitatis (after 70 A.D.) where the judgment ("reddet infernum debuitum suum et perditio restituita paratene suam, ut reddam unicumque secundum opera sua") is followed by the renewal of all things ("et extinguetur mors et infernum claudet os suum . . . et erit terra alia et caelum alium habitaculum sempiternum")

So much for the doomed. The bliss of saints occupies the closing vision (xxi.-xxii. 5). From the smoke and pain and heat it is a relief to pass into the clear, clean atmosphere of the eternal morning where the breath of heaven is sweet and the vast city of God sparkles like a diamond in the radiance of his presence. The dominant idea of the passage is that surroundings must be in keeping with character and prospects; consequently, as the old universe has been hopelessly sullied by sin, a new order of things must be formed, once the old scene of trial and failure is swept aside. This hope of the post-exilic Judaism (cf. Isa. lxv. 17, lxxi. 22) was originally derived from the Persian religion, in which the renovation of the universe was a cardinal tenet; it is strongly developed in Enoch (xci. 16, civ. 2, new heaven only) and 4 Esd. iv. 27 f. ("if the place where the evil is sown pass not away, there cannot come the field where the good is sown"). The expectation (cf. on Rom. viii. 28 f.) that the loss sustained at the fall of Adam would now be made good, is hardly the same as this eschatological transformation; the latter prevailed whenever the stern exigencies of the age seemed to demand a clean sweep of the universe, and the apoca-
lyptic attitude towards nature seldom had anything of the tenderness and pathos, *e.g.*, of 4 Esd. viii. 42-48 (*cf.* vii. 31). The sequence of xx. 11 f. and xxi. 1 f. therefore follows the general eschatological programme, *e.g.* in Apoc. Bar. xxi. 23 f., where, after death is ended (very mildly), the new world promised by God appears as the dwelling-place of the saints (*cf.* also xxi. 1 f.). The earthy Jerusalem is good enough for the millennium but not for the final bliss; the new order (xxi. 5) of latter (*cf.* above) coincides, as in Oriental religion (*Jeremiai*, 45 f.), with the new year (*i.e.*, spring) festival of the god’s final victory.—The literary problem is more intricate. With xxi. 1-8, which is evidently the prophet’s own composition, the Apocalypse really closes. The rest of the vision, down to xxi. 5, is little more than a poetical repetition and elaboration of xxi. 1-8, to which xxi. 6 f. forms the appropriate conclusion, just as the doublet xix. 9 b, 10 (in its present position) does to xix. 1-8. When xix. 9 b. 10 is transferred to the end of xvii. (see above), the parallelism becomes even closer. Both xvii. (the vision of the harlot-Babylon, with her evil influence on the world, and her transient empire) and xxi. 9-xxii. 5 (the vision of the Lamb’s pure bride, with her endless empire) are introduced alike (*cf.* xvii. 1-xxi. 9) and ended alike, though xxi. 6-8 has been slightly expanded in view of its special position as a climax to the entire Apocalypse. As xvii. represents John’s revision of an earlier source, this suggests, but does not prove, a similar origin for xxi. 9-xxii. 5. He might have sketched the latter as an antithesis to the former; certainly the “editorial” work in xxi. 9-xxii. 5 is not nearly so obvious and abrupt as, *e.g.*, in xviii. Upon the other hand there are touches and traits which have been held to imply the revision of a source or sources, especially of a Jewish character (*so* variously Vischer, Weyland, Ménégoz, Spitta, Sabatier, Briggs, Schmidt, S. Davidson, von Soden, de Faye, Kohler, Baljon, J. Weiss, and Forbes), delineating the new Jerusalem (*cf.* xxi. 1-2). In this event the Christian editor’s hand would be visible, not necessarily in xxi. 22 (see note), but in the ἄπροσ- allusions, in xxi. 14 b, 23 (cf. xxi. 5), 25 b (=xxii. 5 a), and 27 (=xx. 15, xxi. 8, xxi. 3 a). Another set of features (xxi. 12, 16, 24-27 a, xxii. 2 c, 3 a, 5) is explicable apart from the hypothesis of a Jewish source, or indeed of any source at all. Literally taken, they are incongruous. But since xxi. 9-xxii. 5 may be equivalent not so much to a Jewish ideal conceived *sub specie Christianae* as to a Christian ideal expressed in the imaginative terms of a Jewish tradition which originally depicted an earthly Jerusalem surrounded by the respectful nations of the world, a number of traits in the latter sketch would obviously be inapplicable in the new setting to which they were transferred. These are retained, however, not only for the sake of their archaic associations but in order to lend pictorial completeness to the description of the eternal city. The author, in short, is a religious poet, not a theologian or a historian. But while these archaic details need not involve the use of a Jewish source (so rightly Schöen and Wellhausen), much less a reference of the whole vision to the millennial Jerusalem (Zahn), or the ascription of it to Cerinthus (Völter) or a chiliasm. Jewish Christian editor (Bruston), may not the repetitions and parallelisms, especially in view of xxi. 6 f., indicate a composite Christian origin, as is suggested, *e.g.*, by Erbes (*A* = xxi. 1-4, xxi. 3-17, 20, 27, = xxi. 5-27, xxi. 1, 2, 18, 19) and Selwyn (xxxi. 16-21, the conclusion of *A* = xxi. 2, xxi. 3-5, xxi. 3-9 a, xxi. 7, xxi. 6 b-8, or of B = xxi. 9-xxii. 2, xxi. 6, 8-15)? Some dislocation of the original autograph or scribal additions may be conjectured with reason in xxi. 6-21 (see below), at least. But the repetitions are intelligible enough as the work of a single writer, whose aim is to impress an audience rather than to produce a piece of literature. The likelihood is that John composed xxi. 9 f. as an antithesis to the description of the evil city he had reconstructed from a source in xvii., and that he repeated the incident of xxi. 8, 9 (as xix. 9, 10 at the end of xvii.), adapting it to its position at the close of the whole book as well as of the immediately preceding oracle.

**CHAPTER XXI.—Vv. 1-8:** the prelude to the last vision.

**Vv. 1-2,** the title: 1 a ἐὰν ἐγέρῃς, II c,
2. καὶ τὴν πτέρυν τὴν ἁγίαν ἱερουσαλήμ ἑαυτήν εἶδον κατα-
βαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ ἡγομασμένην ὡς μήμην
κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτής. 3. καὶ ήκουσα φωνῆς ἡ μεγάλης ἐκ
tοῦ θρόνου λεγούσης,

"Ἰδοὺ ἡ ἁγία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ σημαίνει μετ' αὐτῶν."

"full of people" (Isa. xlix. 18). f xi. 12, xvi. 1. g xix. 5; cf. xx. 11. h xiii. 6, Ezek.
xxvii. 27, Zech. ii. 10, viii. 8, cf. Isa. lvii. 15.

The absence of the sea from John's ideal universe is due not to any Semitic horror of the ocean, nor to its association with Rome (xiii. 1), nor to the ancient idea of its dividing effect ("mare dissociabile," "marea linguata," "salt, estranging sea"), but to its mythological connexion with the primitive dragon-opponent of God, the last trace of whom is now obliterated. Cf. Sib. v. 159, 160, 447 (Ἑτεραὶ δὴ ὕπαται καιρὸς ἐν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις), Ass. Mos. x. 5, 4 Esd. vi. 24, Test. Levi 4, etc., for this religious antipathy to the treacherous, turbulent element of water. "La mer est une annullante, une stérilisation d'une partie de la terre, un reste du chaos primitif, souvent un châtiment de Dieu" (Renan, 449). Plutarch (de Iside, 7 f, 32) preserves the Egyptian sacred tradition that the sea was no part of nature (παραφυσική) but an alien element (ἄλλων περιττήμα), full of destruction and disease. The priests of Isis (32) shunned it as impure and unsocial for swallowing up the sacred Nile. One favourite tradition made the sea disappear in the final conflagration of the world (R. 17. 289), but John ignores this view. The world is to end as it began, with creation; only it is a new creation, with a perfect paradise, and no thwarting evil (Barn. vi. 13). His omission of the ocean is simply due to the bad associations of the abyss as the abode of Topham or Tiāmat (cf. Oesterley's Evol. of Messianic Idea, 79 f., G. A. Smith's Jerusalem, i. 71 f., and Hastings' D. B. iv. 194, 195).

Ver. 2. ἐκ = origin, ἀρχαῖον = originator.

This conception of the new Jerusalem as Messiah's bride in the latter days is an original touch, added by the prophet to the traditional Jewish material (cf. Volz, 336 f.). In 4 Esd. vi. 26 (Lat. S. r.) "the bride shall appear, even the city coming forth, and she shall be seen who is now hidden from the earth"; but this precedes the 400 years of bliss, at the close of which Messiah dies. In En. 28 f. a new and better house is substituted for the old, while in 4 Esd. ix.-x. the mourning mother rather suddenly becomes "a city builded" with large foundations (i.e., Zion). These partial anticipations lend some colour to Daniel's plea that the conception of a pre-existent heavenly Jerusalem was extremely limited in Judaism, and that John's vision is to be isolated from the other N.T. hints (see ref.). For a fine application of the whole passage, see Etce Homo, ch. xxiv. The vision conveys Christian hope and comfort in terms of a current and ancient religious tradition upon the new Jerusalem (cf. Charles on Apoc. Bar. iv. 3). The primitive form of this conception, which lasted in various phases down to the opening of the second century, was that the earthly Jerusalem simply needed to be purified in order to become the fit and final centre of the messianic realm with its perfect communion between God and man (cf. Isa. lx., liv. 11 = Tobit xii. 16-17, Ezek. xl.-xlviii., En. x. 16-19, xxv. 1, Ps. Sol. xvii. 25, 33, Ap. Bar. xxii., 16-17, Ezek. xl.-xlviii., En. x. 16-19, xxv. 1, Ps. Sol. xvii. 25, 33, Ap. Bar. xxviii., xxxix.-xl., lxix., lxiv., 4 Esd. vii. 27-30, xii. 32-34, etc.). But alongside of this, especially after the religious revival under the Maccabees, ran the feeling that the earthly Jerusalem was too stained and secular to be a sacred city; its heavenly counterpart, pure and pre-existent, must descend (so here, after En. xc. 28, 29, Ap. Bar. xxvi. 3, 4, Test. Dan 5, etc.). In rabbinic theology, the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem was taken from Adam after his lapse, but shown as a special favour to Abraham, Jacob and Moses (cf. Ap. Bar. iv.). The Christian prophet John not only sees it but sees it realised among Christian people—a brave and significant word of prophecy, in view of his age and surroundings.

Vv. 3, 4. σήμερον (chosen on account of its "assonance with the Hebrew to express the Shekinah," Dr. Taylor on Pirke
The unusual aoristic (cf. Helbing, 67) termination of 
γεγενασαν (Νέα, S., Iren., edd.) has started the variants 

gεγενασαν-ιον (38), 
γεγενασαν (41, 94: "no doubt a conj. of Erasmus based on vg., his MS. as reading γεγενασαν," Gwynn), and 


Aboth iii. 3) is the real tabernacle (Heb. viii. 2, ix. 11). The whole meaning and value of the new Jerusalem lies in the presence of God (En. xiv. 6, ixii. 14, Test. Jud., 25, etc.) with men which it guarantees. The O.T. promises are realised (see reff.); God is accessible, and men are consoled with eternal comfort (cf. Enoch x. 22, καλαριπτεροντα 
παντα δι γη απο παντοτε μιαματος και 
απο παντες ακαθαρσια και δραχις και 
ματσγας). If we were to read the passage in the light of Isa. ixii. 3-10, the tears wiped away would signify that the penitents were newly espoused to the Lord; but the context here implies tears of grief and pain, not of repentance. "There shall be no more labour, nor sickness, nor sorrow, nor anxiety, nor need, nor night, nor darkness, but a great light" (Slav. En. lxv. 9).

Ver. 5. The first and only time that God addresses the seer, or indeed (apart from i. 8) speaks at all. The almost unbroken silence assigned to God in the Apocalypse corresponds to the Egyptian idea of the divine Reason needing no language but noiselessly directing mortal things by righteousness (Plut. de Iside, 75; hence the deity is symbolised by the crocodile, which was believed to be the only animal without a tongue).

Ver. 6. "'Tis done, all is over" (ac. 
οτα αλ ους or παντα). The perfecting of God's work is followed, as in isa. liv.-lvi., by a liberal promise of satisfaction to all spiritual desire, and the three ideas of consolation, eternal refreshment, and Divine fellowship are thus conjoined as in vii. 14-17. Compare the foetal passage in Philo, de migrat. 

Abr. § 6 πηγη δε', δε' ή όμοια τα 
μεκανη, η του φιλοδρομων θεου σων 
ου λειν ινεφρετομακε τα 
των ενεργουσι ωφον, Ενομα μετα σου. 

The promise implies (like Isa. xliii. 3, not lv. 1) that thirst is accompanied by readiness and eagerness to accept the boon, which is free (6) and full (παντα) and filial (ver. 7). The thirst for God is opposed to the unbelief and vice which quench it, just as the victorious life is contrasted with the craven spirit which shrinks from the hardships and demands of faith. Similarly the life of strenuous obedience now enters on its majority; it comes into an estate of filial confidence to the great God, bestowed on all who acquit themselves nobly in their probation. By a rare touch (since iii. 22) in the Apocalypse, the individual Christian is singled out. Usually the writer is interested in the general body of Christians. Here, however, as in ii.-iii., religious individualism aptly follows the idea of personal promise and encouragement (cf. xxii. 17), as afterwards of judgment (xxii. 12-13).

Ver. 7. These boons (3-7), however, are reserved for the loyal; the third (son
of God) was a title applied to Augustus and the emperors generally throughout the Greek and Roman world. ἐπάρχωμαι (here only in Apoc.) in general sense = "enter into possession of," "partake of." ("This place" of bliss is a ρέματος, which bulks so prominently in apocalypses like Fourth Esdras and is employed in a cosmic sense by Paul as lordship over the whole creation (see Bacon, Biblical and Semitic Studies, Yale Univ. 1902, pp. 240 f.). The solitary allusion to sonship expresses the close relation to God for which this writer elsewhere prefers to use the metaphor of priesthood. Partly owing to the bent of his mind, partly owing to the stern circumstances of his age, he (like Clem. Rom.) allows the majesty and mystery of God to overshadow that simple and close confidence which Jesus inculcated towards the Father (Titus, x, 14), as also the direct love of God for his people (only in iii, 19, xx. 9).

Ver. 8. The reverse side of the picture (cf. xx. 12-15 and below on ver. 27): a black list of those who have not conquered. Θησωτι = "cowards" or apostates, who deny Christ in the persecution and worship Caesar (Intro. § 6) through fear of suffering; θελεῖν does not of course itself allow that it is timorous, but would shelter its timidity under the more honourable title of ἠλάβσεια" (Trench, Synonyms, § x). It embraces further all those who draw back under the general strain of ridicule and social pressure (Heb. vi. 4; 2 Ti. iv. 16, etc.), like Bunyan's Pliable, but unlike his Mr. Fearing (cf. 1 Macc. iii. 16).—ἀπιστῶν not = incredulous (so e.g., Dittenberger's Syllae, 828, 3 = 1 Pet. iv. 19, but, as in Luke xii. 46 (cf. Sir. ii. 12 f.), = "faithless," untrustworthy, those who are not πιστοί (i. 5, ii. 10, 13, 2 Ti. ii. 13). All διώκοντες are ἄπιστοι (cf. Intro. § 6), but not all ἄπιστοι are διώκοντες. There are more reasons for disloyalty to Christ than cowardice, and some of these are hinted at in the following words, which suggest that ἄπιστοι includes the further idea of immorality (as in Tit. i. 15, 16, where it is grouped with βελδεύωντες). Lack of faith is denounced also in Apoc. Bar. iv. 21, 4 Ess. ix. 7, etc., and διώκοντες for βελδεύωντες (as εἰλημμένοι for εἰλημμένοι, etc., cf. Field on Gal. ii. 11; Simcox, Lang. N. T. 128, 129), "de-testable" because "defiled and fouled" by the impurities of the pagan cults (xvii. 4, xviii. 3, etc.; cf. Hos. ix. 10; Slav. En. x. 4) including unnatural vice. Murder (and fornication, Jas. ii. 13) in the popular religions of the ancient world caused ritual impurity and disqualified for access to God, unless atoned for.—φαρμακοῖ = "poisoners" or "sorcerers" (xiii. 15), cf. Dan. ii. 27 LXX, and above on ix. 21, where (as here and in Gal. v. 21) witchcraft or magic is bracketed with idolatry. Idolaters, in Apoc. Pet. 16, have a special place πάλιν τοῦτον παρόδο γέμων. φθονοῦντα = "liars," primarily reprobate Christians who deny their faith and Lord, or worship false gods (Rom. i. 25); but also untruthful Christians who cheat (Acts v. 3) and lie to one another (Col. iii. 9, cf. Apoc. xiv. 5); further perhaps to be taken in its general ethical sense (Slav. En. xiii. 13; cf. Did. v. 2) = Oriental duplicity.—τὸ ἔνεις § 6: as in LXX, the subject of the principal clause is thrown forward into the dative (Viteau, ii. 41, 48). The special standpoint of the Apoc. renders the terms of exclusion rather narrower than elsewhere (cf. Volz, 313). Thus there is no allusion to sins of omission, especially as regards justice and kindness between man and man (as Slav. En. x., xiii. 5-9, Matt. xxv. 41 f.—the former apocalypse finely excluding from heaven all guilty of "evil thoughts" and magic, all harsh or callous men, and finally all idolaters). The parallels with the rest of
the Apocalypse, as well as the general style, indicate that xxii. 9-8 comes from the pen of the prophet himself; there is no evidence sufficient to support the conjecture that 5:8-11 is a Christian editor's gloss in a Jewish original (Wiecher, von Soden, S. Davidson, Rauch = 6 b-8, Spitta). The catalogue of vices, not unparalleled in ethnic literature (cf. Dieterich, pp. 163 f., 174 f., Heinrioni on 2 Cor. vi. 4 f.), diverges from those of ix. 9-21 and xxii. 15. The second agrees with Sap. xiv. 22-28 in making idolatry the fontal vice, and with Did. v. in putting theft after ἄρσενα (cf. Heb. xiii. 4-5; Eph. v. 5, etc.). Paul, again, invariably starts with the blighting touch of ἄρσενα or ἀκαθαρσία (cf. Seeberg's Catechismus d. Urc. 9-29, and von Dobschütz, pp. 406 f.) as in xxii. 15. No special significance attaches to the lists of the Apocalypse beyond the obviously appropriate selection of idolatry (ix. 20) as the outstanding vice of paganism, with carnalise (xxii. 8) as the foil to victorious confession (xxii. 7, 13, 17, xv. 3); note the division of xxii. 15 into the repulsive or filthy (first three) and the wicked (second three), corresponding to xxii. 11. The κόσμος of xxii. 15 roughly answer to the "abominable" of xxii. 8. xxi. 1-8 are a summary of what follows: xxi. 1, 2=9-21, xxi. 3, 4=xxi. 22-xxii. 5, xxi. 5-8=xxii. 16-21.

xxi. 9-xxii. 5: the new Jerusalem (resuming the thought of ver. 2, cf. xix. 7), corresponding to the new universe (ver. 1). The fall of Jerusalem accentuated the tendency to rise from the expectation of a new or renovated city on earth to the hope of a heavenly, transcendent city (cf. Apoc. Bar. iv. 2-6, etc.), though the passionate desire for a restoration of city and temple in the messianic age was still strong (cf. R. J. 326 f., Vol. 3, 334 f.). John introduces the definitely Christian identification of the heavenly Jerusalem with the bride of the messiah, and combines the various features of a renovated, a heavenly, and a pre-existent city—features which occasionally reflect the mythological background of such earlier ideas. The whole conception, if not the passage itself, is satirised by Lucian (Vera Hist. ii.), in his account of the golden city with its emerald wall, its river, and the absence of night, to say nothing of vines ὀμφατικοὶ καὶ κατὰ μήνα ἔκκοστον καρποφοροῦσαν. Vv. 11-21 describe the exterior, vv. 22-27 the interior.

Ver. 10: a fresh vision, marked by a new transport of ecstasy (cf. Ezek. iii. 14, xi. 1, etc.)—ὁδός, the vantage-ground of elevation from which the seer views the site and buildings. If the hill is the site of the city, it is a truncated cone like Cirta, or a terraced sikkurat. Ezra sees the vision of the descent of the new Jerusalem in a field of flowers (cf. 4 Esd. ix. 26 f., xiii. 35 f.), but John follows either the older tradition of Enoch (En. xxiv. xxv.) who visited a high mountain which, as his cicerone Michael explained, was the throne of God "where the great and holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit when he shall descend to visit the earth with goodness," or more probably the primitive association of paradise with a mountain (cf. Oesterley's Evol. of Mess. Idea, 129 f., Vol. 3, 375).

Ver. 11. "With the dazzling splendour of God," cf. on ver. 3, Ezek. xliii. 5, Isa. ix. 1, 2. Ἡ ἀκαθαρσία διαφήμισε τοὺς ἀποκαλυφτέοις: ἴδε, here, as usually in a apocalyptic literature, denotes the manifestation and realisation of the divine presence. A realistic turn is given to the expression by the "shimmering radiance" of ἄρσενα, the "sister of the luminous sphere" (asündetos); "her brilliance is like a very precious stone, a jasper, crystal-clear" (i.e., transparent and gleaming as rock-crystal). The
modern jasper is an opaque tinted quartz, only partially translucent at the edges. Perhaps, in reproducing Isa. liv. 11-12 (and θησων τας ἐπιλείψεις σου λαοίν και τᾶς πυλὰς σου λίθων κρυστάλλου), the writer regarded both clauses as complimentary (Cheyne); hence ως Λ. 1. χ. Otherwise λαοίν might represent an opal, a diamond, or a topaz, any one of which answers better to the description of "transparent and valuable". Flinders Petrie, however, suggests some variety of the dark green jasper.

Ver. 12. ἔξοψα. The constr. becomes still more irregular, the participles agreeing with an imaginary nominative, ἢ πόλις, sugg. by οὗ φωτείη. The inscribed names denote the catholicity of the church and its continuity with the ancient people of God. A writer who could compose, or could produce, or retain (as we choose to put it), passages like v. 9 and xiv. 4, is not to be suspected of particularism here. Even on the score of poetic congruity, the new Jerusalem implied such an archaic and traditional allusion to the twelve tribes. The angelic guardians of the gates are an Isaianic trait added to the Ezekiel picture.

Ver. 13. In one first century inscription (cf. Dittenberger's Orientis Graeci Inscript. Selectae, 1908) ἄνω ἀνατολῆς and ἄνω δύσεως are East and West respectively.

Ver. 14. ἔξων, another rough asyndeton. ἔξων κ.τ.λ., a symbolical and corporeal expression for the historical origin of the church in the primitive circle of the disciples who adhered to Jesus (cf. on xxii. 19). It is not their names but their historical and apostolic position which is in the writer's mind. The absence of Paul's name is no more significant than the failure to emphasise that of Peter. For the objective and retrospective tone of the allusion, with its bearing on the question of the authorship, see Intro. § 8. Foundation-stones in an ancient building were invested with high, sacred significance. Here the twelve apostles correspond roughly to the twelve φίλαριχος of the Mosaic period (Matt. xix. 28, Clem. Rom. xlii.-xliii.).

Vv. 15-17. The measures of the city are now taken, as in Ezek. xl. 3, 48, xlii. 16 f., to elucidate the vision (otherwise in xi. 1, 2). It turns out to be an enormous quadrilateral cube, like Ezekiel's ideal sanctuary, a cube being symbolical of perfection to a Jew, as a circle is to ourselves. Whether 1500 miles represent the total circumference or the length of each side, the hyperbole is obvious, but John is following the patriotic rabbinic traditions which asserted that Jerusalem would extend as far as Damascus in the latter days (Zech. ix. 1) if not to the high throne of God. In Sib. Or. v. 250 f. the heaven-born Jews who inhabit Jerusalem are to run a wall as far as Joppa. Further measurements in Baba-Bathra f. 75, 2 (cf. Gfrörer, ii. 245 f.; Bacher,
Agada d. Tann. i. 194 f., 392). As in the case of the tabernacle in Jerusalem of the Hexateuch, so here: the symmetry and harmony of the divine life are naïvely represented by Oriental fantasy in terms of mathematics and architecture. A wall of about 72 yards high seems oddly unsymmetrical in view of the gigantic proportions of the city, though it might refer to the breadth (Simcox) or to the height of the city above the plain. But the whole description is built on multiples of twelve, a sacred number of completeness.

The wall is a purely poetical detail, required to fill out the picture of the ancient city; like the similar touches in 24, 26, xxii, 2, it has no allegorical significance whatever. Cf. Slav. En. lxv. 10: "and there shall be to them" (i.e., to the just in eternity) "a great wall which cannot be broken down."—μέσον κ.τ.λ., another naive reminder (cf. xix. 9, 10, xxii. 8, 9) that angels were not above men.

Vv. 18-21: the materials of the city. οἱ ἀρχαίοι, so an undated but pre-Christian inscription, τ. ἀρχαίοι τοῦ τάφου (Dittenberger's Sylloge inscrip. Graec. 583), where the orthography is pronounced "nova" (see ref.).

While the city itself (or its streets, ver. 21) is supposed to be constructed of transparent gold like the house of Zeus ἀρχαίοι (Hippol. 69), the wall appearing above the monoliths or foundation-stones is made entirely of jasper, which again is the special ornament assigned to the first foundation-stone (19, see on ver. 11). The Babylonian sikkurat were picked out with coloured bricks; but the exterior of this second city is to be what only the interior of a Babylonian sanctuary had been—brilliant as the sun—flashing with precious stones and gold and silver. In Yashit xiii. 3 the heavenly Zoroastrian palace of the sky also "shines in its body of ruby." The general sketch is suggested by Isa. iv. 11, 12, and even more directly by Tobit xiii. 16, 17 ("For Jerusalem shall be built with sapphire and emerald, thy walls with precious stones, the towers and battlements with pure gold; and the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl and carbuncle and stones of Ophir"). The Egyptian mansion of Life is also composed of Jasper, with four walls, facing the south, the north, the east, and the west (cf. Records of Past, vi. 113). The twelve gems correspond upon the whole to those set in gold (cf. Ezek. xxviii. 13) upon the high priest's breastplate in P (Exod. xxviii. 17-20, xxix. 10-13), which the writer loosely reproduces from memory. What the old covenant confined to the high priest is now a privilege extended to the whole people of God (cf. ver. 22); for the astrological basis and the relation of the two O.T. and the present lists, cf. Flinders Petrie in Hastings' D. B. iv. 619-621; Myres in E. Bi. 480 f.; St. Clair in Journ. Theol. Studies, viii. 213 f.; and Jeremias, 68, 88 f. No occult or mystical significance attaches to these stones. The writer is simply trying to convey the impression of a radiant and superb structure.—σάκχαρος = lapis lazuli (sap-
22. καὶ ταῦτα ὅν τι ἔδωκεν ἐν αὐτῇ.

δὸγαρ Ὁρίων ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ράδε αὐτῆς ἤτοι, καὶ
tὸ ἄριστον.

23. καὶ ἡ πόλις ὁδὸι παρεῖν ἔχει τοῦ ἅλιον σοῦ τῆς σελήνης Ἰνὰ ἐγνώρισάν αὐτὴν

καὶ δὸ γαρ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφώνευν αὐτὴν,

 καὶ δὸ λόγους αὐτῆς τὸ ἄριστον.

a Ver. ii; cf. 4 Esd. vii. 42. From Zech. ii. 5 (LXX), Ps. Sol. iii. 16.

phirus et aureis punctis collucet. Caerul-leae et sapphir, rarorque cum purpura, Pliny, H. N. xxxvii. 39, a blue stone prized in Egypt and in Assyria, where it was often "used to overlay the highest parts of buildings" (E. Bi. 2710). — χάλανθος—either a variety of diopside or emerald gathered on a mountain in Chalcedon (Pliny), or more probably an agate (karkeda Pesh. rendering of רָבָש = LXX διαγός Ex. xxviii. 19), i.e., a variegated stone, whose base is chalcedony. The modern chalcedony is merely a translucent (grey) quartz, with a milky tinge. χρυσόλιθος = a gem of some (sparkling?) golden hue (LXX = ὄψη), perhaps some variety of our topaz or beryl, which ranges from emerald-green to pale blue and yellow. The modern chrysocolite is merely a hard greenish mineral, of no particular value. χρυσόλιθος and χρυσόπρασος (a leek-coloured stone) are probably varieties of the ancient beryl, unless the latter is the green chalcedony, and the former the modern topaz. γαργαρίαν κ.τ.λ. (on their value in the ancient world, see Usener's study in Theol. Abhand. 203-213): the conception is simplified from an old Jewish fancy of R. Johanan preserved in Baba-Bathra, f. 75, 1, "Deus adducer gemmas et margaritas, triginta cubitos longas totidemque latas, easque excuavabit in altitudinem xx cubitorum, et latitudinem xx cubitorum, collocabitque in portis Hierosolymorum". ἡ ἐποδήμαρ, generic = "the streets" (like ὀδον, xxii. 2), unless it has the sense of "forum" or "market-place" (as 2 Chron. xxxii. 6, Job xxix. 7 LXX). But the singular may allude to the fact that "the typical Eastern city had ... one street which led from the void place at the entering in of the gate to the court of the king's palace" (Simcox). Philo (quis hæcer. § xiv., leg. alleg. § xx.) had already made gold emblematic of the divine nature diffused through all the world, owing to the metal's fusible qualities.

Ver. 23. The Daily prayer of Jews at this time was "restore thou the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of thy house". But while this may have represented the popular religion of Judaism (Schürer, Hist. ii. 2, 174) which tenaciously clung to a restored temple as the religious centre of all future bliss, there were finer spirits who shared the Iranian repugnance to temples, possibly under a semi-Essene influence, and who seemed to have partially anticipated the more spiritual outlook of the Apocalypse (cf. Baldensperger, 53 f.); the second temple, owing to the debasing strifes of the first century B.C. and the growing reverence for the law, never quite absorbed the religious consciousness as the first had done. The holy City is to be unlike many Chaldean cities where the temple was a dominating and distinctive feature, often indeed the original nucleus of the town. To the seer, earth suggests heaven not only by anticipation but by contrast.

Ver. 23. Another fulfilment of the O.T. ideal (Isa. ix. 19, 20). It is a Jewish-Christian symbol for Paul's thought—God shall be all and in all. So in 4 Esd. vii. [42] at the last judgment there is neither sun nor moon nor any natural light, "but only the splendour of the glory of the Most High". "As the sum of righteousness Christ has been able to vanquish the sol inscitus of the Roman Caesar-cultus" (Usener, Götternamen, p. 184). A cruder form of the idea occurs in the pseudo-Philonic Bible, Antiquit. where "non erat necessarium lumen (for the night-march), its exaplent
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Vv. 24-26 further traits borrowed from Isa. ix. (see ref.).

Ver. 25. νυξ κ.τ.λ. "for no night (when even in peace they would be shut, Neh. xiii. 19) shall be there".

Ver. 26. From the tradition of En. liii. 1 and Ps. Sol. xvii. 34-35 (where the Gentile nations seek Jerusalem φέροντες δόμα . . . καὶ ἴδεις τὴν δόμαν κυρίου, ήν ἰδέαν αὐτὴν ὁ θεός); cf. Apoc. Bar. lviii. 2. The idea of 24 and 26 is of course literally inconsistent with those of xix. 17 f. and xx. 12 f., since on the new earth there were no residents except the risen saints. Both ideas were current in rabbinic eschatology (Gfrörer, ii. 238 f.), but the Apocalyptic is entirely free from any such complacent estimate of Gentile outsiders (cf. En. xc. 30). The discrepancy here, as in xxii. 5, is imaginary. These details are simply poetical and imaginative, inserted from the older symbolism, in which they were quite appropriate, in order by their archaic and pictorial fulness to fill out the sketch of the future city. They have no allegorical significance.

Ver. 27. R. Jochanan (Baba-Bathra f. 76, 2) said the coming Jerusalem would not be like the present one: in hanc ingreditur quicunque uult, in illam uero non nisi qui ad eam ordinati sunt. Citizenship similarly in John's new city is a matter of moral character and of divine election, not of nationality. The Lord's city is like the Lord's table, as the Ep. to Diognetus finely puts it (5 καὶ ἄλλα τὰ τὸ κοινόν, communes but not profanes, common and open to all, yet in another sense no common thing." The trait is adapted from Slav. En. ix., where the garden-paradise of the third heaven is only for those loyal to their faith, humble, just, charitable and benevolent, blameless and whole hearted, while the hell of torture (x. 4-6) is reserved for all addicted to sodomy, witchcraft, theft, lying, murder, and fornication, besides oppression and callousness to human suffering. But 48. and ψ. may be simply "idolatry" (as in LXX); the keynote of the book being struck once more (as in En. xiii. 9). In the Egyptian litany of the nine gods (E. B. D. 35) every petition ends with the words, "I have not spoken lies willingly, nor have I done aught with deceit," and in Apoc. Bar. xxix. 6 the seer accuses the Roman Empire thus: "by it the truth will be hidden, and all those who are polluted with iniquity will flee to it, as evil beasts flee and creep into the forest."
earthly Jerusalem with its inferior stream, the new city was to be richly equipped with conduits and all that makes a city prosperous and secure (Isa. xxxiii. 21). 

Ver. 2. *καταβαίνειν* ("street," or "boulevard") collective and generic (cf. Jas. v. 6) like ἐξελείνυ. "Take from... satisfying" with what precedes, and begin a fresh sentence with κατὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ (W. H.), ἐξελείνυ being governed by ὑποστάσεις (from ver. 1). The river, which is the all-pervading feature, is lined with the trees of life. The writer retains the traditional singular of Gen. ii. 9, combining it with the representation of Ezekiel (yet note sing. in xlvi. 12); he thus gains symbolic impressiveness at the expense of pictorial coherence. Ramsay (C. B. P. ii. 455) observes, however, that the waters of the Marsyas were "probably drawn off to flow through the streets of Apameia; this practice is still a favourite one in Asia Minor, e.g., at Denizli."—κ. μᾶς, the poetic imagination soars over the prosaic objection that months are impossible without a moon (xxi. 22).—

καταβαίνειν, κ.τ.λ. To eat of the tree of life was, in the popular religious phraseology of the age, to possess immortality. In En. xxiv., xxv., where the prophet sees a wonderful, fragrant tree, Michael explains that it must stand untouced till the day of judgment (καταβαίνειν ἐξελείνυ ἐδώρων ἄνθρωπον), "Then the righteous and the holy shall have it given them; it shall be as food for the elect unto life."

So in contemporary Judaism; e.g., 4 Esd. vii. 53 and viii. 52 ("For unto you is paradise set open, the tree of life is planted, the time to come is prepared, a city is built and rest is established") as already in Test. Levi, 18, where the messianic high-priest is to "open the gates of paradise and remove the sword drawn against Adam, and permit the saints to eat of the tree of life."

For the association of God's city and God's garden, cf. Apoc. Bar. iv. 5; for the notion of healing, Apoc. Mos. vi. 12 f., and the Iranian idea that (Brandt, 434 f.) the tree of many seeds had curative properties. John is therefore using the realistic and archaic language of Jewish piety to delineate the bliss of Christians in a future state where all the original glories and privileges of God's life with man are to be restored. The Christian heaven is to possess everything which Judaism claimed and craved for itself, cf. the Christian addition to 4 Esd. ii. 34, 35, 38 f.; also the famous hymn to Osiris (E. B. D., ch. cxxxiii. : "I have come into the city of God—the region which existed in primaeval time—with my soul, to dwell in this land. . . . The God thereof is most holy. His land draweth unto itself every other land. And doth he not say, the happiness thereof is a care to me?")

Ver. 3. καταβαίνειν, a corrupt and rare form of καταβαίνω = anything accused (lit. a curse itself, Did. xvi. 8), i.e., abstract for concrete, here = "a cursed person," so Ps. Sol. xvii. 29 f.—λατρεύσων, unfettered and unspoiled devotion. The interruption of the daily service and sacrifice in Jerusalem on 17th July, 70 A.D., had sent a painful thrill to the heart of all who cherished the ideal of Acts xxvi. 7. No fear of that in the new Jerusalem!

Ver. 4. The ancient ideal of intimate confidence is also to be realised (cf. on Matt. v. 8 and 1 John iv. 14). With this phrase and that of xii. 23 compare Browning's lines: "Why,
where's the need of temple when the walls of the world are that... This one Face, far from vanish, rather grows | Becomes my universe that feels and knows." The idea here is that reproduced in the seventh and supreme degree of bliss in Enoch vii. [78] where the saints "shall rejoice with confidence, have boldness undismayed, and gladness unafraid, for they shall hasten to behold the face of him whom they served in life". By Oriental usage, no condemned or criminal person was allowed to look on the king's face (Esther vii. 8). In the ancient ch. 25 of E. B. D. (papyrus of Nu) the "triumphant Nu saith, 'I have come to see him that dwelleth in his divine aurea, face to face, and eye to eye... Thou art in me, and I am in thee'," The Apocalypse, however, shuns almost any approach to the inner union of the individual Christian and Christ which distinguished both Paul and the fourth gospel; it also eschews the identification of God and man which was often cruelly affected by Egyptian eschatology. No allusion occurs to the supremacy of the saints over angels (Ap. Bar. i. 12, etc.), though John is careful elsewhere to keep the latter in their place (see on xxi. 17, xxii. 9). He also ignores the problem of different degrees in bliss,—σωματίζεσιν. In Chap. 5.6 there is a story of a blind rabbi who blessed some departing visitors with the words, "Ye have visited a face that is seen and sees not: may ye be counted worthy to visit the Face which sees and is not seen". The Christian prophet has a better hope and promise. Compare, however, Plutarch's touching faith (Isis, 70) that the souls of men after death will "migrate to the unseen, the good," when God becomes their king and leader and where "they, as it were, hang upon him and gaze without ever wearying, and yearn for that unspeakable, indescribable Beauty". Ver. 5. Philo (de Jos. 24) had already described heaven as θησαυρὸς αἰώνων, 

υμνότευ καὶ τιάσθαι σκιᾶς διάτοχον. Cf. En. vi. 6.—Such teaching on heaven, though in a less religious form, seems to have been current among the Asiatic peoples. Irenæus (v. 36, 1-2) quotes them as holding (cf. above on ii. 7) that some of the blessed της τῶν παρεδειγμένων τριήμερης ἀπαλαύσεως, οἱ δὲ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πάλαις καθίσωσιν τανταχάρι γὰρ οἱ Σωτῆρ ὡς Ὀμοθέται, καθὸς ἔμποροι οἱ ὀρφιέταις αὐτὸν, κ.τ.λ.

The epilogue (6.21) is a series of loose ejaculations, which it is not easy to assign to the various speakers. It is moulded on the lines of the epilogue to the astronomical section of Enoch (lxxxi.f.) where Enoch is left for one year with his children—"that thou mayest testify to them all... Let thy heart be strong, for the good will announce righteousness to the good, but the sinners will die with the sinners, and the apostates go down with the apostates". Two characteristic motifs, however, dominate the entire passage: (a) the vital importance of this book as a valid and authentic revelation, and (b) the nearness of the end. The former is heard in the definite claim of inspiration (6 f., 16) and prophetic origin (8, 9) which guarantees its contents, in the beatitude of 7.5 (cf. 17), and (cf. 21) in the claim of canonical dignity (18, 19). The latter is voiced thrice in a personal (7, 12, 20) and twice in an impersonal (6, 10) form. Both are bound up together (cf. 20 and i. 3). It is as a crucial revelation of the near future and a testimony to the authority and advent of the messiah (cf. 20) that this apocalypse claims to be read, and honoured in the churches. This general standpoint is clear enough, but the details are rather intricate. It is characteristic of the Apocalypse, as of ep. Barnabas, that the writer often leaves it indefinite whether God or Christ or an angel is speaking. Sometimes the divine voice is recognised to be that of Christ
5—9.  

**APOKALYPSE IΩANNIOY**

8. "καὶ ἤλθεν Ἡλλάντις δὲ, ἀλέθως καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα· καὶ ἦτε ἥκουσα· As in i. 9 καὶ ἰδέως, ἔπεσα προσκυνήσας ἐν προσφορᾷ τῶν ποιητῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ "δεικνύοντος μοι ταῦτα. 9. καὶ λέγει μοι, "δρα μὴ σύνθεσθαι σοῦ εἴμαι καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν τηροῦντων τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ· τῷ θεῷ προσκυνήσας."

6. καὶ εἶπέν μοι, "Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ καὶ οἱ κύριοι θεῶν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν ἀπόστειλε τοῖς ἀγγελοῖς αὐτῶν δείξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτῶν δει γενεσθαι εἰς τάξεις.

7. καὶ ἦδον ἔφυγον ταῦτα. "μακάριοι δὲ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ θεοῦ.

for they are faithful and true.

[...]

(cf. i. 10 f., iv. 1), or may be inferred from the context to be that of an angel (e.g., xvii. 15, cf. i and xix. 9), perhaps as the divine spokesman (xxi. 5, 6, cf. 5 and 7). But frequently, even when the seer is addressed (x. 4, xiv. 13), the voice or Bath-Qol is anonymous (e.g., xi. 12, xii. 10, xiv. 2, xvi. 1, cf. 17). In the epilogue, as it stands, it is impossible and irrelevant to determine whether Jesus (16) begins to speak at ver. 10 (so Spitta, Holtzm., Porter, Forbes) and resumes in 18-20 a. But, while 6-7, and 8-9 are both intended in a sense to round off the entire Apocalypse, and not merely the immediately preceding vision, 8-9 (a replica of xix. 9-10) stands closer to xxi. 9-xxii. 5 than does 6-7. No λόγος in the last vision justify the reference in 6, whereas the specific δεικνύοντος μοι ταῦτα in 8 echoes the cicerone-function of the angel in xxi. 9-10, xxii. 1. Vv. 6, 7 very probably lay originally between 9 and 10 (for the juxtaposition of ἐπεφέραν and λύθην cf. xvii. 7, 15), where they definitely mark the beginning of the epilogue already anticipated in 8 (cf. i. 4, 9) and in the broadened close of 9 (contrast xix. 10 above). It is not necessary (though perhaps a later scribe may have thought so) to account for John's action in 8-9 by supposing that he mistook the ἄγγελος ἱεράς for Christ. The λόγος of 6, when this order is adopted, acquire their natural sense (cf. 10), and the three successive angel-utterances (8-9, 6-7, 10-11) have a proper sequence. It is needless, in view of xvi. 15 (cf. iii. 11) to omit 7 a as an interpolation (Könnecke). But 12-13 probably have been displaced from their original order (13, 12) and position after 16 (Könnecke), where 17 echoes 12 a, and 14, 15 carries on the thought of 11. Vv. 18, 19 are plainly editorial, interrupting the connexion of 17 and 20. In 11 Resch (Agrapha, § 13) attempts to prove that some logion of Jesus is quoted. On the "inconsistent optimism" of xxii. 13 and 15, cf. Abbott, p. 107.

Ver. 8. There is no trace of any reluctance on the prophet's part to return to earth, as in Asc. Isa. (Gk.) ii. 33-35.

Ver. 9. The warning against any Christian λόγος τῶν ἀγγέλων 174 194, as in the parallel passage, an indirect exaltation of the prophetic order as equivalent to the angelic in religious function, but an assertion that even ordinary Christians who accept the Apocalypse are equal to the hierophant angel. Unlike Neb, the angelic interpreter of Marduk's will in Babylonian religion, he is not to be worshipped, for all his importance. Precautions against angel-worship could hardly be more stringent.

"The repetition of the scene is enough to show that it does not represent a natural ebullition of feeling and its correction, but that the narrative has a purpose... and that those who observed the practice made use of" John's name, or at any rate believed they could appeal to him as sanctioning their superstition (Weizsäcker, ii. 203-204).

Ver. 6. As in En. cviii. 6 (only mention of prophets in Enoch), "what God announces through the mouth of the prophets" relates to the future.—πνεύμα, the plurality of spirits is an archaic detail (cf. i. 4) adapted also from the Enochic formula (xxxvii. 2, etc.), "God of the spirits."
IO. καὶ λέγει μοι, "Μη σφαγίζης τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας
tοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. " διό και τὰ γάρ ἔγγυς ἔστων.

II. o ἄδικων ἄδικας ἦσσαν ἐτὶ.
καὶ o ῥυπαρός ῥυπαθής ἦτι.
cαὶ δικαιος δικαιοσύνην 
καὶ δικαιος ἀγιασθής ἦτι.

1. Mayorum Jaso, sk.: moral

14. Μακαριοι ο εἰς πλοντες τὰς στολάς αὐτῶν. " ίνα ἐσται ἡ

1. εξουσία αὐτῶν ἐτι. το ἡ εξολο τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τύοι πλεύνων εὐδαι-

15. ἦσσαν ἐτι τήν πόλιν. 2. ἦσσαν κάτι καὶ τάς φαρμακοὶ και

1. The ample style of the Apoc. tells against the conjecture (Zahn, Nestle's Einf. 264-265; Bebb, Studia Biblica, ii. 209-210) that the original reading is preserved in Ep. Lugd. ο εὐαγγελος ανομφατο καὶ τό δικαία δικαιοσύνην αὐτῶν, the rest being glossematic. The v. l. δικαιοσύνην (38, 79, vg.) has been mechanically conformed to εὐαγγελος.

2. Instead of the well-supported οἰνοιούμενα τακτολακαυτος (Q, min., Syr., Arm., Me., Areth., And., Tert., Tic., Cyp., cf. 1 J. v. 21; so de Wette, Diast., Ba.), οἰνοιούμενα τακτολακαυτος (6A, 7, 38, vg., Aeth., Pr., Haym., etc., edd.) is to be read, the variant being possibly due to the feeling that some moral characteristic was needful after 11 (Wa.).

are the envoys and mouthpieces of God here as in the O.T., and therefore entitled to speak in his name or in that of Christ. " The Oriental mind hardly distinguishes between an ancient personage and one who appears in his power and spirit " (A. B. Davidson on Ezk. xxxiv. 29). In 4 Esd. v. 31-40 the angel is also addressed as if he were the Lord—the angelic personality evidently fading into the divine, as here, and the writer being equally unconscious of any incongruity in the representation (cf. Zech. iii. 1-4).

As the "showing" of the 8. y. to τ. in (1. 1) an ἄγων. of Jesus, he (or a word of his) naturally breaks in (7 a).—τῷ τητὶ τίν. κ. ἣ. γ. ἄγων, an apocalyptic form of emphasis. Cf. e.g., Slav. En. xxvii. 1-3 and xxvii ("tell thou thy sons and all thy household before Me, that they may listen to what is spoken to them by thee . . . and let them always keep my commandments, and begin to read and understand the books written out by thee.") All apocalypses were meant to be transmitted to mankind, but the usual method of delivery is complicated (cf. En. lxxxi. 1, 2; Slav. En. xxxviii. 9, xlvi. 2, 3, etc.).

Ver. 10. The book of Daniel, the great classic of apocalyptic literature, is represented (cf. Slav. En. xxxviii. 9-11, xxxv. 3; En. xcviii. ro, civ. 12, etc.) as having been providentially kept secret at the time of its composition, since it referred to a future period (viii. 26, xii. 4, 9). This was a literary device, to explain why it had not been divulged before. As John's apocalypse is for an immediate crisis, it is not to be reserved for days to come. It is not merely valid (7) but intended for the prophet's contemporaries (unlike Isa. xxx. 8, cf. Cheyne's note), though reserved, like most of its class, as esoteric literature for the "wise" (contrast 4 Esd. xiv. 38-48). Some interval, however, is presupposed between the vision and its fulfilment, otherwise it would be futile to write the visions down, and to arrange for their circulation throughout the churches. A certain career (7, 9, 18-19) is anticipated for the Apocalypse. But (ver. 11) persistence in good and evil is about all the writer expects—a stereotyped feature of the apocalyptic outlook on the obduracy of the wicked and the perseverance of the saints. Apocalyptic never encouraged propaganda, and no radical or widespread change is anticipated during the brief interval before the end. As in Dan. xii. 10, 11, so here, the crisis simply accentuates and accelerates human character along previous lines. No anxiety is shown, however, as in 4 Esd. iv. 50 f., whether the prophet himself is to see the end.

Ver. 15. κύριες, an archaic metaphor,
coloured by the nomad’s hatred of hounds; cf. *Arabia Deserta*, i. 337, 339 (‘only the dog has no citizenship in the nomad life’). ‘It is the only life mishandled by the gentle Arab, who with spurns and blows cast out these profane creatures from the tent.’ Here κόνινα are not merely impure pagans, but the impudently impure, possibly in the special and darker sense of ‘sodomites’ (cf. 1 Tim. i. 10; Deut. xxii. 23; Isa. xxii. 15) etc. colleted (cf. xxiii. 18 and 19). Cf. xxiii. 8 and Cooke’s *North Sem. Inscriptions*, p. 68. Such loathsome practices were not uncommon in the Oriental cults.

Ver. 16. Jesus in person now speaks in the colloquy (16, 13, 12) to ratify what has just been said. This apocalyptic is not an individual fantasy (as Peter i. 21). For the contemporary need of such accrediting, cf. Herm. Sim. ix. 22 and Asc. Isa. iii. 30, 31 (where in the last days ‘everyone will say what is pleasing in his own eyes. And they will make of none effect the prophecy of the prophets which were before me, and these my visions also will they make of none effect, in order to speak after the impulse of their own hearts.’) Deut. xi. 18—Deut. xii. 4. Not John (Weiss, Wellh.) but the *angels interpres* (cf. on i. 2 and 20).—Διακήρυξεν, the plural here and in ver. 6 (cf. i. 1) might suggest that John’s apocalypse incorporated some visions of other members belonging to the prophets in the Asiatic circle or school (cf. the tradition about the co-operative origin of the Fourth gospel, in the Muræan canon). But while any Jewish Christian sources may have been drawn from this quarter, the final authorship and authority is claimed by (or, for) John himself (cf. ver. 8).—Δανειθήθη. Like most early Christians, John attached more weight to the Davidic descent of Jesus as messiah (Baldensperger, 82 f.), than Jesus himself allowed. Here Christ’s authority in revelation is bound up with his legitimate claim to be messiah, and thus to inaugurate the new and eternal day of God.

As ἀνασκόπη (the dawn = πρωί) was already a messianic symbol, and employed in LXX (Jer. xxiii. 5, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12) to denote the messianic branch or stem, this double usage explains the imagery here (so Justin, *Apol.* i. 32). Jesus has not only the historic preparation of Israel behind him but the infinite future before him. In one sense he was the climax of Hebrew prophecy: in another, he is of world-wide significance. In connexion with the heavenly Jerusalem it was natural that Jesus should be hailed as the sion of the David who had founded the first Jerusalem. The star-metaphor reflects the significance of the morning-star which meant the beginning of a new day for toilers in the Levant; but its eschatological outlook was taken ultimately from Babylonian astrology, where Nebel (Mercury = prophet), the morning-star, announced the new era, or from Egyptian theology where (cf. E. B. D. p. cxliii.) Pepi the dead king ‘goeth forth into heaven among the stars which never perish, and his guide the Morning-Star leadeth him to Sekhet-Netep [the fields of peace]’. The phraseology brings out the conviction of the early church that the present trial was only the cold, dark hour before the dawn. Their faith in Jesus assured them that an eternal prospect of bliss awaited them, and this vista of hope was bound up with the person of the risen Jesus (cf. ver. 13). The watchword was, sunrise and morning-star (cf. *Expos.* Dec. 1902, 424-447). Christianity was not some ephemeral Oriental cult, which had had its day; the cosmic overthrow meant a new era for its adherents. The Apocalypse thus closes, as it began (i. 5, 6) with a note of ringing emphasis upon the eternal significance of Christ in the divine plan and purpose.
Ver. 13. "έγιν το 'Δμα και το δ,  
ό πρώτος και ο ἐσχατος,  
η ἄρχη και το τέλος."

Ver. 17. The promise of 12 a is caught up and answered by a deep "come" from the prophets in ecstasy (πνεύμα personified, cf. ii. 7, etc.) and the Christian congregation. — πνεύμα. Hitherto (xxi. 2, etc.) this term has been reserved for the church triumphant in the world to come. Now, with the memory of these oracles fresh in his mind, the prophet applies it to the church on earth, as Mark had already done. — κα λ ἀνθρω  
πιστ. λ., a liturgical note, like Mark xiii. 4 (cf. Weinel, 84, 85). — κα λ διψων κ.τ.λ., addressed to strangers who sometimes attended the Christian worship (cf. i Cor. xvi. 24). For this fine turn of expression (the double use of come), cf. Did. x. 6, "may grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If anyone is holy let him come [i.e., to the Lord's table]; if anyone is not, let him repent. Μάραθα θα" (cf. below, ver. 20). The less likely alternative is to take έρχον here as addressed not to Jesus but to the outside world.

Vv. 18-19. Luther strongly objected to the extravagant threat of this editorial note. The curse is certainly not only an anti-climatic like the editorial postscript in John xxi. 24, 25 (both indicating that either when published or when admitted to the canon, these two scriptures needed special authentication) but "an unfortunate ending to a book whose value consists in the spirit that breathes in it, the bold faith and confident hope which it inspires, rather than in the literalness and finality of its disclosures" (Porter). But the words are really a stereotyped and vehement form of claiming a canonicity equal to that of the O.T. (cf. Jos. Ant. xx. 1. 2, τον τον τον αποκάλεσεν δι' αυτων, δια αυτων ουτε προσθεϊ

VER. 13. "έγιν το 'Δμα και το δ,  
ό πρώτος και ο ἐσχατος,  
η ἄρχη και το τέλος."

VER. 17. The promise of 12 a is caught up and answered by a deep "come" from the prophets in ecstasy (πνεύμα personified, cf. ii. 7, etc.) and the Christian congregation. — πνεύμα. Hitherto (xxi. 2, etc.) this term has been reserved for the church triumphant in the world to come. Now, with the memory of these oracles fresh in his mind, the prophet applies it to the church on earth, as Mark had already done. — κα λ ἀνθρω  
πιστ. λ., a liturgical note, like Mark xiii. 4 (cf. Weinel, 84, 85). — κα λ διψων κ.τ.λ., addressed to strangers who sometimes attended the Christian worship (cf. i Cor. xvi. 24). For this fine turn of expression (the double use of come), cf. Did. x. 6, "may grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If anyone is holy let him come [i.e., to the Lord's table]; if anyone is not, let him repent. Μάραθα θα" (cf. below, ver. 20). The less likely alternative is to take έρχον here as addressed not to Jesus but to the outside world.

Vv. 18-19. Luther strongly objected to the extravagant threat of this editorial note. The curse is certainly not only an anti-climatic like the editorial postscript in John xxi. 24, 25 (both indicating that either when published or when admitted to the canon, these two scriptures needed special authentication) but "an unfortunate ending to a book whose value consists in the spirit that breathes in it, the bold faith and confident hope which it inspires, rather than in the literalness and finality of its disclosures" (Porter). But the words are really a stereotyped and vehement form of claiming a canonicity equal to that of the O.T. (cf. Jos. Ant. xx. 1. 2, τον τον τον αποκάλεσεν δι' αυτων, δια αυτων ουτε προσθεϊ ντις ουτε ἄρχη ντε αυτων ουτε μετα-
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third time (7, 12): "Most assuredly, I am coming speedily".

1 Om. Pr.—Of the variants for πατερον ημων (vg., Aeth.), either πατερον των αυγων (Q, min., Me., Syr., S., Arm., And., Areth., Bs.) or preferably πατερον (A. am., Lach., Ti., Düst., Wa.) seems more original than των αυγων (Ni, gig., Tr., AL, Simcox, WH, BJ., J. Weiss, Sw.: for a textual discussion see Nestle's Einführung, 125 f. (E. Tr., 157 f.) and Hastings' D. B., iv. 733.—After ηςου, Χριστου is added by Q, min., vg., gig., Syr., Arm., Aeth., Andr.

They are adapted from Enoch civ. io f. where the author expects his book to be a comfort and joy to the righteous, but exposed to perversion and alteration: "Many sinners will pervert and alter the words of uprightness" instead of refusing to "change or minish aught from my words". Similar threats to careless or wilful copyists especially in Irenæus (Eus. H. E. v. 20), and Rufin. pref. to Origen's wepl Δραξων (cf. Nestle's Einführung, 161 f.). This nervous eagerness to safeguard Christian teaching was part and parcel of the contemporary tendency to regard apostolic tradition (cf. xviii. 20, xxi. 14, etc.) as a body of authoritative doctrine, which must not be tampered with. An almost equally severe threat occurs in Slav. En. xlvii. 7-9, liv. (also iii. 3), so that the writer, in this jealousy for the letter rather than for the spirit, was following a recognised precedent (R. γ. 125 f.), which was bound up with a conservative view of tradition and a juristic conception of scripture (Tittius, pp. 206 f., Deism, 115 f.). Rabbinic libraries got a similar warning in that age (cf. Bacher's Aqada d. Tann. i. 254), and Christian copyists, if not editors, required it in the case of the Apocalypse, although apparently they paid little heed to it, for as early as the time of Irenæus there were serious discrepancies in the copies circulated throughout the churches. John had himself omitted a contemporary piece of prophecy (cf. on x. 4). But he explains that he was inspired to do so; this verse refuses to let others deal similarly with his book.

The prayer of ver. 17 is answered in ver. 20, which repeats the assurance of the messiah's speedy advent. This μαρτυρια ηςου, in the prophetic consciousness (xix. 10), is specifically eschatological. The close and sudden aspect of the end loomed out before Judaism (cf. 4 Esd. iv. 26, 44, 50, Apoc. Bar. xxi. 7, lxvii. 1) as before the Christian church at this period, but it was held together with calculations which anticipated a certain process and progress of history. The juxtaposition of this ardent hope and an apocalyptic programme, here as in Mark xiii. 5-37 and 4 Esd. xiv. 11, 12, is one of the antinomies of the religious consciousness, which is illogical only on paper. In Sanhed. 97 a, a rabbinic cycle of seven years culminating in messiah's advent is laid down; whereason "Rab. Yose of Lanna. There have been many septennial cycles of this kind, and he has not come... Rabbi Zera saith, Three things come unexpectedly: the messiah, the finding of treasure-trove, and a scorpio" (cf. Drummond's Jewish Messiah, 220).

—Κυρια. The Lordship of Jesus is defined as his right to come and to judge (xxii. 12), which is also the point of Rom. xiv. 9-12 (cf. Kattenbusch, ii. 509, 658 f.). "Ερχονται, κυρια is the Greek rendering of the Aramaic watchword of the primitive church (cf. on ver. 17), which possibly echoed a phrase in the Jewish liturgy (cf. on 1 Cor. xii. 22, and E. Bi. 2935, 2936).

Ver. 21, A benediction at the close of the reading (i. 3, xxii. 7) before the congregation, rather than an epistolary...
epilogue to the Apocalypse. The epistolary form in which apocalypses, like historical and homiletical writings of the age, were occasionally cast, was connected with their use in Christian worship. Such open letters of pastoral counsel were circulated by means of public reading, and were indeed designed for that end. They were not to be rejected as merely local (cf. ii. 7, 23, xxii. 7-21; Mark xiii. 14 and 37); any more than their contents were to be arbitrarily treated by individuals (xxii. 18, 19) in accordance with their own predilections.