

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

THE
EPISTLES OF ST. PETER AND
ST. JUDE

REV. CHARLES BIGG, D.D.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLES OF ST. PETER
AND ST. JUDE

BY THE

REV. CHARLES BIGG, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

SECOND EDITION

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1902

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

The Rights of Translation and of Reproduction are Reserved.

PREFACE.

I SEND this laborious volume to the press with a clear sense of its limitations. But on this subject no more need be said; the shortcomings of the work will be at least as evident to others as to myself.

The books that I have used most for the purpose of the commentary are those of Alford, Kühl, and von Soden, that of Dr. Hort for part of the First Epistle of St. Peter, that of Spitta for 2 Peter and Jude.¹ Of Introductions I know at first hand only those of Salmon, B. Weiss, Westcott, Jülicher, and Zahn, the excellent articles of Dr. Chase in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and Harnack's *Chronologie*. No one can write of the early Church without feeling how greatly he has been helped in an infinity of directions by the eminent scholar last named.

But the apparatus of a commentator on the New Testament ought to be much wider than it usually is. The Antinomians with whom we meet in 2 Peter and Jude cannot be understood from the New Testament alone. To see what they were we must turn not merely to Corinthians, Thessalonians, or the Apocalypse, but to the lives of Luther and Wesley, to the times of Eckhart, Tauler and Ruysbroek, or to such books as Barclay's *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*. Every great religious upheaval repro-

¹ Valuable summaries of the Literature are found—for 1 and 2 Peter, Hastings' *D. of the B.*, vol. iii. pp. 817, 818; for Jude, vol. ii. pp. 805, 806, and Smith's *D. of the B.*, vol. i. p. 1839, ed. 1893.

duces the same phenomena. There can be no doubt that they existed also in apostolic times. The Gnostics again, with whom these Antinomians have been confounded, cannot be understood without some acquaintance with the magic and devil-worship which reigned throughout the Greco-Roman world. For this we must go to Plutarch, Apuleius, Lucian, the Neo-Platonists, or the papyri. Deissmann, in his *Bibelstudien*, gives some specimens of magical formulæ, and the *Pistis Sophia* will show how the sacred names of the Bible and of the heathen mythology were mixed up together.

At this moment in Hayti there are Gnostics who blend Vaudoux, or snake-worship, with Roman Catholicism, and it is probable that the same kind of "syncretism" is known to missionaries in other quarters. The Gnosticism of the Greeks and Orientals was probably not quite so sinister as that of the Haytian negroes, but it belonged to the same family.

A point which gives the commentator much trouble is the nature of the Greek with which he has to deal. It is Vulgar Greek, but this is a most indefinite term. There is (1) the Greek that was written by men of education, by Epictetus, Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Clement of Alexandria. In this there are many new words and expressions, and the niceties of Attic grammar are relaxed; at the same time the old classics exercise a strong influence over the writer's mind. (2) Again there is colloquial Greek, which, as it was spoken in Egypt, we see fresh from the source in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, published by Grenfell and Hunt. (3) There is, again, the colloquial Greek as written by Jews, whose grammar and phraseology were more or less influenced by the Septuagint and the genius of the Hebrew tongue. (4) Again we have to take into account the force of Christian usage, which coined many new terms of its own. (5) Finally, there are perceptible differences in the linguistic habits of the New Testament writers themselves. Constantly we have to ask whether any inference can be drawn

from the presence or absence of the article, what sense is to be attached to a *μή* or an *ἐν*, whether such a phrase as *κρίσις βλασφημίας* is Hebrew or Greek, whether *ἐν Χριστῷ* is Pauline or liturgical. Much has been done in later years to simplify these questions. The admirable *Concordance* of Hatch and Redpath is often the best of commentaries. Field has done much good service, and books like Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* (of which an English translation has recently been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark) are of great use. Finally, Dr. Blass has earned the gratitude of all commentators by his *Grammar*. It is the work of one who with a profound knowledge of classical Greek combines a large and accurate acquaintance with the language of the New Testament, and no book shows so clearly, what we want especially to know, the difference between the two.

Some of my readers may be startled, or even shocked, by the view taken in this volume of the relation between the two great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. It has not been adopted hastily, nor is it, I trust, irreverent. But it will not be accepted by anyone who regards the *Didache* as belonging to the first or even to the second century. My own conviction is that it belongs to the fourth. According as the reader accepts one view or the other, his conception of the early history of the Church will be fundamentally different.

As regards the relation between St. Peter and St. Paul again, there is need of a wider historical sense than is usually brought to bear upon the question. The difference between the two apostles was, as I believe, practically that which divided Hooker from Cartwright. I say practically, as meaning that a strictly Pauline Church would, in the details of worship and discipline, approximate very closely to the ideal of the Puritans. It would be built upon the theory of direct and personal inspiration, not upon that of indirect and corporate inspiration. These two theories produce very different results in the way of organisation, as, in fact,

everybody knows. I have called St. Paul a Mystic and St. Peter a Disciplinarian, not because the latter was not truly inspired, but because his inspiration was of a different type, of that type which is on amicable terms with reason, education, and law.

People often tell one that the more Mysticism is explained the more obscure it becomes. It is a natural difficulty, because up to a certain point all Christians are Mystics, as indeed are many who are not Christians at all. I may refer all those who wish for light upon this perplexing question to the excellent *Bampton Lectures* of my friend Mr. Inge. Or they may consider the difference between Law's *Serious Call* and his *Spirit of Prayer*. Or they may read the *Sermons* of Tauler, or that most instructive book the *Journal* of George Fox. Or they may ask themselves that question, on the answer to which everything turns, what they mean by the right of private judgment, on what it rests, and how far it extends.

No man may presume to ask whether St. Peter or St. Paul was the greater saint. Nor can we ask whether the Pauline or the Petrine spirit is the more profitable for our times, for this, too, God alone knows. But, as we read the second chapter of Galatians, we cannot fail to be struck by the remarkable fact that St. Peter made no reply, nor can we well avoid the attempt to see what he might have said for himself, if he had thought it wise to take up the glove. Further, every Christian ought to ask which of these great apostles speaks more directly to his own soul. If it be Paul, let us be sure that we know what Freedom means, where it meets and where it parts from Law. If it be Peter, let us be sure that we know where Discipline begins and where it ends, lest for others, and indeed for ourselves, it become a yoke too heavy to be borne.

Like all brethren of the guild of students, I owe more than I can tell, to more people than I can name. It has been my desire to acknowledge all debts. But the great

libraries are not easy of access to a dweller in the country, and often, from lack of intercourse with fellow-labourers, one does not even hear of good books. In this way, not only is much valuable information missed, but it becomes impossible to render the due tribute of respect and appreciation to those who have tilled the same ground beforehand. If there is any scholar who may think that I have been vending his wares without his trade-mark, I trust he will accept this imperfect apology. But I must tender special thanks to the Rev. Dr. Plummer, Master of University College, Durham, who has revised all the proofs with laborious care, and whose learning and judgment have been exceedingly helpful at many points; and to those eminent and most courteous scholars, the Rev. Dr. Sanday and the Rev. Dr. Driver, who have been most kind in answering questions as to which I was very much in the dark.

With these words of explanation and gratitude the book must go forth to face the world. Whatever be its fate, it is a sincere and humble endeavour to promote the interests of scholarship, edification, and peace.

CHARLES BIGG.

FENNY COMPTON, *June 29, 1901.*

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

As the Publishers inform me that a new issue of this volume is called for, I trust that it has been found useful.

The modern custom of stereotyping does not allow a writer much freedom in revision. I have corrected a great number of small errors, pointed out to me not by crabbed reviewers, but by accurate and most benevolent readers, whose wounds are the faithful wounds of a friend, and to whom I tender my grateful thanks.

Also, I have added on the pages immediately following a handful of *addenda et corrigenda*, which could not be inserted in the body of the book.

CHARLES BIGG.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
November 4, 1902.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.



To the *Testimonia* for First Peter may be added—

Barn. xi. 11, καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

Ep. ad Diognetum, xii., κληροὶ συνάγονται, cf. 1 Pet. v. 3.

Sarapion of Antioch, in Eus. *H. E.* v. 19. 2, παρὰ πάσῃ τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ἀδελφότητι, cf. 1 Pet. v. 9.

Page 56, line 3.—Add Julian, *Ep.* 63, to the other references to the Decree of Jerusalem.

Page 100.—A remark should be added to the note upon *τηρημένην* εἰς ὑμᾶς (i. 4). With the addition of ἔτι καί, and in connexion with verbs distinctly expressive of survival, εἰς ὑμᾶς might mean “until your time,” cf. Herod. i. 92, ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν περιέοντα, and, for a late instance, Julian, *ad S.P.Q.R. Athen.* 269 D (ed. Spanheim), σῶζεται δὲ ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς ἔτι τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς ὥσπερ ἐμπύρενμά τι σμικρόν. But these phrases are not parallel. In Acts xxv. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 9, iii. 7; Jude 6, τηρεῖν εἰς means “to reserve for,” not “to preserve until.”

Page 111, note on *νῦν ἀνηγγέλη*.—Yet compare Dionysius of Alexandria, in Eus. *H. E.* vii. 5. 2, οἷς νῦν ἐπεστείλατε, “to whom you wrote the other day.” Dr. Hort insists that the aorist must here keep its proper sense.

Page 124, line 40.—My friend Mr. Plummer of C. C. C. observes that *Gospel* is not *good spell*, but *news about God*; but it is not possible to rearrange the text of the passage where this error occurs.

Page 134, note on τὰς ἀρετάς.—In ecclesiastical Latin *uirtutes* constantly means “miracles.” See Tertullian, *Apolo.* 21, *de praesc. haer.* 30, 44; Silvia, *Peregr.* 20 (ed. Geyer, p. 66), ut et uirtutes faciant multas; Paul. Nol. *carm.* xix. 291, uirtutes ut eas idem celebraret humatus; Sid. Ap. *Ep.* vii. 16, sed confessorem uirtutum signa sequuntur.

Page 140, line 2.—Mr. Plummer notes that, in the East, the title βασιλεύς came to be so exclusively confined to the Emperor, that, when the Byzantine historians speak of any other prince, they call him ῥήξ (*rex*). See the Glossary to Georgius Cedrenus in the *Corp. Script. Hist. Byzantinae*, Bonn, 1839.

Page 150, line 8.—It should be observed that Clement does not quote the words of Isaiah as they are rendered by the LXX., δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. See Lightfoot's note upon the passage in Clement, and Swete, *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, p. 469.

Page 165, note on ῥύπος. — St. Peter's use of the word may be illustrated from Marcus Antoninus, vii. 47, ἀποκαθαίρουσι γὰρ αἱ τοῦτων φαντασίαι τὸν ῥύπον χαμαὶ βίον.

Page 165, line 31.—“ἐπερωτᾶν is not used of prayer to God.” Ἐπερωτᾶν τὸν Θεόν, ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν Κυρίῳ, διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου are common phrases in the LXX., but signify not “to pray to God,” but “to ask God a question,” “to ask Him for an oracle.” See Isa. xxx. 2, lxxv. 1 (quoted by St. Paul in Rom. x. 20); Jer. xxi. 2; Ez. xx. 1. Ἐπερωτᾶν σοφίαν in Prov. xvii. 28 is probably “to consult or question wisdom,” not “to pray for wisdom.” Ἐρωτᾶν is used in the New Testament of prayer by St. John, xiv. 16, xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20; 1 John v. 16 (see Bishop Westcott's note on this last passage). But it means strictly not “pray,” but “ask.”

Page 168, line 23.—The verb οἰνοφλυγεῖν is found in Deut. xxi. 20, not the noun οἰνοφλυγία.

Page 184, line 30.—For “high priest's family” read “high-priestly families.” There seem to have been about four families from which the high-priest was selected.

Page 189, line 1.—The reader's attention should here have been drawn to the just remark of Professor Ramsay (*C. R. E.*, p. 367), that corporate or collegiate responsibility did not exist in the ancient polity. “Each individual possessed the full powers of the whole body. The act of one was authoritative as the act of all; each could thwart the power of his colleagues; no idea of acting by vote of the majority existed.” Dr. Hatch's view introduces a strictly modern conception into a quite alien state of things.

To the *Testimonia* for Second Peter may perhaps be added—

Dionysius of Alexandria, in Eus. *H. E.* vii. 7. 2, συμφύρεσθαί τῷ τῆς πονηρίας αὐτῶν βορβόρω.

Novatian, *De Regula Fidei*, 8, siue quoniam ad igneum diem iudicii mundus iste festinat, where Jackson discerns an allusion to 2 Pet. iii.

Page 264, line 32.—*Μνήμην ποιέσθαι*, “to remember,” is commonly used in the sense of “to mention,” see for instance Herod. i. 15, Ἄρδνος δὲ τοῦ Γύγω μετὰ Γύγγην βασιλεύσαντος μνήμην ποιήσομαι. With the addition of the article it means “to call to remembrance,” see Thuc. ii. 54, πρὸς ἃ ἔπασχον τὴν μνήμην ἐποιοῦντο, “they called (the oracular verse) to their remembrance in the shape that agreed with their sufferings”; they maintained that *λοιμός* was the right reading. *Μνήμη* is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. Apparently it had been almost pushed out of colloquial use by *μνεία*, see Bekker's *Anecdota*, 107. 25. Thus we find πάντες σου διαπαντὸς μνείαν ποιούμενοι, in a papyrus of 172 B.C. (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 210); cf. Philemon 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16. In all these passages it would be difficult to say whether the precise meaning is “mention by name,” or “call to remembrance.” The phrase “to remember in prayer” includes both senses. It may be noticed that P and some cursives have *μνείαν* here.

Page 277, note on *τεφρώσας*.—In the fourth century Silvia was shown the ruins of the Five Cities. See *Peregr.* 12 (ed. Geyer, p. 54), quae tamen Segor sola de illis quinque in hodie constat. Nam et memoriale ibi est, de ceteris autem illis ciuitatibus nichil aliud apparet nisi subuersio ruinarum, quemadmodum in cinerem conuersae sunt.

Page 283, line 15.—For ἀκαταπάστους, Lachmann and W H read ἀκατάστους, following the strong combination of A B. See W H, Introduction, p. 170. Ἀκαταπάστους might, without great difficulty, be regarded as a vulgar form of ἀκαταπαύστους, since the verb παύω in later Greek shows a tendency to drop the *v*; thus we find ἐπάην, παήσομαι, ἀναπάεσθε (reading of D in Mark xiv. 41), δὲ ἀναπάεται in a Roman epitaph (*C. I. G.* 6595), and ἀναπαμός for ἀνάπανσις. But W H prefer to regard the word as meaning “insatiable,” and as derived from the poetic verb πατέομαι. “After pointing out that in Homer this verb means no more than to taste, Athenaeus adds in contrast (i. 43. p. 24A), οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τιθέασιν τὸ πάσασθαι.” That is to say, in later Greek, πάσασθαι meant “to eat heartily,” or “to repletion,” not merely “to taste.” Ἀπαστος means “fasting,” or, not having *tasted*, but it is just possible that ἀκατάπαστος, if the word could be shown to exist, might mean “hungry” or “greedy.” The word might more easily be derived from καταπάσσω. Thus it might be used of diseased eyes “not anointed” with *collyrium* (Epict. ii. 21. 20, iii. 21. 21), or with

clay (John xix. 6). I cannot find that *καταπάσσω* is employed in this medical sense, but in Tobit xi. 11 we read, *καὶ προσέπασε τὴν χολὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*. In this way *ἀκατάπαστος* might mean "purblind." But it is safer to stand by the reading of the Sinaitic MS., *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστούς μοιχαλίας καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους αμαρτίας δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρικτοῦς*. The erroneous form *μοιχαλίας* may easily be explained (see p. 212). *Ἀμαρτίας* will go with *δελεάζοντες*, which can hardly stand without a dative to express the nature of the bait employed, and *ἀκαταπαύστους* is an apt epithet for roving licentious eyes. Translate "Having eyes full of adultery and restless, catching unstable souls with the bait of sin."

Page 310.—Add to the list of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, in Jude, *ἐκπορνύειν*¹ and *ὑπέχειν*¹.

Page 336.—The word *μεμψίμορος* occurs in Epictetus, iii. 2. 14. Other references are given in Liddell and Scott.

Page 344, note on *μόνω Θεῷ*.—It should be observed that, in using the phrase, "the only God," of the Father, Jude is in agreement with St. John (xvii. 3), St. Paul (Eph. iv. 6), all the early Fathers (Hermas, *Mand.* 1; Irenaeus (Stieren), i. 9. 2, 3, i. 10. 1, and *passim*; Tertullian, *ad. Prax.* 2, *de praescr. haer.* 36, *de uirg. uel.* 1; Novatian, *de Reg. Fidei*, 9; Justin, *Dial.* 126; Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* x. 103; Cyprian, *quod idola dñi non sint*, 8–11; Origen, in *Joann.* i. 22 and *passim*), and the Nicene Creed itself, which, in accordance with earlier creeds and theology, begins with the words *πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα*. The Father was held to be the one ultimate author of all that exists in heaven or on earth. This view was not thought to be inconsistent with belief in the true divinity of the Son, though it led to the use of guarded expressions (Ignatius, *ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*; Cyprian, *Deus noster*; Justin, *Θεός*, not *ὁ Θεός*).

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER	1-87
§ 1. The Catholic Epistles	1
§ 2. Vocabulary and Style	2
§ 3. Testimonia Veterum	7
§ 4. The Relation of 1 Peter to the rest of the New Testament	15
§ 5. The Allusions to Persecution in 1 Peter	24
§ 6. Doctrine, Discipline and Organisation in 1 Peter	33
Note on Post-Apostolic Prophecy	50
§ 7. St. Peter and St. Paul in the New Testament	52
§ 8. The Diaspora, Babylon, and the Elect Lady	67
§ 9. Mark, Silvanus, and Date of the Epistle	80
NOTES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER	88-198
INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER	199-247
§ 1. Testimonia Veterum	199
§ 2. Observations on the Testimonia	210
§ 3. The Relation of 2 Peter to Jude	216
§ 4. Vocabulary, Grammar, and Style of 2 Peter	224
§ 5. Organisation and Doctrine in 2 Peter	232
§ 6. To whom and against whom was 2 Peter written?	237
§ 7. Date, Authenticity, and Occasion of 2 Peter	242
NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER	248-304
INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE	305-322
§ 1. Testimonia Veterum	305
§ 2. Vocabulary and Style	310
§ 3. Indications of Date in Jude	312
§ 4. Authorship of the Epistle. Where, and to whom was it written?	317
NOTES ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE	323-344
INDEX	345

THE
EPISTLES OF PETER AND JUDE.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF
ST. PETER.

§ I. THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

THE group of Epistles in which 1 Peter occupies a place is variously known as *Catholic*, *Canonic*, or *Apostolic*.

The title *Catholic* is used by the Council of Laodicea, Chrysostom, Johannes Damascenus, Ebed Jesu, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, the Alexandrine Codex, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Leontius, Nicephorus.

Canonic is used by Junilius, Gelasius (according to two MSS.), John of Salisbury, Hugo of St. Victor, and by the *Liber Pontificalis* (see Duchesne).

Apostolic is used by Gelasius (according to the reading preferred by Bishop Westcott), and perhaps also by Ebed Jesu.

The title *Catholic* appears to be understood by Ebed Jesu as signifying the universal acceptance of the Epistles. His words are :

“ Tres etiam Epistolae quae inscribuntur
Apostolis in omni codice et lingua,
Jacobo scilicet et Petro et Joanni ;
Et Catholicae nuncupantur.”

But Leontius explains it differently : καθολικαὶ δὲ ἐκλήθησαν ἐπειδὴ οὐ πρὸς ἓν ἔθνος ἐγράφησαν, ὡς αἱ τοῦ Παύλου, ἀλλὰ καθόλου πρὸς πάντα. This, however, can hardly be the true explanation, for James, 1 and 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, all have a limited address, and there can be little doubt that 1 John and Jude are also intended for a definite circle of readers.

Canonic is understood by Junilius to mean “containing the rule

2 INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

of faith": Qui libri ad simplicem doctrinam pertinent? Canonice septemdecim. . . . Quae sunt perfectae auctoritatis? Quae canonica in singulis speciebus absolute numeravimus.

The references for this section will be found in Westcott, *On the Canon of the New Testament*, Appendix D.

Canonic appears to be the Western title, *Catholic* the Eastern. The two words probably mean the same thing, "included in the Canon," "universally received," "orthodox."

The order of the books in the New Testament varies greatly in different authorities.

In the Greek MSS. it is usually Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse.

In the Sinaitic MS. and Peshito Version it is Gospels, Pauline Epistles, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse.

In the *Canones Apostolici*, the Memphitic and Sahidic Versions, it is Gospels, Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles, Acts, Apocalypse.

In the Muratorian Fragment the order is apparently (see third section) Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse. This is the prevalent usage in the West. There are numerous variations of minor importance. (See Gregory and Abbot, p. 132 sqq.)

Since the fourth century the generally received order of the Catholic Epistles has been James, Peter, John, Jude, but there are many ancient variations which will be found in Gregory and Abbot, pp. 138, 139.

§ 2. VOCABULARY AND STYLE OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

The vocabulary of the Epistle is remarkable as containing a large number of words which are not used by any other of the New Testament writers. The list of them is as follows:

ἀγαθοποιία, ἀγαθοποιός¹, ἀδελφότης¹, ἀδίκως¹, ἄδολος, αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἀμαράντινος, ἀμάραντος¹, ἀναγεννᾶν¹, ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀναζώννυσθαι¹, ἀνάχυσις, ἀνεκλάλητος, ἀντιλοιδορεῖν, ἀπογίνεσθαι², ἀποινόμεν¹, ἀπροσωπολήπτως, ἀρεταί¹, ἀρτιγέννητος, ἀρχιποιίμην², βιοῦν¹, γυναικεῖος¹, ἐγκομβοῦσθαι (ἐγκολποῦσθαι), ἐμπλοκή, ἐνδυσις¹, ἐξαγγέλλειν¹, ἐξερευνᾶν¹, ἐπερώτημα¹, ἐπικάλυμμα¹, ἐπίλοιπος¹, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν¹, ἐποπτεύειν², ἱεράτευμα¹, κλέος¹, κλήροι, κραταῖος¹, κτίστης¹, μῶλωψ¹, οἶνοφλυγία, ὁμόφρων, ὀπλίξεσθαι², πατροπαράδοτος, περίθεσις², πότος¹, προθύμως¹, προμαρτύρεσθαι, πτόησις¹, ῥύπος¹, σθενοῦν, σπορά¹, συμπαθής¹, συμπρεσβύτερος, συνεκλεκτός, συνουκεῖν¹, ταπεινόφρων¹, τελείως¹, ὑπογραμμός¹, ὑπολιμπάνειν, φιλάδελφος¹, φιλόφρων (v.l. in iii. 8), ὠρέεσθαι¹.

Their number in all sixty-two. Words marked (1) are found in

the Septuagint. Words marked (2) are found in one of the other Greek versions of the Old Testament.

Ἀναγεννηθείς occurs only as a doubtful variant for *παραγεννηθείς* in the preface to Sirach. Some MSS. appear to have read this word in John iii. 3, 5, but here it is possibly borrowed from St. Peter.

What observations are necessary on these words will be found in the Notes. Here we may remark that the language and the thoughts of the author are deeply tinged by the influence of the Greek Old Testament. He appears to have had a special predilection for Maccabees, with which he has many words in common (*καταβολή, διασπορά, ἀμίαντος, δόξαι, ἀναστροφή, παροιμία, ιεράτευμα, περιέχω, ἀρεταί, ὑπογραμμός, πτόσις, ἀπνέμει, συμπαθής, ξενίζειν, κίσσης, ἀδελφότης*), and for Wisdom (*ἄφθαρτος, ἀμίαντος, ἀμάραντος*). His vocabulary is marked by a certain dignity and elevation. It shows no trace of the Atticist affectation which was common in the second century, but is such as might have been employed by a well-read Jew of good social standing in the first.

The Hebraisms which occur are neither many nor harsh. We find *ἐλπίζω ἐπί* (i. 13); *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* (i. 14); *τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας* (i. 13); *ἀπροσωπολήπτως* (i. 17); *ῥῆμα Κυρίου* (i. 25); *λαὸς εἰς περιτοίησιν* (ii. 9); *σκεῶς* (iii. 7); *πορεύσθαι ἐν* (iv. 3), and so on; but there is nothing to suggest that the writer habitually spoke or thought in Hebrew, or that he was translating from a Hebrew original. There are no Latinisms.

What may be called the new Christian vocabulary appears, of course. We find *Χριστιανός, βάπτισμα, ἀγαπᾶν, πίστις, εὐαγγελίζειν, ἀλήθεια, ἐκλεκτός, ξύλον, πρόγνωσις, ἀγιασμός, πειρασμός, πνεῦμα, πρεσβύτερος, ταπεινός, κλήροι*, and other words might be added. But we do not meet with *νόμος, ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος, ἐκκλησία*. There is no mention of the Christian Prophet, or of Widows or Orphans. Nor do we find any of those words which belong especially to the circle of St. Paul's ideas (*δικαιοῦν* and its family: *ἄκροβυστία, περιτομή; ἔλλογῆν: ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι: νιοθεσία: πλήρωμα: μοστήριον: ἀραβῶν: παράπτωμα, παράβασις, παραβάτης: πρόθεσις, προορίζειν: καυχᾶσθαι: καταργεῖν: σταυρός, σταυροῦν: μορφή: ζύμη: γράμμα*, and so forth).

What grammarians note as vulgarisms or colloquialisms of later Greek are present, but not in any striking degree. There are a few words of late coinage, like *καθώς, ὑπολιμπάνειν*. The terminations *-μα* and *-μος* are confused; thus we have *ὑπογραμμός* for *ὑπόγραμμα*, and some words, e.g. *προμαρτύρησθαι, δοκίμιον*, seem to be incorrectly used. But, generally speaking, the orthography and grammar are not bad. In some points, indeed, there is remarkable correctness in the writer's use.

Thus the particle *μέν* occurs six times, and is always followed by *δέ*. But two of these instances (ii. 14, iv. 14) are dubious.

The article is employed in more classical style than by any other writer of the New Testament. Take, for instance, the quite Thucydidean clause in iii. 3, ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, and eight times he uses the nice arrangement exemplified in the phrase τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον (i. 17, iii. 1, 3, 20, iv. 14, v. 1 *bis*, 4). In iv. 3 he has τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνων, the collocation which in the rest of the New Testament is almost universal.

Still more striking is the refined accuracy of his use of ὡς in i. 19, ὡς ἄμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ: ii. 16, μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν: iii. 7, ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκευεὶ τῷ γυναικέϊω. In the first passage Χριστοῦ ὡς ἄμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου would be Greek, but the masters of style prefer the arrangement followed by Peter; for instance, Plato, *Laus*, 905 B, ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις αὐτῶν ταῖς πράξεσιν, compare *Diognetus*, vi. 6, κατέχονται ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ: Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 9. 5, ὡς ὑπὸ κρείττονος κακοῦ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας νικωμένον. This subtlety was a stumbling-block in later Greek (see Cobet, *Variæ Lectiones*, pp. 163, 532). I find no other instance of this nicety in the New Testament except in Hebrews, xii. 7, ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός. Peter himself follows the other, to us more natural, order in ii. 12, καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν.

On the other hand, Peter constantly omits the article altogether, especially in the case of a noun used with another noun in the attributive genitive,—ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος, εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος, i. 2; δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, i. 3; ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, i. 7; σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν, i. 9; ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς, ii. 12,—but also with single nouns, πνεῦμα ἄγιον, i. 12; Θεός, *passim*; ἐν καιρῷ ἑσχάτῳ, i. 5; γραφῆ, ii. 6; γυναῖκες, iii. 1; ἄγγελοι, i. 12; νεκρῶν, i. 3; ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, iv. 5; ποικίλης χάριτος, iv. 10; λόγια, iv. 11; πρεσβυτέρους, v. 1. Some of these may be instances of that dropping of the article before familiar words or in current phrases which is common in all Greek writers; in some again there may be a doubt whether the absence of the article does not give the noun a qualitative force, whether, for instance, ἄγγελοι, in i. 12, means “the angels,” or “even angels,” “such wonderful beings as angels.” But there are cases where no reason can be found, and where the attempt to find one only leads to mistranslation.

As elsewhere in the New Testament, *μή* is used with the participle where classic usage would exact *οὐ*; see i. 8, iv. 4; but we have *οὐκ ἰδόντες*, i. 8.

It is doubtful whether any distinction is made between the present and the aorist imperative in ii. 17.

Ἴνα is followed once by the fut. ind. (iii. 1); elsewhere invariably by the subjunctive, whatever the tense of the principal verb.

Very few connecting particles are employed. *Ἄρα*, *γε*, *ἐπεί*,

ἐπειδή, τε, δὴ, που, πως, do not occur. Nor is ἄν to be found in the Epistle. This fact alone is sufficient to show that the writer was not a Greek.

The writer of the Epistle was probably unable to produce such work as we see in the highly finished preface to St. Luke's Gospel. Nevertheless he was quite awake to the difference between good Greek and bad, and used the language with freedom and a not inconsiderable degree of correctness. It follows almost necessarily that St. Peter cannot have written the Epistle himself. The apostle could not speak even his own native tongue with refined precision, but was easily recognised by dialect or accent as a Galilaean (Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70; Luke xxii. 59). He struck his own countrymen as an unlearned and ignorant man (Acts iv. 13), and it is not probable that he ever acquired an easy mastery of Greek, for primitive tradition represents him as making use of Mark as interpreter (Papias in Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39. 15; Irenaeus, iii. 1. 1; 10. 6). Basilides the Gnostic pretended to have learned some part of his doctrine from Glaucias, "the interpreter of Peter" (Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. 17. 106); and though this is fiction, it testifies to the prevalent belief of the early Church that St. Peter shrank from the effort of literary composition in Greek. On the other hand, the Epistle shows no trace of translation, and we may dismiss with confidence Jerome's view (*Epist. ad Hebr.* 150) that it was originally written in Aramaic.

It is highly probable that the Epistle as it stands is the work of an "interpreter," and this was the general view held by scholars of the last generation (Semler, Eichhorn, Ewald, W. Grimm, Renan, Weisse; in recent times Kühl). Opinions differ as to who the interpreter was. Many have fixed upon St. Mark, guided by the old tradition which makes him the ἑρμηνεύς of Peter. But the evangelist was probably not the only friend who helped the apostle in literary composition, and the style of the Epistle is very unlike that of the second Gospel. It is more probable that the interpreter was Silvanus; indeed this may very well be the meaning of the words διὰ Σιλβανουῦ ἡμῖν ἔγραψα (v. 12). Kühl insists that διὰ can only denote the bearer, not the draughtsman of the Epistle. But he is certainly mistaken in thus limiting the sense of the preposition. Dionysius of Corinth (in Eus. *H. E.* iv. 23. 11) speaks of the Epistle of Clement as ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαν, meaning clearly that Clement was the mouthpiece or interpreter of the Church of Rome. It is quite possible that St. Peter's phrase is to be understood in the same way. At the same time, Silvanus might be, and probably was, the bearer as well as the draughtsman of the Epistle.

Neither is it certain what was the precise function of the "interpreter." He would be more than an amanuensis (ὑπογραφεύς,

ταχυγράφος), such as was employed by St. Paul, Origen, and indeed most ancient writers; but how much more we cannot say. We might suppose that the apostle dictated in Aramaic, and that Silvanus expressed the substance in his own Greek. In this sense King Oswald served Aidan as *interpretres uerbi caelestis* (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 3; see Mr. Plummer's note). Or the apostle may have dictated in Greek—St. Peter must have been able to speak the language in some degree—and the interpreter may have altered and corrected his expressions more or less, as was necessary. Thus Josephus (*contra Apion.* i. 9) availed himself of the assistance of Greek scholars to polish and correct the style of his writings. There is yet a third possibility, that the interpreter received only general instructions, and was allowed a free hand as to the manner in which they should be carried out, subject to the revision and approval of the author. This seems to have been the position of Clement of Rome. But Clement, though the servant of the Church, was yet its leading member, and we can hardly suppose that the liberty allowed to St. Peter's assistant would be so wide as this.

If an interpreter, in any of these senses, was employed, it follows that the actual words of the Epistle are not altogether those of the apostle himself; and this consequence must be borne in mind when we come, as we shall come later on, to discuss the relation of 1 Peter to other documents in the New Testament. But there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that the points handled, the manner in which they are developed, the general tone of thought, are those of St. Peter himself. There are certain striking characteristics which undoubtedly are the property of the author: the constant allusions to the Old Testament; the strong sense of an unbroken continuity between the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel; the absence of anything that can be called speculation; the fatherly pastoral temper, and constant preference of the concrete to the abstract; the imagination which, though never lofty or soaring, is yet tender and picturesque; and, lastly, the connexion of ideas, which is conversational, like that of a good old man talking to his children. There is no definite plan or logical evolution of a train of thought. One idea haunts the whole Epistle; to the author, as to the patriarch Jacob, life is a pilgrimage: it is essentially an old man's view. Out of this central sentiment (which differs from that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as there the pilgrimage is that of the world, here that of the individual soul) spring the sister thoughts of suffering, patience, humility. These constantly return, each time with some new application; the apostle travels round and round his beloved spot, and at each recurring halt some fresh feature in the view presents itself. Even the words repeat themselves, always in a different connexion; the repeated word appears to suggest the thought

which follows (see a list of instances in the Prolegomena to 2 Peter, § 4). This habit of verbal iteration deserves more notice than may at first sight appear, because it meets us again in 2 Peter, and is a point of some importance in the discussion of the authenticity of the later Epistle.

§ 3. TESTIMONIA VETERUM.

Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 25. 2) places the First Epistle of Peter among the *Ὁμολογούμενα*, or books which were accepted by the whole Church without any feeling of doubt. There is no book in the New Testament which has earlier, better, or stronger attestation, though Irenaeus is the first to quote it by name.

The Second Epistle of St. Peter.

“The earliest attestation to Peter’s First Epistle is that given in the Second (iii. 1); for those who deny this Second Epistle to be the work of Peter acknowledge that it is a very early document” (Salmon, *Introd.* pp. 457, 458). This reference in 2 Peter would prove not only that 1 Peter existed, but that it bore the name of Peter. But it should be observed that Spitta, Zahn, and others consider that 2 Pet. iii. 1 refers not to 1 Peter, but to a lost Epistle, and that 2 Peter is the older of the two.

The Epistle of St. James.

This also may be cited as an attesting witness; see next section.

Barnabas.

The date of the Epistle of Barnabas is 70–79, Lightfoot; 80–130, probably towards the end of this period, Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 427.

Barn. i. 5, ζῶης ἐλπίς, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος πίστεως, cf. 1 Pet. i. 9, κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.

Barn. iv. 12, ὁ Κύριος ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον· ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται, cf. 1 Pet. i. 17, καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον.

Barn. v. 1, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνισθῶμεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ, cf. 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐν ἀγιασμῷ Πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (but see also Heb. xii. 24, where αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ occurs, though without mention of sanctification).

Barn. v. 6, οἱ προφήται, ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν, cf. 1 Pet. i. 11, προφήται . . . ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἦ

ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλουν τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρούμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα.

Barn. xvi. 10, πνευματικὸς ναός, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5, οἶκος πνευματικὸς.

Clement of Rome.

About 95, Lightfoot; 93-95, hardly so late as 96 or 97, Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 255.

Bishop Lightfoot gives a list of twelve parallelisms between 1 Peter and Clement; Harnack in his edition numbers twenty. The following points may be selected:

Clement has a considerable number of words from the vocabulary of 1 Peter:—ἀγαθοποιεῖν¹, ἀγαθοποιία, ἀδελφότης, ἄμωμος¹, ἀντιτυπὸν¹, ἀπροσωπολήμπως, ἀρκετός¹, ἀσπιλος¹, παροικία¹, ὑπογραμμός. These words, with the exception of those marked (¹), and even these are rare, are not found in the New Testament except in 1 Peter.

The salutation of Clement's Epistle appears to be suggested by that of 1 Peter: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη. This resemblance is peculiarly important in view of Harnack's suggestion that the Address of 1 Peter is a later addition.

Clem. vii. 4, ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἐστὶν τίμιον τῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, cf. 1 Pet. i. 19.

Clem. ix. 4, Νῦν πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυσεν, καὶ διέσωσεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ δεσπότης τὰ εἰσελθόντα ἐν ὁμοιοῖα ζωᾷ εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, which is apparently a reminiscence of 1 Pet. iii. 20.

Clem. xxxvi. 2, εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς (the words θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ are omitted by Clement of Alexandria in quoting this passage): lix. 2, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτόντος εἰς φῶς, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

Clement has also in common with 1 Peter two quotations.

Clem. xxx. 2, Θεὸς γάρ, φησί, ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν, cf. 1 Pet. v. 5; Jas. iv. 6. Both have Θεός, while the LXX. (Prov. iii. 34) has κύριος.

Clem. xlix. 5, ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, so 1 Pet. iv. 8: here the LXX. (Prov. x. 12) has πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία.

Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum.

Mr. Sinker thinks that the date of this book is to be placed in a period ranging from late in the first century to the revolt of Bar Cochba. Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 569 sqq.) distinguishes between a Hebrew original and a Christian edition; the latter, he thinks, was known to Origen, and possibly but doubtfully to Irenaeus.

The book offers certain similarities to 1 Peter which are deserv-

ing of notice, the words ἀγαθοποιία, *Jo.* 18; ἀγαθοποιεῖν, *Benj.* 5; μισμός, *Benj.* 8: and certain phrases, *Nephit.* 4, κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, cf. *1 Pet.* i. 3; *Jo.* 19, ἀμνὸς ἁμώμος, cf. *1 Pet.* i. 19; *Gad* 6, ἀγαπάτε οὖν ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ καρδίας, cf. *1 Pet.* i. 22; *Benj.* 8, ἀναπαύεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, cf. *1 Pet.* iv. 14; *Aser* 4, οὐ θέλει ἡμέραν ἀγαθὴν ἰδεῖν (from *Ps.* xxxiii. 13?), cf. *1 Pet.* iii. 10; and in *Levi* 4 there is mention of the Harrowing of Hell, τοῦ ἄδου σκυλευομένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου.

Hermas.

The *Pastor* was probably published about 140, and written at various times between 110 and that date; Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 266, 267.

Vis. iii. 5, the account of the stones in the Tower may have been suggested by the λίθοι ζῶντες of *1 Pet.* ii. 5.

Vis. iv. 3, 4, ὡσπερ γὰρ τὸ χρυσίον δοκιμάζεται διὰ τοῦ πυρός, cf. *1 Pet.* i. 7.

Sim. ix. 28, 5, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζετε ὀφείλετε τὸν Θεόν, cf. *1 Pet.* iv. 14.

Mand. viii. 10, in the list of Christian virtues, several Petrine words occur close together: φιλόξενος, ἡσύχιος, ἀδελφότης, ἀγαθοποίησις (= ἀγαθοποιία).

Sim. ix. 16, 5, οὗτοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κοιμηθέντες ἐν δυνάμει καὶ πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκήρυξαν καὶ τοῖς προκεκοιμημένοις, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κηρύγματος: these words are probably an expansion and explanation of *1 Pet.* iv. 6; just before them comes the Petrine word ζωοποιεῖν.

Polycarp.

He died a martyr in 155. *Eus. H. E.* iv. 14, 9, ὁ γέ τοι Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους αὐτοῦ γραφῇ φερομένη εἰς δεῦρο, κέχρηται τισι μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρον προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς.

In Polycarp we find not merely similarities, but actual quotations — i. 3 = *1 Pet.* i. 8; ii. 1 = *1 Pet.* i. 13, 21; ii. 2 = *1 Pet.* iii. 9; v. 3 = *1 Pet.* ii. 11; vii. 2 = *1 Pet.* iv. 7; viii. 1 = *1 Pet.* ii. 24, 22; x. 2 = *1 Pet.* ii. 12. Polycarp does not name St. Peter; hence Professor Harnack thinks that though he knew the Epistle, he did not know it as Peter's. St. Paul is mentioned four times, and twice quoted by name, xi. 2, 3; but there is a special reason for this, because St. Paul also had written to the Philippians, and Polycarp writes to remind them of the fact. Otherwise, though his epistle abounds in quotations, it is not his habit to name his authority. On this point see Dr. Chase's article on *Peter, First Epistle*, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. pp. 780, 781.

Papias.

He wrote between 130-140 or even later; Lightfoot.

Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39. 17, κέχρηται δ' αὐτὸς μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.

Justin Martyr.

His death has been placed as late as 163-165, but Dr. Hort (*Journal of Philology*, iii. 155, *On the Date of Justin Martyr*) sets it as early as 148. The later date is more probable.

Apol. i. 61 we find the word ἀναγεννᾶν: *Τρυφή*, 110, ἄσπιλος, is used as an epithet of Christ; it is so used in the New Testament only in 1 Pet. i. 19; *Τρυφή*, 35, ἄμωμος, of Christ (1 Pet. i. 19 or Heb. ix. 14); *Τρυφή*, 114, τοῦ ἀκρογωνιαίου λίθου, of Christ (1 Pet. ii. 6 or Isa. xxviii. 16); *Τρυφή*, 116, τῆς πυρώσεως, ἣν πυροῦσιν ἡμᾶς ὁ τε διάβολος καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ ὑπηρέται πάντες. The word πύρωσις in this sense is peculiar to 1 Pet. iv. 12. *Ibid.*, ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμέν ἡμεῖς, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9; *Τρυφή*, 119, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ μόνον λαός, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸς ἁγίος ἐσμεν, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 10 (but Justin is here referring to Isa. lxii. 12); *Τρυφή*, 138, the story of Noah is commented upon in a manner that seems to imply a knowledge of 1 Pet. iii. 18-21. Noah is a type of Baptism, the eight persons are dwelt upon, and we find close together ἀναγεννᾶν, διεσώθη, δι' ὕδατος.

Justin speaks also of the descent of our Lord into Hell, to preach the gospel to the dead (*Τρυφή*, 72); but he appeals to an apocryphal quotation which he ascribes to Jeremiah. The same quotation is used by Irenaeus.

It is probable, but not certain, that Justin knew 1 Peter.

Melito of Sardis.

His *Apology*, the latest of his writings, is assigned by ancient authorities to the year 169 or 170.

Apology (Otto, vol. ix. p. 432), "haec cum didiceris, Antonine Caesar, et filii quoque tui tecum, trades iis haereditatem aeternam quae non perit"; cf. 1 Pet. i. 4. The authenticity of this *Apology*, which exists only in Syriac, has been impugned. Bishop Westcott (*Canon*, p. 222) thinks that "though, if it be entire, it is not the *Apology* with which Eusebius was acquainted, the general character of the writing leads to the belief that it is a genuine book of Melito of Sardis." But Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 522 sqq.) maintains that the piece is of Syrian origin, and belongs to the beginning of the third century.

Theophilus of Antioch.

He died probably 183-185; Lightfoot.

Ad Autol. ii. 34, πειθόμενοι δόγμασιν ματαίοις διὰ πλάνης πατρο-
 παραδότου γνώμης ἀσυνέτου, cf. 1 Pet. i. 18.

Ibid., ἀπέχσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀθεμίτου εἰδωλολατρείας, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3.

Letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum.

The date is 177.

Eus. *H. E.* v. 2. 5, ἐταπείνουν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν κραταίαν χεῖρα,
 cf. 1 Pet. v. 6.

Ibid. v. 1. 32, we find the Petrine word ἀδελφότης.

Ibid. v. 2. 6, ἵνα ἀποπνιχθεῖς ὁ θῆρ, οὓς πρότερον ᾤετο καταπεπω-
 κέναι, ζῶντας ἐξεμέσση, cf. 1 Pet. v. 8.

Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs.

The date is 180. See *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. No. 2, ed. J. A. Robinson, p. 114, "Donata dixit: Honorem Caesari quasi Caesari; timorem autem Deo"; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 17, τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε τὸν βασιλεία τιμᾶτε.

Irenaeus.

Harvey thinks that he was born in 130. This Father is the first to quote 1 Peter by name; see iv. 9. 2; 16. 5; v. 7. 2.

Earlier than Irenaeus himself is the Presbyter "qui audierat ab his qui apostolos uiderant." From him come the words, iv. 27. 2, "et propter hoc Dominum in ea quae sunt sub terra descendisse, euangelizantem et illis aduentum suum; remissione peccatorum existente his qui credunt in eum." Irenaeus appeals to the same apocryphal quotation as Justin, ascribing it in one place (iii. 20. 4) to Isaiah, in another (iv. 22. 1) to Jeremiah. It may be suspected that this apocryphon is itself shaped on the words of 1 Pet. iv. 6, νεκροῖς εἰηγγελίσθη.

Tertullian.

Born, 150-160; died, 220-240.

Scorpiace, xii., "Petrus quidem ad Ponticos, Quanta enim, inquit, gloria est," etc.; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 20 sqq.

Ibid., "et rursus; Dilecti ne epauescatis ustionem," etc.; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 12 sqq.

Adu. Judaeos, x., "Christus, qui dolum de ore suo locutus non est"; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 22.

12 INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

Adu. Marcionem, iv. 13, "sed et cur Petrum? . . . An quia et petra et lapis Christus? Siquidem et legimus positum eum in lapidem offendiculi et in petram scandali"; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8. This reference Bishop Westcott considers very doubtful. The same phrase is found also Rom. ix. 33, but it is used by Tertullian to explain the name Peter, and is therefore probably taken from the Petrine Epistle.

De Oratione, xv., "de modestia quidem cultus et ornatus aperta praescriptio est etiam Petri, cohibentis eodem ore, quia eodem et spiritu quo Paulus, et uestium gloriam et auri superbiam et crinium lenoniam operositatem; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 9.

Bishop Westcott (*Canon*, p. 263, note 3) thinks that both the *Scorpiace* and the *aduersus Judaeos* are "more or less open to suspicion." But Jerome mentions the *Scorpiacum* (*ad Vigil.* viii.) as a work of Tertullian's, and quotes the *Ad. Judaeos* (*Com. in Dan.* ix. 24; v. 691, Vall.). See *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, p. 681.

Epistula ad Diognetum.

Harnack thinks that for the present the Epistle must be assigned to the end of the second or beginning of the third century (*Chronologie*, p. 515).

Ad Diogn. ix., τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 18.

Ibid., τὰς ἀμαρτίας καλύψαι, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 8 (?).

Clement of Alexandria.

Died about 213, probably.

Clement quotes very freely from every chapter of the Epistle; it is needless to set out the references. He commented on 1 Peter in his *Hypotyposes*, and a Latin version or abstract of the Commentary is extant. See the text in Zahn's *Forschungen*, iii. p. 79 sqq., and Zahn's remarks, p. 133 sqq.

The First Epistle of Peter was known to several of the Gnostic writers.

Basilides.

Zahn (*Kanongesch.* i. p. 763) dates his commentary on the Gospels 120-125; Professor Harnack, soon after 133 (*Chronologie*, p. 291); Basilides professed to be a pupil of Glaucias, "the interpreter of Peter" (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* vii. 17. 106).

Clem. Strom. iv. 12. 81, ἵνα μὴ κατάδικοι ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι, μηδὲ λοιδορούμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχὸς ἢ ὁ φονεὺς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Χριστιανοὶ πεφυκότες, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 15, 16.

The Valentinians.

Clem. *Excerpta ex Theod.* 12, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι παρακῦψαι, ὁ Πέτρος φησὶν (the same passage is quoted again in 86), cf. 1 Pet. i. 12.

Ibid. 12, κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τιμίῳ καὶ ἀμόμῳ καὶ ἀσπίλῳ αἵματι ἐλυτρώθημεν, cf. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

Ibid. 41, διότι πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἰκότως λέγεται ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκλελέχθαι, cf. 1 Pet. i. 20 (?).

The Marcosians.

Irenaeus, i. 18. 3, καὶ τὴν τῆς κιβωτοῦ δὲ οἰκονομίαν ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ, ἐν ᾗ ὀκτὼ ἄνθρωποι διεσώθησαν φανερώτατά φασι τὴν σωτήριον ὄγδοῦδα μνηύειν. Bishop Westcott thinks that these words have a marked similarity to 1 Pet. iii. 20. The correspondence becomes more striking if we compare Justin, *Trypho*, 138 (referred to above), and if we add

Marcion.

Theod. *Haer. Fab.* i. 24 (cf. Irenaeus, i. 27. 3), οὗτος τὸν μὲν Κἄν καὶ τοὺς Σοδομίτας καὶ τοὺς δυσσεβεῖς ἅπαντας σωτηρίας ἐφήσειν ἀπολελυμένους προσελλυθέντας ἐν τῷ ἄδῳ τῷ σωτήρι Χριστῷ καὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀναληφθῆναι. Marcion goes on to say that Abel, Enoch, Noah, the Patriarchs, prophets, and just were not saved, because they refused to come to Christ. Marcion did not accept, and is here giving one of the reasons why he did not accept, 1 Peter. Just Noah was not saved, because our Lord said, "I came not to call the just."

The First Epistle of Peter is found in the Syriac Peshito, and in the Egyptian, Aethiopic, Armenian, and Arabic versions. See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, p. 84 sqq.; Gregory, *Prolegomena*, pp. 814-929.

There is, however, an ancient Syriac tradition represented by the *Doctrine of Addai* and the *Homilies* of Aphraates, which ignores the Catholic Epistles altogether; see Dr. Sanday's article in *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. p. 245 sqq.

It existed also in the *Vetus Latina*, though only fragments are now extant, 1 Pet. i. 1-12 in *s* (Gregory, p. 966); 1 Pet. i. 8-19, ii. 20-iii. 7, iv. 10 to end in *q* (Gregory, pp. 967, 968). But Westcott and Hort (p. 83) consider that *q* exhibits "a later (? Italian) text," and that "the palimpsest fragments of 1 Peter accompanying *s* of the Acts are apparently Vulgate only."

The First Epistle of Peter is found in all the catalogues of the

New Testament given by Bishop Westcott in Appendix D of his *Canon*, and also in the Cheltenham List (see Dr. Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. p. 217). No one of these catalogues is older in its present shape than the fourth century.

On the other hand, it is not to be found in the *Muratorianum*, which probably belongs to the end of the second century (see Lightfoot, *Clement of Rome*, ii. p. 405 sqq.; Westcott, *Canon*, p. 521; *Geschichte der altch. Litteratur*, p. 646).

The *Muratorianum* is mutilated both at the beginning (where the notice of Matthew and Mark has perished) and at the end. It treats in succession of the Gospels of Luke and John, the Johannine Epistles, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Gnostic forgeries, Jude, two Epistles of John, Wisdom, the Apocalypse of John, the Apocalypse of Peter, Hermas, other Gnostic and Montanist *vóθa*. In the existing text there is no mention of Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, James, 3 John.

There is at least one lacuna in the text. The notice of Acts ends with the words *sicute et semote passionē petri euidenter declarat. sed projectionē pauli ab urbes ad spaniā proficescentis*. "The passion of Peter" may refer to John xxi. 18, 19, or to 2 Pet. i. 14; the journey of Paul to Spain is mentioned only in Rom. xv. 24. It is clear that some words, we cannot guess how many, have dropped out here.

Again, the three Catholic Epistles are introduced in a very peculiar way, in the midst of a list of *vóθa* and *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. After speaking of Marcionite documents, which are to be rejected, because "gall must not be mingled with honey," the text proceeds: *epistola sane iude et superscriptio iohannis duas in catholica habentur*. The apologetic *sane*, "it is true that," seems to imply, what we gather from the general run of the passage, that the three Epistles named here had all been challenged. The Epistles of John had already been mentioned immediately after the Gospel, but it is not stated there how many they were. Now, if for the corrupt *superscriptio* we take Dr. Westcott's emendation *superscripti*, "of the before-named John," it may very well be the case that the *Muratorianum* is here defending 2 and 3 John and Jude. It is possible, however, though less probable, that the right reading is *superscriptae*; and if so, only two Johannine Epistles are recognised.

It seems highly improbable that 1 Peter should have been passed over in silence by one who accepted the Apocalypse of Peter. Two explanations may be hazarded—(1) the Petrine Epistle, or indeed Epistles, may have been noticed after the Gospel of St. Mark, as those of St. John are after the Gospel of St. John; or (2) the Catholic Epistles may have been placed after Acts; this is a position which they frequently occupy. The words *sicute et semote*, etc., "as also (Scripture?) expressly mentions in separate places, in passages which do not come quite where we should expect them,

the passion of Peter and Paul's journey to Spain," seem to imply that other information about the apostles not to be found in Acts has just been given. Such might very well be the connexion of James with the Diaspora and of Peter with Asia Minor. The author of the Fragment, whoever he was, may have regarded James, 1 and possibly 2 Peter, 1 John as undisputed, and have recurred to Jude, 2 and 3 John in his list of spurious or doubtful works, because he knew that some authorities viewed them with suspicion.

But conjecture more or less plausible is all that we can attain to on this point.

Some of the *Testimonia* adduced in this section may be challenged, but the chain as a whole is strong, and the evidence of Clement of Rome is very remarkable.

§ 4. THE RELATION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER TO THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The facts collected in the foregoing section prove that the First Epistle of Peter was regarded as canonical from the time when "canonical" first began to have a meaning. They may be held to show that the Epistle is older than that of Clement of Rome, probably older than that of Barnabas. We now proceed to inquire to what books of the New Testament 1 Peter bears any resemblance, and what is the extent and nature of the resemblance; whether, in so far as it exists, it is such as may be accounted for by the general similarity of all Christian writers, or whether it goes beyond this, and can only be explained by actual documentary use. We must bear in mind that the actual words of 1 Peter may very probably be the creation not of the apostle, but of his interpreter.

There can be little doubt that St. Peter had read several of St. Paul's Epistles. In the Second Epistle (iii. 16) he tells us so; and even if the Second Epistle is regarded as a forgery, it lies in the nature of things that each apostle would desire to know what the other was doing, and would take pains to keep himself informed. But what we want to ascertain is whether there is anything like positive proof that St. Peter had any of the Pauline writings, or indeed any book of the New Testament, in his mind as he wrote or dictated; whether his words, ideas, beliefs were in any degree shaped or given to him by anybody else.

It should hardly be necessary to guard the reader against the presupposition that St. Paul invented either the doctrines or the terminology of the Church. In certain directions he modified both. But there is no reason why we should not here apply the common-sense rule, that what is peculiar to a writer belongs to himself, and what is not is the property of the society of which he is a member.

Only, if we are to use this rule with profit, we must look more narrowly into differences between the sacred writers than theologians are generally willing to do.

With what books, then, in the New Testament does St. Peter display an acquaintance in his First Epistle? The extraordinary variety of the answers to this question shows the uncertainty of the ground. Early in the century Daniel Schulze maintained that the Petrine Epistle was little more than a cento of reminiscences of the Epistles of St. Paul; and in recent times Holtzmann and Jülicher think it can be proved that our author was acquainted with nearly the whole of the New Testament. On the other hand, Rauch, Jachmann, B. Brückner regard Peter as wholly independent. Between these extreme views lie others of a more moderate character. Von Soden finds a definite literary connexion between 1 Peter, Romans, Galatians, 1 Timothy, and Titus. Bishop Lightfoot (*Clement*, ii. p. 499) judged that "with two Epistles of St. Paul more especially the writer shows a familiar acquaintance—the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Ephesians." Dr. Hort entertained the same view. Sieffert even maintained the amazing proposition that Ephesians and 1 Peter were written by the same hand. The elder and younger Weiss, with Kühn, admit a connexion between 1 Peter, Romans, and Ephesians, but assign the priority to 1 Peter.

We will take the Pauline Epistles first and begin with Ephesians. The parallelisms most commonly cited are the following:

Eph. i. 1-3 = 1 Pet. i. 1-3. There is no special similarity in the Address. In both there follows a benediction of Hebrew type. This appears to have been a common form in the letters of devout Jews. See the letter of Suron (Hiram), king of Tyre, given by the historian Eupolemus of Alexandria (in Eus. *Praef. Euang.* ix. 34), *Σούρων Σολομώνι βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ χαίρειν. Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός, ὃς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔκτισεν.* On the form of the Petrine Address, see note.

Eph. i. 4 = 1 Pet. i. 20, *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.* The phrase is quite common; found in the Synoptists, Hebrews, and the Assumption of Moses.

Eph. i. 14, *εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως* = 1 Pet. ii. 9, *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* (from Mal. iii. 17).

Eph. i. 14, *εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* = 1 Pet. i. 7, *εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν.*

Eph. i. 21, *καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος* = 1 Pet. iii. 22, *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.* Here we have a remarkable similarity, yet it may be based upon a common formula attached to the common doctrine of the Session at the Right Hand.

The names of angels are found elsewhere; see note, and add Test. XII. Patr., *Levi*, 3, *θρόνοι, ἔξουσία*.

Eph. ii. 21, 22 = 1 Pet. ii. 5, the brotherhood form a spiritual temple; the same thought is expressed in quite different terms.

Eph. v. 22-24 = 1 Pet. iii. 1-6. Instructions to Wives. One phrase, *αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ = γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*, is nearly identical, but the treatment of the subject is altogether different. Paul is mystical; the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church; Peter is very simple and practical.

Eph. v. 25-33 = 1 Pet. iii. 7. Instructions to Husbands. Here, again, the treatment is wholly different. In Ephesians marriage is a type of the union between Christ and the Church. Peter bids the husband honour the wife as the weaker vessel, because she is fellow-heir of the grace of life.

Eph. vi. 1-4. Instructions to Children. Not in Peter.

Eph. vi. 5-9. Instructions to Slaves and Masters = 1 Pet. ii. 18-25. Instructions to Slaves alone. Quite different in detail.

Similar addresses to the members of families may very well have been a commonplace.

The Epistle to the Ephesians abounds in strong words and striking thoughts of which there is no trace in 1 Peter—*e.g.* *νίθεσσία, ἄφεσις, μυστήριον, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, ἀρραβών, οἰκονομία, πλήρωμα, προφῆται* (of Christian prophets), *προσφορά, τέκνα φύσει ὄρηγῆς, τέκνα φωτός, πανοπλία*. Some of these must have been found in 1 Peter, if the writer was familiar with Ephesians. Not one of the resemblances cited above turns upon a phrase of any significance, except the Benediction of God; if this is struck off the list, very little remains.

Dr. Hort says that "the connexion (between 1 Peter and Ephesians) 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." But others will fail to detect these subtle affinities. Indeed the two Epistles may seem to illustrate two wholly different types of mind, that of the mystic and that of the simple pastor.

The majority of critics regard the two Epistles as connected, and many believe that Ephesians is the later of the two. Von Soden decides that it is possible, but not certain, that the one author had seen the work of the other. But a doubt may be expressed whether the evidence carries us even so far as this.

As regards Romans, the passages generally cited are as follows:

Rom. iv. 24, *δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογιζέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν* = 1 Pet. i. 21, *δι' ὑμᾶς τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*. Here the specially Pauline word *λογιζέσθαι* is not in Peter; the phrase

πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν in the latter is unique (see note); the other words are probably common property.

Rom. vi. 7, *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* = 1 Pet. iv. 1, *ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπναιται ἁμαρτίας*. Neither language nor meaning is the same.

Rom. vi. 11, *οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίσεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* = 1 Pet. ii. 24, *ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν*. In Peter *ἀπογενόμενοι* does not mean "having died"; Peter again uses *δικαιοσύνη* in a sense which is not that of St. Paul, and *ἁμαρτία* has in the one passage a meaning which it does not possess in the other.

Rom. viii. 18, *πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς* = 1 Pet. v. 1, *ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινῶς*.

Rom. viii. 34, *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς . . . ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* = 1 Pet. iii. 22, *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Probably a common form.

Rom. xii. 1, *παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ* = 1 Pet. ii. 5, *εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἁγίον, ἀνεγκλιὰ πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ*. This is one of the most original passages in Peter.

Rom. xii. 2 = 1 Pet. i. 14. Both have *σοσχηματίζεσθαι*, which is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

Rom. xii. 3-8 = 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. Both inculcate the duty of diligence in the use of the diverse gifts of grace. The mode in which the subject is treated is similar, but there is little resemblance in phrase. St. Paul dwells upon the figure of the One Body, and mentions prophecy; both these points are missing in Peter.

Rom. xii. 9, 10, *ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστρυφόντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι* = 1 Pet. i. 22, *τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς*. There is little resemblance except in the word *ἀνυπόκριτος*, which is found also in Jas. iii. 17. Little importance can be attached to *φιλαδελφία*.

Rom. xii. 14-19, *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε . . . τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονούντες . . . μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδίδοντες . . . εἰρηνεύοντες* = 1 Pet. iii. 8-12, *ὁμόφρονες . . . μὴ ἀποδίδοντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ, ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τοῦναντίον δὲ εὐλογούντες . . . ζῆτησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν*. In Peter "seek peace, and ensue it," is quoted from a Psalm; but there is a strong resemblance between the two passages.

Rom. xiii. 1-4 = 1 Pet. ii. 13-15. Duty of Obedience to Magistrates. Here there is a considerable similarity, not so much in expression as in the general idea. Like the sections on the Family Duties in Ephesians, the passage may be a recognised commonplace.

There remains for consideration the remarkable similarity

between Rom. ix. 33 and 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7. Here we find a peculiar combination of quotations from the Old Testament which can hardly have been made independently by two different writers. For the sake of clearness the text may be broken up into its component clauses.

Rom. ix. 33, *καθὼς γέγραπται.*

(i.) *ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών, Isa. xxviii. 16a.*

(ii.) *λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, Isa. viii. 14.*

(iii.) *καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχνθήσεται, Isa. xxviii. 16b.*

1 Pet. ii. 6, 7, *διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ.*

(i. iii.) *ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἐκλεκτόν, ἔντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχνθή, Isa. xxviii. 16a b.*

ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπιστοῦσι δὲ

(iv.) *λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22.*

(ii.) *καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, Isa. viii. 14.*

In (i.) there is a remarkable departure from the original. The LXX. has *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών*, which is a fair translation of the Hebrew (Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, R.V.). In both writers this has been altered, in Peter we might suppose because the *λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος* is regarded as the "head of the corner," in Romans because the stone is immediately spoken of as *λίθος προσκόμματος*, a loose stone which could not be a foundation.

In (ii.), again, both writers abandon the text of the LXX., which has *καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθον προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε, οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτόματι*. "The LXX. translators shrank from the plain sense, and boldly substituted a loose paraphrase containing a negative which inverts Isaiah's drift" (Hort). Theodotion and Symmachus have *εἰς λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ εἰς πέτραν πτόματος*: Aquila, *εἰς λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ εἰς στερεὸν σκανδάλου* (Field, *Hexapla*). Both St. Peter and St. Paul here represent the Hebrew original, but it is not necessary to suppose that either invented the phrase *λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου*. Von Soden thinks it probable that both writers used a Greek Bible, the text of which differed from that of the LXX (see Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Greek*, pp. 47, 403).

But how are we to explain the peculiar combination of passages which, as most critics have felt, can hardly be independent? Kühn argues positively that St. Paul has borrowed from St. Peter, because (1) the words *πιστεύων κ.τ.λ.* belong to the "chief corner stone elect precious" with which they are rightly connected in 1 Peter, while their connexion with *λίθος προσκόμματος* in Romans is so harsh that St. Paul could hardly have written as he does unless he had somewhere seen the two passages of Isaiah brought into juxtaposition; (2) the whole run of the passage in 1 Peter is easier and more natural. Peter begins (ii. 4) by an allusion to Ps. cxviii. and Isa. xxviii., and proceeds in his habitual fashion to develop

the allusion by quoting the two passages, and adding to them Isa. viii. One word suggests another—λίθος ἔντιμος, πιστεύων, τιμῆ, ἀπιστοῦντες, ἀπεδοκίμασαν, λίθος προσκόμματος. St. Peter, it may be added, elsewhere (Acts iv. 11) makes use of Ps. cxviii., but St. Paul nowhere does so. There is some force in this argument of Kühll's, though Dr. Hort dismisses it as a paradox. Yet the facts admit of a different explanation. Volkmar (*die alttestamentl. Citate bei Paulus*, p. 41) thinks that the early Christians may have possessed anthologies of Messianic prophecies, and it is noticeable that in Lk. xx. 17 the quotation from Ps. cxviii. is followed by words (πάς ὁ περὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνον τὸν λίθον) which may be, or may have been thought to be, an allusion to Isa. viii. 14. It is possible, therefore, that St. Peter and St. Paul may both have drawn from a common source (see Swete, pp. 394, 397).

In the case of Romans as in that of Ephesians the resemblances to 1 Peter are quite superficial, attaching only to current commonplaces. As Ephesians is the most mystic, so Romans is the most scholastic of the Pauline Epistles; but not one of its salient features in words, in imagery, in argument reappears in 1 Peter. If the author of the latter Epistle was really familiar with the great *Apologia* of St. Paul, it is most singular that he should never draw any distinction between Grace and Works, Spirit and Letter, Law and Promise; that he should omit the figure of the One Body in passages which were, as some think, actually before his eyes; that he should never touch upon the rejection of Israel, or that he should speak of predestination as he does (ii. 8) without a hint that any difficulty on that subject had ever been suggested to him. In truth, the two Epistles are as different as they can be, except that they have a few not very remarkable phrases, and a couple of obvious practical topics in common. It may be argued with some force that this peculiar combination of agreement in the commonplace, and disagreement in the remarkable, tends to prove the originality of St. Peter. St. Paul might very easily have borrowed any of the phrases quoted above. But if St. Peter was the borrower, it is surely a very curious fact that he should carefully have avoided every one of that large family of words, images, and ideas that St. Paul delights in. We can, however, sufficiently explain the phenomena of the case by supposing that the draughtsman of 1 Peter was one who had often heard St. Paul preach. Or, again, all the resemblances may very well be covered by what we may call the pulpit formulæ of the time.

As regards Galatians, Von Soden rests his judgment on Gal. iii. 23, iv. 7 = 1 Pet. i. 4 sqq.; Gal. v. 13 = 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 24 = 1 Pet. iii. 16. None of these points seems serious. But, if a writer calling himself Peter had read Galatians, it is hard to believe that he would not have made some distinct allusion to the

second chapter of that Epistle. The fact that no such allusion is to be found in 1 Peter may be regarded as a strong indirect argument in favour of its authenticity. If the author wrote before the publication of Galatians, his silence is natural; but, if he wrote after that date, he must have possessed great strength of mind or great dignity of position.

The Epistles to Timothy present little that is germane to our present purpose, but the relation between Titus and 1 Peter deserves closer consideration.

In the Address we find the word "elect" (Tit. i. 1 = 1 Pet. i. 1). The readers are "a peculiar people" (λαὸς περιούσιος, Tit. ii. 14 = λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, 1 Pet. ii. 9), who are saved by the washing of regeneration (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, Tit. iii. 5 = ἀναγεννᾶν, 1 Pet. i. 3; σώζει βάπτισμα, 1 Pet. iii. 21). They are heirs according to hope of eternal life (Tit. iii. 7 = 1 Pet. iii. 7, i. 3, 4), and throughout this Pastoral Epistle hope is brought to the front as in 1 Peter and Hebrews (i. 2, ii. 13). The readers are redeemed (λυτροῦσθαι, Tit. ii. 14, here only is the verb used by St. Paul, = 1 Pet. i. 18). They are to deny worldly lusts (Tit. ii. 12 = 1 Pet. ii. 11), and emphasis is laid on the necessity of good works (Tit. i. 16, iii. 1, 8, 14) and sound doctrine (Tit. i. 9, ii. 1). Titus is "mine own child," γνήσιον τέκνον (Tit. i. 4), as Mark is Peter's *viós*. The authority of the Elder is rated very high, and Elder is here an official title, though Bishop may be used as an alternative designation (Tit. i. 5, 7). St. Paul still maintains his own doctrinal position (Tit. iii. 5), and is still vexed by those of the circumcision (Tit. i. 10).

In Titus we also find another edition of the family duties (old men and women, wives, young men, servants), and the special phrases *ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν—ἀρχαῖς, ἐξουσιαῖς ὑποτάσσεσθαι*: but these commonplaces occur also in Romans and Ephesians.

Upon the whole, the resemblance between Titus and 1 Peter lies not in mere words, as is the case in regard to the other Pauline Epistles, but in ideas; and these ideas seem to imply a certain change in St. Paul's mental attitude towards discipline and ordinances. But in this St. Paul was drawing perceptibly nearer to a type of Church life older and stronger than that depicted in his Epistles of the first and second groups—in other words, he was approximating to the Petrine view, and the inference that 1 Peter is older than the Pastoral Epistles has much to recommend it.

The affinity between 1 Peter and Hebrews is of a more intimate kind. Let us take the facts as they are given by Von Soden with some slight modification. The two documents employ in common a considerable number of words and phrases not found elsewhere in the New Testament, or not in the same sense and connexion, e.g.

ἀντίτυπος, παρεπίδημος, γεύσθαι, οἶκος (of the Church), *λόγος ζῶν, εὐλογία κληρονομεῖν, ποιμὴν* (of Christ; but so also in John x.), *ἀναφέρειν* (of sacrifice; so also Jas. ii. 21). Other resemblances of diction are to be found: e.g. the Doxology (1 Pet. iv. 11 = Heb. xiii. 21); the final prayer (1 Pet. v. 10 = Heb. xiii. 21); *εἰρήνην διώκειν* (1 Pet. iii. 11 = Heb. xii. 14); the reproach of Christ (1 Pet. iv. 14 = Heb. xi. 26, xiii. 13); *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν* or *τῶν χρόνων* (1 Pet. i. 20 = Heb. i. 2). There is an affinity between the terms used of the work of Redemption, *ἄμωμος* of Christ (1 Pet. i. 19 = Heb. ix. 14); *ἅπαξ* (1 Pet. iii. 18 = Heb. ix. 28); the phrases *ἀναφέρειν ἁμαρτίας* (1 Pet. ii. 24 = Heb. ix. 28) and *βαντισμός* (1 Pet. i. 2 = Heb. xii. 24). Faith is nearly identified with *ἐλπίς*, and the object of Faith is the invisible (1 Pet. i. 8 = Heb. xi. 1). It is the habit of both writers to clothe their admonitions in Old Testament words, to use Old Testament personages as examples, and transfer Old Testament predicates to the Christian Church. Patience under suffering is enforced by the example of our Lord (1 Pet. ii. 21-23, iii. 17, 18 = Heb. xii. 1-3). Both Epistles describe themselves as short exhortations (1 Pet. v. 12 = Heb. xiii. 22); both authors are bracing their readers to endure persecution which is impending, and is a sign of the end (1 Pet. iv. 7, 17-19 = Heb. x. 37).

Von Soden himself considers that these resemblances are sufficiently accounted for by the supposition that the authors were contemporaries, and breathed the same spiritual atmosphere. The affinities, however, are very close, and the two Epistles may be said to belong to the same school of thought, which is neither Johannine nor Pauline; on the great question of the relation of the Law to the Gospel they seem to be in complete accord. Their resemblances should be borne in mind when we come to compare the Petrine and Pauline theologies.

The points of contact between 1 Peter and the Apocalypse are that Christians are called *δοῦλοι Θεοῦ* (1 Pet. ii. 16 = Apoc. i. 1), and priests (1 Pet. ii. 9 = Apoc. i. 6, v. 10); that Christ is Shepherd (1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4 = Apoc. vii. 17), and Lamb (1 Pet. i. 19, *ἀμνός* = Apoc. v. 6, *ἀρνίον*). There is a doxology to Christ (1 Pet. iv. 11 = Apoc. i. 6); Rome is called Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13 = Apoc. xiv. 8 and five other passages). There is a certain similarity between *στέφανος τῆς δόξης* (1 Pet. v. 4) and *στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς* (Apoc. ii. 10), and the metaphor of gold tried in the fire is employed in both (1 Pet. i. 7 = Apoc. iii. 18). For our purpose the most important of these points is the use of Babylon for Rome. There is a certain affinity between the minds of the two authors; the imagination of both is concrete not abstract, and it was not without some fitness that an Apocalypse was composed in the name of Peter. But there is nothing to show that the one book was known to the author of the other.

But there can be little doubt that a positive literary connexion exists between James and 1 Peter. The student may compare especially 1 Pet. i. 1=Jas. i. 1 (the Diaspora); 1 Pet. i. 6, 7=Jas. i. 2, 3 (*δοκίμιον*); 1 Pet. i. 23-ii. 2=Jas. i. 10, 11, 18-22; 1 Pet. v. 5-9=Jas. iv. 6, 7, 10. The general opinion is that the one writer was acquainted with the work of the other; and Von Soden agrees with Grimm, Holtzmann, Brückner, Weiss, Usteri, that St. James was the borrower. Intrinsic probability is in favour of this view. We can sometimes explain St. Peter's phrases by showing how he came to form them (see notes on *δοκίμιον* and on *ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν*: this last instance seems very strong), while the corresponding phrase in the Epistle of St. James seems to have been picked up ready made. Dr. Hort, however, is of opinion that the Epistle of St. James was used by St. Peter; and the same view is held by Dr. Mayor (article on *Epistle of James* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*).

Von Soden thinks that in 1 Peter we cannot fail to observe a large number of allusions to the Gospels in some pre-canonical shape. This is a point of great importance, for it may be maintained that St. Peter stands appreciably nearer to the Synoptical Gospels than any other apostolical writer.

The use of the leading facts in our Lord's history is much the same as we find elsewhere. Here we have Father, Son, and Spirit; the Passion, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension; the Second Advent; the sacrament of Baptism. A peculiar feature of the Epistle is the Preaching of Christ in Hades, to which we have an allusion in Matt. xxvii. 51-53. But besides these, there are a number of phrases which may well be regarded as reminiscences of the Gospel story. We may take as the general standard of reference the Gospel of St. Luke, to which 1 Peter shows upon the whole the nearest resemblance—1 Pet. i. 10=Luke x. 24, 25; 1 Pet. i. 11, 21=Luke xxiv. 26; 1 Pet. i. 13=Luke xii. 35; 1 Pet. i. 17=Luke xi. 2; 1 Pet. i. 23=Luke viii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 7=Luke xx. 17, 18; 1 Pet. iii. 9=Luke vi. 28; 1 Pet. iv. 10=Luke xii. 42; 1 Pet. ii. 12=Matt. v. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 14=Matt. v. 10. We may add certain points of resemblance between 1 Peter and the Gospel of St. John—1 Pet. i. 3=John iii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23=John i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 19=John i. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 25=John x. 11; 1 Pet. v. 2=John xxi. 16. Any single one of these allusions may be disputed, but much will remain. Von Soden remarks that we do not find in 1 Peter certain ideas or phrases which are familiar in the Synoptical Gospels, especially Kingdom of God and Son of Man. We have an allusion to the kingdom in the *βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα* of ii. 9, and our Lord never appears to have been called Son of Man except by St. Stephen.

Our Epistle has certain words in common with Acts—*παροικία*,

πρόγνωσις, *ἐκτενής*, *ἐκτενῶς*, *κακοῦν*, *ξενίζεω* (to astonish), *Χριστιανός*, *ἀγαλλιᾶν* (in Gospels and Apoc.), *ἄγνοια* (in Eph.), *ἀθέμιτος*, *ἄμνός* (in John's Gospel), *ἀπειλεῖν*, *διασώζειν* (in Matt. and Luke), *ἡγεμών* (in Gospels), *κατακυριεύειν* (in Matt. and Mark), *περιέχειν* (of the contents of a document), *συντρέχειν* (in Mark), *φονεύς* (in Matt. and Apoc.).

A few other parallelisms may be noted; we may divide them into phrases connected in Acts—(i.) with St. Peter, (ii.) with St. Paul.

(i.) Petrine. God is no respecter of persons, 1 Pet. i. 17 = Acts x. 34; the soul is purified through faith, 1 Pet. i. 22 = Acts xv. 9; Ps. cxviii. quoted, 1 Pet. ii. 4 = Acts iv. 11; the Christian rejoices in shame, 1 Pet. iv. 13, 16 = Acts v. 41; the qualification of an apostle is that he is a "witness," 1 Pet. v. 1 = Acts i. 8, 22, v. 32, x. 39. (ii.) Pauline. Heathenism is ignorance, 1 Pet. i. 14 = Acts xvii. 30; God has called the Christian out of darkness into light, 1 Pet. ii. 9 = Acts xxvi. 18; feed the flock, 1 Pet. v. 2 = Acts xx. 28 (or John xxi. 15).

The evidence of style, vocabulary, phraseology does not appear to afford any conclusive evidence of either the absolute or relative date of 1 Peter. It has been dated after Ephesians, or after 62; between Ephesians and Romans, between 62 and 58; or before Romans. For each of these opinions plausible grounds may be alleged. Such uncertainty attaches from the nature of things to all arguments drawn from language or ideas, unless the marks of derivation are strong and clear. In the present case, if it be granted that there is a connexion, direct or indirect, between Romans and 1 Peter, we cannot cut the knot by the round assertion that St. Paul could not have borrowed from St. Peter. On the contrary, the supposition in itself is probable enough. We must therefore look round and consider what other means we have at our disposal for fixing the relative dates of the documents in question.

§ 5. ON THE ALLUSIONS TO PERSECUTION IN 1 PETER.

The date of our Epistle will depend in part on the exact significance of those allusions to the sufferings of Christians in which it abounds. It will therefore be necessary to survey the history of persecution during the period in question; and we cannot well stop short of the Rescript of Trajan, for it has been held that the language of the Epistle is such as could not have been employed till after the issue of the famous directions to Pliny. We may take in order the state of things depicted in Acts, in the Epistles, in the Apocalypse, and in profane history. After this review, it will be possible, perhaps, to attach a definite value to the phraseology of St. Peter.

In the Book of Acts the treatment of the rising Church within the limits of Judaea proper depends mainly on the attitude of the Sanhedrin, though the reign of Herod Agrippa I. comes in as an interlude. Even under Roman rule the Sanhedrin, the Court of the Seventy-one, enjoyed very considerable power. Theoretically, its authority did not exist outside of the eleven toparchies which made up Judaea proper; Galilee and Samaria were exempt from its jurisdiction; but wherever a synagogue of Jews was to be found, its orders were executed so far as the secular authorities would sanction or connive. Within Judaea the Sanhedrin could order arrests (Matt. xxvi. 47; Mark xiv. 43; Acts iv. 3, v. 17, 18), and could finally dispose of any case which did not involve the death penalty (Acts iv. 5-23, v. 21-40). It could even pronounce sentence of death, though all judgments of this nature were invalid until ratified by the procurator (John xviii. 31). The procurator was not compelled to guide himself by the Jewish law, but he was at liberty to take this course, and often did so. Indeed, in one most remarkable case, the Roman governor appears to have had no option. If any one, who was not a Jew, intruded into the inner court of the temple, he was put to death, and even the privilege of Roman citizenship did not save the offender from his doom (see Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, English trans. II. i. 184 sqq.).

Thus in the Book of Acts we find the Sanhedrin arresting, imprisoning, flogging, and menacing the apostles. Shortly afterwards the rapid increase in the number of the brethren led to the stoning of St. Stephen. It is most likely that this bloody deed was in excess of jurisdiction; still it was the act of the Sanhedrin; its method was in strict accordance with Jewish law; and it shows at least what extravagances might be and were tolerated by the Roman government. The death of St. Stephen was followed by a short reign of terror. Pushed on probably by the fiery energy of Saul, the Sanhedrin ordered domiciliary visitation. Many were cast into prison, and many fled from Jerusalem. At the same time it seems to have been possible for Peter and John to remain unharmed in the sacred city. But Saul even went so far as to set out for Damascus, armed with a warrant, which he had persuaded the high priest to grant, empowering him to arrest Christians, man or woman, and bring them away in chains to Jerusalem for trial. Such a warrant would, of course, need endorsement, but Saul does not appear to have felt the slightest doubt that he would obtain the *exequatur* of the civil authority. Who this was is not quite certain; but Aretas, who within three years was so anxious to apprehend Saul himself on the same charge of Christianity, was possibly already master of the city.

That Saul was the prime mover and instigator of this violent

measure appears from the fact that from the moment of his conversion the persecution ceased. Not only in Samaria and Galilee but in Judaea, the legitimate sphere of the Sanhedrin's power, the Churches had rest and were edified. From this time the anger of the Jewish powers seems to have concentrated itself with undying animosity on the head of him whom they regarded as the great renegade and traitor, and the chief enemy of the sacred law. When Saul revisited Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion, we read that the Jews "went about to slay him." Some years later, Herod Agrippa, perhaps taking occasion of discontent excited by the famine in the reign of Claudius, vexed certain of the Church, beheaded St. James, and imprisoned St. Peter. Peter was released by an angel, and "went into another place,"—fled for refuge, probably, to some spot outside Herod's jurisdiction. But the king died shortly afterwards, the persecution did not outlive him, and as far as we can gather from Acts, the Christians in Judaea lived a quiet life till Paul, no longer Saul, reappeared upon the scene, after the end of his third mission journey. On this occasion, again, the fury of the Jews seems to have bent itself entirely against the Apostle of the Gentiles, whom they would undoubtedly have killed, if they had not been prevented by the Roman government.

St. Luke, however, tells us little of the condition of the Church in Jerusalem from the time when St. Paul began his mission labours. There are some words in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians which may point to troubles of which we do not read in the Book of Acts—"For ye, brethren, became followers of the Churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews" (I ii. 14). There was probably many a scourging and many an imprisonment of which we have no record. Even without these penalties a people like the Jews, in which the Church is identical with the nation, has the power of inflicting, by excommunication and social outlawry, sufferings of a very poignant kind. No doubt this power was used then, as it is now in India.

In the countries which St. Paul traversed as a missionary he was far away from the domains of the Sanhedrin, yet even here his enemies were able to reach him. They drove him out of Antioch and Iconium, and stoned him at Lystra. Even in Europe, at Thessalonica, Beroea, and Corinth, they were strong enough to occasion dangerous tumults. But in Greece the Jewish law was held in scanty reverence. Any disturbance came immediately before a Gentile magistrate, whose sole care was for the maintenance of order. A high official, like Gallio, would not at this time dream of going into points of theology; the only question he would ask would be, who began the brawl, and the answer might be anything but satisfactory to the ruler of the synagogue. But at Philippi, and

again at Ephesus, we catch sight of one result of the new faith which led instantly to serious trouble, and was fraught with evil consequences in the future. Nearly every way in which a man gained his living in the Greco-Roman world was connected with idolatry, but the law insisted that every man should be allowed to gain his living without interference. At Philippi, Paul and Silas were flogged and imprisoned for stopping the trade of some men who kept a slave-girl to tell fortunes, and it is curious to notice that these rogues were the first to formulate the real crime of the Christian missionary. They charged the apostles not with disloyalty to Caesar, but with "teaching customs which it is not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans." They had seen at a glance, with the keen eye of a disappointed tradesman, that heathenism and Christianity were two incompatible lives. Later on the same cause brought the apostle into collision with the silversmiths of Ephesus, who drove a profitable trade in silver images of Artemis. These men also found their receipts falling off, and at once appealed to mob-law. We read no more of these incidents, but it is evident that we have here a cause of hostility which would be immediately and universally operative. In every town and village where Christianity struck root the local tradesman would find his custom diminished, and his shop placed under what we have learned to call a boycott. He would protest against this, and the magistrate would be quite ready to help him with a strong hand.

The references to persecution in the Epistles of St. Paul are in the same key as those in the Pauline chapters of the Book of Acts. In Thessalonians we read of afflictions, persecutions, and tribulations (I i. 6, ii. 2, 14, iii. 3; II i. 4). The apostle is afraid that his novices may be "moved" by these trials; but the phrases he employs and the tone in which he speaks are such as might be employed of the sufferings, for instance, of a Hindu convert in British India. In Galatians we find only the words "did ye suffer so much in vain?" In Romans we read how Priscilla and Aquila had laid down their own necks for the apostle's life; in order to save St. Paul they had brought themselves into some real danger of death either at Corinth (Acts xviii. 12) or at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23), and there is a passing allusion to the sword (Rom. viii. 35), which is perhaps not to be interpreted literally. In Corinthians, St. Paul appeals repeatedly to his own sufferings as the seal of his commission (I iv. 9, xv. 32; II iv. 9, vi. 5, xi. 23). Some of these passages show that the narrative of St. Luke gives a very inadequate idea of the apostle's persecutions. It may well be that the Jews were fiercer against St. Paul than against the other apostles, and that he had really more to bear; certainly he claims this distinction (II xi. 23); and again his words may be used to show how much pain was endured by the early believers in silence. But the

apostle does not speak as if the Corinthians themselves had much to fear.

In the Epistles of the Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles we perceive the same tone. The apostle speaks naturally of his own chain and his own fears. He exhorts the Philippians (i. 28-30) not only to believe on Christ, but also to suffer for His sake; but the exhortation is not specially pressing or urgent. Even in his second captivity he speaks of his own death as imminent (2 Tim. iv. 6), but gives no indication of any special peril hanging over the heads of the brethren. They dared not stand by him at his first answer (*ibid.* 16); but the apostle would hardly have blamed their timidity, if Nero's fury against the Church had already declared itself.

So far it would seem as if the ordinary Christian, though he had much to bear, was not confronted by any perils, except such as a sincere and resolute believer might be expected to overcome. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we come upon an entirely different state of things. The Epistle comes from a Church where many were in bonds, and many were bearing great sufferings (*κακουχούμενοι*), and its language is marked by that stern solemnity which betokens the imminence of the supreme moment. The Hebrews are warned against apostasy, as a quite possible and yet absolutely unforgivable offence, worse than any death (vi. 6, x. 26-39). So far they had done well; they had taken joyfully the spoiling of their goods. But a worse and more fearful trial was at hand. And at last we come to the decisive words: "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood."

Here we have a new language. The time has arrived when Christians saw their property confiscated by process of law, and when not apostles only, but everybody must make up his mind whether he was or was not ready to shed his blood for the Name's sake. The State has drawn the sword. What is the particular persecution referred to we cannot say, but it was clearly widely spread. It was in full action in the Church from which the letter came, and it had begun in the Church to which the letter is addressed. It may very well have been the persecution of Nero.

The Apocalypse was, no doubt, written later. Many had been slain for the word of God (vi. 9), one of them, Antipas, at Pergamos, (ii. 13). Rome was drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus (xvii. 6, xviii. 24). We need not ask whether this language refers to the time of Nero or of Domitian. The point is that it is quite different from the language of Acts or of the Pauline Epistles. Christian blood had been shed deliberately, not by Jews, but by the pagan government. The fact caused an indescribable shock of horror, alarm, and execration. After this no Christian could speak of tribulation or persecution in the same tone as before.

What kind of language, then, is used on this subject in the First Epistle of St. Peter?

Christians were spoken against as evil-doers (ii. 12). So they were in the time of Nero (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44), and so they had been by the masters of the Philippian slave-girl. They suffered reproach for the name of Christ (iv. 14). So also did the apostles in the very first days of the Church (Acts v. 41). They were to be ready to give an answer to every man that asked a reason of their hope (iii. 15), and even to suffer for righteousness' sake (iii. 14; compare Matt. v. 10-12). Suffering in St. Peter's mind does not by any means necessarily extend to death, even when it is spoken of in immediate connexion with the death of Christ. Thus we read: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God" (iv. 1, 2). There is but one passage that seems to go beyond these: "Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler in strange matters (*ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*; see note on the passage); but if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." It is urged that murderers were put to death by process of law, and that, therefore, the Christian who is coupled with them must have been in the same danger. But thieves were not put to death, not to speak of "busybodies" (or whatever the word so translated may mean). And suffering, as has already been pointed out, need not by any means imply loss of life. The passage is, beyond a doubt, ambiguous, to say the least, and St. Peter could not have spoken ambiguously, if both himself and those whom he addresses were in imminent peril of the death sentence. If we recall the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Apocalypse, it seems quite clear that Christian blood had not been shed in any formal systematic way by the Roman government at the time when St. Peter wrote.

Professor Ramsay, in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, maintains that not only is State persecution referred to in the Epistle, but that this persecution had already entered on a later and more formidable stage. He holds that "Nero introduced the principle of punishing the Christians" on the ground that "certain acts which all Christians were regularly guilty of were worthy of death" (p. 244); in other words, that at first Christians were executed for what Pliny calls the *flagitia coherentia nomini*, the crimes and moral offences which were popularly believed to be practised in secret by all members of the Church. But between 75 and 80 A.D., under the reign of the Flavian emperors, a new form of process was adopted. Henceforth the Christian was condemned *propter nomen ipsum*. No charge of crime or immorality was brought against him; he was simply asked,

"Are you a Christian?" Further, the Christian was placed in the same class as the *sacrilegi, latrones, plagiarii, fures*, who were to be hunted out by the Roman governors in pursuance of their standing instructions (*Digest*, i. 18. 13); and in whose case no definite accuser was needed. Trajan by his famous Rescript adopted in the main the Flavian policy, but ameliorated the position of the Church in so far as he forbade the governors to seek out Christians, and required proceedings against them to be set on foot by an informer who should give his name and take responsibility for his action. Thus the Rescript "marks the end of the old system of uncompromising hostility." In conclusion, Mr. Ramsay thinks that the First Epistle of St. Peter was written "soon after Vespasian's resumption of the Neronian policy in a more precise and definite form," probably about 80 A.D. (see *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 196 sqq.).

But this elaborate argument is really baseless. There is no evidence whatever that a new form of procedure against Christianity was adopted by the Flavians. Mr. Ramsay builds his view almost entirely on the words of St. Peter, "If ye be reproached for the name of Christ" (iv. 14), which he regards as substantially identical with the phrase of Pliny, *propter ipsum nomen*, "for the name alone," and takes as meaning that Christians at this time were punished as such, and not as evil-doers. But St. Peter tells us that Christians were regarded as evil-doers (ii. 12), and he says, "for the name," not "for the name alone." It is surely obvious that, whatever the pagan might say, the Christian would from the first regard the sufferings entailed by his profession as borne "for the name" and for no other cause, however the true issue might be disguised by the malice or prejudice of his adversaries. Nor, again, can Mr. Ramsay be right in maintaining that Pliny followed a mode of procedure marked out for him by the Flavian *cognitiones*. Pliny expressly says that he did not know anything about the method which had been pursued in these cases. He invented a method for himself, and the object of his despatch is to obtain from Trajan a sanction for what he had done, and a clear direction for his future guidance in a matter which had proved much more serious than he anticipated. Certain persons had been definitely informed against as Christians (*deferebantur*). These he simply asked, three times over, whether they were Christians, warning them at the same time of the consequences of their reply. Those who persisted in their faith he ordered for immediate execution (*duci iussi*), except some who were Roman citizens; these he directed to be sent to Rome for trial there. Here we have an instance of the regular three summonses, disobedience to which constituted the offence of *contumacia* (*Digest*, xlii. 1. 53). Pliny possessed the undefined and formidable power of *coercitio*. He simply ordered these unfortunate

people to give up their faith, and, on their refusal, dealt with them as rebels. Later on, an anonymous accuser posted up or sent to Pliny a list of many names of persons who were liable to the same charge. These Pliny examined; clearly he had taken alarm at the magnitude of the task before him. Some denied that they were or ever had been Christians; these he ordered to worship the gods and Caesar, and especially to "curse Christ," and, on their compliance, dismissed. Others asserted that, though they had been Christians, they had ceased to be so. When these also had justified themselves by the same tests, Pliny proceeded to find out from them, what one would think he might have tried to learn at an earlier stage of the proceedings, what Christianity really was. They told him that it was not a conspiracy but a religion, that it consisted in the worship of Christ as God, that there were no *flagitia* at all, and that the reason why they had left the Church was, that the religious practices of Christians conflicted with the law against clubs or guilds (*hetaeriae*). Pliny obtained corroboration of this statement by putting to the torture two slave-women, who were possibly deaconesses (*quae ministrae dicebantur*). Upon the whole, he came to the conclusion that Christianity was nothing worse than a debased and extravagant superstition. And so he turns to the emperor and asks whether he had done right; whether he is to punish Christianity as such (*nomen ipsum*), or only wicked and criminal Christians (*flagitia cohaerentia nomini*); whether Christianity is a crime like murder, for which repentance is no atonement, or a merely religious offence, which change of mind wipes out; and, lastly, whether it admits of degrees and distinctions, or whether all offenders, man and woman, young and old, are to be treated with the same severity.

Trajan replies that Pliny has acted rightly, and proceeds to state certain rules for his future guidance. Christianity is not a crime like others, and no definite formula can be laid down. Christians are not to be hunted out, like notorious malefactors, by the police. The contumacious are to be put to death; those who recant may be discharged. But anonymous accusations are on no account to be received. They are bad in themselves, and the spirit of the age condemns them.

In these last words the emperor administers a severe and well-merited rebuke to Pliny. But Pliny's despatch throughout is as silly and helpless a production as was ever penned. First he puts men to death without inquiry, then he inquires, and then he does not know what to do. We can gather little from him for our present purpose beyond the fact that *cognitiones* had been held upon Christians in Rome, probably not long before and not infrequently.

The precise effect of Trajan's Rescript has been much debated.

Some have held that it altered the position of the Christian for the better, some for the worse. It may be maintained that it made no difference at all. "So far as I can see," says Professor Harnack, "Tertullian is the only independent witness for the Rescript in ecclesiastical literature." It is not mentioned in the Rescript of Hadrian. In the Vienna persecution the proconsul acted without any reference to it; "sought out" Christians; listened to charges of "Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean incest"; tortured Blandina, Sanctus, Biblias, Pothinus, to ascertain the truth of these horrid stories, just as Pliny had done; finally, wrote to Rome for instructions, and received much the same answer as Pliny (*Eus. H. E. v. 1. 14, 19, 20, 25, 29, 44, 47, 52*). It is not clear what was the force of a Rescript in the time of Trajan. Gaius, writing under Marcus Aurelius, says that it has never been doubted that a Rescript has the force of law; yet again he tells us that a letter from the emperor had not always a general application (Gaius, i. 2, 5, 73, in Huschke, *Jurisprudentiae anteiustinianae quae supersunt*, pp. 171, 189—the text in the last passage is uncertain). Before the time of Hadrian there are very few traces of general rescripts (see the *Index Fontium* at the end of Huschke), and they seem to be unknown to Tacitus. The Emperor Macrinus, who was an accomplished lawyer (see his Life in *Hist. Aug.* chap. 13), at one time thought of repealing all the rescripts of his predecessors, "saying it was monstrous that the will of Commodus and Caracallus and other ignorant men should be counted law, when Trajan never answered petitions (*cum Traianus numquam libellis responderit*)." Macrinus was thinking, perhaps, rather of favours or exemptions granted by rescript; but he could hardly have said what he did if Trajan's rescripts laid down general rules, modified accepted methods of procedure, and formed a new law to be followed in all similar cases.

At any rate it seems clear that Trajan's Rescript was not published, or was not included in the directions given to provincial governors. It was not known at Vienna; just as another rescript referred to by Tertullian (*ad Scapulam*, 4), by which Christians were ordered to be beheaded, not burnt alive, was not known, or not obeyed, in his province.

Yet Trajan's words clearly dictate a sterner line of conduct than Pliny would probably have followed if left to himself. What the emperor approves is Pliny's treatment of his first batch of prisoners. Pliny had inquired into the *flagitia*. But Trajan tells him that this is mere waste of time; the offence is the *nomen ipsum*. Gradually, as the issues of the struggle between paganism and the Church became clearer, this rule prevailed. The Christian was not allowed to plead his loyalty or his moral innocence. His mouth was shut, and his trial resolved itself into a plain yes or no. Hence the bitter complaints of the Apologists that the Christian, unlike all other

offenders, was punished for a mere name (Justin, *Apol.* i. 4; Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 2; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 27; Theophilus Antioch. i. 1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 1). The best illustration of the justice of these complaints may be found in the *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs* (the date is A.D. 180; see the text in *Texts and Studies*, edit. J. A. Robinson, p. 112 sqq., Cambridge, 1891).

We have been wandering rather far afield in the latter part of this discussion. But the reader who will consider the Rescript of Trajan, the way in which Tacitus speaks of the Neronian persecution (*Annals*, xv. 44), the language of the Apocalypse and even of the Epistle to the Hebrews, will feel that the First Epistle of St. Peter must come in point of date before them all. At the time when it was written Babylon had not yet unmasked all its terrors, and the ordinary Christian was not in immediate danger of the *tunica ardens*, or the red-hot iron chair, or the wild beasts, or the stake.

§ 6. DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND ORGANISATION IN I PETER.

It has been argued in preceding sections that I Peter was probably not composed by the hand of the apostle himself—that, though the ideas of the Epistle are those of St. Peter, the words, to a degree which cannot be precisely ascertained, belong to his draughtsman—that the resemblances of expression between I Peter and the Pauline Epistles turn upon phrases and topics of a commonplace kind, do not include any of the favourite words, ideas, or metaphors of St. Paul, and generally are not such as to prove a literary use of any of the Pauline Epistles by the author or composer of I Peter, and that the language of I Peter on the subject of Christian suffering is such as to lead to the conclusion that our Epistle was written before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution. We may now turn to another topic, the realisation of the Christian idea as it is presented to us in I Peter. The question is of some interest as regards the date, but may be called vital as regards the authenticity of the Epistle. Does I Peter represent, as has been said, “a step in the process by which Pauline ideas passed into the consciousness of the Church”? If so, the author may have been a very good man, but he was certainly not St. Peter, though he decked himself with the apostle’s name. This opinion is, however, widely entertained by scholars of great authority. Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 452) holds that “the author of I Peter is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Pauline Christianity,” and many other scholars use terms implying that he was a docile but not very intelligent disciple of the one great apostle. Indeed, many go further still, and regard St. Paul as having given such a stamp,

such a direction and impulse to Christianity, that he might without impropriety be called its founder. It must be of importance to get clear ideas upon this point.

Let us endeavour, then, to see what is the agreement, and what is the disagreement, between St. Paul and St. Peter. It will be argued in the following pages that in what we may call dogma the two apostles are substantially in accord; that in the practical sphere St. Peter differs widely from St. Paul, not as one who misunderstands a teacher, but as one who looks at things from a different point of view. It will be argued also, and this is a point that is usually passed over, that, where the two differ, St. Peter stands perceptibly nearer to the evangelists and to the Book of Acts. We may venture to assume here that Acts is a genuine history, written by St. Luke, an educated, intelligent, sincere man, who had personal knowledge of much that he relates, and took pains to inform himself about the rest.

It is of the highest importance that we should study the differences between the sacred writers. As yet this task has hardly been attempted except by Baur and Ritschl with their respective followers. Baur was a Hegelian, and the Hegelian theory of history, with its perpetual thesis and antithesis, led him to imagine that there were great differences in dogma between the Twelve and St. Paul. Yet Hegelianism has the great merit of giving to Art, Knowledge, and Discipline their true value as means of education. Ritschl was a Kantian, and Kantism may be called the philosophy of Lutheranism. From the Kantian point of view Art, Knowledge, and Discipline have no religious worth, and the one thing necessary is Faith. Hence the disciplinary system of 1 Peter is to be regarded as a degradation or misapprehension of the Pauline view of freedom. On the other hand, theologians as a rule have refused to see any differences at all. One school has interpreted the whole of the New Testament in terms of St. Peter, another in terms of St. Paul. Since the time of Mr. Maurice there has been a strong tendency in England to make St. John the norm. But the duty of the critic is neither to separate things which are the same, nor to confuse things which are different. Harmonising, as it is wrongly called, is the more pressing danger of the two. Out of it flow all our mutual excommunications, and by it we impoverish the rich variety of the Christian life.

There are, as is well known, grave practical differences between eminent and sincere Christians. Is it absurd to maintain that these differences have always existed, that they are to be found in the Gospels, that they correspond to the ancient and inevitable distinction between the Realist and the Nominalist, that they caused as much heat in primitive times as in our own, that they brought even apostles into sharp antagonisms, that in effect St. Peter was the first

great High Churchman, and St. Paul the first great Low Churchman? At any rate we may look at matters from this point of view, and endeavour to ascertain how far it is in agreement with facts.

That the dogmatic teaching of the two apostles was identical we know on indisputable authority, that of St. Paul himself. In the Conference at Jerusalem the apostles "added nothing to him," in other words they approved his creed, there was no dispute about the essential points of the truth of the gospel (Gal. ii. 6). And at a moment when St. Paul's feelings were warmly excited, and he was the less likely to minimise differences, he based his rebuke of St. Peter on the very fact that in theology they occupied common ground: "We, who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ" (Gal. ii. 15, 16). Such words could not possibly have been uttered and written down, after time for reflexion had intervened, if St. Paul had been divided from St. Peter by such a gulf as Baur imagined.

Let us endeavour to see how the matter stands. It will be well to begin by considering how far the theology of the Epistle agrees with the doctrine of St. Peter, as he is depicted by St. Luke in the Book of Acts. The following points call for notice. In Acts (ii. 22) St. Peter calls the Saviour Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. In the Epistle the name Jesus is not used by itself, and the nickname "Nazoraean" has given way to the other nickname "Christian" (see note on 1 Pet. iv. 16). In the Epistle we do not find the phrase παῖς Θεοῦ (Acts iii. 13); but the passage of Isaiah, from which the phrase is taken, is constantly before the writer's eyes. Much significance has been found in two expressions that are used by St. Peter in Acts—ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ (ii. 22), and Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ὃ Θεὸς ἐποίησε (ii. 36)—which have been thought to involve what was afterwards known as the Adoptianist view. But they do not necessarily involve it, and language of precisely the same character is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author of which was certainly not an Adoptianist (i. 2, ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησε τοὺς αἰῶνας: 4, κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων: iii. 2, Ἰησοῦν πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιῶσαντι αὐτόν). The relation between the divine and human natures of our Lord is not expressed in the New Testament with the precision insisted upon by later theology. Even St. John writes that "the Word became flesh" (i. 14), and in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* we find phrases that might seem to involve psilanthropism side by side with others that might be interpreted as Sabellianism (see Sinker's *Introduction*, p. 91 sqq.). But the broad similarity between the Peter of the Acts and the Peter of the Epistle is so strong that it far outweighs these verbal differences. In Acts, as in the Epistle, Jesus was crucified by the foreknowledge of God (Acts ii. 23); God hath

raised Him up, and now He is exalted at the right hand of God (ii. 32, 33), to return once more at the restitution of all things and judge both quick and dead (x. 42). Even the most striking peculiarity of the Epistle, the Descent into Hell, is implicitly contained in the quotation from Ps. xvi. (Acts ii. 25 sqq.), which is not applied to our Lord elsewhere in the New Testament. To Christ, again, all the prophets give witness (x. 43); He is Lord of all (x. 36), and for His Name the disciples suffer shame (v. 41).

The last two passages are of the greatest importance. In the Epistle "the word of the living God" is "the word of the Lord" (i. 23, 25), and also the word of the spirit of Christ which spoke in the prophets (i. 11). Again, the Lord of the Psalmist is Christ (ii. 3). Thus the Name of Christ for which the Christian suffers reproach (iv. 14), is that same Name of the Lord on which whosoever calleth shall be saved, the only Name given under heaven among men whereby they can be saved (Acts ii. 21, iv. 12). It is St. Paul's "Name that is above every name" (Eph. i. 21; Phil. ii. 9), and it is identified in many places with the Divine Name in the Old Testament.

There is, in fact, no theological difference of any moment between the Peter of the Epistle and the Peter of Acts, nor, on the other hand, between St. Peter and St. Paul. Our Epistle opens with the Three Names of the Trinity, and assigns to each a distinct part in the redemption of mankind. God is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as in Eph. i. 3 and in the Gospel of St. John xx. 17. He is also our Father (i. 17), as Creator (iv. 19), and Regenerator (i. 3). To Him belong foreknowledge and election (i. 2), judgment (i. 17), great mercy (i. 3), our calling (v. 10) and establishing because He is the giver of all grace. The Son is Lord (i. 3), in such a sense that passages used in the Old Testament of Jehovah may without fear be applied to Him (ii. 3). To Him a doxology is addressed (iv. 11). He it was that inspired the prophets (i. 11). He was the spotless Lamb by whose blood we are redeemed (i. 19). He suffered for us, the just for the unjust (iii. 18). He was our sin-offering and expiation (ii. 24, iii. 18), and is our Pattern (ii. 21), Shepherd (ii. 25), and Overseer. He descended into Hades to preach to the dead (iii. 19, iv. 6), ascended into heaven, is on the right hand of God (iii. 22), and shall come again in the Revelation of Glory to bestow the amaranthine crown (v. 4). The Spirit is one of the Three (i. 2), and a Person, for *πνεῦμα* in our Epistle means a personality (see below), who was "sent" from heaven to forward the preaching of the gospel (i. 12). He sanctifies (i. 2), and rests upon the Christian (iv. 14), as the Spirit of glory and of God.

Two points only are peculiar to St. Peter—the preaching in Hades, which is probably alluded to in Matt. xxvii. 51, 52, and

possibly in Eph. iv. 9; and the inspiration of prophecy by Christ, which may be found without great difficulty in 2 Cor. iii. 7 sqq. We can therefore easily understand the appeal made by St. Paul to St. Peter at Antioch on the ground of their common belief. The creed was the same, though the manner in which it expressed itself in conduct might be very different.

For all those terms that we use in theology may be employed in two senses, the Mystic and the Disciplinarian. These two words denote not a difference in the thing believed, but a difference in the way of believing it. Let us try to make this clear without going too far into metaphysics.

A Disciplinarian is one who hears God speaking to him; a Mystic is one who feels the presence of God within. The former says, "Christ is my Saviour, Shepherd, Friend, my Judge, my Rewarder"; the latter says, "Not I live, but Christ liveth in me." The former sedulously distinguishes the human personality from the divine; the latter desires to sink his own personality in the divine. Hence the leading Disciplinarian ideas are Grace considered as a gift, Law, Learning, Continuity, Godly Fear—in all these human responsibility is kept steadily in view. But the leading Mystic ideas are Grace as an indwelling power, Freedom, the Inner Light, Discontinuity (Law and Gospel, Flesh and Spirit, World and God), and Love. Nothing is more difficult than to define these two tendencies in the abstract, because they run into one another in shapes of manifold diversity. Yet it is easy in practice to see the difference between, for instance, William Laud and George Fox. A great part of the difficulty of discrimination arises from the fact that many people use mystic language, though they are really and truly disciplinarians.

Now this is just the difference of which we are sensible in reading the Pauline and the Petrine Epistles. Let us compare the two theologies from this point of view.

In 1 Peter, God though full of mercy (i. 3), and the giver of all grace (v. 10), is above all holy (i. 15), and mighty (v. 6); our chastening Father, who sends suffering for our good (iv. 19, v. 5 sqq.); the just Judge (i. 17); and on all these accounts He is to be feared with godly fear (i. 17, ii. 17). St. Peter does not speak of loving God, though Christians love Christ with joy unspeakable (i. 8). Throughout the Epistle the attitude is one of profound awe and reverence. Bishop Butler was a true disciple of St. Peter.

On the other hand, St. Paul's thought tends rather to the love of God, to joy in God (Rom. v. 8, viii. 39); and God is not merely Judge, Rewarder, Father, but that infinite and eternal Spirit who shall one day fill all things, and in whom all things shall find perfect rest (1 Cor. xv. 28). St. Peter teaches that after this life

we shall meet God, and that this must be an awful thought even to the righteous (iv. 18). St. Paul rejoices in the expectation of knowing even as we are known, and seeing face to face (1 Cor. xiii. 12, 13). It is sufficient briefly to refer to those many passages where St. Paul dwells on the unity of the believer with God in Christ (1 Cor. vi. 17).

Both these views of the spiritual life have been taken by great saints, and both are to be found in the Gospels. What we are to observe is that St. Paul's view is the more mystical, and that St. Peter's view is the more disciplinarian. It will be remembered with what sympathy St. Paul quoted upon the Areopagus the words of the Greek mystic—"For in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring."

This general difference of intention makes itself felt at every point. We may select by way of illustration a few striking instances.

Take *πίστις*. St. Paul uses this word in more than one shade of meaning, and nowhere exactly defines it. Yet we may say that to him it signifies much more than loving trust. It is the comfortable sense of the Lord's presence in the heart, whereby the believer is able to say, "Yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which now I live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me" (Gal. ii. 20). It is because of this mystic sense of faith as producing a real unifying contact between the soul and Christ, that St. Paul is able to speak of the believer as justified by faith and not by works of law. He is so justified because he has within him the Source of life and righteousness, because by faith he is one with the Risen Lord.

Now, compare the language of St. Paul with that of St. James, "By works a man is justified, and not by faith only." St. James has been harmonised with St. Paul, but only by force. It is palpable that the two use "faith" and "justify" in different senses. St. Peter says that good conduct is thankworthy (ii. 19), that the righteous man is hardly saved (iv. 18); and these phrases imply a similar conception to that of St. James. Conduct is something; it springs from the motive, and receives its value from the motive; yet at the same time it reacts upon the motive. In the view of St. Paul, action is merely the sign of the inspiration within, and has no other value; in that of St. Peter and St. James it is not merely the sign of faith, but the necessary condition of a higher and stronger faith. Neither St. Peter nor St. James would have denied that the Christian is saved by faith, though probably they would not have said that he is justified by faith (cf. 1 Pet. i. 5, 9 with Gal. ii. 16). But to them faith is not so much the presence of God in the heart, as the steadfast will to follow God through all the trials of life. The

practical difference between these two conceptions of the same thing is very great indeed, as we know from history.

St. Peter does not define Faith, but he uses the word in the same sense as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen . . . he that cometh unto God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 1, 6). It is not merely belief, which may be non-moral or even immoral (Jas. ii. 19), but strong conviction, carrying with it trustful obedience in the midst of trials which we do not understand, godly fear, and the love of Christ. It is not salvation, but it is the way to salvation (1 Pet. i. 9); it destroys sin, but only through patience under suffering (1 Pet. iv. 1). Strong conviction is its beginning, but the blessing of God rests upon the disposition which it produces, on the conduct in which it finds expression. St. Peter's conception of faith we may say is simpler, more Hebrew, more evangelical, than that of St. Paul. His Faith is that which we find expressed in Ps. cxix.

Or take again the word *χάρις*. From the mystical Pauline point of view Faith and Grace are really the same thing; they differ only in so far as the divine immanence, the unity between God and man, must have an earthward as well as a heavenward side. Faith is Grace, the inner life, the divine life manifesting itself in man; and the gifts of Grace (*χαρίσματα*) are those spiritual supernatural infusions which testify to the immediate presence of the Holy Ghost (Rom. i. 11, vi. 23; 1 Cor. xii.; even in Rom. xii. 6 the idea is the same). In St. Peter, Grace is not the life, but anything that conduces to the life, any gift of the personal God to the personal man, any good thing whatever that comes down to us from the merciful Father—the gospel (i. 10), the promised joy of heaven (i. 13), or life (iii. 7), or money and the power of dispensing hospitality (iv. 9, 10). Grace is the bounty, or mercy, or favour of God. Here again St. Peter is more evangelical, more Jewish. God is the good Father who bestows; the Christian is the good child, the faithful servant, who receives, and receives more in proportion to the faithfulness of his service. God's gifts are free, of course, but this thought does not trouble St. Peter. He does not speculate about it, nor go out of his way to ask why some men receive and some do not. God is free, but He is good, and not arbitrary, and this suffices for the apostle's simple creed.

One striking consequence of this theological attitude is, that in the mind of St. Peter the future outweighs the present to a much greater degree than in that of St. Paul, St. John, or the mystics generally. Faith has, indeed, a present assurance in the Spirit of glory and of God which "rests upon" the Christian, as the Shechinah rested on the tabernacle (iv. 14), and causes joy un-

speakable and full of glory (i. 8); but it is closely allied, indeed it is almost the same thing with Hope, as it is also in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here, again, Peter is more evangelical; and his sober patience is just what we should expect in a personal companion of Christ's after the day of Ascension. His frame of mind is that which is suggested by the later parables in St. Matthew's Gospel. The kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country. Soon He will return bringing His reward with Him. Meanwhile His servants dwell as strangers, as pilgrims, in a world of trouble. They are kept through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed (i. 5); they are to hope perfectly for the grace that is to be brought (i. 13); they are to look for the return of the Chief Shepherd with the amaranthine crown (v. 4). The Christian has joy, peace, good days (iii. 10), but his lot here is one of temptation; and temptation is not the bitter strife against evil within, but the crushing load of sorrow from without (i. 6, 7). What we mean by temptation in our modern phraseology is called by St. Paul *ἁμαρτία*, by St. Peter *ἐπιθυμία*. The same sense of the inadequacy of the present life is to be found, of course, in St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 19); but St. Paul had felt a deeper mental anguish, and risen to a more triumphant sense of victory than St. Peter. Hence, though he prizes hope, he is less oppressed by the deferring of the hope.

A few words may be added here on the psychological and ethical terminology of St. Peter, which is entirely unlike that of St. Paul. *Πνεῦμα*, as applied to man, denotes his soul as a whole, considered as immaterial and immortal. It is used of disembodied spirits (iii. 19), and is opposed to *σάρξ* as mind to body. In one place (iii. 4, *ἡσυχίου πνεύματος*) it signifies merely disposition or temper. But St. Peter never employs it, as St. Paul frequently does, to denote inspiration, or the faculty through which man is capable of inspiration. He does not distinguish it from *ψυχή* (cf. 1 Thess. v. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 45, 46) or from *νοῦς* (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15). Two very important points are here involved. One has already been noticed, that, as applied to the Holy Spirit, *πνεῦμα* must certainly in 1 Peter mean Ghost or Personality. The other is that St. Peter could not say, as St. Paul does, "the spiritual man judgeth all things." Both the phrase and the idea are foreign to him. He points no antithesis between *πνεῦμα* and *γράμμα*, nor, in an ethical sense, between *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ*. Indeed, in the First Epistle *σάρξ* has no moral significance at all; it means simply the body (cf., however, 2 Pet. ii. 10, 18), though the desires belong to the flesh (ii. 11). *Κόσμος* also is simply the world (i. 20, v. 9), not the evil world. *Ψυχή*, again, denotes the whole inner nature of man, the principle of life, the personality (see i. 9, 22, ii. 25, iii. 20, iv. 19). It does not bear the sense of the lower life of sense or carnal understanding, opposed to the higher life of reason or intelligence; hence such

phrases as ψυχικός άνθρωπος (I Cor. ii. 14), σῶμα ψυχικόν (*ibid.* xv. 44), do not, and indeed could not, occur. Ψυχή is, in fact, the very word which St. Peter uses throughout of the soul in relation to the religious life. Besides these words, we have διάνοια (i. 13), ἔννοια (iv. 1), ἐπιθυμίαι (i. 14, ii. 11, iv. 2, 3), and the Hebraistic καρδιά (i. 22, iii. 4, 15). It is a simple, slender, rather archaic list of words, just sufficient for the author's purpose, taken from common usage, and clearly untinged by speculation.

It has been pointed out in the foregoing paragraphs that the Petrine theology regards God as the object of Christian thought, aspiration, worship, rather than of experience, possession, inner realisation; that it dwells on the transcendental nature and majesty of God, rather than on the mystic union between God and the believer. St. Peter does not, indeed, fail to do justice to the experimental side of the religious life; his people have "tasted that the Lord is good" (ii. 3). Still, his view is predominantly objective; and this is at all times the attitude of the disciplinarian. He gives very few details of the religious life as it existed among his readers; this was not his object. But there are in the Epistle a certain number of ideas and words belonging to the sphere of practical theology; and these all point in the same direction. Everything is simple, easy, stamped by plain, pastoral common sense; everything again is conservative; the Church has advanced from its old Hebrew resting-place, but no further than is necessary.

The first great point that we notice is, that the corruption of man is still regarded in the same light as in the Old Testament and the Gospels. There is, at any rate, no trace of the Pauline doctrine of inherited sin, and ἁμαρτία always means the concrete act, "a sin," as in the Synoptic Gospels, not "sinfulness," as in the mystics St. Paul and St. John. Even when he is speaking of the saving power of Baptism, St. Peter calls moral evil "the filth of the flesh," and appears to mean simply that sin is the yielding to those desires which have their root in the body. We cannot absolutely infer from his silence that he did not know, or did not approve, the doctrine of St. Paul, but he certainly is silent. To another very important Pauline doctrine, that of Imputation, he makes not the slightest allusion, and we may gather with confidence that he would not have admitted it without reservation, for he speaks of "the righteous man" in exactly the same way as the Psalmist or the Book of Proverbs (iv. 18).

Equally important is the absence of the word Law. There is no sign of any difficulty or dispute, nor is any difference whatever made, between Jew and Gentile. Both appear to be living in peace, side by side under the same authoritative supervision. We may account for this remarkable fact in different ways. We may suppose that the whole Church was violently agitated by the circumcision dispute,

and did not settle down in quiet for some years; and this is the view which has been derived from too exclusive a use of the Epistles of St. Paul. Or we may suppose that the heat was generated by a handful of fanatics, that it was a mere crackling of thorns, which never received any support from the Twelve, and died away at once; and this is the view which we should gather from the Book of Acts. What St. Paul wrote about the Law, except in Galatians, is not directly polemical—it is simply the free expression of his mystic belief that all external authority disappeared with the advent of the Spirit. That St. Peter did not share this belief is abundantly evident; but why should we expect him to write against it? Or if he was writing against it, how could he do so more properly than by such an Epistle as the present?

The truth appears to be that, in the mind of St. Peter, Christianity itself is a Law, the will of God (ii. 15), the Law fulfilled, transfigured, re-established on a surer foundation by Jesus Christ, yet still in its eternal elements, in its essential nature as Law, lying at the root of all moral life. Hence in St. Peter we find that same sense of the continuity of history which is so nobly expressed in Hebrews. There has been no rejection of the Jew; he has simply been called like everybody else to move on to a higher plane. There is no antithesis between Law and Promise. The titles of the chosen people are transferred without hesitation to the Christian community. The Christians are priests, kings, a holy nation, the people that God always had in view; they are the Diaspora, pilgrims like Abraham; and all good women are daughters of Sarah. There is no trace of bitterness against the Jews. In a word, history flows on from the far past to the present in a widening but continuous stream.

Closely allied to the continuity of the faith is its authority. In the view of St. Paul there is no authority except that of the inner light; the spiritual man judgeth all things, and is judged of none. Freedom is emancipation from all external control; it is based on that conscious union with God which lifts a man above all precepts and ordinances.

But there is another view that Grace (as John Wesley said) is not necessarily Light, and that, at the outset of the spiritual life, men must do, not because they understand and love, but in order that they may understand and love.

Here, again, we may test the difference between the apostles at many significant points. In the eyes of St. Peter all Christians are "babes" (ii. 2); it is their natural estate in this life, and to the end of their earthly probation they need to be fed with the "milk" of God's word. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, influenced, perhaps, by some writer of the same school as Philo, speaks of the Catechism as "milk" for babes, and contrasts it with the "strong meat," the deeper and wider belief of the grown-up Christian. Still

he seems to mean that the lower belief of obedience is a natural preparation for the higher belief of intelligence, that as a regular thing men do rise through the state of Law to the state of Freedom. This attitude we may call that of disciplinary mysticism (Heb. v. 12, 13). But to the mind of St. Paul the evil of this lower stage is more obvious than its good. "Milk" is the food of the carnal, of the weak brother who sets great store by externals, and is always ready to quarrel about them. To him the "babe" is not the Christian, as to St. Peter, nor the novice, as to the author of Hebrews, but the formalist, the disciplinarian (1 Cor. iii. 1). Obviously St. Peter would restrict within reasonable limits that right of private judgment which St. Paul bestows without reserve on all Christians. Notice again the use of the word *ποιμαίνειν* and *ποιμήν* in St. Peter (ii. 25, v. 2, 4). St. Paul hardly uses this appropriate metaphor of the Christian pastor (Acts xx. 28; Eph. iv. 11), and never applies it to Christ. Another important word is *ἅγιος*, which in St. Paul is often a noun—all Christians are saints; but in St. Peter is only an adjective—all Christians ought to become saints. Or observe how St. Peter directs his people to speak like the oracles of God (iv. 11). Scripture is the external norm or pattern for all our words. Or, again, how St. Paul relaxes the gospel rule of marriage, to this extent at least, that in the case of mixed marriages, if the heathen partner desires a separation, the Christian partner is not under bondage (1 Cor. vii. 15). "For," the apostle adds, "what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or what knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?" But St. Peter appears to know of no such liberty, and exhorts all wives to be in subjection to their own husbands, "that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives" (iii. 1).

But more important than all is the entire absence in 1 Peter of any allusion to Christian prophecy. The point is of such consequence that it may be permissible to deal with it at some little length.

In the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke (not in St. Mark or St. John) our Lord speaks of sending prophets to the Church (Matt. x. 41; Luke xi. 49). They are distinguished from "wise men and scribes" (Matt. xxiii. 34). Prophecy is a miraculous gift, analogous to the power of casting out devils, and might be bestowed on or assumed by people whose conduct was not good (Matt. vii. 22). These are false prophets (Matt. vii. 15); and we gather that the false prophet specially concerned himself with that topic on which Christians are forbidden to speculate (Matt. xxiv. 36), the day and hour of the Second Advent (Matt. xxiv. 11, 23, 24).

At the beginning of the Book of Acts we read of the outpouring of the spirit of prophecy on the day of Pentecost, and on several

occasions we find the same gift bestowed on the newly baptized. We may suppose this form of prophecy to have been an ecstatic outburst of thanksgiving and adoration ; but this particular form of the grace does not appear to have been universal or permanent, nor did it make its recipient a prophet in the regular acceptation of the word.

But we meet also with persons who were recognised as prophets and of the same family as the prophets of old, because in their case inspiration was not, indeed, habitual,—this it never was,—but at any rate frequently recurrent. We find them at Jerusalem (xi. 27), at Antioch (xiii. 1), at Tyre (xxi. 4), at Caesarea (xxi. 9), but not elsewhere. Some of them were men, some were “virgins.” They read the secrets of men’s hearts (v. 3), or predicted future events (xi. 28, xxi. 11), or delivered special mandates from the Holy Spirit to the Church (xiii. 2). Some of them were also teachers (xiii. 1) ; and two, Judas and Silas, exhorted the brethren at Antioch with many words (xv. 32), explaining to them the circumcision dispute, and pressing upon them the acceptance of the Jerusalem Decree.

One passage in the Book of Acts relating to prophecy is so important that it calls for special comment. Originally there were at Antioch two Churches, one of Jews and one of Greeks, and even at the time described in the thirteenth chapter it is not clear to what extent the two had been amalgamated. The Gentile Church was founded by men of Cyrene, and Lucius of Cyrene was one of the prophets and teachers by whom Barnabas and Saul were set apart for their mission (xi. 19, 20, xiii. 1). The selection or ordination of the two evangelists may possibly have been the act of the Greek Church alone. Nor is it certain what it was that the prophets and teachers actually did. We may, however, suppose with great probability that the plan of a missionary campaign had already been discussed and approved, and that the whole Church was gathered together, fasting and praying for some definite word from the Holy Ghost, telling them whither to go and whom to send. All eyes and hearts would be fixed upon the five prophets through whom the heavenly voice had so often made itself heard before. At last the mandate comes and the mouthpiece speaks : “Separate me Barnabas and Saul.” A very similar account of the method of prophecy is given by Hermas, who knew it well. “When the man who hath the divine spirit cometh into a congregation of righteous men who have the faith of the divine spirit, and intercession of the congregation of those men is made to God, then the angel of the prophetic spirit, who is attached to him, fills the man, and the man being filled with the Holy Ghost speaketh to the assembly as the Lord willeth” (*Mand.* xi. 9). What we find described here is not the ordinary meeting for public worship, but a special assembly of intercession for a definite object.

Elsewhere also (1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14) we find the prophet playing the same part in the selection of God's ministers. Timothy, however, though marked out by the prophets, was commissioned and, as we should say, ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. St. Luke does not expressly say that the presbyters laid hands on Barnabas and Saul, but this is probably what he means.

Generally speaking, from the Book of Acts we should infer that the gift of prophecy, in the proper sense of the word, was not commonly bestowed, that its form was that of direct inspiration, that its expression was occasional and limited. In 1 Peter, James, Jude, Hebrews, we read of no prophets at all. In 2 Peter (ii. 1) mention is made of false prophets. John knows both of false prophets and of true (1 John iv. 1; Apoc. xi. 18, xix. 20). If we take the Pauline Epistles, we find little or no trace of the existence of prophets at Ephesus (see, however, Eph. iv. 11), or Philippi, or Colossae, or in Galatia, or at Rome. Prophecy is, indeed, mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans (xii. 6); but when the apostle tells us that he longed to impart unto that Church some spiritual gift (i. 11), we are probably to understand that he hoped to stir up a grace which as yet had not been bestowed upon it. But in two Churches, at Thessalonica and at Corinth, we find a very different state of things. Both were new Churches, composed probably in the main of Gentiles, who but a few months before had been idolaters. Yet in both these communities prophets were very numerous, and the apostle gave them great encouragement (1 Thess. v. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 39).

At Thessalonica the prophets were busily doing exactly what our Lord forbade, they were proclaiming that the day of Christ was imminent (*ἐνέσθηκεν*, ii. 2); and for this error they were rebuked by St. Paul. Even in this town, prophetism appears to have been very active and, on the whole, mischievous. There were those who regarded it with disfavour, and wished to suppress it altogether, or, at any rate, to bring it under control by the imposition of restraints which St. Paul thought too rigorous. "Quench not the Spirit," he says; "despise not prophesyings" (1 Thess. v. 19, 20). At the same time he adds a needful word of warning: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

But at Corinth the state of affairs was really extraordinary. The number of those who laid claim to the spiritual gifts of speaking with tongues and of prophecy must have been very large. But these miraculous endowments, instead of leading to meekness and unity, caused much angry rivalry, which turned even the public worship of the Church into a scene of disorder. These were not good fruits; indeed, to speak quite plainly, they are the contradiction of anything that we can reasonably attribute to the Spirit of God. St. Paul treats these extravagances with great wisdom. He

asserts his own authority, both as apostle and as prophet, with explicit resolution. But he deals only with the symptoms, with the disorders. He does not name the offenders, nor does he charge them with self-deceit, nor does he expressly point out in what way their notion of "prophecy," of "liberty," was connected with those moral and doctrinal extravagances which he condemns. But he lays down firmly the rule of decency and order, the great principles of Charity and Unity, and points out clearly the besetting danger of what in the eighteenth century was called Enthusiasm. "Knowledge puffeth up." Knowledge, the knowledge of mysteries, is very closely related to prophecy. A close parallel to the conduct of St. Paul is to be found in that of George Fox towards the Bristol fanatics. Fox was in the same position as the apostle. He, too, had fostered and encouraged prophecy, and, when the behaviour of Naylor opened his eyes to the gulf at his feet, he acted in the same way as St. Paul, not denying his own principles, but building the necessary fence along the edge of the precipice with authority, discretion, and reserve.

From Fox's own account we could hardly guess the nature and the peril of the Bristol crisis, and we can do little more than guess at the inner history of the Corinthian Church. But in the time of Fox, and afterwards of Wesley, Bristol, a seaport and a great seat of the slave trade, was not unlike Corinth in some pertinent features. Corinth had never borne a good reputation, nor had Greeks ever been patient of discipline in any shape. It is in such places that the leaven of Christianity produces the most violent fermentation. Sudden conversions are common; and the sudden conversion of an undisciplined character is always strongly mystical. It is not surprising, therefore, to find many prophets in the town, nor is it difficult to conjecture what would be the results.

At Corinth, as elsewhere, prophecy bore its usual and proper form of "revelation" (1 Cor. xiv. 26), that is to say, of immediate communication from the Holy Spirit. Revelation always implies Ecstasy (Acts x. 10, xi. 5, xxii. 17), that state which is also called "being in the Spirit" (Apoc. i. 10), and is described by St. Paul himself (2 Cor. xii. 2) as a condition in which the man knew not whether he were in the body or out of it. It was, in fact, a trance, in which sense was suspended, but intelligence, though not active, was quickened into a condition of high receptivity. The prophet understood what he saw or heard, and when he spoke, spoke intelligible words. Hence he might be said to edify, comfort, console (1 Cor. xiv. 3). He read the secrets of men's hearts (*ibid.* 24, 25), and the hearers might learn from his prophecies (*ibid.* 31). Both the prophet and the speaker with tongues were allowed to "give thanks" after Communion (*ibid.* 16). But the Prophet is expressly distinguished from the Teacher (1 Cor. xii. 28). The distinction

rests not so much on the matter of prophecy as on its form. Prophecy was ecstatic (those later writers who denied this only meant that Christian ecstasy differed from Pagan); it was a direct communication from the Spirit, a revelation, not, like Teaching, an exposition of other men's revelations. For this reason the Prophet took rank before the Teacher, indeed before every member of the Church except the apostles. Yet, of course, the same man might be at once Apostle, Prophet, and Teacher. The Prophet was an ornament, but not an officer of the Church; and the manifestation of his gift was so occasional that he cannot have been intrusted, at any rate in his capacity of Prophet, with any regular ministrations. Indeed this is self-evident from the fact that there were women who prophesied as well as men.

When we come to ask what were the precise subjects of Corinthian prophecy, we find ourselves on uncertain ground. Yet, when we consider the topics dwelt upon by the apostle, and compare them with what we know to have been the themes of prophecy elsewhere, we can arrive at a tenable conclusion.

At Thessalonica, the favourite subject was the Second Advent, a question which involved that of the condition of the faithful dead (1 Thess. iv. 14 sqq.). Beyond a doubt this would be the predominant burden of speculation at Corinth also, as it always has been everywhere. Hence St. Paul addresses to that Church the noblest of all his prophecies on this very point (1 Cor. xv.). There were many ways in which the prophet might speak of Eschatology without infringing our Lord's prohibition. He might have a vision of the angelic hierarchy, like Ignatius, or of the state of the soul after death, like Perpetua, or of heaven and hell, like the author of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, or of the signs that precede the Second Advent, like the author of the *Didache*. Even this alluring theme was full of peril. It was forbidden to fix a date for the Second Advent, and this command was often forgotten. But there were some at Corinth who denied the resurrection of the dead. If St. Paul means that they denied the resurrection of the body, there were Gnostic prophets who did the same thing.

Again, there were those who defended the act of the man who had married his father's wife (1 Cor. v. 1, 2). St. Paul tells them that they are "puffed up." But it is knowledge which "puffeth up" (viii. 1), and knowledge is practically identical with prophecy (xiii. 2). Sexual irregularity has, in fact, often been justified by pretenders to the inner light, and cannot be justified in any other way.

Another subject which exercised the minds of the prophets was that of Church discipline. Ignatius gives us the text of one of his own prophecies, in which occur the words, "Do nothing without the bishop" (*Phil.* vii.). Hermas also touches on the relation of the prophet to the presbyter (*Vis.* iii. 1, 8, 9), and Montanism was

largely concerned with this point. If there were prophecies on the one side, there would be prophecies also on the other, and certainly the Corinthian prophets, numerous and self-assertive, and claiming some authority in the regulation of public worship, would not tamely submit to the direction of officials. Indeed, in the Corinthian Church we cannot affirm with confidence that there were any officials at all.

To some extent the Corinthians must have been self-deluded. The genuine spirit of prophecy has never been given to masses of men; nor can it often have been bestowed upon those who, but the other day, were worshipping stocks and stones, and contaminated by the vices of such a city as Corinth. But St. Paul could not absolutely forbid this outbreak of fanaticism. He was himself the most remarkable of Christian prophets, full of the Holy Ghost, and longing unspeakably to see others like himself. He would believe the best. After all, among the tares would be blades of wheat, and he would not dare to run the risk of plucking up these. But the consequences are very clearly to be discerned. The Church of Corinth was full of the most shocking disorders, both in faith (1 Cor. xv. 12) and in morals. If there was any control there, we cannot see where it resided, or what was its good. It is not too much to say, that if this form of prophetism had not disappeared, the Church could not possibly have endured.

Prophetism sums up in one word the difference between St. Paul the mystic and St. Peter the disciplinarian. Where a body of prophets has assumed the direction of affairs, discipline is impossible. But it is evident that the confusion which reigned at Corinth, and possibly in a lower degree at Thessalonica, was abnormal. The vast majority of the Churches were, as they had been from the first, carefully instructed and diligently supervised; and what is true of a couple of Greek communities in Europe is by no means true of Asiatic Christianity. How things were ordered in the Eastern Churches we can gather with confidence from the notices in the Book of Acts, from 1 Peter, from Hebrews, and from the Letters to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse. Indeed, the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul tell the same tale.

The communities addressed in 1 Peter were clearly under strict and sober government; but their organisation, as far as we are able to descry it, was of a very simple, primitive kind. In the first place, the writer does not use the word "Church," a peculiarity which he shares with Hebrews, for in that Epistle also, "Church," though it twice occurs (ii. 12, in quotation from O.T., xii. 23), does not bear its familiar technical sense. He calls himself "an apostle of Jesus Christ" (i. 1), or, what is the same thing, "a witness of the sufferings of Christ" (v. 1); but he writes with the greatest modesty in a tone of exhortation, not of command, exhorting, not rebuking,

calling himself a brother of the presbyters. Nothing in the Epistle is more authoritative than the brief emphatic phrase in which he commends the faithfulness of so eminent a man as Silvanus. Clearly he expected to be heard with deference; but the tone is just what we should have expected in St. Peter, and just what we should not have expected in anyone masquerading under his name. He addresses his readers as the Dispersion, the brethren or brotherhood ("the brethren" is a familiar phrase in Acts), and uses the word "Christian." If there were any widows or orphans receiving regular assistance from the common fund, at any rate they are not mentioned. The Deacon possibly did not exist, certainly is not named. There was no Bishop; the noun *ἐπίσκοπος* is used of Christ (ii. 25), and the verb *ἐπίσκοπεῖν* of the Presbyters (v. 2), in a manner which shows us how the title came into being as a synonym for Shepherd; but it has not as yet definitely assumed an official sense. On the other hand, the Presbyter who, as we know from Acts, was the original rector and pastor of the Church, wields great authority, which he is strongly admonished to exert with willingness, uprightness, and sobriety. Of the Sacraments, Baptism is spoken of as having a saving power (iii. 21); the Eucharist is not mentioned.

Thus the organisation also appears to be marked by the same primitive simplicity that we have noticed as characteristic of the Epistle in other points. If we attach any historical value to Acts—and how can we help doing this?—the polity of the Petrine Churches is more conservative than that depicted in or suggested by any of the Pauline Epistles.

But, now, if the relation between the Petrine and Pauline Epistles is as it has here been described, if in dogma they agree and in practice they differ, and if, when they differ, the Petrine Epistle is more primitive, as it proved to be more enduring, how are we to explain these singular facts?

We may say that the sub-apostolic Church, with all its reverence for St. Paul, failed to understand his idea of Freedom, that his pure and noble mysticism was too hard for them (*δυσνόητον*, 2 Pet. iii. 16), that the time for it was not yet come, and that God sent His people back again into the wilderness after a first glimpse of the Promised Land.

But, then, how are we to account for the fact that where the Petrine writer falls away from St. Paul he is falling back upon the Synoptic Gospels? If his Christianity had been derived from that of St. Paul he could not have taken this line. Those who started from a misunderstanding of the mysticism of St. Paul became Antinomians; this is what actually happened to many of the Gnostics, and to many sects in later times. If the Petrine writer fell back, he must have had something to fall back upon. There must have been some other stamp of Christianity, some other method of

working out in detail the truth of the Resurrection, than that described in the Pauline Epistles. That there actually was one—indeed that there were several—we learn not only from the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament, but from St. Paul's own testimony.

But if this is the case, why should the Petrine writer be thought to have fallen back at all? Why should not his Epistle be just what it professes to be, the work of St. Peter himself?

Note on Post-Apostolic Prophecy.

Ignatius describes one subject of his prophetic visions in *Trall.* v., *δύναμαι νοεῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς καὶ τὰς συστάσεις τὰς ἀρχοντικὰς, ὄρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα.*

In another very remarkable passage, *Phil.* vii., he gives the actual text of one of his prophecies, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγον τάδε· χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε τὴν σάρκα ἡμῶν ὡς ναὸν Θεοῦ τηρεῖτε τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀγαπάτε τοὺς μερισμοὺς φεύγετε μμηταὶ γίνεσθε Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

Here it is to be observed that the subject-matter is the same as that of the Teacher, but that the form is entirely different from that of Teaching. The admonitions are given as a direct communication from the Holy Spirit, hence in style they are ejaculatory and dogmatic, not discursive.

Ignatius exhorted Polycarp to pray for the same gift.

Polycarp, i., αἰτοῦ σύνεσιν πλείονα ἧς ἔχεις.

Ibid. ii., τὰ δὲ ἀόρατα αἶτει ἵνα σοι φανερωθῆ, ἵνα μηδενὸς λείπη καὶ παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύης.

Polycarp acknowledges that he himself did not possess the gift of prophecy.

Ad Phil. xii., “confido enim uos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis, et nihil uos latet; mihi autem non est concessum.” It was enough for him to follow humbly in the footsteps of St. Paul, *ibid.* iii.

Here we see that a great and recognised and most authoritative Teacher might yet not be a prophet. But before Polycarp's death this grace was vouchsafed to him. *Martyrium Polyc.* v., δεῖ με ζῶντα κατακαῆναι. With him as with all prophets the gift took the form of a vision or voice.

The prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, Maximilla, and others of the same sect, will be found collected in Bonwetsch, *Montanismus*, p. 197 sqq.

Tertullian says of them, *de exhort. cast.* 10, “uisiones uident et ponentes faciem deorsum etiam uoces audiunt manifestas tam salutare quam occultas.”

Salutares means moral or disciplinary, as in the second passage

from Ignatius. *Ocultas* means pertaining to heavenly mysteries, as in the first. Oehler does not explain the words *ponentes faciem deorsum*; apparently the prophet bent his head downwards in the attitude of listening to a voice from above.

Of Ecstasy, Tertullian says, *adu. Marc.* iv. 22, "gratiae extasis amentia. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, uel cum per eum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet uirtute diuina." This agrees very well with the language of St. Paul.

Alcibiades (or Miltiades), *Eus. H. E.* v. 17. 1, wrote a treatise against the Montanists entitled *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν ἐν ἑκστάσει λαλεῖν*: but he was certainly using the word *ἑκστασις* in a peculiar sense, for it is used of true Christian prophecy, *Acts* x. 10, xi. 5, xxii. 17, and "to speak in ecstasy" means neither more nor less than "to speak in the Spirit." And the author to whom we owe our knowledge of this treatise of Alcibiades (or Miltiades) goes on to say that the mark of the false prophet is not ecstasy but parecstasy—that is to say, debased ecstasy. *ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης ἐν παρεκστάσει, ᾧ ἔπειτα ἄδεια καὶ ἀφοβία, ἀρχόμενος μὲν ἐξ ἑκουσίου ἀμαθίας, καταστρέφων δὲ εἰς ἀκούσιον μανίαν ψυχῆς.* The false prophet was culpably ignorant—that is to say, he was one so far deficient in morals, or instruction, or both, that the brethren could not regard him as a likely organ for the prophetic spirit, and his trance was "a madness." Madness will mean frenzied utterance or gesticulation and "possession." The last, in particular, was a most serious point. Simon Magus "gave out that he himself was some great one" (*Acts* viii. 9); and Montanus said, "I am the Lord God Almighty coming down in man" (*Epiph. Haer.* xi. p. 437),—a phrase which is strictly analogous to that of the demoniac, "My name is Legion" (*Mark* v. 9). The idea that the spirit, good or bad, takes possession of the man, replaces his personality, and speaks with his own voice, is wholly alien to Biblical prophecy, and belongs to demonology or heathen vaticination. But ignorance was quite serious enough. It would be shown by demanding payment or expecting reward as a prophet (*Eus. H. E.* v. 18; *Hermas, Mand.* xi.); by doctrinal unsoundness (1 *John* iv. 1, 2); and in the eyes of a loyal Churchman by interference with the wholesome and apostolic discipline of the Church.

Professor Harnack (*Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, p. 126) is inclined to regard all these tests as invented by the later Church for the purpose of condemning the Montanists. But they are obvious deductions from eternal common sense. Except non-fulfilment of predictions, for which the existing brotherhood might have to wait in vain, the one and only test of genuine prophecy is that of conformity to the teaching and practice of undoubted prophets, of Christ and His apostles; and this test all Christians were bound to apply at all times under very serious penalties.

A careful review of the facts seems to show two things very distinctly: (1) that the condition of the Corinthian Church is not to be regarded as the normal state of a Christian community in the time of the apostles; (2) that the Prophet is not, and cannot be, the same thing as the Teacher. The two functions might, no doubt, be combined, but in themselves they are radically different.

§ 7. ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We may proceed to compare, in the next place, the characters and histories of St. Paul and St. Peter. To some extent, at any-rate, the investigation will throw further light upon the conclusions arrived at in the preceding chapter.

When St. Stephen was stoned to death the witnesses laid down their clothes at the feet of a young man whose name was Saul (Acts vii. 58). He was of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, and a Pharisee (Phil. iii. 5), born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in Jerusalem, where he sat at the feet of the famous Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). He was a Roman citizen, and son of a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 28), spoke and wrote Greek, used the Greek Bible, and had some acquaintance with Greek literature (Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Tit. i. 12).

We are not told at what age he left Tarsus, but he was probably verging on man's estate at the time, for he had already been introduced to the study of the Greek poets, and he continued to regard the city as his home and natural place of shelter (Acts ix. 30). He was no cosmopolitan, and though he passed his early years under the shadow of a Greek university, remained a strict Jew. Yet Tarsus was a Stoic stronghold, and St. Paul had read and admired at least one Stoic poet. He was aware then that there was current among educated heathen a view of God as the great indwelling Spirit which is antagonistic to any shape of formalism. But doubtless he had imbibed this belief from Scripture, and from the struggles of his own spiritual experience—if we may regard Rom. vii. 9 sqq. as referring to a time preceding that of his conversion. We may suppose that he was a Pharisaic Mystic of the same type as St. James. But we first see him at Jerusalem, approving of Stephen's death, leading and goading on the party of persecution.

So far he appears to us as well-born, probably wealthy, well-educated, still young, full of fiery conviction and prompt resolution, a natural leader of men in times of great excitement. He was unmarried and childless, and seems to have owed his power entirely to the vigour of his character, for he does not appear to have been a member of the Sanhedrin.

Not content with oppressing the disciples in Jerusalem, he extorted from the high priest a despatch authorising the extermina-

tion of the heretics at Damascus, and was on his way to that city, "breathing threatenings and slaughter," when he was struck down to the earth by that Jesus whom he was persecuting. Thus in one moment he became a Christian.

All attempts to account for his conversion by natural agencies are vain. No doubt the way for this astounding change had been prepared. St. Paul was familiar with many thoughts of many minds; he must have been familiar also with that lurking sense of disappointment which always besets those who set their hopes on anything lower than the highest, and he had seen St. Stephen die. But the final blow was struck from above with overwhelming force and instantaneous effect.

His change was not from immorality to morality, but from one principle of action to another, from moralism to mysticism. It was analogous, not to the conversion of St. Augustine, but to that of Luther, or Wesley, or Law. But the point is, that these sudden changes always leave a mark. A swift uplifting, because it is so immediately divine, gives great nobility of mind. It carries the man up at once into a sphere from which all forms, props, mechanisms, seem very little things, and it imparts great peace, confidence, and joy. At the same time it makes a breach between the present and the past. The converted man looks back upon his old struggles with fear, pain, and horror. For him the hopeful promise of discipline and obedience ended only in cruel defeat. Of what value, then, can they be to others?

The Vision on the road to Damascus is enough to stamp St. Paul as a prophet; but throughout his life he continued to receive immediate manifestations of God's presence and care. His revelations, conveyed sometimes in trance, sometimes in dream; bringing sometimes directions, sometimes prohibitions; sometimes unfolding mysteries, sometimes displaying the formless glory of things unspeakable—were very numerous (Acts xvi. 6, 9, xviii. 9, 10, xix. 21, xx. 23, 29, xxii. 17, xxvii. 23, 24; Gal. ii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 1-7). The sense of direct inspiration seems never to have failed him, except perhaps when discipline was in question (1 Cor. vii. 12). Much of his knowledge in the faith was imparted to him through the same channel (Eph. iii. 3; Gal. i. 12 sqq., ii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 3). But here we are perhaps justified in making a distinction. Even though he never saw Christ in the flesh, he would know, from hearsay or from reading, the general facts of the Gospel history, and he must surely have learned from ordinary sources the saying of our Lord's which he quoted in his speech at Miletus (Acts xx. 35). What he means is probably, that the one fact of the Resurrection and the inner meaning of all the facts, his whole theology, came to him direct by way of revelation. We find unmistakable fruits of his prophetic gift in Thessalonians and in 1 Cor. xv.

Such were the salient features in the character and history of St. Paul. St. Peter on every point forms a strong contrast. He was a poor Galilean fisherman, a labouring man, uneducated, rough in speech and manner (Matt. xxvi. 73 ; Luke xxii. 59 ; Acts iv. 13), a husband, and, according to ancient tradition, a father, and he had lived in close intimacy with the Saviour upon earth. He was a simple pious Jew, if not actually a disciple of John the Baptist at any rate the brother of one who was (John i. 40),—that is to say, he was open-minded and docile, a son of Abraham who did not presume upon that privilege (Luke iii. 8), but was well aware of the need of repentance, and was looking for the kingdom of heaven and the advent of Messiah.

He was a married, uneducated labourer. Such men always bear the stamp of their class. In England, and presumably elsewhere, they are tender-hearted, but slow. They have seen too much of the hard realities of life to be greatly elated or greatly depressed. But they make fine soldiers, who will follow their captain to the last, and fall where he has placed them.

St. Peter is often spoken of as ardent and impulsive, but our Lord called him Cephas, "Rock," and the fiery apostles were James and John. He was often the first to speak, because he was the leader and mouthpiece of the Twelve. The quietest of men, when driven past endurance, are often fiercest ; and as Moses, the meek, once smote an Egyptian, so Peter struck a hasty blow in the Garden of Gethsemane. In an hour of utter despair and extreme alarm, he denied his Lord. The Gospels paint him as a man of slow understanding, but strong conviction, of tender, but not demonstrative feeling, with an exquisitely delicate conscience, and a deep sense of the majesty of God. It was he who made the great confession, "Thou art the Christ," and yet would have saved Christ from suffering and the Cross (Matt. xvi. 16, 22), just as the disciples besought St. Paul not to go up to Jerusalem where he was to be delivered to the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 12) ; it was he who at the Last Supper beckoned to St. John to ask the question which he dared not ask himself (John xiii. 24) ; it was he, again, who said, "Depart from me ; for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (Luke v. 8) ; who went out and wept bitterly when the Saviour turned and looked upon him (Luke xxii. 62), and whose repentance and forgiveness are described with magical power in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel. The Lord loved John better, but He trusted Peter more (Luke xxii. 31, 32).

We may imagine Peter as a shy, timid, embarrassed man, apt on a sudden emergency to say and do the wrong thing, not because he was hasty, but because he was not quick. He was one of those who become leaders because they have been called and appointed, not because nature seems to have marked them out for command.

His defect had been want of readiness and decision. When this was cured, he was all the better fitted to be a guide and pastor by reason of the weakness which the Holy Spirit redressed. "Be ye ready," he says in his Epistle (1 Pet. iii. 15), "always to give an answer to every man that asketh for a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." He was meek and fearful, and he knew well the danger of unreadiness.

St. Peter had been instructed, trained, disciplined by our Lord Himself, and led on in smooth and unbroken progress from the law to the gospel. He was a prophet, but hardly a visionary. He had witnessed the Transfiguration, he had seen the risen Saviour, he had received admonition in his trance at Joppa, and an angel had been sent to deliver him from prison. The Holy Ghost had come down upon him at Pentecost. But we do not read that he enjoyed the same kind, or the same frequency, of communion with the unseen world which was given to St. Paul or St. John. There is the same shade of difference that we observe in the Old Testament between Moses and Jacob. Further, it is evident that to St. Peter the past would not wear the same colour as to St. Paul. He would look back with affection and regret to days spent in company with our Lord on earth, and he would look forward with intense longing to the time when the Chief Shepherd should reappear. The interval would appear to him as a period of loss, of hope deferred; and this is exactly what we find in the Epistle. St. Paul's past was one of shame; there was no brightness in it; and his heart swells with a rapture of gratitude when he thinks of his deliverance from the city of confusion and house of bondage.

We need not here dwell minutely on the history of St. Peter as it is given in the first twelve chapters of the Book of Acts. There he appears for some ten or twelve years as spokesman, judge, leader of the disciples at Jerusalem. As occasion served, and the frontier of the Church was pushed forward, he made excursions to other places. We see him at Samaria, passing through all quarters to Lydda and Joppa, and again at Caesarea. After this we read of the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem, of Herod's persecution, of Peter's imprisonment, deliverance, and departure "to another place." From this point St. Luke's thoughts are occupied almost exclusively with the history of St. Paul. But on three occasions we find the two great apostles in actual personal contact. Here, then, it becomes necessary to compare the narrative given in the Book of Acts with that of the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. i. 15-24, ii. 1-10, 11 sqq.). But let us first grasp firmly the key to all the difficulties which may arise. St. Luke is writing as a historian; his object is *summa sequi fastigia rerum*; his interest lies in the permanent, and specially in the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem, which was the first monument of Canon Law, and was

unquestionably accepted and obeyed by the Church (Acts xxi. 25 ; Apoc. ii. 14, 20 ; Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 26 ; Tert. *de Idol.* x. ; *Apol.* ix. ; Clem. Alex. *Paed.* ii. 1. 8 ; *Didache* vi.—I quote this as a fourth century authority. The Decree was falling into desuetude in the West in St. Augustine's time, *contra Faust.* xxxii. 13). St. Paul's intention, on the other hand, is polemical, autobiographical, and apologetic. He wrote in the midst of a very heated dispute which touched him particularly. His first object is to show that the Gentile Christian ought not to accept circumcision ; and, in order to establish this first point, he goes on to maintain a second, that his own authority is equal, and even superior, to that of St. Peter.

In St. Paul's account of his first meeting with St. Peter there is very little difficulty (Gal. i. 15-24 compared with Acts ix. 19-30). St. Luke says that immediately after his conversion St. Paul preached Christ in the synagogues at Damascus, and does not mention his retirement into Arabia. But we do not know how long that retirement lasted, and it was certainly devoid of external incident. It was of deep significance in the eyes of the apostle himself. When he says "immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood" (Gal. i. 16), what he means is that he did confer with the Holy Spirit, and did not apply for instruction to the Twelve. He looks back upon that time, as St. Augustine remembered the days that immediately followed his own conversion, as a period of rapid growth and great joy ; but he uses it in the Epistle as the proof of his independence. It is natural enough that it should be passed over in Acts ; nor is there any stumbling-block in St. Luke's statement that St. Paul "immediately" preached Christ. The very day after his baptism the apostle may have given "in the synagogues" some explanation of his sudden change ; he was a fearless man, and would not shrink from the ordeal of publicly resigning his commission from the high priest. We may suppose that he did this, and then withdrew for a brief space of recollection, before he felt able definitely to advocate his new faith. But, in any case, if the retirement to Arabia lasted but a few weeks, the word "immediately" may very well pass. A proof of the general accuracy of St. Luke's information is to be found in his notice of the manner of St. Paul's escape from Damascus, when he was let down from the wall in a basket. St. Paul does not mention the fact in Galatians, but in another Epistle he incidentally confirms what St. Luke tells us (2 Cor. xi. 32).

After "many days," the narrative in Acts proceeds (and by the vague Hebrew phrase a period of three years is here covered), St. Paul went up to Jerusalem, and endeavoured to join himself to the disciples. The phrase is a little singular, and seems to imply that he did not address himself to the recognised leaders of the Church. His advances were met with great and not unnatural suspicion ; but

the good Barnabas, who was always merciful and charitable, took him by the hand, brought him to the apostles, and acted as his sponsor, defending Paul against those whom he had persecuted, as he afterwards defended Mark and Peter against Paul himself. We learn from Galatians that the particular apostles in question were Peter and James the Lord's brother. In Acts we read that St. Paul spent some time in Jerusalem, disputing against the Hellenists. St. Paul himself says simply that he abode with Peter fifteen days. We are to understand, either that he spent a fortnight in Peter's house, or that at the end of this fortnight Peter was called away from Jerusalem; for Paul's object here is simply to show that his personal contact with Peter had been very slender. For the same reason he omits to mention the attempt upon his life and his flight from Jerusalem (Acts ix. 29, 30), simply informing us that he went away to Syria and Cilicia. St. Luke says that he went home to Tarsus. The difference in the form of expression may possibly imply that Paul used Tarsus as a centre for single-handed missionary excursions in the neighbouring regions. It is difficult to suppose that he would be idle, and he would hardly have been invited to Antioch unless he had continued to display both zeal and capacity. From the time of his flight from Jerusalem, St. Paul tells us he remained unknown by face (*ἤμην ἀγνωστούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ*, Gal. i. 22) unto the Churches of Judaea which were in Christ. In other words, he saw them no more till his next visit eleven years later; for we give the more natural meaning to his "fourteen years," if we suppose that here also he is dating from his spiritual birthday.

So far all is pretty clear. St. Paul had seen but little of St. Peter, but what intercourse there had been was not unfriendly, at any rate after the first approach. As regards the second meeting (Gal. ii. 1-6 compared with Acts xv.) there is much perplexity, which we can only resolve by making large allowance for the difference of intention which underlies the two narratives.

The visit to Jerusalem, which St. Paul describes in the second chapter of Galatians, has been identified with that incidentally mentioned in Acts (xi. 30); but there are many objections to this. In the first place, we should be compelled to leave a blank space of ten years at least in the apostle's working life. But it does not seem at all probable that Barnabas, having once taken St. Paul by the hand, would leave him unemployed for so long a time. Again, there was at the time no trace of the circumcision dispute; and, moreover, we still read of "Barnabas and Saul" at that date. Saul was as yet known only as a preacher who was doing good work at Antioch, and had by no means that standing which is implied in the narrative of Galatians. It is far easier to suppose that St. Paul does not mention his second visit to Jerusalem; and an adequate reason for his silence is to be found in the words of St. Luke, who

tells us that Barnabas and Saul visited the elders, but does not mention the apostles. It was "about that time" (Acts xii. 1) that Herod's persecution was in progress, and we can readily imagine that the two Antiochene envoys did not on this occasion meet any of the Twelve. But, if so, this visit was perfectly immaterial to the argument of Galatians, for the object of St. Paul there is to reckon up the number of occasions on which he had seen and discoursed with St. Peter.

We shall be on safe ground if we follow Bishop Lightfoot rather than Professor Ramsay, and conclude that what we find in the second chapter of Galatians is that occasion on which "Paul and Barnabas" (no longer "Barnabas and Saul") were sent up by the Church of Antioch to attend the Council at Jerusalem. With them went certain others; and their journey was a triumphal progress through Phenice and Samaria (Acts xv. 3). The question to be decided was that of the continued obligation of circumcision, which had been causing great trouble. The question had been pushed forward not by any of the apostles, but by "certain men which came down from Judaea" to Antioch, "certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed" (Acts xv. 1, 5), by the Hotspurs among the Jewish Christians. These extreme ritualists probably looked to James as their leader (Gal. ii. 12). They would be, as often happens in such cases, a sore trouble to their nominal chief, whose opinions they exaggerated and caricatured. At the same time, James would be extremely anxious to retain his hold upon them, and not to see them driven into open revolt. Such a position of things is always fruitful of grave misunderstandings between the leaders themselves. They want to keep together men who are pulling in different directions, and they lay themselves open to the charges of tergiversation and of disloyalty to first principles.

According to St. Luke, the two envoys went up to Jerusalem by commission from the Church of Antioch; St. Paul tells us that he was directed or permitted to go by "revelation," by an immediate communication from the Holy Spirit. The two modes of expression are easily reconcilable. A commission from the Church of Antioch implied a revelation (Acts xiii. 1); but we may observe that here again St. Paul is striking the note of independence. He was received with all the respect due to his character, services, and position. And yet the tone of his narrative seems to say that there was something wanting, something which he does not quite know how to express. The main point had been established, yet not quite by himself. He had been met by agreement where perhaps he did not quite expect it, and he had been obliged to make concessions of which he did not quite approve; hence he manifests a certain uneasiness lest his authority should have suffered disparagement in the opinion of his more immediate followers. For there were

jealous eyes and bitter spirits on the watch to magnify and distort every point that could be made against him.

What had really happened we may gather with tolerable clearness by piecing together the accounts given in Galatians and in Acts. There can be little doubt that the main business of the Council of Jerusalem, like that of all other councils, was transacted in committee. St. Paul tells us of the committee; St. Luke, of the general assembly in which formal speeches were delivered and the decree was solemnly adopted.

It seems evident that in this committee St. Paul had been in some sense put upon his trial before the twelve apostles. "I communicated unto them," he says, "that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles; but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run in vain." He had been called upon to state his position before the supreme tribunal of the Church, and had received their sanction and approval.

This seems to be the fact which St. Paul expresses by the singular phrase "they added nothing to me," that is to say, "they had nothing to teach me." There is an embarrassment, there is even a touch of anger in St. Paul's language here (Gal. ii. 6), which seems to spring from a mortifying sense that after all he cannot make his position quite clear. He had gone to Jerusalem to dictate terms, and those from whom he expected opposition had offered none. He had gone as the equal of the apostles, and his enemies might say that the apostles had tried and acquitted him. There had been agreement as to the burning question of circumcision, and yet he had been made to feel that between himself and the Twelve there existed that difference of principle which, though it can hardly be defined, often divides men like a river.

One of the most difficult sentences in St. Paul's narrative is that in which he describes the result of the conference: "James, Cephas, and John, who were reputed to be pillars" (here again the note of irony is heard), "gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." There was a compact, St. Paul says. The field of labour was divided. Each party was to take its own way, but within its own sphere.

But how is this to be understood? St. Paul himself constantly preached to Jews after this date, and, in fact, never ceased to do so. At Corinth he turned away in despair from blaspheming Jews (Acts xviii. 6); yet at Ephesus, again, he preached in the synagogue (Acts xix. 8), and almost his first act on arriving in Rome was to call together the chief of the Jews (Acts xxviii. 17). St. Peter, on the other hand, visited Antioch; and though St. Paul blamed the conduct, he made no complaint of the presence of his brother apostle. St. Peter again, if he had not actually preached in Corinth,

which is far from unlikely, had friends there, and a party known by his name; yet here, again, St. Paul does not assert that any compact had been broken. The brethren of the Lord again were known at Corinth; and St. John, perhaps in St. Paul's lifetime, exercised authority over the Seven Churches of Asia. Other apostles again are connected by strong tradition with Gentile Churches. Nor, in the case of Peter and John, can we see any reason for such a positive delimitation of the sphere of work as seems to be here indicated. Neither of them taught the universal necessity of circumcision; both allowed the rite in the case of Jewish Christians; St. John (in the Apocalypse), and probably St. Peter, admitted a certain precedence of Jew Christian over Gentile Christian, and this was in all respects the position of St. Paul himself (Acts xi. 2 sqq., xv. 21; Apoc. vii. 4, 9; 1 Cor. vii. 18; Rom. iii. 1). It was the position of St. James also. But within this general agreement in principle there might be, and no doubt were, considerable differences in practice. St. Paul obeyed the ceremonial Law on occasion (1 Cor. ix. 20; Acts xxi. 26), but on occasion also held himself perfectly at liberty to disregard it. St. James, on the other hand, maintained that the Law was always and everywhere binding upon a born Jew (Acts xxi. 20, xv. 21). It followed that, in the opinion of St. James, when Jew and Gentile met, they could not eat at the same table. St. Paul held very strongly that in such cases the Jew ought to give way. St. Peter held that in such cases the Jew might very well give way, but was not compelled to do so. This appears to have been the whole extent of the difference among the apostles themselves.

The dispute about the Law was local, transient, and insignificant. The feeling out of which it sprang hardly existed except at Jerusalem; and even there the body of the Church was contented with the tolerant Judaism of St. James. They were "zealous of the Law," and regarded St. Paul with suspicion, not on account of his treatment of Gentile converts, but because they had been informed that he taught Jews to forsake Moses (Acts xxi. 20, 21). There was, however, a party at Jerusalem who insisted that every Christian ought to become a Jew. It existed still in the days of Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 47), and for a short time maintained an active propaganda at Antioch and in Galatia; but their efforts were discountenanced by the authorities of the Church, and must have quickly died away. Nevertheless Jerusalem was clearly a place which required special treatment. The community there was almost entirely Jewish, the slightest indiscretion might have caused a rupture, and St. Paul was regarded there with jealousy or positive dislike. Under these circumstances the most politic course would be to make some sort of compact by which Paul and Barnabas bound themselves not to preach in Judaea, while James agreed not

to preach elsewhere. To this Cephas and John would be assenting parties, though the terms did not limit their own personal activity, nor, indeed, that of the other apostles. This appears to be the only tenable interpretation of the words "that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." A necessary article in such a treaty would be that Paul and Barnabas should "remember the poor." The Jew Christians at Jerusalem would lose all share in the distribution of the temple funds, and, if they were not to send out collectors of their own, it was imperative that Paul and Barnabas should undertake to make good the deficiency. They agreed to do so, and subsequent references to the great collection in the Pauline Epistles show that their promise was loyally carried out.

Here St. Paul's narrative breaks off, and to the actual session of the Council he makes no allusion. We should know the reason of his silence if we knew exactly what had been said against him in Galatia. Clearly he is defending himself, not striking at random, but replying to particular accusations, or, we should rather say, to particular scoffs and insinuations. In regard to the Council itself, his enemies had found nothing that they could turn against him, and therefore he passes it over. It is not necessary to suppose that at this time he felt any difficulty in speaking about the Decree. Yet this may have been a further reason for his silence. That St. Paul never can have approved of the Decree, that he could not on principle regard this, or any other ecclesiastical canon, as binding upon the conscience, is certain. At first he appears from Acts to have accepted it; though St. Luke nowhere tells us that he personally recommended it. But he ate the meal set before him by the jailer at Philippi (Acts xvi. 34) without question, and at Corinth he treated the eating of things offered unto idols as a matter which the individual must decide entirely for himself (1 Cor. viii.). St. Paul's language on this subject cannot have been regarded with favour either by the Twelve or by those who in the Gentile communities still looked upon the Twelve as the princes of the Church. It is highly probable that it created a new and formidable stumbling-block in St. Paul's path. The Petrine party at Corinth would certainly ask how St. Paul, who was not in the strict sense of the word an apostle at all, could thus treat an apostolic decree as a mere matter of opinion. That they did so seems probable from St. Paul's own words (1 Cor. ix. 1-4), "Am I not free? am I not an apostle? . . . have we not authority to eat and drink?" where the meaning is, "Because I am an apostle I too can legislate." But we can understand how men's minds would be perplexed by these conflicting views of duty. We may take as a strictly analogous case the rule of fasting communion which makes much trouble in our own times. Some regard it as an ecclesiastical rule; some as merely an ecclesiastical rule. St. Peter would probably have taken

the former view, St. Paul the latter. The distinction is one of those that are small to great minds and great to small minds, and will serve to show the difference between St. Peter and St. Paul on the one hand, and their followers on the other.

A third meeting between St. Peter and St. Paul is recorded in Galatians (ii. 11 sqq.). We may assume with certainty that it happened after that which we have just been considering, though this has been questioned. It is true that in one place the order of St. Paul's narrative is not the order of time (2 Cor. xi. 23-33), but there is no reason for doubting that in Galatians events are described in their proper sequence.

Not long probably after the Council, St. Peter visited Antioch, stayed there some time, and was present on more than one occasion at the Agape. The Church there was still divided, and separate tables were laid, possibly in separate buildings, for Gentiles and Jews. At first Peter took his seat among the Gentiles. This was what he had done in the house of Cornelius; and it is not easy to see how his conduct involved any breach of the recent Decree. Shortly afterwards, certain emissaries of St. James came down to Antioch, and learning what had occurred, remonstrated with St. Peter on his conduct. Their point probably was that the Decree was intended only for Gentile Christians, that under it unclean meat, for instance swine's flesh, might be set upon the table, and that therefore no Jew could be present at the Gentile Agape without violating the spirit, if not the letter, of the Decree. Upon this St. Peter "withdrew himself" and took his place at the table of the Jews, Barnabas and the other Jews following his example. This led to a stormy scene. St. Paul reprimanded St. Peter in public and in very strong language, charging him with an attempt "to compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews," and with "hypocrisy," by which we are to understand not merely vacillation, but dereliction of the principles of the gospel.

Unfortunately we have no other account of this incident, and we are left to construct St. Peter's apology as best we can from the Book of Acts. But it is evident that there is much more to be said in his defence than is allowed even by Bishop Lightfoot (*Galatians*, "St. Paul and the Three"). In the first place, St. Peter was not compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews; the question at issue was whether Jews ought to be compelled to live as do the Gentiles. St. Peter did not endeavour to force one law upon everybody; on the contrary, he allowed a difference of ritual. He shaped his own conduct first by the one ritual and then by the other, and this tolerance may be regarded as criminal inconsistency by zealots on either side. Nor is St. Paul himself less inconsistent. He circumcised Timothy not because he was obliged on principle to do so, but for the sake of expedience (Acts xvi. 3); he

tells the Galatians (v. 1-3) that circumcision carries with it the obligation to fulfil the whole law; yet he certainly did not regard Timothy as bound to observe the law of clean and unclean meats (1 Tim. iv. 4). Nor can it reasonably be doubted that St. Peter held the doctrine of the Atonement in the same sense as St. Paul (Acts xi. 17; Gal. ii. 16), or that he regarded his conduct at Antioch as not involving any disloyalty to the gospel. Nor, again, can we imagine that Barnabas felt that he had done wrong in following the example of St. Peter. On the contrary, we may connect this sharp altercation at Antioch with another which occurred probably immediately afterwards at the same place, and led to a temporary estrangement between Paul and Barnabas (Acts xv. 37-39). If we suppose that Mark had openly espoused the cause of his cousin in the matter of the Agape, we find at once very serious reason for this division.

It would seem that St. Paul in the heat of the moment did not make the necessary distinction between St. Peter and St. James, or between these two apostles and that extreme party whom they were anxious to conciliate, and against whom he himself had so much reason for legitimate indignation. Even at Antioch his position was not secure; there was a Jew as well as a Gentile party. The question of the hour was not really one of principle but of compromise, of policy, of comprehension. The Council of Jerusalem had decided that there should be a compromise, with the usual result that neither party was satisfied. It is true that beneath this question of the hour there lay a question of principle, of mysticism or disciplinarianism, of the kind and degree of respect due to ecclesiastical regulations. We have not settled this question yet, and it was not even formulated by the primitive Church. All we can say is, that St. Paul was pulling in the one direction and St. Peter in the other; that St. Peter was silent and St. Paul protested; that St. Paul was right in one sense and St. Peter in another; that compromise is necessary to unity, and that, whenever the terms of a compromise are called in question, heats and misunderstandings are certain to arise.

St. Paul does not record any other meeting between himself and St. Peter. Yet, directly or indirectly, the two apostles came into collision at Corinth also. Whether St. Peter had actually visited that city we cannot say with certainty. Yet, not Peter only, but his wife also were well known there, and there is ground for thinking that both had received pecuniary assistance from the common fund of the Church (1 Cor. ix. 5). By the time when he wrote to the Corinthians, St. Paul had quite made up his mind about the Jerusalem Decree, and laid down clearly his two great principles, that "the spiritual man judgeth all things," and that "meat commendeth us not to God." Those who observed precepts and insisted upon

rules appeared to him as cherishing needless scruples, as the weaker brethren, as the carnal agents of strife and division. Whatever may have been the party of Christ (it was most probably composed of the advocates of antinomian freedom), we may suppose that that called by the name of Apollos, the Alexandrine, was allegorical, and held opinions in which mysticism and discipline were combined as they are in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Petrine party we may well suppose to have observed the Decree of Jerusalem, and to have doubted St. Paul's claim to the title of apostle. Certainly there were at Corinth Christians of whom these statements may be made with confidence.

Here we can hardly avoid the question, when St. Paul was first recognised as an apostle. We need not ask when he first became an apostle. The answer to the question in this shape is given in the history of his conversion (Acts ix. 15), and his selection by the Church of Antioch was only a confirmation of his original divine commission. But by what steps did he come to be regarded by the Church as an apostle and as equal to the Twelve? Obviously he won his way by degrees. Saul does not fill the same place in the eyes of men as Paul. Obviously, also, there were for many years those who denied his right to be called an apostle; and it is not necessary to suppose that these were in all cases bitter and fanatical opponents.

"Apostle" is one of a large class of words which, having originally been no more than temporary appellatives or descriptions, begin in time to denote a fixed rank and authority. All titles belong to the same class—duke, count, minister, elder, bishop. What is true of one is true of all. They have come to be titles, and there are cases in which it is hard to decide whether they have as yet become definitely titles or not.

The way in which the title apostle first came into being is given by Matthew (x. 5), Mark (vi. 30), and Luke (ix. 10). Jesus sent forth His twelve disciples, and thus they became His envoys, emissaries, or missionaries. Matthew and Mark do not use the word apostle except on this occasion. John, in his Gospel, exhibits it only once, and then in the loose popular sense (xiii. 16). But in Luke's Gospel it occurs several times, and in Acts it is the regular official designation of the Twelve. It was even thought necessary to maintain the exact number of the college by the election of Matthias. In fact, after the Resurrection, Envoy has become a definite title; it denotes no longer a temporary occupation, but a special office. The Twelve are no longer envoys, but The Envoys; and there are neither more nor less than twelve, corresponding to the number of the tribes of Israel (Apoc. xxi. 14). We have here what we may call the official view. At the same time, the looser use of the word continued. There were those who "said that they were apostles" in the titular sense, though they were apostles only in the

occasional sense, and the author of the Apocalypse severely blames this misuse of language (ii. 2).

In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, the earliest of his Epistles, written during his second journey, soon after his arrival in Corinth, St. Paul speaks of himself, Silvanus, and Timotheus, not in the address, but in the body of the Epistle (ii. 6), as "apostles of Christ." Here, apparently, the word is still used in its general sense; we might substitute "ambassadors" for "apostles" without altering the meaning. Neither Silvanus nor Timothy is elsewhere called an apostle; and there are passages in which it is pretty clearly implied that Timothy was not one (2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. iv. 5). In all his later Epistles, except Philippians and Philemon, St. Paul distinctly claims the style and title of apostle for himself in the address. He applies the title also to the Twelve, and probably, not quite certainly, to James the Lord's brother (Gal. i. 19). Some think that he speaks of Andronicus and Junias (Rom. xvi. 7) as apostles, but the second name is more probably Junia, and the sense is uncertain. In Acts (xiv. 4, 14), Paul and Barnabas are called apostles after their commission by the Church of Antioch. At an earlier date, St. Luke distinguishes Barnabas (ix. 27), and, at a later date, in the account of the Council, both Barnabas and Paul from the apostles (Acts xv.). Nor does St. Paul himself ever expressly call Barnabas an apostle (not even in 1 Cor. ix. 6). Upon the whole, it may be said that the title apostle, in the full official sense, is not given in the New Testament to anyone except the Twelve.

But in Galatians and Corinthians, St. Paul unmistakably claims the title, maintaining his right in the face of all opposition with great resolution and not a little warmth. In Galatians he uses of the Twelve language which, however measured, is certainly language of disparagement. The Twelve are "those who seemed to be somewhat," "those who seemed to be pillars" (ii. 6, 9); and in Corinthians there are even stronger expressions (*οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι, ψευδαπόστολοι*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, 13), which, if they are not directly aimed at the Twelve, certainly glance very near them. In the later Epistles, though the old lion is still vexed by opposition (Phil. i. 15), the warmth has passed away; his position is adequate to his purpose, and there is no more need of self-assertion.

It seems clear that the period at which Galatians and Corinthians were written marks a great change in the attitude of St. Paul. Then, for the first time, as he looked round on the success with which God had blessed his ministry, he felt the need of openly asserting his authority and thus consolidating his work. If we could pretend to fix more precisely the date at which he first openly asserted his equality with the Twelve, we might place it at that moment when he ceased to baptize with his own hands (1 Cor. i. 14-16). St. Peter does not appear to have baptized anybody

(Acts x. 48), following in this the precedent set by our Lord Himself (John iv. 2). It may be that one of the marks by which an apostle was distinguished from, for instance, the deacon (Acts viii. 38) was that the former did not personally administer the rite of baptism, and that by ceasing to do so St. Paul intended to declare his assumption of the apostolic dignity.

We, who look back upon the history of St. Paul in the light of its glorious completion, and whose knowledge of the primitive Church is so largely derived from his writings, can hardly grasp the fact that, great as he was, there were other figures which in the eyes of the first Christians seemed even greater. They were not prolific writers; probably they were not eloquent speakers; very likely they were not what we should call profound thinkers or ready debaters. When St. Peter met Simon Magus, he did not argue with him, because he had neither the learning nor the logic for such an attempt. All he could find to say was, "Thy heart is not right in the sight of God" (Acts viii. 21). The Twelve, with the exception of St. John, were not intellectual, and even St. John was not cultivated; they found and wished for no biographer; their names are written on the foundations of the New Jerusalem, but their portion has been oblivion, or, at best, a vague and impersonal respect among men. Yet the Lord meant them to be, and no doubt they were, the great builders of the Church.

If we had lived in Corinth, if we had been taught to obey the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem, and to regard St. Peter with the greatest reverence,—and if then we had looked round upon that wild sea of spiritual anarchy—for this is not too strong a phrase for the condition of that unhappy Church,—what should we have thought? No good Christian could be blind to the nobleness of St. Paul's character, or would seek to extenuate his magnificent services. But might we not have asked in much perplexity what precisely were the nature and the reach of his commission? He had "seen the Lord"; yet not in the same sense as the Twelve. And five hundred brethren at once had also seen the Lord without on that account claiming to be apostles. His visions, which are now recorded in Scripture, lay at that time between himself and God; yet he was manifestly not working in perfect harmony with the Twelve, and he was not upon the Church roll. St. Paul's conduct in this last respect was nobly disinterested; yet it might be interpreted as implying an unwillingness to come under control, and range himself frankly on the side of authority. We cannot imagine that all those Corinthians who called themselves followers of Peter or of Apollos, were simply dogging the footsteps of St. Paul with the malignant intention of making mischief.

Even to fair-minded men the only positive credential that St. Paul could produce was the rich harvest that had followed his

labours. Upon this he himself falls back—"The seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord" (1 Cor. ix. 2). But this proof would have very different cogency at different times; it would be one thing at Tarsus, another at Antioch, another at Jerusalem, and another at Rome. It is certain that St. Paul's claim to rank on an equality with the Twelve met at first with much opposition, down, at any rate, to the date of Corinthians; it is probable that even the Twelve at the time of the Council regarded him with a certain uneasiness and coolness. Time alone could heal these feelings. It is possible that St. Paul was not generally regarded as an apostle, in the eminent sense of the word, till his imprisonment marked him out as the most conspicuous sufferer for the Name. Finally, his martyr death placed him once for all on his deserved pinnacle.

Some conclusions of importance may be drawn from this review. We have seen that in the earlier chapters of Acts, St. Peter is represented as constantly on the move. He certainly spent some time in Antioch, most likely not very long after the Council. It is possible, even probable, that he had been in Corinth, and in Galatia he was well known, at any rate by repute. St. Paul had treated him with great rigour at Antioch, and was not on easy terms with him even at the date of Corinthians. There is no evidence that St. Peter ever retaliated. In 1 Peter St. Paul is not alluded to, and the personal relations of the two apostles do not assist us in fixing a date. In 2 Peter he is mentioned with affection and great respect, yet with a certain reserve.

It is clear that there was a difference between St. Peter and St. Paul, which we may call little or great according to the point of view. It was little, because it turned not on dogma but on conduct; it was great, because it was a party question. An attempt has been made in the foregoing pages to ascertain as exactly as possible what was its real nature, and the result appears to confirm in substance the conclusions arrived at in the last chapter from a comparison of the Petrine and Pauline Epistles.

§ 8. THE DIASPORA, BABYLON, AND THE ELECT LADY.

The First Epistle of St. Peter is directed to the elect, that is to say Christian, sojourners of the Diaspora, or Dispersion, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Are we to take these district names in their official or in their popular sense? Four of them are names of Roman provinces, but Pontus is not; and all of them except Cappadocia mean one thing in the usage of the Roman government, another in the mouths of the people, who still remembered the old kingdoms out of which the provinces had been carved. Let us see what the difference was.

Pontus was the ancient kingdom of Mithridates. The sea-coast of Paphlagonia, as far as a point a little east of the bay of Amisos, belonged in the first century A.D. to the province of Bithynia, which, according to Professor Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 15), was officially known as Bithynia Pontus. The rest of Paphlagonia was given to the province of Galatia, and the other regions of Pontus (Pontus Galaticus, Polemoniicus) as they fell into Roman possession were assigned in A.D. 63 to Galatia, in A.D. 99 to Cappadocia.

Galatia, another ancient kingdom, was formed into a province in B.C. 25. In the first century after Christ the province included a great part of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, and Isauria; in A.D. 63 it was enlarged by the addition of the Pontine districts already mentioned; and from the time of Galba to that of Vespasian it embraced also Lycia and Pamphylia. The province of Galatia, therefore, was very much wider than the country of the Galatae or Gallograeci from which it took its name.

Cappadocia became a province in A.D. 17, and in the first century there appears to be no noteworthy difference between the name of the province and that of the old kingdom, though in A.D. 78 the province was united to that of Galatia, continuing nevertheless to retain a separate administrative existence (Ramsay, *C. R. E.* p. 15).

Asia was bequeathed to the Romans by its last sovereign, Attalus III., in B.C. 133. The province included western Asia Minor as far as Bithynia on the north and Lycia on the south. Eastwards it included a large part of Phrygia, as far as the frontiers of the province of Galatia. The name Asia had also a popular use in which it embraced the coast lands of the Aegean, but not any part of Phrygia (Ramsay, *C. R. E.* p. 150). The reader may consult with advantage the maps which he will find in Mr. Ramsay's book, or in Mommsen, *die Provinzen*, vol. v. of his Roman History. See also Dr. Hort's Excursus on *The Provinces of Asia Minor included in St. Peter's Address*; and Zahn, *Einleitung*.

The question arises, then, whether the geographical names are to be taken in their stricter official or in their looser popular sense. On the first hypothesis, which is maintained by Professor Hort and Professor Ramsay, we are confronted by the fact that Pontus was never by itself a distinct province, and that the Pontine districts already referred to were not included in the province of Galatia till A.D. 63. On the second, Phrygia, the great central district of Asia Minor, might seem to be excluded; and this can hardly be intended, for the bearer of the Epistle could not pass from Cappadocia to Asia without traversing Phrygia, where, as we know, there were many Christians (Acts xviii. 23). But the point is, for our present purpose, hardly worth debating, though it may be observed that Galatia, coming as it does between Pontus and Cappadocia, must

certainly include N.-W. Galatia. Whether St. Peter is thinking of the Roman provinces or of the ancient kingdoms, his list of names embraces the whole of Asia Minor except the south coast. Lycia, Pamphylia, the kingdom of Antiochus and Cilicia seem clearly to be omitted; though, as has been observed, Lycia and Pamphylia belonged for a time and in a sense to the province of Galatia.

We have here distinct evidence of a bold and extensive mission, larger in scale than any of the journeys of St. Paul. It was not a voyage of discovery or conquest, but belonged rather to the secondary stage of missionary enterprise. There were Christian communities scattered all over Asia Minor—we do not know how many, or at what intervals, or how large. Silvanus is to visit them all, in person or by deputy, and to send copies of the Epistle everywhere. The object was to establish and confirm the Churches, to bring them into touch, consolidate, comfort them, and so pave the way for a further advance. For such a purpose no better Epistle could have been written, and it would be largely supplemented by word of mouth.

Another question that has been much discussed is that arising from the order in which the countries are named. The list begins in a surprising way at Pontus, takes a circular sweep from left to right through Asia Minor, and ends where it began. Dr. Hort describes, with every appearance of probability, the route intended. It would run from some Pontic seaport, through Galatia proper to Ancyra, thence to Cappadocian Caesarea. Here the traveller would strike the great highroad leading westward through Phrygia by way of Apamea and Laodicea to Ephesus in Asia. Hence another great route would take him northward past Smyrna and Pergamos to Cyzicus in Mysia on the shore of the Propontis, and from this town a short voyage would carry him to some Bithynian harbour. Or from Pergamos he might strike off to the east up the valley of the Caicus, and so reach Bithynia by land. The only difficulty lies in the fact that Pontus is selected as the point of departure. If St. Peter was writing from Babylon proper, it seems incredible that Pontus should have been the first region in Asia Minor to occur to his mind; and even if he was writing from Rome, which is by far the more probable supposition, it is not easy to see why he did not direct his envoy to start from Ephesus. There must have been some good grounds for this peculiar arrangement. Dr. Hort thought that Silvanus may have found it more convenient to carry the Epistle from Rome by sea, and that circumstances unknown to us, the opportunity of a good ship or some other reason, may have induced him to go first to Sinope, on the Euxine coast. Another likely port would be Amisos, from which the merchandise of Central Asia was carried to Rome (Ramsay, *C. R. E.* p. 10). But the personal convenience of the envoy would hardly determine the

choice of route. There must have been some further reason, though we can only guess what it was. But, if a great mission was in contemplation, the movement must have originated in some particular Church. The first mission of St. Paul was planned by the Church of Antioch, and it is permissible to think that the Holy Spirit may have put a similar purpose in the heart of the Pontic Christians. If so, they might very naturally apply to St. Peter for his sanction and guidance; and, as the scheme was their own, the envoy would certainly go first to them.

The Epistle clearly implies that there were Christian communities dotted all over Asia Minor. What would be their nature and composition? They are regarded as belonging to the Diaspora, a word which in its proper sense denotes those Jews who for one reason or another were domiciled in foreign countries. They abounded in Asia Minor from an early date. Even in the fourth century before Christ, Aristotle had met there a Jew who was "Hellenic, not in language only, but in soul." Antiochus the Great settled two thousand Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia in Phrygia and Lydia (*Jos. Ant.* xii. 3, 4). In B.C. 138 the Roman Senate wrote on behalf of the Jews to the kings of Pergamos and Cappadocia (1 Macc. xv. 16-24). Agrippa in his letter to Caligula (Philo, *Legatio ad Caium*, 36, Mangey, ii. 587) asserts that there were numerous Jewish settlements in Pamphylia, Cilicia, and the greater part of Asia as far as Bithynia and the recesses of Pontus. Petronius (*ibid.* 33, Mangey, ii. 582) says that Jews abound in every city of Asia and Syria (see Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Eng. trans. ii. 2. 221 sqq.).

It is possible that around these Asiatic Jewish communities the same state of things may have existed as in the Crimea. We have a number of inscriptions from Tanais (belonging probably to the second or third century A.D.), emanating from Greek religious societies, who worshipped exclusively the Most High God (Θεὸς ὑψίστος). The authors describe themselves as "adopted brethren worshipping the Most High God" (εἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόμενοι Θεὸν ὑψίστον),—they must have been some kind of proselytes,—and as having given in their names to a presbyter (ἐνγράψαντες ἑαυτῶν τὰ ὀνόματα περὶ πρεσβύτερον)—obviously for the purpose of instruction. Professor Schürer thinks that they were not exactly Jewish proselytes, because the communities are distinctly Greek, and identify the Highest God with Zeus. It may be that we have in these inscriptions merely one of many symptoms of that inclination to a kind of monotheism which we know to have existed among the heathen in imperial times; but as Judaism was strong in Panticapaeum and Gorgippia, and had been so for a long time before, Schürer considers that they are very possibly an indirect fruit of Jewish propaganda (Latyschev, *Inscriptiones antiquae orae*

septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae; vol. ii., *inscriptiones regni Bosporani*, Petropoli, 1890; Schürer in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 9, 1 Mai, 1897).

If we may transfer these ideas from the Crimea to Asia, and suppose them to have been current in the first century, we may imagine the Jews of the Diaspora and their proselytes to have been surrounded by a number of hybrid societies, who watched their ways and copied their belief and practice without definitely breaking loose from heathenism. Indeed, we know that "proselyte" was a term of very loose application. The formal distinction between the proselyte of righteousness and the proselyte of the gate is later than apostolic times. But even in the first century the Jewish propaganda was active and widely spread. It desired to make of every convert a strict observer of the Law; but it contented itself with accepting from every man as much as he was willing to give. There were proselytes who were circumcised and obeyed the whole Law. Others kept the Sabbath, fasted on the appointed days, burned the Sabbath lights, and observed the precepts respecting clean and unclean meats (Josephus, *Apion*. ii. 39). Others, again, were united to the synagogue by a still looser tie. In Antioch the Jews persuaded a large number of Greeks to attend their religious services, and treated them as, in a certain sense, a part of themselves (Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3). In this the synagogue resembled the church; the doors stood open, and heathen were not only permitted but encouraged to attend certain portions of the public worship. Thus every Jewish community became the nucleus of a large group of adherents, of whom some were converts in the strict sense of the word; others, in various shades and degrees, were partial conformists, allies, interested spectators, well-wishers (see Schürer, ii. 2. 305 sqq.).

Some synagogues probably went over to Christianity in a body; in other cases a part would secede, and this part would exhibit a vertical section of the parent group from top to bottom. It would include proper Jews, half Jews, and a number of persons who, though attracted by Judaism, had never definitely adopted its tenets or its practices, but hovered on its outskirts. There would be no difficulty about the Law. Anyone who chose still to observe it in its integrity could no doubt do so, just as anyone was at liberty to lead an ascetic life, provided that he did not interfere with the liberty of others. But even the proper Jews of the Diaspora were thought lax by the Pharisees of Jerusalem, and many of their converts and adherents never had professed to keep the whole body of the Mosaic ordinances. Baptism would readily take the place of that bath which was common in the case of proselytes; the Eucharist represented the Passover; the "blood which was sprinkled" for the proselyte was no longer necessary,

because all Christians have been sprinkled once for all with the blood of Christ (1 Pet. i. 2), and the strict law of meats was replaced by the Jerusalem Decree (see Schürer, ii. 2. 319 sqq.). Hence (as has been already observed in § vi.) the Church appears to St. Peter as a continuous entity; God's purpose seems to have grown and widened without any breach of sequence, and all the titles, which in old times He bestowed upon the chosen people, have passed on in the natural course of things to the Christian brotherhood, just as in the history of our own race the name Englishman survived the absorption of Danes and Normans into the great national family.

It hardly seems probable that many of the primitive Churches were exclusively Gentile, composed, that is to say, wholly of brethren who, up to the time of their conversion, had no knowledge, direct or indirect, of the Old Testament. On the other hand, scarcely any can have been exclusively Jewish, excepting, perhaps, that of Jerusalem. In some large towns where Jews were numerous, there may have been for a time a double Church, as at Antioch. But it is not at all likely that this often happened, or that it long endured when it did happen. Generally speaking, we must ask not whether a Church was Jewish or Gentile, but what proportion the Jews, with their proselytes and allies, bore to the rest of the congregation, or, in other words, who set the tone of the new religious life at the outset. Even in this shape we cannot answer the question with any great degree of precision.

At what date may we suppose Christianity to have first gained a footing in the regions addressed by St. Peter? It is not easy to say. We know from Pliny's despatch to Trajan that there were many Christians at Amisos, in the extreme north of Asia Minor, on the coast of the Black Sea, about A.D. 87. But long before this, on the day of Pentecost, we read that among St. Peter's audience were people from Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia (Acts ii. 9, 10). St. Luke can hardly have given this list of countries without an ulterior reason; it is probable that he knew the work of evangelisation to have begun immediately afterwards in all of them. At any rate, among the three thousand souls who received baptism at the time of that great outpouring of the Spirit, there must have been many who went home and preached their new faith. Very much good work must have been done by obscure missionaries of whom we have no record at all. By unknown hands Christianity had been planted in Rome before A.D. 58, and no reason can be given why it should not have taken root in Pontus quite as early. Even in N.-W. Galatia, though the region may very possibly not have been visited by St. Paul himself, there would be no lack of voices to spread the good tidings. Pilgrims, chapmen, and traders of all kinds, soldiers, subordinate officials, played a part

in the dissemination of the gospel, and there was probably no corner of the empire where Christianity had not been heard of within a very few years.

It has been thought surprising that St. Peter should address his Epistle to Churches connected, in part at any rate, with the name of St. Paul. But we must consider in the first place how small a portion of Asia Minor was visited by St. Paul. In Lycia, Caria, Mysia, Bithynia, Pontus, and Cappadocia he never set foot. Of Galatia and Phrygia, if Mr. Ramsay is right, he touched but the southern fringe; and, if Mr. Ramsay is wrong, we do not know at all what was the extent of his voyagings. In Asia, of the Seven Churches mentioned in the Apocalypse, Ephesus alone is known to have enjoyed his presence, though he wrote to Laodicea. We do not hear of his working at Miletus, and at Troas he stayed but seven days. There are, indeed, large gaps in our information about St. Paul. We do not know by what road he travelled from Syria to Ephesus at the end of his second journey (Acts xviii. 18, 19), or how much is covered by such expressions as "the upper coasts," or "all they which dwell in Asia" (Acts xix. 1, 10). Yet much must have been left for other hands to do; and there is no reason for supposing that it was undertaken exclusively by personal adherents of St. Paul, or that the communities were of a specially Pauline type. Indeed, even Ephesus was governed, as we know, by presbyters; but we could not affirm this fact with confidence of Thessalonica or of Corinth.

And here may be expressed a suspicion that there is more in a conjecture of Weiss than has generally been allowed. Why was St. Paul forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia and Bithynia on his second expedition? (Acts xvi. 6, 7). The Holy Ghost is Wisdom, and there must have been some reason for this prohibition. It may have been merely that the providence of God was calling St. Paul onwards, to carry the war straight into the enemy's country, and advance boldly upon his western strongholds. But it may also have been, as Weiss thinks, that other preachers were already at work in the forbidden regions, and that it was neither necessary nor desirable that St. Paul should direct his energies thitherwards. The apostle passed by Mysia, where not long afterwards, if the earlier date of the Apocalypse is correct, we find the Church of Pergamos. It may have been in process of formation at this very time. Nay, if conjecture be permissible, we might venture a step further. Even on his first journey, St. Paul hurried through Pamphylia without stopping, and did not preach in the country, except once at Perga, on his return (Acts xiv. 25), though Pamphylians had been present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and the ground was therefore to some extent prepared for the seed. Again, it was immediately after entering Pamphylia

that Mark parted from St. Paul. The two facts, the hasty advance and the return of St. Mark, may possibly be connected, and, if they are, we must ask what explanation will fit them both. Considerations of health might conceivably, as Mr. Ramsay urges, determine the apostle to press on and leave Pamphylia unworked; but this reason, which might have been expressed in two words, is not given by St. Luke, and still we are left to wonder why Mark went back, why Paul resented his conduct, and why Barnabas excused it. It is possible to suppose that evangelists were already at work in Pamphylia; that Mark did not think it desirable to interfere with them; that, being a young man, he pressed his opinion in a manner that might give offence; that Barnabas agreed with Mark in substance though not in expression, and that Paul yielded and moved on to Antioch without delay.

Upon the whole, it seems tolerably certain, not only that Christianity advanced with great rapidity in Asia Minor, but that there were many Churches which were not founded by the direct personal initiative of St. Paul. It is clear also that the apostle's hold upon Asiatic Christianity was neither deep nor lasting. At the time when he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy (i. 15), all the Churches of Asia—the province of Asia—had turned away from him, though he had still a footing in Ephesus, where Onesiphorus remained true. There may have been signs of defection in Galatia also, whither Crescens is despatched (iv. 10). Yet this cannot have been the precise date of 1 Peter, because Mark was in Asia, not in Rome, and was in close personal relations with St. Paul (iv. 11). What conclusions are we to draw? We can but grope our way through the dim light. There were probably at a very early date Churches dotted all over Asia Minor. Some of them were Pauline, some were of another type, which we may loosely call Petrine. There was agitation among them, and some passed from the one side to the other. To our modern eyes the difference between the Mystic and the Disciplinarian seems very great, because it has been embittered by the fierce controversies of the last five centuries. To St. Paul also it seemed very great. Law, in his eyes, was incompatible with mystic freedom, and he united in a very high degree speculative keenness and masterful enthusiasm. But did it seem equally great to the other apostles, or even to St. Paul's own attached followers? The difference as yet existed only in germ; its consequences had not developed themselves. Can we not imagine that Mark or Silvanus may have been equally ready to take their orders either from St. Peter or from St. Paul.

Is there any real reason why, if the Pontic Christians had planned a great mission or visitation of the Churches, St. Peter should not have been asked to write a circular letter which should give an authoritative basis to the enterprise? or why Silvanus, if

he was not at the time in actual personal attendance upon St. Paul, should not have been the envoy? or why St. Mark, if he was at the time with St. Peter, should not have been mentioned affectionately in the Epistle?

Whence was St. Peter writing, and what is the exact place which he calls Babylon? Three answers have been given to this question; for we may leave Joppa and Jerusalem on one side, though both towns have found advocates. Down to the Reformation, Babylon was generally understood as here signifying Rome. Since that date many commentators, following the lead of Erasmus and Calvin, have argued that the name must be taken in its natural sense, and that the Assyrian Babylon is intended. Others again, notably Bishop Pearson, have advocated the claims of the Egyptian Babylon or Old Cairo. We may consider these three views in the reverse order.

Strabo the geographer, who was writing as late as A.D. 18, tells us (xvii. p. 807) that the Egyptian Babylon is a strong fortress, founded with the permission of the Pharaoh of the time by certain refugees from the Assyrian Babylon. "At present," he adds, "it is the camp of one of the three corps which form the garrison of Egypt." Near it, or round it, grew up a town which is of considerable interest in the history of the Coptic Church, of the Arab invasion, and of the Crusades. But in the first century it appears to have been merely a great military station, the last place where we should expect to find St. Peter and his friends (see A. J. Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*; Evetts, *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*; Amélineau, *La Géographie de l'Égypte*).

According to the letter of Agrippa to the Emperor Caius (in Philo, *Legatio ad Caium*, 36, Mangey, ii. 588), there were at that date many Jews in Babylon of Assyria. Persons from this region had been present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and it is possible that evangelists were at work there not long afterwards. But towards the end of the reign of Caius great disasters fell upon the Babylonian Jews. Many were massacred; many fled to Seleucia and thence to Ctesiphon (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 9). If St. Peter ever went to the East, it is rather in the last-named city than in Babylon that we should expect to find him. Again, tradition associates with Parthia the name, not of Peter, but of Thomas, and considerable weight may be attached to this fact. Besides, the regions beyond Euphrates lay in another world. It is hardly credible that one and the same person should have taken an active part in evangelising the far Orient, and yet have kept up a close connexion with Greek-speaking communities in Asia Minor. The earliest Syriac tradition connects St. Peter with Rome, and does not mention Babylon (Dr. Chase, article on Peter, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). Nor have we the least reason for supposing that

Mark and Silvanus ever visited Assyria ; indeed, all the probabilities are heavily against it.

There remains only the third explanation, that by Babylon St. Peter means Rome. Down to the time of the Reformation this view was universal. It was rejected by the Reformed divines, partly, perhaps, because it appeared to favour the Papal claims. But among modern commentators it is still the predominant opinion.

That Rome was commonly spoken of as Babylon by Jewish writers of an apocalyptic tinge is beyond question. No one doubts what is meant by Babylon in the Book of the Apocalypse. There is, indeed, some difficulty in ascertaining the precise date at which this metaphor came into vogue.

Bishop Lightfoot (*St. Clement of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 492) refers to a passage in the *Sibylline Oracles* (v. 158): *καὶ φλέξει πόντον βαθὴν αἰτὴν τε Βαβυλῶνα Ἰταλίας γαῖαν θ' ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ ὄλοντο Ἑβραίων ἅγιοι πιστοὶ καὶ ναὸς ἀληθῆς*. But these particular lines in which there is a reference to the destruction of the temple must have been written after the time of Vespasian. The same observation will apply to a passage in the Apocalypse of Baruch (xi. 1, ed. R. H. Charles, 1896), "Moreover, I, Baruch, say this against thee, Babylon: If thou hadst prospered and Zion had dwelt in her glory, it would have been a great grief to us that thou shouldest be equal to Zion. But now, lo, the grief is infinite, and the lamentation measureless, for, lo, thou art prospered and Zion desolate." This passage also Mr. Charles, the learned editor, assigns to a date after A.D. 70 and before A.D. 90. It is obvious that the sack of Jerusalem would bring the name of Vespasian into close proximity to that of Nebuchadnezzar, and suggest at once the parallel between Rome and Babylon. But there is no reason why this comparison should not have been vividly present to the minds both of Jews and Christians long before the final catastrophe. In the Apocalypse, which was most probably written before the fall of Jerusalem, Rome is Babylon, not because she has destroyed the Holy City, but because she is the mother of harlots and abominations, drunken with the blood of the saints (xvii. 5, 6). Such metaphors, or applications of prophecy, seem to have been not uncommon among the first Christians; and even Jerusalem, "the great city where our Lord was crucified," was spoken of "spiritually" as Sodom or Egypt (Apoc. xi. 8). St. Paul had called the Holy City "Sinai" (Gal. iv. 25). Such turns of speech are very natural, and present little or no difficulty. The moment a pious Jew set his foot in the Transtiberine Ghetto, and saw with his own eyes the splendour and the vices of the capital, or heard of the influence of the "Chaldaean" astrologers, or of the blasphemous follies of Caligula, he might very well bethink him of Isaiah, and say to himself, "Surely this is Babylon, not Rome."

It has been urged that to use such a metaphor in the actual

dating of an official letter might cause uncertainty and confusion. But there is little force in this objection. The letter did not drop from the sky, nor even go through the post. It was carried by Silvanus, who had come from the place, whatever it was, where the author was residing. It is quite possible that there is another metaphor in the same verse (1 Pet. v. 13). For, although the Sinaïtic MS. and other ancient authorities insert the word *ἐκκλησία* before *συνεκλεκτή*, we may maintain with confidence that the right translation of what St. Peter wrote is not "the fellow-elect Church," but "the fellow-elect Lady in Babylon greeteth you." But this, again, may be a metaphor, for many hold with Bishop Lightfoot that we must see in the phrase a personification of the Church in which the apostle was resident at the time. Bishop Lightfoot compares the (probably not parallel) use of *κυρία*, 2 John i. 5; see *Clement of Rome*, ii. 491; we may add the Lady of Hermas.

But it is not necessary to treat the lady also as a figure of speech. The sister-wife whom St. Peter led about with him must have been a well-known and well-loved personage in many places. Clement of Alexandria had heard that she died a martyr death before her husband (*Strom.* vii. 11. 63). There is no reason for doubting his story; and, if it is true, it implies that she had been not only the companion, but the active assistant of her husband. She was one of the heroines of the primitive Church, and would hold a far higher position in the eyes of men than Phoebe, or Priscilla, or Euodia, or Syntyche, or those other good women who laboured with St. Paul. She may very well have desired to add a brief message of Christian affection to her great husband's Epistle. Peter, again, was not only a husband but a father (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* iii. 6. 52; *Eus. H. E.* iii. 30. 1); he never mentions divorce; he does not appear to have attached any merit to celibacy; he seems to have been a typical Hebrew, who looked upon married life as the best, happiest, and most blessed condition; the Lord Jesus had deigned to visit his wife, and had been good to his wife's mother. He would speak of his wife, as Synesius in a later age spoke of his, with affection that was not ashamed, and knew no reason why it should be ashamed, of expressing itself.

If we take the word "lady" in a metaphorical sense, we are probably sacrificing to mere prudery a noble and distinctive feature of St. Peter's character, and losing a touch of nature which speaks strongly in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle. "My wife and my son Marcus, two persons who are very near and dear to me, join in my greeting to you"—this is surely what St. Peter means. We must add that the word "lady" is not found in the Greek text. *Κυρία* may, indeed, be used in a figure of the Church, but what St. Peter actually says is "she who is fellow-elect." We may supply *γυνή*, if we please, and even more easily than *κυρία*. Thus,

even if *κνρία* in 2 John meant a Church, the case would not be parallel. *Γυνή* could hardly be used in a metaphorical sense.

Nothing has been said in the foregoing paragraphs as to the authenticity of the address and concluding verses of the Epistle which has lately been impugned by Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 451 sqq.). A few words on the subject will not be inappropriate here.

Dr. Harnack thinks that the Epistle does not profess to be the work of a personal disciple of Jesus, *μάτρος* in v. 1 meaning, not an apostle, but merely one who has suffered after the pattern of Christ; that it is so saturated with Pauline ideas that it might conceivably have been written by St. Paul himself; that it displays no personal acquaintance with the life of Jesus, and hardly a trace of any knowledge of the gospel; that it describes the state of the Church and its afflictions in such a manner that the date may be fixed between 83 and 93, but possibly as early as 73 or 63 A.D.; that it is the production of some distinguished teacher and confessor; that it was known to Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Papias, and the author of the so-called *Second Epistle of Clement*, but not under the name of Peter; that Babylon means possibly Rome, but more probably Jerusalem; that it floated about in an anonymous condition, till between A.D. 150 and 170 it was seized upon by the writer who forged the Second Epistle of Peter and furnished with a head- and tail-piece.

Dr. Harnack admits that the general state of things described in the Epistle is such that the date might be fixed without absurdity as early as A.D. 63, before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution, and within the lifetime of St. Peter. But he maintains that it cannot be the work of St. Peter himself, because of its Paulinism, of its impersonality, and of the vagueness of its references to the Gospels. Hence it becomes necessary *à priori* to regard the address and subscription as forged; but Dr. Harnack also finds these passages full of difficulty.

As to the general character of the Epistle, much has already been said in the course of this Introduction, and more will be added in the Notes. Paulinism is not to be found in the Epistle, except in that sense in which Paulinism is identical with Christianity; the Gospel allusions are more numerous than Dr. Harnack is disposed to admit; in a circular letter, written at a very early date, there was neither room nor occasion for precise quotation or detailed information; and for the note of personality, we should look naturally to the beginning and end, which the hypothesis requires us to regard as spurious. There are difficulties and obscurities, no doubt, but the worst conceivable method of handling them is to regard them as traces of interpolation or forgery. The forger's object is to make things as clear and natural as

possible; why, then, should anyone, writing as late as A.D. 160, with the Pauline Epistles, if not the Book of Acts, before him, have pitched upon Silvanus and Mark, of all people in the world, as likely to be in attendance upon St. Peter? The mention of these two names causes great perplexity in modern times, and certainly could not have caused less in ancient. Further, it is not easy, though it is not impossible, to suppose that some unscrupulous person first concocted an epistle in the name of Peter, and then seized upon a well-known but anonymous ancient document, and affixed to it the name of Peter, in order to give some sort of support to his own fabrication. If 2 Peter is to be regarded as a forgery, it is much more likely that what happened was just the reverse; that the forger found 1 Peter in existence as we have it, and used it, address, subscription and all, as a pattern for his own concoction. But, indeed, forgery is even a more dangerous word than interpolation. It is our bounden moral duty to require cogent evidence before we charge one who is presumably an honest and sensible man with deliberate falsification. For that harmless masquerading which we find later on in the *Judicium Petri*, the *Clementine Homilies*, the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, or *Dionysius the Areopagite*, is in the present instance quite out of the question.

In style, the address and subscription are indistinguishable from the body of the Epistle. The language of the address (διασπορά, παρεπίδημοι, ἀγιασμός, ὑπακοή, ῥαντισμός) paves the way with great propriety for the admonitions which follow, and contains a sort of abstract or premonition of all that was in the writer's mind. St. Clement of Rome, writing about A.D. 95, not only makes use of the body of the Epistle, but moulds his own address very closely on the address of the Epistle (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη: see Lightfoot's note). Dr. Harnack's view involves the extremely improbable supposition that this form of address was the invention of Clement; that at a somewhat later date it was loosely imitated by Jude; that half a century afterwards the forger of 2 Peter, writing with both Clement and Jude before him, copied more accurately the Clementine address, and prefixed it not only to his own concoction, but to an ancient Epistle which he found floating about without a name. It is true that St. Clement does not quote St. Peter by name, but it is equally true that though, according to Dr. Harnack's *Index Locorum*, he quotes or alludes to twenty-two of the New Testament documents, he nowhere gives the name of his authority. Yet, though he quotes St. Paul without naming him, he knew quite well that St. Paul was the author of the Epistles from which he quotes (xlvi. 1, ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου), and we may confidently infer that he had the same knowledge in the case of St. Peter.

There is therefore some internal and strong external evidence in

favour of the authenticity of the address. But if the address is genuine, no one will care to dispute the genuineness of the subscription. The difficulties involved in the latter passage are not of a kind that can be regarded as insuperable.

For the later evidence on the subject of St. Peter's sojourn in Rome, the reader may consult the article by Dr. Chase, who has marshalled all the statements with great care and lucidity. There also will be found references to the literature of the question. The only addition which I can make to Dr. Chase's quotations is one from Clement of Alexandria, taken from a note in the *Codex Marcianus* (text in Zahn, *Forschungen*, iii. 70): "Petrus et Paulus Romae sepulti sunt . . . Clemens in quinto libro hypotyposeon id est informationum." Zahn expresses a doubt whether this statement is really derived from Clement, but gives no reason. It may very well be genuine. The fifth book of the *Hypotyposes* certainly contained information about the apostles, as we know from Eus. *H. E.* i. 12.

§ 9. MARK AND SILVANUS.

When St. Peter despatched his Epistle, Mark and Silvanus were in his company.

Mark is called by St. Paul (Col. iv. 10) the cousin of Barnabas. We may therefore with confidence identify him with the John Mark of whom we read in Acts (xii. 12). It can hardly be doubted that this is the same Mark who was with St. Peter.

Mark was the son of a woman named Mary, who lived in Jerusalem, and whose house was a meeting-place for the brethren. Like his cousin Barnabas, he was probably a Levite. St. Peter was well acquainted with Mark's mother, for it was to her house that he turned his steps on his deliverance from prison. He knew Mark, therefore, before St. Paul did; and when he calls him his son, he may mean that he induced Mark to accept baptism, or at any rate was instrumental in bringing him to Christ. But the term may denote nothing more than close and affectionate familiarity.

Barnabas and Saul took John Mark with them on what is known as the First Mission Journey (Acts xii. 25), as their "minister" (*ὑπηρέτης*, Acts xiii. 5. E has here *εἰς διακονίαν*, evidently wishing to get rid of an ambiguous word). It is not quite clear what we are to understand by the word "minister." Sometimes, but rarely, it means "a minister of the word" (so Luke i. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 1; Acts xxvi. 16: in this last passage it is applied by Jesus to St. Paul), but more commonly it is used in the New Testament of menials or subordinate officers of an inferior class. Possibly Mark went as personal attendant on the apostles, as their courier or dragoman; but for this purpose they would naturally

select a fellow-believer who had a gift of exposition, and could help in other ways, besides ministering to their comfort, arranging routes, and managing business generally. With Barnabas and Saul, Mark traversed Cyprus—a country which may have been known to him, for it was the native land of Barnabas. But at Perga in Pamphylia “John departing from them returned to Jerusalem” (Acts xiii. 13). Paul resented his conduct, and when Barnabas proposed to take John Mark with them on their second journey (Acts xv. 37), objected so strongly that there was a sharp contention between him and Barnabas. Finally, the two great friends departed asunder, Paul taking for his companion the prophet Silas, while Barnabas went with Mark to Cyprus.

Two questions suggest themselves here. The first is, What was the age of Mark at this time? A worthless tradition, which is directly contradicted by the Elder of Papias (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 39. 15), represents him as having been one of the Seventy. Some commentators in recent times have identified him with the young man mentioned in his Gospel (Mark xiv. 51). This, again, is somewhat unsubstantial conjecture. But the word “minister” seems to imply that he was a novice to mission work, and that he was a young man. Though he was cousin, not “sister’s son,” of Barnabas, he may have been many years younger than that apostolic man.

Again, why did he leave the apostles so abruptly? St. Luke makes no comment, and we are thrown back on hypothesis. Yet it is clear that the breach was not between Mark and Barnabas, but between Mark and Paul. Barnabas defended him with great warmth. The reason for Mark’s departure, therefore, can hardly have been that his courage failed, or that his health broke down, or that he proved incompetent for his office. But if these causes are inadequate, what can we suppose but that there was some difference of opinion between Paul and Mark which Paul regarded as unfitting him for the purpose in hand, while Barnabas, who inclined to the party of Peter (*Gal. ii. 13*), did not. It is not easy to suppose that Barnabas, however strong his family affection may have been, would have selected again for his helpmate one who could not be trusted on an emergency. Nor would Mark himself have been willing to renew an adventure of which he knew that he was incapable. He ended by going with Barnabas to Cyprus, where possibly the dangers were less; but he appears to have been quite willing to plunge into Asia Minor, though he must have heard all about the sufferings of the previous expedition. Nor is it easy to suppose that St. Paul would have still been embittered by a failure of courage of which Mark had so evidently repented. It seems far more likely that Mark had taken alarm at St. Paul’s views; that during the interval, probably under the persuasion of Barnabas, he had come to regard the difference as unimportant;

and that St. Paul felt rightly, though with some sense of personal vexation, that, however slight the grounds of disagreement might look to others, they would prevent him from working successfully with one who was disposed to criticise and disapprove. Some slight confirmation of this view may be found in the fact that the companion chosen by St. Paul was Silas, a prophet, and in the previous connexion between Mark and St. Peter. Mark is not again mentioned in the Book of Acts.

At a later date, when the apostle's own views were much milder and more tolerant than they had been, we find Mark with St. Paul in Rome (Col. iv. 10), and contemplating a journey to Colossae. Possibly he was not personally known to the Colossians, for the apostle adds, "if he come unto you, receive him." It may be that St. Paul is here giving Mark an introduction, but we should hardly be justified in pressing this sense upon the words. At a later date (2 Tim. iv. 11) Mark was somewhere in Asia Minor, and Timothy is desired to bring him to Rome; for, says the apostle, "he is useful to me for ministry" (*εὐχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν*). And in the Epistle to Philemon (24) we find him in Rome with Epaphras, Aristarchus, Demas, and Lucas, the fellow-labourers of St. Paul. But we do not know when or how St. Mark first set foot in the capital.

Ancient tradition connected St. Mark very closely with St. Peter. Papias stated, on the authority of the Elder (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39. 15), that Mark had never been a follower of the Lord Himself, but had served Peter as interpreter, and that his Gospel represents the occasional discourses of St. Peter, which Mark reproduced accurately from memory. The Elder, as reported by Papias, does not actually mention Rome, and does not say expressly that the Gospel was composed after Peter's death, though this is probably implied in his statement that Mark wrote from memory.

Irenaeus, after telling us (iii. 1. 1) that Matthew wrote while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel in Rome and founding the Church, proceeds, "After their death (*ἐξόδον*) Mark also, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the substance of Peter's preaching." Clement of Alexandria (in Eus. *H. E.* ii. 15) affirms that Mark wrote his Gospel to satisfy the importunities of the brethren, and without the apostle's knowledge, before the death of Peter, and submitted it when complete to the apostle's judgment. Origen (Lomm. vol. iii. p. 1; Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25. 5) says that Mark wrote as Peter dictated to him (*ὡς Πέτρος ὑφήγησάτο αὐτῷ*). These four accounts, while they differ in details and may be independent, agree in bringing Mark into close personal relations with Peter. Not one of them says in so many words that his Gospel was written in Rome, but the language of Irenaeus seems clearly to imply this, and it was probably the belief

of the other three also. Clement certainly thought that the First Epistle of Peter was written from Rome.

Tradition also taught that, after publishing his Gospel, Mark went to Egypt, there preached the faith, and became first Bishop of Alexandria (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 16. 1; Epiph. *Haer.* li. 6; Jerome, *de Vir.* Ill. 8). Here in later days his tomb was shown in the great church of Baucalis, which stood near the harbour. There was, however, an ancient opinion, which has been preserved in the heterodox *Clementine Homilies* (i. 8), that the Church of Egypt owed its origin to Barnabas, not to Mark.

The Silvanus of Peter has been generally identified with the Silas of Acts, the Silvanus of the Pauline Epistles. Like St. Paul, he was a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37, 38). A foreign burgess would have a Roman name borrowed from the personage from whom he or his ancestor had received the franchise. Silvanus is a well-known cognomen borne by many distinguished families, the Ceionii, Granii, Pomponii, and others. See Hoole, *The Classical Element in the N.T.*, p. 61.

In Orelli there is a long inscription (No. 750) in honour of Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus, who was consul suffect in A.D. 45. He was a meritorious officer, who stood high in the favour of Vespasian, and had been proconsul of Asia, as Wilmanns thinks, just before or just after Silanus, who held the same office in A.D. 54. M. Plautius Silvanus (Orelli, No. 622) was consul in B.C. 2, and received the triumphal ornaments for service in Illyricum. L. Flavius Silvanus (Wilmanns, *Inscriptiones Latinae*, No. 285) was consul in A.D. 81.

The name Silvanus was also borne by persons of lower station, freedmen or dependants of the great houses. Thus (Orelli, No. 695) we find a funeral inscription to Sylvania Maria, which is dated *duobus Geminis*; this, according to Tertullian, was the year of our Lord's crucifixion. Another epitaph (*C. I. L.* vol. vi. No. 4073) in the *columbarium* of the servants of Livia Augusta runs thus:

M. LIVIVS. SILVANVS. DECVR. THYMELE. SILVANI.

This Silvanus was decurion, or head, of one of the numerous bodies of officials or servants in the Imperial household. Thymele was probably his wife. Again (*ibid.* No. 4316) we read: A. SILVANO.

The name Silvanus or Silvanius was not uncommonly borne by persons of the same class to which we may suppose the companion of the apostles to have belonged; and from the name Maria, which in one instance we find associated with it, we may infer that some of them were of Jewish parentage. It is particularly interesting to find a Silvanus actually employed in the family of the Caesars. Here we may possibly discern one of the little links by which

Christianity attached itself from the very first to the Imperial court. Our Silvanus had certainly namesakes, possibly relatives, among that vast body of servants, clerks, readers, physicians, librarians, civil and domestic officials, who surrounded the emperor and served him in all sorts of capacities, from that of cook to something very like what we should call a Secretary of State. And it is in no way surprising to find him in Rome.

There can be little doubt that the Silas of Acts is the Silvanus of the Pauline and Petrine Epistles, but the relation between his two names is not quite clear. The vulgar abbreviation of Silvanus would naturally be Σιλβᾶς or Σιλονᾶς. Hence it has been maintained that the real name of this apostolic man was the Aramaic Sili, which by the addition of a common Greek termination becomes Silas; and that Silvanus is not a lengthened form of Silas, but a Gentile by-name adopted merely because it was similar in sound to the original (compare Joshua, Jason. See Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. p. 23; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 184). If this view is correct, the name of Silvanus ceases to have any particular meaning. But Zahn does not quite solve the problem. If Silvanus is equivalent to Silvas, not to Silas, why, we may ask, did Silas call himself Silvanus and not rather Silanus? The same difficulty recurs in either case. Again, though Silvas is actually used for Silvanus (Zahn cites a Φλαούιος Σιλβᾶς from Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 1), it is not safe to assert that the same rule was always observed. In these vulgar abbreviations the final -ας represents a large variety of terminations; thus we have Hermas for Hermogenes, Epaphras for Epaphroditus, Nymphas for Nymphodorus, and so on. Popular usage follows very loose rules, as we know from the analogy of English pet names. Finally, there is the probability that Silas and Silvanus only accidentally resemble one another, that the first was the name given to the man by his Hebrew parents, the second his name as a Roman burgess and client of a noble Roman house. We are left to make the same choice of alternatives in the case of a more famous pair of names, Saul and Paul.

It is probable then that Silvanus or one of his ancestors had been manumitted by one or other of the Roman Silvani. He appears first as one of the leading men among the brethren at Jerusalem, and was one of the delegates appointed to carry to Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia the Decree of the Council. He must, therefore, have been heartily in accord with the substance of the Decree. He was a prophet, meeting St. Paul on this side, and at Antioch he exhorted the brethren, probably the Gentile brethren, with many words and confirmed them. From Antioch he appears to have returned to Jerusalem (Acts xv. 34 is to be omitted), but shortly afterwards he was chosen by St. Paul to accompany him on his Second Mission Journey. We hear of him for the last time in

the Book of Acts at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5; compare 2 Cor. i. 19), where again, as at Antioch, he appears as a preacher. Silvanus also, like Mark, dwelt at first in Jerusalem, and must have been well known to St. Peter before he became acquainted with St. Paul.

This account of Mark and Silvanus enables us to fix with certainty a prior limit of date for the First Epistle of St. Peter. Mark was probably a novice when first we read of him, and attended St. Paul on the First Journey. Silvanus went with the apostle on the Second. Hence 1 Peter cannot possibly have been written before the end of the Second Journey. The date of the apostle's fourth visit to Jerusalem, with which this journey terminated (Acts xviii. 22), is very variously computed from A.D. 49 (Bengel) or A.D. 51 (Schradler) or A.D. 52 (Turner) to A.D. 56 (Eichhorn and Ideler). The date most in favour is A.D. 54. (See the table in Farrar's *Life of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 624.) But all calculations of time for the Book of Acts are inferential, and this is probably some few years too late.

As to the posterior limit of date, there is not the same certainty. Reasons have been assigned in a previous section for believing that the Epistle was written before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution in A.D. 64, but many eminent authorities dispute this conclusion.

Are there any other considerations that will enable us to come to a more definite result?

It has been thought that Mark and Silvanus could not possibly have been in Rome, and in attendance on St. Peter, till after the death of St. Paul. But, in the first place, there is no reason for supposing that St. Peter outlived St. Paul by any considerable length of time. Dionysius of Corinth, our earliest authority (Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 27, places him under M. Aurelius and Commodus), says that the apostles perished "about the same time" (*κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν*, Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25. 8; Routh, vol. i. p. 180); and the natural inference from these words is, that though the apostles may not have ended their lives on the same day, their deaths were not far separated. But it is surely incredible that, if the Neronian persecution were actually raging at the time, and St. Paul himself had been slain with the sword not long before, the language of St. Peter's Epistle should be what it is.

Nor can it reasonably be supposed that Mark and Silvanus were adherents of St. Paul in such a sense that they could not at any time have written and carried a letter for St. Peter, and joined him in sending a greeting to the Asiatic Churches. On the contrary, the difficulty is to understand how either Mark or Silvanus can ever have been thoroughgoing advocates of the distinctively Pauline teaching. Let it be remembered that Mark parted from St. Paul under painful circumstances at the very outset of the First Journey, and that Silas was the chosen advocate of the Jerusalem Decree.

The natural inference from such facts as we have is that, till the dispute about the law which St. Paul presses so vehemently in Galatians and Romans had died down, neither Mark nor Silvanus can have been in quite unclouded relations with the outspoken champion of Faith against Works.

There are long blank spaces to be filled up in the history of both men. What was Mark doing after he went with Barnabas to Cyprus, during St. Paul's Second and Third Journeys, or during the imprisonment at Caesarea? Even after this date we catch but a few flying glimpses of him; and of Silvanus we know absolutely nothing from the time of his arrival in Corinth.

Thus we are driven back upon the question of the literary interdependence of the Pauline and Petrine Epistles. According to most scholars, the Petrine Epistle is later than Romans (A.D. 58) or Ephesians (A.D. 63). In the view of others it is later than any of the Pauline Epistles; indeed it has been supposed to borrow from almost every book in the New Testament.

The evidence, both linguistic and doctrinal, has been considered in previous sections, and it does not appear to point to any definite conclusion.

Mark and Silvanus may very well have been together in Rome at any time after the Second Mission Journey. But at what date can we suppose St. Peter to have been in the city with them?

This is a question which cannot be answered with certainty. Lipsius maintained that St. Peter never visited Rome at all. Of late it has been generally allowed that the evidence on the other side is too strong to be rejected. But the tendency is to place St. Peter's arrival in the capital as late as possible, towards the end of St. Paul's first imprisonment, at the end of A.D. 63 (Dr. Chase) or in the beginning of A.D. 64 (Bishop Lightfoot).

Both these dates rest upon the assumption that, if St. Peter had visited Rome at any earlier time, the fact must have been mentioned in the Book of Acts or in the Pauline Epistles. But it can hardly be said that the silence of either of these authorities amounts to negative proof. In Acts, St. Peter disappears from the scene altogether after the Council of Jerusalem. St. Luke must have known much about the apostle's later movements, but for some reason or another he did not see fit to say a single word upon the subject. The silence of St. Paul affords an extremely difficult problem. St. Peter had certainly visited Antioch, but St. Paul only mentions the fact incidentally, and with a polemical object. Dr. Harnack thinks it highly probable (*Chronologie*, p. 244, note) that he had also been in Corinth; but we cannot gather this with certainty from the words of St. Paul. He may have preached in Galatia also; but this again we can only suspect. As to the origin of the Church in Rome we

are left to grope in the dark ; but questions arise to which we must not too readily assume an answer.

A Church had been founded there many years before (Rom. xv. 22), not by St. Paul, and had attained some considerable dimensions. Whom would these believers be so anxious to see as Peter, whose name must have been familiar to them from the day of their conversion? Who was that "other man" upon whose foundation the Roman Church was built? (Rom. xv. 20). Why, again, does St. Paul, writing to a Church that he had never seen, enter so fully and controversially into questions which had probably never been heard of in Rome? for the Jews of Rome, when he came there as a prisoner five or six years later, knew "no harm" about him (Acts xxviii. 21); and, though these Jews were not Christians, they could hardly have spoken thus, if the Pauline view of Law had been debated among their compatriots in the city. Or what was that spiritual gift which St. Paul desired to impart at Rome (Rom. i. 11), if not prophecy, the essential mark of difference between Pauline and Petrine Christianity? The Epistle to the Romans is, in fact, an *Apologia*, and seems to imply the pre-existence of that form of doctrine which we find in the First Epistle of St. Peter. And this mode of opinion continued to be actively taught in Rome during St. Paul's first imprisonment, as we may gather from Philippians (i. 15-18). Professor Harnack thinks it not impossible that St. Peter may have paid a visit to Rome even under the reign of Claudius, that is to say, before A.D. 54 (*Chronologie*, p. 244, note); and certainly this opinion is not untenable.

In any case, if we place the end of Acts and of the first imprisonment of St. Paul in A.D. 58,—the opinion of Eusebius, which has of late received the powerful support of Blass and Harnack,—there is a space of some six years before the outbreak of the Neronian persecution, in A.D. 64, during which we know nothing of Mark and Silvanus, and very little of St. Paul. There is no reason against our assigning the First Epistle of St. Peter to this interval of time. If the Epistle does after all, as many think, display an acquaintance with Romans and Ephesians, the fact would be thus accounted for. If Mark made his first acquaintance with Asia Minor immediately after the date of Colossians, we should be able to explain how he comes to be mentioned. Time would be allowed for the growth of the numerous Christian communities implied in the address of the Epistle, and also for the wakening of hostility among the Gentiles, who, though not yet quite prepared for measures of bloody repression, were evidently fast moving in that direction.

On the whole, therefore, it seems the most likely supposition that the First Epistle of St. Peter was written between A.D. 58 and A.D. 64.

NOTES ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

The Title. In the oldest MSS. the Epistle is headed Πέτρον ᾧ (B), or Πέτρον ἐπιστολῇ ᾧ (N A C). In Greek cursives we find Πέτρον καθολικῆ πρώτῃ ἐπιστολῇ (or ἐπιστολῇ πρώτῃ) : τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρον ἐπιστολῇ ᾧ : L has ἐπιστολῇ καθολικῆ ᾧ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ πανευφύμου ἀποστόλου Πέτρον. The Codex Amiatinus gives *epistula Petri prima* ; the Codex Fuldensis, *Petri epistula ad gentes*, so Junilius and Cassiodorus (in Westcott, *Canon*, Appendix D) ; Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 12, quotes the Epistle as *Petri ad Ponticos*.

I. 1, 2. *The Address.* The ordinary type of the address of a Greek letter is that found in Acts xxiii. 26, Κλαύδιος Λυσίας τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλικι χαίρειν : cf. 1 Macc. x. 18, 25, xi. 30, xii. 6. Χαίρειν was felt to be objectionable by some of the religious heathen ; thus the author of the third Platonic Epistle prefers εὖ πράττειν, on the ground that joy or pleasure befits neither man nor God. But the old heathen formula was at first used even in apostolic letters. We have an instance in the address of the letter which enclosed the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23), and another in that of the Epistle of St. James.

To the name of the writer is naturally added his title. In 2 and 3 John we find simply ὁ πρεσβύτερος : in James, Ἰάκωβος Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος : in 1 Peter, Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ : in 2 Peter, Σίμων Πέτρος δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ : in Jude, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου. The usage of St. Paul varies. In 1 and 2 Thessalonians the names only are given ; in the polemical Epistles, Romans and Galatians, he defends and explains his right to the title of apostle ; in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Timothy the words διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ are added with the same purpose ; in 1 Tim. we have κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ added ; in Philippians he calls himself δούλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (like James, Jude) ; in Titus, Romans, both δούλος and ἀπόστολος (like 2 Peter) ; in the pathetic Epistle to Philemon the phrase he selects is δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

The name of the addressees is sometimes given quite simply, as by James, by St. Paul in Philemon, Galatians ; but generally a few words descriptive of their Christian character are added, and these

are often very significant of the leading thoughts in the writer's mind (*παρεπίδημοι* in 1 Pet. ; *κληροὶ ἅγιοι* in Rom., 1 Cor. ; *ἅγιοι καὶ πιστοὶ* in Col. ; *ἀγαπῶ, ἀλήθεια*, 2 and 3 John).

The heathen *χαίρειν* becomes the Christian *χαρίς*. To this is naturally added the Jewish Peace (1 and 2 Pet., 2 John, all the Pauline Epistles), and often Mercy (2 John, 1 and 2 Tim., Tit.), or Love (Jude has mercy, peace, and love).

We are not to suppose that St. Paul set the pattern for all these addresses ; this is extremely improbable. No one man creates epistolary forms.

Ignatius still uses the old heathen *χαίρειν*, except in *Philad.* ; and Barnabas begins his Epistle with *χαίρετε*.

Πέτρος. The apostle's name was Simon (properly Simeon). Our Lord gave him the surname of Cephas (John i. 42), which signifies a rock or a stone. What our Lord meant was no doubt "rock" not stone, firmness not mere hardness (Matt. xvi. 18) ; but the Greek noun *πέτρα* is feminine, and when used as the name for a man necessarily takes the shape of *Πέτρος*. Our Lord always addresses the apostle as Simon except Luke xxii. 34, where Peter seems to be used with reference to the meaning of the name (in ver. 31 we find "Simon, Simon" ; in Matt. xvi. 18, again, Peter is an appellative, not the mere name). The apostle is called Simon (Symeon) also by his brother apostle St. James, Acts xv. 14, and by Mark and Luke before the Mission of the Twelve. John calls him indifferently Simon Peter or Peter. Simon Peter is found also Matt. xvi. 16 ; Luke v. 8 ; 2 Pet. i. 1 ; "Simon who is called Peter" occurs in Matt. iv. 18, x. 2, and four times in Acts (x. 5, 18, 32, xi. 13) ; all these last occur in the story of Cornelius ; possibly in his Hebrew original St. Luke found the name Simon and added the other words. Even in the Gospels, Peter is the name generally used, and in Acts it is employed throughout with the few exceptions that have been noted. St. Paul generally speaks of "Cephas," 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5 ; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11, 14 (though he uses Peter in ii. 7, 8), and we may infer that this title was current in the Church of Jerusalem where St. Paul first met the apostle. Some have supposed that St. Paul uses Cephas with a polemical intention, to remind his readers of the compact referred to Gal. ii. 9 ; but probably it was his habit. The older Syriac versions of the New Testament, the Curetonian (with the recently discovered Sinaitic of the Gospels) and the Peshito, render Peter sometimes Kepha, sometimes Simon Kepha, and sometimes Simon. Peter is found Acts i. 13 ; 1 Pet. i. 1. Evidently Simon and Kepha were the common usage in the second century in the Aramaic countries. Elsewhere Simon went rapidly out of use, and Cephas was preserved only by the same archaeological interest which clung to *Talitha cumi*, as the exact words used by our Lord. See Hort ;

Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. 21, ii. 60; Chase on "Peter" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 756; Plummer on Luke vi. 14.

ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς. "To the elect sojourners of the Dispersion": the omission of the article appears here to have no significance. See Introduction, § 2. There is no verb to govern the dative, cf. Rom. i. 7; 2 John 1-3. It is better to take ἐκλεκτοῖς as an adjective, though the R.V. appears to render it as a substantive. Those to whom the apostle writes are chosen by God, elect (γένος ἐκλεκτόν, ii. 9, from Isa. xliii. 20). St. Peter does not use the Pauline κλητοί, nor does he expressly distinguish καλεῖν from ἐκλέγεσθαι. Election does not carry with it the final salvation of the individual (iv. 15-19). God must guard them (i. 5); but, if they resist the devil and remain solid in the faith, He will make them perfect and establish them (v. 9 sqq.). There has been no change in the counsels of God. Israel has not been rejected. The Church is still the Church of old; but the vision of the prophets has been realised, and whosoever will may enter in.

Elect, in fact, means simply Christian. What the apostle is thinking of is corporate citizenship among the elect people; the individual elements of the new life are faith and obedience.

In St. Matthew (xxii.) all are "called," but many do not accept the invitation; some accept, but have no wedding garment; many are called, but few are elect (cf. Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Mark xiii. 20, 22, 27; Luke xviii. 7). John does not use καλεῖν in this sense, nor κλητός, nor ἐκλεκτός in his Gospel, but in the Apoc. xvii. 14 we have κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ as different names for the same thing. In the Synoptical Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Apoc. elect denotes personal, not corporate election. It is true, as Dr. Hort remarks, that "the preliminary election to membership of an elect race does not exclude individual election," and we cannot reconstruct St. Peter's theology with precision from two short Epistles. Nevertheless, so far as he has explained himself, he appears to mean that the individual is called into the elect society. Certainly he attaches more value to the corporate life, as regards both growth in knowledge or faith and the efficiency of sacraments (σώζει βάπτισμα, iii. 21), than St. Paul does.

The word παρεπίδημος occurs twice in the LXX. Gen. xxiii. 4, πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν: Ps. xxxviii. (xxxix.) 13, ὅτι πάροικος ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐν τῇ γῆ καὶ παρεπίδημος καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου. These two passages were before St. Peter's mind both here and i. 17, ii. 11. In the former, Abraham speaks of himself to the sons of Heth as a stranger and sojourner among them; in the latter, the same figure is used of man who has on earth no abiding city, like the patriarch who sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles (Heb. xi. 9). He is an exile from heaven, his true home. We must not take the word

here in its secular political sense, though this would be very applicable to the Jews of the Diaspora, who were exiles from Jerusalem, dwellers in a foreign land. For an instance of this use see Justin, *Apol.* 67 (Otto, p. 188), *τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις ὄντι ξένοις*, of strangers who are stopping in a town but do not possess a permanent domicile there, and examples from the papyri are given by Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 146, Eng. trans. p. 149.

The Christian is chosen and called by God (the choosing precedes the calling) to leave his earthly father's home. The call makes him a pilgrim; henceforth he journeys by slow stages, through many dangers, towards the far-off promised rest. The pilgrim is sustained by faith in the unseen, by hope, godly fear, and the love of Christ; he is always a babe (ii. 2); he tastes of joy, but only as the wanderer drinks of the brook by the way. It is the same conception of the Christian life that we find in Hebrews.

In this tone of hope deferred we may find a characteristic note. St. Peter had walked with the Lord on earth in close personal union, and must have felt the Ascension as a bereavement. St. Paul had never known the Lord in the flesh, but after the Ascension had been delivered by a vision from bitter spiritual struggles. To him naturally the sense of joy and freedom, of being here and now actually in the Kingdom, was far more than to St. Peter.

On the Diaspora and the local names, see Introduction, § 8. In the address of the Epistle of St. James the Diaspora seems to include Christian Jews only. Here it embraces alike Gentiles or Jews. There is no difference at all; all titles and prerogatives pass on from the Church of the fathers to the Church of Christ. There has been evolution, but no breach of continuity.

κατὰ πρόγνωσιν . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The three clauses are strictly co-ordinate in the construction, but the order of the whole sentence is loose, and the precise connexion of these words has been disputed.

The general and preferable arrangement is to take them with *ἐκλεκτοῖς*—"Elect according to foreknowledge," etc.; this gives perfectly good sense; the only difficulty is that we should have expected *ἐκλεκτοῖς* to be placed after *Βιθυνίας*. The Greek commentators Cyril, Theophylact, and Oecumenius take them with *ἀπόστολος*. This increases the difficulty arising out of the order of the words, and is open to a further objection, that, whereas St. Paul feels it necessary to justify his claim to the title of apostle, no such necessity would be felt by St. Peter. Hence we should not suffer ourselves to be influenced by the supposed analogy of the Pauline addresses.

The three clauses give the three Names and three functions of the Trinity (the arrangement of the Names is not significant). *Κατὰ πρόγνωσιν*: the Father (Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, i. 3;

our Father, i. 17) has the attribute of foreknowledge; on this election depends. Foreknowledge includes foreordaining (i. 20, ii. 8), but St. Peter does not use the words *προορίζειν* or *πρόθεσις*. He speaks quite simply as a devout Jew, and the metaphysical difficulty does not affect him at all. The problem of predestination is suggested in St. John's Gospel and discussed by St. Paul; in both cases it arises out of the rejection of the gospel by the mass of the Jews. It may be that St. Peter had had good success among his countrymen, or that he wrote before it became evident that as a nation they would prove refractory. See note on ii. 8.

ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος. "In (or by) sanctification of the Spirit." Compare 2 Thess. ii. 13, *ὅτι εἴλετο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας*. It has been supposed, without reason, that St. Paul means "sanctification of *your* spirit." In any case the collocation of the three Names, Father, Spirit, Jesus Christ, shows that this cannot be the meaning here. Further, St. Peter does not use *πνεῦμα* in the sense of the spiritual faculty of man, as distinct from his reason or emotions. See Introduction, p. 40, and note on iii. 4.

Foreknowledge is the condition, Sanctification is the atmosphere, or perhaps rather the instrument, of the elect life. We may translate *ἐν* either "in" or "by means of"; the latter, Hebraistic, use of the preposition is very common in the New Testament. See Blass, p. 130. Holiness is the attribute of God in whom is no stain of evil, either in thought or in deed: the Spirit, by the act of sanctification or hallowing, imparts this divine attribute to the Christian society, consecrating it, setting it apart, calling it out of the world, devoting it to God, and furnishing it with divine gifts and powers.

Sanctification leads to, results in (*εἰς*) obedience, and sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ.

Obedience is obedience to the law of God, faithful service, righteousness, by virtue of which men are just. In the address of Romans (i. 5), St. Paul speaks of *ὑπακοή πίστεως*, but in quite a different sense. What is meant there is "obedience to faith," acceptance of the gospel of Free Grace (cf. Rom. xvi. 26).

ῥαντισμόν. "Sprinkling" is a sacrificial word, and, as the result of Sanctification and Obedience, can here mean nothing but the means by which we are brought into real spiritual conformity to the Death of Christ; it conveys to the believer those divine gifts which are the fruit of that Death. What this conformity and these gifts were in the mind of St. Peter we shall gather from later passages.

ῥαντίζειν occurs Heb. ix. 13, 19, 21, x. 22; *ῥαντισμός*, Heb. xii. 24. It is by "sprinkling" that the merits of Christ's Death are transferred to the "brother." The idea is foreign to St. Paul,

but recurs in Barnabas viii., οἱ βαντίζοντες παῖδες οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν ἀφεσὺν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τὸν ἀγνισμόν τῆς καρδίας—the παῖδες, it is added, are the twelve apostles.

St. Peter is here alluding to some passage or passages of the Old Testament, but to which?

Dr. Hort insists that the reference must be to a passage in which the sprinkling of *persons* with blood is combined with the distinct mention of obedience. The only passage which fulfils these conditions is "the sprinkling which formed the ratification of the covenant between Jehovah and His people through the mediator Moses, as described in Ex. xxiv. 3-8." This, however, is too logical. A reference to the passages in Hebrews will show that many different sprinklings were in the mind of the writer of that Epistle, and the same is no doubt the case with St. Peter. If we consider the use which our author makes of Isa. liii. we may even find here an allusion also to Isa. lii. 15, where Aquila and Theodotion have "sprinkle many nations" (βαντιεί). See Cheyne's note on this passage.

The obedient are "sprinkled with the Blood of Jesus Christ." If we are to lay stress upon the order of words, "sprinkling" cannot here mean Forgiveness or Reconciliation, which is the effect of the Blood in Rom. v. 8-10. Here the "sprinkling," following obedience, seems to impart the spirit of readiness, not so much to do God's will as to suffer for Christ's sake. This is the highest stage in the progress of the Christian life on earth.

Throughout this Epistle the writer dwells so constantly upon the sacrifice of the Cross that the Blood of Christ can mean nothing else than His Death and Passion. Bishop Westcott will not allow this (*The Gospel of Creation*: Additional notes on 1 John i. 7 and on Heb. ix. 12). "The Blood (*Hebrews*, p. 294) represents the energy of the physical earthly life as it is. . . . The Blood poured out is the energy of present human life made available for others." Death (p. 298) "was the condition under the actual circumstances of fallen man, whereby alone the life of the Son of Man could be made available for the race. . . . Thus Blood and Death correspond generally with the two sides of Christ's work, the fulfilment of the destiny of man as created, and the fulfilment of this destiny though man has fallen. The first would have been necessary even though sin had not interrupted the due course of man's progress and relation to God."

The question whether the Incarnation was contingent or necessary was first expressly raised in the twelfth century by Ruprecht of Deutz (see R. L. Ottley, *Incarnation*, ii. p. 202; Dorner, ii. 1. 322, 366), but it does not arise here. Nor will any Christian deny that Christ gives Life, or that the Life is intimately connected with His human and divine personality. The points which arise from the

text of 1 Peter are: (1) what is the meaning of the words "the Blood of Jesus Christ"; and (2) whether the apostle finds any distinct value in the Passion, considered as Death and not as Life.

(1) Much importance has of late been attached to Gen. ix. 4, 5, Deut. xii. 23, where the blood is regarded as the seat or ground of animal life in man or in the brutes, and on that account might not be drunk. The reason of this prohibition may have been that the nature of the brute was supposed to pass into him who drank its blood, or rather that blood was the favourite beverage of demons and false gods (Ps. xvi. 4, see Dr. Cheyne's note; the "hard gods" of the Greeks were blood-drinkers, Aesch. *Choeph.* 577, Ἐρνὸς . . . ἄκρατον αἷμα πίνειται). Demons and ghosts were supposed to derive physical vigour from the blood which they lapped (Hom. *Od.* xi. 36, 95, 152, 232).

Whether in ancient Hebrew belief the blood-soul possessed moral and intellectual as well as merely physical faculties, it would be hard to say. The prohibition of the drinking of blood seems to imply a purely physical conception. But it comes from a time when the immortality of the soul was not clearly believed, and psychology did not exist. Dr. Liddon remarks (*Epistle to the Romans*, p. 76) that in Scripture, though blood and soul are combined, blood and spirit never are. Indeed, the blood-soul is hardly compatible with the image and likeness of God (Gen. i. 26), or with the breath of God which makes the soul live (Gen. ii. 7). In early Greek psychology Empedocles invested the Homeric blood-soul with the power of thought (αἷμα γὰρ ἀνθρώποις περικάρδιόν ἐστι νόημα, in Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. 1026; see Ritter and Preller, § 177); but this fancy, though it was not forgotten (Arist. *de Anima*, 2; Bekker, p. 405b; Cic. *Tusc. Quaest.* i. 9. 19; Virg. *Georg.* ii. 484), did not find favour with philosophers or with religious men. Strangely enough it was adopted by the materialist Tertullian (*de Anima*, 15; see Oehler's note). But it was not seriously taken by the heathen world, nor is it of any moment except for the archaeology of the Bible. By the Rabbis the blood-soul, the Nephesh, was distinguished from Ruach and Neshamah as σάρξ, ψυχή, πνεῦμα are distinguished by Philo (see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 58 sqq.; and Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 240).

The Blood then appears to signify the Life only, or mainly, in a peculiar and limited sense. But the common phrase the blood of Abel, of Naboth, of the saints, unquestionably denotes the death of the persons indicated.

In the New Testament, if we take Apoc. v. 9, ἐσφάγης καὶ ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου: Acts xx. 28, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου (Θεοῦ) ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου: Col. i. 20, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ: or Rom. v. 8-10, where Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν answers to δικαιοθῆναι ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, or

καταλλαγῆναι διὰ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, while ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ corresponds to σωθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, it seems evident that where Ransom, Purchase, or Reconciliation are in question, the Blood of Christ means His Passion. In other connexions than that of the Atonement there can be no doubt that αἷμα means death and not life. See Matt. xxvii. 24, 25; Acts v. 28 (where the Blood of Christ is spoken of by Pilate or the Jews); Matt. xxiii. 35; Luke xi. 51; Acts xviii. 6, xx. 26; Apoc. vi. 10.

As regards the Eucharist, Christ's Blood is called the Blood of the New Covenant, Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26; and here again the phrase is explained of the Death by St. Paul and in Heb. ix. 16, 17.

One aspect of the Eucharist is that of a feast upon a Sacrifice (John vi., probably; 1 Cor. v. 7, x. 20, 21; Heb. xiii. 10). Here Christ becomes our Food, filling us with new life, and for this purpose commands us to do what the old worshippers were forbidden to do. Here not the Blood alone, but the Body and the Blood, are a symbol of life, in so far as they are a symbol of the Incarnation. Yet the two are separate as in Death; the remembrance of a Death, and of a particular kind of violent Death, is forced upon us as of primary significance. The Death is more than an accident of Christ's Humanity; it makes the Christian life, let us not say available, but possible.

(2) The material cause of Atonement under the law was the blood-soul: Lev. xvii. 11, "For the life of the soul is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your soul; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the soul." The blood-soul of the victim was destroyed in sacrifice. What made atonement for the worshipper was not the abiding life, but the innocent death and unmerited suffering of the victim. That the Blood of Christ was united to a perfect human and divine consciousness seems to make no difference as regards this particular point, though the fact vastly enhances the efficacy of the Cross in other respects. We can hardly understand 1 Peter without attributing to the author the belief that suffering is distinct from obedience, and that innocent, cheerful suffering has in itself a power for good, for ourselves and for others. In other words, that it is an expiation, and moves the mind both of God and of man. But this will appear more clearly as we come to the passages in question.

These three clauses are expanded in the following verses (πρόγνωσις, 3-12; ἁγιασμός, 13-17; and the αἷμα Χριστοῦ, interwoven with ἁγιασμός and ὑπακοή, 18-25). Indeed, the whole Epistle is a commentary upon them. It is exceedingly difficult to see any foundation for Dr. Harnack's suspicion that the Address is a later addition to the Epistle.

χάρις. See i. 10, 13, ii. 19, iii. 7, iv. 10, and Introduction, p. 39. **εἰρήνη.** For the use of this word in the address of a letter, see 2 Esdr. iv. 17, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς Ῥεοῦμ . . . εἰρήνην. In the addresses of the letter of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, Dan. iii. 31, vi. 25, we have εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθεῖη. The same verb is added in 2 Peter and Jude; in Clem. Rom. i.; Polycarp, 1; *Mart. Polyc.* 1; *Const. Apost.* i. 1. The expression is borrowed from Daniel, but 1 Peter is probably the original of all the other uses.

3. εὐλογητός. The blessing of God immediately after the address appears to have been a regular formula in Jewish letters; see Introduction, p. 16. There is therefore no sufficient reason for supposing that St. Peter is here imitating 2 Cor. or Eph. Dr. Hort notices that "thanksgiving (εὐχαριστώ, in 2 Tim. χάριν ἔχω) stands for blessing in the corresponding place of St. Paul's other Epistles, except Gal., 1 Tim., Titus." Similar blessings are found in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms (Gen. ix. 26; Dan. iii. 28; Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 20; cf. Luke i. 68). They are of essentially Hebraistic type; instances of their use in the temple worship are given in Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae* on Matt. vi. 13, and they are very common in Jewish prayer-books (see F. H. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*). The form is rare in the liturgical portions of early Christian literature; but see the Liturgies of Clement, St. James, and St. Chrysostom (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 19, 32, 341). Dr. Hort observes that in the LXX. εὐλογητός is nearly always used of God, εὐλογημένος nearly always of men, adding that the distinction exists only in the Greek Version, the same Hebrew word being found in all cases. Εὐλογητός means rather "worthy of blessing" than blessed, *benedicendus* rather than *benedictus*; but the distinction is late and artificial, and has not been preserved in Latin or in any modern Western language. Indeed, what the Septuagint translators wanted to bring out, the difference between the natural excellence of God and the derived excellence of man, is hardly capable of expression in a single word. God is always blessed, because He is perfect, and all creation praises Him; if man were dumb, the stones would cry out. Man is only conditionally blessed, by God or by his fellow-men. But, as blessing is an act and as such contingent, we may raise the question whether blessedness is an attribute or an accident of the divine perfection, and upon this depends the further question whether we are here to supply *ἐστίν* or *εἶη*.

ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." See 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Rom. xv. 6. For the phrase God of Jesus, cf. Matt. xxvii. 46; John xx. 17; Eph. i. 17; Heb. i. 9; Apoc. i. 6, iii. 2, 12. It will be observed that the phrase is found in the same Gospel in which we read "the Word was God." It may be explained by reference to "the days of His

flesh," Heb. v. 7 (where the writer is thinking of our Lord's prayer to the Father in the Garden of Gethsemane ; see Westcott's note there), but St. Peter does not feel it necessary to give any explanation.

τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν is a translation of the Aramaic Maran (1 Cor. xvi. 22) or Marana. The title is one of great interest and importance, but its history involves much difficulty. The κύριε by which the disciples addressed Christ in His lifetime appears generally to stand for Rabbi or Rabboni (the Ribbon of the Targums); these words actually occur in Matt. xxiii. 8, xxvi. 25, 49; Mark x. 51; John xx. 16. Rabbi (=my great one) does not mean teacher, though, as an expression of extraordinary respect, it was given to teachers of great eminence; but the evangelists use διδάσκαλος as its equivalent (Luke six times renders it by ἐπιστάτης, Matthew once by καθηγητής, xxiii. 10). By what title the disciples generally spoke of Christ to other people, or to one another, is less clear; but if we compare Matt. xxi. 3, ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν χρεῖαν ἔχει, with Matt. xxvi. 18, ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, this also may have been Rabbi. Dalman, however, thinks that Maran was used in these cases. Of the evangelists, Matthew never calls Jesus ὁ Κύριος; Mark never, except in the disputed last verses, xvi. 19, 20; Luke eleven times (see Plummer, p. xxxi, and on v. 17); John five times, iv. 1, vi. 23, xi. 2, xx. 20, xxi. 12.

Maran could hardly have come into general use after the Resurrection, unless it had been employed on occasion before that date; and in the Gospels we can distinguish several groups of instances where it is more likely to be the word represented by κύριος than Rabbi. The first is to be found in what we may call the Hymns of the Nativity in St. Luke's Gospel, i. 43, ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου: ii. 11, σωτήρ ὃς ἐστὶ Χριστὸς Κύριος. The second is connected with the mission of John the Baptist: Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27, we read Ἰδοῦ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου (Mal. iii. 1 has πρὸ προσώπου μου). The Lord, therefore, before whose face John the Baptist was sent, is identified with Christ, cf. Luke i. 76; and probably the words of Isaiah, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3; Luke iii. 4; John i. 23, are understood by the evangelists in the same sense. A third meets us in the accounts of the miracles in St. Matthew, Κύριε, υἱὲ Δαβίδ, xv. 22, xx. 30; or in Luke v. 12, Κύριε, εἰάν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι: v. 8, ἐξέλιθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰμι, Κύριε (this passage in which "Lord" is contrasted with "sinner" is particularly noticeable); again, in Mark vii. 28, where it may be observed that the vocative Κύριε does not occur elsewhere in Mark's Gospel, except as a variant in ix. 24, in the account of another miracle. A fourth is found in the parables of Judgment, Matt. xxiv. 42, xxv. 11, 37; in the last passage He who is addressed as κύριε, had just been described as βασιλεύς. A fifth, again, after the

Resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 6, ἴδετε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο ὁ Κύριος (words of the angels): Luke xxiv. 3, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ: 34, ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ Κύριος: John xx. 28, ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου: xxi. 7, 12.

Mari (my Lord) or Maran (our Lord) is a title of high dignity. It is applied in Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar and to God. In the Syriac versions of the Old Testament it represents the Hebrew Adon or Adonai, and is used of Abraham, of the king, or of God. In the Syriac of the New Testament it is used of Pontius Pilate, Matt. xxvii. 63, and of Christ wherever κύριος occurs in the Greek. Immediately after the Resurrection it appears to have been in general use among those Christians who spoke Aramaic; and there is little doubt that the title was addressed to, and accepted by, Christ in His lifetime. Dalman says that after the Resurrection Christ declined the Rabboni of Mary and approved the ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεός of Thomas; and this was probably the sentiment of the Church. Maran has a considerable range of meaning. If we suppose it to have been the word actually employed in the third and fourth groups, it is connected with deep moral awe, supernatural power, and the quality of Judge; the last meaning attaches to it also in 1 Cor. xvi. 22. That it was so employed is rendered probable by the fact that in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 21, 22) Christ not only accepts the title Κύριος, but connects it with the power of the Name, in particular with prophecy and with the casting out of evil spirits. Compare Matt. x. 24 sqq.; John xiii. 13, where also He accepts the title, and distinguishes it from διδάσκαλος or Rabbi. In the first and second groups it comes very near to Jehovah. The Hymns of the Nativity appear to be taken from a Hebrew document which is probably the oldest source of St. Luke's Gospel. St. Luke regarded them as contemporaneous and authentic. Professor Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 57) thinks that the Gospel was written before the spring of 59; and it may be surmised that these Hymns were in existence before the Crucifixion, for they still speak of Messiah as a conquering Prince (Luke i. 71, 74). At any rate, the identification of Christ with the Lord before whose face John Baptist was sent, appears to have been made by Jews, and, probably, by Jews of Jerusalem.

From the Gospels we may infer that Maran was often used even before the Resurrection, that it was sanctioned by Christ Himself, that it carried with it certain superhuman associations, and that it was connected with the power of "the Name." It would bear different senses to different persons at different times, and its full force is not reached before John xx. 28. In Acts "the name of the Lord," "the name of Jesus," "Lord," "the Lord," are hardly distinguishable; and here we are still among Hebrew Jews, so that heathen usages can have had little or no influence. The same thing

is true of the Epistles of the Hebrew St. Paul, who goes so far as to say that there is "one Lord" (1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. iv. 5). We are not to suppose that the apostles identified Christ with Jehovah; there were passages which made this impossible, for instance, Ps. cx. 1; Mal. iii. 1, and, in later writers, Gen. xix. 24. It was God who gave Jesus "the Name which is above every name" (Phil. ii. 9), who "made" (not "hath made," as R.V.) Jesus Lord (Acts ii. 36). In both places the human appellation "Jesus" is used of Him who was thus exalted. But passages which belong to Jehovah are frequently interpreted of Christ. "The Father" always and "God" generally retain a distinct meaning, but "Lord" has practically ceased to do so. The early Church, in fact, interpreted strictly the words of Christ. The Son reveals the Father, and to Him belongs all Revelation, whether of the New Testament or of the Old. It is easy to see how Sabellianism arose out of the New Testament, though the present passage, among many others, forbids that mode of interpretation. See for this subject Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu*.

ἔλεος. The God and Father, in accordance with His abounding mercy, begat us anew, regenerated us, became for a second time our God and Father. In St. Paul's eyes also the admission of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 30-32, xv. 9), and of Jews and Gentiles alike (Eph. ii. 4, 5), into the Church is due to the rich mercy of God. But there is a difference to be observed. In the Pauline passages God has mercy upon the infirmity of the human will, which cannot satisfy the law of works. Hence He provides a better way, the gospel of free grace. St. Peter's meaning is that God has compassion on our misery. Hence He gives us a gospel, which tells us that suffering is the road to glory. The mercy is the simple human sympathy of Christ, who would not send the multitude away fasting, because He had compassion on them (Matt. xv. 32).

ἀναγενήσας. The verb occurs as a doubtful variant in Sirach, prol. 20, ἀναγεννηθεῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον (A B have παραγενηθεῖς εἰς). Ἀναγέννησις is found in Philo, *de incorr. mundi*, 3 (ii. 490), of the rebirth of the physical world. Later the term *renatus* is used of those who have received the baptism of blood in the Taurobolium (Hort refers to Orelli-Henzen, 2352, 6041), or have been initiated in the mysteries of Isis, Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 26. It was probably borrowed by the New Paganism from Christianity. In John iii. 3 many ancient authorities take ἀνωθεν to mean "again," and Dr. Westcott thinks this the correct translation. Irenaeus, referring to John iii. 5, uses ἀναγεννηθῆναι for γεννηθῆναι (Stieren, i. p. 846), possibly only by a slip of memory; but the Old Latin and Vulgate have *renatus fuerit*. See Tischendorf's note. There is no good reason for thinking that ἀναγεννηθῆναι was found in any Greek MSS. of John. In later times ἀναγεννᾶν is commonly used of baptism (Justin, *Apol.*

i. 51; *Clem. Hom.* xi. 26; see Suicer, *s.v.* Ἀναγέννησις), and we need not doubt that the word is taken from 1 Peter. But it was suggested to St. Peter by the saying of our Lord recorded by St. John, and goes to show that ἀνωθεν really does mean “again,” and not “from above.”

εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν. The first result of the new birth and the first characteristic of the new pilgrim life is Hope (the anchor of the soul, Heb. vi. 19). Hope is living (cf. i. 23, ii. 4, 5), not merely because it is active (ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργής, Heb. iv. 12), nor merely because it is a hope of life, but because it is divine and eternal, given through the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and bound up with His eternal life. Cf. John iv. 10, vi. 51; Acts vii. 38; Apoc. vii. 17, and the fine lines of Sophocles, *Ant.* 456 sq., οὐ γὰρ τι νῦν γε κάχθεις, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ποτε ζῆ ταῦτα κοῦδεὶς οἶδεν ἐξ ὄπου φάνη.

4. εἰς κληρονομίαν. The pilgrim's hope is further defined by its object, the inheritance, or rather the paternal estate, the *patrimonium*, not the *hereditas*. Dr. Hort notes that the Hebrew words chiefly represented by κληρονομία in the Old Testament denote, not hereditary succession, but “sanctioned and settled possession,” and is inclined to doubt whether any idea of futurity is implied in St. Peter's phrase. Even in Greek κληρονομία means a property already received as well as one that is expected. But in the present passage the κληρονομία is kept for the believer, not on earth, but in heaven, and is another name for that salvation which is ready to be revealed.

The patrimony, the kingdom, may be spoken of in different ways. In part it is already present, in fulness it is yet to come. To some the present joy seems far more than to others, as to St. Paul (Col. i. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 18), or to St. John (iii. 36); but even the most enthusiastic spirits feel at times as a heavy burden the imperfection of the present, and in St. Peter this is the dominant key. We must therefore hold firmly to the future sense here. The pilgrim, stranger, sojourner, sees in hope the Promised Land, but sees it afar off, and his prayer is “Thy Kingdom come.”

The patrimony is ἀφθαρτος, ἀμίαντος, ἀμάραντος. Ἀφθαρτος means incorruptible, immaterial, spiritual, eternal. Ἀμίαντος (in Hebrews, James, Wisdom, 2 Macc.), incapable of pollution. Cf. Apoc. xxi. 27 for the sense; for the word, Lev. xviii. 27, ἐμίανθη ἡ γῆ—the land was defiled by the abominations of the Canaanites. Ἀμάραντος (in Wisd. vi. 12; here only in New Testament), of a flower that never fades. Dr. Hort thinks that ἀφθαρτος means “never ravaged by a foe,” but gives no instance of this use of the word.

τετηρημένην. “Which hath been (and is) kept in heaven for you” (εἰς ὑμᾶς = ὑμῖν: cf. Luke xv. 22, ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας). Those who regard the κληρονομία as present in fruition (as Dr. Hort and von Soden) must translate “until you”—kept until your

appearance but now bestowed. But this sense appears to be foreign to our passage, and "until you," for "until your days," is a very singular, if not impossible use of the preposition. *Οὐρανοῖς*, "In heaven": the plural has no more significance here than in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 9. There may be a reminiscence here of the Book of Enoch xlvi. 7, "And the wisdom of the Lord of spirits hath revealed him to the holy and righteous, for he preserveth the lot of the righteous": lviii. 5, "And after that it will be said to the holy that they should seek in heaven the secrets of righteousness, the heritage of faith" (see notes in Mr. Charles' edition).

5. *τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρούμενους διὰ πίστεως*. "Who in (or by) the power of God are guarded by faith." *Φρουρεῖν* means "to keep a city safe with a garrison." Here faith is the garrison which keeps the soul (or the Church) safe till its Lord comes and raises the siege. Cf. Phil. iv. 7, where the heart is guarded or garrisoned by "the peace of God."

On St. Peter's conception of faith, and its difference from that of St. Paul, see Introduction, § 6. There is no word as to which it is more important not to read the thought of the one apostle into the language of the other. Faith here, as in Heb. xi., is the power by which we grasp the unseen realities, the conviction that God is, that He is a Rewarder, and that His reward far exceeds the troubles of this life. It is "firm trust in God in spite of suffering: the salvation of his soul the Christian will receive only as τέλος τῆς πίστεως" (Kühl, von Soden). It produces "endurance to the end," unshaken by offences, false prophets, or lawlessness, Matt. xxiv. 10-13; by it we resist the devil, and the *παθήματα* which he brings against us (1 Pet. v. 9). There are several points of importance. In St. Peter's mind faith is not the faith of Abraham only, but of Moses; it does not justify or save, but is the condition of righteousness and salvation (see especially iv. 17-19); it is not so intimately connected, as by St. Paul, with love and knowledge, carrying with it only the germ of both, and hence it lends itself more easily to the notions of authority and discipline. Its object is God, but God is seen without rather than felt within. This has been called an attenuation (*Entleerung*) of faith; and certainly it differs widely from the Pauline idea, leading to a different practical shaping of the Christian society, as was seen, though not quite distinctly, by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. But when it is called an attenuation, it is implied that it is not an evangelical view of faith; and this is highly questionable. It will be observed that much of the element of futurity attaches to faith itself; it is largely faith in the distant and as yet unknown; hence it is intimately related, as in Hebrews, to hope.

σωτηρίαν. Salvation or rather Deliverance, another aspect of that patrimony which is the object of Hope; in Heb. i. 14 we read

τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν. Salvation itself is here regarded as future, and this is the general sense (σωτηρία is not used by St. John except iv. 22 and in Apoc.). In the Gospels σώζειν means to deliver (*a*) from danger, Matt. viii. 25; John xii. 27; (*b*) from disease, Matt. ix. 21; John xi. 12; (*c*) from the condemnation of God, Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 13; (*d*) from the disease or danger of sin, Matt. i. 21; and one or other of these senses attaches to the verb wherever it recurs. In the present passage it is used of the great final deliverance, not from the wrath of God (Rom. v. 9; cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 18), but from the siege of Satan, from persecution and sorrow.

The Deliverance is ready to be revealed in the day when Jesus Christ Himself will be revealed (i. 7, 13). The epithet "ready" introduces a consoling thought, reminding them how short a time these sufferings will endure (the End is not far off, iv. 7), and that the Deliverer stands waiting for them.

ἐν καιρῷ ἔσχατῳ. "In the last time." The exact phrase καιρὸς ἔσχατος is not elsewhere found. In St. John's Gospel we find ἐν τῇ ἔσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ (vi. 39, and in five other places): in Acts, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔσχαταις (ii. 17, from Joel iii. 1): in Jas. v. 3 and 2 Tim. iii. 1, ἐν ἡμέραις ἔσχαταις (from Joel, or, as Dr. Hort thinks, from Prov. xxix. 44): in Heb. i. 2, ἐπ' ἔσχατου τῶν ἡμερῶν: in 2 Pet. iii. 3, ἐπ' ἔσχατων τῶν ἡμερῶν: in Jude 18, ἐπ' ἔσχατου χρόνου: in 1 John ii. 18, ἔσχατῃ ὥρᾳ. The Last Day is the Day of Judgment; the Last Days, Time, Hour are either the age of the Christian dispensation or that portion of it which lies nearest to the End, when the signs of the Parousia are beginning to show themselves. Either the first or the last of these meanings must be that of St. Peter. He may mean "in the last time," that is to say, in the Day of the Parousia. Καιρὸς means not "time" but "the time," the fit or appointed time or season for some particular thing, whether it be a period or a moment. It might be used quite correctly of the Day of Judgment, and this is not an impossible explanation here. Many commentators, however, regard the phrase as meaning "in the last days," in the time of darkness and suffering. The Parousia puts an end to the suffering, but, coming suddenly, may be said to come in the midst of it all. Upon the whole this appears to be the best explanation. Dr. Hort translates "in a season of extremity," ὁ ἔσχατος καιρὸς being used in Polybius and Plutarch for "the direst peril." But in all the analogous New Testament phrases ἔσχατος means simply "last in order of time," and the absence of the article cannot be pressed.

6. ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε . . . πειρασμοῖς. "In which ye exult, though just now for a little while ye were grieved, if need were, by manifold trials." Ἐν must here be temporal, as in iv. 13 below; cf. Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 24. Ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι ἐν in the sense of to exult *at* or *over* is not found in the New Testament (in John v. 35, ἀγαλλιασθῆναι ἐν

τῷ φωτί, the preposition has its local sense "in the light," and the same observation applies to the reading of D in Luke x. 21 and to iv. 13 below), though it must be admitted that χαίρειν ἐν is sometimes used for "to rejoice at," Luke x. 20; Phil. i. 18; Col. i. 24; see Blass, p. 118. The antecedent is best found in καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ. "In the last days" the brethren exult because their sufferings are so nearly at an end, and deliverance and glory are so near. Compare Luke xxi. 28, ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι (when the troubles that precede the end show themselves) ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν· διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν: Matt. v. 11, 12, μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν . . . χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε· ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. These latter words may have been in St. Peter's mind, if we consider how immediately the phrase τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς has preceded, and look also at iii. 13, εἰ καὶ πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην μακάριοι. There is no real contradiction between this verse and iv. 13, χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι. Ἀγαλλίασις belongs to the Revelation of glory, but living hope makes it present even in the midst of suffering. The aorist λυπηθέντες is to be taken, not of the pain, but of the mental distress caused by persecution. The pain still endures, but the grief, the perplexity, the sense of abandonment are gone for those who understand what these παθήματα mean. Kühl and von Soden take ἐν ᾧ as neuter, and find the antecedent in the contents of the preceding clause, "in which assurance ye do rejoice." Dr. Hort makes the relative masculine, and refers it to Θεός or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. In either case we must give ἐν a sense which it can hardly bear.

εἰ δέον. "If need was"; if it was God's will. This is probably the right reading (so \aleph B, c^{80r}, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 20. 129): εἰ δέον ἐστὶ has good authority (A C K L P, Origen), but is very difficult grammatically; we should certainly have expected εἰ δέον ἐστὶ λυπούμενοι.

ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς. "In manifold trials," in different kinds of trial. This sense of ποικίλος is found in the New Testament, in Maccabees, and in Aelian (*V. H.* 98), but is almost unknown in classical Greek (Hort). Πειρασμός here means not the inner wrestling with evil inclination, but undeserved suffering from without. This is the general sense of the word in the Old Testament and even in the New. See Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 71 sqq. What we mean by "temptation," as distinct from "trial," is in the language of St. Paul expressed by ἁμαρτία or ἐπιθυμία, in that of St. Peter by the latter word alone.

7. ἵνα introduces the divine purpose of λυπηθέντες.

τὸ δοκιμῖον. The substantive δοκιμῖον or δοκιμῆιον means "a test," that is to say, a thing used for testing; and in Jas. i. 3 manifold trials are perhaps called the test or touchstone of faith;

but the meaning may be "the testing" of your faith worketh patience. In Prov. xxvii. 21, *δοκίμιον ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσῷ πύρωσις*, the word seems to mean "testing" rather than "test," for *πύρωσις* denotes a method, not a thing. But in Ps. xi. (xii.) 6, *τὰ λόγια κυρίου λόγια ἀγνά, ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον, δοκίμιον τῆ γῆ, κεκαθαρισμένον ἑπταπλασίως*, the word is evidently an adjective. St. Peter was probably thinking of one or the other or both of these passages (see *πύρωσις* below, iv. 12). "Test" is here a quite impossible rendering; the means by which faith is tested is suffering, and suffering cannot be called more precious than gold, nor is it "found" in the Last Day. "The testing of your faith," for the same reasons, is hardly, if at all, less impossible. We are driven, therefore, to take *δοκίμιον* here as adjectival, and to translate "the tested residue of your faith," that faith which remains when all impure alloy has been burnt away. There is a variant *δόκιμον* found in a few cursives, which Dr. Hort is inclined to accept as the right reading. Otherwise, the passage above quoted from Psalms may justify us in regarding *δοκίμιος* as a vulgar by-form of *δόκιμος*.

If St. Peter's expression here was suggested by a passage, or by a combination of two passages from the Old Testament, it becomes probable that the phrase of St. James is borrowed from that found in our Epistle.

χρυσίου. "Than gold that perisheth, yet is always tested, refined, by fire." What we might have expected is *χρυσίου διὰ πυρὸς δεδοκιμασμένον*: but the writer has complicated his expression by the sudden introduction of *ἀπολλυμένου*, implying a reason for *πολυτιμότερον*, or a contrast to the following *εἰρεθῆ*. Faith is eternal, gold is perishable and temporal. Faith is far more precious than gold, yet even gold must be refined by fire; much more your faith.

εἰρεθῆ. "May be found," may endure when other things pass away, and appear when they disappear. Compare the use of the word in Phil. iii. 9; Heb. xi. 5, from Gen. v. 24, and possibly 2 Pet. iii. 10. It means much more than "may prove to be," or "may result in"; it is not man, but God who "finds."

εἰς ἔπαινον. The praise is, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," Matt. xxv. 21. Praise is spoken of as bestowed by God upon man, 4 Macc. xiii. 3; Rom. ii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 5. The phrase is quite as simple and natural in the mouth of St. Peter, who speaks of good conduct as *χάρις παρὰ Θεῶ* (below, ii. 20), as it is in the Gospel.

δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν. Heb. i. 3; Ps. viii. 6, *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανώσας αὐτόν*. Glory and honour belong to God (Job xl. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17), but He bestows them on man (Rom. ii. 7, 10).

ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. i. 13, iv. 13; the phrase is suggested by Luke xvii. 30, *ἢ ἡμέρα ὃ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτ-*

ται, and is used also by St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7. In all these passages it denotes the revelation of Christ in His majesty as Judge and Rewarder. Here it appears to repeat and define the idea involved in the words *εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐποίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ*.

8. *ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες . . . δεδοξασμένη*. "Whom, though ye never saw Him, ye love; in whom believing, though now ye see Him not, ye rejoice with joy unutterable and glorified." A K L P, Clem. Alex. and some other Fathers with the Coptic version have *οὐκ εἰδότες*, "though ye never knew Him"; for this use of *οἶδα* cf. Matt. xxv. 12, Luke xxii. 57. *Εἰς ὃν* belongs in construction to *πιστεύοντες* only, so that *ὁρῶντες* is left without an object. A similar irregularity is found in ii. 12; see note there. *Μή* is used with *ὁρῶντες*, though, according to classical usage, *οὐ* would be required. Attempts have been made to distinguish the negatives in this passage. In modern Greek *ὄχι* (= *οὐχί*) with participle is adversative, while *μή* is causal (Geldart, *Guide to Modern Greek*, p. 73). Hence Mr. W. H. Simcox would translate here "though ye have not seen," "because ye do not see" (*Language of the New Testament*, p. 187). But the participles here are both adversative. The nice classical rules for the use of *οὐ* and *μή* were not understood even by Lucian, and in the vulgar Greek of the New Testament the use of *οὐ* with the participle has almost disappeared. There are but about thirteen instances of it altogether, and if we take the Gospel of St. Matthew, *μή* with the participle occurs sixteen times, *οὐ* once (xxii. 11); in St. Luke, *οὐ* once. See Blass, p. 253. For the contrast of faith and sight, cf. John xx. 29; 2 Cor. v. 7; Heb. xi. 1.

The whole passage (6-9) has caused much trouble, because from the whole tone of the Epistle it seems strange that St. Peter should tell his readers that they actually do "exult" in the midst of all their sufferings. Such language appears to contradict the very object with which he wrote. That this difficulty is not merely fanciful, is shown by the number and character of the commentators who have felt it. Yet others have not felt it; for instance, Leighton, who says, "Even in the midst of heaviness itself, such is this joy that it can maintain itself in the midst of sorrow; this oil of gladness still swims above, and cannot be drowned by all the floods of affliction, yea, it is often most sweet in the greatest distress." We can understand a pastor exhorting his flock to stand fast in trouble, and at the same time reminding them that they have a wellspring of joy and even of exultation in their living hope. The alternative to the explanation given above seems to be to take *ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ* of the Last Day and make the first *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* imperative. But the second *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* must be indicative (for *ἀγαπᾶτε* certainly is so), and thus we should only stave off the difficulty for a moment. Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Luther, and others, including

Alford, take ἀγαλλιᾶσθε as present indicative, but regard it as bearing a future sense in both places; but this is harsh, even if possible, and again ἀγαπᾶτε stands in the way. The text of the passage is not free from doubt. In ver. 6 there is some evidence for ἀγαλλιᾶσεσθε, λυπηθῆναι (see Tischendorf), and in ver. 8 ἀγαλλιᾶτε has good authority. Polycarp, *Phil.* 1, quotes ver. 8 in an abbreviated form, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένη. Irenaeus, iv. 9. 2, v. 7. 2, has *quem quum non uideritis diligitis; in quem nunc quoque non uidentes creditis, credentes autem exsultabitis gaudio inenarrabili* (ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὄροντες πιστεύετε, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσεσθε). The same reading is found in the old Latin version of Polycarp. Augustine, *Pecc. Mer.* 1, has *quem ignorabatis; in quem modo non uidentes creditis; quem cum uideritis exsultabitis* (ὃν οὐκ εἰδότες, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὄροντες πιστεύετε ὃν ἰδόντες ἀγαλλιᾶσεσθε). Origen, the Vulgate, Peshito, and the Armenian appear to have read ἀγαλλιᾶσεσθε, and it would certainly remove a difficulty if the future could be established.

ἀνεκκαλήτῳ. "Unutterable." The word is found here only in the Bible, but recurs in Ignatius, *Eph.* xix. 2, and in Polycarp in his quotation of this passage. Ἀλάλητος is used by St. Paul, Rom. viii. 26. The Christian joy is unutterable because it is spiritual, heavenly, passing all human speech and understanding, like the peace of God (Phil. iv. 7); but also because it is so paradoxical: it is a joy in the midst of sorrow.

δεδοξασμένη. "Glorified." Glory in its fulness is bestowed when suffering is over (τὰ παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας); but even here and now, in the midst of trials, the joy of the Christian sufferer is irradiated by that glory which will be given in the Revelation. The Spirit who rests upon him is the Spirit of glory (iv. 14); hence he can glorify God by meek endurance (iv. 16), and teach others also to glorify Him (ii. 12).

θ. κομιζόμενοι. "Receiving the end of your faith, the deliverance of your souls." The absence of the articles with σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν appears to have no significance. The participle "receiving" is to be taken as meaning "because ye receive." Deliverance is the ground of the joy, as in Apoc. v. 9 and elsewhere. Dr. Hort, however, makes the participle co-ordinate with the verb—"ye rejoice and also receive"—on the ground that "exultation in Jesus Christ cannot be a mere joy about the saving of their own souls." But this thought would hardly have occurred to St. Peter. The deliverance delivers from all pain and sorrow, and is open to all. Kühn points out that κομιζεσθαι is used in the New Testament of receiving that which has been promised, that which men have earned by their conduct (see references in Bruder). Deliverance is the end of your faith (or of faith, or perhaps of the faith; B and many Fathers omit ὑμῶν). It is the great promise involved in the

name of Jesus, the object of belief, the end of the life of pilgrimage, the entry into the Promised Land. It is described as future (i. 5, 13, v. 4); but even in this life of trial there are "good days" (iii. 10). Besides, the gospel *is* deliverance. Hence we are said to receive now, in a foretaste, the reward which will be fully bestowed in the Revelation. *Ψυχή* in St. Peter's usage denotes the whole inner nature of man, as in Greek philosophy, in common Greek parlance, in the Gospels and Acts, and is never opposed, as it is by St. Paul, to *πνεῦμα* or *νοῦς*. See Introduction, p. 40.

10. *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας*. St. Peter lingers upon the word *σωτηρία*, at each repetition finding something new to say about it. Here the word is practically an equivalent for the gospel, which was revealed to the prophets by the Spirit of Christ, and of which the main substance is the sufferings of Christ and the glory for Himself and others (*δόξαι*, plural), in which those sufferings result.

ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν. The phrase is perhaps a reminiscence of 1 Macc. ix. 26. In the New Testament the form *ἐραννάω* is to be preferred to the classic *ἐρευνάω*. See Blass, p. 21.

προφήται. Again the omission of the article appears to be insignificant; the word is adequately defined by the following clause, and it is quite needless to translate (with Kühn and Hort) "even prophets," so as to get the sense "even men so highly favoured as prophets saw these great things dimly and afar off" (see note on ver. 17 below).

περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος. "About the grace intended for you, which should be given unto you," cf. *εἰς ὑμᾶς* above, ver. 4. *Χάρις* here is not "grace," but "a grace," a favour or gift of grace, and in 1 Peter the word usually bears this meaning.

11. *ἐραυνῶντες . . . δόξας*. "Searching for what time or for what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did declare and testify beforehand the sufferings appointed for Christ, and the glories that should follow them." The best construction for *ἐδήλου* is found by taking it as governing *τὰ παθήματα* in conjunction with *προμαρτυρούμενον* (so most of the German commentators and Hort). *Δηλοῦν εἰς καιρόν*, "to point to a season," appears to be quite unexampled; but this is the translation of the A.V., Alford, and many others. Nevertheless, *εἰς καιρόν* has a certain connexion with *ἐδήλου*: the Spirit pointed out the sufferings for a particular time. Kühn and others regard *ἐδήλου* as standing without any object; but it is difficult to see how the word is to be rendered here at all on this supposition. *Προμαρτυρούμενον* (the word is not attested elsewhere till after St. Peter's time) ought to mean "calling to witness beforehand" (see Dr. Hort's note). If this sense is to be kept here, we must translate "the Spirit of Christ pointed out the sufferings that should come upon Christ, calling God for a witness of the truth." But though *μαρτύρομαι* may be used without an

object (=I protest, I appeal; see references in Liddell and Scott), there is always something in the context to show that an appeal is made, and to whom it is made. And this is not the case here. In Acts xx. 23, 24, *διαμαρτύρεσθαι* means "to bear clear witness" (cf. Luke xvi. 28; Acts ii. 40, viii. 25, x. 42, xviii. 5; Heb. ii. 6); indeed, this word constantly has the meaning of "to affirm solemnly," "attest," though it is used with an indistinct reminiscence of its proper sense in 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1. The Greek of the New Testament is not correct, even as correctness was understood by Epictetus or Plutarch; we have observed already that it does not clearly retain the distinction between *ὄν* and *μή*, and it is not surprising that it should confuse *μαρτύρεσθαι* with *μαρτυρεῖν*. See note on *δοκίμιον* above.

The prophets knew what they prophesied; they knew not, and sought to understand, at what appointed date, or in what stage of the world's history, in what kind of time (*ποῖον καιρόν*), the prophecy would be fulfilled. Alford quotes Justiniani: "non modo *quod* . . . sed etiam *quale* . . . pacisne an belli tempore, seruitutis an libertatis, quo denique reipublicae statu . . . Et quidem David *Orietur*, ait, *in diebus eius iustitia et abundantia pacis* (Ps. lxxi. 7, Vulgate): et in eandem sententiam Esaias *conflabunt gladios suos in uomeres*" (ii. 4). Some not unnatural difficulty has been found in the words *ἐξεζήτησαν, ἐξηραίνησαν, ἐραυνῶντες*, which all express study and reflexion, and seem to be inconsistent with the notion of inspiration. Yet the difficulty is only apparent. The great revelation of suffering and glory awakes an eager desire to know when and how these things shall be, and this is answered by a further revelation (*οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη*). "Knock, and it shall be opened unto you," was in some sense true, even of the prophets. So St. Paul prayed for the removal of his *σκόλοψ*, and at last an answer came; not the answer that he hoped for (2 Cor. xii. 7-9). The revelation described in Acts xiii. 2 was also probably a reply to much anxious thought. Both in the Old Testament and in the New, God often answers questions. The connexion between study and inspiration, search and discovery, is a great mystery, and revelation may be much more common than we suppose. How does one investigator discover what others do not? Philo thought (*de migr. Abr.* 7, i. 441) that philosophic truth was given by inspiration—"I was suddenly filled with thoughts showered upon me from above like snowflakes or seed"—and this may apply to all truth; for it is certainly not attained by the mere use of logical machinery. Nor does this thought detract from the dignity of spiritual revelation, which, though the noblest in kind, may yet have its analogies.

The words *τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* must be accepted quite frankly. Christ was in the prophets, and from Him came their inspiration. Barnabas (v.) understood St. Peter in this sense, *οἱ*

προφήται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν: on which Harnack notes, "Christum Veteris Testamenti prophetas inspirasse et ab iis uisum esse ad unum omnes priscae ecclesiae scriptores confitentur"; cf. 2 *Clem.* xvii. 4; Ignatius, *Mag.* viii. 2; Justin, *Apol.* i. 31-33; *Dial.* lvi. sq.; Iren. iv. 20. 4; *Frag. Mur.* 44 sq., "Romanis autem ordine (ordinem?) scripturarum, sed et principium earum Christum esse intimans" (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 536). These passages are sufficient to show the belief of the later Church. Note also the use of ῥῆμα Κυρίου, 1 Pet. i. 25, comparing Acts xi. 16, where words of Christ are called by St. Peter ῥῆμα Κυρίου. In Matt. vii. 22 we read, Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν: xxiii. 34, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας. Some difficulty attaches to the latter citation, because St. Luke, in the parallel passage (xi. 49), has διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν Ἀποστέλω εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας, and the words have been supposed to be a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv. 18-22. But in the Sermon on the Mount false Christian prophets claim to be inspired by Christ; and in the other passage of Matthew our Lord sends (inspires) true Christian prophets. No distinction of kind can be drawn between Jewish and Christian prophecy, and thus we have in the first Gospel a clear foundation for St. Peter's words. We must take into consideration also those passages of the Gospels where Christ is described as the Revealer, Matt. xi. 27; John i. 18, xvi. 14, 15. In Acts again (ii. 33), in the speech of St. Peter, Christ sheds forth the spirit of prophecy. It can hardly be thought but that St. Paul held the same view as to the source of Christian prophecy (1 Cor. xii. 3), as also does the Apocalypse (xix. 10), whether we translate ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, "the testimony given by Jesus," or "the testimony borne to Jesus"; compare also 1 John iv. 2, 3. As to the Hebrew prophets, St. Paul does not explicitly declare his opinion, but in 2 Cor. iii. 12 sqq. the glory on the face of Moses which he covered with a veil, is the glory of Christ, who is the Lord, the Spirit.

Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ probably means that Spirit which is Christ (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν . . . ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος); but it may conceivably signify the Holy Spirit of Christ, sent by Christ. Often prophecy is attributed to the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 16; 2 Pet. i. 21, and elsewhere), and the sending of the Spirit is the work of Christ (Acts ii. 33).

Certainly the repeated "Christ" in this verse must be taken each time in exactly the same sense, of the really existing Christ who was manifested in history. Kühl, in an exceedingly complicated note, takes the first of the ideal Christ, who existed only in the foreknowledge of God, and the second of the historical Christ, and makes πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ mean "a Christlike spirit," because he thinks that St. Peter is not so much affected by theological reflexions as the rabbinically educated St. Paul, and there-

fore cannot have personified the ideal. But the distinction between person and idea is itself philosophical. Dr. Hort appears to hold the same view; the Spirit of Christ is that Spirit of the Lord which afterwards came upon Christ, a Spirit of divine anointing, or Christhood, or prophethood. Here, again, we may repeat, that in 1 Peter Spirit means not an influence, but a personality. There is no need to speak of Rabbinitism or Jewish Platonism at all. St. Peter's view rests upon a perfectly unscholastic interpretation of Scripture. The Lord spoke to the Prophets; Christ is the Lord; therefore Christ spoke to the Prophets.

There is no difference upon this point between St. Peter and St. Paul. Both held the same belief, though they express it in different language.

In τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας it is quite possible that we have a reference to the words recorded by St. Luke xxiv. 26, 27, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ. Δόξαι, not commonly used in the plural (but see 2 Macc. iv. 15), may refer to the successive manifestations of Christ's glory—Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, Miracles (Acts iii. 13), Judgment—or to the glory of Christ, and the glory that shall be bestowed on His faithful. To St. Peter, the essence of the gospel seems to lie in suffering and glory; to St. Paul, in free grace and deliverance from law. Hence the former sees a just and permanent picture of the Christian life in Isa. liii., while the latter looks back, not to the prophets (except Hab. ii. 4), but to Abraham. Hence, to St. Peter, the admission of the Gentiles is no great mystery; the Church is continuous. Further, in St. Peter's view (as in the Gospels), the great obstacle to Christianity is the suffering of Christ; and so, in fact, it always has been to Jew (Justin's *Trypho*) and Greek (the *True Word* of Celsus), and in modern times, because His suffering involves our acceptance of the law of suffering. But, in the view of St. Paul, the great obstacle is the tendency of men to rely upon their own merits, which is a common and serious defect, but applies, as regards Christianity and Judaism, rather to the professor than to the faith; it could not fairly be charged against the best Jews of old, and modern Jews would not plead guilty to it. See Mr. Montefiore's *Hibbert Lectures* for 1892, especially chap. ix., "the Law and its Influence."

12. οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη. It was revealed to them that the realisation of their prophetic vision was not for their own time. The reference may be to distinct passages, such as Num. xxiv. 17; Deut. xviii. 15, or rather to the general indeterminate futurity of all prophecy. The prophets saw Messiah, and St. Peter evidently means that they saw Him with great clearness and accuracy in the broad outlines; but when they strove to know when these things should

be, an answer came, "Not yet. The promise is for others, not for you. Inquire no further." ὑμῶν δέ is the reading of the great bulk of MSS., though ἡμῶν δέ has the support of K and some versions. "For you Christians" (we need not here press the fact that they were Asiatics), or "for us Christians"; either way there is no substantial difference in the sense.

αὐτά. The substance of their vision, τὰ παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. Νῦν ἀγγέλλη: ἀγγέλλεται would be more strictly correct, but the aorist is used for the perfect, as in ii. 25 below. See Blass, p. 199.

διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς. The phrase in itself neither includes nor excludes the apostle himself.

ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. Dr. Hort omits ἐν on the authority of A B, a few cursives, the Vulgate, and some Fathers; see Tischendorf's note. "In (or by) the Holy Spirit sent from heaven." The omission of the article with Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον is very common (John xx. 22 and many other passages), and is of no significance (cf. Acts viii. 15, 18). Here the Holy Ghost who was "sent from heaven" on the day of Pentecost, and inspired the preachers of the gospel, is introduced as a guarantee that the gospel cannot contradict the message of the prophets who were inspired by the Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. Von Soden and Dr. Hort translate "by a holy spirit"; but there can hardly be any doubt that the same Spirit is meant here as in ver. 2 above, where also there is no article. Ἐξαποστέλλω is used of the sending of the Spirit in Luke xxiv. 49; in John xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, the verb is πέμπω.

εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακῦψαι. "Upon which even angels desire to look"; here the omission of the article must certainly have its proper force. Παρακῦπτειν properly means "to take a shy sidelong glance," as when one peeps out of a window or door at a person passing in the street, and is perhaps so used in Luke xxiv. 12; John xx. 5, 11. Even in Jas. i. 25 the meaning may be "he who has once cast a glance upon the perfect law of liberty"; the slightest look upon the law is sufficient to show the folly of those who hear and do not. On the other hand, James may mean "He who has gazed steadily upon the law." If we give παρακῦπτειν its classical sense here, a not inconsiderable difficulty arises. The angels are "all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation" (Heb. i. 14), and they must long for much more than a casual glance upon the Church and its gospel of suffering and glory. Ἐγκύπτειν εἰς means "to pore over," "study intently" (Clem. Rom. xl. 1 and elsewhere; see Harnack's note); and it may be thought that παρακῦπτειν εἰς is used, not quite correctly, by St. Peter and St. James, in the same sense. The use of παρακῦπτειν may have been suggested here by Enoch ix. 1, καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ τέσσαρες μεγάλοι ἀρχάγγελοι Μιχαὴλ καὶ Οὐριήλ καὶ

Ῥαφαὴλ καὶ Γαβριὴλ παρέκυσαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (quoted by Hort). Above, on ver. 4, was noticed another possible reference to Enoch, and others may be detected. They should be borne in mind, because, when we come to consider the relation of Jude to 2 Peter, it will appear that while in 1 and 2 Peter there are allusions to apocryphal books, these allusions are developed by Jude into actual quotations.

13. διό. "Wherefore"; the reference is to the general contents of vers. 3-12, which were suggested by the third Name of ver. 2. From this point to ii. 10 the author develops the meaning of ἁγιασμός.

ἀναζωσάμενοι. "Having girded up the loins of your mind"; the verb is used of gathering or tucking up long skirts by means of a belt so as to be ready for energetic action. Cf. Prov. xxix. 35, ἀναζωσαμένη ἰσχυρῶς τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτῆς, of the brave woman. Here, where νήφοντες immediately follows, St. Peter is probably thinking of our Lord's words, Luke xii. 35, 46. The word used by Luke is περιεζωσμένοι (taken probably from the account of the Passover, Ex. xii. 11). Ἀναζώννυσθαι is not common in classical Greek, though it was used by Didymus the grammarian (*Athen.* 139d), but *succingē* is well known in Latin. The word recalls the ὑπακοή of ver. 2. Those who have girded up their loins are ready for instant obedience.

διανοίας. For this word cf. Matt. xxii. 37, ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου . . . ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου (from Deut. vi. 5). St. Paul uses the word in his later Epistles (Eph. ii. 3, iv. 18; Col. i. 21), but always in a bad sense, of the mere logical faculty which sets itself against the truth. But what precisely is meant by "girding up the mind"? Girding brings the mind into what Carlyle calls "a compact frame," cutting off vague loosely flowing thoughts and speculations that lead nowhither, and only hamper obedience. Hence it is followed immediately by νήφοντες. Sobriety guards men against the "intoxication" of false prophets, against false views of ελευθερία, against moral and doctrinal caprices such as are denounced in 2 Peter. The Girdle is Law or Truth (Eph. vi. 14).

τελείως is best taken with νήφοντες, "being perfectly sober" (most modern commentators take this view). Down to Dean Alford's time it was generally connected with ἐλπίσατε. In this case we must translate "hope with a perfect hope," not "hope unto the end." The idea of final perseverance is involved, but not expressed in the perfection of hope.

ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ . . . χάριν. "Hope for the grace that is being brought unto you in the revelation of Jesus Christ." Ἐλπίζω ἐπὶ followed by the accusative is found only here and 1 Tim. v. 5; but the construction (it is a Hebraism) is common in the LXX. A question has been raised whether ἐπὶ introduces the ground or

the object of the hope; Dr. Hort takes the former, Kühn the latter view (see their notes on this passage). The points are that there is no Hebrew verb which exactly answers to ἐλπίζειν; that the five Hebrew verbs represented in the LXX. by ἐλπίζειν mean some "to trust upon," some "to wait for"; that in Ps. li. (lii.) 10, ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Hebrew original means to "trust upon the mercy of God," while in Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 18 the same Greek words represent what in the Hebrew signifies to "wait for the mercy." Upon the whole it seems better to regard ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ here as equivalent to ἐλπίζειν εἰς (John v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 5), and to take the following accusative as denoting the object towards which the hope is directed. It is a subtle question, and has no direct bearing upon the sense.

τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν. Χάρις is the gracious gift of deliverance, which is being brought, and ere long will surely be given, in the Revelation (see vers. 5, 7 above). Many commentators (Erasmus, Luther, Calovius, Bengel, Steiger, Hort) take "grace" in the Pauline sense, and regard "the revelation" as meaning the continuing and progressive unveiling of Christ in the Christian's soul (cf. Rom. i. 17); but there can be little doubt what St. Peter means here by the Revelation.

The editions generally place a full stop after Χριστοῦ, as also after i. 21, ii. 17. In all these places a colon might be used so as to allow the preceding imperative to run on; but after ii. 25, iii. 6, iii. 7 the full stop is clearly right. The style is loose and conversational, not so strictly bound by grammatical fetters as that of practised writers.

14. ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. "Children of" is a Hebraism; τέκνα ἀπωλείας, Isa. lvii. 4; υἱὸς θανάτου, 2 Sam. xii. 5. In the New Testament we have τέκνα ὀργῆς, Eph. ii. 3; τέκνα φωτός, Eph. v. 8; τέκνα κατάρτας; 2 Pet. ii. 14; υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, v. 6; Col. iii. 6; υἱοὶ φωτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, 1 Thess. v. 5; υἱὸς εἰρήνης, Luke x. 6; ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, 2 Thess. ii. 3; John xvii. 12. There is no more reason for supposing that τέκνα ὑπακοῆς was suggested by υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας than there is for supposing that St. John borrowed τέκνα Θεοῦ from St. Paul; indeed there is not so much. On the contrary, the phrase recurs quite naturally to the ὑπακοή of ver. 2. Children of obedience are those whose mother is obedience, in whom is the spirit of obedience, who are obedient, not "obedient children."

μὴ συσχηματίζομενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις. "Not conforming yourselves to the lusts which formerly ruled you in your ignorance." The not uncommon verb συσχηματίζεσθαι (see Liddell and Scott) is found also Rom. xii. 2, μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἵῳι τούτῳ. In respect to Rom. xii. there is somewhat better reason for suspecting a direct or indirect connexion between St. Peter and St. Paul than elsewhere, but we cannot safely build any

inference on this particular word. See pp. 18, 20. *ἄγνοια* is perhaps more applicable to those of St. Peter's readers who had been Gentiles than to those who had been Jews. St. Paul speaks of Gentile ignorance, Acts xvii. 30; Eph. iv. 18; see Abbott's note; but St. Peter attributes the crucifixion to the *ἄγνοια* of the Jews, Acts iii. 17. It is not easy to say whether St. Peter here is thinking of ignorance of God and His Law, or more particularly of ignorance of Christ. If the latter, his words will apply equally to Jews and Gentiles. All alike had sat in darkness, Matt. iv. 16; Luke i. 79; John i. 5, 10, 11. *Ἐπιθυμίαι* again seems to point rather to Gentiles, whose lives were generally more licentious than those of Jews. But there were many wicked Jews, Rom. ii. 17 sqq.; Eph. ii. 3; and our Lord was speaking to Jews when He insisted upon the sinfulness of lust, Matt. v. 28. But the readers of the Epistle were neither all Gentiles nor all Jews. See Introduction, p. 71.

15. ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντά ὑμᾶς ἅγιον. "But after the pattern of that Holy One who called you." It is best to take *ἅγιον* as substantial; it is hardly possible to make it an adjectival predicate and translate with von Soden, "after the pattern of Him who called you, who is holy." This use of *κατά* (which is quite classical and common; see instances in Liddell and Scott) is found Gal. iv. 28, *κατὰ Ἰσαάκ*, like Isaac. *Καλεῖν* is a word that belongs to the vocabulary of Christendom, and St. Peter uses it several times,—God called us out of darkness unto light, ii. 9; called us unto His eternal glory in Christ, v. 10; the call makes the pilgrim, above, ver. 1;—but he uses it in a simpler and less technical manner than St. Paul; he does not speculate on its difference from other verbs (cf. Rom. viii. 28 sqq.); nor does he appear to distinguish *κλητός* from *ἐκλεκτός* in the same way as St. Paul (ver. 1 above). St. Peter does not use *κλητός*, nor *κλήσις*, except in the Second Epistle, i. 10, where A has *παράκλησις*, and *ἐκλογή* is added apparently as identical, or at any rate as giving another aspect of the same thing. In the Gospels *καλεῖν* has many senses, of which the chief are illustrated by Matt. ii. 15, "out of Egypt did I call My Son"; v. 9, "they shall be called sons of God" (from Hos. ii. 1); ix. 13, "to call sinners" unto repentance; xxii. 9, "call to the wedding"; xx. 8, "call the labourers" into my vineyard. It has, in fact, four chief meanings—(a) of calling out of a lower state, Egypt or sin; (b) of inviting to a feast; (c) of summoning to a duty; (d) of giving a name corresponding to a character. It seldom seems to imply selection; all are called alike. In Hebrews it is used of the call of Abraham (xi. 8, as in a); of the new name, "in Isaac shall thy seed be called" (xi. 18, from Gen. xxi. 12; cf. ii. 11, as in d); of those who are invited into the Covenant (ix. 15, as in b); of the call of Aaron to the priesthood (v. 4, as in c, but with the notion of personal selection). In Peter the typical call appears to be that of

Abraham, though the Patriarch is not named in this connexion; the Christian is a homeless wanderer, called out of the darkness of the past into the light of the gospel, travelling towards glory or an inheritance or a crown, called especially to suffer with Christ (ii. 21). The new name (Christian, iv. 16) is a name of suffering. St. Paul alludes to the new calling or name, quoting Gen. xxi. 12 (Rom. ix. 7) and Hos. ii. 1 (Rom. ix. 26). He does not connect the Call with any Old Testament type. The Call is from the Covenant of Works to the Covenant of Grace, and Abraham exemplifies not obedience to a summons or command, but belief in a promise; two things which, though closely combined, yet represent different sides of the same action, and are in theory very distinct. If we throw the whole stress upon belief, three difficulties at once arise: why do some believe while others do not? what is the value of partial belief? how can belief which causes action be itself in any degree the effect of action? All these perplexities were acutely felt by St. Paul. St. John also felt the difficulty, but found an answer in his conception of Love which grows by familiarity and obedience. The Synoptic evangelists, St. Peter, the sub-apostolic Fathers, hardly touch the problem. Many modern scholars regard Peter as a later writer, who was perfectly familiar with the Pauline Epistles, but failed to grasp their meaning. But the fact to be explained is that, instead of misapprehending or perverting the distinctive Pauline thoughts, he leaves them altogether on one side.

ἅγιον. St. Peter's idea of Holiness must be considered in relation to the terms in which he speaks of God. Christ is the object of Love (ver. 8). God, though Father, of fear; the justice, might, majesty of God are predominant thoughts in this Epistle. In the present passage we are referred to Lev. xi. 44, xix. 2, xx. 7. In all these passages the Israelites are commanded to keep themselves from uncleanness, because God is holy. The Hebrew Qadesh comes from a root which means to divide. God is holy, because He is separate from all uncleanness. No defilement can approach Him under penalty of being consumed (Heb. xii. 29); He is *ἀπείραστος κακῶν*, Jas. i. 13; *φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον*, 1 Tim. vi. 16. Justice is the positive idea most usually connected in the New Testament with holiness, John xvii. 11, 25; Luke i. 75; Rom. vii. 12 (the law is holy and just and good). In the present passage the holy God is also the just Judge. Justice is more nearly connected with holiness than is goodness. The epithet is applied to Christ, Luke i. 35, iv. 34; John vi. 69; *τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον*, Acts iii. 14; iv. 27, 30; Apoc. iii. 7, possibly also vi. 10, always with reference to His purity or majesty. St. Paul uses the epithet only of the Holy Ghost, holy things, or holy men.

There is an important point involved, because Albrecht Ritschl maintained that "the conception of the holiness of God is for the

religion of the New Testament abolished (*aufgehoben*), at any rate is in no respect essential" (*Rechtf. und Vers.* ii. 12, 13; see Mielke, *das System Albrecht Ritschl's*, p. 23), on the ground that aloofness and transcendent majesty involve mystery in doctrine, and fear as in some degree an allowable motive for Christians. Ritschl's view is an application of Kant's theory; nothing can be known except relations; nothing can have any religious value except God's relation to us; this has been perfectly revealed in Christ as a relation of love. It is interesting chiefly as showing the impossibility of squaring any philosophical theory with the Bible, or with any book in the Bible. Mystery and Fear cannot possibly be eliminated from Religion.

καὶ αὐτοὶ . . . γενήθητε. "Do ye also become holy in every manner of conversation." The aorist of the imperative is constantly used in this Epistle, when, according to the ordinary rule, we should have expected the present: see i. 13, 17, 22, ii. 2, 13, 17, iii. 10, 11, 14, 15, iv. 7, v. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9. Blass (p. 194 sqq.) hardly seems to recognise adequately the looseness of New Testament grammar on this point. Closely parallel in sense are the words quoted by St. Paul from Isa. lii. 11, ἐξέλθετε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε· κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ, 2 Cor. vi. 17. It should be noticed that St. Peter does not address those to whom he writes as ἅγιοι, saints, though they belong to the ἔθνος ἄγιον, ii. 9, or what Clem. Rom. calls the ἁγίου μερίς, xxx. 1. Ἀναστροφή (a favourite word of St. Peter's), which in Aeschylus and Aristotle means "a repair," "haunt," or "abode," in Polybius is used of "a manner of life," literally "a turning to and fro," "a walking up and down." The exact Latin equivalent is *conuersatio* (see Liddell and Scott, and Facciolati). It is greatly to be regretted that the fine word "conversation" has been rejected by the Revised Version to the impoverishment of the English language. "Different kinds of ἀναστροφή are to be spoken of further on in the Epistle: here at the outset St. Peter lays down what is true for them all" (Hort).

16. Ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε. Lev. xi. 44, xix. 2, xx. 7; the future is here equivalent to an imperative; cf. Matt. v. 48.

17. καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε . . . ἀναστράφητε. "And if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear" (R.V.). This is the common and, according to classic usage, the better translation. But that of the A.V., "if ye call on the Father who," etc., may be defended. Πατήρ is one of those words which easily dispense with the article (cf. ver. 2 above), and the article is omitted, where a defining clause follows, without any perceptible alteration of the sense; cf. προφήται οἱ προφητεύσαντες, ver. 10 above; εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας, Jas. i. 25; παῖδιός τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ

καθημένοι, Luke vii. 32 ; ὑγαιίνουσι λόγοις τοῦ Κυρίου, 1 Tim. vi. 3. In any case the stress falls here upon the definition, "If the Father, to whom you pray, is also the righteous Judge, see that ye fear Him." The Father "giveth good things to them that ask Him" (Matt. vii. 11) ; but He is not merely, as the heathen thought, a δωτῆρ ἑάων. He chastises His children (Heb. xii. 5, 6), and He judges. He is Πατὴρ ἅγιος, δίκαιος (John xvii. 11, 25). Kühn remarks that in Peter's view the Old Testament motive (Holiness, Fear) is not abolished, but rather strengthened by the new relation of sonship. The point became of importance in the controversy with the Gnostics, who maintained that God was Love simply and solely. Fear, of course, means such fear as may be felt towards a good father, not slavish, superstitious dread. It is a lower motive than love, yet is not to be regarded as merely negative ; it is the safeguard of holiness, and it prompts obedience in things which we do not as yet understand,—and there are always things which we do not understand. Even St. Paul uses occasionally the same language as St. Peter, see 2 Cor. v. 10, 11. St. John (I iv. 18) writes that "perfect love casteth out fear" ; but his words do not apply to those whose love is not yet perfect. Our Lord says at one time, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" (Matt. xxii. 37), at another, "Yea, I say unto you, Fear Him" (Luke xii. 5).

In the words Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε there is a possible allusion to the Lord's Prayer (so Weiss, Huther, Kühn, Hort), but it is not certain ; the words may be suggested by Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 27.

ἀπροσωπολήπτως. Neither the adverb nor the adjective from which it is formed occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, but we have the phrases λαμβάνειν, βλέπειν εἰς, θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον. They all denote the righteous Judge, who makes no distinction between high and low, rich or poor, Jew or Gentile, in the eye of whose holy law all men are equal. It is interesting to compare the words of St. Peter (Acts x. 34), ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτῃς ὁ Θεός· ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἔστι. Cf. also Rom. ii. 10, 11. Dr. Hort thinks that these passages are based on Deut. x. 17, but the thought and expression must have been not uncommon among pious Jews ; thus we find in the *Book of Jubilees* (ed. Charles, p. 73), "quia Deus uiuens est et sanctus et fidelis et iustus ex omnibus ; et non est apud eum accipere personam, ut accipiat munera, quoniam Deus iustus est et iudicium exercens in omnibus qui transgrediuntur sermones eius et qui contemnunt testimonium eius." Cf. Ep. Barn. iv. 12.

τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον. The collocation is common in Peter but rare elsewhere in the New Testament ; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 40 ; 2 Cor. viii. 8, and see Introduction, p. 4. Παροικία. See note on παρεπίδημος above. Παροικεῖν is found Luke xxiv. 18 ; Heb. xi. 9 ;

πάροικος, Acts vii. 6, 29; παροικία, Acts xiii. 17. St. Paul will not use *πάροικος* of Christians; they are already *συμπολίται τῶν ἀγίων*, Eph. ii. 19. The word *παροικία* has a very interesting history; the "pilgrims" or "sojourners" in a district or town formed the diocese or "parish." See Suicer, *s.v.* *παροικία*, *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, *s.v.* Parish; Bede, ed. Plummer, vol. ii. p. 212 sq.

18. εἰδότες ὅτι. The Holiness and Justice of God are the ground of Fear, which is strengthened by another thought, that of the high cost of Redemption. The same cast of thought finds expression in Heb. vi. 5 sqq., and Clem. Rom. xxi., τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, οὐ τὸ αἷμα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη, ἐντραπῶμεν. Further on Clement speaks of the fear of God as *καλὸς καὶ μέγας καὶ σώζων πάντας τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ ὁσίων ἀναστρεφόμενους ἐν καθαρᾷ διανοίᾳ*. This fine passage affords an admirable illustration of what we may call "Petrinism," the mingled severity and tenderness of the Christian disciplinarian.

οὐ φθαρτοῖς . . . πατροπαραδότου. "That not with corruptible things, silver or gold, were ye redeemed from your vain conversation handed down from your fathers." Silver and gold (which are *ἀπολλύμενα*, ver. 7, or *φθαρτά*) are dross compared with the price that was paid for you. *Λύτρον* is the ransom paid for slaves, Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 1 Tim. ii. 6 we have *ἀντίλυτρον*; *λυτροῦσθαι* is used Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14; *λύτρωσις*, Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12; *λυτρωτής*, Acts vii. 35 of Moses. The Ransom is here the Blood of Christ; in Matt. xx. 28 the *ψυχὴ* of Christ. We are redeemed from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us, Luke i. 68 sqq.; from *ἀνομία*, Tit. ii. 14; here from vain conversation: the historical type suggested in all these passages is that of the great deliverance from the house of bondage in Egypt (cf. Ex. vi. 6). The Bible does not attempt to say to whom the Ransom is paid, a question on which, in later times, there was much unfortunate speculation. The question ought never to have been asked, because it does not admit of an answer, except in some sense which is hardly compatible with the metaphor of Ransom. A money ransom is paid to him who holds the slave, but this is not true of a spiritual ransom. To take an analogous case, the Algerian slaves were redeemed by the blood and suffering of English sailors, but to whom was this ransom paid?

Closely connected, though not identical, with the idea of Ransom is that of Buying. By one and the same act God redeemed us from captivity and bought us for His own slaves, Acts xx. 28 (*περιποιήσατο*); in 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Apoc. v. 9, xiv. 3, 4, the verb used is *ἀγοράζειν*, and in all these passages the price expressed or intended is the Blood of Christ.

St. Luke uses the word *ἀπολύτρωσις* of final deliverance at the Last Day, xxi. 28; and St. Paul, who does not use the simple *λύτρωσις*, has the compound in the same future sense, Rom. viii. 23;

Eph. i. 14, iv. 30; such is probably the meaning also in Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; in Heb. xi. 35 ἀπολύτρωσις is equivalent to λύτρωσις; so also in ix. 15. See Abbott on Eph. i. 7.

πατροπαράδοτου. This phrase again might seem to be aimed rather at Gentiles than at Jews. From the Apologists we may see how reluctant the Gentiles were to cast off the "manner of life" of their ancestors, and by so doing to pronounce condemnation upon their parents, philosophers, statesmen. See Clem. Alex. *Protr.* x.; Min. Felix, *Oct.* vi. The strength of this sentiment is powerfully exemplified in Mr. Dill's *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Roman Empire*. Races like the English, whose past history was less glorious, did not feel the difference so keenly; see Bede, *H. E.* ii. 13. "Vain" again is constantly used of idolatry (Acts xiv. 15). Yet Jews also had a παράδοσις, Matt. xv. 2 sqq., which came from their fathers, Gal. i. 14, and was in some points against the law of God and vain.

19. ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι . . . Χριστοῦ. "But with precious blood of Christ as of a lamb unblemished and spotless." On the collocation of the words, see Introduction, p. 4. On the Blood of Christ see note on ver. 2 above. Here, no doubt, the absence of the article before τιμίῳ αἵματι is not without meaning. "Ye were redeemed not with corruptible gold, but with precious blood"; both the adjectives and the substantives are in strong contrast. ἄμωμος, which in classic Greek means blameless, is used by the LXX. of victims which have no physical blemish. Hence the name of the μωμοσκόπος, an official whose business it was to ascertain this fact, Philo, *de Agric.* 29 (i. 320); Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 18. 117. "The translators having to express the Hebrew *mum*, a blemish, apparently caught at the sound of the Greek μῶμος, and employed it for their purpose" (Hort). It should, however, be observed that in the Old Testament the ceremonial and the moral are not easily kept apart, and that ἄμωμος is used of moral integrity, Ps. xiv. (xv.) 2, and elsewhere. ἄσπιλος, "spotless," is metaphorical, but is rather moral than ceremonial; it is found in the version of Symmachus, Job xv. 15, but not in the LXX. ἄμωμος is used of Christ in a passage very similar to this, Heb. ix. 14. The physical perfection of the victim is regarded as typical of the sinlessness of Christ, which makes His Blood τίμιον.

Christ is called ἄμνός by the Baptist, John i. 29, 36; in Apoc. v. 6 and elsewhere the word used is ἀρνίον. The Paschal Lamb or Kid is called πρόβατον τέλειον, Ex. xii. 5; in Isa. liii. 7 we read, ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη, καὶ ὡς ἄμνός ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος ἀφονοῦ οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα. Here the sheep is slain, the lamb is only shorn, and it has been questioned whether the prophet in this particular verse is thinking of the Paschal Lamb or, indeed, of any sacrifice at all (see Dr. Cheyne's note). The

chapter, however, is full of sacrificial imagery, and the Suffering Servant is depicted both as an Atoner (*τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει*), and as a Redeemer (*τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν*); indeed the ideas of Atonement and of Redemption are blended throughout. The Isaianic passage was very early applied to our Lord, Acts viii. 32.

There can be little doubt that Isa. liii. was in the mind of St. Peter here. Just before we have had an allusion to Isa. lii. 3, *οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε*, and references to Isaiah, and to chap. liii. in particular, abound in the Epistle. But the "blood of the Lamb" does not come from this source. It is found most easily in Ex. xii. : the difference of the words *πρόβατον* and *ἀμνός* is a merely superficial difficulty, and *τέλειον* is equivalent to *ἄμωμον καὶ ἄσπιλον*. We really do not know what words St. Peter himself used. But in the case of such allusions there is danger in the attempt to bind an author down to fixed passages. St. Peter may have meant quite generally the lamb of sacrifice. See note on *ῥαντισμός*, ver. 2 above.

The question has been raised whether the blood of the Paschal Lamb was really a ransom, but it is difficult to understand the point of view from which the question is framed. In one sense, of course, it was not, as the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us. But in another, as a shadow, it was both an Atonement and a Ransom; it covered the houses of the Israelites from the destroying Angel, it redeemed the firstborn, and was a condition of the deliverance of the whole people from the house of bondage.

Dr. Hort quotes the Midrash on Ex. xii. 22, "With two bloods were the Israelites delivered from Egypt, with the blood of the paschal lamb and with the blood of circumcision."

20. προεγνωσμένου. The foreknowledge of God does not necessarily imply the pre-existence of the thing or person foreknown (see ver. 2 above; Acts xv. 18; Rom. xi. 2), but does not exclude it. *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.* Matt. xiii. 35 (here, perhaps, *κόσμου* should be omitted), xxv. 34; the phrase is used also by Luke, John, Paul, and in Hebrews: Apoc. xiii. 8, the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. It is found also in the *Assumption of Moses*, and is quoted therefrom in the *Acta Syn. Nic.* (Gelasius Cyzic. ii. 18, p. 28), *καὶ προεθεάσατό με ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναί με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην* (Moses is speaking to Joshua). This passage of the *Assumption* was possibly alluded to by St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19, and may have suggested the language of St. Peter here. The word *καταβολή* is used 2 Macc. ii. 29 of the foundation or ground-plan of a house. Dr. Hort quotes also *found. Moralia*, ii. 956 A, *τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἅμα τῇ πρώτῃ καταβολῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

φανερωθέντος. Cf. John i. 31; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John iii. 5, 8.

“Taken by itself the word suggests a previous hidden existence, and it was not likely to be chosen except in this implied sense” (Hort).

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων. “In the last of the times,” in the last epoch of the world’s history; or “at the end of the times” (ἐσχάτου being taken as neuter and substantival, as in the phrase ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, Heb. i. 2).

δι’ ὑμᾶς. The purport of this verse is still further to deepen the reader’s sense of the need of holiness and godly fear. Not only is the blood precious, but the sacrifice of Christ was purposed by God before creation, and all for you.

21. τοὺς δι’ αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν. Πιστεύοντας is supported by the authority of \aleph C K L P, a number of other MSS., and the Syriac Versions; but the great textual critics prefer πιστοῦς, the reading of A B, a good cursive, and the Vulgate, on the ground that πιστεύοντας is an obvious correction designed to get rid of the otherwise unexampled phrase πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν. Πιστός in the active sense (=believing) is rare even in the New Testament, and except in this passage is always used absolutely. See Dr. Hort’s elaborate note. Nevertheless εἰς is used after πιστεύω, and there is no obvious reason why πιστός in the active sense should not be followed by the same preposition. We must translate “who through Him do believe in God.” No other meaning will suit the context, and εἰς after πιστός in its passive meaning (=trusted, trustworthy) appears to be not only unexampled, but impossible. For δι’ αὐτοῦ cf. Acts iii. 16, ἡ πίστις ἣ δι’ αὐτοῦ (the words of St. Peter). Above, ver. 8, Christ is Himself the immediate object of Faith; here by Him, by the historical Christ, δι’ ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν (ver. 3), by the παθήματα and δόξαι (ver. 11), in a word, by the gospel, we come to believe in God, who raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory. It is to be observed that here the brethren believe in God, not because the Son has revealed the Father (Matt. xi. 27), but because the Father has revealed the Son. The two propositions are reciprocal and interchangeable; hence it is clear that we believe in God through Christ not in the same sense as that in which we believe through Apollos or Paul, who were διάκονοι (1 Cor. iii. 5). Here, again, it is impossible to say whether St. Peter is addressing himself to Jews or to Gentiles; the peculiar attribute ascribed to God was equally new to both.

τὸν ἐγείραντα . . . δόξαν. The Resurrection and Exaltation are appealed to just as in St. Peter’s speech on Pentecost, and indeed in the Book of Acts throughout. Here the Resurrection is a revelation of God and His abounding mercy; it is also the means (or one means) of the ἀναγέννησις (ver. 3), and gives efficacy to Baptism (iii. 21). But there is no trace in our Epistle of the favourite Pauline thought that the Christian is risen with Christ or

has died with Christ. The substance of St. Peter's teaching is the same, but the expression is not.

God gave Jesus Christ glory in the eyes of unbelievers (Acts iii. 13) and of the Church, bestowing upon Him of grace "the Name which is above every name" (Phil. ii. 9; see Lightfoot's note). Cf. Apoc. i. 17, 18. Thus we can understand John xvii. 5.

ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς Θεόν. "So that your faith and hope is towards God." Faith in Christ (ver. 8) is also faith in God, who gave Christ glory, whose mercy is the ultimate source of the resurrection, the regeneration, and the gospel generally. Kühl, with a number of German commentators, translates "so that your faith is also hope towards God." In this way we should get the sense "so that your faith is transformed into hope," and thus escape the apparent tautology between πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν, πίστιν εἰς Θεόν. There is no other substantial argument in favour of this artificial rendering (it is rightly rejected by Dr. Hort). Tautology is a characteristic of St. Peter's style; see Introduction, p. 6. Further, faith and hope are so closely connected in St. Peter's mind that they are merely two aspects of the same thing; the one involves the other so completely that it is difficult to see how he could say that the one becomes the other.

At this point ends what we may call the doctrinal section of the Epistle. St. Peter has been explaining the three Names, their three attributes, and their several relations. Here he passes to the practical Christian life, catching up and expounding the words ἀγιασμός, ἀναγεννάειν. The word suggests the thought, doctrine and exhortation are blended in easy natural flow, and there are constant recurrences and developments of ideas already expressed.

22, 23. Ἠγνικότες carries us back to vers. 2, 15; ὑπακοή to vers. 2, 14; the following ἀναγεγεννημένοι to ver. 3; but something new is added to each word. The order of conception seems to be truth, regeneration, obedience, purity, love of the brethren. Truth is explained by the words διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος. It is the word uttered by the Spirit of Christ through the prophets (vers. 10-12); through this truth comes the New Birth. The Truth must be obeyed, carried out in action as a law even before we understand it, in order that we may understand it (as in John vii. 17); see note on ver. 2. Obedience leads to purity of soul. Ἄγνός in classical Greek is mainly a moral word (*sanctus* not *sacer*; but these, like ἅγιος, ἄγνός, are connected in etymology); it is used especially of virginity; but the verb is generally used of ceremonial purification. In the New Testament ἄγνός always has the moral sense; ἀγνίσειν is used of ceremonial cleansing in John xi. 55 and Acts xxi. 24, 26, xxiv. 18, but in Jas. iv. 8, 1 John iii. 3, as here, of spiritual cleansing. We may compare the phrase ἀγιάζειν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, John xvii. 17, 19. Purity from evil inclinations, especi-

ally from rancour and malice, leads to love of the brethren (not "brotherly love"). The word *φιλαδελφία* in secular Greek and in 4 Macc. xiii. 21, 23, 26, xiv. 1, means the mutual love of brothers by birth; but in 2 Macc. xv. 14 Jeremiah is called *ὁ φιλάδελφος οἷτος* because of his love for all Jews (Hort). In the New Testament it is used (Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 7) in what is really a new sense, of love for those who are brethren by virtue of the *ἀναγέννησις*. Love of the Christian brotherhood must be (1) *ἀνυπόκριτος* (Rom. xii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 6), not affected, Pharisaic, formal, mechanical, but sincere and from the heart. (2) *ἐκτενής*, "fervent"; the word seems to convey the idea of straining intensity, but some regard it as meaning "steady," "unintermittent." The adverb *ἐκτενῶς* occurs only in later Greek, and was regarded as a vulgarism; see Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, p. 311; Dr. Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 365, thinks that even the adjective is not Attic.

σπορά is fixed to the sense of "seed" (*semen* not *satio*) by the epithets. Many modern German commentators and Alford understand the meaning to be "born again not of a human father" (cf. John i. 13, iii. 4); but a better explanation is found in the parable of the Sower; cf. Luke viii. 11, *ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

In *διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος* the article is again omitted. The epithets are best taken with *λόγου*. As *λόγου* is antithetical to *σποράς*, so are *ζῶντος καὶ μένοντος* to *οὐ φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*; again we have *λόγος ζῶν* in Heb. iv. 12, and *ἐλπὶς ζῶσα* in ver. 3 above; and finally *λόγος μένοντος* is caught up and illustrated by the words *τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει* in the following quotation. This is the construction adopted by A.V., R.V. (text), Alford, Kühn, von Soden, and most modern commentators. Dr. Hort follows the Vulgate and many, especially of the older scholars, in coupling the epithet with Θεοῦ (cf. Dan. vi. 26, *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν Θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*). *Λόγος* is identified by St. Peter himself with *ῥῆμα*, and this again with the gospel which his readers had heard (*τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς*: cf. *διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς*, ver. 12 above), virtually with the *παθήματα καὶ δόξα*.

24. *διότι* is used by St. Peter to introduce quotations from the Old Testament, i. 16, ii. 6, and here. In iii. 10 *γάρ* is used (Hort).

πάσα σὰρξ. From Isa. xl. 6-8. St. Peter departs from the LXX. in inserting *ὡς* before *χόρτος*, and in substituting *αὐτῆς* for *ἀνθρώπου* and *Κυρίου* for *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, but follows it in omitting two clauses of the Hebrew ("because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it; surely the people is grass") after *ἐξέπεσεν*. Dr. Hort observes that St. Peter possibly found all these changes already made in the text of the LXX. which he used.

ἐξηράνθη and *ἐξέπεσε* are gnomic aorists which may be rendered

in English by the present. Dr. Hort illustrates the *ἄθος χόρτου* by reference to *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 139, where Dean Stanley describes the blazing scarlet of anemones, tulips, and poppies among the thin, shortlived grass of spring in the Levant, and points out the fine comparison of this *δόξα* of nature to the "conversation" inherited by the Greeks from their fathers, which, "vain" as it was, was also so brilliant and attractive. But the main point of the quotation is the contrast between the shortness of earthly beauty and the eternity of the word of God. St. James manifestly alludes to this passage of Isaiah (i. 10, 11) in a different context; he is disparaging wealth, and omits all reference to the word of God. If there is any literary connexion here between the two Epistles, the right of priority seems to belong to St. Peter, who introduces the quotation with far greater ease, appropriateness, and power. See note on *δοκίμιον*, ver. 7 above.

25. *Κυρίου* stands, as already observed, for the *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* of the LXX. and Hebrew. Dr. Hort observes that "*Κυρίου* without the article must be taken, as in most cases, for Jehovah, the God of Israel, our God." But the noticeable point is that in a matter of such grave import there should be any exceptions at all: and the fact seems to be that if we exclude direct quotations from the Old Testament, and such phrases as *ἄγγελος*, *φωνή*, *χεῖρ*, *πνεῦμα Κυρίου*, which are taken from the Old Testament and stereotyped by usage, it is hardly possible in the New Testament to make any distinction between *Κύριος* and *ὁ Κύριος*. Even in the Old Testament *ὁ Κύριος* stands not infrequently for Jehovah (passages quoted Matt. xxii. 44; Luke ii. 23; Acts ii. 25); and in the New Testament *Κύριος*, without the article, is constantly used of Christ (Luke ii. 11; Acts x. 36; in Rom. xiv. 5-9 *Κυρίῳ* and *τῷ Κυρίῳ* are used quite indifferently; xvi. 2 sqq., *ἐν Κυρίῳ*, this is a common phrase; 1 Cor. vii. 17-39, x. 21, 22, xvi. 11; 2 Cor. iii. 16-18; Phil. iii. 20; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2, 12). We have seen that in St. Peter's view the Spirit of Christ was in the prophets, and it is not possible to say that in the present passage he intends to draw any absolute distinction between *Κυρίου* and *Χριστοῦ*.

εἰς ὑμᾶς. "Unto you," is equivalent to *ὑμῖν*, as in ver. 4 above. Dr. Hort would give the preposition its sense of motion, "which was preached (reaching even) to you." The R.V. translates, "And this is the word of good tidings which was preached unto you"; and it should not be forgotten that in the times of the apostle *εὐαγγέλιον* still preserved distinctly the meaning of "good spell" or tidings, which we are so apt to forget when we use the abbreviated "gospel."

II. 1. Here begins a new passage of exhortation suggested by the word *ἀναγεννημένοι*. It extends to the end of ver. 10.

ἀποθήμενοι οὖν. "Therefore," since ye are born again, since ye

have become babes, lay aside all kinds of wickedness, and desire the milk which Christ will give you. Milk causes growth; the growth will fit them for their place in the spiritual house, the royal priesthood. Here again the Christian is addressed as member of a corporation. *Ἀποθέσθαι* is to be taken rather in the sense of cleansing defilements (iii. 21, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου) than in that of putting off clothing (as in Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 5 sqq.). The sins named are such as are specially destructive of *φιλαδελφία*. *Κακία* in the classics means either vice generally, as opposed to *ἀρετή*, or specially cowardice. Suicer distinguishes three ecclesiastical uses of the word: (1) Evil, misery, trouble; Matt. vi. 34, ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἢ κακία αὐτῆς. (2) Vice; the word is commonly so used by the Fathers, and Theophylact gives it this sense in Rom. i. 29 (*ad Rom.* chap. iii.); but it is very doubtful whether he is right. (3) Malice; 1 Cor. xiv. 20, τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, where Theophylact notes νηπιάζει τῇ κακίᾳ ὁ μηδένα κακοποιῶν ἀλλ' ὡσπερ νήπιον ἄκακος. Cf. Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3. Dr. Hort maintains that in the Pauline Epistles *κακία* always bears this sense. In the present passage the A.V. has "malice," the R.V. "wickedness." The addition of *πάσαν*, "every kind or form of," suits "wickedness" better than the more determinate "malice," and the same remark applies to *σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ*, Eph. iv. 31. In ii. 16 below *κακία* seems clearly to mean "wickedness." Upon the whole it seems best to regard *κακία* as the general term which is defined by the following special vices. In Jas. i. 21, διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσεΐαν κακίας, the general sense "wickedness" seems to suit better. It may be observed that James appears to combine 1 Pet. ii. 1, iii. 21, so that here, too, he is more naturally regarded as the borrower.

ὑποκρίσεις. So \aleph A C K L P, the Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian; B, the Peshito, Coptic, and Aethiopic have *ὑπόκρισιν*. For the sense see *ἀνυπόκριτος* above. St. Peter is probably thinking of our Lord's denunciations of the Pharisaic hypocrisy, which was strict in outward observances but cold at heart, setting its rules and forms above charity. The plural may mean *kinds* of hypocrisy or *acts* of hypocrisy; as *ἀρεταί* in classical Greek means "virtues" or "virtuous deeds."

καταλαλιᾶς. "All backbitings." The verb *καταλαλεῖν* is used by Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 752, of a slave who "blabs" his master's secrets; it is quoted also from the lost *Γῆρας*, Bekker, *Anecd.* i. 102. In later Greek it bears the sense of talking or railing against. The adjective *κατάλαλος* (Rom. i. 30) and substantive *καταλαλιά* (2 Cor. xiii. 20) are found only in the New Testament.

2. *ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη*. "As newborn babes." "*Ἀρτιγέννητος* is a late and rare word, replacing *νεογνός*. This is the only place where *βρέφη* is used figuratively, *νήπιοι* being commonly so used"

(Hort). The simile, which is very appropriate for those who are ἀναγεγεννημένοι, recalls Matt. xviii. 3. In St. Peter's view Christians are always babes, and therefore also always recently born. This is in substance the explanation of Dr. Hort and von Soden. Kühn insists that ἀρτιγέννητα must mean that the readers had been quite recently converted, and finds in the word a confirmation of his view that the readers of the Epistle did not belong to Churches founded by St. Paul, and that the Epistle was written before Romans. But this is too large a conclusion from so slender a premiss. Even if the readers had been converted by St. Paul, their Christianity was still young. But in respect of Eternity, as von Soden well says, the beginning of the new life must always seem a thing of yesterday.

ἐπιποθήσατε . . . σωτηρίαν. "Desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby" (A.V.). "Long for the spiritual milk, which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation" (R.V.). The words εἰς σωτηρίαν are undoubtedly genuine; see Tischendorf's note. Λογικὸν γάλα is understood by the great majority of commentators, as by the A.V., to mean "milk of the word," on the grounds that St. Peter is recalling the λόγος of i. 23 (just as in ἄδολον he recalls the δόλον of the preceding verse), and that λόγος in the New Testament always means "word." Of those who thus translate the phrase, some regard "milk of the word" as meaning "the milk which is the word" ("lac uerbi est periphrasis uerbi ipsius," Bengel); others, "the milk which is contained in the word," that is to say, specially Christ (so Kühn, Weiss, Keil, von Soden). This latter point seems unimportant, if we consider what St. Peter has said touching the relation of Christ to Scripture.

Dr. Hort insists that λογικός in the Stoic writers (even in Aristotle; see Bonitz, *Index*), in later Greek, and commonly in Philo, means rational, and can mean nothing else; further, that in Rom. xii. 1 (the only other passage in the Greek Bible where the word is found) it bears this sense, and that Eusebius uses the word with the same meaning. It may be observed, however, that St. Paul does not use the phrase λογικὸν γάλα, and that his λογικὴ λατρεία corresponds to St. Peter's πνευματικὰς θυσίας; that the usage of St. Paul can never be compared with that of St. Peter without great caution and reserve; that λόγος, in the sense of the word of God, or scripture, is unknown to secular Greek; and that λογικός, "belonging to the word," is at any rate strictly analogous to λογικός, "belonging to the human reason." Finally, as it is certainly the habit of St. Peter to pick up and repeat his words, it would seem that the balance of argument is in favour of the translation of the A.V. Ἄδολος does not mean "unadulterated," nor exactly "veracious," as in Aesch. *Ag.* 95, χρίματος ἀγνοῦ μαλακαῖς ἄδολοισι παρηγορίας, but "guileless," as the pattern of sincerity, and as forbidding all δόλος, cf. ii. 22. Γάλα is probably a reminiscence of Isa. lv. 1; if so, there is an

additional reason for taking λογικόν as above. In any case the word is suggested to St. Peter quite simply by ἀναγεγεννημένοι and βρέφη. The passage marks better than any other the difference between St. Peter, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and St. Paul. In St. Peter's eyes the Christian is always a babe, always in need of mother's milk, always growing, not to perfection, but to deliverance. In Heb. v. 12, vi. 2, milk is the catechism, the rudiments of the faith, including repentance, faith, baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection, judgment, and is contrasted with "the solid meat" of the perfect, who have a formed character (διὰ τὴν ξέιν), can judge for themselves, and do not need a guide. This is an adaptation of the teaching of Philo (*de migr. Abr.* 9 (i. 443), ἕτερος νηπίων καὶ ἕτερος τελείων χώρος ἐστίν : 6 (i. 440), ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ γένος ἐστὶ σοὶ τὸ αὐτομαθές, τὸ αὐτοδίδακτον, τὸ νηπίας καὶ γαλακτώδους τροφῆς ἀμέτοχον : but Philo probably borrowed it from the Stoics ; cf. Epictetus, ii. 16. 39, οὐ θέλεις ἤδη, ὡς τὰ παῖδια, ἀπογαλακτισθῆναι καὶ ἀπτεσθαι τροφῆς στερεωτέρας ; It takes up the old philosophic distinction between the βίος πρακτικός and θεωρητικός, and regards the Christian as moving up naturally and properly through instruction, obedience, law, discipline, into knowledge and freedom. This was the view adopted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and indeed by the whole of the later Church. It represents a *via media* between St. Peter and St. Paul. The latter draws the same distinction as Hebrews between γάλα and βρῶμα (1 Cor. iii. 1, 2), but regards the "babes in Christ" as οὐ πνευματικοί, σάρκῖνοι, or σαρκικοί. Here also the distinction is probably based, if not on Philo, on some cognate Rabbinical teaching. St. Paul is vexed with "the babe," who is in fact the weaker brother, the formalist, and needs not to be carried further along the same line, but to be put upon a different line. Neither to St. Paul nor to Hebrews is "milk" the biblical milk of Isaiah, nor is "the babe" the little child of the Gospels. St. Peter not only differs from them both, but he differs as being more scriptural and evangelical. This point, which is in many ways of the gravest importance, has not received the attention it deserves.

3. εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος. "If ye have tasted that the Lord is good." "Milk" suggests a quotation from Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 9, γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος. The words καὶ ἴδετε are omitted as not quite suiting the milk. A.V., R.V. translate "that the Lord is gracious," but we need an adjective that will suit the figure of speech. "In the Psalm ὁ Κύριος stands for Jehovah, as it very often does, the LXX. inserting and omitting the article with Κύριος on no apparent principle. On the other hand, the next verse shows St. Peter to have used ὁ Κύριος in its commonest, though not universal, N.T. sense of Christ. It would be rash, however, to conclude that he meant to identity Jehovah with Christ. No such identification can be clearly made out in the N.T." (Hort). But

the point, as already observed, is that the writers of the New Testament take no trouble to guard their readers against misapprehension on a subject of such consequence. See p. 124, above.

4. *πρὸς ὃν προερχόμενοι*. "Coming unto whom." The phrase is suggested, as Dr. Hort thinks, by ver. 6 of the Psalm just quoted, *προσέλαθε πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ φωτίσθητε*. Indeed the whole Psalm was present to St. Peter's mind throughout the Epistle; cf. ver. 10, *φοβήθητε τὸν Κύριον πάντες οἱ ἄγιοι αὐτοῦ*, with i. 15-17; ver. 5, *ἐκ πασῶν τῶν παροικιῶν μου ἐρρύσατό με*, with i. 17; vers. 13-17 are quoted below, iii. 10-12; in ver. 23 we have the word *λυτρώσεται*, and ver. 20, *πολλὰ αἱ θλίψεις τῶν δικαίων, καὶ ἐκ πασῶν αὐτῶν ῥύσεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Κύριος*, gives in little the main theme of the Epistle. The present participle is used because stones keep coming one after another; but it may, as Kühl thinks, denote the perpetual lifelong drawing nigh of the soul to its Redeemer. The idea of stones "coming" is not very natural, and it is therefore all the more probable that Hermas was influenced by St. Peter when he speaks of stones "coming up" (*ἀναβαίνειν*) to be built into the tower (*Simi.* ix. 3. 4).

λίθον ζῶντα. "A living stone." Cf. *ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν*, i. 3; *λόγος ζῶν*, i. 23; the phrase means much more than "an animated stone": that "lives" in St. Peter's sense which is spiritual, divine, eternal. The apostle here brings in a new metaphor, the stones, the house, in order to reiterate with fresh force the necessity of holiness; the keyword is the *ἅγιον* of ver. 5. But he has already in view the quotations which he is about to introduce in ver. 6 sqq. The word *λίθος*, once used, draws him on to say more about it. This artless conversational method is highly original; and it will be observed that the hints or suggestions which guide the thought are usually words or phrases of Scripture. This is a consideration which ought to be allowed weight in discussing the relation between vers. 6-8 and the parallel passage in Romans.

5. *καὶ αὐτοὶ . . . πνευματικός*. "Be ye also as living stones built up a spiritual house."

It seems best to take *οικοδομείσθε* as imperative, the last link of the chain of imperatives extending from i. 13 onwards. Dr. Hort regards it as indicative, and translates "ye are being builded." Here again St. Peter keeps distinctly in view the corporate idea of the Christian life; the house or temple is the community as in Eph. ii. 21, 22, not the individual soul as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19. The word *οἶκος* is used here probably because it means both "house" and "household," and thus suits both the preceding *οικοδομείσθε* and the following *ἱεράτευμα*. *Πνευματικός*, "spiritual," "immaterial," or perhaps "reasonable." Philo has the adjective *πνευματικός* (*de mundi officio* 22, i. 15). In his psychology *πνεῦμα*, the breath of life, which makes the animal soul "live"

(Gen. ii. 7), is synonymous with the Greek *νοῦς* (*quod detur potiori insid.* 22, i. 207. See Siegfried, p. 240, and Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 126).

εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἁγίου. "To be a holy priesthood." The A.V. follows K L P, the Vulgate, and Peshito in omitting *εἰς*. Here again St. Peter is looking forward to a passage of Scripture which he means to quote more precisely; in Ex. xix. 6, *ἅγιον* is the epithet of *ἔθνος* not of *ἱεράτευμα*. The living stones, when they are built into the house, become also the body of priests who minister in the house, and the priests must be holy. The word *ἅγιος* is repeated here with emphasis from i. 15, and resumes all that has been said from that point.

ἀνεύγκαι . . . Χριστοῦ. "To offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." *Ἀναφέρειν* is thus used, not in classical Greek, nor by St. Paul, but commonly in the LXX. (e.g. Gen. xxii. 2, 13, of the sacrifice of Isaac), by James (ii. 21), and in Heb. (vii. 27, xiii. 15). St. Peter does not define the sacrifices further than by saying that they are spiritual, as befits the spiritual house and the holy priesthood. The epithet *πνευματικός* distinguishes them from the offerings of the Law; they are not shadows and symbols, but realities, such as spirit offers to spirit, and a holy priesthood to a holy God. It would, however, be pressing the word too far to regard it as excluding all connexion with material objects; for a gift of money is spoken of as a *θυσία* (Phil. iv. 18; cf. Acts x. 4; Heb. xiii. 16). Purely spiritual acts of self-dedication, praise, faith, are also spoken of as sacrifices (Röm. xii. 1; Phil. ii. 17; Eph. v. 1, 2); and no doubt no sacrifice is *πνευματική* without the act of self-surrender. Here, where the sacrifices are those of the community, it seems impossible so to restrict them as to make them merely another name for *φιλαδελφία*, or for the putting away of all malice or wickedness. The praise and prayers of the assembly of brethren are no doubt meant, but their gifts are not excluded.

εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. "Acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." *Εὐπρόσδεκτος* is not used in the LXX. or Apocrypha (the simple *δεκτός* being preferred in this sense), but it was known to Greek religion (Schol. on Arist. *Pax*, 1054), and also to ordinary Greek language (Plutarch, *Praec. Ger. Reip.* 801 C)" (Hort). Commentators appear to be very evenly divided on the question whether *διὰ* is to be taken with *ἀνεύγκαι* or with *εὐπροσδέκτους*. Heb. xiii. 15 favours the former construction; the order of words, the latter. There is a difference in the sense. In the former case we offer through Jesus spiritual sacrifices which are acceptable because spiritual; in the second, we offer spiritual sacrifices, which are acceptable because offered through Him, deriving all their worth from Him who presents them to God, and with whose one sacrifice they are bound up.

6. διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ. "Because it contains in Scripture." Γραφή drops the article here just as "Scripture" does in English. Περιέχειν is absolute and impersonal, as in Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 4. 7, βούλομαι γίνεσθαι πάντα καθὼς ἐν αὐτῇ περιέχει. The same use of the word is found in Origen and in Adamantius (see Hort). In other passages, though the verb has ceased to be transitive, it is followed by an adverb or adverbial phrase; thus we find ἐπιστολαὶ περιέχουσι τὸν τρόπον τούτον, Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 4. 11; ἐπιστολὰς περιεχούσας οὕτως, 2 Macc. ix. 18, xi. 22. Περιοχή is used for a table of contents or summary of a book (see Facciolati, *Periocha*), or for a paragraph or passage, Cic. *ad Att.* xiii. 25. 3; Acts viii. 32.

In the passage which follows we have a cento of quotations from the Old Testament. Ἴδὸν τίθημι . . . καταισχυνθῆ is from Isa. xxviii. 16; λίθος . . . γωνίας from Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22; λίθος . . . σκανδάλου from Isa. viii. 14; γένος ἐκλεκτόν from Isa. xliii. 20; βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον from Ex. xix. 6; λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν . . . ἐξαγγείλητε from Isa. xliiii. 21 (λαὸν μου ὃν περιποίησάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι). Οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς . . . ἐληθέντες is a clause made up of phrases taken from Hos. i. ii.

The relation between 1 Pet. ii. 6-8 and Rom. ix. 33 is discussed in the Introduction, p. 18 sqq. St. Peter is catching up, reiterating, justifying from Scripture, words which he has used immediately before, in vers. 4 and 5; but some of them have been present in his thoughts from the first; thus ἐκλεκτός, i. 1; τιμῆ, τίμιος, i. 7, 19; ἅγιος, i. 15; λόγος, i. 23, ii. 2; and we may add οὐ λαός compared with ἀναγεγεννημένοι, i. 23. The passage which occurred to him first was Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22, from which comes the ἀποδοκιμασμένον of ver. 4; this word started the train of association which suggested the other quotations. This particular quotation is used elsewhere by St. Peter, Acts iv. 11, and in the Gospels (Luke xx. 17 with parallels), but nowhere else. These features seem to be strongly in favour of St. Peter's originality here; but Dr. Hort and many other high authorities think it morally certain that St. Peter borrowed the common part of his quotation from St. Paul.

ἰδοῦ, τίθημι . . . καταισχυνθῆ. "Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, honoured; and he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame." The LXX. version of Isa. xxviii. 16 is ἰδοῦ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελεῆ ἐκλεκτόν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῆ. St. Peter omits πολυτελεῆ, "precious"; ἔντιμον might bear the same meaning, but he clearly takes it to mean "held in honour," which is the more usual sense of the word.

ἐπ' αὐτῷ after πιστεύων is found in most MSS. of the LXX., and was inserted, as Dr. Hort thinks, before the Christian era. The Hebrew text as translated by the R.V. is "Behold, I lay in Zion for

a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste." The Stone is Jehovah Himself (Cheyne), or the Messianic King (Hort). "Shall not make haste," shall not flee in terror, is not in itself badly represented by οὐ μὴ καταισχνυθῆ: but these words are here understood, "shall not be ashamed, but shall come to honour." Ἀκρογωνιαίον makes of the stone not a foundation, but the "head of the corner"; and this mistranslation probably accounts for the substitution of τίθημι ἐν for ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια. In Rom. ix. 33, ἰδοὺ, τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος, a different but equally cogent reason can be assigned for the same substitution; it was not possible for St. Paul to speak of "the stone of stumbling," a loose stone lying in the road, as a foundation. Both apostles therefore may have made the same change independently, but it is quite possible that they found it already made in some common source.

Πιστεύειν here has quite the same sense as in Isaiah. St. Paul finds in it a proof of the difference between the righteousness of faith and that of works.

7. ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. "For you therefore which believe is the honour." The words are an explanation of ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχνυθῆ and of the preceding ἐντιμον. Cf. i. 7, εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν. In the following sentence the contrasted dishonour is explained by προσκόπτουσι, the honour itself by the lofty titles which are given to those who are built upon the stone. The translation of the A.V. "unto you therefore which believe he is precious" (it comes from Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, and Bengel, and found its way into the English Bible through Tyndale), is objectionable grammatically, for ἡ τιμὴ is subject not predicate. The R.V. has, "For you therefore which believe is the preciousness." "It is you that are concerned in the preciousness of which Isaiah speaks; for you that stone is before God of great price; the benefit of its high prerogatives accrues to you" (Hort). But this explanation is based upon the omitted πολυτελεῖ, assigns no meaning to ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχνυθῆ, and gives to τιμὴ a sense which it cannot bear. Τιμὴ means "a price" (Matt. xxvii. 6), or "honour," but is hardly used of intrinsic worth, and never of that value in affection which we call "preciousness."

ἀπιστοῦσι δέ. "But to such as disbelieve," "to anybody who disbelieves." The article is occasionally omitted before the participle when the persons denoted are left quite indeterminate. So Plato, *Rep.* x. 595 C, πολλὰ τοι δεύτερον βλέπόντων ἀμβλύτερον ὀρώντες πρότερον εἶδον, "short-sighted men often catch sight of things before men of keener vision."

λίθος . . . γωνίας. From Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22 quite literally except that the LXX. has λίθον (attracted to the case of ὄν). The

verse is quoted by our Saviour (Matt. xxi. 42 ; Mark xii. 10 ; Luke xx. 17), and by St. Peter (Acts iv. 11), but not elsewhere.

8. λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου is from Isa. viii. 14. The Hebrew text is translated in the R.V. "for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence." "The LXX. translators apparently shrank from the plain sense, and boldly substituted a loose paraphrase containing a negative which inverts Isaiah's drift, καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθον προσκόμῃ συναντήσεσθε (αὐτῷ) οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι" (Hort). Theodotion and Symmachus have εἰς λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ εἰς πέτραν πτώματος. Aquila, εἰς λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ εἰς στερεὸν σκανδάλου (Field's *Hexapla*). St. Paul (Rom. ix. 33), λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου. It would seem that the LXX. translation was known to be faulty, and that it had been corrected into a shape very similar to that given by St. Peter and St. Paul. Indeed there is reason for supposing that the exact shape was in use. Λίθος προσκόμματος is given by Aquila, and πέτρα σκανδάλου seems to underlie the words of our Saviour (Matt. xvi. 23), ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπε τῷ Πέτρῳ· Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ. At any rate this speech would very readily suggest to Christian minds the slight final correction that was needed. It should be noticed, moreover, that these three prophecies were naturally much used by Christians, and that they recur in combination. In the Gospels, Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 22 is followed by words (πᾶς ὁ πεισὼν ἐπ' ἐκείνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται, Luke xx. 18) which appear to be suggested by Isa. viii. 14. In Rom. ix. 33 and here in Peter we have all three; and in Barnabas vi., ἐπεὶ ὡς λίθος ἰσχυρὸς ἐτέθη εἰς συντριβὴν· Ἴδου ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών, a quotation of Isa. xxviii. 16 is preceded by words (ἐτέθη εἰς συντριβὴν) which seem to be a reminiscence of τίθημι ἐν Σιών and of λίθος προσκόμματος. It is therefore quite unnecessary to suppose that St. Peter's version of Isaiah is derived from that of St. Paul.

ὁὶ προσκόπτουσι τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες. "Who stumble on the word through disobedience." The proper meaning of ἀπειθεῖν is "disobey," and of ἀπειθής "disobedient." "Disobey" is not the same thing as "disbelieve," but the two are closely connected and here practically equivalent, because disobedience is the outward expression of disbelief. Τῷ λόγῳ is better taken both with προσκόπτουσι and with ἀπειθοῦντες, but the German commentators generally incline to take it with ἀπειθοῦντες alone: "who stumble through disobeying the word." The chief reason given by Kühn for this construction is that τῷ λόγῳ could not without some explanation be put for τῷ λίθῳ, because such a substitution involves a nearer approach to the Johannine use of "word" than we can find in Peter. This, however, is needless refinement. The unbelievers stumble on the word of prophecy, the word which makes Christ the chief corner stone. The participle appears to have its usual adverbial

force, they stumble "because they disobey," so that disobedience, rebellion, causes the stumbling. We cannot take *ἀπειθοῦντες* as co-ordinate with *προσκόπτουσι*, "they stumble and disobey," because of the parallelism with *ἀπιστοῦσι ἐγενήθη λάθος προσκόμματος*.

εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. "Whereunto also they were appointed" by the ordinance of God; cf. *εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη ἐγὼ κῆρυξ*, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; John xv. 16; Acts xiii. 47. The antecedent to *εἰς ὃ* is the main verb *προσκόπτουσι*: this follows as a necessary consequence from the subordination of the participle. Hence those who (like Calvin and Beza) make the relative refer to *ἀπειθοῦντες*, and those who find the antecedent in both *προσκόπτουσι* and *ἀπειθοῦντες*, are no doubt mistaken. The sense, therefore, is "they disobey, and for that reason stumble"; "because they disobey, God ordains that they shall stumble." Their disobedience is not ordained, the penalty of their disobedience is. An illustration may be found in the Book of Exodus (v. 2): "And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." Therefore "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart" (vii. 3), and brought him to ruin. The words may be taken as meaning that disbelief, disobedience, come first and entail "hardening," judicial blindness, wilful rebellion, and destruction as their consequence; and this, which may be supported from other passages of Scripture, and is, indeed, the teaching of experience, appears to be the view of St. Peter. We may, if we please, add the further question, Whence comes disbelief? Does not this imply a preliminary hardening? This question is raised by St. Paul (Rom. ix. 17, 18) in the anguish of his desire to find some hope for Israel as a people, and to vindicate what he still regarded as a universal promise of God. But the question ought never to be asked, because it can never receive an answer. The only logical answers are Universalism and Reprobation, of which the former contradicts both Scripture and experience, while the latter is irreconcilable with the idea of God. The Platonic school held, the Bible generally and St. Peter here imply, that man has, by virtue of his divine creation, a certain knowledge of God, a certain love of goodness; that, if he holds fast and obeys this rudimentary faith, he is carried forward towards fuller light; that, if he will not follow, he becomes "hard," ignorant, impenitent, and openly rebellious. The New Testament teaches that the remedy for hardness is not instruction, which the hard man despises, nor chastisement, against which he rebels, but the vicarious suffering of Christ above all, and of good and innocent men in their several places and functions, the priest for his people, the mother for her child, the teacher for his pupils, and so on. This is the law which we see at work in all the world, both physical and moral; why it should be the law we are not to inquire.

Θ. ὑμεῖς δέ . . . περιποίησιν. "But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for a peculiar possession." In these words is explained the *τιμή* of ver. 7. All the titles are corporate, and all are transferred from Israel to the brotherhood. Israel has been purged, not rejected. *Γένος ἐκλεκτόν* is from Isa. xliii. 20; the word *γένος* denoting blood-relation is applied to the Christians as members of one family through the new birth; cf. i. 23. From its use here possibly comes the expression *τρίτον γένος*, applied to Christians (see Aristides, *Apol.* ii., *τρία γένη εἰσὶν ἀνθρώπων*: xv., *οἱ Χριστιανοὶ γενεαλογοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*). The phrase was also used derisively by the heathen, as if this "third race" was not wanted and ought not to exist, Tert. *ad Nat.* i. 8. 20. *Βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον* are from Ex. xix. 6. The same passage is referred to in Apoc. i. 6, *ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ*: v. 10, *ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*: here there is a closer approximation to the Hebrew, which has "a kingdom of priests," or possibly "a kingdom, priests" (see Dr. Hort's note). It is barely possible that in the LXX. *βασιλείον* is a substantive (= kingdom), but in Peter it is certainly an adjective. *Ἱεράτευμα* is explained in ver. 5; the Christians are a body of *ἱερεῖς*, because they offer spiritual sacrifices; the *ἱεράτευμα* is royal because it belongs to the King, who has chosen it as His own possession, and because, therefore, it shares in His glory; not because the *ἱερεῖς* are themselves kings, and shall reign upon earth (as in the Apoc.). The title is applied in Exodus to the people of Israel, who, in a sense, were all *ἱερεῖς*, yet possessed a specially consecrated body of *ἱερεῖς*. Here also, therefore, it affords no presumption against the existence in the Christian community of a class of spiritual officials. But the spiritual official is *πρεσβύτερος*, not *ἱερεῖς*. *Ἔθνος* is generally a secular word, but it is used of God's "nation" (1 Esdr. i. 4, *θεραπεύετε τὸ ἔθνος αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*: Ps. cv. (cvi.) 5). The nation is *ἅγιον* because separated from other nations and consecrated to the service of God (*sacrum* not *sanctum*). The consecration implies an obligation to personal inward holiness, but does not exclude the necessity of such an exhortation as we find in i. 15. The following title is taken from Isa. xliii. 21, *λαὸν μου, ὃν περιποιήσάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγέισθαι*, but the phrase *εἰς περιποίησιν* is suggested by Mal. iii. 17. In Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18, we find *λαὸς περιούσιος*. The figure was familiar to St. Paul also (Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 14).

ὁπως τὰς ἀρετὰς . . . φῶς. "That ye may proclaim the excellences of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." *Ἀρετή* in the Bible never signifies moral virtue, except in Phil. iv. 8 (see Vincent's note); 2 Pet. i. 3, 5, and the Apocrypha. Here it is used in its proper Greek sense of any shining or eminent

quality, such as makes a man noble in himself and glorious in the eyes of others. The Hebrew word represented in Isaiah by τὰς ἀρετὰς means "my praise." Here the sense is very nearly that of μεγαλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (Acts ii. 11, the Vulgate has *magnalia Dei*). The Christian is to show forth in word and life, not merely the goodness of God, but His glory, His greatness, all His noble attributes, wisdom, justice, strength. In the current Greek of St. Peter's time the miracles wrought by a god were called his ἀρεταί: see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 91, Eng. trans. p. 95; but this special limitation of the word must not be attributed to Isaiah, St. Peter, or their readers.

10. οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός . . . ἐληθόντες. Hos. ii. 23. St. Peter appears to follow the reading of A, καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου λαός μου εἰ σύ. St. Paul, Rom. ix. 25, combines Hos. ii. 23 with the second half of i. 10 and follows the text of B, καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην. καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρήθη αὐτοῖς. Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. St. Paul applies the words to the admission of the Gentiles. Hosea was speaking of the conversion of the Jews themselves, and St. Peter uses his phrases here in such a way that they are equally applicable to all readers of the Epistle, whether Jews or Gentiles. It is quite needless to suppose that he was here following a lead given by Romans.

11. ἀγαπητοί . . . ψυχῆς. Here we might say begins a fresh exhortation, the former extending to this point from i. 22. But it is extremely difficult to divide the Epistle into sections, or, if we make a new section here, to say precisely where it ends. If we regard the subject as being the duty of Christians in their several positions and vocations, we may make the next break after iii. 7; but the same subject recurs iv. 7-11, and the duty of Presbyters is treated later on, v. 1 sqq. It is better not to be too systematic.

"Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from the desires of the flesh, which war against the soul." NKJ and the Vulgate read ἀπέχεσθαι: A C L P, the Syriac, Coptic, and Aethiopic, ἀπέχεσθε. The balance of authority rather inclines in favour of the imperative, and is turned definitely in this direction by the absence of ὑμᾶς and by the following ἔχοντες. Dr. Hort, upon the whole, prefers the infinitive, on the ground that St. Peter shows a very strong preference for the aorist in imperatives; but just below we have three presents imperative.

The words "strangers and pilgrims" carry us back to i. 1-17; there is still more instruction to be gathered from these words. Here they suggest, not heaven from which the Christian is an exile, but the lawless heathen among whom he dwells for a time. Yet, because he dwells among them, he has a duty towards them; they are not kindly, yet they may become even as he.

αἴτινες = *quippe quae*, introduces a reason, "abstain, for they

war." Ἀπέχουσαι ἐπιθυμιῶν is a classical phrase. Dr. Hort quotes Plato, *Phaedo*, 82 C, οἱ ὀρθῶς φιλοσοφούντες ἀπέχονται τῶν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀπασῶν. The ethical use of σὰρξ in the Epistles may have come from Epicurus (see Ritter and Preller, p. 424) and the Stoics—Epictetus, ii. 23. 20, παρελθούσα ἡμῖν λεγέτω, κράτιστον εἶναι τῶν ὄντων τὴν σάρκα: Marcus Anton. ii. 2, τῶν μὲν σαρκίων καταφρόνησον: Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apoll.* 13 (*Moralia*, 107 F), τὸ γὰρ ἀδούλωτον τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ τοῖς ταύτης πάθει διάγειν, ὕψ' ὧν κατασπώμενος ὁ νοῦς τῆς θνητῆς ἀναπίμπλαται φλυαρίας, εὐδαιμόν τι καὶ μακάριον. But the question is complex. A large number of New Testament words are found in Epictetus, δόγμα, κανών, σώζεσθαι, ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἀμαρτάνειν, κηρύσσειν (= to preach, iv. 6. 23), τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ (iv. 7. 17), καλεῖν (of God, ii. 1. 39), ἀπιστία (ii. 14. 8), μάρτυς (ii. 24. 113), ἄγγελος (iii. 22. 23), κύριε ὁ Θεός (ii. 16. 13), Κύριε ἐλέησον (ii. 7. 12). The Stoics were closely connected with the East; one of their strongholds was Tarsus, and their vocabulary may well have been modified by Jewish influence. It is possible even to think that Epictetus had some acquaintance with Christian terminology. New words and ideas spread quite as rapidly under the Empire as they do now. But some Christian words come from Stoicism, such as προκοπή, Phil. i. 25; κατόρθωμα, which some MSS. have in Acts xxiv. 2; ζῆσις, Heb. v. 14 (though the Stoics distinguished this word from διάθεσις); διάνοια, 1 Pet. i. 13; φύσις θεία, 2 Pet. i. 4. No doubt there was a certain amount of give and take. In the present passage the seat of desire is the σὰρξ, which St. Paul opposes to νοῦς (Rom. vii. 23) in the same way as Plutarch, though he generally finds the antithesis in πνεῦμα. Here St. Peter contrasts σὰρξ with ψυχῆ, the soul, the whole immaterial nature of man; we may compare the phrase quoted by Antoninus from Epictetus, ψυχάριον εἶ βασιτάζον νεκρόν. "Ψυχῆ here, in opposition to σὰρξ, is the higher spiritual part of man, in which the higher spiritual religious life develops itself, to which the final Deliverance belongs (i. 9)," Kühn. In iii. 18, St. Peter contrasts σὰρξ with πνεῦμα as flesh with spirit or ghost. See note there.

12. τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν. "Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles" (A.V.). Καλήν (which is marked as predicate by the position of the article) is the Latin *honestus*, gracious, dignified, commanding admiration. Unfortunately the English *honest* has almost lost its original sense, but we ought by all means to rescue it from further degradation.

ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν. "In order that in that very matter in which they speak against you as evil-doers." Ἐν ᾧ, which must be taken with both καταλαλοῦσιν and δοξάσωσι, cannot here be temporal, because δοξάσωσι is future in sense, and must therefore be regarded as equivalent to ἐν τῷ ἀναστρέφεσθαι. Ἔτσι they vilify your conduct (vilify

you in your conduct); one day they will glorify God for it (in it). *Κακοποιός* just below, ii. 14, and again in iv. 15, means not merely an evil-doer in the general sense of a wicked man, but one who does evil in such a way that he is liable to punishment from the magistrate. Cf. John xviii. 30, *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακοποιός, οὐκ ἄν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν*. The word, therefore, naturally reminded the Tübingen critics of Suetonius, *Nero*, 16, "afflicti supplicis Christiani genus hominum superstitionis nouae ac maleficae"; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, "quos per flagitia inuisos uulgo Christianos appellabat"; Pliny, *Ép.* x. 96, "flagitia cohaerentia nomini." We must observe, however, that St. Peter does not hint at the existence of those accusations of cannibalism and incest which were levelled against the Christians in the second century, Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 14, 26; and that the molestation of the brotherhood by their pagan neighbours does not appear to have advanced substantially beyond calumny (*καταλαλοῦσιν*). The state of things is that described in Acts, and all that is said would apply very well to the persecution in England of the early Quakers or Methodists. Then also there were calumnies, tumults, and the law was invoked, not directly for the punishment and suppression of religious opinion, but indirectly and occasionally for the punishment of actions arising out of the opinion. Calumnies of a very formidable kind would arise immediately in that pagan society, which, with all its cultivation, was exceedingly savage. Charges of "boycotting" or interference with trade (Acts xvi. 16, xix. 23), of setting slaves against masters (Philemon), children against parents, and wives against husbands, would be made instantly; that of disloyalty to Caesar in some vague and general way was also immediate (John xix. 12) and inevitable. Beyond this kind of calumny the language of St. Peter does not go. Yet we cannot doubt that the viler accusations would instantly occur to any pagan who heard of the new religion. Jews were regarded as haters of the human race (Mayor's Notes on Juvenal, xiv. 96 sqq.), and the Christians were a kind of Jews, only worse (Celsus, *True Word*). Cicero charges Vatinius quite incidentally and in the coolest way with sacrificing boys (*in Vat.* vi., "cum puerorum extis Deos Manes mactare soleas"), and Horace (*Epodes*, v.) makes the same charge against Canidia. What was a jest to the light-hearted poet would be deadly earnest to the vulgar. Public prostitution again was connected with many Eastern rites, even with those of Cybele (Juvenal, ix. 22 sqq.), and accusations of this kind would lie near at hand. It should not be forgotten that, in spite of the fine language of the philosophers, the really popular religions in Greece and Rome were forms of devil-worship, intimately blended with magic in all its grades. Hence it is evident what the baser sort of men might think and say about Christianity from the very first. From the way in which Cicero and Horace talk it is also

evident that they might say the most abominable things without any intention of putting Christians to death on this account. Yet we can also understand that, where men are savage enough to entertain such suspicions, they will sooner or later act upon them; the mob will cry out, and there will be a Nero.

ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων . . . ἐπισκοπῆς. "From your honest actions, as they behold them, they may glorify God in the day of visitation": ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες (αὐτά). The grammar is slightly embarrassed by the introduction of a participle which requires a construction different from that of the main verb. Cf. i. 8, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὄρωντες (αὐτὸν) πιστεύοντες δέ, and in the classics, Hom. *Il.* vii. 303, δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον ξὺν κολεῷ τε φέρων: Soph. *O. C.* 475, οἷος νέερος νεοπόκη μαλλῶ λαβῶν: *El.* 47, ἄγγελλε δ' ὄρκω προστιθείς: Arist. *Aues.* 56, λίθω κόπον λαβῶν: Thuc. vi. 34, εἰ τῷ ταχυναυτοῦντι κουφίσαντες προσβάλοιεν: iii. 59, φείσασθαι . . . οἰκτῶ σῶφρονι λαβόντας: in all these places the object of the participle must be supplied from an adverbial phrase (dative or preposition with noun) attached to the main verb. Ἐποπτεύοντες (cf. iii. 2) merely means beholding. The verb is used by Symmachus in his version of Ps. ix. 35 (x. 14), xxxii. (xxxiii.) 13, but does not occur in the LXX. In the vocabulary of the Greek mysteries the Epopt was one who had reached the highest grade of initiation, and was admitted to gaze upon the sacred things; and Clement of Alexandria, who is fond of mystic Neoplatonic terms, employs the phrase ἐποπτεύειν τὸν Θεόν (*Strom.* iv. 23. 152); but we must not attempt to apply this non-biblical usage here. Von Soden, Kühn, Weiss, Usteri, Hort, observe with justice that in the words of St. Peter there is an unmistakable echo of Matt. v. 16, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς, a current biblical phrase, from Isa. x. 3, dispenses with the articles. God "visits" sometimes with comfort or deliverance (Ex. iii. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 21; Job x. 12), sometimes to punish (Ex. xxxii. 34; Ps. lviii. (lix.) 6; Job xxix. 4), sometimes for the purpose of judicial investigation (Ps. xvi. (xvii.) 3). In Luke xix. 44, οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, the sense appears to be this last; Jerusalem had not made herself ready for the coming, the "visitation," of her judge. Indeed, this is the general idea which seems to underlie all the passages referred to. God "visits" as judge, and rewards or punishes as He finds occasion. The question here is whether St. Peter is speaking of the supreme and final visitation, in other words, of the Day of Judgment, or of an intermediate visitation, when the truth of the gospel is brought home to the heart, so that we might express it in paraphrase "in the day of their conversion." Kühn and most modern commentators take the latter view, von Soden and Schott the former, thus making ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς refer to that ἀποκάλυψις which occupies so large a place in St. Peter's thoughts.

This seems to be the better explanation. The sense is little different in either case; the heathen could not be said to glorify God in the Revelation, unless they had already been converted.

13. With the following sections compare Rom. xiii. 1-6; Eph. v. 21-vi. 9; Tit. ii.; Col. iii. 18-iv. 1. We need not suppose that there was any direct borrowing on either side; a few expressions are very similar, but there are also considerable differences. The topic is a missionary's commonplace, as we see from its repetition in the Pauline Epistles. There was great and obvious danger of incurring the suspicion of disloyalty or of interference with the family bond, especially in the case of slaves. All Christian preachers must have received definite instructions as to the attitude they were to maintain, and the language they were to employ on these highly delicate questions.

13. *πάση ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει*. "To every human institution." *Κτίσις* in Rom. i. 20 means "the act of creation"; *ibid.* viii. 19-21, the whole assemblage of created things, "creation" in the concrete sense; *ibid.* viii. 39, "a creature." In secular Greek the word usually signifies "the foundation of a city," but *κτίζειν* is used in the sense of founding or instituting (*ἐορτήν* or *βωμόν* in Pindar), or creating, inventing (*χαλινόν*, Soph. *O. C.* 715). It is by this secular use that we must explain St. Peter's phrase; *πάσα ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει* is "every foundation," or "institution of man." If we attempt to give *κτίσις* the sense of "divine ordinance," we bring the substantive into direct contradiction with its epithet, *ἀνθρωπίνῃ*, which can only mean "human." The idea involved is that, while order is a divine command, all special forms of civil government by consuls or kings, republican or monarchical, are mere means of carrying out God's design for the welfare of society, depend upon the will of man, and are in themselves indifferent. Both in expression and in point of view St. Peter differs very widely here from St. Paul, who speaks of Caesar as holding his authority from God, not from the people (Rom. xiii. 1). A doctrine of divine right could be built upon the words of St. Paul, but not upon those of St. Peter. In the early days of the Empire it was still seriously debated whether the government was a Republic or a Monarchy (see Dion Cassius, liii. 17). St. Peter takes the former view, St. Paul the latter.

διὰ τὸν Κύριον. "For the Lord's sake." Not because the Lord ordained Caesar, but because the Lord's life was one of obedience, because He Himself showed respect to Pilate, and because He commanded His people to obey, Matt. xxii. 21. Many commentators (Hofmann, Keil, Usteri, von Soden) understand the words to mean "so as not to bring dishonour on the name of Christ" by unruly behaviour.

14. *εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι*. "Whether to the King as above all." *Βασιλεύς* was the regular title for Caesar in the Greek-speaking

parts of the Empire (cf. Apoc. xvii. 10-12), though the Romans always refused to call him *rex*.

εἶτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενοι. "Or to governours as sent by him." "Ἡγεμών was specially applied about this time to governours of provinces, whether *legati Augusti*, or proconsuls, or anything else" (Hort). Πεμπόμενοι is present, because they are sent one by one, from time to time (cf. προσερχόμενοι, ii. 4). They are commissioned by Caesar, not by God. Διὰ (generally, not always; see Blass, p. 132) expresses the intermediate agent, and Dr. Hort regards the preposition as indicating that Caesar is the channel through which divine authority is conveyed to the governour. But if Caesar himself was an ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, so assuredly was the proconsul. Order, the State, is divine, and the Emperor's authority is derived from the State, not immediately from God. St. Paul calls the magistrate διάκονος Θεοῦ: St. Peter does not go so far as this. What he says is that the magistrate is to be obeyed because Caesar sends him; and that Caesar, though a human institution, is to be obeyed, because order is God's will. The passage is full of interest, and its meaning ought not to be missed. St. Peter throughout his Epistle maintains that νόμος πάντων βασιλεύς: God is King, but rules through Law. His frame of mind is constitutional. St. Paul, the Roman citizen, is Imperialist both in politics and in theology; the grace of God is as supreme in the one department as the grace of Caesar in the other.

εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν. "For punishment of evil-doers and praise of well-doers." In these words St. Peter comes very close to St. Paul (Rom. xiii. 3, θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβέσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ εἴσεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς: 4, Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἐκδικὸς εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι), and it is not impossible that there may be a connexion between the two passages, though it is not necessary to suppose that it was direct or documentary. Ἐκδικεῖν, ἐκδίκησις are common late words for avenging or punishing. It may be noticed that though the individual Christian is forbidden to take the law into his own hands and avenge his own injuries (Matt. v. 39), yet it is the duty of the civil power to avenge them for him; and unless this duty is firmly discharged the State cannot exist. Κακοποιῶν. See note above. But it should be added that Roman law made no sharp distinction between "immoral" and "criminal." The governour was father as well as magistrate, and his power extended to every action that was *contra bonos mores*. Thus he was specially directed to take care that children obeyed their parents and freedmen their patrons. *Digest* i. 16. 9, "De plano autem proconsul potest expedire haec: ut obsequium parentibus et patronis liberisque patronorum exhiberi iubeat; comminari etiam et terrere filium a patre oblatum, qui non ut oportet conuersari dicatur, poterit de plano: similiter et libertum

non obsequentem emendare aut uerbis aut fustium castigatione." A Christian son, or freedman, might very well be thought *non ut oportet conuersari*, his *ἀναστροφή* would be far from *καλή* in the sight of a heathen father, or patron, or patron's family. Owing to this paternal jurisdiction *ἔπαινος* was much more directly and frequently the function of the ancient magistrate than of his modern counterpart. Yet we still speak of the sovereign as "the fountain of honour," and of late years the scriptural belief that it is the duty of the State not only to repress evil but to encourage good, has taken practical shape.

15. *ὅτι οὕτως . . . ἀγνωσίαν.* "For this is the will of God, that by well-doing we should muzzle the ignorance of foolish men." *Φιμοῦν* (Σ reads *φιμοῦν*, and Westcott and Hort retain this vulgar form; Introduction, § 410, Appendix, p. 166) is used because the ignorance expressed itself in speech (*καταλαλοῦσιν*), which can be muzzled. The general sense of the verse is clear, but the construction is open to doubt. We may regard *ὅτι οὕτως* as referring back to *ὑποτάγητε*—"Be subject, for this is the will of God,"—in this case the following words, *ἀγαθοποιούντας . . . ἀγνωσίαν*, must be regarded as a loose explanatory afterthought. Or we may take the whole verse as a parenthesis referring to the words *ἔπαινον ἀγαθοποιῶν*. If we adopt this view *οὕτως* anticipates the infinitive—"For this is the will of God, namely, that we should muzzle." *Ἀγνωσίαν*: "*ignorationem* de Christianorum probitate. Hoc uerbo continetur ratio cur Christiani debeant miserationem ethnicis," Bengel.

16. *καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.* "And not as men who hold liberty a cloak for vice." The negative *μὴ* and the nominative *ἔχοντες* are both determined by the imperative *ὑποτάγητε*. Here again in the position of *ὡς* we have the same refinement as in i. 19; see Introduction, p. 4. The Christian *ἐλευθερία* might easily be interpreted to mean emancipation from moral restraint, and repeated warnings were necessary; cf. Gal. v. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 19. It is just possible that *ἐπικάλυμμα τῆς κακίας* is a reminiscence of Menander, *Boeotia*, *πλούτος δὲ πολλῶν ἐπικάλυμ' ἐστὶν κακῶν* (Stobaeus, *Flor.* xci. 19; Meineke, iv. p. 94; Kock, iii. 2. 28, No. 90). Greek poets are quoted by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Tit. i. 12; and Apoc. v. 8, *φιάλας χρυσᾶς γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων*, reminds us of Soph. *O. T.* 4, *πόλις δ' ὁμοῦ μὲν θυμιαμάτων γέμει*.

δοῦλοι Θεοῦ. Cf. Matt. vi. 24; 1 Thess. i. 9; Tit. i. 1. But St. Paul prefers the phrase *δοῦλος Χριστοῦ*, Rom. i. 1, xiv. 18, xvi. 18, and elsewhere.

17. *πάντας τιμῆσατε.* All men are to be honoured, but not with the same honour. "*Alieniores ciuilliter tractandi: patres familiariter*," Bengel. The wise Christian will know what degree or

kind of observance is due to Caesar, to a master, a husband, or a wife. We might have expected *τιμᾶτε*, as the command is not special but general. But the aorist is repeatedly used in the same way, i. 13-22, and it seems clear that St. Peter does not discriminate the tenses. See note on i. 15. *Τὸν Θεὸν φοβείσθε*. The slaves of God must fear God; cf. i. 17, v. 6. Kühn rightly notes that St. Peter still speaks the language of the Old Testament, and regards Fear as the natural and proper attitude (*die Grundbestimmung*) of the Christian soul towards God. It is probable that the apostle is here alluding to Prov. xxiv. 21, *φοβοῦ τὸν Θεόν, υἱέ, καὶ βασιλεία*.

18. οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι. "Ye domestics being subject." This and the three following paragraphs (iii. 1, 7, 8) begin with participles, which the writer probably connected in his own mind with one of the preceding imperatives. We may compare this paragraph with Eph. vi. 5-7; Col. iii. 22-25; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10. St. Peter's treatment of the subject seems to be quite independent. *Οικέτης* means any member of a household, and includes wife and children. Here, as usually, it is restricted to the slaves: yet denotes them not as slaves, but as belonging to the *familia* or *οἶκος*, like the Latin *famuli*, or our *domestic*. Some of their masters would be good and *ἐπιεικεῖς*, equitable, reasonable. The latter word is defined by Aristotle, *Ethica Nic.* v. 14, *καὶ ἔστιν αὐτῇ ἡ φύσις τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς, ἐπανόρθωμα νόμου ἧ ἑλλείπει διὰ τὸ καθόλου*. Law is the hard and fast rule which equity modifies according to circumstances. St. Paul speaks of the "reasonableness of Christ," 2 Cor. x. 1; the bishop should be *ἐπιεικής*, 1 Tim. iii. 3, and in Jas. iii. 17 the wisdom which cometh from above is *πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστὴ ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος*: this is a string of golden words. Some, again, would be crooked, perverse (*σκολιολί*). All alike are to be obeyed *ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ*. The fear is not fear of man (as in Eph. vi. 5), but fear of God; this is evident from the following *διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ*. Three dangers would beset the Christian slave. If his master were a Christian, he might fancy that because all men are equal in the Church they are therefore equal in all things: this point is touched by St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 2). Or he might rebel against the injustice of his servile condition and set his heart on emancipation (1 Cor. vii. 21). Lastly, if the master were a harsh man, the newly learned doctrines of justice and mercy might make the slave more inclined to resist. This is the danger that occurs to St. Peter; he meets it by reminding the slave that innocent suffering is the lot of all Christians. It is instructive to notice how completely both apostles abstain from casuistry. Neither makes any allusion to the scruples of conscience that would suggest themselves so easily to the Christian slave of a

heathen master. At every turn he must have been called upon to bow his head in the house of Rimmon, to fetch the incense for his master to burn, to dress the door with branches on pagan festivals, to wear clothing embroidered with idolatrous emblems. A very liberal measure of outward compliance must have been tolerated at this time.

19. τούτο γὰρ χάρις εἶ διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσων ἀδίκως. "For this is thankworthy, if for consciousness of God one endures griefs, suffering unjustly." R.V. has in text "this is acceptable," in margin "this is grace." Both A.V. and R.V. have "for conscience towards God." "Acceptable" is εὐπρόσδεκτον, and if we render χάρις by this word we disguise, and indeed pervert, a remarkable saying in order to force the teaching of St. Peter into harmony with that of St. Paul. It is singular that the Revisers should here have departed from their general rule of translating, as far as possible, the same Greek word by the same English word. In τούτο χάρις, ποῖον κλέος; τούτο χάρις it is very probable that St. Peter has in his mind the saying of our Lord recorded in Luke vi. 32-34, where the repeated ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί; is rightly translated by the Revisers "what thank have ye?" Indeed, no other translation is possible. In the parallel passage, Matt. v. 46, the phrase used is τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε. Matthew and Mark do not use the word χάρις at all. Luke has it in vi. 32-34 and again xvii. 9, μὴ χάριν ἔχει τῷ δούλῳ, in the common Greek sense of a favour done by one person to another, or of the gratitude called forth by a favour. In Luke i. 30, ii. 40, 52, where the evangelist is using Hebrew documents, the word has its Old Testament sense, "favour," "goodwill," felt by God to man, or by men to one another. But this Hebrew sense is familiar in Greek also; the "goodwill" has a reason in the character and conduct of the person towards whom it is entertained, as Sophocles says, *Ajax*, 522, χάρις χάριν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἢ τίκτουσ' ἀεί. "Words of grace," Luke iv. 22, may mean "words of beauty," which would again be a Greek sense, or "words inspired by the divine favour." In John i. 14, 17, χάρις is apparently defined by ἀλήθεια: it is the special gift of truth: in i. 16, χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος may mean "one gift or blessing after another," or more easily, "God's goodwill towards us in return for our goodwill towards God." In the Gospel of St. John the word is only found in the first chapter; in the Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse it occurs only in the benedictions, 2 John 3; Apoc. i. 4, xxii. 21. In Acts χάρις becomes suddenly much more common. It is used (1) in the secular Greek sense, xxiv. 27, xxv. 3, 9; (2) of favour or goodwill in the eyes of man or God, ii. 47, vii. 46; (3) of the favour, in the special sense of the protection, of God, xiv. 26, xv. 40; (4) of special divine gifts, χάρις καὶ σοφία, vii. 10; χάρις καὶ δύναμις, vi. 8; (5) of the word of grace, i.e. the gospel, xiv. 3,

xx. 24, 32 ; cf. xiii. 43, *προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, to stand fast by the gospel ; xv. 11, *διὰ τῆς χάριτος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι* : xviii. 27, *οἱ πεπιστευκότες διὰ τῆς χάριτος* : (6) of a large outpouring of divine love on the disciples at Jerusalem, iv. 33 ; at Antioch, xi. 23. We may say that *χάρις* is hardly an evangelical word at all. Only on two occasions is it put in our Saviour's mouth, and then only in its Greek sense. Even in Acts the metaphysical difficulty arising from the freedom of God's gifts is no more to be found than in the Old Testament. To some limited extent the antithesis between the divine favour and the merits of man may be found in those passages where "the grace" means the gospel, but it is as yet latent. This applies also to the use of *χάρις* in Hebrews and in James. In the present passage St. Peter speaks of good conduct without the slightest embarrassment as thank-worthy, a glory, a favour in the eyes of God. Those who are willing to suffer innocently do what God desires and "find favour." *Διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ*, "For consciousness of God" ; "*propter Dei conscientiam*," Vulg. C reads here *διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ ἀγαθῆν* : A has a conflated text, *διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ ἀγαθῆν*. The reading of C is not without support (see Tischendorf), but is probably a mere correction designed to bring the passage into harmony with others where "a good conscience" is spoken of (Acts xxiii. 1 ; 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, 1 Pet. iii. 16), and to get rid of a difficult expression. *Συνείδησις Θεοῦ* is without parallel ; in 1 Cor. viii. 7 there is a variant *τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου*, but the best MSS. have *τῇ συνηθείᾳ*. *Συνείδησις* is a word of late and vulgar formation meaning "consciousness," or, specially, "conscience." Its coinage was facilitated by the common use of *σύννοια* in such phrases as *σύννοια ἐμαντῶ ἄγνοιαν*. Probably the Greek word was invented to represent the Latin *conscientia*, which has the same two meanings, consciousness and "conscience" ; for the latter, see Cicero, *pro Milone*, 23, "*magna uis est conscientiae in utramque partem*." In the New Testament *συνείδησις* occurs frequently, and, except in Heb. x. 2, means "conscience," moral and self-judging consciousness. The A.V. and R.V. render "for conscience towards God," keeping the general sense of *συνείδησις*, but giving the genitive *τοῦ Θεοῦ* a sense which it cannot bear. We must translate "for consciousness of God." Consciousness of God is, as Alford says, the realisation in a man's inner being of God's presence and relation to himself. "*Conscientia Dei, dum quis non hominum sed Dei respectu officio suo fungitur*" (Calvin). "The consciousness that it is God's will, and that God helps, gives strength to bear" (von Soden).

ἀδίκως. The Christian writer does not hesitate to say that a master may be "unjust" to his slave. Aristotle teaches that justice, in the proper sense of the word, does not exist between a

man and his chattels, his children or slaves, *Eth. Nic.* v. 10. 8, οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀδικία πρὸς τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀπλῶς, τὸ δὲ κτήμα καὶ τὸ τέκνον, ἕως ἂν ᾗ πηλίκον καὶ μὴ χωρισθῆ, ὥσπερ μέρος αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸν δ' οὐθεὶς προαιρεῖται βλάπτειν διὸ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία πρὸς αὐτόν.

20. ποῖον γὰρ κλέος, εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε ; “For what glory is it, if, when ye sin and are buffeted for it, ye shall endure it patiently?” Κλέος, which in the classics is mainly a poetical word, is found in Job xxviii. 22, xxx. 8. There may be a question whether ἁμαρτάνοντες should be translated “when ye do wrong,” “for your faults,” as by A.V., or “when ye sin,” as by R.V. In favour of the first view it may be argued that the master would strike the slave, not for sin against God, but for neglect of duty towards himself. On the other hand, the κλέος comes from God, in whose eyes the neglect of earthly duty is sin. Further, ἁμαρτάνοντες is balanced against ἀγαθοποιούντες in the following clause. Hence it should retain its usual sense here.

ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιούντες καὶ πάσχοντες. “But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it.” The words repeat πάσχων ἀδικῶς, and are antithetical to ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι.

21. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε. “For unto this were ye called : because Christ also suffered for you.” Εἰς τοῦτο = εἰς τὸ ἀγαθοποιούντας καὶ πάσχοντας ὑπομένειν. For ὑπέρ A has πέρι. Ὑπέρ is constantly thus used of Christ's death ; see for a good instance John xi. 50-52. Πέρι is employed in the same connexion, 1 Cor. i. 13, ἑσταυρώθη περὶ ὑμῶν : cf. Matt. xxvi. 28. The difference appears to be that while ὑπέρ means “on behalf of,” περὶ conveys an allusion to the sin-offering, the περὶ ἁμαρτίας, and thus acquires a significance which does not attach to this rather colourless preposition in itself. The MSS. often vary between the two, Mark xiv. 24 ; 1 Cor. i. 13 ; Gal. i. 4 ; Heb. v. 3 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18. When the apostle says that Christ also suffered on behalf of you, he means that the believer profits morally and spiritually by the pains of Christ in some way which he does not here define. In ver. 12 above we are taught that unbelievers also profit by the sight of the patient endurance of the brethren under undeserved suffering ; the disciple's cross “draws” as does that of his Master ; the sacrifice is the same in its degree, and so are the results. In the present passage St. Peter begins with the simple object of inculcating patience ; hence in the opening words he speaks of Christ as the great Example. But he proceeds quite naturally to enlarge and deepen the thought, and in the following verses Christ is set before us also as Sacrifice, as the Giver of the New Life, and as Shepherd.

ὑπολιμπάνω is a late form for ὑπολείπω. Ἀπολιμπάνω, καταλιμπάνω are also found in secular authors. Ὑπογραμμός is used, 2 Macc. ii. 28, of the “outlines” of a sketch which the artist fills in with details. But in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 8. 49 the word means

“a copyhead” in a child’s exercise book, a perfect piece of writing which the child is to imitate as exactly as it can. So here Christ is spoken of as the Pattern which we are to reproduce in every stroke of every letter, till our writing is a facsimile of the Master’s.

22. *ὁς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.* From Isa. liii. 9, *ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ δόλον ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.* St. Peter has *ἁμαρτίαν* for *ἀνομίαν*, but his *οὐδὲ δόλος εὐρέθη* appears to be nearer the Hebrew than the *οὐδὲ δόλον* of the LXX. The R.V. has, “Although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.” The first clause Professor Cheyne translates, “although he had done no injustice.” The verse is a good illustration of St. Peter’s method of composition, or manner of talking. Constantly there are reminiscences of Scripture, which at first are obscure, but are picked up again and made explicit. The sinlessness of Christ we have had in the *ἀμνοῦ ἀμόμου καὶ ἀσπίλου* of i. 19. *Δόλος, ἄδολος*, in ii. 1, 2, point forward to Isaiah, and also to the quotation from the Psalms given in iii. 10.

23. *ὁς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει.* *Ἀντιλοιδορεῖν* is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible. It is a natural and correct formative, but is quoted in the lexicon only from late writers. The language is a loose adaptation of Isa. liii. 7, *ὡς ἄμνος ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα.* This verse has already been alluded to in the *ἀμνός* of i. 19. From Acts viii. 32 we see that it was a favourite passage with the first Christians. The imperfect tenses, expressing habit, bring out the lesson of *ὑπομονή*.

πάσῃων οὐκ ἠπέλει may be illustrated by a passage in the *Passio S. Perpetuae (Texts and Studies*, ed. J. A. Robinson, 1891, p. 89). Some of the martyrs found it difficult to abstain from menacing words. As they left the court “Perpetua sang psalms, but Reucatus, Saturnilus, and Satorus addressed the crowd of bystanders, and, as they passed before Hilarianus, pointed their finger at him and said, Thou judgest us, but God will judge thee.”

παρεδίδου. “Committed Himself.” The verb is commonly used of handing persons over to a judge (see Liddell and Scott), but requires an accusative. The omission of the object has occasioned some difficulty. Generally speaking, *παρεδιδόναι τινὰ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ* means “to deliver up a malefactor for punishment,” and St. Peter’s words have been understood to mean that Christ handed over His persecutors to the judgment of God. But the whole drift of the passage forbids this interpretation, and there is nothing in the word *παρεδιδόναι* itself to imply that the person handed over is guilty. It is better therefore to render “committed Himself.” A.V., R.V. have in the margin “committed His cause,” but in judicial phrases the object of the verb seems to be always personal.

τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως. Compare τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα, i. 17.

24. ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας . . . ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον. "Who Himself carried up our sins in His own body on to the tree." From Isa. liii. 12, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε, combined with Deut. xxi. 23, ὅτι κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πάς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλον. The verse of Deuteronomy is quoted by St. Paul (Gal. iii. 13), and alluded to in those passages of Acts where St. Peter (v. 30, x. 39) and St. Paul (xiii. 29) speak of the Cross as τὸ ξύλον. Ἀναφέρειν is commonly used in the LXX. of bringing a sacrifice and laying it upon the altar, and the phrase ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον bears an unquestionable similarity to the common ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, Jas. ii. 21; Lev. xiv. 20; 2 Chron. xxxv. 16; Bar. i. 10; 1 Macc. iv. 53. Here St. Peter puts the Cross in the place of the altar. The addition of ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον was, no doubt, suggested by the use of ἀνήνεγκε in Isa. liii. 12. But the use of the verb in this verse appears to be due to the LXX. translators; in ver. 4 we have τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, and the Hebrew word is the same in both places. Isaiah is alluding in both verses to the sin-offering. Professor Cheyne notes on ver. 4, "The meaning is first of all that the consequences of the sins of his people fell upon him the innocent; but next and chiefly that he bore his undeserved sufferings as a sacrifice on behalf of his people," and adds that "this is the first of twelve distinct assertions in this one chapter of the vicarious character of the sufferings of the Servant." But the turn which St. Peter has given to the words represents Christ as not only the sin-offering, who bore the consequences of the sins of His people on the Cross of shame (ἤνεγκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου), but as the priest who took the sins, or the sin-offering (ἡ ἁμαρτία = τὰ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Lev. vi. 26), and laid the sacrifice on the altar of the Cross (ἀνήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον). Thus Alford appears to be right in giving ἀναφέρειν here a double meaning; but the two meanings "bear" and "carry" both belong to the one Greek word, and St. Peter has done his best to cure the ambiguity by expanding Isaiah's αὐτὸς into the highly emphatic αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, which, reinforced as they are by the following μῶλωπι, clearly mean "He Himself, by His own personal suffering, carried the sins up"; in other words, the Priest was also the Victim.

Kühl will not allow the analogy between ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον and ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, nor will he admit any reference to sacrifice on the grounds (1) that the cross is never regarded as an altar (he should have said not elsewhere, and even this is doubtful, if we remember Heb. xiii. 10); (2) that nowhere are sins spoken of as the actual sacrifice (but see Lev. vi. 26 referred to above); (3) that in the Old Testament the body of the victim is never burnt upon the altar (this seems quite beside the point: the sin-offering is

certainly said ἀναφέρεσθαι, and Isaac was actually laid upon the altar ἐπάνω τῶν ξύλων, Gen. xxii. 9); (4) that, above all, we contradict the Old Testament idea of sacrifice, if we think of sin as laid upon the victim and brought with the victim to the altar, for nothing but what is pure can come to the altar before the sight of God (but the essence of sacrifice lies in the idea that the innocent victim is not polluted by the load of guilt which it carries). Τὸ ξύλον he takes to mean simply "die bei Sklaven übliche Todesstrafe." But in the apostle's time τὸ ξύλον is not "a gibbet" but "the stocks," Acts xvi. 24. Finally, he translates, "He carried our sins up to the tree and thereby took them from us," adding by way of explanation, "because He bore our sins, in their consequences, in form of sufferings, as evils, in His body, so that, with the life of His body, our sins and their consequences were destroyed." But the real difficulty of the passage lies in the number of allusions which St. Peter has crowded into one short phrase, and Kühl's explanation leaves it untouched.

ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν. "That having been loosed unto (from) sins we might live unto righteousness." Ἀπογίνεσθαι occurs only here in the New Testament, and is not found in the LXX.; but Theodotion has it in Dan. ii. 1, in the sense of "to depart from." In Herodotus and Thucydides it is put where ἀποθανεῖν might have been employed, perhaps by way of euphemism; but this use does not appear to attach to the verb elsewhere. Schwartz notices three instances of its use in imperial times, Tatian, *ad Graecos*, vi., οὐχ ὡς οἱ Στωικοὶ δογματίζουσι κατὰ τινὰς κύκλων περιόδους, γινομένων ἀεὶ καὶ ἀπογινομένων: Galen, *Hist. Phil.* xxii. p. 612, 15, τὴν δὲ φθορὰν ὅταν ἐξ ὄντων πρὸς τὸ μὴ εἶναι καθιστῆται καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπογινομένων ζώων: Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* xv. (*Moralia*, p. 109 F), ἀλλ' οἷοι σὺ διαφορὰν εἶναι μὴ γενέσθαι, ἢ γενομένων ἀπογενέσθαι; All these passages are philosophical, and balance γίνεσθαι against ἀπογίνεσθαι, "coming to be" against "ceasing to be." It seems highly doubtful whether ἀπογίνεσθαι could ever have been used as a direct antithesis to ζῆν, and almost certain that it could not in St. Peter's time. Hence it is better to translate not "having died unto sins," but "having fallen away" or "having been loosed unto sins." Grotius renders *longefacti a peccatis*; von Soden, *los von den Sünden*. Beck takes the same view, and apparently Bengel, though his language is not quite clear. There remains the difficulty of the dative; but this is no greater than in Rom. vi. 20, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Here, as there, the case is determined by the antithesis. Thus St. Peter speaks here of the death of Christ as having for a distinct purpose that the believer should be set free from sin and brought into the new life of righteousness; but the Pauline images of death or burial with Christ do not cross his mind. In this particular clause he is

speaking only of that aspect of our Lord's death which is technically called Redemption, chap. i. 18 above.

οὐ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε. From Isa. liii. 5, τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. Here \aleph L P and many cursives have οὐ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ, the αὐτοῦ of the LXX. having been reinserted by a careless scribe. Μώλωψ (*"uibeex, frequens in corpore seruili,"* Bengel) is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. The weals are those left by the scourging, John xix. 1; Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15. "Ye were healed by His scars" is a strong expression of that belief in the value of vicarious suffering which recurs in an even stronger form in iii. 18.

25. ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι. "For ye were as sheep going astray." C K L P have πλανώμενα, "as sheep that go astray," a needless attempt to simplify the grammar. The words are taken from Isa. liii. 6, πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν.

ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. "But are now returned to the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls." The aorist ἐπεστράφητε is here clearly equivalent to the perfect. Cf. i. 12. Ἐπιστρέφειν means properly only "to turn towards," but is used by Lucian and Plutarch of "turning back from error." It is a favourite word with Plotinus to express what we call "conversion." When a man forgets God he "turns away"; when he remembers his Father he "turns back" (ἐπιστρέφεται). See *Enn.* v. 1. 1. The word is used in the same sense in the New Testament; hence we may translate it "returns," not simply "turns."

Ποιμὴν, Shepherd, and here Shepherd of souls (for ψυχῶν cf. i. 9 above), is a word that includes all that Christ does for our souls, loving care, feeding, instruction, guidance, government. It brings out the general ignorance and helplessness of man, who, without aid from above, can only go astray like sheep without a shepherd. In the Old Testament we have this figure in Ps. xxiii.; Zech. xiii. 7; Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24. In the Gospels we read of the sheep, Matt. x. 6, xxv. 33; Mark vi. 34; Luke xv. 4. Christ is Shepherd, Matt. ix. 36; Mark vi. 34; John x.; Heb. xiii. 20. Ποιμαίνειν is used of Christ, Matt. ii. 6; Apoc. ii. 27, vii. 17, xii. 5, xix. 15 in the sense of "govern"; and of Christian ministers, John xxi. 16; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2. Ποίμνη is used of the Christian flock, Matt. xxvi. 31; John x. 16; ποιμνιον, Luke xii. 32; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2, 3. It is curious that St. Paul never uses the metaphor, except of the Christian minister, and that but twice (Acts xx. 28; Eph. iv. 11). On the other hand, ποιμὴν is never used of the Christian minister, except in this last passage from Ephesians. John x. shows clearly that it is an error to restrict shepherding to government, though this idea is, no doubt, always included; and St. Peter's phrase, Shepherd of souls ("souls" including in his usage the whole of man's spiritual nature), implies

that the Lord gives us all that is needful for intelligence, emotions, or will.

Ἐπίσκοπος is here a description, not a title. It is nearly equivalent to ποιμήν: cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 11, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκζητήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου, καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτά: though it is more general. Philo, *de Som.* i. 15 (i. 634), calls God ὁ τῶν ὄλων ἐπίσκοπος. The ecclesiastical use of the word comes from Ps. cviii. (cix.) 8, quoted in Acts i. 20; in part also from Isa. lx. 17, καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει, as quoted by Clement of Rome, xlii. 5. In Acts xx. 28 ("the flock wherein the Holy Ghost made you overseers") ἐπίσκοπος is used by St. Paul very much as St. Peter uses the word here, as a description, and in much the same sense as ποιμήν. In the later Pauline Epistles (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7), but not elsewhere in the New Testament, we find an official entitled Ἐπίσκοπος, who in the two Pastoral Epistles appears to be also entitled *Presbyter*.

It would seem that the ecclesiastical ἐπίσκοπος was taken from the Old Testament and carried with it its Jewish associations. The word was in common use among the Greeks, as Overseer is among ourselves, to denote kinds of supervision that were purely secular (see Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, ed. 1882, p. 36 sqq.); but the ecclesiastical use can be explained quite easily from the Old Testament, and there is no reason for attempting to derive it from other sources. Why St. Paul altered the recognised title of the Christian official we can only guess, but he may have been influenced by the words of Isaiah, in which the mention of δικαιοσύνη and πίστις as the divinely given qualifications of overseers and ministers fits in so aptly with his own views. See note in *Addenda*.

Ἐπίσκοπος contains an idea of eminence and authority which πρεσβύτερος in itself does not, and it had also, as we have seen, a loose connexion with the Apostolate. Hence, we may suppose, as one Elder came to be invested with special functions, he came also to be distinguished as Ἐπίσκοπος, which word then became a title, Bishop, no longer Overseer.

III. 1. The Duty of Wives is inculcated also, Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 18; Tit. ii. 4.

ὁμοίως may be taken closely with ὑποτασσόμενοι: slaves are to be subject, so likewise wives. But it is best taken as referring to ii. 17. Slaves are to show honour to masters, likewise wives to husbands. For the construction of ὑποτασσόμενοι, see note on ii. 18. The same phrase, ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, is found in Ephesians and Titus, and with the omission of ἰδίοις in Colossians also. See Introduction, p. 17. Ἰδίοις strengthens the article τοῖς, which by itself is possessive and means "your." It gives the same sense that we find in the English, "your own husbands"; you belong to them in a special way, and your duty to them is very near and clear. Further,

it softens the rule of subjection. It is not obedience to a stranger that is required.

ἵνα . . . *κερδηθήσονται*. "That if any obey not the word, they may without the word be won by the conversation of their wives." The use of the future indicative after the final *ἵνα* belongs to late and vulgar Greek (Cobet, *Variae Lectiones*, p. 508; Blass, p. 208); instances occur in Mark xv. 20; Luke xx. 10; 1 Cor. xiii. 3; Gal. ii. 4; Apoc. iii. 9, and elsewhere.

2. *ἐποπτεύσαντες*. See note on ii. 12 above. In *ἄνευ λόγου* the absence of the article is probably immaterial, and we may translate "without the word," without any direct appeal to the teaching of Christ, which, in the eyes of an unbelieving husband, would have no authority. Otherwise the meaning will be "without a word"; the wife need not argue at all, the mere sight of her conduct will suffice. For the sense of *κερδαίνειν*, cf. Matt. xviii. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 19-21. It is a fine Christian expression, on which Leighton dwells with unction: "A soul converted is gained to itself, gained to the pastor, or friend, or wife, or husband who sought it, and gained to Jesus Christ; added to His treasury, who thought not His own precious blood too dear to lay out for this gain." A striking instance of the "gaining" of the heathen husband by the Christian wife will be found in the account of Monnica in Augustine's *Confessions*. But, though Monnica did not, to use a common expression, "preach" to her husband, she owed her influence over him largely to wise words. The patient well-doing of the wife has power for the salvation of others; cf. ii. 12 above. St. Peter, it will be observed, admits no questioning about the indissolubility of marriage in cases of religious disparity. At Corinth the question had been raised, and St. Paul expresses his personal opinion (I, not the Lord, 1 Cor. vii. 12) to the effect that the Christian partner should not seek divorce or separation, but that, if the heathen husband or wife choose to dissolve the tie, it may be done. He adds, "For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?"

τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφὴν. "Your conversation chaste in fear." "Your chaste conversation coupled with fear" (A.V., R.V.) hardly brings out with sufficient force the close collocation of *ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν*. The conversation is chaste, because it moves in the fear of God (cf. ii. 18 above). Here again St. Peter does not mean "fear of your husband," though in Eph. v. 33 we read *ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα*.

3. *ὣν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν . . . κόσμος*. On the use of the article in this passage, see Introduction, p. 4. The translation of A.V., "whose *adorning* let it not be that outward *adorning*," is not strictly accurate, as *ὁ κόσμος* is not repeated. What St. Peter says is "whose must be, not the outward adornment of plaiting hair and putting round of jewels or putting on of robes, but the hidden man

of the heart." *Κόσμος* is in antithesis to *ἄνθρωπος*, visible ornaments to the invisible soul. It is possible that there is a play on the two meanings of *κόσμος*, "ornaments," and the "world," or "multitude of men"; at any rate this supposition would help to explain the antithesis. As *κόσμος* is used in classical Greek, so *mundus* is used in classical Latin for all kinds of embellishments. Livy, xxxiv. 7, "munditia et ornatus et cultus, haec feminarum insignia sunt : hunc mundum muliebrem appellarunt maiores nostri." Tertullian (*de habitu mul.* 4) makes a distinction between *cultus*, jewellery and dress, and *ornatus*, the personal beautification of the toilet, and confines *mundus* to the former. "Cultum dicimus, quem mundum muliebrem uocant ; ornatum, quem immundum muliebrem conuenit dici. Ille in auro et argento et gemmis et uestibus deputatur ; iste in cura capilli et cutis et earum partium corporis quae oculos trahunt."

ἐμπλοκῆς. Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 9-13. The two passages are very similar, but our Marriage Service rightly prefers that of St. Peter. On plaiting of hair, see Ovid, *de arte am.* iii. 136 sqq. It was an art highly cultivated by Greek and Roman ladies.

περιθέσεως. Ornaments of gold were worn round the hair (in the shape of golden nets), round the finger, arm, or ankle.

4. ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος. "The hidden person of the heart, clothed in the incorruptible of the meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." *Ἐν* is used as in Jas. ii. 2, *ἄνθρωπος χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ*. With *τὸ ἀφθαρτον* contrast *χρυσίον τὸ ἀπολλύμενον* of i. 7. The neuter adjective forms a substantive, and no substantive is to be supplied ; but the sense is as given by the R.V., "the incorruptible apparel." The incorruptible or heavenly raiment and jewellery of the hidden person is the meek and quiet spirit which befits Christians ; whether the exact antecedent to *ὃ* is *τὸ ἀφθαρτον* or *πνεῦμα*, it is impossible to decide, but the question does not affect the sense. *Πνεῦμα* is here spirit, disposition, temper, a sense which is not borne by the word elsewhere in the New Testament. In this Epistle *πνεῦμα*, as applied to man, does not denote a distinct faculty, but is nearly equivalent to *ψυχή*. In iii. 18, 19, iv. 6 it means the whole of the inner nature of man as opposed to *σάρξ*, the body. Man is made up of body and *ψυχή*, or body and *πνεῦμα*. *Πνεῦμα* denotes the inner nature as immaterial, invisible, impalpable, but this nature in its relation to God is *ψυχή*. Hence in i. 2 it is impossible to translate *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος*, "in sanctification of your spirit" ; if this had been St. Peter's meaning he would have said *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ ψυχῆς* : cf. i. 22, *τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες*. Hence again, as applied to the Holy Spirit, *πνεῦμα* means "the Immaterial Being," not a special influence or gift of God. It will help to make the matter clear if we observe that, in phrases which approach the one under consideration, St. Paul always defines *πνεῦμα* by a substantival genitive ; thus we find *πνεῦμα δουλείας*,

δειλίας, σοφίας, πράοτης (1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1). All these are modelled upon the Hebrew πνεῦμα κατανύξεως (Rom. xi. 8 from Isa. xxix. 10), and imply that the frame of mind spoken of is breathed into the man by God, as the πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου (1 Cor. ii. 12) is inspired into him by the spirit of evil.

St. Paul uses "man" in much the same way as St. Peter, distinguishing ὁ ἕξω from ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16), and the "old" from the "new" man (Eph. iv. 22, 24; Col. iii. 9). The commentators throw no light on this peculiar use of ἄνθρωπος for personality; it seems to be Hebrew, and there are many phrases in the Old Testament that might suggest it, man of God, man whom the Lord doth choose, man of earth, and so on.

5. οὕτω γάρ ποτε. "For in this manner in days of old the holy women also, who hoped in God, used to adorn themselves." For εἰς Θεόν **κ** reads ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν. In its Biblical meaning ("I have hope") ἐλπίζω is followed by εἰς (2 Cor. i. 10): ἐπί with dative (1 Tim. iv. 10): ἐπί with accusative (1 Pet. i. 13; 1 Tim. v. 5). Ἐν Χριστῷ, Κυρίῳ, ἐλπίζω occur 1 Cor. xv. 19; Phil. ii. 19; but this is not to be counted among the constructions of ἐλπίζω, because ἐν Χριστῷ may be added to any verb, and does not belong to one more than to another. Ποτέ, "in the days of old." The saintly women of the Old Testament are cited as a model for Christian matrons. Here we find another instance of St. Peter's strong sense of the continuity of the religious life. There may be a hidden reference to Isaiah's denunciation of women's trinkery (iii. 16 sqq.); but St. Peter speaks not of what good women of old did not wear, but of what they did wear. They adorned themselves with a meek spirit by subjection, or because they were subject.

6. κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα. Gen. xviii. 12. Here again Monica illustrates the language of St. Peter. When other matrons came to her and complained of their husbands, she would "blame their tongues, telling them that when once they had heard the marriage lines read over to them, they ought to have looked upon them as indentures by which they were made handmaids; they ought therefore to remember their condition, and not rebel against their lords and masters" (*Conf.* ix. 9. 2).

ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα. "Whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well," A.V. "Whose children ye now are, if ye do well," R.V. These translations are substantially identical, and both give the aorist ἐγενήθητε the sense of the perfect γεγόνατε. There is no strong objection to this; cf. ἀγγέλη, i. 12: ἐπεστράφητε, ii. 25. There is, however, no sufficient reason why we should not keep the proper meaning of the aorist, and render "whose children ye became by doing good." It is true that in this case a certain difficulty arises out of the participles. Ἀγαθοποιῶσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι seems to be

clearly an exhortation; and the force of the exhortation may be thought to be somewhat blunted, if the apostle is taken to say that they have been doing good ever since they became children of Sarah, and even before that time. Yet this difficulty is rather artificial; the meaning may very well be "Ye became children of Sarah by doing good; continue so to do, or ye will cease to be her children." Bengel regards the words *ὡς Σάρρα . . . τέκνα* as forming a parenthesis. On this view, *ὑποτασσόμεναι ἀγαθοποιούσαι φοβούμεναι* all belong to *ἐκόσμουν*. Bengel's expedient is allowed a place in the margin of the R.V., but it is unnecessary and awkward.

τέκνα τῆς Σάρρα is a phrase of much the same meaning as *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* (i. 14). Those who exhibit the same character as Sarah may be called in a figure her children. The words are as applicable to matrons of Jewish as of heathen origin.

καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν. From Prov. iii. 25, *καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν οὐδὲ ὄρμας ἀσεβῶν ἐπερχομένας*. This again is one of St. Peter's favourite chapters; it is quoted again v. 5 below. *Πτόησις* (quite a classical word) means fluttering, excitement, perturbation of spirit, caused by any passion, but more especially by fear. If the word retains its proper sense here, we must take it as a cognate accusative, and translate "are not afraid *with* any alarm." But in Proverbs the epithet *ἐπελθοῦσαν* and the parallelism with *ὄρμας* give it a concrete meaning, and it is better to render "are not afraid of any alarm." St. Peter may be thinking, in the first place, of alarms caused by the ill-temper of a bad husband (it is probable that *ἀσεβῶν ὄρμας* was in his mind). Yet his words have a wider scope. Alarms about children, about servants, about the fortunes of the family, about the growing ill-will of heathen neighbours—the Christian matron who hopes on God will face them all unperturbed.

7. ὁμοίως. Here, where there is no duty of subjection to be enforced, the "likewise" seems clearly to refer to ii. 17. Honour is due to all; honour therefore your wives. For the construction of *συνοικούντες*, see ii. 18, iii. 1.

κατὰ γνώσιν. "According to knowledge," like wise and sensible men who understand the due gradations of honour. The Pauline sense of *γνώσις*, in which it signifies the understanding of spiritual mysteries, is quite foreign to St. Peter. In the following words we observe the same elegant classicism as in i. 19. The sense is precisely the same as if the author had written *τῷ γυναικείῳ σκεύει ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω*. The husband is to pay honour to the wife as to the weaker vessel; such honour as is due to the weaker, that is to say, consideration, wise guidance, marital helpfulness. *Ὡς* here has its common limiting force, and gives, not the reason for the honour, but a qualification of the command. *Σκεῦος* means—(1) a chattel, or

piece of furniture, Matt. xii. 29; Mark iii. 27; Luke viii. 16; *σκεύη* in the same house differ in value and purpose, Rom. ix. 21-23; (2) an implement or instrument adapted to a particular end; thus we have *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*, an elect instrument, Acts ix. 15; (3) a vessel which contains things, John xix. 29; (4) in 1 Thess. iv. 4 *σκεῦος* may mean "wife," a peculiar sense which the word bears sometimes in Rabbinical Hebrew; see Alford's note. Here, however, this meaning is excluded by the comparative *ἀσθενεστέρῳ*, which clearly implies that husband and wife are both vessels. As there is here no reference to purpose or contents, we must take *σκεῦος* to mean simply "chattel." Husband and wife are both parts of the furniture of God's house, though one is weaker and the other stronger. In the passage quoted from 1 Thess. some commentators give *σκεῦος* the sense of "body." But it is doubtful whether the word ever has this sense. In 2 Cor. iv. 7, *ἔχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν*, the apostle does not mean in "earthy bodies," but uses a metaphor from money stored, as it often was, "in earthen jars." In the present passage we can hardly suppose St. Peter to be thinking only of the bodily weakness of the wife. Many modern commentators, it should be noticed, connect the dative not with *ἀπονέμοντες*, but with *συνιοκοῦντες*. This leaves the honour without any restriction or limitation, which can hardly have been the apostle's intention.

ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς. "As being (not only husbands, but) also fellow-heirs of the grace of life." B, the Vulgate, Armenian, and some cursives have *συγκληρονόμοις*. The first *ὡς* gives the limitation of the honour, the second its reason. The wife must not forget the duty of subjection; the husband must remember that she, whom nature and the law make his inferior, is his equal, and may be his superior, in the eyes of God. *Χάρις ζωῆς* (the article again is dropped before a familiar phrase) is rightly understood by Alford to mean God's gracious gift of life eternal; for *κληρονομία* compare i. 4; for *χάρις*, i. 13. Desire to make St. Peter speak the same language as St. Paul led Erasmus and Grotius to paraphrase the words by *χάρις ζωσα* or *ζωοποιούσα*. NA, and some other authorities, including Jerome, read *ποικίλης χάριτος ζωῆς*: but the epithet has been inserted from iv. 10, where it is natural and appropriate.

ἐγκόπτεσθαι. "Hindered"; K L and other authorities have *ἐκκόπτεσθαι*, "cut off," a stronger expression. Hofmann seems to be right in taking *ὑμῶν* as referring to the husbands alone; the sighs of the injured wife come between the husband's prayer and God's hearing: so St. James speaks of the complaints of the oppressed as frustrating prayer (v. 4). Others regard *ὑμῶν* as including both husbands and wives. The two cannot join in prayer, as they ought to do, for a blessing on their married life,

if there is injustice between them. Such prayers are "hindered," because the two are not agreed, and the one voice protests against the other.

8. The imperatives still run on, and the section begins with adjectives and participles. Τὸ δὲ τέλος, "finally," is adverbial. Τέλος δέ is more usual in the classics, but τὸ δὲ τέλος is found in Plato, *Laus*, 740 E. With the word "finally" St. Peter turns from special to general admonitions. "Ὁμόφρονες mente, συμπαθεῖς affectu, in rebus secundis et adversis," Bengel. Ὁμόφρων (not found elsewhere in the New Testament) is used by the Greek poets, as Homer, *Il.* xxii. 263, ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες. The word expresses rather likeness of sentiment or disposition than of opinion, but includes community of faith and hope. Cf. Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; Phil. iii. 16. Συμπαθής (another ἀπαξ λεγόμενον) is found in Aristotle, and denotes community of πάθη, in the broad Greek sense, of all feelings whether of pleasure or of pain. For φιλάδελφοι, see note on φιλαδελφία, i. 22. Εὐσπλαγχία in Eur. *Rhesus*, 192, means courage. But in Hebraistic Greek σπλάγχνα are the seat of mercy, hence εὐσπλαγχνος here, and Eph. iv. 32, means tender-hearted, pitiful. For ταπεινόφρονες, "humble-minded," K P have φιλόφρονες, "courteous." L, the Vulgate, and some other authorities exhibit both adjectives. Ταπεινόφρων is found in Prov. xxix. 23, and forms one of St. Peter's many allusions to that book.

9. μὴ ἀποδίδωσι κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ. In Prov. xvii. 13 we read ὃς ἀποδίδωσι κακὰ ἀντὶ ἀγαθῶν, οὐ κινήσεται κακὰ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ. St. Paul, Rom. xii. 17, has the same phrase as St. Peter, μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες: cf. also 1 Thess. v. 15. The words λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας look back to ii. 23. Εἰς τοῦτο may refer to the preceding words (cf. ii. 21 above), or to those which follow. It is just possible to render, "Contrariwise blessing (for hereunto were ye called) in order that ye may inherit blessing"; but the parenthesis is awkward, and the construction appears to be the same as in iv. 6, εἰς τοῦτο . . . ἵνα κριθῶσι. It is better then to translate with R.V. "contrariwise blessing: for hereunto were ye called that ye should inherit blessing" or "a blessing." The Christian hope is also the Christian rule. "Bless, and ye shall be blessed," is strictly parallel to "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven."

10. γάρ. The "for" introduces a reason for the whole admonition contained in vers. 8, 9, not merely for εἰλογούντες. The passage which St. Peter proceeds to cite treats not only of the tongue and its government, but of righteous conduct generally. The words which follow are quoted *verbatim* from Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 13-17, except that in the first verse the LXX. has τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῶην, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθὰς; The Hebrew is translated in the R.V. "What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good?" St. Peter has, "He that willeth to

love life and see good days." Possibly his interpreter, who wrote better Greek than the LXX, as a rule, may have been influenced by the feeling that ὁ θέλων ζωὴν could carry no meaning to Greek ears. Ἀγαπῶν ἰδεῖν again is not Greek: ἀγαπᾶν ζωὴν, though unusual, may be defended by 2 Tim. iv. 10, ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα. Elsewhere the object of the verb is nearly always personal.

ζωή means this present earthly life (though de Wette and some few others have taken it of life eternal). "He that willeth" can in spite of all sorrow and unjust usage make his life lovely and his days good. The words may be taken in connexion with i. 6-19, but the tenor is different. There the Christian has a joy arising out of persecution itself, the joy of the soldier who looks forward to victory; here life in itself may be made sweet and delectable by righteousness. The passage illustrates the essentially Hebrew character of St. Peter's mind; it serves as a relief to his profound sense of the insufficiency of this life; it shows that persecution was as yet no more than a not intolerable vexation, while to such of his readers as were Gentiles it would convey in a very persuasive manner what is meant by "good days."

12. ἐπὶ δικαίους. The eyes of the Lord are upon righteous men for their good, and His ears are turned towards their prayer. Δίκαιος is quoted from the Old Testament, in the sense which there it bears; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 7, δίκαιον Δῶτ. But the face of the Lord is upon men who do evil, not for their good. For the omission of the article with ποιούντας, cf. ii. 7.

13. καὶ τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς; "Who is he that can harm you?" Who is able to do you any real hurt? The words are taken from Isa. l. 9, ἰδοὺ Κύριος βοηθήσει μοι, τίς κακώσει με; The R.V. has "Who is he that will harm you?" that is to say, Who will wish to do you any hurt? This rendering might be defended by the words of the *Didache*, i. 3, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισούντας ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε ἐχθρόν, where possibly we have a reminiscence and attempted explanation of St. Peter's words. But the apostle clearly thought that suffering is the lot of Christians, and there could be no πάσχειν ἀδίκως without ἀδικούντες. Ζηλωταί, "zealous ardent lovers": the word, which is quite classical, is similarly used in 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Tit. ii. 14.

14. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε. "But if ye should even suffer." Εἰ καί generally introduces a supposition which is more or less improbable. The optative is rarely used in hypothetical sentences in the New Testament; indeed the mood was becoming obsolete in vulgar Greek. See Blass, pp. 37, 220. St. Peter here seems to have had in his mind the words of our Lord, Matt. v. 10, μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης. It will be observed that he uses δικαιοσύνη in the old Hebrew sense, as did our Lord Himself (cf. δικαίους above), and that he gives μακάριος that full sense in

which it is used in the Gospels, in Jas. i. 12, 25, and in the Apoc. xiv. 13 (and six other passages). St. Paul uses it in the same way three times in quotations, Acts xx. 35 (in a saying of our Lord's), Rom. iv. 7, 8 (from the Old Testament); in 1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15 he applies it to God; in Tit. ii. 13 to blessed hope; but, when he uses it of man, gives the word a lower sense (= happy), Acts xxvi. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 40; perhaps even in Rom. xiv. 22.

τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβήθητε. "Be not afraid of their terror." Do not fear their threats. Φόβος has here a concrete sense, like *πίτῳσις* in iii. 6. The words are from Isa. viii. 12, 13, τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ παραχθῆτε· Κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε. The passage runs, "Say ye not, a conspiracy, concerning all whereof this people shall say a conspiracy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be in dread thereof." In the LXX. the meaning is "do not be afraid as they are," and φόβον is a cognate accusative. To this extent St. Peter has changed the sense of the original. For the meaning here can hardly be, "Do not be afraid, as your heathen neighbours are, of mere earthly misfortunes."

15. Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε. "But sanctify the Lord, that is to say, the Christ." The words τὸν Χριστὸν are substituted for αὐτόν in the text of Isaiah to make the meaning clear. Some of the early readers of the Epistle were alarmed by this change; hence in K L P and some other authorities we find a variant τὸν Θεόν for τὸν Χριστόν. The R.V. has, "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord," taking Κύριον as predicate by reason of the absence of the article. This translation might stand, if we took the words by themselves and out of connexion with the Isaianic text, but not otherwise. The absence of the article before Κύριος has no significance. In any case the Christological import of the passage is not affected. Ἀγιάσατε is sufficiently explained by the words which follow in Isaiah, "Let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread."

ἔτοιμοι αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογία. "Always ready for an answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you." We might have expected *περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν πίστεως*, but in St. Peter's mind the two words are very nearly identical. Ἀπολογία (followed by a dative, as in 1 Cor. ix. 3) means any kind of answer or self-justification, whether formal before a judge, or informal. Here παντί fixes the word to the latter sense. Λόγον αἰτεῖν is a classical phrase. Every cultivated sensible man was expected by the Greeks to be prepared λόγον διδόναι τε καὶ δέξασθαι, to discuss questions of opinion or conduct intelligently and temperately, to give and receive a reason. The phrase λόγον ἀποδιδόναι, below, iv. 5, is quite different. Φόβου (cf. ii. 18, iii. 2) is fear of God, not of man. It is surely not fanciful to see here an allusion to St. Peter's own experience. When the critical moment came upon him, he was not ready with his answer, and so denied his Lord. Further, it

was through want of meekness and fear that he denied; of meekness, because he had fancied that he loved the Lord "more than these"; and of fear, because though he feared man, the Lord at the moment was not his dread.

16. *συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν . . . ἀναστροφῆν*. "Having a good conscience; in order that, wherein ye are spoken against, those who revile your conversation, which is good in Christ, may be ashamed." For *συνείδησιν*, see ii. 19. Ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε, the very thing wherein ye are spoken against, is the ἀναστροφή: cf. ii. 12, ἀναστροφῆν ἔχοντες καλὴν, ἵνα, ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν. Constantly the apostle repeats his phrases with new significance and in a new light. In the former passage he speaks of the righteousness of the Christian as likely to promote the conversion of the heathen, here simply as stopping the mouths of his defamers. Τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ are to be taken together; cf. τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφῆν, iii. 2. Three times (here and v. 10, 14) St. Peter uses the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ, which in the Pauline Epistles is very common (there are thirteen instances in Romans). Elsewhere it is not found; but the idea that all is in Christ constantly recurs in John's Gospel, i. 4, vi. 56, xiv. 20, xv. 1-5, xvi. 33, xvii. 21. The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ is mystical, and this is why St. Paul loves it. But it is not necessary to suppose that he invented it. Ἐπιηραζόντες is generally regarded as governing ἀναστροφῆν, which is a possible construction (see Luke vi. 28). But in good Greek the verb is not transitive, and is followed by a dative or preposition. Here it would be quite possible to take ἀναστροφῆν with *καταισχυνθῶσιν*, "that those who revile you may be abashed by your good conversation"; nor is the position of ὑμῶν a conclusive argument against this rendering.

17. *κρείττον γάρ*. A further reason for patient endurance. Not only will it silence calumny, but it is Christlike, and it has a value for others. Here again recurs the thought involved in ii. 12, and in the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of ii. 21. There is a parallelism between the sufferings of Christ and those of the Christian, but it is not quite clear how far it is meant to be carried. Εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα, "if the will of God should will," is a rugged emphatic pleonasm, similar in sense to the εἰ δέον of i. 6. For the optative, see note on ver. 14 above.

18. *ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανε*. It is better "because Christ also once for all died for sins." Ἀπέθονεν, & A C, and all the Versions; B K L P have ἔπαθε. Ἄπαξ, as in Heb. ix. 28, distinguishes the one sacrifice of Christ from the repeated deaths of victims under the Law. Περὶ ἁμαρτίας is the regular phrase for the sin-offering, Lev. v. 7, vi. 30; Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 7; Ezek. xliii. 21. Ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας occurs in Ezek. xliii. 25, xliv. 29, xlv. 17, xlvi. 20. The sin-offering was propitiatory; Lev. v. 6, καὶ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ ἧς ἤμαρτε, καὶ ἀφθῆσεται αὐτῷ ἡ ἁμαρτία, and is called ἱλασμός, Ezek. xliv. 27. Christ suffered not for particular

offences, but for all sins of all men; hence in the New Testament we frequently find *περί* or *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν*, Heb. v. 1, 3, x. 26; 1 John ii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. i. 4. He died as the one true sin-offering, *δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*, just on behalf of unjust. In i. 19 we read that the sinlessness of Christ gave His Blood its value. What we see in the world is that the unjust man is saved, or made better, by the sufferings of the just, who not only sets an attractive example, but actually bears the punishment of the unjust. The consequence of moral evil is moral insensibility; the pain of wrongdoing is felt, at any rate in the first instance, by the innocent person who desires to amend the offender; take, for example, the anguish of a mother over a theft committed by her child. In the police courts a different rule prevails; there *iudex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur*. Owing to a confusion between these two forms of justice, the human and the divine, St. Peter's words, *δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*, have often given great offence. Plotinus, one of the best and ablest of men, says, probably with reference to Christianity, *κακὸς δὲ γενομένουσ ἀξιούσ ἄλλουσ αὐτῶν σωτήρας εἶναι ἑαυτοὺσ προεμένουσ οὐ θεμιτὸν εὐχὴν ποιουμένων*, "for men who have become evil to demand that others should be their saviours by sacrifice of themselves is not lawful even in prayer," *Enn.* iii. 2. 9. The Neoplatonist admitted that *my* suffering makes *me* better, but thought it absurd to suppose that the suffering of another could do so. The same difficulty lay at the root of Socinianism (see Ritschl, *Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Eng. trans. p. 299 sqq.).

ἵνα ἡμᾶσ προσαγάγη τῷ Θεῷ. "That He might bring us to God." As to the mood of *προσαγάγη*, it may be noticed that the optative is never found in the New Testament in final clauses; see Blass, pp. 211, 220. The meaning of *προσάγειν* has been much debated. It is used of the priests, Aaron and his sons, whom Moses "brings before God," and who may be regarded as sacrificial gifts. Thus in Ex. xxix. 4, *καὶ Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοὺσ υἱοὺσ αὐτοῦ προσάξεισ ἐπὶ τὰσ θύρασ τῆσ σκηνῆσ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*: cf. ver. 10 of the same chapter, *καὶ προσάξεισ τὸν μόσχον ἐπὶ τὰσ θύρασ τῆσ σκηνῆσ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*. Hence Kühl understands the meaning to be "that He might make us priests to God." But there does not appear to be any reference here to the priesthood of the Christian; and in the passages quoted, as von Soden points out, *προσάγειν* merely means "to bring near." Others have supposed the phrase to signify "that He might make us a sacrifice to God"; *προσάγειν* being frequently used of the victim, Lev. iii. 12, iv. 4, viii. 14. But this sense is inapplicable here; for, in the words immediately preceding, Christ is spoken of as being Himself the Victim. If, therefore, *προσάγειν* possesses here any sacrificial sense at all, it is merely in a distant and indirect way. We shall find the best explanation in Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16, vii. 25, x. 22, xii. 22, where, as von Soden says, the free

access of Christians to the Father corresponds to the priestly *προσάγειν* of Christ. The sin-offering opens the door and leads us through it.

Θανατωθεῖς, ζωοποιηθεῖς. "Being put to death in flesh, but quickened in spirit." The participles are not antecedent in point of time to *ἀπέθανε*, but there is no difficulty in this; they are equivalent to *ὡς ἐθανατώθη, ἐζωοποιήθη*. The datives *σαρκί, πνεύματι* are antithetical; Christ died in body, and was quickened in soul or spirit. St. Peter does not mean that the spirit had died. The divine spirit of Christ which was in the prophets (i. 11) cannot have been subject to dissolution; and we can hardly suppose the meaning to be that His human spirit was first destroyed and then re-created, for there is no trace of such an idea elsewhere in the Bible, and the next verse shows that in St. Peter's view the spirits of the antediluvians were alive. We may explain *ζωοποιηθεῖς* perhaps by the *χάρις ζωῆς* of iii. 7. The life of heaven is not unnaturally distinguished from that of earth as a new life, a second *ἀναγέννησις*, a fresh grace of God, though the two are continuous and not disparate. Or we may compare John x. 18, "I have power to lay down My life, and I have power to take it again," where the life is spoken of as ending and beginning again, yet the "I" continues through the change. All phrases which apply to the point of transition from the old life to the new are necessarily vague, and the speculations which may be built upon them are endless.

How far are we to suppose the parallelism between the Passion of Christ and that of the Christian to extend? If we read *ἀπέθανεν* for *ἔπαθεν* one point of similarity is greatly attenuated, for nowhere in the Epistle does St. Peter regard the sufferings of the brethren as likely to culminate in a violent death. A great number of modern commentators have found a parallel in *ἅπαξ*. "He suffered once; His sufferings are summed up and passed away; He shall suffer no more. And we are suffering *ἅπαξ*; it shall soon be so thought of and looked back upon" (Alford). But this interpretation also would vanish with *ἔπαθεν*, and is in any case rather artificial. Nothing, then, seems to remain except *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, δίκαιος, ἵνα προσάγῃ*, and *σαρκί*. He died as the innocent sin-offering, and our innocent sufferings have in their degree a similar value; He brought us near to God, and we may bring others. But these lessons are only allusively conveyed, and do not lie on the surface. The apostle makes clear his chief point in iv. 1 sqq.: Christ suffered in the flesh, and in the flesh we also must suffer.

19, 20. *ἐν ᾧ . . . δι' ὕδατος*. "In which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, whereunto few, that is, eight souls escaped through water."

19. This and the following verse seem to be primarily intended as a proof of *ζωοποιηθείς*. After our Lord's Death He still lived and ministered. The order of time is *ἀπέθανε, πορευθείς ἐκήρυξεν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ πορευθείς εἰς οὐρανόν*. There can be no doubt that the event referred to is placed between the Crucifixion and the Ascension. We must therefore dismiss the explanation of Augustine, Bede, Aquinas, and others, that Christ was in Noah when Noah preached repentance to the people of his time. On this view *ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο* is taken with *ἐκήρυξεν*, not with *ἀπειθήσασι*, and *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ* is understood to mean "those who were then in the prison of sin," or "those who are now in the prison of Hades, but were then alive."

What St. Peter says is that Christ not only ministered to men upon earth, but also (*καί*) went as a spirit to preach to spirits in prison. Of these spirits we are told that they had been disobedient in the days of Noah.

But who were the spirits? The context seems to imply that they were those of the men who refused to listen to Noah. *Πνεύματα* may be used of men after death (Heb. xii. 23), and the *νεκροῖς* of iv. 6 fixes this as the right sense.

The *εὐηγγελίσθη*, again, of iv. 6 must be taken to prove that in St. Peter's view our Lord preached the gospel to these spirits, and offered them a place of repentance. Under the influence of later theological ideas many commentators have been unwilling to admit this, maintaining (1) that Christ must have preached to them not hope, but condemnation; or (2) that He preached only to those that were righteous; or (3) only to those who, though disobedient, repented in the hour of death; or (4) that He preached the gospel to those who had been just, and condemnation to those who had disobeyed. But all these afterthoughts are excluded by the text. St. Peter clearly means that all the men of the time except eight souls were disobedient.

Again, these explanations are all needless. The thought which underlies St. Peter's words is that there can be no salvation without repentance, and that there is no fair chance of repentance without the hearing of the gospel. Those who lived before the Advent of our Lord could not hear, and therefore God's mercy would not condemn them finally till they had listened to this last appeal. So Clement of Alexandria says (*Strom.* vi. 48) that it would have been *πλεονεξίας οὐ τῆς τυχούσης ἔργον*, "extremely unfair," to condemn men for not knowing what they could not know. Clement is referring to this very passage, though he does not actually quote it. Thus St. Peter does not here contemplate the case of those who have actually heard the gospel and refused it (on this point see ii. 6-8).

It is probable that St. Peter is here expressing in a modified form

a belief which was current in the Jewish schools. In the *Book of Enoch* (ed. Charles, chaps. lx. 5, 25, lxiv., lxix. 26) will be found obscure and mutilated passages which may be taken to mean that the antediluvian sinners, the giants, and the men whom they deluded, have a time of repentance allowed them between the first judgment (the Deluge) and the final judgment at the end of the world. In the last passage referred to we read that there was great joy among them "because the name of the Son of Man was revealed unto them." Weber (quoted by Kühl) cites two passages from the *Bereschit Rabba*, "But when they that are bound, they that are in Gehinnom, saw the light of the Messiah, they rejoiced to receive Him"; and again, "This is that which stands written: We shall rejoice and exult in Thee. When? When the captives climb up out of hell and the Shechinah at their head." See also Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. p. 77 sqq. St. Peter limits this Jewish doctrine to the special case of those who have not heard the gospel on earth. It will be observed also that he alludes to Jewish tradition without expressly quoting it.

In the second century we find references to a passage which is quoted as from the Old Testament (Irenaeus, iii. 20. 4, ascribes it to Isaiah, iv. 22. 1 to Jeremiah; Justin, *Trypho*, 72, ascribes it to Jeremiah, but adds that the Jews had recently cut it out of the Bible), ἐμνήσθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἅγιος Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ, τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χύματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοὺς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. The source of this passage is unknown, but it probably comes from some Jewish apocalypse.

It will be observed that what St. Peter affirms here is not simply the *Descensus ad Inferos*, which is already contained in his Pentecostal sermon, Acts ii. 27, in Luke xxiii. 43, possibly in Eph. iv 9, but a special form of the *Descensus*, the Harrowing of Hell. Possibly this belief underlies Matt. xxvii. 52, 53; it is connected with this passage of the Gospel in the *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum*, *Levi*, 4, σκυλευομένου τοῦ ἄδου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου. See also Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16. 5-7; Iren. iv. 33. 1, 12, v. 31. 1; the Presbyter in Irenaeus, iv. 27. 2; Marcion in Irenaeus, i. 27. 2; the Fragment of the Gospel of Peter, 41; Tert. *de Anima*, 55; Origen, *Celsus*, ii. 43; in *Lucam*, Hom. iv. (Lomm. v. 99); in *Joan.* ii. 30 (Lomm. i. 158); *Acta Thaddaei* in Eus. *H. E.* i. 13. 20; Ignatius, *Magn.* ix. 3.

20. ὀλίγοι may imply a reminiscence of the question—Are there few that be saved? Luke xiii. 23.

ὀκτὼ ψυχαί. Gen. vii. 7, viii. 18. Ψυχαί, of living men, Acts ii. 41, xxvii. 37; Rom. xiii. 1; Apoc. xvi. 3, and elsewhere.

Διεσώθησαν. Cf. Thuc. i. 110, καὶ ὀλίγοι ἀπὸ πολλῶν πορευόμενοι διὰ τῆς Λιβύης ἐς Κυρήνην ἐσώθησαν: iv. 113, διασώζονται ἐς τὴν Λήκυθον. Διεσώθησαν διὰ must mean "escaped through"; the water already surrounded them when they fled into the ark.

Many commentators here give *διά* its instrumental force, "were saved by water." This not only gives the preposition a sense different from that which it bears in the compound verb, and necessitates our translating *εἰς ἣν* "in which," but produces an impossible sense. The very object of the ark was to save Noah from the water.

The difficulty which suggested this false translation arises from arguing back, on a mistaken analogy, from the antitype to the type. St. Peter has been thought to mean that in Baptism we are saved by water, and that therefore Noah was saved in the same way. But St. Peter, on the contrary, says here, in this particular figure, that we pass through the water of Baptism into safety, as Noah passed through the Flood into the ark. Similar language is used elsewhere of Baptism. "Our fathers all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Here also the figure is substantially the same, that of escape through water. In Rom. vi. 3, again, the water represents the Death of Christ, through which we pass to the Resurrection. In all these figures the stress is laid, not on the water, but on the going into or under the water, and the rising from it and leaving it. The water expresses, not the instrument through which we receive the grace, but rather the evil life which we leave behind. Of course the water, being tied to the sacrament by divine command, is a condition of the grace; but this particular point is not directly involved in the figure of the ark. To bring out this point other figures are needed, such as that of washing, to which an allusion immediately follows.

21. "Which, in an antitype, Baptism, not the putting away of filth of flesh, but a question of a good conscience, brings you also safe to God." **N**, the Coptic, and Aethiopic omit *ὁ*: Erasmus, following some cursives, read *ψ*, a mere device to make the construction easier. The antecedent to *ὁ* is either *ὑδωρ* or *τὸ διασωθῆναι δι' ὕδατος*: but St. Peter suddenly changes his figure, introducing two new metaphors; hence arises the embarrassment of the grammar. The mention of Noah had led him to speak of Baptism, which at first strikes him as analogous to the Flood, inasmuch as it is a deliverance from drowning in the waters of sin. But here he is struck by the thought that this is not an adequate account of Baptism, or that there are other aspects of the sacrament which are equally valuable. It has an outward and an inward part; it is a washing, a question which brings you safe to God. No trace of the parallel which he set out to draw remains except in *εἰς Θεόν = εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν*, and *δι' ἀναστάσεως = δι' ὕδατος*. The word *ἀντίτυπον* is used also Heb. ix. 24 (see Bishop Westcott's note there). Properly speaking, the type is the seal of which the antitype is the impression, or the original document (*τὸ ἀθεντικόν*) of which the antitype is the copy. In Hebrews the earthly temple is antitype of the

eternal. This is the general use ; cf. 2 Clem. xiv. (see Bishop Lightfoot's note) *Const. App.* v. 14. 4, vi. 30. 1, where the Flesh of Christ is the antitype of His Spirit, or the bread and wine of His Body and Blood. But St. Peter uses *ἀντίτυπον* of the nobler member of the pair of relatives, of that to which the *τύπος* points and in which it finds its fulfilment, of the seal not of the copy.

σώσει βάπτισμα is a strong phrase. Cf. Mark xvi. 16, *ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται* : Tit. iii. 5, *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου*. But St. Peter's phrase goes beyond either of these. For *ἀπόθεσις* see *ἀποθέμενοι*, ii. 1 ; both this word and *τύπος* are *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*. For *συνειδήσις ἀγαθή* cf. ii. 19, iii. 16. Baptism is not merely an outward and visible form, but an inward and spiritual grace ; not merely a cleansing of the body, but a cleansing of the soul. But instead of writing *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις τύπον ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς*, St. Peter substitutes for *ψυχῆς* the difficult words *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα*. *Ἐπερωτᾶν* means to ask a question, or, in later Greek, to ask for a thing. *Ἐπερώτημα* accordingly means either "a question" or "a demand."

Commentators almost universally couple *εἰς Θεόν* with *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα*, and understand the meaning to be prayer to God of (proceeding from) a good conscience, or prayer to God for a good conscience, or inquiry of a good conscience after God. The last version (Alford's) is based upon 2 Kings xi. 7, *καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν Δαυὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην Ἰωάβ* : "David asked about the peace, or health, of Joab." But it requires *ἐπερώτησις* : and though this is perhaps not an insuperable difficulty, yet "inquiry after God" applies to one who is just turning towards the light, not to one who has made up his mind and is actually being baptized. To the other two renderings it is a fatal objection that *ἐπερωτᾶν* signifies to ask men for favours, Ps. cxxxvi. (cxxxvii.) 3 ; Matt. xvi. 1, but is not used of prayer to God. Lastly, none of these explanations gives the sense required. What we want is a version which will not only express the inner reality of baptism, but express it in a shape which forms an antithesis to *σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις τύπου*.

The best way seems to be to take *εἰς Θεόν* with *σώσει*, so as to form an antithesis to *δισωθήσαν εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν*, and to understand *ἐπερώτημα* of the Baptismal "question" or "demand." Faith and repentance are the antecedent conditions of baptism ; they may be said to make "a good conscience," and to be the real "putting off of the filth of the soul." The candidate must always have been asked, in the form of words familiar in later times, or in some other, whether he possessed these qualifications. We may translate "question of" or "concerning," or "demand for, a good conscience," the question, "Dost thou believe?" the demand, "Wilt thou renounce?" "Wilt thou obey?"

δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. "Through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." The words are formally parallel to δι' ἕδωτος. They are connected grammatically with σώζει: and baptism saves us *through*, in the sense of *by the virtue of* the Resurrection. Here again, then, the mixture of metaphors causes a slight difficulty; but this is met by using the word "through," which, like the Greek διά, means both "passing through" and "by means of."

Regeneration is connected with the Resurrection above, i. 3.

22. ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ. Christ is spoken of here as "being" at the right hand of God, cf. Rom. viii. 34. The phrase "sitting" comes from Ps. cx. (Matt. xxii. 44), but was used by our Lord Himself, Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69; cf. Eph. i. 20; Heb. i. 13, x. 12, xii. 2; Mark xvi. 19; Acts ii. 34 (where Ps. cx. is quoted by St. Peter). St. Stephen (Acts vii. 55, 56) saw the Son of Man "standing" at the right hand of God, as if He had risen from the throne to succour His dying servant; with this compare the story of Carpus in *Ep.* 8 of *Dionysius the Areopagite*. See also Dr. Milligan, *The Ascension of our Lord*, p. 58.

πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν. The Resurrection is distinguished from the Ascension, though the interval of time is not stated.

ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων. "Angels and authorities and powers having been made subject unto Him." Cf. Rom. viii. 38, οὔτε ἄγγελοι, οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐνεστώτα, οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις, οὔτε ὑψώματα, οὔτε βάθος, οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα: Eph. i. 21, ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος . . . καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν κτλ.: Col. ii. 10, κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. For the verb ὑποτάσσειν cf. also 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 8: its use was suggested by Ps. viii. 7, πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. See the *Book of Enoch* (ed. Charles, lxi. 10; the passage comes just before one of the Noachic fragments which St. Peter may possibly have had in view in the preceding verses), "And He will call on all the host of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities." This part of Enoch, Mr. Charles thinks, was written between B.C. 94-79, or more precisely between B.C. 70-64. From some such source are derived the angelic divisions as they are given both by St. Peter and St. Paul. Enoch's phrase opens a question whether we ought not, in the present passage, to translate "angels both of authorities and of powers." The "authorities and powers" probably mean the departments of nature over which the several angelic orders bear sway. In the *Book of Jubilees* (ed. Charles, p. 5), the highest angels are those that stand before the Face, next come the angels of Glory, then angels of Winds, of Clouds and Darkness, of Snow, Hail, Frost, and so on.

IV. 1. Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος . . . ἁμαρτίας. Here also \aleph has ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν: A KLP add ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν after παθόντος: BC have παθόντος only. For ἁμαρτίας B has ἁμαρτίας, and this appears to be the reading of the Aethiopic, Vulgate, and Peshito.

οὖν introduces the main lesson to be drawn from iii. 18-22. Ὀπλιζέσθαι (one of St. Peter's ἀπαξ λεγόμενα) is used here in its classical poetical sense; cf. Soph. *El.* 995, ὀπλιζέσθαι θράσος. Ἐννοια (Heb. iv. 12) is an idea, design, or resolve, that of suffering with patience. Here, again, *Christus Patiens* is our ὑπογραμμός. He suffered in the flesh and so must we; of course, ἀγαθοποιούντες or διὰ δικαιοσύνην is implied. But St. Peter goes on to add a very remarkable statement about this bodily suffering. It is not only χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ (ii. 20), or κρέττον (iii. 17), but it also makes the man better. "For he who hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." Ὅτι gives the reason for ὀπλίσασθε. Πέπανται is middle, not passive; the meaning is, "he hath ceased to do evil," not "he hath been delivered from the power or guilt of sin." Ἄμαρτία in 1 Peter always means "a sinful act." He that in meekness and fear hath endured persecution rather than join in the wicked ways of the heathen, can be trusted to do right; temptation has manifestly no power over him. St. Peter does not say that our guilt is taken away by our sufferings, or that Christ did not suffer for us all, or that our sufferings can do us any good, except in so far as they are borne for the love of Christ. These points do not here arise. The passage is not to be compared with Rom. vi. 7, ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

2. εἰς τὸ μηκέτι . . . χρόνον. "So that he lives the rest of his time in the flesh no longer by the lusts of men, but by the will of God." Εἰς τό gives the result of πέπανται ἁμαρτίας, cf. Rom. i. 20, iv. 18, and other passages. If we take εἰς τό as "in order that" (cf. iii. 7 above), we must couple it with ὀπλίσασθε, and translate as R.V. "Arm yourselves with the same mind, that ye no longer should live." The article is used with the same easy correctness as in iii. 3. Βιώσαι (used in LXX., not elsewhere in N.T.) is a classical verb, but the first aorist (familiar in the proverb λάθε βιώσας) is late; the Attic form is βιώναι, see Cobet, *Nouae Lectiones*, p. 576. The datives ἐπιθυμίας, θελήματι express the rule by which the man shapes his life. From this verse it is evident that παθεῖν σαρκί, as applied to the Christian, rather excludes than suggests the idea of death. The prospect of martyrdom is clearly not immediately present to the writer's mind.

3. ἀρκετὸς γάρ . . . κατειργάσθαι. "For the time past may suffice to have wrought the wish of the Gentiles." After γάρ C KLP have ἡμῖν: \aleph , the Coptic, and Aethiopic, ἡμῖν. For the construction of ἀρκετὸς cf. *Anthol. Graeca*, ix. 749, ἀρκετὸν οἴνω αἰθεσθαι κραδίην· μὴ πυρὶ πῦρ ἔπαγε. But a Greek would probably

have written ἀρκετὸς ὁ παρεληλυθὸς χρόνος, ἐν ᾧ . . . κατείργασθε: cf. Isocrates, *Paneg.* 75 D, ἰκανὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὸς (χρόνος), ἐν ᾧ τί τῶν δεινῶν οὐ γέγονεν; Βούλημα is used, Rom. ix. 19, of the will of God; here, in contrast to that will, it means the wish of heathen neighbours who would gladly see the Christians living the same kind of life as themselves. Τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνῶν is one of the phrases relied upon to show that the readers of the Epistle were themselves of Gentile birth, but this is not a necessary inference from the words. Lax Jews might, and very frequently did, adopt the evil ways of the heathen. Possibly St. Peter is thinking of passages such as 4 Kings xvii. 8, καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαίωμασι τῶν ἔθνῶν. St. Paul uses language which implies that the general morality of the Jews was little higher than that of the Gentiles, Rom. ii. 21-24, iii. 9-18; Eph. ii. 1-3; and ready to hand lie the instances of the Herods, Bernice, Drusilla, and the sons of Sceva, a chief priest (Acts xix. 14). There is a possibility again that ἡμῖν really belongs to the text; and if it does, the writer is certainly not addressing Gentile Christians only.

πεπορευμένους ἐν is a Hebraism. The tense of the participle is adapted to that of κατειργάσθαι, cf. θανατωθεῖς, ζωοποιηθεῖς in iii. 18. Ἀσέλγεια in classical Greek means brutality, but is used by later writers specially of lasciviousness. The plural means either kinds or acts of lasciviousness. Οἰνοφλυγία is found in the LXX. Deut. xxi. 20, but not elsewhere in the New Testament. Κῶμοι (Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21) were revels, carousals, merry-makings, sometimes private, sometimes public and religious. Plato regarded them with disapproval, as tending to foster the tyrannical licentious character, *Rep.* 573 D, Τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα ἑορταὶ γίνονται παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ κῶμοι καὶ θάλειαι καὶ ἑταῖραι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα, ὧν ἂν Ἐρως τύραννος ἐνδον οἰκῶν διακυβερνᾷ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἅπαντα: *Theaet.* 173 D, δειπνα καὶ σὺν ἀλητρίσι κῶμοι. At such revels the talk seems to have turned largely upon "Love," which is the theme of conversation in the *Symposium*. By philosophers and poets such a subject might be handled as it is by Socrates and his friends; in other cases "Love" would signify πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη. Even the excellent Plutarch thought that it was absurd to be squeamish over wine, and that it was not only excusable, but a religious duty, to let tongues go; the gods required this compliment to their mythological characters. *Quaest. Conviv.* vii. 7, Εἰ γὰρ ἄλλοτε μάλιστα δὴ που παρὰ πότον προσπαιστὸν ἐστὶ τούτοις καὶ δοτέον εἰς ταῦτα τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ψυχῆν. Among the Romans *comissari*, *comissator*, *comissatio* are words which imply debauchery, and carry with them a strong moral disapproval (see references in Facciolati). Except in so far as they were corrupted by Greek ideas, and this in Imperial times is a large exception, the Romans did not regard lust and drunkenness as acts of religious observance.

ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις. "Unlawful idolatries." In Acts x. 28, the only other place where ἀθέμιτος occurs in the New Testament, it is used by St. Peter of that which is forbidden by the law of Moses; and this is probably the meaning here. In classical Greek it means "forbidden by θέμις," by the natural law of reason and conscience. This is the sense adopted by R.V., which translates "abominable idolatries." The question is of importance, because, if the meaning is "unlawful," St. Peter would seem to be addressing Jews, if "abominable," then Gentiles. Many Jews fell into idolatry, like Alexander, the nephew of Philo; and many more would be contaminated by conniving at it. See, for a striking example of this fact, the magical formula given by Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 26 sqq., Eng. trans. p. 274, which must have been composed by a Jew. Nor need St. Peter be taken to mean that all his readers had joined in idol worship. The phrase forms the chief argument of those who maintain that the Epistle was directed to Gentile readers. But, upon the whole, the most natural supposition is that among the Asiatic Christians were both Gentiles and Jews, and that St. Peter uses words that touch sometimes one, sometimes the other, sometimes all alike.

4. ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται . . . βλασφημοῦντες. "Wherein they are amazed that ye run not with them into the same pool of recklessness, blaspheming." Ἐν ᾧ, "in which thing," "in which manner of life" (ἐν ἀσελγείαις κτλ.), should be taken with συντρεχόντων. The reason of the amazement is given by the genitive absolute, and ξενίζεσθαι ἐν τινί is hardly a possible construction. Just below, iv. 12, the verb is followed by the simple dative. Ξενίζεω, which properly means "to entertain a guest," is used in later Greek in the sense of "to astonish"; cf. Acts xvii. 20. This "amazement" was a fruitful source of persecution. The Christians were compelled to stand aloof from all the social pleasures of the world, and the Gentiles bitterly resented their puritanism, regarding them as the enemies of all joy, and therefore of the human race. An instructive passage will be found in Minucius Felix, xii.

Συντρέχειν expresses the blind haste of the wicked man who rushes headlong on his pleasure; cf. Rom. iii. 15, "their feet are swift to shed blood." Ἀσωρία (Eph. v. 18; Tit. i. 6) in Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* iv. 1. 3) is opposed to φειδώ, and signifies the utter recklessness in expenditure of the ἀκόλαστος, who has lost all self-control. A good instance is to be found in the Prodigal Son. Ἀνάχυσις (not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible) means "a pouring out," "effusion"; hence any broadening of water, such as an estuary or a marsh, caused by the overflow of a river. In Virg. *Aen.* vi. 107, "tenebrosa palus Acheronte refuso," Heyne explains *refuso* by ἀναχυθέντος. Kühn refers to Aelian, *de an.* xvi. 15, and Script. graec. apud Luper. in Harpocr. Suidas, however, gives βλακεία, ἔκλυσις as synonyms, as

if the word had taken a physical meaning, of the pouring out or loosening of fibre, hence of "dissoluteness."

βλασφημοῦντες, "blasphemers that they are," comes with great force at the end of the clause, so as to form a strong basis for the following words. *βλασφημεῖν* in classical Greek has a weaker and a stronger use, of calumniating man or God; the difference lies, not in the verb itself, but in the object. In Tit. iii. 2 it means merely "to calumniate," but it is always a stronger word than *καταλαλεῖν* or *λοιδορεῖν*, and brings out the wickedness of calumny (cf. Rom. iii. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 13, x. 30; 1 Tim. i. 20). It is used of the Jews who reviled our Lord (Matt. xxvii. 39), and in many passages means what we call "blasphemy," contumely against God (Matt. ix. 3, xxvi. 65). In the present passage the run of the sense shows that it bears this stronger meaning. The charges made by the heathen were not only false, but turned the Christian faith into impiety, the Christian virtue into vice, and involved a different and blasphemous idea of God.

5. *οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον*. "But they shall give account to Him that is ready to judge quick and dead." For the sudden vehement use of *οἶ*, compare Rom. iii. 8, *ὃν τὸ κρίμα ἐνδικόν ἐστι*. *Ἀποδιδόναι λόγον*, "to render an account to a master or judge," "to stand trial," generally with the implication that defence is not easy (Matt. xii. 36; Luke xvi. 2; Acts xix. 40; Heb. xiii. 17), is to be distinguished from *λόγον αἰτεῖν* or *διδόναι* (iii. 15 above). *Ἐτοίμως*: the Judge is ready; cf. *σωτηρίαν ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, i. 5, and *ἤγγικε* just below. The Judge is not here named. Above, i. 17, He is the Father; but St. Peter connects the judgment with the Revelation of Jesus Christ, i. 13, and with the appearance of the Chief Shepherd, v. 4.

6. *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη*. "For this is the reason why the gospel was preached (not only to living, but) also to dead, that, after they had been judged like men in flesh, they should live like God in spirit." *Γὰρ* introduces an explanation of the words immediately preceding. He is ready to judge quick and dead; for soon the living will have heard, and the dead have already heard the gospel. "Paratus est Judex; nam euangelio praedicato nil nisi finis restat," Bengel. *Νεκροῖς* must be taken in the obvious sense of the word; they were dead at the time when the announcement was made. Further, it must have the same sense as in *ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*, that is to say, it must include all the dead, not merely those who perished in the Flood. *Εὐηγγελίσθη* is impersonal; but, if St. Peter had meant that the agent was any other than Christ, he must have said so expressly. The difference of tense in *κριθῶσι*, *ζῶσι*, makes the former verb antecedent in time to the latter, and the sense is the same as if St. Peter had written *ἵνα κριθέντες ζῶσι*. Judgment in the flesh is death (cf. the passage from Enoch, quoted

on iii. 19 above, where the Deluge is spoken of as a first judgment to be followed by a second, "when the name of the Son of Man will be revealed unto them"). Death is that penalty which all men alike must pay. *Κατά* has the same force as in i. 15. Thus we get a complete antithesis, *κριθῶσι* answering to *ζῶσι*, *κατὰ ἀνθρώπου* to *κατὰ Θεόν*, *σαρκί* to *πνεύματι*. Life like God in spirit is blessed life; the object of the preaching was the salvation of the dead; but St. Peter does not say, and probably does not mean, that the object was in all cases attained. The idea seems to be that God will not judge any man finally till the whole truth has been revealed to him. If this interpretation is right, the "preaching" is the same that was spoken of in iii. 19, but the audience here includes all those who had died before the Descent into Hell, whether saints or sinners; for, if those who *ἠπειθήσαν* before the Deluge heard the Word, those who were disobedient afterwards cannot have been shut out.

The meaning of the passage has been much debated. Augustine, Cyril, Bede, Erasmus, Luther, and others took *νεκροί* to mean "those who were dead in trespasses and sins," the spiritually dead, or more especially the Gentiles (Matt. viii. 22; Eph. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13); but it is impossible to suppose that St. Peter used the same word twice, almost in the same breath, in two different senses. Bengel explained *νεκροί* of those first Christians who were dead in St. Peter's time, giving the word the sense of "those who are *now* dead." This explanation was suggested by his belief that it was impossible for Christ to have preached to the dead. "Quum corpus in morte exiit, anima uel in malam uel in bonam partem plane figuratur. Euangelium nulli post mortem praedicatur." But the same sense has been given to *νεκροί* by a number of modern commentators. Von Soden thinks that ver. 6 is intended as a comfort, and that St. Peter is replying to a difficulty indirectly suggested by his words in the preceding sentence. God will soon judge both quick and dead. "Yes," the Christian reader might say, "the blasphemer will have his recompense. But how will this avail our friends who have died in the midst of suffering?" Even for them, the apostle answers, the thought of the judgment is full of consolation; for this is the very reason why the gospel was preached to our departed brethren, that after death they might have eternal life. This explanation makes our passage nearly parallel in sense to 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, but a glance at St. Paul's words in that place will show how differently St. Peter must have expressed himself, if this had been his meaning. Further, on this hypothesis he would surely have written *τοῖς τεθνηκόσι* or *τοῖς κεκοιμημένοις*, not *νεκροῖς*. Hofmann gives *νεκροῖς* the same signification, but regards the verse as a word of menace, making *γάρ* refer to *βλασφημοῦντες οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον*. In this case the sense will be, "Let not the blasphemer think that,

if he escapes punishment in this life, he has escaped altogether. For this is why the gospel was preached to those who are now dead in order that (if they listened) they might have eternal life (but if they refused to listen, might heap up to themselves further condemnation)." But here we have to make a large and arbitrary parenthesis to get the sense which Hofmann desires, and the objections to this meaning of νεκροῦς remain.

In very early times the εὐηγγελίσθη of iv. 6 was distinguished from the ἐκήρυξεν of iii. 19 and ascribed not to Christ, but to the apostles; see Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16. 5-7; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6. 45, 46. This view was only rendered possible by the impersonality of εὐηγγελίσθη, and is quite fanciful. Further, Hermas, Clement, Irenaeus (iv. 22. 1, 2), and Ignatius (*Magn.* ix. 3) restrict the preaching to the just, guided probably by the mention of the "saints" in Matt. xxvii. 52. But, as noticed above, the use of ἀπειθήσαουσιν in iii. 20 seems clearly to imply that in St. Peter's belief the offer was made to all, though some might reject the light in Hades, as many do reject it in this world.

7. πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. "But the end of all things has drawn near." The "but" introduces a new train of thought suggested by the mention of the judgment. It has drawn near, and there is increased need for watchfulness and prayer. The day is near (ἐτοίμην, i. 5; ὀλίγον ἄρτι, i. 6; τῷ ἐτοίμῳ ἔχοντι, iv. 5; cf. Jas. v. 8; Phil. iv. 5; Apoc. xxii. 12). It is nearer than it was (Rom. xiii. 11), but it is not imminent (οὐκ ἐνέστηκεν, 2 Thess. ii. 2); it will not come without warning; men are not to neglect their duties, or fall into panic terror. There is a close similarity here between St. Peter, Mark xiv. 38 (γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε), and Luke xxi. 36 (ἀγρυπνεῖτε δὲ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι). For νήψατε cf. i. 13, v. 8; 1 Thess. v. 6; Luke xxi. 34. It may be noticed that St. Peter says nothing about the signs of the end. Even in 2 Peter, where the Parousia is so immediately in question, this subject is not touched except in so far as the Mockers (2 Pet. iii. 3) belong to the Last Days. Neither the apostle nor his readers can have felt any interest in these speculations. They were rife at Thessalonica. From the second century onwards, there were repeated attempts to fix a date for the end of the world; see Alexandre, *Oracula Sibyllina*, ii. p. 485 sqq.

8. τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες. "Cherishing love which is fervent towards one another." Ἐκτενῆ is marked as predicate by the position of the article. "Amor iam praesupponitur, ut sit uehemens praecipitur," Bengel; cf. i. 22, ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς. Both there and here Kühn would give ἐκτενῆς the sense of "persistent." The easy rapid connexion of the following sentences with the imperative by participle and adjective ἔχοντες, φιλόξενοι, διακονοῦντες is found also ii. 18-iii. 8 above. Ἀγάπη εἰς ἑαυτοὺς (to

yourselves = to one another; for this use of the reflexive, which is not unclassical, see Blass, p. 169) is the *φιλαδελφία* of i. 22.

ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν. "Charity covers," or "atones for a multitude of sins." In Prov. x. 12 the LXX. has *μῖσος ἐγείρει νεῖκος, πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία.* The sense of the Hebrew is, "Hatred stirreth up strifes, but love covereth all transgressions." St. Peter's version is nearer to the Hebrew than that of the LXX. The meaning of the Hebrew is that, while hatred stirs up strife by dragging the faults of others to light, charity covers them up and hides them. This, however, can hardly be the sense here, and certainly cannot be in Jas. v. 20, *ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου, καὶ καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.* In this latter passage "cover" must signify "cover from the sight of God," "make atonement for,"—a sense suggested by Ps. xxxi. (xxxii.) 1, *μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,* and other passages where the verb *Kíppēr* is used (see Cheyne, *Isaiah*, ii. p. 210, n.); and this appears to be the meaning of St. Peter also. The love of Christ covers sins (Luke vii. 47); and love of the brethren, flowing as it does from the love of Christ, may be regarded as a kind of secondary atonement. Brother becomes a Christ to brother, and, in so far as he renews the great Sacrifice, becomes a partaker in its effects and a channel through which the effects are made operative for others. If there is any connexion here between St. James and St. Peter, it is clear that the former is the borrower, for the connexion of his phrase with the verse of Proverbs can only be made clear by taking the phrase of the latter as a help. If St. Peter had not first written *ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν*, St. James never could have said that he who converteth a sinner *καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.*

9. φιλόξενοι. By hospitality is not meant the giving of feasts, but the reception, entertainment, and relief of travellers. Inns were rare and little used, though we read of them in two passages of St. Luke's Gospel, ii. 7, x. 34. The entertainment of strangers was specially enjoined by our Lord (Matt. xxv. 35). It was to be practised without asking questions, for thus angels might be entertained unawares (Heb. xiii. 2); but became a stringent obligation in the case of brethren, especially if they were travelling on the affairs of the Church (Acts x. 6, xxi. 16), and injunctions to hospitality are frequent (Rom. xii. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 10; Tit. i. 8; 3 John 5). Indeed, without a liberal practice of this virtue, the missions of the Church would have been impossible.

10. ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβε χάρισμα. "As each hath received a gift ministering it to one another." St. Peter does not speak of miraculous *χαρίσματα*, of healings, or miracles, or prophecy, or discerning of spirits, or tongues, or interpretations (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10). Throughout the Epistle he lets fall no word to show that these

extraordinary gifts of the Spirit existed among the Diaspora, or that he himself attached any importance to them. Here, where the injunction to hospitality so closely precedes, it would seem that money, the means of hospitality, is regarded as a *χάρισμα*.

οἰκονόμοι. St. Paul uses "steward" of himself (1 Cor. iv. 1), and of the Bishop (Tit. i. 7). Here every Christian is a steward. There may be a reference to Matt. xxiv. 45, where, as here, the mention of the good steward follows immediately on that of the Second Coming. For *ποικίλης* see note on i. 6. *Χάρις* is here the bounty of God, of which the *χαρίσματα* are the component parts.

11. *εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ*. "If any man speak, speaking as the oracles of God." The article is omitted, as with *γραφή*, ii. 6; but, if it be thought necessary to mark the omission, we may translate "as oracles of God speak," that is to say, "as Scripture speaks," with sincerity and gravity. The Christian's talk is to be modelled on the Bible. The verb *λαλεῖν* might be used of speaking with tongues or of prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 2, 4), but not without a defining addition. Words reveal the character, and should always be "words of grace," whether addressed to the heathen (the *ἀπολογία* of iii. 15) or to the brethren. We may compare Jas. iii.; Matt. xii. 37. *Λόγια* means Scripture. The word originally signifies "oracles," and was borrowed from Greek heathenism by Jews and Christians. *Τὰ λόγια* sometimes means specially the Ten Commandments (Aristeas in Eus. *Praef. Eu.* viii. 9. 27; Acts vii. 38; Philo in Eus. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5; Basil, *de S. S.* xiii. 30). Philo, however, uses *λόγια* or *χρησμοί* of all the writings of Moses, the only portion of Scripture of which he expressly treats. *Οὐκ ἄγνοῶ μὲν οὖν, ὡς πάντα εἰσὶ χρησμοί, ὅσα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις γέγραπται, χρησθέντες δι' αὐτοῦ*—immediately after this he employs the word *λόγια*, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 23 (ii. 163). In the *De Praemiis et Poenis*, i (ii. 408), he says that there were three species of "the *λόγια* given by the prophet Moses," the cosmogonical, the historical, and the legislative. When he speaks of "the *λόγια* given by the prophet Moses," he implies that there were other *λόγια* given by other prophets, and as he expressly applies the word "oracles" to the narrative portions of Scripture, it would seem that the *λόγια* in his view include the whole Hebrew Bible. Though he deals at large only with the Mosaic books, he quotes freely from the historical books, from Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Jonah, Zechariah. In Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12, *τὰ λόγια* means the Hebrew Bible. As Christian writings gained currency and authority the same title was extended to them; see Clem. Rom. xiii., xix., liii., lxii., and 2 Clem. xiii. When Polycarp speaks of *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* as including the history of the Resurrection (Phil. vii.), he means the Gospels, and embraces under the term not only the words of

our Lord, but the narrative; and there can be little doubt that *λόγια Κυριακά* was used in the same sense by Papias (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39. 1, 16). Ephrem Syrus, according to Photius, divided the New Testament into *Κυριακά λόγια* and *ἀποστολικά κηρύγματα*, and it is probable that all the earlier writers restricted *λόγια* to the Gospels. Eusebius, however, uses *τὸ λόγιον* of a historical passage in Acts (*H. E.* ii. 10. 1), and in his time the word denotes all Holy Scripture, Jewish or Christian. Socrates (*H. E.* iii. 20) calls the prophecy that not one stone of the temple should be left upon another *τὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος λόγιον*, the "oracle," or "prediction" of Christ. This is an unusual but quite proper use of the word. The meaning of *λόγια* has been much disputed: the reader may consult Heinichen's note on Eus. *H. E.* iii. 19. 15; Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 172 sqq.; Salmon, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 98 sqq.; Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung*, pp. 486 sqq., 492 sqq., and the Introductions generally.

The R.V. translates our passage, "If any man speak, speaking as it were oracles of God," taking *λόγια* as accusative; and many commentators follow Bengel in this mode of explaining the words. There are, however, serious objections to this rendering. In the first place, we must give different senses to *ὡς* after *διακονοῦντες* and after *λαλεῖ*: in the former case it will represent *ut*, in the latter *quasi* or *tanquam*. But, further, what tolerable sense can be gathered from the words "as it were oracles of God"? Dean Alford, who follows the same construction as R.V., thinks that the admonition is addressed to the prophet, and that what St. Peter means is that the prophet "is to speak what he does speak as God's sayings (oracles), not as his own." But *λαλεῖν* alone cannot signify *λαλεῖν ἐν πνεύματι*, and who would exhort a prophet to speak as if his utterances were not his own, when this is the very essence of all prophecy? Or, if it be supposed that the teacher is meant, how could he be recommended to speak quasi-oracles? It is the very thing that a teacher ought to avoid.

ἔ τις διακονεῖ. All Christians are "ministers," as was the Son of Man (Matt. xx. 28, xxiii. 11). They are to render their services not by way of patronage, with any show or feeling of superiority, but "as of strength which God supplies," with humble acknowledgment that all their power of doing good is given by God. *ἦς* is in Attic attraction; other instances will be found in Bruder.

ἵνα ἐν πάνσι δοξάζηται ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. On the apostolic doxologies (Gal. i. 5; Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; Phil. iv. 20; Eph. iii. 21; 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 18; Jude 25; Apoc. i. 6, v. 13, vii. 12) see Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 464; Bingham, xiv. 2. 1; Hooker, *Ecol. Pol.* v. 42. 7. Glory is given to God "through Christ" in three (Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Jude 25; so also in Clem. Rom. lviii.). In

later times this became an Arian watchword ; see Basil, *de S. S. i. 3* ; Socrates, *i. 21* ; Theodoret, *ii. 23*.

δέστιν ἡ δόξα. The collocation of the words is rightly considered by Hofmann and von Soden to show that the doxology is addressed to Christ, as are those in *2 Tim. iv. 18* ; *2 Pet. iii. 18* ; *Apoc. i. 6*. It is hardly to be supposed that any serious writer would lay himself open to misunderstanding on so grave a point, when by merely throwing back the words *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* he could have prevented all possibility of mistake. The same remark will apply to *Heb. xiii. 20, 21*. The Christian doxologies, except that in *2 Pet. iii. 18* (for the Jewish form see *i. 3*), end with Amen. Our Lord used this word, in a manner peculiar to Himself, to affirm His own utterances, not those of another person ; and this usage was adopted by the Church. See Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 185. Dr. Chase says that the addition of Amen marks the formula as liturgical, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, p. 170.

12. μὴ ξενίσεθε . . . ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος. "Be not amazed by the fiery trial in your midst, since it is sent to prove you, as though some amazing thing were happening to you." Πύρωσις is used *Apoc. xviii. 9, 18*, of the conflagration which devours Babylon. Here, however, the allusion is to the fire by which gold is tested, and the word is probably taken from *Prov. xxvii. 21, δοκίμιον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσῶ πύρωσις*: cf. *Ps. xvi. (xvii.) 3, ἐτύρωσας*. See *i. 7* above. What St. Peter desires to bring out is not so much the fierceness of the heat and the pain, as the refining power of fire. "Trial by fire" would perhaps be a better translation than "fiery trial." On *ξενίσεσθαι* see *iv. 4*. The participle *γινομένην* without article is adverbial.

13. χαίρετε. Even now the Christian may rejoice in the thought that he is a partaker in the sufferings of his Master ; but ἀγαλλίασις, exultation, rapture, is reserved for the Revelation. Compare *i. 6-9*. "Partake in suffering" is a phrase which seems to imply that the Christian not only suffers like Christ, but that his sufferings produce in their degree the same result as Christ's. The same thought, as von Soden points out, is involved in the section *iii. 17-iv. 6*.

14. εἰ ὀνειδίξεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ μακάριοι. "If ye are reproached in (in the matter of, for, or, possibly, by) the Name of Christ, blessed are ye." There is a striking resemblance here to *Matt. v. 11, 12, μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσι ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσι, καὶ εἰπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ. Χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε*. For *μακάριοι* see note on *iii. 14*. This is the only passage in the New Testament where ὄνομα Χριστοῦ occurs. Elsewhere we find ὄνομα Κυρίου, Ἰησοῦ, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. St. Peter constantly uses "Christ" alone ; but there is a special reason for his doing so here, where he is leading up to "Christian." Suffering

for the Name is a common phrase, cf. Matt. xix. 29; Acts v. 41, ix. 16, xxi. 13. The most serious and pressing form of suffering as yet is reproach, not imprisonment or death, cf. ii. 12.

ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης . . . ἀναπαύεται. "Because the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." The phrase is from Is. xi. 2, καὶ ἀναπαύεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The article is repeated with great emphasis, "the Spirit of glory, yes, the Spirit of God." He is the Spirit who enables us to glorify God through suffering. He rests upon the Christian as the Shechinah rested on the tabernacle, and brings a foretaste (cf. *χαρὰ δεδοξασμένη*, i. 8) of that glory which is fully given at the Revelation. The Spirit of glory is a spirit of power; through this power the conduct of the Christian puts his adversaries to shame (iii. 16), and his words are unanswerable. Δόξα is here selected as the attribute of the Spirit, because of the preceding *ὀνειδίξεσθε*: the Spirit turns reproach into glory. St. Peter cannot mean "the temper of glory and of God"; see note on iii. 4. Here, as elsewhere, by Spirit he means spiritual being or ghost. How he would, if challenged on the point, have distinguished the Ghost (i. 2), the Ghost of Christ (i. 11), the Ghost of God, is not easy to say, but we must allow the chain of later belief its due weight.

15. ὡς φονεύς, ἢ κλέπτης, ἢ κακοποιός, ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος. "As a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as meddling with things forbidden." Πάσχειν is simply "to suffer"; the verb does not define the nature of the suffering, nor the manner, whether by legal process or otherwise, in which it is inflicted. Φονεύς, a murderer, in the ordinary sense of the word. We are not to discern here an allusion to the charges of child-slaying and cannibalism brought against Christians at a later date. A Christian might quite well be guilty of murder. The times were wild, and conversions must often have been imperfect. According to Apollonius, one Alexander, a Montanist, was condemned for brigandage (Eus. *H. E.* v. 18. 9). Clement of Alexandria tells of a favourite disciple of St. John who became captain of a band of robbers; *λήσταρχος ἦν βιαιότατος, μαιφονότατος, χαλεπώτατος*, *Q. D. S.* 42. There were men in the Apostolic Church who had been κλέπται, and were still in danger of falling back into evil ways, see 1 Cor. vi. 10; Eph. iv. 28. For κακοποιός see note on ii. 12.

ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος is a word not found elsewhere, and probably coined by St. Peter. How easily it could be formed is shown by the passage quoted by Zahn from Epictetus, iii. 22. 97, οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἀλλότρια πολυπραγμονεῖ (ὁ κυνικός), ὅταν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἐπισκοπῇ. The exact meaning is not certain, but, as the compound must signify "one who busies himself about τὰ ἀλλότρια," we can classify and compare the different senses which are possible.

1. ἀλλότριος may mean "that which belongs to another," and

has been supposed to refer (*a*) to other people's money,—hence the Vulgate has *alienorum appetitor*; Calvin and Beza, *alieni cupidus*. But ἐπίσκοπος can hardly mean “one who covets,”—(*b*) to other people's affairs generally. Thus in Tertullian, *Scorpiace*, 12, the old Latin version has *alieni speculator*; A.V. “a busybody”; R.V. “a meddler in other men's matters.” In this way we get a tenable sense for ἐπίσκοπος, but meddlesomeness seems a trivial offence to be ranked in such a list as that given here. Yet πολυπραγμοσύνη was regarded as a high social misdemeanour, and a Christian might give great offence by ill-timed protests against common social customs, such as the use of garlands, or of “meat offered to idols” at dinner parties. The word might even be so understood as to convey a reproof of all needless defiance of paganism, such as that of the Christian who would strike with his stick the statue of a god in the open market-place; see Origen, *contra Celsum*, vii. 36, 62, viii. 35, 38, 39, 41; Minucius Felix, 8; Tert. *de Idol.* 11; *ad uxorem*, ii. 5; Prudentius, *περὶ στεφ.* iii. 130. The Church always discouraged these extravagances of zeal.

2. ἀλλότριος may also mean that which is “foreign to a man's character,” and from this point of view, again, two different explanations are possible. (*a*) The Christian may here be warned against conduct which “does not befit him as a citizen.” Ἀλλοτριπραγεῖν (see Liddell and Scott) was used like πολυπραγμονεῖν in a political sense (= *nouas res moliri*). It is just possible that St. Peter is here admonishing his readers against sedition, and repeating in another form the advice given above, ii. 13.

Under this head will fall the explanation given by Professor Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 293 note, 348 note), who thinks “that the word refers to the charge of tampering with family relationships, causing disunion and discord, rousing discontent and disobedience, and so on.”

(*b*) But it seems best to understand ἀλλότριος as referring to things “which do not befit a Christian.” The word is constantly used in the LXX. for “outlandish,” “unlawful,” “heathen,” thus we have Θεοὶ ἀλλότριοι frequently; πῦρ ἀλλότριον, Lev. x. 1; Num. iii. 4; ἐδέσματα ἀλλότρια, Sir. xl. 29; cf. Justin, *Τρυφή*, 30, ἃ ἐστὶν ἀλλότρια τῆς θεοσεβείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. There were many trades which the heathen themselves regarded as disgraceful, those of the *lanista*, the *leno*, the *histrion*, and so on. Almost all trades were intimately allied with heathenism; every object might be adorned with images of gods (Tert. *de Idol.* 3). A Christian might even be a *mathematicus* (Tert. *de Idol.* 9): indeed there were innumerable ways in which he might be drawn into the gravest inconsistencies, and many so-called Christians lived half-heathen lives, as we learn from Hermas and Tertullian. Such conformity to heathen customs would bring upon the Christian the charge of hypocrisy or cowardice,

and this charge carries with it penalties which the pagans would take delight in making as severe as possible.

It will be observed that the meanings given under (2) are not mutually exclusive and may possibly all be right. The repetition of *ὡς* before *ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος* seems to show that St. Peter is not adding another offence, but summing up all possible offences in a comprehensive *et cetera*. "Neither as murderer, nor thief, nor evildoer generally, nor, in a word, as a bad Christian." The movement of thought is from particular to general, from special crimes to all lawlessness and immorality, and from this again to all actions forbidden by the still wider rule of the faith.

16. *εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός*. "But if he suffers as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." *κ* has *χρηστιανός*, *β* *χρειστιανός*. Possibly we might translate "as a *Christite*," or "as a *Chrestian*," for it may be that St. Peter uses the word here as a nickname given to the "brethren" by Gentile scorn. If it had been in common use among the members of the Church, St. Paul could hardly have avoided some reference to the fact in 1 Cor. i. 13. The name Christian was first given to the brethren at Antioch (Acts xi. 26), probably at the time when St. Luke notices its emergence, during the year which St. Paul spent in that city (about A.D. 43). A Gentile Church had been formed there by Barnabas and Paul; this new development would excite attention, and the word was coined probably by the Gentile Antiochenes who were notorious for their factions, biting tongues, and ingenuity in framing party epithets. The Jewish nickname for the disciples of Christ was *Ναζωραῖοι* (Acts xxiv. 5). The word Christian is of Latin formation; it is made upon the analogy of many party names which appeared during the civil wars, Sullani, Mariani, Caesariani, Pompeiani, and so on. But this Roman fashion had been caught up by the Greeks; thus in the Gospels we find *Ἡρωδιανοί*. St. Luke's words, "the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch," imply that the name rapidly became current, and it was used by Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 28). By A.D. 64 it was in the mouth of the populace in Rome (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Suet. *Nero*, 16), and possibly it is to be found among some mutilated and obscure words scribbled on a wall in Pompeii before A.D. 79 (a facsimile of them will be found in Aubé, *Histoire de l'Église*, i. p. 417). By the time of Ignatius it had been completely accepted by the Church (Eph. xi. 2; Rom. iii.; Polycarp, vii.). Either it had lost its original reproach, as has been the case with many other nicknames, such as Whig and Tory, or it was embraced for the very reason that it had not lost it.

The true original form of the nickname is doubtful. Professor Blass, following the authority of the Sinaitic MS. (which gives the same spelling in both passages of Acts and here), thinks that it

was *Chrestianus*. Chrestus (Good) was a proper name familiar to Gentile ears (it is found thirteen times in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, and in Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25, we find "impulsore Chresto"), while Christus was an unknown word. *Chrestianus* was certainly in common use among the Gentiles (Justin, *Apol.* i. 55; Tert. *Apol.* 3), but Tertullian implies that this form was not universal. Lactantius (*I. D.* i. 4) ascribes it to ignorance, but this does not touch the point. It is very possible that Professor Blass is right; at the same time it should be observed that the difference of sound between *Χριστιανός*, *Χρηστιανός*, and *Χρειστιανός* (the reading of B) would be imperceptible, and that the two latter spellings may be merely instances of Etacism. Theories have been built upon this interesting word affecting both the date of 1 Peter and the historical character of Acts. It has been found possible to maintain that the term "Christian" originated in Rome not before the time of Trajan. The reader will find the literature on the subject given in the article on *Christian* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

μη̅ αἰσχυνέσθω. If St. Peter had been preparing his readers for martyrdom he must have used much stronger language; cf. Heb. x. 38, 39, xi. 35-37, xii. 4. The sufferings which a Christian may have to undergo do not, as a rule, extend beyond reproach and insult (*δνειδέξασθαι*), or cause any worse trial than false shame and moral cowardice, which, though grave sins, do not need to be dwelt upon.

δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. "But let him glorify God in this name (the name of Christian)." K L P, other later MSS., and Theophylact have *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ* (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 3). Hence A.V. and some commentators translate "on this behalf." But the true reading is no doubt *ὀνόματι*, and *ὄνομα* can only be rendered "name." In Mark ix. 41 the R.V. translates *ἐν ὀνόματι ὄτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε*, "because ye are Christ's," but the A.V. correctly has "in my name because ye belong to Christ." There is no other passage in the New Testament where *ὄνομα* can mean "reason" or "account," nor does the word appear to possess this sense in Greek. In Latin *hoc nomine* (a phrase derived from the names or headings in a ledger) sometimes means "on this account"; but we must not confuse the idioms of the two languages without authority.

δοξαζέτω is in strong antithesis to *αἰσχυνέσθω* as *δόξα* to *δνειδος* just above. It is for this purpose that the Spirit of glory rests upon the Christian. For the union of glory and suffering cf. i. 11.

17. *ὄτι ὁ καιρὸς*. "For it is the time appointed for the judgment to begin with the household of God." It is best to supply simply *ἐστί*: after the neuter verb the article may be used with a definite predicate, cf. Matt. xxvi. 63, *εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and Mark xiii. 33, *οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν*. *Κρίμα* is used here in the sense of *κρίσις*, cf. Acts xxiv. 25; Heb. vi. 2;

Apoc. xx. 4. Verbals in *-μα* and *-σις* not infrequently interchange meanings, for instance *ὄψις* and *ὄραμα*. The *οἶκος Θεοῦ* is not quite the same as the *οἶκος πνευματικός* of ii. 5. What St. Peter means here is the household or family, Christians considered not as living stones, but as stewards, ministers, servants. But why does he say that judgment begins with or from the household of God? Perhaps he is thinking of the parable of the Pounds (Luke xix.), where, after the good and bad servants have been dealt with, sentence is pronounced upon "the enemies." There is no apparent reference to a First and Second Resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 23; Apoc. xx. 4, 5). Alford finds a reference to Jer. xxv. 15 sqq.; Zeph. i. ii., and other passages where the prophet sees the day of the Lord coming first to Jerusalem, and then passing on in a widening circle to the whole earth. But none of these passages expresses distinctly the idea that the chosen people will be judged first and the heathen afterwards. The meaning appears to be that the sufferings of the Christians are the actual beginning of the final judgment; so Bengel says, "Unum idemque est iudicium a tempore euangelii per apostolos praedicati usque ad iudicium extremum." Thus the *ὅτι* with which the verse begins seems to introduce a second reason for steadfastness. The first lies in *δοξαζέτω*: the second is that this *πύρωσις* is the immediate preliminary to salvation or deliverance. Hence they may commit their souls to God in unshaken confidence. Thus the words of menace are parenthetical and secondary. Kühl thinks that the *ἀπειθοῦντες*, here and in ii. 8, are the Jews whom the apostle judges more severely than the heathen, supposing that ii. 11, 12, iii. 14-16 refer especially to the latter. But we have a similar flash of denunciation in *οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον*, iv. 5, which certainly is pointed at the heathen.

18. *εἰ ὁ δίκαιος*. See iii. 12, 14. To St. Peter as to Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vi. 6. 47, *δίκαιος δικαίον καθὸ δίκαιός ἐστιν οὐ διαφέρει*. Christian righteousness "exceeds" that of Jews (Matt. v. 20), but is essentially of the same character. The righteous is "hardly saved" because he "comes out of much tribulation," Apoc. vii. 14. If they have been safely led through this ordeal the final judgment brings not dread but *ἀγαλλίασις* (iv. 13). The words are from the LXX. version of Prov. xi. 31. The Hebrew original is, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: how much more the wicked and the sinner."

19. *ὥστε καί*. The words pick up the thread of consolation, which has been tangled for a moment by the sudden thought of the sinners and their doom. There is some question whether the *καί* should be taken with *οἱ πάσχοντες* or with *παραιθέσθωσαν*, but the latter course seems the better. Translate, "Wherefore also let them that suffer commit." The imperative introduces a new injunction.

Let them not only glorify, but also trust God. For *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, cf. iii. 17. *Πιστῶ κτίστη*, "to a faithful Creator," may be a reminiscence of the prayer of Jonathan in 2 Macc. i. 24, which begins, *Κύριε, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ πάντων κτίστης*. The epithet *πιστός* is selected, because of the trust implied in *παρατιθέσθωσαν*, the title Creator, because it involves power which is able, and love which is willing to guard His creatures. That St. Peter, speaking to Christians, should have here given this name to God, instead of Father or Saviour, shows in a striking way how deeply the Old Testament affected his thoughts. The word *κτίστης* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but is used of God, not only by Philo, *de Somn.* i. 16 (i. 634), but by Clement of Rome, xix. 2; Aristides, *Apology*, xv., xvii.; and Clement of Alexandria, Dindorf, vol. iii. p. 507. The love of God displayed in creation is used by St. Paul as an argument in addresses to heathen, Acts xiv. 15, xvii. 25; cf. also Rom. i. 20; but the nearest parallel to St. Peter's phrase will be found in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vi. 26 sqq.

παρατιθέσθωσαν. "Let them commit their souls," or rather "deposit them in safe keeping." Cf. Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 5, *εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνευμά μου*: Luke xxiii. 46. *Παρατίθεσθαι* is used in the classics of giving one's money into the safe keeping of a friend. In days when there were no banks this was constantly done by people going on a long journey, and such a deposit (*παραθήκη, παρακαταθήκη*) was regarded as entailing a peculiarly sacred obligation, which none could violate or think of violating without the deepest guilt. See the story of Glaucus, son of Epicydes, Herod. vi. 86. The use of the verb is illustrated by Acts xiv. 23, *παρέθεντο αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ εἰς ὃν πεπιστεύκεισαν*: xx. 32, *παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ*: 1 Tim. i. 18, *ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι*: 2 Tim. ii. 2, *ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις*: in the last passage the depositaries are to be *πιστοί*, "trusty," and probably in the first *εἰς ὃν πεπιστεύκεισαν* is "on whom they had trusted." The noun *παραθήκη* is found 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14; in all these places *παρακαταθήκη* occurs as a variant.

ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ. Well-doing, diligent obedience in the midst of suffering is the sign of trust. St. Peter does not seem to be thinking of Quietism, but his words form a barrier against that form of error.

V. 1. *πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ*. "The presbyters therefore among you I exhort." The reading here given is that of A B, which is followed by the great textual critics; K L P and other authorities omit *οὖν*: \aleph has *πρεσβυτέρους οὖν τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν*: K L P, the bulk of the later MSS., the Vulgate, Coptic, and Syriac, and some Fathers have *πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν*. It seems highly doubtful whether we should read *οὖν*, or *τούς*, or *οὖν τοὺς*. *Οὖν* introduces some special applications of the general exhortation just

given. The omission of the article appears to have no significance. If it is to be insisted upon, the translation will be "I exhort presbyters," "such as are presbyters." It has been so pressed as to give the meaning "presbyters, if there are any"; and so to imply a doubt in St. Peter's mind whether these officials existed in all the Churches addressed; but this, as von Soden points out, is impossible in view of iii. 1, where γυναῖκες cannot mean "wives, if there are any." It seems evident from the words which follow that these personages possessed considerable authority, and were in the proper sense of the word officials. Age is still a general qualification for the office; the original sense of elder is not quite extinct. But πρεσβύτερος is distinctly used not only as an official designation, but as a personal title (here and in 2 and 3 John), and it is better to mark this fact by translating it presbyter or priest, just as it is better to render ἐπίσκοπος by bishop in Philippians or the Pastoral Epistles, but by overseer in Acts and 1 Peter.

We read of presbyters at Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30; they were ordained κατ' ἐκκλησίαν by Paul and Barnabas on the First Mission Journey, Acts xiv. 23; and they existed at Ephesus, Acts xx. 17. Presbyters receive the money brought from Antioch to Jerusalem by Barnabas and Saul, Acts xi. 30; apostles, presbyters, and brethren form the Council of Jerusalem, Acts xv. 23; the presbyters form so important a part of the Council that the Decree was attributed to apostles and presbyters alone, Acts xvi. 4. Presbyters of Ephesus were summoned to Miletus by St. Paul as representatives of their Church, Acts xx. 17; they knew the apostle's doctrine, *ibid.* 21; were his natural defenders, *ibid.* 26, 34; had been made "overseers" over the flock by the Holy Ghost to "shepherd" the Church, *ibid.* 28; with a special view to keeping out erroneous doctrines; the "shepherd" is to resist the "wolf," *ibid.* 29.

In these passages the presbyter appears as treasurer, member of the Church parliament, ambassador, shepherd; as teacher, as exercising some kind of authority in faith and discipline, as deriving his power from the Holy Ghost, as ordained (χρηστονέειν) by the apostles; and we gather also that there were as a rule many presbyters in each Church.

On the other hand, in the Gentile Church of Antioch, about the year 45 A.D., prophets and teachers (it has been supposed on the insufficient ground of the repeated τε that Barnabas, Symeon, and Lucius belong to the former class, Manaen and Saul to the latter) minister (λειτουργοῦσι) to the Lord, and receive a special mandate from the Holy Ghost to set apart (ἀφορίζειν) Barnabas and Saul for mission work, Acts xiii. 1-3. But neither this passage (see Introduction, p. 44) nor Acts xv. 32 forms an exception to the statement that in Acts the prophet is one who sees visions, utters predictions,

or delivers to the Church special revealed and occasional mandates, and whose province is entirely distinct from that of the presbyter.

In James, 1 Peter, the Johannine Epistles, and the Apocalypse the presbyter appears to hold the same position as in Acts. In James he is called in by the sick that he may pray over them and anoint them, v. 14; in the Apocalypse four and twenty presbyters sit round the throne, as in later times we find them sitting in a semicircle round the altar. In the Pauline Epistles the presbyter is not mentioned except in 1 Timothy and Titus, when he is identified with the bishop, and teaching is one of his functions, 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 9. The bishop appears also with the deacon in the address of Philipians, but the presbyter is not mentioned in that Epistle.

Πρεσβύτερος is a familiar official designation among the Jews, and denotes a member of the local *βουλή* or *συνέδριον* which administered the local affairs of towns or villages, and acted in particular as a judicial body (Deut. xix. 12; Judg. viii. 14; Matt. x. 17). Such local courts existed throughout the country of the Jews, and consisted usually of at least seven elders with two Levites to act as officers. Some of the seven were priests (Schürer, *Jewish People in Time of Jesus Christ*, Eng. trans. ii. 1, p. 150 sqq.). Smaller *συνέδρια* were subordinate to larger, and after the Greek period (it is doubtful to what extent before) all were subject to the great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, which consisted of seventy-one members, elected by co-optation, and admitted to office by the laying on of hands. The designation elder belonged in a general way to every member (1 Macc. vii. 33) as one of the *γερονσία* (2 Macc. i. 10), but a distinction is made between *ἀρχιερείς*, *γραμματεῖς*, and *πρεσβύτεροι* (Gospels and Acts *passim*). Those who were neither members of the high priest's family nor professional lawyers were simply elders, under which name both priests and laymen might be included (Schürer, ii. 1. 165 sqq.).

The Elders of the local Sanhedrin were also elders of the synagogue (Schürer, ii. 2. 58). As such they had exclusive direction of all religious matters, and possessed the power of excommunication. But they did not in their official capacity take any part in public worship. In the synagogue no special officer was appointed to preach, pray, or read the Scriptures. The lessons were fixed, and the prayers were written, but any member of the congregation might officiate with the permission of the *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*, who as a rule was an elder.

Schürer notices (ii. 2. 249) that in inscriptions belonging to the Diaspora, though we find *γερονσιάρχης* and *ἀρχων* used as personal titles, *πρεσβύτερος* is never so employed. For pagan usage, see Deissmann, *s.v.*

The designation elder or presbyter, which, unless Acts is a

romance, is certainly many years older than bishop, is generally supposed with sufficient reason to have passed over from the synagogue to the Church. It does not follow that the offices were identical in the Church and in the synagogue. Indeed the passages cited above show that the Christian presbyter was not only an administrative, but also a spiritual officer. The circumstances of the Church would make this change inevitable. The new congregations would require to be instructed not only in the gospel, but in the whole Bible, and this duty would need to be assigned to *πιστοὶ ἄνθρωποι*. Further, instruction was the preliminary to baptism, that is to say, to admission into the community; here there was a most important difference between synagogue and church, and none but a highly trusted person could be allowed to confer the Christian franchise. We are not directly informed whether the presbyter actually officiated in public worship. Since the publication of the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* in 1883, there has been a tendency to suppose that this was the function of the prophet. But, on the other hand, it may be urged (*a*) that this cannot be gathered from the New Testament itself; (*b*) that the term prophet is limited to one "who has a revelation" (1 Cor. xiv. 30); (*c*) that the condition of the Church of Corinth was quite abnormal; (*d*) that prophetesses, who were common, could not have led the service even in a Pauline church; (*e*) that even in the *Doctrine* the function of the prophet is confined to prophecy and to extemporary inspired outbursts of thanksgiving at the Eucharist; (*f*) that the *Doctrine* is probably not older than the fourth century, and that its character is exceedingly doubtful; (*g*) that in the majority of churches it is dubious whether there were any prophets at all. In the Apocalypse (v. 8, 9) the presbyters offer to the Lamb the prayers of saints and sing the new song. This passage is strongly in favour of the traditional view, and 1 Peter may be held to make in the same direction. Nevertheless it must be admitted that the Pauline Epistles (excluding the Pastorals) are extraordinarily silent about the presbyter. Not only is the name not used, but there is hardly a trace of the existence of the authority under this or any other title; and from this fact and from the use of bishop in Philippians it might be inferred that the Churches of Macedonia and Achaia had, at any rate at first, an organisation unlike that of other communities. From the Pastoral Epistles, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, bishop and presbyter appear to have been used for a time as alternative names for the same personage. We might suppose that, towards the end of his ministry, St. Paul brought his special adherents into line with the rest of the Church, and that the fusion of the two titles was a consequence of this reunion. It is worth notice that the peculiar Isaianic nomenclature of the Epistle to the Philippians had a long life. There were, in the time of Constantine,

Novatians and Montanists who had bishops and deacons, but apparently no presbyters (Sozomen, vii. 19). The same usage was to be found in Arabia and Cyprus, and existed also in the Churches for which the *Doctrine* was compiled. It would be vain, in the absence of definite information, to ask whether these communities were survivors of a distinct Pauline Church, whether they had attempted at a later date to revive the Pauline organisation, or whether, owing to the smallness of their settlements and from reasons of convenience, they had simply allowed the presbyterate to drop.

There has been much discussion on these topics, and many different opinions are held. The reader may consult Lightfoot's Excursus in his edition of *Philippians*; Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*; Gore, *Christian Ministry*; the editions of the *Didache*, especially that of Harnack; the articles of Dr. Sanday, Dr. Harnack, and others in vols. v. and vi. of the third series of the *Expositor*; Professor Gwatkin's articles on *Bishop* and *Church Government* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*.

ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος. Not a fellow-presbyter, but the fellow-presbyter whom you know so well. For the word *συμπρεσβύτερος* (not found elsewhere in the New Testament) see Eus. *H. E.* v. 16. 5, vii. 5. 6, 11. 3. 20; Chrys. *Hom. i. in Ep. Phil.* 1 (xi. 194 B), ὅθεν καὶ νῦν πολλοὶ "συμπρεσβυτέρῳ" ἐπίσκοποι γράφουσι καὶ "συνδιακόνῳ." The first title which St. Peter gives himself involves a claim to their affection; the second, to their reverence.

μάρτυς. The term is best taken here of "an eye-witness," as in Acts i. 8, 22, ii. 32, iii. 15, v. 32, x. 39, 41. In this sense *μάρτυς* is practically equivalent to *ἀπόστολος*. St. Paul claims the title for himself as given by revelation, Acts xxii. 15, ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. His vision had made him an eye-witness. When he says in 1 Cor. xv. 15, ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι ἤγειρεν τὸν Χριστόν, he does not mean merely that he had preached the Resurrection, but that he had testified to it as a fact of which he was assured by the evidence of his own senses. Kühl and others understand "witness" here to mean no more than "preacher," on the ground that, as St. Peter by the use of the word *συμπρεσβύτερος* has just put himself on a level with the other presbyters, he cannot intend in his next words to exalt himself above them, but there is no force in this objection; the climax is quite natural, and the author calls himself *ἀπόστολος* in the address. Further, if he meant only "fellow-preacher," the word *συμμάρτυς* lay ready to his hand. If Kühl is right, the three epithets are all brotherly: "fellow-presbyter, fellow-preacher, fellow-heir of glory." Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 452) takes the meaning to be that the author is a witness of the sufferings of Christ by reason of the sufferings which he had himself endured for the Name. Luther and Calvin held this view. But a witness witnesses

to truth or fact. A witness of the sufferings of Christ is one who is in a position to certify that the sufferings actually occurred. There are special and appropriate phrases for those who imitate the patience of their Master; they are said to partake in the sufferings of Christ (1 Pet. iv. 13), to be conformed to Christ's death (Phil. iii. 10), and so on. In the Apocalypse (ii. 13) *μάρτυς* is used in its familiar later sense of one who suffers even unto death for the truth; but it would be extremely difficult to introduce this meaning into the phrase *μάρτυς τῶν παθημάτων*. Jülicher (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 134) remarks on the word *μάρτυς*, that no one who had really known Jesus in the flesh could have written an Epistle which tells so little about the life of our Lord. The remark applies equally to Acts and to the Epistles of James and John. It was not the object of any of these writings to add to the knowledge given in the Gospels, or to supplement the regular teaching of the disciples. Attention has been drawn in preceding notes to the fact that our Epistle contains a remarkably large number of allusions to the Gospels, which are all the more striking because they are not quotations. What looks like one of them is found in the next verse. Each such allusion may be disputed, but it is hardly possible that all are fallacious. Yet it is a singular fact that the early Christians seem to have felt very little curiosity about the details of our Lord's earthly life—His features, tones, gestures, daily habits, and so on. The thirst for anecdote and minutiae begins with Papias and the Gnostics, who pretended to possess portraits of Jesus drawn by Pilate (Iren. i. 25. 6). *ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης*: "The partaker also of the glory that shall be revealed." The *ὁ καὶ* seems to mark this as the apostle's third and highest claim, and as something peculiar to himself. Hence it is probably right to see here an allusion to a definite promise made to the apostle by our Lord; we may find it either in John xiii. 36, or better in Matt. xix. 28, *ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους*. In this case the meaning is that he is to share with Christ in His glory. Otherwise we must understand "your partner in the glory." But if this had been St. Peter's meaning he would probably have written *συγκοινωνός*. With *τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης*, cf. iv. 13, *ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, and i. 5, 13. St. Peter's phrase is found also Rom. viii. 18; in Gal. iii. 23 we have *τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*. These resemblances are not so striking as might at first appear; in the New Testament *μέλλω* is often a mere auxiliary (see Blass, p. 204).

2. *ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*. "Tend the flock of God which is among you." For the metaphor of the Shepherd and the sheep, see note on ii. 25. Von Soden remarks that, used as it is in 1 Peter, both of the presbyter and of Christ, the idea

conveyed is that of pastoral, spiritual, not administrative, duty. There is very probably a reference to John xxi. 16; cf. also Acts xx. 28. Calvin translated τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν "as far as in you lies," but the run of the words is decidedly against this; Bengel and Luther, "which depends upon you," "is entrusted to you"; but this gives ἐν a sense which it cannot bear without the addition of κείμενον. The preposition must be local. "The flock which is among you" may be taken to mean "the flock in your town or village." The flock is God's, therefore they are to tend it, not because they must, (ἀναγκαστῶς), but with a willing mind (ἐκουσίως); not like hirelings for the sake of pay (αἰσχροκερδῶς), but gladly and eagerly (προθύμως). Ἐπισκοποῦντες (the word is omitted by \aleph B) is equivalent to ποιμαίνοντες, see note on ii. 25. Ἀναγκαστῶς gives the idea of a definite burden of duty, which men may be inclined to rebel against as excessive. After ἐκουσίως \aleph A P add κατὰ Θεόν: Westcott and Hort omit the words, Tischendorf inserts them. If we keep them and translate in the most natural way "willingly like God," we make God the Shepherd. God is the owner of the flock, but there can hardly be a doubt that by the Chief Shepherd of ver. 4 Christ is meant. Thus we should be brought very near to the inference that St. Peter uses Θεός and Χριστός interchangeably; nor need i. 3 be taken to forbid this conclusion; see note there. Possibly Rom. viii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 10 might justify us in giving κατὰ a looser sense, "according to God's will," "in godly fashion." Αἰσχροκερδῶς implies that the presbyter was in receipt of a stipend; otherwise it would have been impossible for him to take the hiring's view.

3. μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων. "Neither as lording it over the lots." Κλήροι (plural), except in the sense of "dice," is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible. Κλήρος in Matt. xxvii. 35 is a die; in Acts i. 17, 25 (?), an allotment or office allotted by the dice; in Acts viii. 21, a share or portion; so also in Acts xxvi. 18; in Col. i. 12, εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν φωτί, it is used of the lot, inheritance, or estate of the saints (κληρονομία). In secular Greek κλήρος constantly means an estate. In Deut. ix. 29 the people of Israel is called the κλήρος of God, His portion or estate, distinguished from the portions of other gods. Possibly this verse may have been in St. Peter's mind, for it contains the phrase ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου τῇ κραταίᾳ, which is employed just below.

κλήροι then must have one of two meanings, "offices" or "estates," and of these the first will not suit the context. The presbyters are not to lord it over their lots or estates, the estates are the people committed to them, and the people (to this extent we may bring in the passage of Deuteronomy) belong to the estate of God. Τῶν κλήρων is most naturally taken to imply that each of these presbyters had a separate cure. Dr. Hatch thought (*Bampton*

Lectures, p. 77) that the office of the presbyter was "essentially collegiate," and that only at a later time was a presbyter thought competent to act alone. But from the first there may have been small isolated congregations in which there was but one presbyter. In cities particular presbyters may have had charge of a particular house church, while for certain purposes all the presbyters met in council. In *κατακυριεύοντες* the preposition gives the notion of hostility or oppression, but *κυριεύω* by itself denotes behaviour forbidden to a Christian pastor, Luke xxii. 25, 26. Here again there may be a reminiscence of the gospel. Discipline in those days might be exercised in very rough fashion, especially towards converted slaves; hence St. Paul warns the bishop that he is to be "no striker" (1 Tim. iii. 3, cf. Tit. i. 7). Or again, the precise sense in which domineering was not unlikely may be found in *αίσχροκερδώς*. But the word is wide enough to include every description of arrogance or tyranny. Domineering is a personal fault, and this again seems more applicable to individuals than to colleges.

τύποι γινόμενοι. "Becoming, making yourselves, examples." Yet it is doubtful whether *γινόμενοι* means much more than *όντες*, cf. Matt. x. 16; Luke xx. 33; John i. 6; Acts v. 24.

4. *φανερωθέντος* is used of the First Advent of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 16; of the Second, Col. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28. *Ἀρχιποίμην* is not found elsewhere in the New Testament; cf. *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ μέγας*, Heb. xiii. 20, and ii. 25 above.

τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον. *Ἀμαράντινος* (here only in New Testament) is a derivative not from the adjective (i. 4), but from the substantive *ἀμάραντος*, and means, not "that fadeth not away" (A.V., R.V.), but "made of amaranth," "amaranthine," not "immortal," but "made of immortelles." For the "crown" cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25, *ἄφθαρτον στέφανον*; 2 Tim. iv. 8, *ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος*; Jas. i. 12, *τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*; Apoc. ii. 10, *τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς*; iii. 11, *τὸν στέφανόν σου*; iv. 4, *στεφάνους χρυσοῦς*. Cf. the word *βραβεῖον*, 1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 14. "Amaranthine" is most applicable to a crown of leaves and flowers. The question has been raised whether St. Peter means us to think of a crown of victory, or of a festive crown, such as was not uncommonly used by Gentiles, and is said to have been used by Jews also, on occasions of rejoicing; but the idea of victory is certainly that which is attached to the crown in St. Paul, St. James, and the Apocalypse; and St. Peter can hardly have any other meaning. The word "crown" is used in the Gospels only of the Crown of Thorns (but Heb. ii. 9 Jesus is *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*). But some of the phrases referred to above, "the crown," "the crown which He promised," are very definite, and may come from some unrecorded saying of our Lord's.

δ. ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder. Ὅμοίως (as in iii. 1, 7) denotes that there is a similarity in principle, though the details are different. The same rule of unselfishness applies both to shepherd and to sheep. Πρεσβύτερος has two senses, the official, in which it has been employed in the preceding verses, and the non-official or natural. St. Paul passes from one of these senses to the other in 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, "Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father; the younger men as brethren; the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters. . . . Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour." But here we have an absolute antithesis between πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι: and what is inculcated must be respect not to office, but to age (so Huther, Keil, Hofmann, Usteri). Alford, Kühn, von Soden give πρεσβύτεροι the same sense as in ver. 1, on the ground that the elder by office was also elder in years. This, however, was not universally the case, as we see from the instance of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 12); and, though a certain age was no doubt a requisite in the bishop or presbyter, there is no reason to suppose that it was such as would distinguish him from the bulk of the congregation as older than all of them, or even as older than the average. The elder was a man of staid and sober age, but not necessarily advanced in years or grey-headed. Indeed, the title was taken by the Church from the synagogue, and among the Jews it did not imply actual superiority in age. It is, therefore, hardly possible to take νεώτεροι as meaning all Christians who are not presbyters (as Alford following Bede). Others (Kühl, Weiss, Schott, Brückner) create an antithesis to πρεσβύτεροι by taking νεώτεροι to denote some kind of inferior official, in whom is to be detected the germ of the later deacon, and find the same sense in the νεώτεροι or νεανίσκοι of Acts v. 6, 10. But in this passage of Acts the "young men" are simply those members of the congregation who, being best fitted for the purpose by their physical strength, would naturally volunteer to carry out the corpses of Ananias and Sapphira.

πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε. "And all of you towards one another apparel yourselves with humility." After ἀλλήλοις K L P and many other MSS. insert ὑποτασσόμενοι. So A. V. Beza, Lachmann, Buttmann, Hofmann, Huther place the full stop after ἀλλήλοις, so as to bring the dative into connexion with ὑποτάγητε: and no strong reason can be alleged against this punctuation, to which R. V. gives a place in the margin. But the dative may, without difficulty, be taken with ἐγκομβώσασθε. For this rare verb some few authorities have ἐγκολπίσασθε or ἐγκολπίσασθε, which the Vulgate renders *insinuate*, "take into your bosoms." Ἐγκομβώσασθαι is derived from κόμβος, which, according to the glossaries, means "a knot," or "anything tied on with a

knot." Hence ἐγκόμβωμα is used of a garment tied on over others. Pollux, *Onomasticon*, iv. 18, describes one form of it as ἱματίδιόν τι λευκὸν τῇ τῶν δούλων ἐξωμίδι προσκείμενον, a little white garment, which slaves wore over their ἐξωμίς: and from Longus, *Pastoralia*, ii. 60, we learn that it was of such a nature that a shepherd, who wanted to run his fastest, would cast it off. The ἐξωμίς was a sleeveless tunic, and from the definition which Suidas gives of κόμβος—ὁ κόμβος τῶν δύο χειριδίων, ὅταν τις δῆσῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον τράχηλον—we may infer that this form of ἐγκόμβωμα was a pair of sleeves, which were fastened and held in place by a knot behind the neck. But κόμβος might also mean the knot of a girdle; hence κομβολύτης, according to Hesychius, is synonymous with βαλαντιοτόμος, "a cutpurse," purses being carried on the girdle. In another place, *s.v.* κοσσύμβη, Hesychius uses ἐγκόμβωμα as equivalent to περίζωμα Αἰγύπτιον, a kind of apron such as that used by blacksmiths. It would seem that any article of dress, that was attached by laces, might be called ἐγκόμβωμα. The verb was used by Epicharmus (Fragment 4 in Ahrens, *de dialecto Dorica*, p. 435). The words of the fragment are εἶ γε μὲν ὅτι κεκόμβωται καλῶς: but Ahrens notes on the authority of Photius, *Epist.* 156, that the right reading is ἐγκεκόμβωται. The meaning is, "If, indeed, because she is bravely apparelled." Hesychius makes κομβώσασθαι equivalent to στολίσασθαι, and ἐγκεκόμβωται to ἐνείληται, as if they were used of putting on garments of a certain amplitude and dignity. This is probably St. Peter's meaning. Humility, like "a meek and quiet spirit," is an ornament of price, a beautiful robe. The R.V. has "gird yourselves with humility," as if the metaphor were derived from tying an apron round the waist, so as to be ready for service (cf. John xiii. 4). But, upon the whole, the facts given above appear to make against this rendering. See Suicer, *s.v.* Ἐγκομβόομαι.

ὅτι ὁ Θεός . . . χάριν. Prov. iii. 34, Κύριος ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσει, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν. The same quotation is found also in Jas. iv. 6, with the same substitution of ὁ Θεός for Κύριος. See iv. 8 above. The passage in the Epistle of St. James offers other resemblances to this part of 1 Peter, ὑποτάγητε τῷ Θεῷ, ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς. There is probably a connexion between the two passages, and there are some apparent reasons why we should assign the priority to St. Peter: (1) in James the mention of humility is sudden and unexpected; (2) though he gives the quotation from Prov. iii. 34 in the same shape as St. Peter, he writes, in ver. 10, ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου, as if he were aware that ὁ Θεός was not quite correct: we may infer perhaps that he had somewhere seen the quotation in its altered shape; (3) the mention of the devil in 1 Peter is not only more natural but more original; (4) in ver. 8, St. James has ἀγνίστατε καρδίας, which may be suggested by τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες of 1 Pet. i. 22:

if this is so, St. James is combining different parts of the Petrine Epistle.

6. ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα. B K L P read χεῖραν. On this vulgar form see Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, p. 157; Blass, p. 26. "The mighty hand of God" is generally connected in the Old Testament with the deliverance from Egypt, Ex. iii. 19; Deut. iii. 24, iv. 34, ix. 29; Dan. ix. 15; or deliverance generally, 2 Chron. vi. 32, but in Ezek. xx. 34 the phrase is used, as here, to denote the dread power of the great Judge.

ἐν καιρῷ. "In the due or appointed time." A P, many cursives, and some versions add ἐπισκοπῆς (from ii. 12). Compare Matt. xxiv. 45, τοῦ δίδόναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ; and, for the exaltation of the humble, Luke xiv. 11.

7. ἐπιρρίψαντες. Ps. liv. (lv.) 23, ἐπίρριψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου, καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρέψει. The μέριμνα is here the alarm of the persecuted Christian. God will care for him; see Luke xxi. 18.

8. νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. The Christian may cast the whole burden of his anxiety upon God, yet is not thereby absolved from the duty of vigilance; cf. iv. 19 above. For νήψατε see i. 13, iv. 7. He is to be sober and wakeful, because his enemy is always at hand: a train of thought which brings us very close to Matt. xxiv. 42, 43, 49. Much the same combination of words is found 1 Thess. v. 6, but in a different connexion; there the Christian is enjoined to watch and be sober, because he is a child of the day.

ὁ ἀντίδικος . . . τινὰ καταπιεῖν. A has τινὰ καταπίη, "seeking whom he may devour": B has καταπιεῖν without τινά, "seeking to devour"; K L P τινὰ καταπιεῖν, "seeking some one to devour" (L P wrongly accentuate τινά). Ἀντίδικος is an adversary in a lawsuit. Διάβολος (almost a personal name, and therefore without article), "the slanderer," is a Greek rendering of the Hebrew Satan. Ὠρνώμενος is probably taken from Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 14, ὡς λέων ὁ ἀρπάζων καὶ ὠρνώμενος: περιπατεῖ, probably from Job i. 7, περιελθὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσας τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πάρεμι. The imagery of the sentence is mixed, derived partly from the prowling lion of the Psalm, partly from the Accuser of Job, who walks up and down the earth to spy out the weakness of God's servants. Satan's "slander" is that Job "doth not fear God for nought," and God allows him to test the truth of this charge by trying Job, first with loss of property and children, afterwards with personal suffering. So here the Devil is the author of persecution. Compare the Epistle from the Churches of Vienna and Lugdunum, Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 5, ἐνέσκηψεν ὁ ἀντικείμενος. In the same epistle, v. 2. 6, those who denied the faith are said to have been swallowed by the Beast, ἵνα ἀποπνιχθεὶς ὁ θῆρ, οὗς πρότερον ᾤετο καταπεπωκέναι, ζῶντας ἐξέμεση. It seems clear that the writers had this passage of 1 Peter in view. Throughout his Epistle, St. Peter seems by "suffering"

to mean the adventitious pain of deliberate persecution. This was *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ* (iv. 19), but possibly in the same sense as Job's trials, as permitted but not exactly purposed by God. The natural tendency of righteousness is to produce "good days" (iii. 10); any other result seems to be regarded as surprising and occasional. It will be observed that St. Peter does not use *κόσμος* as the name of a hostile, irreligious power. Here, again, we may perhaps detect the Hebraistic cast of the apostle's mind.

Θ. *στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει*. In its proper physical sense *στερεός* means hard or solid. The word occurs 2 Tim. ii. 19, *στερεὸς θεμέλιος*, a solid foundation; Heb. v. 12, 14, *στερεὰ τροφή*, solid food, opposed to liquid milk: the verb *στερεοῦν* in Acts iii. 7, 16, is to make solid or strong; the substantive is found in Col. ii. 5, *τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν*, the strong wall or foundation of your faith in Christ. When transferred to a moral quality in the classics, *στερεός* inclines to a bad sense, hard, harsh, brutal. In the present passage its meaning appears to be solid, strong, impenetrable, like a wall, rather than steadfast or brave. The adjective will affect the translation of *τῇ πίστει*. *Ἡ πίστις* is sometimes "faith"; the article before the abstract noun being constantly used in Greek as in French, where the English idiom rejects it, to mark off the virtue in question from other kindred virtues, for instance, *ἡ ἀγάπη* in 1 Cor. xiii.; sometimes "the faith," that is to say, the Christian belief as distinguished from other beliefs. Thus we have in 2 Cor. i. 24, *τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἐστήκατε*, for it is by faith that ye stand; and, on the other hand, in Acts vi. 7, *πολὺς ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει*, "a great multitude of the priests became obedient to the faith"—in other words, changed their convictions and became Christians. "The faith" is a phrase that does not appear in Romans or Corinthians, but Gal. i. 23 we find *εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρευε*: Eph. iv. 5, *μία πίστις*, one faith distinguished from all others; Phil. i. 27, *μὲν ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, the faith in which all agree, which is defined in the gospel; Col. i. 23, *τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι*, the faith is that definite hope of the gospel from which the Church is not to be moved; 1 Tim. i. 19, *περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν*, some have suffered shipwreck as regards the faith, by falling into erroneous doctrines: iii. 9, *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως*: iv. 1, *ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως*: v. 8, vi. 10, 21; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Tit. i. 13, ii. 2. The notion of "the faith" as a body of sound doctrine naturally became more important in St. Paul's eyes from the time of his imprisonment, as contact with one error or another awakened him to the fact that there might be semi-Christian types of opinion of a misleading nature. In Heb. xi. 1 faith is not merely loving trust in God, but strong conviction, which admits of definition by its subject-matter, by the particular things hoped for and not seen. In the present passage the use of the word

στερεοί inclines the balance in favour of "the faith." Solidity applies rather to convictions, which are well-grounded, firmly connected, and therefore impenetrable, than to trust, which is ardent or confident, but not solid.

εἰδότες . . . ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. "Knowing that the same sufferings are being accomplished in your brotherhood which is in the world," is the translation generally given. If this is correct, the words must be regarded as a consolation. You are not alone in your sufferings; all Christians have the same burden to bear. But almost every word of this rendering is open to serious objection. *Εἰδώς* followed by an infinitive means "knowing how" to do a thing, cf. Luke xii. 56; Phil. iv. 12; Krüger's *Greek Grammar*, lvi. 7, 9; Blass, p. 227; "knowing that" is *εἰδὼς ὅτι*. *Τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων*, if it means "the same sufferings," is quite unparalleled; the passages quoted by Alford, *τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς*, Heb. vi. 17; *τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως*, Phil. iii. 8; *τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας*, Thuc. i. 68, in which the neuter adjective or participle represents an abstract substantive, do not help in the least. It is impossible to see why St. Peter did not write *τὰ αὐτὰ παθήματα*, if these words would convey his meaning. He was not a scholar, but there are some errors of expression which no man could make. *Τῇ ἀδελφότητι ὑμῶν*, again, is a singular phrase; we should have expected *τῇ ἀδελφότητι* alone or *τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὑμῶν*. The dative is more naturally construed with *τὰ αὐτὰ* than with *ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*, with which it can only be taken loosely as a *dativus incommodi*. Finally, the meaning of *ἐπιτελεῖν* is uncertain; it may be "to accomplish," "bring to an end," or possibly "bring towards an end," or, again, "to pay in full." Liddell and Scott are mistaken in giving the verb the sense of "to lay a penalty upon a person." In the passage referred to, Plato, *Laws*, x. p. 910 D, *τὴν τῆς ἀσεβείας δίκην τούτοις ἐπιτελούντων*, the meaning is "let them carry to a finish the prosecution for impiety against these men." The only commentator who has really grappled with the text is Hofmann, who translates "knowing how to pay the same tax of suffering as your brethren in the world." Compare Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 8, *τὰ τοῦ γήρωσ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*, "to pay the tax of old age," in loss of sight, hearing, memory, and so on. This version meets most of the difficulties; but *τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων* for "the same tax of suffering," is, to say the least, an unusual phrase, and *ἡ ἀδελφότης ὑμῶν* remains a stumbling-block. Yet neither phrase falls outside the limit of toleration.

10. ὁ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος. "The God of every grace." From Him comes every good and perfect gift (Jas. i. 17). See note on *ποικίλη χάρις*, iv. 10. Many commentators couple *ἐν Χριστῷ* with *καλέσας*, and we might understand this in a variety of ways. (1) God was in Christ who called you; or (2) God called you by Christ as His instrument (cf. Gal. i. 6, 15, *τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν*

χάριτι—διὰ τῆς χάριτος); or (3) ἐν Χριστῷ may be used in that vague sense in which everything is said to be in the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 22, ὁ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος), Christ being, as it were, the atmosphere of all Christian life. But Hofmann may be right in joining δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ. The glory which is here attributed to God is closely related to Christ in i. 7, 21, iv. 11, 13, v. 1, 4. For ὀλίγον παθόντας, "after ye have suffered a little," or "for a little while," compare i. 6. Καταρτίσει, "shall correct" or "amend." So Mark i. 19, καταρτίσει τὰ δίκτυα: Gal. vi. 1, καταρτίσετε τὸν τοιοῦτον (where Lightfoot notes that καταρτίσειν is used as a surgical term of setting a broken bone): 1 Thess. iii. 10, καταρτίσει τὰ ὑστερήματα: 1 Cor. i. 10, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι (the apostle is speaking of the healing of schisms). God will amend them through suffering, which is the cure of sin; compare iv. 1, ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπνται ἁμαρτίας. Στηρίξει, "shall stablish," so that you shall not be shaken by alarms; compare iv. 12, μὴ ξενίζεσθε. Σθενώσει is one of St. Peter's ἄπαξ λεγόμενα. \aleph K L P, all later MSS., the Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian versions, Theophylact and Oecumenius have θεμελιώσει after σθενώσει: the word is omitted by A B, the Vulgate, and Aethiopic. Many of the later MSS. exhibit the optative, καταρτίσαι, κ.τ.λ., for the future indicative.

11. αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος. "His (God's) is (or, be) the might." God has power to do all if you humble yourselves under His "mighty hand." St. Peter dwells, and wishes his readers to dwell, on the majesty and power of God, which to the Jew was always a most comfortable thought, and is not less so to the Christian. It is perhaps worth observing that κράτος occurs in only one of the eight Pauline doxologies, that of 1 Tim. vi. 16.

12. The words which follow were possibly added by the hand of St. Peter himself (this is the opinion of Blass, *Grammar*, p. 123), just as St. Paul concludes 2 Thess. and Galatians with a few lines of autograph. Διὰ may denote either the bearer or the draughtsman of the Epistle, or both; on this point and on Silvanus see Introduction. Τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, "the (well-known) trusty brother." Similar forms of commendation occur 1 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. vi. 21; Col. i. 7. Ὡς λογίζομαι, "as I reckon," in the sense of "as I think," cf. 1 Cor. iv. 1; Rom. viii. 18. There is no ἐγώ, and the "I" is therefore not emphatic. St. Peter does not mean "I think him trusty, though others do not." The Epistle is short (δι' ὀλίγον, cf. Heb. xiii. 22), not so much in itself, as in comparison with all that was in the apostle's heart, and all that he would have liked to say. Silvanus would supplement it largely by word of mouth, and it is natural that St. Peter should here speak of him as "trusty," one who knew the apostle's mind and could expound it faithfully. But Silvanus was an eminent man, and only one who was still more eminent could venture to praise him for so simple a virtue.

"Ἐγραψα, "I write," is the epistolary aorist; instances occur in Philem. 19, 21; Rom. xv. 15; 1 Cor. v. 11, ix. 15; Gal. vi. 11; 1 Macc. xv. 19; 2 Macc. ii. 16; Plato, *Epist.* vii. *ad finem*, ἀναγκαῖον ἕδοξέ μοι ρηθῆναι.

παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. "Exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God." The article is omitted before ἀληθῆ χάριν. Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν is to "bear witness to" a fact, not to "bear new, or fresh, testimony." "This" refers to the whole of the contents of the Epistle, whether doctrine or exhortation. The apostle's words here have a strongly emotional tinge, but not more so than we expect from a pastor who is deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of his flock in a time which was no doubt one of stress. We need not suppose that there was any great danger of apostasy. Still less need we suppose that by laying emphasis on the "truth" of his Epistle the apostle is here reflecting upon other teachers. The gospel is constantly spoken of as "the truth," in opposition to the imperfect light of Judaism, or the errors of heathenism, John i. 17, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια: Col. i. 6, ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: 1 Pet. i. 22, ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας, means "by obedience to the gospel." But Gal. ii. 5, ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, is "the right conception of the gospel," as of grace not of works, truth, that is to say, as opposed to the errors of other Christian teachers. So again 2 Pet. ii. 1, "the way of truth" is set against the delusions of ψευδοπροφήται and ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, who were, no doubt, professedly Christian. It has been supposed that here also ἀληθῆς is used of orthodox belief.

Kühl thinks that the communities addressed had not been evangelised by any apostle, and that St. Peter is here giving the official seal to the instruction which they had received. The Tübingen school, on the other hand, holding that the author (not St. Peter) is writing to Pauline Churches, consider that he is expressing his approval of the doctrine of St. Paul. But all that he means is, "What I have made Silvanus write, this gospel of bearing the cross with patience, is God's truth. See that ye stand fast in it."

Usteri, pressing the absence of the article before ἀληθῆ χάριν, would translate "this (this persecution) is a real grace of God. Stand ye fast to meet it." But there is nothing in the text to justify such a narrowing of the sense of "this," and persecution, in itself, is regarded as the work of the Devil.

εἰς ἣν στήτε. "Wherein stand fast." \aleph A B and many cursives have the imperative; K L P and the mass of inferior MSS. read ἐστήκατε. Εἰς is probably used as in ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν, Mark xiii. 16, as a mere equivalent for ἐν; see Blass, p. 122. Von Soden, however, quoting i. 13, τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν, thinks that here also

the *χάρις* is regarded as future, and would translate "whereunto stand fast."

13. ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή. "The fellow-elect woman in Babylon." **N** after Βαβυλῶνι adds ἐκκλησία: the Vulgate has "ecclesia quae est in Babylone," and the same addition is found in the Peshito, in the Armenian, in Theophylact, and Oecumenius. A catena explains that by Babylon is meant Rome; Syncellus says that some took it to mean Rome, others Joppa. St. Peter's words have been the subject of much speculation from an early date. We are not to supply ἐκκλησία, nor any other word. Ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι is a complete phrase, and means "the woman in Babylon." This may be understood either literally or metaphorically. Bengel, Mayerhoff, Jachmann, Alford, and some few others take the words literally, and understand the apostle to mean his own wife. On the other hand, the great majority of commentators take them metaphorically of the Church in Babylon, but are divided on the question whether Babylon itself is metaphorical or not. The latter point may be treated independently of the former. Both phrases may be literal, one may be figurative, or both.

Against the literal interpretation of ἡ may be urged (1) that St. Peter would have spoken of his wife in plain terms and by name; (2) that ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι is a singular phrase for an ordinary woman residing or sojourning in Babylon. Both these objections are considerably weakened, if St. Peter's wife was a very well-known personage; and there can be no doubt that she was. St. Paul tells us that she accompanied her husband (1 Cor. ix. 5), and tradition could not have regarded her as a martyr (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 11. 63), unless she had done something to earn martyrdom—unless, that is to say, she had taken an active part in her husband's labours.

Against the metaphorical interpretation it may be argued that ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι is an unprecedented and perhaps impossible phrase for "the Church in Babylon." In the Old Testament we have "the daughter of Zion" (Isa. xxxvii. 22); in the New Testament it is possible that St. John speaks of a Church as κυρία, and of another Church as her ἀδελφή (2 John i. 5, 13); the meaning of the Woman in the Apocalypse is open to doubt. In *Hermas* (*Vis.* i. 1. 4, 5) the Church appears to the prophet as γυνή, and is addressed by him as κυρία. But in all these cases the metaphor is far more obvious than it is in the present passage. Again, what is easy and natural to imaginative writers like Isaiah, John, or *Hermas*, is not so to St. Peter. Lastly, "the Church and Marcus my son" strikes one as a somewhat more difficult combination than "my wife and Marcus my son" (see Introduction, § 8). On Marcus and Babylon, see Introduction, § 9.

14. ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. Compare Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26. St. Paul's phrase is φίλημα ἁγιον.

The kiss is one of the most ancient of ritual usages. Justin, *Apol.* i. 65, ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν, the kiss came after certain εὐχαί and before the εὐχαί of communion; Tert. *de Orat.* 14, "quae oratio cum diuortio sancti osculi integra?" In Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Myst.* v. 3, the kiss is placed before the *Sursum Corda*; he adds, σημεῖον τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὸ φίλημα τοῦ ἀνακραθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξορῖζειν μνησικακίαν. See also *Const. App.* ii. 57, viii. 11; Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*; Palmer, *Or. Litt.* ii. 102; Suicer, *s.v.* φίλημα; Ducange, *s.v.* Osculum; Bingham; Probst, *Liturgie*; Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*.

εἰρήνη. In this final benediction St. Peter uses the Hebrew and evangelical "Peace" (cf. Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19, 21, 26) instead of the later "grace," which we find in the corresponding passages of the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. "Peace" carries us back to the Address; the Epistle begins and ends with peace. The phrase τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ "can hardly signify the mystical life-union (*die mystische Lebensgemeinschaft*) of Paul, of which there is no trace in the Epistle, but is merely another name for Christians, and conveys the last warning not to forsake this community of Christians" (von Soden).

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

§ I. TESTIMONIA VETERUM

It will be most convenient to begin the Introduction to 2 Peter by a discussion of the external attestation of the Epistle.

Jerome.

Born about 346; died, 420.

In the *Epistle to Paulinus*, prefixed to editions of the Vulgate, Jerome accepts all the seven Catholic Epistles without reserve:

“Jacobus, Petrus, Joannes, Judas Apostoli, septem epistolas ediderunt tam mysticas quam succinctas, et breues pariter ac longas: breues in uerbis, longas in sententiis; ut rarus sit, qui non in earum lectione caecutiatur.” Here the word *caecutiatur* seems to be taken from 2 Pet. i. 9.

In the extracts from the *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, which also are printed in editions of the Vulgate, he notices that there was some considerable doubt as to the authenticity of 2 Peter, and tells us that the doubt rested on the style of the Epistle:

“Scripsit duas Epistolas, quae Catholicae nominantur: quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur, propter stili cum priore dissonantiam.”

In the *Epistle to Hedibia*, 120, *Quaest.* xi., he suggests that this difference of style might be accounted for by the supposition that St. Peter employed two different interpreters:

“Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cuius euangelium Petro narrante et eo scribente compositum est. Denique et duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et caractere discrepant structuraque uerborum. Ex quo intelligimus pro necessitate rerum diuersis eum usum interpretibus.”

Jerome thus records, explains, and perpetuates the doubt, yet his great authority practically laid it to sleep in the Greek and Latin

Churches. But in or about the time of Jerome there were several eminent Fathers who either rejected 2 Peter or regarded it with grave suspicion. "Among the innumerable quotations from and allusions to Scripture found in the writings of Chrysostom, Theodore, and Theodoret, there does not appear to be one reference to 2 Peter" (Dr. Chase in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. p. 805; as regards Chrysostom this statement is to some extent modified by the note). Amphilochius of Iconium (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 557) says that some accepted seven Catholic Epistles, some only three. Didymus of Alexandria accepted 2 Peter as authentic, and wrote a commentary upon it; yet at the close of this work the reader is startled by the words (only preserved in a Latin translation), "non est igitur ignorandum praesentem epistolam esse falsatam, quae, licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est." Mr. Warfield (*Southern Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1882) suggests that Didymus here expresses a view which he afterwards rejected. At a later date Junilius of Africa (about 550 A.D.; Westcott, *Canon*, p. 545) places 2 Peter among the books which he calls *mediae*, those which, though not absolutely undoubted, are yet accepted by very many (*quam plurimi*). Junilius, though African by birth, lived in Constantinople, and derived his Syrian theology directly or indirectly from Theodore of Mopsuestia (see Dr. Salmon's article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*). The doubt as to the authenticity of 2 Peter appears to have been most strongly felt in the Antiochene Church, and rested largely on the absence of the Epistle from the Peshito, which recognised only three of the Catholic Epistles, James, 1 Peter, 1 John; indeed there is some doubt whether the Syriac version originally included even these; see Introduction to 1 Peter, p. 13.

Eusebius.

The date of his *History* is about 324.

H. E. iii. 3. 1, 4, Πέτρον μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἢ λεγόμενη αὐτοῦ πρότερα ἀνωμολόγηται ταύτη δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλοι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτω ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηται συγγράμμασι. τὴν δὲ φερομένην δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρον, ὧν μίαν γηρσίαν ἔγνω ἐπιστολὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλοι πρεσβυτέροις ὠμολογημένην τασαῦτα.

H. E. iii. 25. 3, τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγόμενων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἢ λεγόμενη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰουδα, ἢ τε Πέτρον δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ. He then goes on to speak about the νόθα.

We gather that οἱ πολλοί, the majority of the Church, accepted 2 Peter as authentic; that Eusebius himself doubted, but did not absolutely deny, its authenticity; that his doubt rested on two

grounds, namely, that writers, whose opinion he respected, regarded 2 Peter as uncanonical (*παρειλήφμεν*); and that, so far as he knew, the Epistle was not quoted by "the ancient presbyters"—by those older writers, that is to say, whose works were to be found in the library of Jerusalem (*H. E.* v. 20. 1), and he probably means "not quoted by name." It is to be regretted that Eusebius does not state from whom he had received his opinion, or who were included among the *οἱ πολλοί*. The seven Catholic Epistles existed in the library of Caesarea, and there is some reason for thinking that they were all accepted as genuine by Pamphilus (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 393 sq.).

Methodius.

Martyred in the Diocletian persecution.

In a fragment of his treatise, *de Resurrectione* (Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, iii. p. 611, quoted by Dr. Chase), we find an express citation of 2 Pet. iii. 8, *χίλια δὲ ἔτη τῆς βασιλείας ὠνόμασεν τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα διὰ τῆς χιλιάδος δηλῶν, γέγραπεν γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος Πέτρος ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.*

We may notice also in the same treatise (ed. Jahn, p. 78) the words *ἐκπυρωθήσεται μὲν γὰρ πρὸς κάθαρσιν καὶ ἀνακαινισμόν καταβῶσι πᾶς κατακλυζόμενος ὁ κόσμος πυρὶ, οὐ μὴν εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἐλεύσεται παντελῆ καὶ φθοράν . . . διὸ ἀνάγκη δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐθις καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐκφλόγωσιν ἔσσεσθαι πάντων καὶ τὸν βρασμόν.* Here the *πῦρ καταβάσιον* is taken from Wisdom x. 6; but the run of the passage reminds the reader strongly of 2 Pet. iii. 9–13, and Methodius, as the first quotation shows, was acquainted with the Epistle.

Origen.

Died, 253.

In Joann. Comm. v. 3 (Lomm. i. 165); see also Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25. 8, *Πέτρος δέ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία, ἧς πύλαι Αἰδου οὐ κατοχύρουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπει, ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ.*

Origen does not express himself so positively as Eusebius; he records the doubt, yet is not unwilling to accept the Epistle. He does not tell us on what arguments the doubt rested, nor by whom it was entertained. In particular, he says nothing about the style of 2 Peter, though he was a keen critic, as may be seen from his remarks on the Epistle to the Hebrews (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 25. 11). In the works of Origen are found six quotations from, and two clear allusions to 2 Peter. Dr. Chase, however, notices that they all occur in those treatises which exist only in the Latin version of Rufinus, and it must be admitted that this fact renders it somewhat doubtful whether they can be ascribed to Origen himself.

Clement of Alexandria.

Died about 213.

Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14. 1, ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ὑποτυπώσειςι, ξυνηλόγῳ εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτεμημένας πεποιήται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελλών, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.

Nothing can be clearer than this statement, which is confirmed by Photius (*Biblioth.* 109). It is in no degree invalidated by the confused utterances of Cassiodorus, who, writing after an interval of more than three hundred years, says, first, that Clement expounded the whole of the Bible; then that he had commented upon 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and James, but not on the other three canonic Epistles; and, finally, made a loose and untrustworthy translation (for the *Adumbrationes* is supposed to be his version of this part of the *Hypotyposes*) of Clement's notes upon 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and Jude, not James.

Dr. Chase does not allow that Clement ever quotes 2 Peter. But in *Protrep.* x. 106 we have the phrase τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας, which is found in 2 Pet. ii. 2 and not elsewhere in the New Testament. Σαρκοῦς ἀπόθεσις, *Strom.* i. 19. 94, may be drawn from 2 Pet. i. 14 (ἀπόθεσις is peculiar to 1 and 2 Peter). In *Ecl. Proph.* 20, 1 Pet. i. 19 is combined with 2 Pet. ii. 1 (see note). See again note on ii. 13 for another possible reference. In *Paed.* iii. 8. 43, τὸ Σοδομοῦ τῶν πάθος κρίσις μὲν ἀδικήσασι, παιδαγωγία δὲ ἀκούσασι, is taken not from Jude, as Dindorf thinks, but from 2 Peter, who mentions Lot, while Jude does not (see also *Paed.* iii. 8. 44, where the same remark holds good, though Clement immediately goes on to quote Jude 5, 6 by name). From the same verse, 2 Pet. ii. 8, comes a phrase which is found in *Strom.* ii. 12. 55, βασανίζων δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἡμαρτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀγαθοεργεῖ. Again, in *Strom.* vii. 14. 88, Clement speaks of the moral law as ἡ ἐντολή, in the singular. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 21. Probably many other borrowings might be detected by anyone who would carefully read Clement through with an eye to this point. It is true that Clement does not quote 2 Peter by name, and some of the phrases here noticed may not be conscious quotations at all. "The way of truth" is found also in Clement of Rome, "the putting off of the flesh" may have been a common expression among Christians. But if they are ultimately derived from 2 Peter, as is probably the case, the fact that these phrases had become a regular part of the parlance of the Church seems greatly to increase the strength of the evidence in favour of the authenticity of the Epistle.

It should be remembered that Clement was the successor and pupil of another learned man, Pantaenus, who was head of the catechetical school perhaps as early as 180. In that year those

who advocate the late date of 2 Peter suppose that the Epistle had not existed more than five, or at the outside more than twenty or thirty years. Pantaenus could hardly have been imposed upon by a forgery so recently perpetrated, as Harnack and Dr. Chase suppose, in Alexandria. And, if Pantaenus did not know the Epistle, or rejected it, how came Clement, the heir of his erudition, to accept it?

Cyprian.

Died, 257.

This Father displays no acquaintance with 2 Peter, yet this fact serves only to show the precariousness of the argument from silence. For a clear allusion to the Epistle is found in a letter addressed to Cyprian by

Firmilian,

Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (Cyprian, *Ep̄p.* lxxv. 6), "Stephanus . . . adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, . . . qui in epistolis suis haereticos execrati sunt et ut eos euitemus monuerunt." Cyprian must have known to what Epistle of St. Peter Firmilian was appealing.

Hippolytus.

Died about the end of the first quarter of the third century.

Refut. Omn. Haer. ix. 6, μετ' οὐ πολλὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βόρβορον ἀνεκκλίοντο, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 22. The expression is, as Dr. Chase says, of the nature of a proverb, but it is not a common proverb. See note on the passage.

Ibid. x. 33, τὰ δὲ πάντα διοικεῖ ὁ λόγος ὁ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτόγονος πατρὸς παῖς, ἡ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου φωσφόρος φωνή, cf. 2 Pet. i. 19, and see note on the passage.

Ibid. x. 34, ἐκφεύξεσθε ἐπερχομένην πύρρον κρίσεως ἀπειλήν καὶ ταρτάρου ζοφεροῦ ὄμμα ἀφώτιστον, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 4, 17, iii. 7.

In Dan. iii. 22, ᾧ γὰρ ἂν τις ὑποταγῆ τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 19.

Ibid. iv. 10, εἰ γὰρ καὶ νῦν βραδύνει πρὸ καιροῦ, μὴ θέλων τὴν κρίσιν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπενεγκεῖν, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 5, iii. 9.

Ibid. xxiii. 24, ἡμέρα δὲ Κυρίου χίλια ἔτη.

The Clementine Literature.

Passages bearing a more or less close resemblance to 2 Peter have been detected in the *Recognitions*, the *Homilies*, the *Actus Petri cum Simone*. On this point the reader may consult the observations of Dr. Chase, and of Dr. Salmon, *Introduction* (p. 520, ed. 1888).

Theophilus of Antioch.

Died, 183-185.

ii. 13, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, φαίνων ὡς περ λύχνος ἐν οἰκῆματι συνεχομένῳ, ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν, cf. 2 Pet. i. 19. In 4 Esdr. xii. 42 we read, "Tu enim nobis superes solus ex omnibus populis . . . sicut lucerna in loco obscuro"; and the word of God is a λύχνος in Ps. cxix. 105. Yet it seems most likely that Theophilus had St. Peter in mind.

ii. 9, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι, cf. 2 Pet. i. 21. Dr. Chase points out that the word πνευματοφόρος is found in Hos. ix. 7; Zeph. iii. 4. It can hardly be maintained that either of these passages is conclusive, but they deserve some weight.

Tatian.

Date of *Oratio*, 150-170.

Or. ad Graecos, 15 (Otto, vi. p. 70) τοιούτου δὲ μὴ ὄντος τοῦ σκηνώματος. This sense of the word σκηνώμα (body) is borrowed from 2 Pet. i. 13. Immediately before, in the single word νᾶος, we have an allusion to 1 Cor. iii. 16. Σκηνώμα is so used by Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25. 6, who possibly found it in Gaius.

The Muratorianum.

P. 106, line 6 (in Westcott's *Canon*) "Sicute et semote passionē petri euidenter declarat." These words must refer either to the Gospel of St. John or to 2 Peter. They can hardly refer to the Gospel, which had been fully noticed. See on this point Introduction to 1 Peter, p. 14.

Aristides.

His *Apology* was presented to Hadrian in 129-130, or, as Mr. Rendel Harris thinks, to Antoninus Pius, in the early years of his reign.

Apol. xvi., ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἦν τις τοὺς δεδόντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, cf. 2 Pet. i. 11, ii. 2. This seems a clear case. Canon Armitage Robinson considers that the Greek text of the *Apology* "as a rule gives us the actual words of Aristides."

Polycarp.

Martyred in 155.

Phil. iii., τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς . . . ἑμὴν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15.

Martyrium Polycarpi.

xx. 2, εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν. So Harnack. Lightfoot has ἔπουράνιον, but αἰώνιον is the reading of two MSS. out of three.

Justin Martyr.

Harnack puts the date of the *Dialogue*, 155-160.

Dial. 51, καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξύ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρόνῳ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσεσθαι αἱρέσεις καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε. Otto refers to Matt. vii. 15, xxiv. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 19. But there would seem to be here a reminiscence of 2 Pet. ii. 1, where ψευδοπροφήται and αἱρέσεις are mentioned in conjunction. In *Dial.* 82, again, Justin uses the word ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, which though, as Dr. Chase remarks, a word of easy formation, is peculiar to 2 Peter.

Dial. 81, συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι Ἡμέρα Κυρίων ὡς χιλία ἔτη. Otto notes, "Sic Tanchuma, fol. 335 A, *Dies dei est mille annorum.*" Here, again, doubt is legitimate. But we have seen above that Methodius quoted this phrase by name from 2 Pet. iii. 8.

Apol. i. 28, καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ μηδέπω τοῦτο πράξαι τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος γεγένηται· προγινώσκει γὰρ τινὰς ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεσθαι, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 9.

Melito.

He flourished in the third quarter of the second century.

Apology (in Otto, vol. ix. p. 432), "Etenim aliquando fuit diluuium uenti, et selecti (ad id) homines occisi sunt aquilone uehementi, et relictii sunt iusti ad demonstrationem ueritatis. Rursus alio tempore fuit diluuium aquarum, et perierunt omnes homines et bestiae in multitudine aquarum, et seruati sunt iusti in arca lignea iussu dei. Atque ita ultimo tempore erit diluuium ignis, et ardebit terra cum montibus suis, et ardebunt homines cum simulacris quae fecerunt et cum operibus sculptilibus quae adorauerunt, et ardebit mare cum insulis suis, et seruabuntur iusti ab ira, sicut socii eorum seruati sunt in arca ab aquis diluuii."

On the date of this Syriac version of Melito's *Apology*, see Introduction to 1 Peter, p. 10. Dr. Chase takes the deluge of wind to refer to the destruction of the Tower of Babel, which is mentioned in the *Sibylline Oracles* iii. 97 sqq., in connexion with the destruction of the world by fire, and is inclined to think that Melito is following the *Sibyl* rather than 2 Peter. There is, however, a different explanation of the Flood of Wind; see Otto's note on the passage, vol. ix. p. 476. But it will be necessary to consider the origin of the belief in the approaching destruction of the world by fire more fully in a later section.

Irenaeus.

Died, 202 or 203.

This Father introduces a quotation from 1 Peter with the words *Petrus ait in epistola sua* (iv. 9. 2); but this phrase does not necessarily imply that he knew only one Petrine letter. Irenaeus certainly knew 2 John, which he quotes explicitly and by name (i. 16. 3, iii. 16. 8); yet, says Mr. Warfield, he quotes 1 John (iii. 16. 5, 8) just as he quotes 1 Peter, with the words *in sua epistola, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ*. Two passages call for notice.

iii. 1. 1, μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.

There can be little doubt that ἔξοδος here means "death." It is so used Wisd. iii. 2, vii. 6; Luke ix. 31; 2 Pet. i. 15. In secular writers it never, so far as I know, bears this sense by itself, though it is commonly used in later Greek in combination with a genitive, ἔξοδος τοῦ βίου *et simm.* There is some slight presumption, therefore, that here the word may be a reminiscence of the Petrine passage. But, further, there were two traditions as to the date at which Mark composed his Gospel. According to the one he wrote before, according to the other after, the death of Peter. It is a most natural and probable supposition that the latter view was connected with 2 Pet. i. 15. Irenaeus does not tell us whence he derived this account of St. Mark's Gospel, but he no doubt borrowed it from some earlier writer, most probably Papias. Thus it may be argued with some confidence that 2 Peter was known to and accepted by men who lived before Irenaeus, and whose opinions Irenaeus followed. It might, of course, be replied that the writer of 2 Peter was himself following the author or authors of this tradition, but this would hardly be reasonable.

v. 23. 2, "Dies domini sicut mille anni"; v. 28. 3, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

Irenaeus does not tell us where he found these words which so strongly resemble those of 2 Pet. iii. 8. In both places he connects them with Chiliasm; the world was created in six days, and will last six thousand years. It has been supposed that he borrowed this adaptation of Ps. xc. 4 from Justin, or from Barnabas, or from the Rabbis. But this point also will require to be further considered in a later section.

Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne.

177-179.

Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 36, 55; 2. 3, ἔξοδος is used absolutely of "death."

Ibid. v. 1. 45, ὁ δὲ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς οὐκ ἀργὸς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος ἐγένετο, cf. 2 Pet. i. 8.

The Epistle, then, was known, if not to Irenaeus, to those with whom he was very closely connected.

Let us notice another phrase in this letter—v. 1. 48, διὰ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς αὐτῶν βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδόν, τουτέστιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας. Here we seem to find a combination of vers. 2 and 22 of the Fragment of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, which is therefore older than the Viennese letter.

Apocalypse of Peter.

110-160, or more nearly 120-140; Harnack. The use of the work by the Viennese Church warns us that the date can hardly be placed after 140.

1, πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφήται καὶ ὁδοὺς καὶ δόγματα ποικίλα τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1.

1, τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν δοκιμάζοντας, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 8.

21, τόπον αὐχηρόν, cf. 2 Pet. i. 19.

22, 28, βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδόν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 2, 21.

30, ἡ ἐντολή, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 21, iii. 2.

In his edition of the Fragment, Professor Harnack (*Bruchstücke*, p. 71) says that the *Apocalypse* and 2 Peter are *blutsverwandt*, but does not pronounce upon the question of priority. In the *Chronologie*, p. 471, he decides that the author of 2 Peter borrows from the *Apocalypse*. But I find it quite impossible to accept this view. Before the *Apocalypse* was written there had been violent persecution (οἱ διώξαντες τοὺς δικαίους καὶ παραδόντες αὐτοὺς, 27; the verb *τηγανίζόμενοι*, 34, belongs to the times of persecution; the word is used in the Viennese letter, Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 38), of which there is no indication whatever in 2 Peter. Again, the description of hell, suggested as it is by Plato, Aristophanes, Homer, and especially Virgil, certainly points to a later date than the Epistle. Jülicher thinks it not improbable that 2 Peter made use of the *Apocalypse*; and Kühl goes so far as to suppose that 2 Pet. ii. may have been written by the same author as the *Apocalypse*. The three reasons given by Dr. Chase in the *Dictionary of the Bible* for thinking it impossible that the author of the *Apocalypse* should have borrowed from 2 Peter, appear to be wholly unsubstantial. I have suggested in the notes that the whole of the later Petrine literature owes its origin to 2 Pet. i. 15; these words gave the busy army of inventors the suggestion and the name for their works of imagination. If this view is tenable, we have here again a remarkable proof of the authority of our Epistle in very early times.

It has been said above that the *Apocalypse of Peter* bears traces of the influence of Virgil and Homer. The general idea which underlies the vision, that our pleasant vices are made the whips to scourge us, may be found in Wisd. xi. 16, δι' ὧν τις ἀμαρτάνει διὰ τούτων

κολάζεται, but in its concrete, pictorial development belongs to the Greek and Roman mythology. But even in details the *Apocalypse* closely resembles the *Aeneid*. Cf. the following passages:—

Apoc. 3, τὰ μὲν γὰρ σώματα αὐτῶν ἦν λευκότερα πάσης χιόνης καὶ ἐρυθρότερα παντὸς ῥόδου, συνεκέκρατο δὲ τὸ ἐρυθρὸν αὐτῶν τῷ λευκῷ, καὶ ἀπλῶς οὐ δύναμαι ἐξηγήσασθαι τὸ κάλλος αὐτῶν· ἢ τε γὰρ κόμη αὐτῶν οὐλλή ἦν καὶ ἀνθηρὰ καὶ ἐπιπρέπουσα αὐτῶν τῷ τε προσώπῳ καὶ τοῖς ὤμοις, ὡσπερὶ στέφανος ἐκ ναρδοστάχυος πεπλεγμένος καὶ ποικίλων ἀνθῶν, ἢ ὡσπερ ἶρις ἐν ἀέρι, τοιαύτη ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ εὐπρέπεια.

Virg. *Aen.* i. 402 :

“Dixit, et auertens rosea ceruice refulsit,
Ambrosiaëque comae diuinum uertice odorem
Spirauere.”

For the contrast of white and rose in the complexion of beauty, see the description of Euryalus, *Aen.* ix. 431–437, or of Aeneas, *Aen.* i. 588–593. Οὐλλή κόμη καὶ ἀνθηρά is a reminiscence also of Hom. *Od.* vi. 230, καὶ δὲ κάρητος Οὐλλας ἦκε κόμας ὑακινθίνῳ ἀνθει ὁμοίας.

Apoc. 5, μέγιστον χώρον ἐκτὸς τούτου τοῦ κόσμου ὑπέραμπρον τῷ φωτί, καὶ τὸν ἀέρα τὸν ἐκεῖ ἀκτίσιν ἡλίου καταλαμπόμενον, καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτὴν ἀνθοῦσαν ἀμαράντους ἀνθεσι.

Virg. *Aen.* vi. 638 :

“Deuenero locos laetos, et amoena uireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas.
Largior hic campos aether et lumine uestit
Purpureo, solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.”

We may remember also the ἀσφοδελὸς λειμῶν of Hom. *Od.* xi. 539.

Apoc. 6, the phrase τόπος αὐχμηρός, of the place of punishment, is taken from 2 Peter, but, used as it is in the *Apocalypse*, it calls to mind the words of Virgil,

Aen. vi. 534 :

“Ut tristis sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires.”

Apoc. 8, 9, 16, the region of torment is full of boiling mud. Cf. *Aen.* vi. 296, “Turbidus hic coeno uastaque uoragine gurges Aestuat”; 416, “Infermi limo”; the boiling mud is that of Phlegethon.

Apoc. 6, οἱ κολάζοντες ἄγγελοι σκοτεινὸν εἶχον αὐτῶν τὸ ἔνδυμα κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου.

Virg. *Aen.* vi. 555 :

“Tisiphone . . . palla succincta cruenta.”

Apoc. 10, τοὺς φονεῖς ἐβλεπον . . . βεβλημένους ἐν τινι τόπῳ τεθλιμμένῳ καὶ πεπληρωμένῳ ἐρπετῶν πονηρῶν, καὶ πλησσομένους ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων ἐκείνων.

Virg. *Aen.* vi. 570 :

“Continuo sontes ultrix accincta flagello
Tisiphone quatit insultans, toruosque sinistra
Intentans angues uocat agmina saeua sororum.”

Apoc. 11, πολλοὶ παῖδες οἴτινες ἄωροι ἐτίκτοντο (text of Canon Armitage Robinson) καθήμενοι ἔκλαιον.

Virg. *Aen.* vi. 427 :

“Infantumque animae flentes in limine primo.”

It may be strongly suspected that the author of the *Apocalypse* was a Western, who had read Virgil. The book first comes before our notice at Vienna, and in the Roman *Muratorianum*; and these facts point in the same direction. Further, the *Clementina* manifests so strong an interest in Rome that we may look for their origin, at any rate for that of their *Grundschrift*, in the same locality. Probably a good deal of the pseudo-Petrine literature came from Rome. But that the whole tone and conception of the *Apocalypse* is later than 2 Peter seems to me to be beyond a doubt.

The so-called *Second Epistle of Clement*.

130-170.

xvi., γινώσκετε δὲ ὅτι ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καίωμενος καὶ τακῆσονται αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πάντα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλιβδος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερά ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

The author here quotes Mal. iv. 1; Isa. xxxiv. 4, but his view of the world-fire is that of St. Peter. Dr. Salmon (*Introduction*, p. 521) suggests that φανήσεται is an attempt to make sense out of the corrupt εὐρεθήσεται of 2 Pet. iii. 10. Add that ἡμέρα κρίσεως in the New Testament is only found in Matthew's Gospel, in 1 John, and in 2 Peter.

Ignatius.

105-117.

Eph., Preface, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν: see Lightfoot's note; the same phrase recurs *Eph.* xviii.; *Rom.* iii.; *Polya.* viii., cf. 2 Pet. i. 1.

Eph. xii., Παύλου . . . ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

Trall. xiii. 3, ἐν ᾧ εὐρεθείημεν ἄμωμοι, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 14.

Magn. ix., ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνετελεν, cf. 2 Pet. i. 19.

No one of these phrases can be regarded as conclusive; yet they are worth noticing as probably echoes of 2 Peter.

Barnabas.

70-79, Lightfoot; 130 or 131, Harnack.

xv. 4, προσέχετε, τέκνα, τί λέγει τὸ Συνετέλεσεν ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις· τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἔτεσιν συντελέσει Κύριος τὰ σύμπαντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη· αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων· Ἴδού σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

See remarks on Irenaeus above; but here the παρ' αὐτῷ comes very close to Peter's παρὰ Κυρίῳ. Hilgenfeld here quotes *Leptogenesis*, 4, "Und (Adam) lebte 70 Jahre weniger als 1000 Jahre, denn 1000 Jahre sind wie Ein Tag nach dem himmlischen Zeugnis. Desswegen ist geschrieben über den Baum des Erkenntnisses: An dem Tage da ihr davon esset, werdet ihr sterben. Darum hat er die Jahre dieses Tages nicht vollendet, sondern er starb an demselben."

Hermas.

110-140, Harnack.

In the *Pastor* there are a few words and phrases which may conceivably have been suggested by 2 Peter; *Vis.* iii. 7. 1, τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀληθινὴν: *Sim.* v. 7. 2, μiasμός: *Sim.* vi. 2. 5, βλέμμα, but in a different sense: *Sim.* ix. 14. 4, δυσνόητος: *Sim.* ix. 22. 1, false teachers are αἰθάδεις.

Clement of Rome.

93-95, hardly as late as 97, Harnack.

Here again we find several phrases which in the New Testament are peculiar to 2 Peter; such are ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, xi. 2: ἐπόπτῃς (but it is here used of God), lix. 3: μῶμος, lxiii. 1: μεγαλοπρεπής, i. 2. In vii. 6 we read Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, which not unnaturally suggests 2 Pet. ii. 5, Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα. Bishop Lightfoot ingeniously suggested that Clement may have borrowed his phrase from a lost passage of the pre-Christian third Sibylline book. See his note.

Jude.

The Epistle of St. Jude may, I believe, be confidently regarded as the earliest attestation of 2 Peter. But the point must be discussed at length in a separate section.

§ 2. OBSERVATIONS ON THE TESTIMONIA

The Second Epistle of St. Peter is very short; its subject, the disorders of a particular section of the Church, is of limited in-

terest, and is treated in a vague and general way, very unlike that in which the same topic is handled in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and conveying little information about the persons and circumstances in view; and it contains very few quotable phrases. It is probably very seldom quoted even in the present day. Yet its attestation is strong; if we accept the evidence of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, very strong; and if we accept that of Jude, overwhelming.

Its authenticity was doubted by many in Jerome's time, because its style was supposed to differ from that of the First Epistle. Eusebius believed that it was not the work of St. Peter, chiefly because he could find no clear instance of its use by the "ancient presbyters." Origen knew that it was regarded with doubt, but gives no reason for the doubt, and was himself rather inclined to accept the Epistle. Of Clement we are expressly informed that he gave it a place in his Bible. Before the time of Clement, if we put aside the *Apocalypse* and Jude, we can only detect scattered phrases and words, which are found in 2 Peter, and of which several are not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

Even scattered words and phrases, such as ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἄργος οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος, αἰώνιος βασιλεία, ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, δυσνόητος, have a certain weight. Phrases have histories. Even in our own time how many turns of expression are in vogue which, though apparently quite casual, have yet a definite origin, and mark the date of the document in which they occur. Not to speak of really great coinages, such as "evolution" or "survival of the fittest," let us take such trivial instances as "within a measurable distance of practical politics," "grand old man," "lost leader," "honest doubt," "sweetness and light." Every one of these current insignificant phrases belongs to a definite period. But they have become current, that is to say, they are constantly used by people who have not the slightest idea where they come from. The same fate may have befallen 2 Peter; the Church of Vienna, for example, may have quoted one of its phrases, and yet never have read the Epistle itself. Indeed, there is reason for thinking that the Epistle did not enjoy a wide circulation. Otherwise it would be difficult to account for the extremely bad state of the text.

To this point attention has been drawn in the notes; but it will be of service to collect here those passages in which the best attested readings of the MSS. are either certainly or very probably wrong, or in which variants existed at an extremely early date.

i. 2, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

The right reading here is very probably τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. See note.

ii. 4, σιροίς.

This is probably the right reading. But K L P have σιραιῖς, and

this seems to have been what Jude found in his copy of the Epistle, and paraphrased by *δεσμοῦς ἀδίκιαι*.

ii. 13, *ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας*.

This is the reading of \aleph B P, the Bodleian Syriac, and the Armenian; it is adopted by Westcott and Hort; Tregelles gives it a place in the margin; and Tischendorf, though he reads *κοιμούμενοι*, remarks in his note, "*ἀδικούμενοι* si aptum sensum praebere iudicabitur omnino praefendum erit."

A C K L, all other MSS., the Vulgate, m⁷, Jerome, the Sahidic, Coptic, Aethiopic, Ephraem, Theophylact, Oecumenius have or translate *κοιμούμενοι*.

Syr^P has a word which Tischendorf translates *ementes*.

It is surely vain to try to get sense out of *ἀδικούμενοι*. Perhaps it is worth while to notice that in the Sinaitic MS. *ἀδικούμενοι* comes at the end of a line, while the next line ends with *ἀδικίας*. It is just possible that a hasty scribe may have taken the *ἀδικ-* from the latter word.

Κοιμούμενοι will make sense, but not good sense. A few verses below *μισθὸς ἀδικίας* means the temporal gain of unrighteousness, and the phrase can hardly have any other sense in the former place. What we appear to want is a participle which should give the sense of "seeking after." *Ementes* might suggest *ὠνούμενοι*. *Κοιμούμενοι* has the look of a mere conjectural emendation.

ii. 13, *ἀπάταις*.

ἀγάπαις is the right reading, though it is supported only by B, the Versions, and Jude.

ii. 14, *μοιχαλίδος*.

So B C K L P: \aleph A and three cursives have *μοιχαλίας*.

Μοιχαλὶς means "adulterous" (Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4), or "an adulteress" (Rom. vii. 3; Jas. iv. 4). "Eyes full of an adulteress" is certainly nonsense. *Μοιχαλὶς* is not a classical word, but occurs in later Greek; see Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, p. 452, note. *Μοιχαλία* apparently does not exist, and is indeed an impossible formation, as there is no verb *μοιχαλεύω*, nor noun *μοίχαλος*. It may be observed that in ii. 18 the Sinaitic has *μαθηταιότητος* for *ματαιότητος*. The scribe had the word *μαθητής* in his head, and did not perceive his error till he had written the first two syllables. So here some still earlier scribe may have meant to write *μοιχίας*, but *μοιχαλὶς* occurred to him, and he inserted a wrong syllable. Hence came the unmeaning *μοιχαλίας*, which some well-intentioned copyist corrected into *μοιχαλίδος*. This error is older than any of the existing MSS.

ii. 15, *τοῦ Βεῶρ*.

So A C K L P. B has *τοῦ Βεῶρ μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησαν*. \aleph has *τοῦ Βεωροσὸρ μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν*. Probably in the original of the Sinaitic the words *τοῦ Βεῶρ ὅς* were illegible, and the scribe did

the best he could with them. The name Bosor does not exist. It will be observed that no single MS. has the right reading τοῦ Βεῶρ ὄς.

ii. 16, παραφρονίαν.

This, again, is a *vox nihili*, but it is the reading of all the great MSS. Six cursives have παραφροσύνην, three παρανομίαν: the latter is the better conjecture, as it is Peter's habit to repeat words, and παρανομίας occurs immediately before.

iii. 3, ἐμπαιγμονῆ.

So \aleph A B C P and many cursives. But this word also did not exist, and therefore cannot have been used by St. Peter.

iii. 10, κατακρήσεται.

So A L and some of the Versions; C has ἀφανισθήσονται: \aleph B K P and some Versions εὑρεθήσεται: the Sahidic and Bodleian Syriac translate *non inuenientur*; am fu harl omit the clause. Κατακρήσεται, ἀφανισθήσονται, seem to be mere corrections; the right reading is probably οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται. But here again we find an error which is older than any of the MSS.

A document which exhibits so many serious textual corruptions can hardly have been very generally read, or very carefully guarded during the first stages of its existence. Yet there is some reason for thinking that τ Peter exerted a considerable and widespread influence in very early times. Four points call for notice.

One is the tradition preserved by Irenaeus, that the Gospel of St. Mark was written after the death of St. Peter. It may, of course, be said that St. Peter does not allude to St. Mark's Gospel in i. 15. But it may also be thought that he does; and certainly his words may have been so understood. It is a fair conclusion that the statement given by Irenaeus was built by earlier writers on the Petrine passage.

The idea that a day of the Lord was a thousand years, existed among the Rabbis. But it was by no means the only idea. Some held that the "day" was 365 years; some that it was 600. There was also great variety among the opinions held as to the duration of Messiah's reign; the Rabbis leave us to choose between 40, 60, 90, 365, 400, 1000, 2000, and 7000 years. Elieser and some others fixed upon 1000 years, and defended this number by combining Isa. lxiii. 4 with Ps. xc. 4 (see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. p. 252 sqq.). This is the opinion which underlies Apoc. xx. 4. In the Christian writers quoted above this peculiar explanation of the "day" is always connected with the millenary reign of Christ. It cannot be maintained that they all based their Chiliasm on our Epistle; yet Methodius expressly quotes τ Peter, and the words of Barnabas bear a very close resemblance to the Petrine passage.

It may be asked how the Fathers came to adopt one particular Rabbinic view as to the duration of a day of the Lord, and one

particular verse of the Old Testament as a proof of this view, unless they were guided by a Christian document to which they attached high authority.

But the most remarkable fact is that St. Peter does not give his adaptation of Ps. xc. 4 any chiliastic turn at all. He employs it simply to prove the long-suffering of God, and to account for the delay of the Parousia. This is surely a sign of great antiquity. From the time of the Apocalypse and *Barnabas* to that of the Alexandrines, Chiliasm was practically the universal belief of the Church (see Justin, *Trypho*, 80-82), and it is extremely difficult to suppose that the author of 2 Peter, dealing as he is with the very verse out of which Chiliasm arose, could have refrained from some allusion to that opinion, if he had been writing at any date in the second century, or even late in the first. It may be observed here that he says not one word about the signs of the End. Clearly he felt strongly bound by the Lord's command not to speculate on the day or hour of the Parousia. This command was soon forgotten, and its observance ought to count largely in favour of our author.

Another interesting point is the belief in the destruction of the world by fire. This also became the predominant opinion.

Writing about the middle of the second century, Celsus says that Christians generally believed in a world-conflagration (Origen, *contra Celsum*, iv. 11, 79), and treats the belief as arising from a misunderstanding of the teaching of Greek philosophers, that ἐκπυρώσεις and ἐπικλύσεις alternate in the history of the world. Origen, in answer, refers to Josephus, *Ant.* i. 2. 3; to Deut. iv. 24; Dan. vii. 10; Mal. iii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 12, but not to 2 Peter, and insists that the office of the fire, as described in Scripture, is to purify and not to destroy. It may be suspected that here we have a glimpse of one of Origen's reasons for his doubts about 2 Peter.

In Clement, *Strom.* v. 14. 121, 122, we find an iambic passage, which is quoted also in the *de monarchia* (Otto, vol. iii. p. 136), and there attributed to Sophocles. The verses speak, not only of the world-fire, but of the Two Ways, and may be later than *Barnabas*. But the words πάντα τὰπίγεια καὶ μετάρσια φλέξει μανείσ' come very close to 2 Pet. iii. 10.

Justin, *Apol.* i. 20, appeals to the Sibyl and Hystaspes as authorities for the belief in the world-fire. The first reference is to *Orac. Sib.* iv. 172-177; this book is supposed to have been composed in the time of Titus or Domitian. The prophecies of Hystaspes were Christian; as to their age, Clement (*Strom.* vi. 5. 43) appears to say that they were quoted in the Πέτρον κήρυγμα, the date of which is not later than A.D. 140-150 (*Chronologie*, p. 472). It may be suspected that both Hystaspes and the fourth book of the *Oracles* belong to the same family as the pseudo-

Petrine literature. Justin's words explain the opening lines of the famous hymn :

“ Dies irae, dies illa
Soluēt saeculum in fauilla,
Teste Daudid cum Sibylla” ;

where the testimony of the Sibyl is coupled with that of the Psalms (probably Ps. xcvi. 3).

But whence did the Sibyl and Hystaspes derive their opinion that the world would be destroyed by fire? It was held by the Valentinians, who may have borrowed it from the Stoics; but it was opposed by Irenaeus (i. 7. 1), whose own belief was that the world would be transformed by fire, but not destroyed (v. 36. 1). It is not to be found precisely in the Old Testament, though there are passages such as Ps. xcvi. 3, “A fire goeth before Him, and burneth up His adversaries round about” (cf. Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxvi. 15, 16, 22; Mal. iv. 1, quoted by 2 *Clement* xvi.), where the fire of the Lord's presence, the refiner's fire, is described as burning up all evil, and so making a new heaven and earth. The general language of the New Testament does not go beyond this (Heb. xii. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 13, vii. 31; 2 Thess. i. 8; Apoc. xxi. 1). Origen referred to Josephus, *Ant.* i. 2. 3, *προ-είρηκεν Ἀδὰμ ἀφανισμόν τῶν ὅλων ἕσεισθαι, τὸν μὲν κατ' ἰσχὺν πυρός, τὸν ἕτερον δὲ κατὰ βίαν καὶ πληθὺν ὕδατος*: but this Adamic prophecy puts the world-fire before the Deluge, and this order is not merely accidental, as appears from the account of Seth and his two pillars, which immediately follows. We should infer from the words of Josephus that *Adam* foretold a catastrophe either by fire or by water; or again, if Josephus is quoting loosely, and we are not to insist upon the sequence of events, we may suppose that he spoke of the Deluge, and of the overthrow of Sodom. It is certain that the destruction of the world by fire was not an article of faith among the Jews, for Philo argues strongly against it (*de inc. Mundi*).

Here again we may ask how a doctrine which was regarded with much suspicion, as belonging to Stoicism and as preached by heretics, came, nevertheless, to be widely held, unless it was supported by some apostolic document.

The Second Epistle of St. Peter must have been written before the persecution of Nero, and therefore must be older than the fourth book of the *Sibylline Oracles*. It is, then, quite a tenable opinion that the belief in the world-fire arose ultimately out of this Epistle.

Lastly, it is not improbable that the whole prolific family of pseudo-Petrine literature springs from the hint given in 2 Pet. i. 15. The apostle had promised something more, and the temptation to supply it was irresistible.

§ 3. RELATION OF 2 PETER TO JUDE.

Of these two writers one borrowed from the other; this is quite certain.

The priority of 2 Peter was affirmed with confidence by Luther. No one, he says, can deny it. But since the time of Eichhorn the opposite view has gained ground, and is maintained with confidence quite as great. Holtzmann writes, "It is not necessary again to refute this hypothesis (of the priority of 2 Peter), which at the present day is practically abandoned." Weiss says that "there can be no question" as to the priority of Jude. Professor Harnack, Reuss, Jülicher, von Soden, Dr. Salmon, are of the same opinion.

Yet Luther's judgment has not been left without supporters. It has been defended in recent times by Dr. Lumby (in the *Speaker's Commentary*), Mansel, Plummer (in *Ellicott's Commentary*), Spitta, and Zahn.

An intermediate position is held by Kühl, who thinks that 2 Pet. ii. 1-iii. 2 is an interpolation; that the original Epistle was used by Jude; that the interpolation was taken from Jude. This peculiar view appears to rest mainly on two supports—(1) that Jude 17, 18 is a quotation from 2 Pet. iii. 3; (2) that the Libertines of the second chapter have nothing to do with the Mockers of the third. The weakness of the latter argument is palpable. The theory of interpolation is always a last and desperate expedient. We shall see as we go on that the style of the Epistle is uniform, and that the second chapter has natural links of connexion with the first and with the third. Nor is there any mark of dislocation at the beginning or end of the passage which Kühl supposes to have been thrust into the original text.

When two writers, whose date cannot be precisely ascertained, are clearly in the position of borrower and lender, the question of priority must turn to a great degree on points of style, and these will always strike different minds in different ways. If the arrangement of the one writer is more logical, and his expression clearer, than those of the other, it may be thought either that the first has improved upon the second, or that the second has spoiled the first. The criterion is of necessity highly subjective, and no very positive result will be attained unless we can show that the one has misunderstood the other, that the one uses words which are not only not used by the other, but belong to a different school of thought, or that the one has definitely quoted the other. There are passages in our Epistles which furnish us with these means of decision.

(a) 2 Pet. ii. 4, *σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας*: Jude 6, *δεσμοῖς ἀδίδις*. Jude's words are most probably to be explained as a paraphrase of the ancient variant *σειραῖς*. It is just possible to find both the

"pits" and the "chains" in Enoch (see notes), but it is not easy to think that the two writers are here drawing independently from the same well.

2 Pet. ii. 11, οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν: Jude 9, οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας. St. Peter says that the angels do not bring against δόξαι (the Fallen Angels) "a railing accusation in the presence of the Lord" (see note on the passage). This gives a perfectly good sense; the Angels are not like the False Teachers who do bring railing, scandalous, passionate charges against δόξαι, the leaders of the Church, and commit this sin in the presence and hearing of the Lord. But here Jude inserts his reference to the *Assumption of Moses*. The devil claimed the body of Moses on the ground that he was a murderer (because Moses had slain the Egyptian). Michael does not "charge the devil with blasphemy," as he might have done, but contents himself with saying, "The Lord rebuke thee." (See the *Assumption of Moses* in Hilgenfeld, *Nouum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum*; the passage in question does not exist in the large fragment which survives in a Latin translation, but is sufficiently attested.) The correct sense of κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας is given by Origen, *Ep. ad Alexandrinus*, Lomm. xvii. p. 8, where, after referring to the words of Jude, he proceeds, "quidam eorum qui libenter contentiones reperiunt, adscribunt nobis et nostrae doctrinae blasphemiam," "they impute blasphemy to me and my doctrine." The passage exists only in a Latin translation, but the meaning is quite clear. Jude has, of course, omitted παρὰ Κυρίῳ, because the dispute between Michael and Satan did not occur in the presence of the Lord. But he has altered and spoiled St. Peter's point, and quite destroyed the parallel. The False Teachers did bring railing accusations, but did not bring accusations of blasphemy.

(b) Jude has certain words, which may be called Pauline, and are certainly not Petrine. Κλητός, 1; ἄγιος (in the sense of "Christians"), 3; πνεῦμα, in the sense of "indwelling spirit," and ψυχικός, 19. Perhaps we cannot lay great stress on the first of these words, but the second most probably, and the third and fourth certainly, are alien from the Petrine vocabulary. To St. Peter ψυχή means the soul, the seat of the religious life, and he could not possibly use ψυχικός in the sense of carnal. Now it is surely far more natural to suppose that Jude was in the habit of using Pauline language, and slipped these words in without any sense of incongruity, than that 2 Peter, while following Jude slavishly elsewhere, cut out these words on doctrinal grounds. Anyhow, Jude mixes up the psychology of St. Peter with that of St. Paul, and this fact seems to tell heavily against him.

(c) 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαίγμονῃ ἐμπαίκεται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ λέγοντες, Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας

αὐτοῦ; Jude 17, 18, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν βημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οἳ ἐλεγον ὑμῖν, Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. St. Peter gives the warning as his own, introducing it just as he does the other warning about the interpretation of prophecy, with the words, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες (i. 20), and the Hebraism, ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται, is quite in his style (see note on ii. 12). Jude gives the words as a quotation, but as an apostolic commonplace. We cannot lay stress on the verb ἔλεγον when we remember the familiar phrase ἡ γραφὴ λέγει. But probably Jude means that he could find the substance of the warning in the teaching of more than one of the apostles. No doubt he could have done so; we may refer to Acts xx. 29, or to the Christian prophecy recorded by St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1. Jude may very well be thinking of St. Paul as well as of St. Peter. But the point is, that this particular form of the prophecy is found only in 2 Peter. There is certainly strong reason for thinking that Jude is here quoting 2 Peter. The reader may consult the remarks of Kuhl, Spitta, Zahn (*Einleitung*, § 43, part ii. p. 81 of the second edition) on the one side, and of Jülicher (*Einleitung*, p. 187) on the other. See also the notes on the passages in 2 Peter and Jude.

It may be thought that the passages and words that have been adduced are such in kind and gravity as to form a presumption, perhaps it may be said a strong presumption, in favour of 2 Peter. But if so, this presumption ought not to be set aside unless it can be rebutted by weightier evidence on the other part. No such evidence can be adduced. The rest of the argument depends upon points of arrangement and style, which can establish nothing beyond a more or less vague opinion. Yet it will be worth while to run through the two Epistles, and note how far the conclusion already suggested is strengthened or weakened by considerations of a more general order.

The Salutation of 2 Peter ends with the words χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη. The formula agrees verbally with that of the First Epistle. It is a salutation of simple archaic type, combining the Christian equivalent for the current heathen χαίρειν with the ordinary Hebrew Peace. Jude has ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη. The verb is the same as in 1 Peter; the nouns remind us of St. Paul's χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη, 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; see also 2 John 3. It should be observed that immediately before these words we find the Pauline κλητοῖς. St. Jude's formula is conflated and later. Some critics believe that 2 Peter is earlier than 1 Peter. But if it is later, and if the author was a forger, it is remarkable that he should have quoted the First Epistle here and here only. On the other hand, if the author was St. Peter himself, it is most natural that he should use his ordinary form of address,

and not surprising that every other part of the Second Epistle should differ from the First.

The rest of the first chapter of 2 Peter forms an exordium. The author does not dash into his subject, but circles round it, dwelling upon thoughts of which we do not quite see the application till they are finally brought to a point. This method is characteristic also of the First Epistle, in which the special lesson of patient endurance under persecution is slowly and gradually approached. In the Second Epistle the object is to guard the readers against the seductions of the False Teachers and Mockers. With this view the writer dwells first upon the fulness and completeness of the apostolic teaching (ver. 3); next, upon its unique power; in this way alone we become partakers of the divine nature (ver. 4); next, upon the consequent necessity of moral and spiritual growth (vers. 5-10), which is the condition of entrance into the kingdom (ver. 11). From this he proceeds to the authority of the apostolic teaching. It rests, not on ingenious speculation, but on the witness of facts, especially of the Transfiguration (vers. 16-18), and is confirmed by Prophecy (ver. 19); but Prophecy must be rightly understood.

This exordium is quite appropriate, and contains nothing to arouse suspicion, unless we are convinced that the Transfiguration is itself a myth. It abounds in thoughts and phrases which anticipate not only the second, but the third chapter (*ἀρετή, εὐσέβεια, ὑπομονή, φθορά, δύναμις καὶ παρουσία, ἐπάγγελμα*).

Some of the phrases employed have been thought to belong to the second century; but without any reason. Deissmann (*Bibelstudien*, p. 277, Eng. trans. p. 360) prints a portion of an inscription from Stratonicea in Caria. It contains the preface to a decree of the town council, and is supposed to belong to the year A.D. 22 or thereabouts. It uses not only the phrase *πάντων σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεισθαι* (2 Pet. i. 5), but also *θεία δύναμις* (2 Pet. i. 3). This latter expression was familiar to town authorities and citizens. It may be observed that *ἰσότιμος* (2 Pet. i. 1) is also a political word. It is quite possible that St. Peter's amanuensis was a Roman citizen, whether Silvanus or another, who had often seen inscriptions like that of Stratonicea, and was familiar with the language current among the officials by whom they were composed. *Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* (2 Pet. i. 4) belongs rather to philosophy, but would be quite intelligible to any fairly educated man in St. Peter's time.

St. Jude's opening consists of an address in two verses, and an introduction in one. He tells his people that he had been intending to write to them "about our common salvation," an ordinary pastoral letter, but "found it necessary to write and exhort you to do battle for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Spitta thinks that his words, *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*, were suggested by *τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς*

(2 Pet. ii. 21). This may be the case; and, if so, it is a strong point in favour of the priority of 2 Peter. But, in any case, St. Jude here again uses a Pauline expression, *τοῖς ἀγίοις*. Clearly, also, he was writing in a hurry. He had meant to do one thing and found himself obliged to do another. It is not difficult to suppose either that St. Peter's letter had reached him and opened his eyes to the mischief that was going on, or that sudden information had been brought to him that Antinomian teachers were at work in his district, that time pressed, and that he copied out, with no very great alteration, as much of St. Peter's letter as he thought necessary. There would be nothing at all extraordinary in this. St. Jude's people were not the same as St. Peter's.

We may notice here another phrase of St. Jude's, which comes a little lower down (ver. 5), "I wish to remind you, though once for all ye know all things," of the instances of God's judgment in similar cases. It is a hasty phrase. What Christians knew once for all, is the faith once for all delivered. The term does not apply very easily even to particular facts recorded in Old Testament history, still less does it apply to the doom of the fallen angels, or to the dispute between Michael and Satan. The words of Jude bear a close resemblance to those of St. Peter (i. 12), "Wherefore I will always remind you of these things (the promises, the need of growth in virtue), though ye know them." It can hardly be denied that the two passages are connected, or that St. Peter's phrase is much more natural and intelligible than St. Jude's.

The second chapter of the Petrine Epistle follows easily and without any kind of dislocation from the first. Prophecy witnesses to the truth of the apostles' doctrine, but it must be rightly understood. There were, as we know, those who did not interpret prophecy in the same sense as St. Peter. Further, even in Israel there were false prophets. "So among you there will be false teachers." There is some difficulty here about the future tense. St. Peter speaks of these false teachers partly in the future, partly in the present, and it is not quite certain whether he means that they are already at work in other districts and will soon invade the Churches to which he is writing, or whether we are to regard the future as meaning "there must be," "there are and always will be." St. Peter does not say expressly that the false teachers claimed to be prophets, but there can be little doubt that they did so, for they could hardly justify their doctrine except by an appeal to revelation. At any rate the analogy between false teacher and false prophet is so close that what is true of the one is in the main true of the other also. The point is, that it does not follow that every one who claims to be prophet or teacher is really what he professes to be. There must be a test. These teachers are false, because they introduce "heresies" (see note on this word), because they

deny the Lord who bought them, because they are immoral. They deceive men with lying words; they will gain much success, and bring reproach on the way of truth, but their doom is destruction.

With this passage (2 Pet. ii. 1-3) the reader must compare Jude 4. St. Jude does not call his antagonists either teachers or prophets, though the word *ἐνπνιαζόμενοι*, in ver. 8, may imply that they claimed prophetic inspiration. "Certain men," he says, "have slipped in." They are already at work. If we may take St. Peter's future, "there will be false teachers," as practically a present, St. Jude's letter may have been written very shortly afterwards. On the other hand, St. Jude's language has been taken to imply a not inconsiderable interval of time. He goes on to say of these men that they are *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*. Spitta finds here a reference to 2 Peter; but it is much easier to take *πάλαι* to mean "in the ancient Scriptures," "in the Old Testament." But what is the meaning of *τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*? No judgment has been mentioned. For an explanation we must go to 2 Pet. ii. 3, where, after the description of the false teachers, we find the words *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεῖ*. St. Jude goes on to say of these men that they are impious, that they change the grace of "our God" into licentiousness, and that they deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ. "Our God" is from 2 Pet. i. 1: the concluding phrase is surely an exaggeration of St. Peter's *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι*. Nay, St. Jude not only exaggerates, but rather spoils the phrase. St. Peter had more than one good reason for inserting *ἀγοράσαντα* before *δεσπότην*.

Here follow in both writers the instances of God's judgments on the impious. It will be convenient to arrange the two lists side by side—

2 PETER.	JUDE.
1. _____	Israel in the Wilderness.
2. The Fallen Angels.	The Fallen Angels.
3. The Flood (Noah).	_____
4. The Cities of the Plain (Lot).	The Cities of the Plain (Lot is not mentioned).
5. _____	Cain.
6. Balaam.	Balaam.
7. _____	Korah.

It will be observed that St. Peter's instances are arranged in strictly chronological order, while Jude's are not. This fact has been counted by some in St. Peter's favour; by others, against him. St. Peter again twice couples an instance of mercy with an instance of judgment; this fact again has been reckoned both on the one side and on the other. We may notice that St. Peter, with his mind fixed on false teachers, naturally begins with the fallen angels, who,

according to Jewish tradition, taught men all kinds of wickedness. There is no particular point in St. Jude's first instance, but it may, of course, be said that St. Peter saw this, and accordingly left it out. The Flood St. Peter mentioned probably because Noah was a preacher of righteousness, a "dignity" who was blasphemed by man but approved by God. But the instance has a further value for him, because he is going to argue in the third chapter that as the world was once destroyed by water, so it will again be destroyed by fire. Here it may be said that St. Peter had a definite reason for adding. Nor is it conclusive, if we say that St. Peter is of a more merciful and pastoral spirit than St. Jude, and that his mention of Noah and Lot points towards the beautiful saying (iii. 9) that God's will is that all men should come to repentance. It is true that there is a certain exaggeration and passion, and a fiery zeal for orthodoxy about St. Jude. He describes the sin of the Cities of the Plain (*ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας*) in such a way that it ceases to be parallel to that of the false teachers, and his view of the proper treatment of penitents (vers. 22, 23) is couched in language of great severity. Again, Cain, the murderer, is rather a fierce parallel. Some have indeed supposed that we have here Philo's whimsical allegorism, in which Cain is the type of the sceptic; but this is not at all in St. Jude's manner. The same fierce note sounds in the instance of Korah, who rebelled against the priests. St. Jude was evidently a zealot, and it may, of course, be said that the author of 2 Peter did not quite like this fire and fury, and did what he could to soften it down. But it seems more probable that the case was the reverse of this, that St. Jude did not think 2 Peter quite strong enough.

Much has been written in Germany about what is called the *Apokryphenscheu* of 2 Peter. St. Jude makes free use of apocryphal authorities: he specifies the sin of the fallen angels, mentions the dispute between Michael and Satan, and quotes Enoch by name. The comparative reticence of 2 Peter is supposed to point to a date late in the second century, about A.D. 170, when the idea of a canon of Scripture was taking shape, and men were beginning to look with suspicion on all books that were not included in the authorised lists. Hence, it is said, we must infer that 2 Peter abbreviated and expurgated Jude. But there is nothing in this argument. Enoch was not absolutely rejected before the fourth century (see the introduction in Mr. Charles' edition), and the use made of Jewish tradition in 2 Peter is very similar to that which we find in 1 Peter, or in Paul, who probably refers to the *Assumption of Moses* in Gal. iii. 19, and certainly adopts a Rabbinical fancy in 1 Cor. x. 4. Further, what I venture to think a conclusive reason for regarding the passage about Michael as an addition made by Jude has been given above, p. 217.

It may be asserted that Peter's mind is clearer and more intelligent than that of Jude. In addition to the two instances cited (*καίπερ εἰδότας*, and the choice and arrangement of the historical examples), the reader should take note of the extraordinary haste and confusion of Jude's censure on the people of the Cities of the Plain. He not only brings out that feature of their wickedness which is not applicable, but goes on to charge them in particular with "blaspheming dignities" (ver. 8). St. Peter does not fall into this error. What he says (ii. 10, 11) is that the false teachers blaspheme dignities, while the angels do not. Certainly St. Peter is the more intelligent of the two. On the other hand, he drops at times into awkward and confused expressions, and here Jude corrects him. One instance of this is to be found in 2 Pet. ii. 13, a badly constructed sentence which Jude (ver. 10) has straightened out, dropping the vulgar Hebraism (*ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται*), and making things much smoother. Another occurs in 2 Pet. ii. 17, where the metaphors are mixed up in the style of a Hebrew prophet; fountains and mists are punished with darkness. Here, again, Jude has laid his finger on the artistic defect. Fountains cannot be sent into darkness, he said to himself; no, but *ἀστéρες πλανῆται* can (ver. 12). To some this will seem an obvious emendation in the style of Bentley; to others, again, the prettiness will appear to be a mark of originality.

Of the concluding section of 2 Peter, of the Parousia section, there is only one distinct trace in Jude. Peter introduces it with the warning that "in the last days there shall come mockers, saying, Where is the promise of His coming?" Jude quoted the first clause as apostolic (see above), but omitted the second clause, in which the nature of the mock is defined. Now, if Peter, on the word "mockers," shut up his copy of Jude and plunged into original composition, it must be admitted that he has disguised the seam with phenomenal skill. On the other hand, if we read over Jude 16-19, it will be seen that vers. 17, 18 can be cut out without damage either to the grammar or to the sense. Further, Jude has inserted the genitive *τῶν ἀσεβειῶν*, which is not wanted, and appears to be suggested by the quotation from Enoch, which he had inserted just before. It is possible that *ἀμώμους*, Jude 24, may have been suggested by *ἀμωμήτους*, 2 Pet. iii. 14, and *προσδεχόμενοι*, Jude 21, by *προσδοκῶντες*, 2 Pet. iii. 14.

If we are to ask why St. Jude omitted St. Peter's argument about the Parousia and the final section of 2 Peter generally, many answers may be suggested. It may be that he could not quite adopt St. Peter's reasoning. It may be that he thought that his quotation from Enoch was a sufficient proof of the Second Advent. It may be that among his flock Antinomianism was a burning question, while the Parousia was not. It may be, again, that he did not quite like the way in which St. Peter speaks of St. Paul, for

Jude uses Pauline language, and clearly did not think that there was anything *δυσνόητον* in the epithet *ψυχικός*. Or it may be simply that he felt that he had said quite enough, and had no time to spare. Sometimes there is a reason for an omission; thus Marcion intentionally left out parts of St. Luke's Gospel: sometimes there is none; thus in the *Apostolical Church Ordinance* the Way of Death is not given.

Nothing has been said in this section about the argument from the vocabulary of the two Epistles. This point has been worked out with great elaboration by Spitta. It is difficult to see how the question can be posed in such a manner as to admit of a definite answer. Yet there are two points on which it is possible to lay some weight. Jude undoubtedly borrows from a vocabulary which is not St. Peter's; and it is noticeable that these peculiar words occur before and after the description of the Antinomian teachers, in those introductory and concluding verses which are, in the main, St. Jude's own property. Again, the style of 2 Peter is uniform throughout, and its most distinctive feature, the habit of repeating words, marks all three chapters alike. But we must deal with this subject, which is of great importance, in the following section.

§ 4. VOCABULARY, GRAMMAR, AND STYLE OF 2 PETER.

The following words are found in 2 Peter, but not elsewhere in the New Testament:

**ἄθεσμος*¹, *ἀκατάπανστος* (*v.l.* *ἀκατάσπαστος*), *ἄλωσις*¹, *ἀμαθής*, *ἀποφεύγειν*¹, *ἀργεῖν*¹, *ἀστήρικτος*, *αὐχμηρός*, *βλέμμα*, *βόρβορος*¹, *βραδύτης*, *διαυγάζειν*, *δυσνόητος*, *ἐγκατοικεῖν*, *ἐκπαλαι*, *ἐλεγξις*¹, *ἐμπαιμονή*, *ἐντρυφᾶν*¹, *ἐξακολουθεῖν*¹, *ἐξέραμα*, *ἐπάγγελμα*, *ἐπόπτης*¹, *ισότιμος*, *κατακλύζειν*¹, *καυσοῦσθαι*, *κύλισμα*, *λήθη*¹, *μεγαλοπρεπής*¹, *μέγιστος*¹, *μίασμα*¹, *μασμός*¹, *μῆμη*¹, *μυοπάζειν*, *μῶμος*¹, *ὀλίγως* (*v.l.* *ὄντως*), *ὀμίχλη*¹, *παραφρονία* (*v.l.* *παρανομία*), *παισιάζειν*, *παισιόφρων*, *πλαστός*, *ροιζήδον*, *σειρός* (*v.l.* *σειρά*), *στηριγμός*, *στοιχείον*¹, (in sense of physical elements), *στρεβλοῦν*¹, *ταρταροῦν*, *ταχινός*¹, *τεφροῦν*, *τήκεσθαι*¹, *τοιῶσδε*¹, *τολμητής*, *ὑς*¹, *φωσφόρος*, *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος*, *ἐπίλυσις*¹.

Words marked (1) are found in the Greek versions of the Old Testament. See Hatch and Redpath.

Ἐμπαιμονή, *παραφρονία* are probably due to corruption of the text. See above, p. 213. On *βλέμμα*, *καυσοῦσθαι*, see note. *Ἐπόπτης* is used in the Old Testament only of God, Esth. v. 1; 2 Macc. iii. 39; 3 Macc. ii. 21.

Leusden counts one thousand six hundred and eighty-six *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* in the New Testament. As there are twenty-seven documents, this would give them about sixty-two apiece. In 2 Peter there are fifty-five, which, considering the brevity of the Epistle, is a very high number.

The vocabulary of 1 Peter is dignified; that of 2 Peter inclines to the grandiose (*ἐξέραμα, ἐπόπτης, ροιζηδόν, ταρταροῦν, τεφροῦν*).

By the help of Bruder we may make a list of about three hundred and sixty-one words which are found in 1 Peter but not in 2 Peter. Among words which, in spite of the great difference of subject, we might have expected to find in the latter Epistle, are the following:

Ἀγιάζειν, ἁγιασμός, ἀγνίζειν, ἄγνός, ἀναγεννᾶν, ἀποκάλυψις, δοξάζειν, ἔλεειν, ἔλεος, ἐλπίζειν, ἐλπίς, ἐπικάλυμμα, εὐαγγελίζειν, καθάρως, κληρονομεῖν, κληρονομία, μακάριος, νήφειν, οἰνοφλυγία (with κῶμοι, πότοι), ὄνομα, παροικία, πάροικος, ποιμαίνειν, ποιμὴν, ποιμνιον, πρεσβύτερος, σκάνδαλον, σκολιός, συνειδήσεις, ὑπακοή, ὑπόκρισις.

In 2 Peter there are about two hundred and thirty-one words which are not found in 1 Peter, and some of these, again, are remarkable:

Ἄκαρπος, ἄνομος, ἄργός, βασιλεία, ἐντολή, ἐπαγγελία, ἐπαγγελλεσθαί, ἐπάγγελμα, ἐπιγινώσκειν, ἐπίγνωσις, εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, θείος, σωτήρ, ὑπομνήσκω, ὑπόμνησις, ὑπομονή.

On the other hand, there are certain points of similarity. Zahn (*Einleitung*, part ii. p. 108) gives the following list:

Ἀναστροφή, ἀναστρέφεισθαι, ἀπόθεσις (this word is peculiar to 1 and 2 Peter), ἀρετή of God (but probably in a different sense), ἐπόπται (cf. ἐποπτεύειν, I ii. 12, iii. 2), ἀστήρικτος and στηριγμός (cf. στηρίζειν, I v. 10), σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι and ἄσπιλος καὶ ἀμώματος (cf. ἄσπιλος καὶ ἄμωμος, I i. 19), ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας (cf. πέπαιται ἁμαρτίας, I iv. 1), ἀσέλγεια, ψυχή (in sense of "soul"). B. Weiss (*Einleitung*, p. 445) considerably extends this list; the most noticeable fact that he adds to it is the fondness of both 1 and 2 Peter for the plural of abstract nouns.

In 2 Peter there are even fewer particles than in 1 Peter. The author never uses *μέν*. He employs very few Hebraisms; there are a couple of reduplications *ἐν φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται*, ii. 12; *ἐν ἐμπαιμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται*, iii. 3; in ii. 10 we have *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορευομένους*: in ii. 1, *αἵρέσεις ἀπωλείας*: in ii. 14, *κατάρως τέκνα*. The article he uses much in the same way as 1 Peter; sometimes omitting it, as with *ἀρχαῖον κόσμον*, ii. 5; sometimes again employing it with unexpected freedom and elegance, for instance i. 4, *τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*: iii. 17, *τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ*: cf. i. 8, 16, ii. 7, 10, 22, iii. 5, 12. The expression in the first chapter is easy and clear; in the later chapters it becomes at times laboured, turgid, involved, and obscure, especially in two passages, ii. 12-14, iii. 5-7. Some allowance must be made here for passion, for the writer was clearly deeply moved by his subject. It should be noticed also that the writer of 1 Peter is extremely embarrassed at times; see iii. 20, 21, iv. 3-6.

Two features of the style call for special notice. One is the habit of repeating words. The following instances may be given:

i. 5, 11, *ἐπιχορηγείν*: i. 10, 19, *βέβαιος*: i. 12, 13, 15, iii. 1,

ὑπομνήσκειν, ἐν ὑπομνήσει, μνήμην ποιῆσθαι: i. 17, 18, ἐνεχθείσης ἐνεχθείσαν: i. 10, 15, iii. 14, σπουδάξεν: i. 4, ii. 18, 20, ἀποφεύγειν: i. 20, 21, προφητεία: i. 20, iii. 3, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες: ii. 1. 3, iii. 7, 16, ἀπώλεια: ii. 4, 5, ἐφείσατο: ii. 4, 9, 17, iii. 7, τηρεῖν: ii. 10, 11, 12, βλάσφημος, βλασφημῆν: ii. 2, 15, 21, ὁδός: ii. 14, 18, δελεάζειν: ii. 16, 18, φθέγγεσθαι: i. 16, ii. 2, 15, ἐξακολουθεῖν: ii. 13, 15, μισθὸς ἀδικίας: ii. 21, iii. 2, ἐντολή: ii. 4, 17, ζόφος: ii. 9, iii. 7, ἡμέρα κρίσεως: iii. 12, 13, 14, προσδοκᾶν: iii. 10, 12, στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα: i. 3, 20, ii. 16, 22, iii. 3, 16, 17, ἴδιος: i. 16, iii. 4, 12, παρουσία. This list might be considerably extended.

Three reflexions may be made upon this peculiarity:

(1) The repetitions extend throughout the Epistle, and form a strong guarantee of its unity against Kühn's theory of interpolation.

(2) Some of the repetitions disappear in the parallel passages of Jude, who has, for instance, only the single *μισθοῦ* (ver. 11) for the duplicated *μισθὸς ἀδικίας* of Peter, and corrects the Hebraisms ἐν φθορᾷ φθείρεσθαι, ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται. Jude avoids repetitions; thus in the verse just quoted we have ὁδὸς τοῦ Καίν, πλάνη τοῦ Βαλαάμ, ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ, and three different verbs are employed. He has a certain skill in devising synonyms. If we take his opening and concluding passages, where he is most independent, we find the phrase κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι used twice, 16, 18; πίστις occurs twice, 3, 20; ἀπαξ twice, 3, 5; ἔλεος twice, 2, 21; ἐλεῖν twice in 22 and 23 (though this is doubtful; see note). But he has more style than Peter, and is not given to the needless iteration of insignificant words. It is therefore important to observe that in the parallel passage he does repeat several of the words which are repeated in 2 Peter, τηρεῖν, 6 (*bis*), 13, 21; ζόφος, 6, 13; κρίσις, 6, 9, 15; βλασφημῆν, βλασφημία, 8, 9, 10. Now, on these facts it seems far more natural to suppose that Jude pruned down, but could not wholly eradicate, the repetitions of Peter, than that Peter copied and exaggerated a not very marked feature of Jude's style. Indeed, we should have to suppose that Peter was so captivated by Jude's tautology that he introduced the same trick freely into his own first and third chapters, where he was writing his own thoughts in his own way.

(3) It is to be observed that the same habit of repeating words is noticeable also in 1 Peter. The following instances may be given: i. 7, 8, δόξαν, δεδοξασμένη: i. 3, iii. 21, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: i. 7, 13, iv. 13, v. 1, ἀποκάλυψις: i. 9, 10, σωτηρία: i. 15, 16, ἅγιος (*quater*): i. 15, 17, 18, ii. 12, iii. 1, 2, 16, ἀναστρέφεισθαι, ἀναστρόφη: i. 2, 14, 22, ὑπακοή: i. 3, 23, ἀναγεννᾶν: i. 25, ῥῆμα (*bis*): ii. 4, 5, λίθος ζῶν, πνευματικός: ii. 4, 6, ἐκλεκτόν, ἔντιμον: ii. 5, 9, ἱεράτευμα: ii. 9, 10, λαός (*ter*): i. 1, ii. 11, παρεπίδημος: i. 17, ii. 11, παροιμία, πάροικος: ii. 12, 14, iii. 16, iv. 15, κακοποιός: ii. 14, 15, 20, iii. 6, iv. 19, ἀγαθοποιός, -ποιεῖν, -ποιία: ii. 19, 20, 23,

and nine other places *πάσχειν*: ii. 13 and six other places *υποτάσσεσθαι*: iii. 16, 21, *συνείδησις*: iii. 18, 19, *πνεῦμα*: iv. 1, *παθὼν σαρκί (bis)*: i. 13, iv. 7: v. 8, *νήφειν*: v. 5, 6, *ταπεινός, ταπεινοῦν*. This list also might be extended.

The habit of verbal repetition is therefore quite as strongly marked in the First Epistle as in the Second. This is a matter of very high importance. It forms a striking link between the two Epistles; and, further, if we suppose St. Peter to have employed an amanuensis, and to have allowed him considerable freedom, it is yet just in such a point as this that we should expect the mental habit of the real author to be visible through the disguise.

Another curious feature of the style of 2 Peter is its tendency to fall into iambic rhythm. Many sentences can be turned into tragic senarii with very little alteration; thus:

- ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι.
- ii. 3, πλαστοῖσιν ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται λόγοις.
- ii. 4, Θεὸς οὐκ ἐφέισατ' ἀλλὰ σειροῖσι ζόφου ἐπαρτάρωσεν εἰς δίκην τηρουμένους.

In i. 19 the cadence and the colour of the words are the same, and in the third chapter again there is a perceptible approach to the movement of blank verse in the sonorous futures passive, and in the character and metrical value of the language, as, for instance, in *στοιχεῖα δὲ κανούμενα λυθήσεται οἱ οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται*.

The Attic tragedians were diligently studied and imitated by Jewish poetasters in Alexandria; for instance by Ezekiel, of whom some fragments have been preserved by Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* ix. 28 sqq.). Our knowledge of this interesting man is derived through Eusebius and Clement of Alexandria from Alexander Polyhistor, a contemporary of Sulla. Ezekiel, probably with the special view of introducing the Bible to the knowledge of cultivated Greeks, dramatised Exodus in iambic trimeters, and possessed a tolerable, though not immaculate, command of the metre. In his *Exodus* he described a wonderful bird which appears to be the phoenix, and this may be the source of the reference to the phoenix in the epistle of Clement of Rome.

There were many of these Jewish iambic writers. Some of them seem to have palmed off their compositions under the names of the famous classic dramatists; thus in the *Stromata* of Clement (v. 14. 113 sqq.) we find passages ascribed to Sophocles, Menander, Diphilus, which are certainly of Jewish manufacture. Such extracts were collected in anthologies, and were probably widely known among educated Christians at a very early date. Some of the first Christians had even read the classic dramatists; thus St. Paul quotes (1 Cor. xv. 33) a verse of Menander, and even in the Apocalypse is found a phrase *γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων* (v. 8), which may possibly be derived from Sophocles, *O. T.* 4. A possible reminis-

cence of Menander has been pointed out in the note on 1 Pet. ii. 16. The habit of iambic composition passed over into the Church, and Irenaeus (i. 15, 6) gives some verses of this kind written by ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτερος καὶ κήρυξ τῆς ἀληθείας on the heretic Marcus.

In Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 68; *Strom.* v. 11. 75, will be found some lines attributed to Euripides. One of these passages, which runs thus:

ποιός δ' ἂν οἶκος τεκτόνων πλασθεῖς ὑπο
δέμας τὸ θεῖον περιβάλοι τοίχων πτυχαῖς,

is clearly taken from 1 Kings viii. 27. Here the author is treating of Solomon, at any rate he is representing the words of Solomon, and it is possible that Proverbs had been wholly or in part versified by one or another of these Jewish paraphrasts. It may be permissible to suspect that the *παροιμία* given by 2 Pet. ii. 22 comes in its actual shape from such a source as this. Certainly it falls very readily into iambs:

ἐπ' ἴδιον ἐξέραμ' ἐπιστρέφει κύνων,
ὅς τ' ἐς κύλισμα βορβόρου λελουμένη.

We should thus be able to account, not only for the combination of the biblical proverb about the dog with the non-biblical proverb about the sow, but for the use of the remarkable words *ἐξέραμα* and *κύλισμα*. (See note on this passage; and for further information on the subject of Jewish Alexandrine poetry, refer to the Fragments of Alexander Polyhistor in Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*; Schürer, *Jewish People in the time of Christ*.)

If the iambic writers really did exercise a certain influence on the style of 2 Peter, two questions arise. Is the fact consistent with an early date? and again, Is it possible to suppose, in view of this peculiarity of style, that the two Epistles of Peter were written by the same hand?

To the first question it may be answered, that the marked features of literary style in the second century are Homerism in vocabulary and Platonism in thought. Of the former there are possibly some faint traces in 2 Peter (see notes on ii. 14, 17), though not more than we can well account for in a contemporary of Philo's; of the latter there are none.

To the second question, again, there is an answer. Many writers who compose, as a rule, in pure prose, fall at times, consciously or unconsciously, into metre. We have a familiar instance of this peculiarity ready to hand in the case of Charles Dickens. Take the following passage, which has often been quoted, from *Martin Chuzzlewit*:

“If there be fluids, as we know there are,
Which conscious of a coming wind, or rain,
Or frost, will shrink and strive to hide themselves
In their glass arteries;

May not that subtle liquor of the blood
 Perceive by properties within itself,
 That hands are raised to waste and spill it ;
 And in the veins of men run cold and dull
 As his did in that hour !”

Dickens was familiar with the grave cadences of the stage, and here the solemnity of his theme, the mysterious sense of impending disaster, shapes his imagination so that his thoughts naturally fall into the appropriate vehicle of tragic metre. It is by no means difficult to suppose that the author of 2 Peter was uplifted in the same way. He sees men bringing blasphemy on the way of Truth, and defying the terrors of God's judgment. Possibly he knew something of the Greek tragedians, certainly the swelling and sometimes turbid imagery of Wisdom and of the Hebrew prophets would recur to his mind. His imagination rises above the region in which it habitually dwells ; but it rises heavily, and with effort. He is no Isaiah, nor even Malachi ; yet for once he is treading the same heights, and endeavouring to speak as they would have spoken. There is a certain dignity in the style of 1 Peter, which, under stress of excitement, might easily become grandiose, and even a little incoherent. Both these traits may be discerned in 2 Peter, though they have been absurdly exaggerated.

Jerome noticed a diversity of style between the two Epistles, but it does not appear that Eusebius, Origen, or Clement, who, on such a point, were much better authorities, had raised this objection. Even greater differences of style were observed by ancient critics in the works of Aristotle and Plotinus. They may be detected in the undoubtedly genuine works of Thomas Carlyle, or in those of Wordsworth, or of Burns. It is a common remark that artists have an earlier and a later manner, or that their inspiration and gift of expression vary with their theme. Unless we can say of two writings that they exhibit a different personality and tone of mind, a different way of regarding the same objects, it is extremely difficult to say at what point formal unlikeness amounts to incompatibility.

Another distinction which has been pointed out between the manners of 1 and 2 Peter is the comparative paucity in the latter of allusions to the Old Testament or to the gospel.

1 Peter sometimes refers to the Old Testament, as when he speaks of Noah and Sarah, repeatedly quotes it, and constantly uses words and phrases which easily remind the reader of their biblical origin. On the other hand, though 2 Peter often refers to the Old Testament, appealing to it for the instances of judgment and the method of creation, he can hardly be said to quote it, and his allusions are not so numerous. The passages specially marked by the use of large type in Westcott and Hort's text are five :

ii. 2 = Isa. lii. 5 ; ii. 22 = Prov. xxvi. 11 ; iii. 8 = Ps. xc. (lxxxix.) 4 ; iii. 12 = Isa. xxxiv. 4 ; iii. 13 = Isa. lxv. 17 ; lxvi. 22. We may add *εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*, Dan. iii. 31 ; *αἰώνιος βασιλεία*, iii. 33 ; *κατακλισμὸν ἐπάγειν*, Gen. vi. 17 ; *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, Josh. xxiv. 27 ; *ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει*, Ps. ii. 6 ; *ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας*, Gen. xxxix. 10 ; Esth. iii. 7 ; Isa. lviii. 2 ; *ὁδός, εὐθεία ὁδός* are biblical phrases ; *ἐξακολουθεῖν ὁδοῦ* is found in Isa. lvi. 11 and elsewhere ; *οἶδε Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι* is a reminiscence of Ezek. xiii. 21 or some similar passage ; *πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω* (only here and once in Luke) is found in Deut. viii. 19 ; *μὴ βουλόμενός τις ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι* is a paraphrase of Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Further, we must take account of a number of detached words—*καθαρισμὸς, καταστροφή, καταπονείσθαι, σκῆνωμα, νυστάζειν, μῶμος*: others are noticed in the catalogue of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* given at the beginning of this section. Objection may be taken to some of the instances here cited (see Dr. Chase, *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 807) ; but, however carefully the list is sifted, enough will remain to show that the author of 2 Peter knew his Greek Bible well, and applied its thoughts and speech with facility.

It must be allowed that 2 Peter is not so saturated with the Old Testament as 1 Peter. But on this point great allowance must be made for the difference of subject. If a clergyman were to write two sermons, one on patience in affliction, another on a peculiar form of Antinomian agnosticism, he would find fifty texts applicable to the former subject for one that lent itself to the latter. And if 2 Peter's use of Hebrew scripture differs from that of 1 Peter to some extent in degree, it yet agrees with it in one remarkable point, the manner in which scripture is blended with tradition. In this respect the two Epistles are very similar, and both differ from Jude.

In 1 Peter, again, there are numerous allusions to words or facts which are to be found in the Gospels. In 2 Peter only three unquestionable instances have been pointed out. We find the phrase *γένεον αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων*, ii. 20, cf. Matt. xii. 45 ; Luke xi. 26 ; a reference to a prophecy made by Christ of the "speedy" or "sudden" death of the author, i. 14, cf. John xxi. 18, and an account of the Transfiguration. To these we may add *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι*, ii. 1, cf. Matt. x. 33 ; a possible reminiscence of Luke xiii. 7, 8 in *οὐκ ἄργους οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους*, i. 8 ; and *ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*, iii. 4, cf. Matt. xxiv. It has been objected that we should have expected to find much more than this. But there is nothing in the Gospels so directly applicable to the particular subject of Christian antinomianism as the words of our Lord in Matt. xii. 45 ; the quotation is, at any rate, extremely apt. Again, St. Paul deals with the same error, the misinterpretation of Christian freedom, in the same way as St. Peter, relying upon general Christian principles, but never

even once quoting the words of Christ. Yet, again, the objection is like the Delphic knife; it cuts with two edges. If it is difficult to understand why St. Peter does not quote the words of our Lord, it is far more difficult to explain why a forger, late in the second century, does not. The apostles, as all their letters show, did not feel bound to be constantly quoting. This habit begins with St. Clement of Rome.

Spitta finds another reference to the gospel history in the words τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς (i. 3). Christ in person called the apostles. The interpretation of the pronouns in the first chapter is much disputed, but Spitta is very possibly right. On this point the reader may consult the notes.

That the reference in i. 14 is to the prophecy of our Lord, recorded in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel, may be regarded as certain, in spite of Spitta's objections (see the answer of Dr. Chase in the *Dictionary of the Bible*); and that the incident described in i. 16 sqq. is the Transfiguration, has been doubted only by Hofmann. The details of these two passages will be found in the notes; here two points only need be considered.

It has been asked why St. Peter, when he is undertaking to prove the truth of the Second Advent, should select for his purpose the Transfiguration rather than the Ascension. It may seem a curious choice, when we remember the words of the angels in Acts i. 11. Yet reasons may be found. It is possible, indeed most probable, that those who denied the Parousia denied also the Resurrection; and, if this was so, it was useless for St. Peter to meet them by blankly affirming the fact of the Ascension. Nor could he well quote the promise of our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiv. 30), for this also they denied. But if all the rest of the gospel history was accepted by his opponents, the story of the Transfiguration was common ground. It may be noticed that St. Peter does not use the Transfiguration to prove the Parousia, but to prove the credibility of the apostles who had preached the Parousia. For this purpose the incident was admirably suited. The apostles had on that occasion not only beheld the majesty of the Lord, but had heard a voice from heaven; they had come into direct communication with God, and this fact was a strong guarantee of the general truth of their teaching. May we not also think that the Transfiguration may have been directly suggested to St. Peter's mind by the preceding μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἕξοδον? The word ἕξοδος occurs in St. Luke's account of the Transfiguration (ix. 31); but this is not the point. St. Peter has just been saying that he will take care that even after his own death his readers shall be reminded of the truth of his doctrine. In Matt. xvii. 9 we read, "Tell the vision to no man till the Son of Man have risen from the dead," that is to say, "till after My death." It is just possible that the similarity of phrase

may have led St. Peter to think of the Transfiguration. This would be quite in the manner of 1 Peter, where the following thought is often dictated by the preceding word.

But it has also been thought that the Transfiguration was selected because St. Peter was one of the three who were present on that occasion, and that this shows too keen an anxiety on the writer's part to identify himself with St. Peter. The same difficulty has been raised with regard to the preceding allusion to the prophecy recorded in John xxi. The argument is one of those over which men may dispute without end. The reader must put himself, as best he can, in the writer's place, and ask himself how an apostle might have been expected to speak in the circumstances, how a forger would probably have expressed himself. If a writer declares his identity in the Address only of an Epistle, as is the case in 1 Peter, the Address is treated as a forged addition. If he hints in an unmistakable way who he is, as is the case in the Gospel of St. John, his words are regarded as so suspicious, and even indecent, that he must be a forger. If he does both, as is the case in 2 Peter, the evidence against him is often treated as irrefutable. Obviously this method of procedure leads to no conclusion. As regards what an author says about himself, we can ask only whether, having regard to his known character and position, it is possible or impossible. Now no man can affirm that what St. Peter tells us about himself, in the Second Epistle, is inappropriate; the objection, indeed, is that it is much too appropriate. But no document was ever condemned as a forgery upon this ground.

The facts which seem to emerge from this review are partly favourable, partly unfavourable, to the view that 2 Peter was written by the same hand as 1 Peter. Chief among the former are (1) the habit of verbal repetition, (2) the use of Apocrypha. Among the latter we have observed (1) that the style of the two Epistles is different, but not openly incompatible, in expression, and in formal use of Scripture; (2) that the favourite phrases of the one Epistle are not those of the other: this point is more than verbal, and calls for further elucidation.

It has been also pointed out that the vocabulary and style contain no elements which were not in existence in the apostolic age.

So far we may agree with Weiss, that no document in the New Testament is so like 1 Peter as 2 Peter.

§ 5. ORGANISATION AND DOCTRINE IN 2 PETER.

Exceedingly little information on the subject of Church organisation is to be gathered from the Epistle. Even the presbyter, who in 1 Peter occupies a conspicuous position, is not mentioned. On

the other hand, great stress is laid in the first chapter on the authority of the apostles; and in the final paragraph St. Paul, though he is not expressly called an apostle, is spoken of as one whose words carry great weight; whose Epistles, if not actually scripture, may at least be named in the same breath with scripture; and whose doctrine, though capable of perversion, is in substantial accord with that of the Twelve. It has been supposed that in iii. 2 the phrase "your apostles" involves a wider use of the title apostles, similar to that found in 1 Thess. ii. 6, where St. Paul calls Silvanus and Timotheus apostles. If this point could be established, it would afford a strong argument for placing the Epistle at an extremely early date. But enough has been said in the Introduction to 1 Peter on the use of the title apostle. There is no sufficient reason for thinking that in 2 Peter it is applied to any but the Twelve.

Some importance may be attached to the absence of all allusion to Church officials in 2 Peter. It has been maintained that the Epistle was written in the second century, and directed against some form of Gnosticism. Now the Gnostic controversy greatly strengthened the position of the hierarchy, and it is hard to believe that, if this debate had actually been raging at the time, the Epistle could have failed to contain some reference to bishops and presbyters. It may be replied that the forger was too clever to betray himself by such an anachronism. But a forger of the second century would not have known that it was an anachronism. In the *Apostolical Church Ordinance*, which is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, we find St. Peter presiding over a highly developed hierarchy. The pseudonymous writers of the early Church, from the nature of things, were never either intelligent or critical. They did not attempt to qualify themselves for their task by an accurate study of the past; indeed, it would not have been possible for them to do so. There is hardly a single instance of a really good pseudo-antique except the *Platonic Letters*, the work of an otiose scholar, who had thoroughly studied his exemplar, and could reproduce his style and circumstances to a nicety. But what was difficult for an Athenian professor with a library at his command was quite beyond the capabilities of an uneducated Christian. Such a man does not comprehend even the simplest rules of the forger's art. We may apply to him the words of Persius, "Digitum exsere, peccas."

The doctrine of the Epistle will be most conveniently considered under the two headings of practical and speculative.

As regards practical doctrine, the Second Epistle agrees very closely with the first. It is disciplinarian, not mystic. Pauline terminology and ideas are absent, and not only absent, but foreign to the writer's point of view. This is seen at once from the crucial words *δίκαιος* (ii. 7, 8) and *ψυχή* (ii. 8, 14). *Ἐπαγγελία* (iii. 4, 9) is not the promise of salvation by faith, but that of new heavens

and earth. Πνεῦμα does not occur except of the Holy Spirit (i. 21). Christian prophecy is not mentioned, but the False Teachers (ii. 1) probably claimed authority as prophets. The prophecies of the Old Testament were inspired by the Holy Ghost (i. 21), but they need an interpreter. This is the view expressed in 1 Pet. i. 10-12; it was held both in the primitive Church (Acts viii. 31) and in later times. Christ has "bought" or ransomed the believer (ii. 1), binding him thereby to a life of moral purity. In baptism men are cleansed from their old sins; and he who lives like a barren tree has forgotten this cleansing (i. 9; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, iii. 21). Faith is given by God (i. 1), but is developed by human action, through virtue and knowledge into love (i. 5-8). Thus "calling" and "election" are made sure (i. 10); and this growth in practical Christian excellences forms the passport, the right of "entrance" into the eternal kingdom of Christ, which will be given by God (i. 11). Life is progress conditioned by obedience, and the fullness of the reward is future. And for this progress the Christian needs constant admonition and instruction from those who know better than he does himself (i. 12-18). It is easy to see why the author speaks of moral obligation as "a command" (ἐντολή, ii. 21), as the Way of Truth, the Straight Way, the Way of Righteousness (ii. 2, 15, 21). Throughout the Epistle great stress is laid upon Fear, and the thought of the Day of Judgment. Sin (ἁμαρτία) is not an inner malign power, but the wicked act proceeding from "desire" (i. 4). It is corruption (φθορά, i. 4, ii. 19), the pollution of the world (ii. 20); but, as in 1 Peter, there is no indication of a belief in the hereditary transmission of evil. In this connexion the use of the secular word ἀρετή (i. 3, 5) deserves a passing notice. Wherever "virtue" is a familiar term, the disciplinary view prevails.

In ii. 13 there is a reference to the Agape in the word *συνευχόμενοι*; but we may go further, and take *ἀγάπαις* to be the right reading. No special information is given about the Agape, unless we may infer from the text that it was celebrated in the daytime. But here again, in this very tempting place, there is no trace of anachronism. Here again, if the author was a forger, he has displayed remarkable skill, and carefully avoided words and ideas which were familiar in the second century.

So far everything is in precise accordance with the teaching of 1 Peter. Our author was well acquainted with the doctrines of St. Paul, but he does not agree with them, and, if he had so chosen, could have given reasons for his dissent (iii. 16). Certainly in these important practical points, in the general view of the Christian life, Weiss is right in saying that no book in the New Testament is so like 1 Peter as 2 Peter. Yet there is something to be said on the other side. It has been noticed that the favourite phrases of the one Epistle are not those of the other. For instance, the word

ἐλπίς is not found in 2 Peter. Nor does he speak of the Christian as a pilgrim (*πάραικος, παρεπίδημος*), nor of his reward as a patrimony (*κληρονομία*). The End of all things again is not "the Revelation" of Jesus Christ, but the Day of Judgment. Again, a favourite word in 2 Peter is *ἐπίγνωσις* (i. 2, 3, 8, ii. 20; it is not a specially Pauline word, though often used by St. Paul). All these differences may admit of explanation from the difference of subject. The theme of 1 Peter is that Hope of the promised land which sustains the pilgrim's heart in his toilsome march through the desert. And to the eye of Hope the Last Day appears as a manifestation of the Lord's glory. On the other hand, the object of 2 Peter is to fortify his readers against the seductions of false freedom and speculative error. For him, therefore, leading thoughts are the knowledge of the Lord and the terrors of the Day of Judgment. Further, while the tone of the First Epistle is fatherly and pastoral, that of the Second is, though with marked exceptions, authoritative and denunciatory. It can hardly be said that the differences just noted are greater than can be accounted for by these considerations.

Let us pass on to the speculative theology of 2 Peter.

As in the First Epistle the Three Names are used.

God is Father of Christ (i. 17). That He is not actually called Father of the Christian is probably a mere accident; yet it must be noticed that this idea is not prominent in 1 Peter. But a striking feature of the Epistle is the use of reverential periphrases—*ἡ μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα*, i. 17; *ἡ θεία δύναμις*, i. 3; *θεία φύσις*, i. 4. Here we shall observe a remarkable similarity of devotional attitude (in both Epistles the predominant feeling towards God is one of intense awe) combined with an equally remarkable dissimilarity of expression.

The Holy Ghost is only mentioned as the inspirer of the Hebrew prophets (i. 21).

The Christology of the Epistle is its most distinctive point. Christ is "our God" (i. 1). If Spitta is right, as he probably is, in preferring the shorter reading in the next verse, it is to Christ in particular that the words *θεία δύναμις* and *θεία φύσις* belong. He is our *δεσπότης* (ii. 1), and it is His *ἐντολή* that we are to obey (iii. 2). His is the *αἰώνιος βασιλεία* (i. 11; cf. Luke i. 33; Apoc. xi. 15). There is the usual difficulty in iii. 8, 9, 10, to decide whether *Κύριος*, *ὁ Κύριος*, mean specially Christ or God; but it is here evident that the question is immaterial. Finally, Christ is the giver of grace and knowledge (iii. 18), as He is the object of *ἐπίγνωσις* (i. 8), and to Him alone the concluding doxology is addressed. Yet He is distinct from, and in some sense subordinate to His Father, from whom He received honour and glory (i. 17).

The subject of the Epistle is, no doubt, the cause of the prominence assigned to our Lord. What the Mockers denied was His

Parousia; what the False Teachers broke was His command. They did not probably deny the divine origin of the Decalogue; what they asserted was that Christ had abrogated it; and St. Peter insists that Christ had not only preached, but authoritatively enacted the moral law of the Church, that in His "I say unto you" the Way of Righteousness received divine sanction. But what we are to ask is, whether the Christology of 2 Peter differs from that of 1 Peter? The answer is, that if we attenuate 1 Peter on the points in question—the pre-existence of Christ, the use of "Lord," the "Name," the doxology—and at the same time interpret strictly or slightly harden the language of 2 Peter, it is possible to make a distinction between the two Epistles. But if we apply the same rule to both, there is really no difference at all.

Yet here again in expression, though not in idea, there is a difference between the two. The author of the Second Epistle is fond of the word "Saviour," which he applies to Christ five times, not singly by itself, but in solemn formulas (i. 1, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ. X. : i. 11, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰ. X. : cf. ii. 20, iii. 2, iii. 18). Elsewhere in the New Testament, though not so commonly as we might have expected, σωτήρ is used to describe the work of Christ, as a predicate (Luke ii. 11; John iv. 42; Acts v. 31, xiii. 23; Phil. iii. 20). Even in the Pastorals, where the word is more frequent, it seems still to retain a distinctly predicative force; see 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 4, where we may translate "Christ Jesus who is our Saviour"; so also Tit. ii. 13, iii. 6. Nowhere in the New Testament is "the Saviour" used as a synonym for Jesus Christ. But in 2 Peter, especially in iii. 2, "our Lord and Saviour," σωτήρ appears as a title and almost a name. In 1 Peter σωτήρ does not occur.

We can hardly say with confidence that this mode of expression is later in date. Quite conceivably also the same man might use it in one Epistle and not in another. But again we cannot see why the difference in the subject of the two Epistles should cause this particular variation of language. Further, devotional phrases like this have often a personal character. Origen, for instance, constantly speaks of "My Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," while Clement of Alexandria never does so. Here again the thought is precisely the same as that of 1 Peter, where redemption is dwelt upon with great iteration, but the form of expression is not the same.

Other points falling under the head of doctrine, the author's belief as to the fall of the angels, or the creation and destruction of the world, are explained in the notes; the subject of the world-fire has been discussed also in a previous section. It is sufficient to say here that they afford no indication of date, and that, in so far as they presume a certain use of Apocrypha, they are quite in keeping with 1 Peter.

§ 6. TO WHOM AND AGAINST WHOM WAS 2 PETER WRITTEN?

The words which we find in iii. 1, "this second Epistle I write unto you," have generally been taken to mean that 2 Peter was addressed to the same Churches as the first. Some critics, notably Spitta and Zahn, deny this, chiefly on the ground that the former letter here referred to does not appear to have dealt with the same topics as 1 Peter. But this is not a conclusive reason. Jude (3, 4) may be taken to show that the disorders complained of, had broken out suddenly and unexpectedly; and, even if we are to explain the future tenses of 2 Peter with grammatical rigour, we get the same idea—a new and unlooked for danger had suddenly become imminent. It follows that a previous letter addressed to the same Churches could not have resembled the later letter either in subject or in tone. The former letter, if mentioned at all, could only be described in general terms as making against Antinomianism and the denial of the Parousia quite as conclusively though not so explicitly as the later (see notes on the passage).

The point has some bearing on the question of authenticity. If 2 Peter was written late in the second century, why did the forger refer in this ambiguous way to a former letter? and why did he say nothing about the Diaspora in the Address? People say that he was transparently anxious to identify himself with St. Peter. Why then did he not do so in those places where it was so obvious and so easy? Certainly the obscurity is rather in favour of the authenticity of the Epistle. A genuine author, who is quite sure of himself, may be excused a little carelessness. Shall we say that the forger was so clever, that he was afraid to show his hand too openly? But this is just what he is charged with doing; and yet again he is supposed to be so stupid, that, having called himself an apostle in the Address, he tells us plainly that he was not an apostle in iii. 2. He is a very shadowy and inconsistent personage.

There is no reason why the apostle, having written to the Diaspora such an Epistle as 1 Peter, should not within a very short time have written to the same people one just like 2 Peter. We often do send very dissimilar letters to the same person within a week. We write to a friend at a distance under the impression that he is quite prosperous; in a few days we are sending fresh messages full of alarm, or warning, or indignation. We have received disquieting news in the interval. Probably, if St. Paul had written to the Galatians three days before he did, he would have selected very different topics. And yet we might say, "I have always told you the same thing. Look back at what I wrote in the past, and you will see that you were forewarned."

There is nothing in the body of the Epistle to show that the

recipients of 2 Peter were not the same as those of 1 Peter. The pronoun *ἡμῶν* in i. 1 has been taken to mean that the writer belonged to a Jewish Church and that he was addressing Gentiles; and the fact that St. Paul had written to them has been interpreted in the same way; but neither of these reasons is good for much. On the other hand, it has been maintained that the Epistle is directed to Jewish Christians. The phrase *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου* is as applicable to one as to the other. What is true of 1 Peter is true also of 2 Peter; the author makes no distinction at all between Jew and Gentile converts; in his eyes both are Christians, all Christians are alike, and the life of the patriarchs exhibits the same faith and obedience that are required of all Christians. In this important point he is Petrine and not Pauline. He does not say expressly that he had himself preached the gospel to his readers; we cannot so press the *ἐγνωρίσαμεν* of i. 16; nor is it necessary to suppose that any of the Twelve had ministered among them (see note on iii. 2). The language of the Epistle only means that the people addressed knew quite well the doctrine of the apostles, and that it was diametrically opposed to that of the false teachers. How long these Churches had existed we cannot say; neither i. 12 nor iii. 4 justifies the inference that they were of old standing.

If 2 Peter was not directed to the Churches of Asia Minor, we do not know what was its destination; though we may feel quite certain that, like all other Epistles, it was addressed to the Christian community of some particular district and not to the Church at large. Beyond a doubt this is the impression which the author wishes to convey. These people had received a particular letter from St. Paul, a particular letter from St. Peter, and were exposed at the time to a particular danger. In this district there had been, or seemed likely in the near future to be, an attempt to propagate Antinomian doctrines, and to discredit the belief in the Second Advent. Who were these false teachers and mockers? And first, were they in part or in whole the same people or not?

In Germany there has been a strong tendency to distinguish them, and Kühl goes so far as to say that it is wholly uncritical to ignore the difference. But this view rests solely upon the belief in the priority of Jude, and is not confirmed by anything in the text of 2 Peter. Indeed, if we look at the matter in the light of common sense, it is quite certain that an Antinomian could not accept the doctrine of the Second Advent as it was held by the Apostolic Church. It is possible to reject the belief in judgment after death without impugning the moral law, but it is certain that among the adherents of this view there will be many who regard it as emancipating them from all restraint. There is therefore no difficulty in identifying the false teachers with the mockers. 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.

At what date may we suppose these sceptical Antinomians to have appeared? Schenkel, Mangold, Völter, and Holtzmann (see Spitta, p. 503) think that they were the Carpocratians ; but this view is historically impossible. The second chapter of 2 Peter is either older than Jude or copied from Jude, and Jude is older than Carpocrates (see on this point the Introduction to Jude). Professor Harnack thinks that 2 Peter appeared between 150 (or more probably 160) and 175, in the midst of the Gnostic controversy ; that Jude was written between 100 and 130 ; and that the author of Jude was aiming, not at the Carpocratians, but at the older forms of Gnosticism, " Archontics, Phibionites, Kainites, Severians, Nicolaitans " (*Chronologie*, p. 466). But all these sects, so far as we are acquainted with them (of the Archontics our knowledge is slender and late ; of the Nicolaitans we know nothing except what we read in the New Testament ; and the Severians did not misinterpret Paul, but rejected his Epistles altogether, Eus. *H. E.* iv. 29. 5), exhibit the fundamental Gnostic trait of dualism, to which there is not the slightest allusion in Jude or in 2 Peter. Yet the latter Epistle must surely have said something on the point when dealing with the subject of creation. Again, the Gnostic principle of the evil nature of matter led equally to immorality and to extreme asceticism ; but to this latter feature again we find no allusion in Jude or 2 Peter. Nor do we meet with any reference to the " genealogies," or to the general Gnostic view of the Old Testament as the work of the Demiurge. In some shape or another Gnosticism existed in the East at a very early time ; one of its sources is Zoroastrianism, and serpent worship is exceedingly ancient. But it cannot be denied that Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles are much more anti-Gnostic than 2 Peter or Jude.

Every feature in the description of the false teachers and mockers is to be found in the apostolic age. If they had " eyes full of adultery," there were those at Corinth who defended incest. If they " blasphemed dignities," there were those who spoke evil of St. Paul. They profaned the Agape, so did the Corinthians. They mocked at the Parousia, and some of the Corinthians denied that there was any resurrection. They used *πλαστοὶ λόγοι*, and some of the Corinthians relied upon " a knowledge which puffeth up." Every point is common, except the charge of pecuniary extortion, which is repeatedly made in 2 Peter. But it is a necessity of the case that a false teacher should live by the contributions of his credulous adherents, and in the eyes of an apostle this would be extortion. It has been thought that the doubt about the Parousia could not be felt in the primitive Church ; but it certainly was.

Some denied the Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 12), and were warned by St. Paul that they might as well say, "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." What they denied was clearly the future life, not merely the Resurrection of the flesh; for belief in a purely spiritual after-life does not involve moral indifference. Whether their scepticism came from Sadduceeism or from philosophy, we cannot say. Others again, at Thessalonica (1 Thess. iv. 13-18), were sadly perplexed by difficulties of another kind. Those who were alive at Christ's coming would enter into His kingdom, but what would be the fate of those who had died beforehand? This doubt would arise over the grave of the first Christian; we have an interesting and most pathetic case in point in the anguish of Irving over the loss of his son, who was taken away before the dawn of that millennium which the father thought to be so near. Others again, at Corinth, appear to have urged the familiar arguments against the resurrection of the flesh. We do not gather from 2 Peter the exact nature of the denial of the Parousia which is there denounced. But it appears to have been supported by a novel argument, derived from the unchanging order of the world. In this is probably involved a belief in the eternity of creation, which was widely held in the apostolic age (see Philo, *de Inc. Mundi*; and Ocellus Lucanus is probably pre-Christian).

It is evident that these false teachers were acquainted with the writings of St. Paul, and found in them expressions which, with a little manipulation, would serve their purpose. Here two questions arise. At what date may the Pauline Epistles have been used as a basis for Antinomianism? At what date may they have been spoken of in the terms used by 2 Peter?

To the first we may answer, that the words, if not the writings of the apostle, were already misinterpreted in this way at Corinth, and probably at Thessalonica. The second question is more difficult; it forms, indeed, the one argument in favour of the later date which has been assigned to 2 Peter.

Yet this argument is not convincing. St. Paul's letters were read in church from the very first, side by side with Moses and the Prophets. There can be no higher testimony to the veneration in which they were held than the fact that even in the apostle's lifetime men forged Pauline Epistles (2 Thess. ii. 2), careful as the apostle was to guard against fraud by an autograph subscription (1 Cor. xvi. 21; Gal. vi. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 17). Letters directed to one Church were sent on to another (Col. iv. 16), and there read publicly. Clearly the apostolic missives were treated with very high respect and scrutinised with great care. There is no difficulty in believing that they were also collected. Cicero's letters were kept together; why not those of Paul? What sort of conception are we to form of the early Church, if we are to imagine that St.

Peter had not read Galatians, in which he was personally attacked, or Corinthians, in which such an extraordinary state of things is described? It is not necessary to think of St. Peter as settled in Rome, holding in his hands all the strings of a great organisation, and receiving constant reports from his lieutenants. But is it possible to believe that one apostle knew nothing about another, or that he did not care what his brethren were doing or saying? There was nothing to prevent his getting every epistle that circulated in the Church within a month or two of its publication. If he agreed with his brother apostle, he would desire to be comforted and edified by some token of his activity and success; if he did not quite agree with him, as was the case between St. Peter and St. Paul, he would be all the more anxious to know what the difference was, and how it showed itself in practical results.

It is quite possible that the author of 2 Peter regarded the Pauline Epistles as scripture; but even this is not conclusive proof that he lived in the second century. The Jews did not place all scripture on the same footing. St. Paul claims to be directly inspired by the Holy Spirit, the author of all scripture, and cannot have made any distinction of kind between Hebrew and Christian prophecy. St. Peter could hardly treat St. Paul as a false prophet; but, if he was a prophet, his Epistles are prophecies, and what is prophecy but scripture?

Certainly Clement of Rome had a collection of Pauline Epistles (Harnack in the Index of his edition gives references to eleven), and so had Ignatius (*ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ*, *Eph.* xii.), while Barnabas (iv. 14) quotes St. Matthew's Gospel as scripture. "Sed caueas," Professor Harnack adds in his note on the passage, "ne temere e γέγραπται illo conicias Barnabam nostrum scripta euangelica tanti aestimasse quanti Veteris Testamenti libros." The caution may perhaps be admitted, but it does not affect the point as regards 2 Peter. He, too, may have treated the Pauline Epistles as scripture without setting them on an equality with the books of Moses. See Plummer on 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16 in Ellicott's *Commentary*.

Thus we have no need to go down to the time of the Scillitan Martyrs to find some kind of parallel for the language of 2 Peter. Even this much disputed passage, then, does not really prove anything against the authenticity of 2 Peter. Indeed it may be thought that a forger writing late in the second century, when St. Paul had been canonised, would not, unless he was amazingly clever, have spoken of that great apostle as "our beloved brother," nor would he have adopted a discreetly critical attitude towards him, and gently objected to his *δυσνόητα*. The last stroke in particular, if not simple nature, is the acme of art. It is easier to regard it as nature.

§ 7. DATE, AUTHENTICITY, AND OCCASION OF 2 PETER.

The preceding review seems to show (1) that 2 Peter is older than Jude ; (2) that it belongs to the same school of ecclesiastical thought as 1 Peter ; (3) that it contains no word, idea, or fact which does not belong to the apostolic age ; (4) that traces of the second century are absent at those points where they might have been confidently expected to occur ; (5) that the style differs from that of 1 Peter in some respects, but in others, notably in verbal iteration and in the discreet use of Apocrypha, resembles it.

These facts are best explained by the theory that the Epistle is really the work of St. Peter, but that a different amanuensis was employed.

On the other hand, those who hold (1) that 2 Peter borrows from the *Apocalypse of Peter* ; (2) that there is no clear trace of its existence before Clement of Alexandria ; (3) that it is later than Jude ; (4) that it is directed against Gnosticism ; (5) that it implies the existence of a Canon of the New Testament, will follow the opinion upheld by Dr. Chase and many other eminent scholars, and assign to the Epistle a date between 150 and 175.

In this case the Epistle is neither more nor less than a forgery. A good history of ancient forgeries would form a most useful book. Pseudonymous composition seems to have begun in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. Its earliest productions, letters of Plato, Aristotle, Phalaris, and so forth, were mere *jeux d'esprit*, like Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* ; but the flood of Orphic and Pythagorean fictions enumerated by Zeller had a serious object, that of recommending peculiar doctrines under shelter of an ancient and venerable name. Alexandrian Jews, as has been noticed above, practised the same dishonest art, in order to persuade cultivated Greeks that the doctrines of the Bible were "stolen" by the classic poets, or that "Plato was an Attic Moses." The early *Sibylline Oracles* belong to the same class. In the Church we find the manufacture of Pauline Epistles carried on in the lifetime of the apostle. In the second century Gnostics are accused of tampering with the text of scripture. They retorted that scripture, as read by the Catholics, was spurious or interpolated. From this time onward we find a great mass of pseudonymous writings. Some of them are forgeries in the worst sense of the word, teaching non-Christian or uneclesiastical doctrines in the name of our Lord and His apostles, and unquestionably intended to deceive. Such are the Gnostic Gospels and Acts, and perhaps we may add the *Clementine Homilies*. Others, like the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, are merely edifying romances of the same family as the modern religious novel. Others again, such as the *Apostolical Constitutions* or the

Apostolical Church Ordinance, describe the Church as it existed in the author's place and time, within a slender imaginative framework, in which the apostles are introduced as still alive. Books of this kind were probably not meant to delude, though they were certain to create delusion. Yet another class sprang from the insatiable craving to know more about the great personages of the early Church than we are told in the genuine books of the New Testament. Hence came a large crop of false Gospels and Acts.

It is difficult to see under which of these classes we can place 2 Peter. The Epistle is not unorthodox, it is not a romance, it contains no anachronism, at any rate none that is indisputable, and it tells us nothing new about St. Peter himself. The *Gospel of Peter* is heterodox, and altered the cry from the Cross, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*, in such a way as to prove that the Divinity of Jesus left Him before He died (*ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις κατέλειψάς με*: where *δύναμις* represents *ἀηλί*, found in L: cf. Clem. Alex. *Excerpta ex Theod.* i. 61). The *Apocalypse of Peter* professes to add to our knowledge of the future life, and draws its imagery from the heathen poets. The *Praedicatio Petri* tells us that Christ commanded His apostles not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years after the Ascension, probably quotes the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, opposes Docetism (*non sum daemonium incorporeum*), teaches communism (*μυμῆσασθε ἰσότητα Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔσται πένης*), is familiar with the later form of the polemic against Greeks and Jews, and generally exhibited such a character that Origen says, "It was written neither by Peter nor by anyone else who was inspired by the Spirit of God" (see the Fragments in *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*). In the *Περίοδου Πέτρον* mention was made of Peter's wife and daughter, and a piece of information was given about the apostle's personal appearance; he was said to have been bald (*GAL*, p. 134). Similarly, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* give a portrait of St. Paul (see Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*, p. 62), and some Gnostics had a portrait of Christ said to have been drawn by Pilate (*Iren.* i. 25. 6). Some of these Petrine pseudepigrapha were more or less orthodox, some, like the *Clementina*, are quite the reverse; but they were all peculiar, and all, as far as we have the means of judging, extremely unlike 2 Peter. We have to consider, then, the possibility of a forgery without any object, without any of the ordinary marks, without any resemblance to undoubted forgeries bearing the name of the same apostle. (See on this point some good remarks of Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 95.)

As to the place from which the Epistle was written we have no information. Professor Harnack, who holds that it is a forgery, thinks that it emanated from Egypt (*Chronologie*, p. 469). Dr. Chase holds the same opinion, on the grounds that the *Apocalypse of Peter* was probably written in Egypt, that 2 Peter makes use of the

Apocalypse, and, further, that the Epistle has some resemblance in phrase and thought to Philo and Clement. But the *Apocalypse* was read in Gaul (see above, pp. 207–209), in Rome (see the *Muratorianum*), and probably in many other places, at an early date; if it was copied, it might have been copied anywhere; there is no trace of Philonism in 2 Peter, and Clement was only accidentally and for a time connected with Alexandria. Jülicher (*Einleitung*, p. 187) suggests Egypt or Palestine as the birthplace of the Epistle. The reason for selecting Palestine is that if the false teachers are to be called Gnostics, they must be referred to one of those earlier and less known sects which had their domicile in that district or in the neighbouring regions of Syria. The truth appears to be that, unless the Epistle is what it professes to be, it is entirely in the air; we can say nothing, except that the forgery must have been old enough to impose upon Clement of Alexandria, and probably upon Pantænus also.

There are difficulties on either hand. But, if we pay due attention to the number and gravity of these disturbing phenomena, if we put steadily aside all prepossessions and compare the book impartially with the rest of the New Testament, it seems far easier to place 2 Peter in the first century than in the second. If we consider, again, the absence of any allusion to persecution, or to the fall of Jerusalem, it is far easier to place it early in the first century than late. But is not this the same thing as saying that it is authentic? If it was written in St. Peter's name and lifetime, we may well think that it was written by his direction and under his supervision.

We may feel certain that 2 Peter is later than 1 Corinthians. The more probable inference from iii. 1 is that it is also later than 1 Peter. The interval of time may have been very short. There were in Corinth false teachers, probably claiming to be prophets, to whom the description of the false teachers in 2 Peter would apply in every feature (see Zahn, ii. p. 101). These men would be well known to St. Peter, who had adherents in Corinth, if he had not visited the town himself. There are, then, two possibilities. If we think that the former Epistle referred to in iii. 1 is non-existent, it is within the bounds of credibility that 2 Peter was written before 1 Peter, and directed to the party of Cephas in Corinth itself. We might then discover in the rather obscure phrase, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὑμῶν* (iii. 2), an answer to St. Paul's *οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι* (2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11). "Your apostles" may very well mean the Twelve. Again, the Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians were probably at least three in number (see 1 Cor. v. 9), and thus we should get a good explanation of the words *ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς*, which have caused so much trouble. Further, if we are to suppose that the Epistle was from the first regarded with suspicion by a certain party

in the Church, the fact would thus be easily accounted for. St. Paul himself would consider the Epistle as an intrusion, and his friends would endeavour to prevent its circulation. Yet upon the whole this tempting view is not the more probable. It is easier to suppose that not all the Corinthian prophets were reduced to order by St. Paul, that some of them were making their way towards Asia Minor, or had already begun work in one of the towns in that country. Nicolaitans, who were men of the same stamp, existed in the seven Churches at the date of the Apocalypse, and our Epistle may have been called forth by the first outbreak of that heresy. If we adopt this view we can retain the current explanation of 2 Pet. iii. 1, and at the same time account for the intermingling of the future and present tenses in the description of the false teachers. They were already preaching in some places, and might shortly be expected in others also. See Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, pp. 69, 70.

In this case again, though the Epistle would not cause so much offence as if it had been actually directed to a party at Corinth, it might still excite the suspicions of the editors of the Peshito. In the second century there were in the East many sects, the Severians (these have been noticed above), the Ebionites (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 27. 4; *Iren.* i. 26. 2), the Elkesaites (*Origen* in *Eus. H. E.* vi. 38), who rejected St. Paul, and spoke against him in very violent terms. Every book which seemed to incline in this direction would be regarded with unfriendly eyes by the orthodox party. It is noticeable that three of the books which were omitted from the Peshito are open more or less to this objection, the Epistle of St. James, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, and the Apocalypse. Spitta observes with perfect truth that the reasons for which documents were accepted or rejected by the early Church were not what we understand by the word "critical." Men guided their judgment largely by what we may call the pedigree of the document in question, but still more by its relation to the orthodoxy of the time. The *Epistolarium* of the New Testament was almost wholly Pauline, and Paulinism shaped the norm of apostolicity. It is true that the men of the second century were not Pauline, but they thought they were, and hence arose the curious inconsistency that those very men who agreed at bottom with St. Peter and St. James could not bear to think that these two apostles had ever uttered a word in their own defence against the sharp sayings of St. Paul. They explained the differences away, or they left out of their canon pieces which struck them as anti-Pauline. They admitted Galatians and doubted 2 Peter. Fortunately there were some who took a different view. Otherwise we should hardly have known that in the primitive Church there existed, not only the radicalism of St. Paul and the stubborn conservatism of the Judaizing section, but also the great central party represented by the Twelve Apostles. The

cardinal error of Baur and his followers, an error which vitiated their many great services to Christian scholarship, was that they arranged these Church divisions in chronological order, as if we could suppose that in England or any other country the Tories produced the Whigs, and, finally, that the fusion of these two gave birth to the men of moderation and common sense. What history teaches us is that, both in secular and religious affairs, the broad catholic party, the party which has no name, always exists and is always powerful. It is Reason, flanked on both wings by Emotion, on the left by eagerness for the Future, on the right by strong affection for the Past. Both Emotions belong to Reason, and Reason knows how to use them in time and in measure. It shapes that view of Christianity which we find in the Synoptic Gospels, in the Book of Acts, and in the Epistles of Peter. It is a disciplinary and logical view; it regards the Bible as a continuous revelation, and it limits the right of private judgment. The "Judaisers" never found a place in the Canon, though James sheltered them as far as he could. On the other wing, the author of Hebrews leans towards St. John, the Catholic Mystic, and, finally, in St. Paul we find the Protestant Mystic.

Thus we gain an intelligible view of the early Church, and thus we see the value of 2 Peter. Value is not the same as authenticity. Yet, if it has been shown that the Epistle fills a definite place, represents a definite party, and expresses views that were really held by St. Peter, something not inconsiderable has been effected towards the removal of hostile preoccupations.

The conclusion at which Dr. Zahn arrives, after an elaborate discussion of all the points involved, is that 2 Peter was written before 1 Peter by the apostle's own hand, not as the former Epistle by an amanuensis or representative (thus the difference of style is accounted for); that it was sent probably from Antioch shortly before the time when St. Peter went to Rome (60-63), to Jewish Churches in Palestine; and that it was called forth by the Corinthian disorders, which, as the apostle feared, might shortly attack his own special flock.

Zahn's views rest on so strong a support of learning and good sense that they must be treated with great respect. The weak point in his final verdict appears to me, if I may venture to say so, to be the characterisation of the recipients of the Epistle as Jews. The conclusion involved, that St. Paul had written an Epistle to a Jewish Church, is not impossible, for it is extremely difficult to see what precisely is meant by Gal. ii. 9; still it is not probable. On the other side, Zahn himself allows that 1 Peter was written, if not by the hand, yet by the direction of St. Peter to Gentile communities; and there can be little doubt that St. Peter had close relations with Gentile Christians in Corinth, Galatia, and Rome. St. Peter again

makes no distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and there is nothing in 2 Peter to differentiate its first readers from those of 1 Peter.

If Dr. Zahn is right in thinking that the former Epistle referred to in iii. 1 is lost, the easiest inference is that 2 Peter was directed to Corinth not long after the date of the Pauline Epistles, from whatever place happened to be St. Peter's residence at the time. The difference of style may be explained as by Dr. Zahn; but here again it is more natural to suppose that, if St. Peter availed himself of the services of a draughtsman or secretary for one Epistle, this was his rule. That he would be assisted at one time by one brother at another time by another, is not only possible, but certain, from the nature of things.

NOTES ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

The Title. \aleph A B have Πέτρον β̄: C, Πέτρον ἐπιστολὴ β̄: K and many cursives, Πέτρον ἐπιστολὴ δευτέρα: other cursives, Πέτρον ἐπιστολὴ καθολικὴ δευτέρα: L, ἐπιστολὴ καθολικὴ δευτέρα τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρον: the Codex Amiatinus, *incipit epistula petri apostoli*, ii.: the Codex Fuldensis, *incipit epistula sci. petri secunda*.

I. 1. "Symeon (Simon) Peter, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained a faith of equal honour with us in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

\aleph A K L P, other inferior MS. authorities, and Theophylact have Συμεών: and this reading was known also to Oecumenius. So Tischendorf. B, many cursives, and the Versions have Σίμων. So WH (giving Συμεών in the margin).

For the names of the apostle see note on 1 Pet. i. 1.

The original Hebrew form, Symeon, is found elsewhere only in Acts xv. 14, where it is used by the Apostle St. James. Theophylact says, τοῦ Συμεών τὸ Σίμων ὑποκορισμός ἐστιν, regarding the latter as a home-grown Hebrew diminutive of the former. In 1 Macc. ii. 3, 65, Simon and Symeon are used indifferently of the same son of Mattathias. It is, however, possible that the shorter form was shaped by Gentile influence, Simon or Simo (from *simus*) being familiar to Latins and Greeks, as we see from Plautus and Terence. See Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. p. 21.

Hofmann, Huther, Schott, Kühl, Zahn, Spitta, accept Symeon as the correct reading. Some think that this form of the name is here used to emphasise the Hebrew character of the writer, and consequently that also of the recipients of the letter; but it is difficult to build such an inference on so slender a basis. The First Epistle makes no distinction between Jew and Gentile, nor does the Second. But, if the reading is correct, it is an argument for the early date of the Epistle, as the form Symeon was not in use in the second century. Simon is found in *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in the *Gospel of Peter*, in the fragments of the *Ebionite Gospel* (in Hilgenfeld), in the *Apostolic Church Order (Duae Viae, in Hilgenfeld)*, in the letters of Peter and Clement to James, prefixed to the *Homilies*, and regularly in the *Homilies* themselves.

No instance of Symeon is quoted. If the use of the Hebrew form here is an archaism, it is very dexterous. For the collocation, Simon Peter, see note already referred to.

δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Rom. i. 1, Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος; Phil. i. 1, Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; Tit. i. 1, Παῦλος δοῦλος Θεοῦ ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; Jas. i. 1, Ἰάκωβος Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος; Jude 1, Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος; Apoc. i. 1, τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ ἢ Θεοῦ) Ἰωάννη. Δοῦλος is used of Christians in general, Acts ii. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 6; Col. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 24, and frequently in the Apocalypse. In 1 Pet. ii. 16 we have δοῦλοι Θεοῦ, but the usual phrase is δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ. They are slaves of Christ as Lord; the correlative of δοῦλος being frequently Κύριος (Matt. xxiv. 50). But a more familiar correlative of δοῦλος is δεσπότης, and possibly this is the word that was in St. Peter's mind (see below, ii. 1). The question has been raised whether "slave of Christ" does not here mean the same as apostle. The phrase is by no means exclusively used of apostles, as will be seen from the passages quoted. As in 1 Pet. v. 1, so here the writer uses first an expression which puts him on a level with those to whom he is speaking before he claims a hearing by right of his apostleship.

ἰσότημον (the word is not found elsewhere in the New Testament) has often been taken to mean "of equal value." So R.V. "a like (in margin 'equally') precious faith"; but the precise sense is rather "equal in honour," or "privileges." Mr. Field, in his *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, points out that τιμή has the two meanings of value and of honour, and that while πολύτιμος generally follows the first, δμότιμος and ισότημος always follow the second. Ἰσότημος is specially used of civic equality; thus Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 3. 1, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχείᾳ πολιτείας αὐτοῦς ἤξιώσε καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν ισότημον ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσαι καὶ Ἕλλησι; Lucian, *Hermot.* 24, αὐτίκα μάλα πολίτην ὄντα τοῦτον, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ, καὶ ισότημον ἅπασιν (other references in Liddell and Scott). Probably St. Peter has this civic sense of the word in his mind. Faith makes those to whom he is writing burgesses in the city of God equally with the apostles.

ἡμῖν is equivalent to τῇ ἡμῶν. There is much difference of opinion as to the meaning of this "we." (1) A large number of commentators take it of Jewish Christians as opposed to Gentile, quoting Peter's words in Acts xi. 17, τὴν ἴσην δωρεάν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν. But the Epistle nowhere refers to this distinction, which, indeed, has nothing to do with the points handled. (2) "We" might be taken to denote the Church from which the apostle was writing, and with which he identified himself. This interpretation, however, is barred by ver. 4, from which it is clear

that "you" stand in the relation of disciples to "us." (3) "We," according to an ordinary Greek usage, might mean St. Peter alone; but there is no reason for thus restricting the pronoun here, and it will be noticed that when the writer speaks of himself alone he uses the first person singular (i. 12-15). (4) Bengel, followed by others, including in recent times Keil, Spitta, von Soden, take the pronoun to refer to the apostles generally. This gives much the best sense. Throughout this chapter St. Peter is thinking of the contrast between the doctrine of the apostles and that of the False Teachers. "Your faith," he seems to say, "is as honourable as ours, though you received yours from us and we received ours from Christ."

λαχοῦσι. "*Sortitis*; non sibi ipsi pararunt," Bengel. Their faith was given to them by the mercy of God.

ἐν δικαιοσύνη. As in 1 Peter (ii. 24, iii. 12, 14, 18, iv. 18), so in 2 Peter (ii. 5, 7, 8, 21, iii. 13), *δίκαιος* and *δικαιοσύνη* bear the same meaning as in the Old Testament. It is therefore quite impossible to find here any reference to the Pauline doctrine of justification. Ἐν δικαιοσύνη can hardly be taken with πίστιν. Even if, in Rom. iii. 25, *πίστις ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ* meant "faith in His Blood," which is exceedingly doubtful, "faith in the justice of God" would be a remarkable expression. Nor can we take as parallels Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15, where faith is said to be in Christ Jesus, for these are merely expressions of the habitual Pauline thought that the whole life of the believer is in his Lord. We cannot translate "faith issuing in a righteousness of God"; for the preposition will not bear this meaning. Nor, again, can we translate "faith standing in, or built upon, the (or a) righteousness of God"; for if we are to give righteousness here its Pauline sense of forensic or imputed righteousness, this follows faith, and does not precede it; while, if we are to give the word its proper Petrine sense, faith rests, not on the divine justice, but on the divine goodness. For this last reason it seems impossible to connect ἐν δικαιοσύνη with λαχοῦσι. The verb *λαγχάνειν* implies a gift of favour, and favours are not received, strictly speaking, from justice. It remains, therefore, to find the determining word in *ἰσότημον*. God is Just, and gives to all Christians equal privileges in His City.

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It has been much disputed whether Two Persons are here spoken of, or only One. Among recent commentators, Alford, Wiesinger, Brückner, Steinfass, Huther take the former view; Spitta and von Soden, the latter; Kühn answers the question with a *non liquet*. The argument has two branches, the grammatical and the historical. As regards the grammar, it may be urged:

1. That the combination of the two substantives under one article is a very strong reason for regarding the two substantives

as names of the same person. It is hardly open for anyone to translate in 1 Pet. i. 3 ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ by "the God and Father," and yet here to decline to translate ὁ Θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ by "the God and Saviour." This point is rather strengthened than weakened by the addition of ἡμῶν to Θεός. It must be admitted that if the author intended to distinguish two persons, he has expressed himself with singular inaccuracy.

2. If the author had intended to distinguish two persons, it is exceedingly doubtful whether he could have omitted the article before σωτήρος. Σωτήρ is used in the New Testament of God or of Christ twenty-three times. Of these instances, two are in St. Luke's Gospel; one in the Gospel, one in the Epistles of St. John; two in Acts; one in Philippians, ten in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul; five in 2 Peter; one in Jude. It is used eight times of God, fourteen times of Christ; one passage, Tit. ii. 13, is doubted. As used of God, σωτήρ has the article five times, and dispenses with it three times (1 Tim. i. 1, iv. 10; Jude 25). As used of Christ it is anarthrous in Luke ii. 11; Acts v. 31, xiii. 23; 1 John iv. 14, but in no one of these passages would the article be in place. In Phil. iii. 20, also, it is anarthrous, and here possibly the article might have been used. Yet in this, the only passage where St. Paul uses σωτήρ outside of the Pastoral Epistles, the meaning may very well be "we expect," not *the* Saviour, but "*a* Saviour."

3. But what we have specially to regard is the usage not of other writers, but of 2 Peter. Five times the author uses σωτήρ, and always in very similar phrases. Here we have τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: below, i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: iii. 2, τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος. Though σωτήρ is one of his favourite words he never uses it alone, but always couples it under the same article with another name. There is strong reason for thinking that the two names always belong to the same person; undoubtedly they do so in four cases out of the five.

Spitta and von Soden, two very keen critics, regard these arguments as decisive. Alford says, "Undoubtedly, as in Tit. ii. 13, in strict grammatical propriety, both Θεοῦ and σωτήρος would be predicates of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. But here, as there, considerations interpose, which seem to remove the strict grammatical rendering out of the range of probable meaning." Yet the first and sovereign duty of the commentator is to ascertain, and to guide himself by the grammatical sense.

The historical difficulty may be posed in the words of Kühn. "The immediate transfer of Θεός to Christ might find a parallel in Heb. i. 8, and in the doxologies addressed to Christ in Rom. ix. 5; Heb. xiii. 21; on the other hand, the immediate attributive con-

nexion of Θεός with Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is without analogy." But there is really nothing startling in the phrase of 2 Peter, if we think of John i. 1, xx. 28; or the three, possibly five, doxologies addressed indifferently to Christ or Jesus Christ (Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 464), one of which forms the conclusion of this Epistle; or the meaning of "Lord" in 1 Peter; or the language of the Apocalypse. Σωτήρ itself is a divine title, transferred without hesitation from Jehovah to Jesus Christ. But after all, the question is not what other authors say, but what 2 Peter says.

It may be argued that because 2 Peter is here speaking of one person, he belongs to the post-apostolic age—to that of Ignatius, who speaks of Jesus Christ as ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, *Εφῆ.*, Preface (see Lightfoot's note); but there is no sufficient reason for relegating this phrase to the second century.

A final strong argument for supposing that St. Peter is here speaking of One Person only, is that those who consider him to be speaking of Two have great difficulty in explaining the word *δικαιοσύνη*. Granting for the moment that Two Persons are here intended, is their righteousness the same, or different? Are we to say with Wiesinger that God is righteous in so far as He ordained the Atonement, Jesus Christ in so far as He accomplished it? or must we not think with Spitta, that the Atonement is not here in question at all; because it can hardly be meant that, on the ground of the Atonement, a faith has been given to the readers of the Epistle which is *ισότιμος* to that of the writer? The righteousness intended is not that which makes atonement, but that which gives equally. But, if the righteousness is one and the same, it becomes exceedingly difficult to keep God and Jesus Christ apart.

2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 2, where precisely the same phrase is found. Jude, in his Address (ἐλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη), follows the same model, but loosely.

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. So B C K, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Lachm., Treg., Tisch., WH: **κ** A L, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: ^{jsct.} τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν: P am fu demid harl corb², τοῦ Κυρίου: a^{scr} c^{scr} m⁸⁷ m⁸⁴ Syriac, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: the Sahidic omits the whole verse. There is great variety of readings here, and all MSS. of 2 Peter are bad (see Introduction). Spitta, following Bengel, regards τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν as the original out of which all these variants arose, on the grounds that (1) the phrase is much more likely to have been expanded than curtailed; (2) that the object of γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις, in i. 8, ii. 20, iii. 18, is Christ alone; (3) that the diplomatic evidence of the shorter reading is by no means inconsiderable, P, which for 2 Peter has great value, being supported by the Itala, the best MSS. of the Vulgate, and the Syriac. It should, however, be observed,

that in regard to 2 Peter, the Syriac is a late and inferior authority. Further, it is to be observed (4) that from the following words, τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, it may be inferred, with great probability, that only one Divine Person was here mentioned. Upon the whole, it may be said that internal probability is strongly, if not conclusively, in favour of the shorter reading. External evidence must be left to the textual critics, but it is certain that there are passages in 2 Peter where no MS. can be relied upon. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 61, takes the same view as Spitta.

ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. If we compare vers. 5, 6, 8, there appears to be a difference intended between γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις. The former, as in 1 Pet. iii. 7, appears to denote good sense, understanding, practical wisdom; the latter is used of the knowledge of Christ. Ἐπίγνωσις is used by Plutarch of scientific knowledge, for instance, of music; and St. Peter may mean that the knowledge of Christ is the master-science, the ἀρχιτεκτονική. But, generally speaking, in the New Testament it is not easy to keep γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις distinct.

3. ὡς, followed by the genitive absolute, may be rendered "seeing that." May grace and peace be multiplied unto you in the knowledge of Christ (and I pray this with confidence), seeing that He has granted unto us (His apostles) all things that conduce to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that called us, by His own glory and virtue.

τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. Christ has θεία δύναμις because He is ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. The phrase is found in an inscription belonging to Stratonicea in Caria, the date of which is about A.D. 22. It is published in *CIG*, ii., No. 2715a b; and in part in Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 277, Eng. trans. p. 361. The expression θεία δύναμις, therefore, was current in St. Peter's lifetime. The author of our Epistle has a tendency to use reverent periphrases for the name of God, as in ver. 17 below. See Introduction, p. 235. Δύναμις is one of the leading words of the Epistle; note the emphasis with which it recurs in ver. 16, δύναμις καὶ παρουσία. The δύναμις, power and majesty, of Christ is the sword which St. Peter holds over the head of the False Teachers. Christ's divine power has given us apostles πάντα τὰ πρὸς ζωῆν καὶ εὐσέβειαν through the knowledge of Him that called us. When He called us, He gave us the knowledge of Himself and, through that knowledge as the means, all that fosters life and Christian conduct.

τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς. He that called the apostles was Christ. Compare Matt. ix. 13, where Christ speaks of Himself as calling sinners. It was He also that called St. Paul, Acts ix. 5. That this is the right explanation seems clear from ver. 11 below. We are called by Christ into the kingdom of Christ. Again, ἐπίγνωσις is of Christ, vers. 2, 8. Generally speaking, in the New Testament it

is God, not Christ, that calls, but in Rom. i. 6 we have κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ. So N A C P, the Versions, Tisch., Lachm., Treg.; B K L, the bulk of later MSS., WH, read διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. "By His own glory and virtue," or "by glory and virtue." The divergence of reading is interesting mainly as showing the uncertainty of the text. Christ's glory might be called His own, though He received it from the Father (ver. 17); for what we have received is our own (1 Pet. iii. 1), and the glory belongs to Him, εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος (iii. 18). Von Soden thinks that δόξα and ἀρετή correspond to ζωή and εὐσέβεια: and if this view is taken, they may be regarded as synonymous with θεία φύσις, and opposed to φθορά in the following verse. Glory and virtue are the divine nature. But, as throughout this introduction St. Peter is paving the way for chaps. ii. and iii., and as it is his habit to introduce words which he means to explain later on (ισότης, ἐπίγνωσις, δύναμις), it is very probable that Spitta is right in regarding δόξα as an anticipation of the reference to the Transfiguration in vers. 16-18. Ἀρετή means the moral goodness of the Ἄμνος ἁμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος: this is the idea which the apostle immediately proceeds to develop.

It is remarkable that this familiar Greek word is not used in its familiar sense of human ethical virtue in the New Testament, except in Phil. iv. 8, here, and in ver. 5 below. "Virtue" is a secular and disciplinary term which, owing to the influence of St. Paul, has never made itself quite at home in theology. Readers of Butler's *Analogy* will know how it links itself on to the doctrine of habit and the idea of moral desert.

In the present passage the word forms a keynote. Christ has virtue, His disciples must add virtue to faith, but the False Teachers reject virtue altogether.

All commentators appear to couple ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ with τοῦ καλέσαντος, yet this construction seems extremely difficult. The moving cause of the call is not glory, but mercy. In 1 Pet. ii. 9, the issue, not the ground, of our calling is that we should tell forth the ἀρεταὶ of God. It is much easier to take the datives with δεδωρημένης: His divine power has given us all things by His glory and virtue, because the attributes are, in fact, the power which enables Him to bestow the gift. That this is the right construction seems clear from the following words, δι' ὧν (practically equivalent to αὐτῷ) δεδώρηται.

If but One Person is spoken of in ver. 1, and if the shorter reading is adopted in ver. 2, there can be no doubt that αὐτοῦ and τοῦ καλέσαντος both refer to Christ. But if Two Persons are mentioned in either place, difficulties arise, which are not very easy of solution. Thus αὐτοῦ is understood of God by Bengel, de Wette, Brückner, Wiesinger, Keil, and others. But the order of the words

is against this; and though it is quite natural for the writer, after calling Jesus Christ "our God," to speak of His "divine power," it does not seem quite natural to speak of "the divine power of God"; the phrase in this case becomes a mere tautology. Again, if *δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ* belong here to God, we must give up Spitta's explanation of *δόξα*, which has so much to recommend it, and deprive *ἀρετῇ* of all direct bearing upon the subject of the Epistle. As applied to God, *ἀρετῇ* or *ἀρεταί* means "excellence" (see note on 1 Pet. ii. 9), and is practically equivalent to *δόξα* (Hab. iii. 3; Isa. xlii. 8, xliii. 21).

4. δι' ὧν . . . δεδώρηται. Here, again, the text is in a very unsatisfactory condition. There is some evidence for δι' ὧν or δι' ἧς, and throughout the verse the chief MSS. differ in minute points, especially as to the order of the words; see Tischendorf. We may translate, "Whereby He hath granted unto us those precious and very great promises." Δεδώρηται is again middle (Dietlein makes it passive); the subject is better found in ἡ θεία δύναμις αὐτοῦ than in ὁ καλῶσας. The antecedent to δι' ὧν is δόξα καὶ ἀρετή. For the use of the superlative μέγιστα, see Blass, *Grammar*, p. 33. The ἐπαγγέλματα (the word is peculiar to 2 Peter) are explained in iii. 13 to mean the promise of a new heaven and a new earth, wherein righteousness dwells. Here, again, we have an instance of St. Peter's habit of anticipation, and a link between the introduction and the third chapter. Already the author is thinking of the doubts about the Parousia.

Hofmann finds the antecedent to δι' ὧν in πάντα: but it is not easy to see how these necessary aids to life and godliness can be spoken of as the means by which the promises are given. Rather they are the means by which the promises are held fast.

ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. "In order that through these (the promises) ye may become partakers of the divine nature." Christ has given us the apostles, as first recipients, custodians, witnesses, these promises, to the intent that you, whose faith is *ισότιμος* with ours, may escape the corruption of lust, and be made like God. But the "you" is not so emphatic as to require the insertion of ὑμεῖς.

Calvin, de Wette, Brückner, Hofmann, Spitta refer τούτων to τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐδείβειαν: Bengel found the antecedent in δόξα καὶ ἀρετή: but τὰυτα can hardly signify anything else than ἐπαγγέλματα, which comes so immediately before it.

The word θεῖος, which is here used for the second time, occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts xvii. 29, where St. Paul, speaking to Athenians, aptly speaks of τὸ θεῖον, the Deity, using a phrase familiar to cultivated Greeks. Here θεία φύσις has a similar ring; it belongs rather to Hellenism than to the Bible. We may compare the Stoic phrase, ἐντὸς εἶναι τῆς φύσεως τῆς θείας,

Stob. *Ecl.* p. 122 : or Philo, *de Somn.* i. 28 (i. 647), λογικῆς κεκοινωνήκασι φύσεως : or Joseph. *contr. Ap.* i. 26, θείας δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως. Φύσεως ἀνθρωπίνης κοινωνεῖν is quoted from an inscription belonging to the first century before Christ, Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 284, Eng. trans. p. 368. But it should be noticed that St. Peter's phrase is neither Stoic nor Platonist. What he says is that the Christian becomes by grace partaker of the Divine nature. What the heathen philosopher taught was that all men are so by nature. Professor Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 469) regards the phrase θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως as one of the proofs that 2 Peter was not written before the latter half of the second century. The question has been discussed in the Introduction. Here it may be said that the author of 2 Peter uses some half-dozen words that were current among educated men ; that such words as he uses were familiar in the first century ; that he shows less acquaintance with Hellenism than St. Luke or St. Paul ; that he is in no sense a philosopher, though this term might be applied to the author of Hebrews ; that he shows no acquaintance with the Gnostic controversy in chap. ii. ; and, when he is speaking of the destruction of the world by fire in chap. iii., makes no reference either to Stoicism or to Platonism.

Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως means very much the same as St. Paul's κοινωνία Πνεύματος, 2 Cor. xiii. 14 ; Phil. ii. 1. But St. Peter, who attaches a very different sense to Πνεῦμα (see notes on First Epistle), could hardly use the Pauline phrase.

ἀποφυγόντες. They will become partakers of the divine nature, not by escaping, but after escaping the corruption which is in the world and resides in desire. Ἀποφεύγειν, which is not used by any other writer in the New Testament, properly takes the accusative, as in ii. 20, below. 1 Peter uses only the plural ἐπιθυμίας. Here and in ii. 20 κόσμος may have an ethical sense which it hardly exhibits in 1 Peter. We may notice the classical use of the article, as in 1 Pet. iii. 3.

β. καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ. "Yes, and (καὶ . . . δέ) for this very reason," because when we have escaped from corruption the promises, if we hold them fast and follow them, will make us partakers of the divine nature. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 21, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὐπὲρ αὐτὸς ἔνεκα φίλων ᾤετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργοῦς ἔχοι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο συνεργὸς τοῖς φίλοις κράτιστος εἶναι, "For, for the very same reason for which he himself thought that he needed friends—that he might have helpers—he on his part endeavoured to be the best of helpers to his friends." So in Plato, αὐτὰ ταῦτα νῦν ἤκομεν, "That is the very reason why we have come." This adverbial usage of αὐτὸ τοῦτο, which is strictly analogous to that of τί, is quite classical ; see Krüger, *Griech. Gram.* xlv. 4 ; Blass, p. 271.

παρεισφέρειν is "to bring in" or "supply besides." The classical

phrase is *σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι*, but *σπουδὴν εἰσφέρειν* is quoted from Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 9. 2, *πᾶσαν σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεισθαι*, from the Stratonicean inscription (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 278, Eng. trans. p. 361).

ἐπιχορηγεῖν. In Athens the State found the chorus, the Choregus provided all that was necessary for its equipment. Hence *χορηγεῖν* came to mean generally "to furnish with," "to supply." The verb is commonly used by the moral philosophers. Thus Arist. *Eth. Nic.* i. 10. 15, *τοῖς ἔκτος ἀγαθοῖς ἰκανῶς κεχορηγημένος*, the natural gifts of man require to be equipped with, supplemented by external gifts of fortune. Cf. also Diog. Laert. vii. 128, *ὁ μέντοι Παναίτιος καὶ Ποσειδώνιος οὐκ αὐτάρκη λέγουσι τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἀλλὰ χρεῖαν εἶναι φασι καὶ ὑγείας καὶ χορηγίας καὶ ἰσχύος*. It is possible that the word is here used as an ethical term, but it was commonly employed without any reference to this scholastic application, thus Polybius, iii. 68. 8, *χορηγεῖν τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις*, and it is found in this general sense in 2 Cor. ix. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Gal. iii. 5; Col. ii. 19. In the compound *ἐπιχορηγεῖν* the preposition brings out the idea that the equipment is an addition to the original stock, but is not really wanted. Later Greek is much addicted to the needless emphasis of compound verbs. We should not omit to notice the Petrine and evangelical contrast between what God gives and what man adds to the gift. "Confer omnino parabolam de decem uirginibus, Matth. xxv. Flammula est id quod nobis absque nostro labore a Deo et ex Deo impertitur: sed oleum est id quod homo suo studio et fidelitate affundere debet, ut flammula nutriatur et augeatur. Sic extra parabolam res proponitur in hoc loco Petrino" (Bengel).

5-7. In the list of excellences which follows we have something analogous to the Stoic *προκοπή*, and it is quite possible that the writer may have heard of the Stoic doctrine; the word *προκόπτειν* was current, and is used by St. Paul in its Stoic sense in Gal. i. 14. The moral and spiritual life is regarded as a germ which is expanded by effort, one step leads on to another, and each step is made by the co-operation of the human will with the divine. The list begins with *πίστις*, practically another name for the divine gift of *ἐπίγνωσις*, and ends with *ἀγάπη*. In Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 8. 1-7, a similar list is *Πίστις, Ἐγκράτεια, Ἀπλότης, Ἐπιστήμη, Ἀκακία, Σεμνότης*: these are daughters one of another. In *Sim.* ix. 15, Hermas gives a list of twelve virtues or virgins which begins and ends in the same way. Harnack refers to *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, where we find the sequence *πίστις, φόβος, γνῶσις, ἀγάπη*. In later times Clement of Alexandria built his theory of the Two Lives on these passages.

St. Peter is thinking throughout of the False Teachers, whom he is about to attack.

Faith is to be supplemented by Virtue. See note on ver. 3.

Virtue is right conduct under discipline, by which faith, the principle or ἀρχή, is developed, good habits are established, and the mists of passionate desire (ἐπιθυμία) are dissipated.

Thus Virtue leads to Knowledge, not of spiritual mysteries as in 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 2; Col. ii. 2, but of the goodness and reasonableness of the will of God. It is that knowledge which makes the friend as distinct from the servant, John xv. 15.

Knowledge has been taken to mean practical skill in the details of Christian duty, "die Fürsichtigkeit, die in allen Dingen das rechte Mass innezuhalten versteht" (Luther). "Virtus facit alacres," says Bengel, "uigilantes, circumspectos, discretos, ut reputemus quid aliorum causa sit faciendum uel fugiendum, et quomodo, ubi, quando."

Knowledge begets Contenance, self-mastery, or self-restraint; the direct opposite of the *πλεονεξία* of the False Teachers.

Contenance issues in Patience, which understands that with God a thousand years are as one day (here St. Peter is looking forward to chap. iii.)—this in Godliness, a large word (see ver. 3) summing up the whole of the practical side of the Christian life—this again in Love of the Brethren (1 Pet. i. 22)—and this again in Ἀγάπη, the love of Christ (1 Pet. i. 8), and in Christ of all mankind.

Faith is here conceived of as in Heb. xi. 1, 3, as strong conviction, belief which determines action; this is the heavenly germ, which, if diligently fostered by obedience, issues in love, the perfection of the spiritual life. This is the view of 1 Peter and of the sub-apostolic Church.

Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* i. 9, starts three questions with regard to what he calls "happiness": (1) whether it is μαθητὸν ἢ ἐθιστόν: (2) whether it comes κατὰ τινα θείαν μοῖραν: or (3) whether it is διὰ τύχην. The third is the naturalistic view; the second on the whole is that of St. Paul; the first on the whole that of St. Peter, who would say that, given Faith, which comes from God (κατὰ τινα θείαν μοῖραν), much depends on the "thankworthy" obedience of man. This is the view of Aristotle himself, as it is also that of Bishop Butler. It is a view which makes ethical philosophy possible, because it leaves wide room for human reason and will. But there is no cause for supposing that St. Peter derived it from any other source than that of his own Christian experience.

8. ταῦτα γάρ. "For, if these things belong to you and increase, they make you not idle nor unfruitful with respect to the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." Πλεονάζω may mean either "to abound" or "to increase," but Spitta seems to be right in thinking that the latter sense is preferable here. Otherwise there is little difference between ὑπάρχοντα and πλεονάζοντα. There has been much discussion as to the precise meaning of εἰς in this passage; the point being whether ἐπίγνωσις is to be regarded as the end of the Christian

progress or as its beginning. On the side of the former view is the R.V., which translates "unto the knowledge"; so de Wette, Brückner, Huther, Fronmüller, Steinfass, Kühl; on the side of the second, the A.V. ("in the knowledge"), Bengel, Ewald, Hofmann, Schott, Weiss, Wiesinger, von Soden, and, substantially, Spitta. The dispute turns upon the question whether *εις* is to be taken with the adjectives or with the verb. *Καθιστάναι εις* means "to bring a person to a place," and we might conceivably translate "these things bring you, not being idle nor fruitless, unto the knowledge." But *καθιστάναι τινὰ ἀργόν* means "to make a person idle"; and if we adopt this construction, *εις* with its case will denote that in respect of which he is idle. The two constructions and the two translations must not be blended or confused, as they are in the R.V. *Καθίστησιν* must either mean "bring" or "make." But now a glance at vers. 2 and 3 will show that the Christian progress begins with *ἐπίγνωσις* (*διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως*) and is in *ἐπίγνωσις*. *Ἐπίγνωσις* is the germ which makes progress possible, and is developed by the progress, but is not represented here as the goal to which the progress tends. Here, as often, commentators have been biassed by the desire to bring the language of St. Peter into exact accordance with that of St. Paul, in Col. i. 10, *ἐν παντί ἔργῳ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ ἀξαναόμειοι εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The two apostles do not disagree here; for this knowledge, which grows with our growth, might very well be said to be the issue of all our strivings. But it is also their root, and this is the point which St. Peter wishes to bring out.

This verse is quoted in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, Eus. *H. E.* v. i. 45, *ὁ δὲ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς οὐκ ἀργὸς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος ἐγένετο*.

Θ. *ὧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα*. The words are equivalent in sense to *ὧ γὰρ μὴ ὑπάρχει ταῦτα καὶ πλεονάζει*, as *τυφλός, μυωπάζων, λήθην λαβών* to *ἀργὸς καὶ ἄκαρπος*. But the group of epithets in this verse gives the cause of the barrenness, and forms a second indictment against the False Teachers. They are not only barren trees (Luke xiii. 6), but they are blind leaders of the blind (Matt. xv. 14).

τυφλός. He is blind because he has lost the light of the *ἐπίγνωσις* of Christ which was given to him (ver. 3), and thus has never attained to *γνώσις*.

μυωπάζων. The correct form of this verb appears to be either *μυωπιάζειν* (cf. *ὑπωπιάζειν*), or *μυωπεῖν* (cf. *ὀξυωπεῖν*). Suidas has in one place *μυωπάζειν*, in another *μυωπιάζειν*. Commentators, following Beza and Budaeus, refer to Arist. *Problem.* xxxi. 16. 25; but though Aristotle there describes the *μύωψ*, he does not use *μυωπάζειν*, nor does the verb appear in the *Index* of Bonitz.

Μύωψ means "short-sighted"; *μυωπάζειν*, "to be short-sighted." The characteristics of a short-sighted man are that he sees things

dimly, or that he sees what is close at hand more distinctly than what is far off. The first gives tolerable sense, but many commentators prefer the second; the purblind see earth far more clearly than heaven (Beza, Grotius, Estius, de Wette, Huther), or sees that he is a member of the Church, and does not see clearly how and on what conditions he became one (Hofmann).

Wolf, Bochart, Spitta, and von Soden take *μύωψ* to mean "one who shuts his eyes" and will not see. But *μύωψ* never has this sense, though it is derived from *μύω*, and means properly "blinking." This explanation is dictated by the wish to find a climax in *τυφλός*, *μωπαζών*: but it is not necessary to suppose that St. Peter was a skilled rhetorician.

The Vulgate translates *manu tentans*, like a blind man, feeling his way with outstretched hand. It is difficult to see how this explanation, which represents the Greek *ψηλαφῶν*, arose.

P reads *μωπαζών*, which seems to imply a false derivation from *μῦς* and *ὀπή* (*μωπία* for "a mouse-hole" is found). Hence Oecumenius says, *μωπαζέειν δὲ τὸ τυφλώττειν εἴρηται, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν μῶν τυφλῶν εἰς ἅπαν διατελούντων*. In this way Erasmus explained the translation of the Vulgate, "*manu uiam tentans, deducta a muribus metaphora, qui parietem, aut tabulam, aut si quid aliud obuium fuerit, sequi solent, donec cauum nacti fuerint.*" See Suicer, *μωπαζώω*.

λήθην λαβόν. "Because he has forgotten"; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 9. 1, *διὰ χρόνου μήκος λήθην λαβόντες*: Athen. xii. 24, p. 523 A, *οἱ μετὰ τούτους λήθην λαβόντες τῆς Κρητῶν περὶ τὸν βίον εὐκοσμίας*. Thucydides, ii. 49. 5, has *τοὺς δὲ καὶ λήθη ἐλάμβανε*, "forgetfulness came upon" the sufferers from the plague. Bengel and von Soden would translate "having chosen to forget," but the notion of wilfulness does not seem to lie in the phrase.

τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν παλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. "The cleansing from his old sins" in Baptism. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21, *σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*. The reference to Baptism is made certain by the word *παλαι*: all previous sins were cleansed at that time. Here as in 1 Peter "sin" is concrete, and there is no necessary implication of birth-sin. The cleansing is based upon the sacrificial Death of Christ (1 Pet. i. 18, ii. 24, iii. 18), and is conditioned by *κλήσις καὶ ἐκλογή*, and by the faith and repentance of the cleansed (*συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα*), but is conveyed by a definite act.

But what is it precisely that the False Teacher has forgotten? First, no doubt, the fear which attaches to the remembrance of the price of Redemption (1 Pet. i. 17-19). But does St. Peter mean also that the special cleansing of Baptism cannot be repeated? This sense may be found in Heb. x. 26 and in 2 Pet. ii. 20-22. There are passages in 1 Peter which seem to mean that the cleansing of

ordinary sins, such as no Christian can avoid, is to be found in suffering (1 Pet. ii. 21, iii. 14, iv. 1, 16). We might say that in Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, Christlike suffering for righteousness' sake is the condition of post-baptismal cleansing. Out of these passages arose the Novatian schism, the question agitated by Hermas, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, whether *μετάνοια* was admissible after Baptism, and, if so, how often, and the whole system of Penance. These consequences could hardly be drawn from the Pauline Epistles.

10. *διὸ μᾶλλον*. "Wherefore the more." *Σπουδάσατε* repeats the exhortation *σπουδῆν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες*, but two additional reasons for diligence have been given in vers. 8 and 9; hence the *μᾶλλον*.

σπουδάσατε. Here as above (*ἐπιχορηγήσατε*, ver. 5) and again in iii. 14 the aorist imperative, which properly refers to a single definite action, as in *δότε μοι τούτο*, is wrongly used for the present. The same grammatical inaccuracy is very common in 1 Peter (ii. 13, iv. 1-7, v. 8).

ποιεῖσθαι. The middle voice signifies "to make for yourselves." Here again the necessity for the co-operation of the human will is very strongly expressed. Christ has called and elected the brethren; it rests with them to hold fast the gift.

For *ἐκλογή* see note on 1 Pet. i. 1. Here as there probably the corporate sense predominates; it denotes selection for a place in the *γένος ἐκλεκτόν*. Ideally selection precedes the call or invitation, which must always be addressed to individuals. Men are called out of darkness into light (1 Pet. ii. 9), out of the Flood into the Ark, or, like Abraham, out of an earthly home to the pilgrim life. All Christians have been called and selected, otherwise they would not be Christians, but they must "work out their own salvation" (Phil. ii. 12). St. Paul adds *Θεὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλει καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας*. St. Peter does not add this qualification, though he goes on to remind his hearers that the reward is a divine gift.

οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε. "Ye shall never stumble." The apostle does not mean "ye shall never sin"—for in this sense we all stumble (Jas. iii. 2). He is thinking of the onward march along the King's highway, and the final entry into the kingdom. Ye shall come safe to the journey's end. "Ut quouis tempore, inoffenso pede, non tanquam ex naufragio uel incendio, sed quasi cum triumpho intrare possitis" (Bengel).

11. *ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται*. The repetition of the verb from ver. 5 brings out with great emphasis the response of God's grace to man's faithfulness.

Dietlein, Spitta, von Soden, Kühl find in the verb an allusion to the rich ornaments with which the chorus was provided by the

choregus for its entry upon the stage; but it is hardly probable that the ancient significance of *χορηγείν* was present to St. Peter's mind. Πλουσίως finds its adequate explanation in the manifold graces of God (1 Pet. iv. 10), the *τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα* of ver. 4. As man supplements the gift of God by ceaseless endeavour, so God supplements man's faithful efforts by a rich and final gift. Thus (Matt. xxv.) the man travelling into a far country delivers the talents to his servants, returns to take account, and calls those who have made due profit into the joy of their Lord. As in 1 Peter, the thought is purely evangelical; there is no trace of metaphysical speculation.

The eternal kingdom is that of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—this the writer says without reserve or qualification. The expression justifies the view taken above of *ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*, of *θεία δύναμις*, and of *ὁ καλέσας*. Christ calls us into the kingdom, because it is His own. We are reminded especially of Luke i. 33, *καὶ βασιλεῦσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος*. The kingdom of God or of heaven is also called the kingdom of Christ in Matt. xiii. 41, xvi. 28, xx. 21; Luke xxiii. 42; John xviii. 36. In Luke xxii. 30 the kingdom is given to the Son by the Father. Cf. Heb. i. 8; Apoc. xix. 16. To none of these writers does the phrase suggest any difficulty; but on this point, as on so many others, St. Paul speculates, 1 Cor. xv. 24.

The end of Christian pilgrimage is the crossing of Jordan and entrance into the Promised Land, the patrimony, the salvation ready to be revealed (1 Pet. i. 4, 5), the kingdom of Christ. There is in 2 Peter the same attitude of expectancy as in 1 Peter.

Obviously the kingdom of Christ does not here mean the Church upon earth. But the word *ἐκκλησία* is not found in either the First or the Second Epistle. See Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 221.

Even in the Gospels the kingdom is frequently spoken of as future. Outside of the Gospels it is seldom regarded as realised upon earth, though we find such passages as Col. i. 13; Apoc. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9. In post-apostolic writers the future sense seems to be universal; see Clem. Rom. xlii. 3; 2 Clem. v. 5, ix. 6, xi. 7, xii. 1; Barn. iv. 13, vii. 11; Herm., *Sim.* ix. 12. 3; Ignatius, *Eph.* xvi. 1; Polycarp, v. 3; *Mart. Polycarpi*, xxii. 1.

The phrase *αἰώνιος βασιλεία* does not recur in the New Testament. It is one of the few salient phrases in this Epistle, and is quoted in the *Mart. Polycarpi*, xx. 2. The word *αἰώνιος* might be included in the list of St. Peter's philosophical terms, for the distinction between *αἰών* and *χρόνος* is an important commonplace in later Platonism. Yet *αἰώνιος* is a common word in the New Testament, and it would be absurd to cite it as an indication of Hellenism, except in so far as Hellenism may mean any degree of education whether large or small.

12. **διό.** Here St. Peter passes to a fresh point which completes his introduction. The faith of his readers is *ισότημος* with that of the apostles, because it embraces all that conduces to life and godliness; it must be developed by effort which leads to virtue, not to licence; without effort none shall enter into the kingdom of Christ.

From this point to the end of the chapter he insists upon the truth of this faith. It rests upon the evidence of eye-witnesses, of whom he himself was one; and upon that of the Hebrew prophets, but the prophets must not be misunderstood.

"Wherefore I shall always put you in remembrance." *Μέλλω* with the infinitive in the New Testament is frequently merely used for the future indicative; the grammar is breaking up, and there is a tendency to form tenses by the use of auxiliaries as in low Latin. The future *μελλήσω* is found also in Matt. xxiv. 6, where *μελλήσετε ἀκούειν* is neither more nor less than *ἀκούσεσθε*. Suidas, however, explains *μελλήσω* by *σπουδάσω*, *φροντίσω*, and the R.V. translates "I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance." The rendering of the A.V., "I will not be negligent," represents *οὐκ ἀμελήσω*, a variant supported by K L, the bulk of the later MSS., and the Syriac.

The words *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθεία* are explained by *εἰδότας*, the things which they know are the truth which is present to them. *Ἔσθηριγμένους ἐν* is a much stronger phrase than *εἰδότας*: "ye not only know them, but are established in them," ye know them and do them. Truth here embraces not only moral truth,—the necessity of growth from *πίστις* to *ἀγάπη*,—but historical or doctrinal truth opposed to *σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι*.

13. **δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι.** "I deem it right"; it is my bounden duty as an apostle. *Ἐφ' ὅσον*, "so long as"; cf. Matt. ix. 15; the *ὅσον* is neuter. **Σκῆνωμα**, "a tent"; this metaphor for the body suits well with the general conception of life as a pilgrimage, 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 11. St. Paul uses *σκῆνος* in the same sense 2 Cor. v. 1. The apostles derived the metaphor from the history of the Patriarchs, but according to Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* v. 14. 94, Plato also called the body *γῆινον σκῆνος*.

διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει. "To stir you by a reminder" is a phrase that recurs iii. 1. The *ἐν* is probably instrumental (a Hebraistic, not a Greek use).

14. **εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου.** "Knowing that the putting off of my tent cometh swiftly." It has been disputed whether "swiftly" here means "suddenly" or "soon." Either explanation is possible, and either yields good sense. If the apostle means that he is to die soon, there was great reason why he should be earnest in admonition. If he means that he is to die suddenly (*i.e.* by violence), the necessity for insistence is still the

same. "Qui diu aegrotant," says Bengel, "possunt alios adhuc pascere. Crux id Petro non erat permissura." In John xxi. 18 our Lord foretold that Peter should die a violent death *θαν γηράσῃς*. If the apostle was *γέρων* when he wrote this Epistle, he would feel that this prophecy must soon be accomplished. The point must be left to the reader's judgment. *Ἀπόθεσις*, "putting off," is a word that suits a garment rather than a tent. The two images are blended in much the same way by St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 2-5.

καθὼς . . . ἐδήλωσέ μοι. The most natural explanation of these words is to be found in John xxi. 18, 19. An argument has been raised against the authenticity of 2 Peter on the ground that the author here quotes the most suspected chapter of a very late gospel, but all that he does is to refer to a prophecy of our Lord's, which is probably that recorded by St. John. Spitta insists that the passage in the Johannine Gospel is not here in question at all, on the ground that there our Lord foretold that St. Peter should die in a particular way, by crucifixion, while in the prophecy here referred to the apostle had been warned that his death should happen *soon*. Hence Spitta thinks that St. Peter is alluding to some saying of our Lord's which has not been preserved elsewhere.

15. *σπουδάσω . . . μνήμην ποιέισθαι*. "And I will take pains also that as occasion requires ye may be able after my death to call these things to remembrance." *Σπουδάσω* is late Greek for *σπουδάσσομαι*, and *ἔχειν* should be *ὅπως ἔξετε*: see Blass, p. 225. *Ἐκάστοτε*, "at each time," "whenever the need arises," as often as similar errors are propagated. *Ἐξόδος*, "death," as in Luke ix. 31 (in the account of the Transfiguration), and in the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Eus. *H. E.* v. 1. 36, 55. The word means properly "end" or "close," so Xen. *Hell.* v. 4. 4, *ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς*. Hence it is used by later writers of the end or close of life, but only with the defining genitive, Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 2, *ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ζῆν*.

Is this promise fulfilled by the writing of this present Epistle, to which the readers would be able to turn, whenever need arose, after the writer was dead and gone? This is the explanation of Bengel, Wiesinger, Dietlein, Schott, von Soden, Kühl; but it is excluded by the future *σπουδάσω*. The sense seems clearly to be "I will myself remind you, so long as I live (as I am doing by this Epistle); and further, I will take care that after my decease you shall constantly be able to refresh your memory as to my teaching." What he promises is something that will show that his teaching did not rest upon *σεσοφισμένοι μῦθοι*, but on historical fact, and this promise cannot be thought to be wholly redeemed by the brief reference here made to the Transfiguration.

Huther thought the meaning to be that St. Peter would establish a succession of teachers, who after his death would keep alive the

knowledge of the truth. But it seems clear that what is promised is a document, to which his disciples would be able to turn and confirm their belief.

In very early times it seems to have been thought that the words pointed to the Gospel of St. Mark. Irenaeus, iii. 1. 1, *μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρον, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρον κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως παραδέδωκε*. Here Grabe cannot possibly be right in taking *ἔξοδον* to mean the departure of the apostles from Rome. That the statement of Irenaeus rests upon the present passage appears partly from the use of the word *ἔξοδος*, and partly from the way in which St. Peter's words are misunderstood. The apostle does not say that the document of which he is speaking should be written after his death, but that it should be written so as to be of use after his death. It is possible that Irenaeus added from 2 Peter the words *μετὰ τὴν τοῦτων ἔξοδον* to information which he gathered from Papias, Eus. *H. E.* ii. 15. 2, iii. 39. 15; but probably he found them in Papias.

Certainly no document would redeem the apostle's promise so well as a gospel; and if a gospel is meant, the reference can hardly be to any other than that of St. Mark.

It seems highly probable that the composition of the later pseudonymous Petrine literature, the *Apocalypse*, *Gospel of Peter*, *Preaching of Peter*, and other books, was suggested by these words. If so, the fact goes to prove that 2 Peter was well known, and regarded as authentic in very early times. It seems hardly likely that such extensive liberties would have been taken with the name of Peter, unless there were a phrase, in a writing generally recognised as his, which gave plausibility to the forgery. Hence we may see in the present passage a reason for dating 2 Peter at any rate before any of the extra-canonical Petrine books.

16. οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες . . . παρουσίαν. "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." *Μῦθος* by itself might mean merely "fables," such as the legendary history of the heathen gods, "false tales," "fictions"; and this may be the meaning of the word where it occurs in the Pastorals, 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14. Yet even there it may, and here the addition of *σεσοφισμένοι* shows that it must, bear the later sense of "a fiction which embodies a truth," "an allegorism." The False Teachers, or some of them, must have maintained that the Gospel miracles were to be understood in a spiritual sense, and not regarded as facts. But they differ from the False Teachers alluded to in the Pastorals, inasmuch as they do not appear to have introduced any "myths" of their own. They were therefore not Gnostics, as Dietlein and Baur supposed; their *πλαστοὶ λόγοι* were simply allegorical explanations of the gospel; they denied the literal

sense, but professed to hold fast the spiritual. It is obvious how this mode of exegesis might be applied to the Second Advent.

ἐγνωρίσαμεν. "We made known." St. Peter does not say that he himself had taught the readers of the Epistle, nor does his phrase necessarily imply that any of the Twelve had done so personally. All that he means is that the teaching which these people had received had come to them mediately or immediately from apostles.

δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν are keywords to the second and third chapters respectively. For **δύναμις** compare ver. 3 above; and for the connexion between **δύναμις** and **παρουσία**, see Matt. xxiv. 30.

ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. "But we had been eye-witnesses of His majesty," and that is why we taught you what we did. **Ἐπόπτης** is equivalent to **αὐτόπτης**, Luke i. 2; compare the use of **ἐποπτεύω**, 1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 2. It was unnecessary for St. Peter to state that three only of the apostles had actually been present. **Μεγαλειότης** (Luke ix. 43; Acts xix. 27; **μεγαλία**, Luke i. 49; Acts ii. 11) is the majesty of Christ which directly involves His **δύναμις**. For the future Parousia no ocular testimony could be adduced, but as the Second Coming is the **ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης Χριστοῦ**, 1 Pet. iv. 13, no apter confirmation could be found than the revelation of glory at the Transfiguration. It is to be observed that St. Peter uses the Transfiguration to prove, not the **παρουσία**, but the credibility of the apostles who had preached the **παρουσία**. If we may suppose, what is by no means improbable, that the False Teachers, while explaining away the Resurrection, admitted the historical truth of the rest of the Gospel, we can see a strong reason for St. Peter's choice of this particular incident.

17. λαβῶν γάρ. "For having received from God the Father honour and glory, such a voice having been borne to Him by the magnificent glory, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The sentence is anacoluthic, **λαβῶν** having no finite verb. **Φωνὴ φέρεται τινι ὑπὸ** is a singular phrase. **Μεγαλοπρεπῆς** is found Deut. xxxiii. 26; 2 Macc. viii. 15, xv. 13; 3 Macc. ii. 9. **Ἡ μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξα** is a reverential paraphrase for God; **θεία δύναμις**, ver. 3, **θεία φύσις**, ver. 4, belong to the same class of expressions of which there are many instances in Jewish apocrypha. Spitta quotes *Test. Levi*, 3, **ἐν τῷ ἄνωτέρῳ (οὐρανῷ) πάντων καταλύει ἡ μεγάλη δόξα**: *Ascensio Isaiaie*, xi. 32, "et uidi quod sedit a dextera illius magnae gloriae": Enoch xiv. 18, 20, "And I looked and saw therein a lofty throne . . . and the Great Glory sat thereon"; so also cii. 3, "And will seek to hide themselves from the presence of the Great Glory." Clement of Rome, ix. 2, also has the phrase, possibly borrowed from 2 Peter, **ἀπενίσωμεν εἰς τοὺς τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεί δόξῃ αὐτοῦ**: but he may have taken it direct from Enoch; see Lightfoot's note. The expression again throws

light upon ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν; the Great Glory is God, whom no man hath seen; Christ is our God, God who hath condescended to become visible.

Wiesinger and Spitta are probably right in identifying μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξα with the νεφέλη φωτεινὴ (the Shechinah) of Matt. xvii. 5.

The sentence is anacoluthic. St. Peter has not added the verb which he intended, and it is not possible to say what it was. The Heavenly Voice arrests his attention and becomes the main object of his thought, because it leads him on to speak of the other voice, that of prophecy. This has led some commentators to accuse him of having begun by promising ocular evidence, and ended by giving aural. The actual vision is described by the words λαβὼν τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, which represent ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς. Some, again, have created a discrepancy with the evangelical narrative by making ἐνεχθείσης come before λαβὼν in point of time; thus St. Peter is made to say that the voice preceded the Transfiguration, whereas in the Gospels it follows. This, however, is quite arbitrary; the temporal relation of the participles is not to one another, but to the main verb. See, for instance, Thuc. iv. 133, ὁ νεὸς τῆς Ἦρας ἐν Ἄργει κατεκαύθη, Χρυσίδος τῆς ἱερείας λύχνον τινα θέισης ἡμμένον πρὸς τὰ στέμματα καὶ ἐπικαταδαρθούσης. Chrysis did not fall asleep before she set the lamp near the garlands. Here there is no καὶ between λαβὼν and ἐνεχθείσης, but this makes no difference; the order of the events denoted by the participle is fixed, not by their tense, but by their sequence.

The first clause of the Voice is not quite certain. B has ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν (so WH, Tisch. vii.): P, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός οὗτός ἐστιν: **Ν** A C K L, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. This last reading, though the best attested, may be due to copyists who remembered the words as given by Matt. xvii. 5 and Mark ix. 7. Peter omits ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ, which is found in all three Synoptists. He omits also the vision of Moses and Elias. His account appears to be quite independent of the Gospel text.

18. καὶ ταύτην . . . ἁγίω. "And this voice we heard borne from heaven, being with Him in the holy mount." The mountain was made holy by the theophany.

19. καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον . . . καρδίαις ὑμῶν. "And even surer is the word of prophecy which we have, whereunto ye do well to take heed, as unto a lamp giving light in a squalid place, till the day break and the day star arise in your hearts." The testimony of the prophets is one, because it all testifies of Christ, His suffering, and His glory, 1 Pet. i. 10. For καλῶς ποιείτε, followed by the participle, cf. Acts xv. 29. Ἐν ἀύχμηρῷ τόπῳ: the light shows up the filth, and makes cleansing possible. The Vulgate renders *in loco*

caliginoso, in a *dark* place; but *ἀρχμηρός* does not appear to bear this sense, though Aristotle uses it of dark or dirty-looking colour (*περὶ χρωμάτων*, iii. p. 793. 11). *Βεβαιότερον* is predicative.

It seems at first sight strange that St. Peter should speak of the voice of prophecy as even more certain than the voice of God. It was, however, the same voice, and, for the apostle's present purpose, it was even more certain and conclusive. The voice at the Transfiguration was not *λύχνος φαίνων ἐν ἀρχμηρῷ τόπῳ*: it conveyed no moral lesson. What St. Peter desires, in addition, is a word that strikes directly and conclusively at Libertinism, and this he finds in Hebrew prophecy.

Augustine took the meaning to be "surer to you." You were not on the Mount as we were, and you may not unreasonably think the word of the old prophets more trustworthy than ours; in *Johann. Tract.* xxxv. 8; *Serm.* xxvii., *de verb. Apost.* vol. v. p. 149 C. But, if this were the meaning, we should have expected *ἔχετε*, as Alford says.

Modern commentators almost universally take the view expressed in the translation of the R.V. "And we have the word of prophecy made more sure," that is to say, the testimony of the prophets is confirmed by the voice from heaven. But it is very doubtful whether the Greek will bear this meaning, which could have been expressed quite easily by *καὶ οὕτως βεβαιούται*. The verb *βεβαιοῦν*, or the substantive *βεβαίωσις*, bear the sense of "confirm," "confirmation"; but *βέβαιος* in classical Greek always means "firm," "steady," "sure." This is its meaning also in the New Testament; see 2 Cor. i. 7; Heb. ii. 2, iii. 6, 14, vi. 19; 2 Pet. i. 10. Even in Rom. iv. 16, *βεβαία ἐπαγγελία*, and Heb. ix. 17, *βεβαία διαθήκη*, the meaning is "valid," not "ratified." The same is true of the passages quoted by Mr. Field in his *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, Charit. Aphrod. iii. 9, *κἀγὼ βεβαιότερον ἔσχον τὸ θαρρεῖν*, my courage was firmer; Chaeremon in Stobaeus, *Flor.* lxxix. 31, *βεβαιότεραν ἔχε τὴν φιλίαν πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς*, let your love be stronger; Isocrates, *ad Demon.* p. 10 A, *ὥστε σοι συμβήσεται παρά τε τῷ πλήθει μᾶλλον εὐδοκιμεῖν καὶ τὴν παρ' ἐκείνων εὐνοίαν βεβαιότεραν ἔχειν*. But in the present passage St. Peter is not comparing different degrees of certainty in the prophetic word, but the word of prophecy with the word of the Transfiguration. Again, the apostle could hardly make a point of the confirmation of prophecy; it needed no confirmation; it was fulfilled by the gospel, but not proved; on the contrary, it was regarded as a proof of the gospel. The most natural view is that he is here appealing to a second witness, which, for the purpose of the second chapter, is even stronger than his first. See Dr. Plummer's note.

It may seem remarkable that St. Peter does not appeal to the prophecies of our Lord Himself, though Matt. xxiv. would have

sued his purpose. But to the apostle the Old Testament is as much the voice of Christ as the New; and having glanced at the latter, he turns quite naturally to the former, where a rich store of instances lay ready to his hand. Further, if the False Teachers denied the Parousia, they must also have denied that our Lord foretold it.

διαυγάζειν occurs in Aquila's version of Job xxv. 5. St. Peter is probably thinking of the Song of Songs ii. 17, iv. 6, ἕως οὗ διαπνεύσῃ ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ κινηθῶσιν αἱ σκιαί. The beautiful word φωσφόρος is probably suggested by Ps. cix. (cx.) 3, ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. The words πρὸ ἑωσφόρου caused a distinction to be made between ἑωσφόρος and φωσφόρος, which in Greek poetry are identical. Hence, Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Haer.* x. 33 (ed. Duncker, p. 540), calls our Lord ἡ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου φωσφόρος φωνή, evidently explaining 2 Peter. Compare also Luke i. 78, ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους. Dr. Plummer refers also to Apoc. xxii. 16.

Why is the Christian to give heed to prophecy till the day star arise in his heart? St. Peter cannot mean "till you are converted," for he is addressing Christians. Some commentators, taking vers. 5-8 as the key, think that the apostle is speaking of the day when faith is made perfect in love. But it is more probable that the day of the Parousia is meant. The voice of prophecy, which is the voice of Christ, will guide men to the end. The expression "arise in your hearts" need not be regarded as an objection to this; it may be taken to denote the ἀγαλλίασις which the day will bring.

20. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες is best regarded as a grammatical irregularity; see below, iii. 3, where the phrase recurs without a finite verb. Here it might, with little difficulty, be connected with καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.

πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς is to be taken of the Old Testament prophecies alone. For ἐπιλύσις, "interpretation," compare ἐπιλύειν, Mark iv. 34. Both the noun and verb are common in the *Clementine Homilies* (see the Index published by the Lightfoot Trustees); Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. i. 1, ἐπιλυτέον τὰ προαπορούμενα: pseudo-Justin, *Expos. Rect. Fidei, τὰς ἐπαπορήσεις ἐπιλυέτω*. The words are indeed familiar in later Greek; a classic would use the simple λύειν, λύσις. Γίνεται cannot possibly be translated, as by Alford, "comes from," "springs out of." The word in the New Testament constantly means no more than "is"; if here we are to keep its proper sense, we must render, "does not fall to," "does not come under," private interpretation.

You do well to study the prophets, but first you are to observe that you must not interpret them just as you like. There is a right way and a wrong. Jews denied the Christian applications of prophecy, and the False Teachers wrested the Epistles of St. Paul and "the rest of scripture" (iii. 16) to their own destruction. St. Peter

warns his people that they may read the Bible amiss, and that therefore they need a guide. That scripture required to be "opened" was the universal belief of the primitive Church. They were opened by Christ (Luke xxiv. 45 ; Apoc. v.) or His ministers—as by Peter, Acts ii., or by Philip, Acts viii. 30, or by Apollos, Acts xviii. 28.

Who were the rightful interpreters of scripture St. Peter does not say. If he had been asked the question, he might have answered in the words of William of St. Theoderic (used by a Kempis, *De Imit.* i. 5), "Quo enim Spiritu scripturae factae sunt, eo Spiritu legi desiderant."

Other explanations of St. Peter's phrase—that (1) the prophets themselves could not interpret their own prophecies, or that (2) they did not, in fact, interpret them—may be set aside without hesitation.

21. οὐ γὰρ . . . ἀνθρώποι. It is not of private interpretation. For, as prophecy was not given by the will of man, so neither can it be explained by the will of man. God gives both the vision and the interpretation thereof (Gen. xl. 8, xli. 16).

ποτέ. "In the old days," as A.V.; cf. John ix. 13 ; Rom. vii. 9, xi. 30. St. Peter is thinking solely of the Hebrew prophets. R.V. and many commentators take ποτέ with οὐ, was never at any time given; but this is against the order of the words.

ἦνέχθη. "Was borne" (as in ver. 18), came from heaven to man. φερόμενοι. "Carried along by the Holy Ghost," as a ship by the wind (Acts xxvii. 15, 17). Here the Spirit is the wind (Acts ii. 2 ; John iii. 8). Similar metaphors are used of inspiration by the heathen writers; thus Plutarch, *de def. Orac.* 40, τὸ δὲ μαντικὸν ῥεῖμα καὶ πνεῦμα θεϊωτάτων ἐστὶ καὶ ὀσιώτατον. But the word which Plutarch applies to the inspired prophet is *κινούμενος*. Philo commonly speaks of the prophet as *θεοφόρητος*: see *Quis rerum div. heres*, 52 (i. 510).

ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. "Men spoke from God"; as mouth-pieces of God, not by their own will. The reading here is uncertain. B P, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, Tisch., WH have ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι: C, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἁγιοὶ ἄνθρωποι: 8 K L, Treg. ἁγιοὶ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι: A, ἁγιοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. Many cursives and Oecumenius insert οἱ after ἐλάλησαν. The variants are most easily accounted for by taking the text of B P as the point of departure; the insertion of ἁγιοὶ by C is easily explained, holy being a common epithet of the prophets (Luke i. 70 ; Acts iii. 21 ; 2 Pet. iii. 2). ΑΠΟ and ΑΓΙΟΙ might easily be confused, the *ductus litterarum* being very similar; but the probability lies on the side of ἀπό, the less tempting word. Still, ἁγιοὶ has authority, and Tregelles, Spitta, and von Soden prefer this word.

There is no difference in the sense in any case. If ἀπό is omitted and ἁγιοὶ read, the emphasis falls on φερόμενοι, "holy men

of God spoke (not by their own will), but as they were moved." On the other hand, the text of B P reiterates very forcibly the apostle's point—"men spoke as they were moved, and spoke from God."

II. 1. ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται. There is another caution to be borne in mind. Not only does all prophecy need interpretation, but even in Israel there were false prophets also as well as true. St. Peter is thinking of Balaam, though he did not prophesy, strictly speaking, in Israel, and of such passages as Jer. vi. 13; Ezek. xiii. 9. The run of the sentence seems to imply that the False Teachers, or some of them, claimed to be prophets. All prophets were teachers; differing from ordinary teachers in this essential point, that the teaching of the prophet was imparted to him by direct inspiration, not by study of scripture, or by any process of reasoning; see Introduction to 1 Peter, p. 46. The false teaching which the apostle proceeds to denounce was certainly doctrinal as well as moral. All ethical teaching rests upon doctrine, and varies with its speculative basis. But the only doctrinal error which the apostle expressly attributes to them, or some of them, is the denial of the Parousia. How naturally this might be connected with lax morality is evident.

The False Teachers are spoken of at first in the future; afterwards in the past or present (ἐπλανήθησαν, ver. 15: οὗτοί εἰσι, ver. 17: δολιχοὶ, ver. 18). Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 1-6, perilous times *shall* come, for men *shall* be . . . of this sort *are* they; and 1 Tim. iv. 1 sqq. St. Peter may mean that he knows these men to be already at work elsewhere, and that he foresees their speedy appearance in the Churches to which he is writing. Or the future may be taken in a more general way. There will, from time to time, as the End approaches, be false prophets, as our Lord foretold (Matt. xxiv. 11), and you may see them already busy among you. Here a second test, besides that of scripture rightly explained, becomes applicable. These men are False Teachers because they (οἰτινες) will privily bring in heresies of destruction.

παρεισάγειν may mean simply to introduce, to bring in (εἰς), and set before (παρά) a person. It may, however, signify to bring in privily, παρά giving the idea of creeping along under some sort of cover; see Liddell and Scott on παρεισδύνω and other verbs of the same formation. Cf. παρεισάκτους, Gal. ii. 4.

The classic meaning of αἵρεσις is a "school" or "sect" of philosophy, and the word implies, primarily, difference of opinion; Cicero *Epist.* xv. 16. It is so used in Acts of the "schools of thought" of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Nazoraeans (v. 17, xv. 5, xxiv. 5). So Acts xxiv. 14, κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν, "according to the Way (the true Christian Way), which they call a school." Here the Way is distinguished from all the "denomina-

tions" or αἵρεσις of the Jews. In its first use αἵρεσις does not imply falsehood or separation. You might call either Platonism or Pharisaism "a heresy," without meaning that it was wrong, or that it was an offence against unity. But so soon as men begin to speak of the Way (the one Truth), αἵρεσις involves both opinion and conduct, both error and division. Hence σχίσμα and αἵρεσις appear to mean the same thing in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19 (where possibly St. Paul is quoting a prophecy of our Lord's; cf. Justin, *Trypho*, 35, p. 253 B, ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις). Cf. Gal. v. 20, ἐριθεῖαι διχοστασίαι αἵρέσεις, where also the words are not technically distinguished, and αἵρέσεις refers to Judaisers who were schismatics but not heretics. In Tit. iii. 10 the reference to false opinion is distinct; new doctrines, of a kind incompatible with the faith of the Church, have crept in, and αἵρεσις is changing its meaning with the change of circumstances. From the time of Ignatius (*Trall.* vi. 1; *Eph.* vi. 2) the word hardens into its later sense, that of denial of the fundamental articles of the Christian creed.

The use of the word in 2 Peter affords no indication of the date of the Epistle. It condemns certain errors of belief and conduct, but the errors are as old as the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

αἵρέσεις ἀπωλείας is a Hebraism, the genitive of the substantive taking the place of the Greek adjective, as in Luke xvi. 8, τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας. See Blass, p. 98. Note the repetition thrice over of ἀπόλεια. Similar repetitions are characteristic both of 2 Peter and of 1 Peter throughout.

καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα . . . ἀπόλειαν. "Even denying the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction." Dr. Plummer observes that a forger would hardly have made St. Peter speak thus of denying his Lord. For the "denial," cf. Matt. x. 33. They were bought by Christ, 1 Cor. vii. 23; Apoc. v. 9, and thereby became His δούλοι. Hence He is here called δεσπότης, a word which elsewhere in the New Testament is used of Him only by Jude 4 (borrowing from this passage) and in Apoc. vi. 10. See Clem. Alex. *Ecl. Proph.* 20, ἀγοράζει ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος τιμῷ αἵματι, κ.τ.λ. Hence the words τιμῷ αἵματι are from 1 Peter; but ἀγοράζει and Κύριος, for which lower down δεσπότης is substituted, point to the present passage. For the omission of the conjunction between ἀρνούμενοι and ἐπάγοντες compare λαβῶν, ἐνεχθείσης in i. 17, and the string of unconnected participles in ver. 13 sqq. below.

Because the Lord bought them they are bound to purity of life, 1 Pet. i. 18 sqq., ii. 24. But by impurity men practically reject their Lord's authority and deny His δύναμις. For ταχινή see note on i. 14; here the sense of "sudden" is more appropriate; for the thought cf. Prov. i. 27.

Much needless difficulty has been made over these clauses.

“Even” is a perfectly familiar sense of *καί*, and the asyndetic participles are quite in the manner of 2 Peter. Some commentators, however, take *καί* as conjunction. Alfred and von Soden regard it as connecting *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* with *ἀρνούμενοι*, “shall be false teachers and deniers”; Huther, as connecting *παρεισάξουσιν* with *ἐπάγοντες*, which he considers to be loosely used for the finite verb. Both views are untenable.

Spitta would treat *ὡς καί . . . ἀπωλείας* as a parenthesis, and take *καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα . . . ἀπόλειαν* with *ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ*, partly on the ground of the extraordinary difficulties that have been manufactured out of the last two clauses of the verse, partly because he thinks, with Ullmann, that St. Peter was bound to say something definite about the False Prophets of Israel. But he only creates fresh and greater difficulties; the run of the sentence is against him, and *τὸν ἀγοράσαντα δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι* can hardly apply to any but Christians. It was quite sufficient for St. Peter here to state the fact that there were of old false prophets (though, as Ullmann says, “we knew it already”); for he desires to make two points, that true prophecy may be misinterpreted, and that there is such a thing as false prophecy. Hence he is content to say that the False Prophets played the same part as (*ὡς καί*) the False Teachers.

2. ἀσελγείαις. Compare 1 Pet. iv. 3; the plural may denote either different forms, or repeated habitual acts of lasciviousness. St. Peter charges these men definitely with disorder at the Agape, adultery, perversion of the Christian idea of freedom, and generally with falling back into the *μιάσματα* of the world. Clearly they permitted and defended immorality in a very broad sense.

δι’ οὓς refers to *πολλοί*. Owing to the licentious ways of their numerous disciples, the Way of Truth shall be evil spoken of by the Gentiles, cf. Rom. ii. 24. In Acts we have *ἡ ὁδός*, ix. 2, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14; *ὁδὸς σωτηρίας*, xvi. 17; *ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ Κυρίου*, xviii. 25. ‘*Ὁδὸς ἀληθείας*’ is found Gen. xxiv. 48 (but in the sense of “the right road”); Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 30; also Pind. *Pyth.* iii. 184. The Way is one of 2 Peter’s favourite phrases; see ii. 15, 21, and Knowing on Acts ix. 2. In *Hermas, Vis.* iii. 7. 1, we find *τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀληθινὴν*; and in *Aristides, Apol.* xvi., *ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἣτις τοῖς ὀδονούτοις εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν*, we have a direct quotation, in which the present verse is combined with i. 11.

3. ἐν πλεονεξία. Cf. ver. 15; the false teachers extracted money from their disciples. *Ἐμπορεύεσθαι* is to traffic in a thing; cf. *Diog. Laert.* vii. 1. 2, *πορφύραν ἐμπορευόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινίκης*; *Athen.* 569 F, *Ἀσπασία ἡ σωκρατικὴ ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθην καλῶν γυναικῶν*; *Philo, in Flacc.* 16 (ii. 536 *ad fin.*), *ἐνεπορεύετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν*. From this verb was formed in the fourth century the word *χριστέμπορος*. The charge of avarice was brought against

Gnostic teachers, *Iren.* i. 13. 3, and against the Montanists, *Eus. H. E.* v. 18. 2, but the evil existed long before, *Tit.* i. 11. The charge might mean merely that the false teacher, not being on the church roll, accepted direct gifts from his adherents. This would be thought wrong in any case, but shocking if he demanded or received money as a prophet. That Antinomian false teachers should not only demand remuneration but be extortionate in their demands, is probable enough. *Comp. Didache* xi. 5, 9, 12, xii. 5; *Hermas, Mandat.* xi.

πλαστοῖς λόγοις. *Herod.* i. 68, ἐκ λόγου πλαστοῦ: *Soph. Ai.* 148, λόγους ψιθύρους πλάσσων. The "forged words," by which these men endeavoured to persuade their hearers, must have contained some kind of reasoning, but the only sample is that given in iii. 4. See note on i. 16.

οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι . . . νυστάζει. "Whose sentence from of old is not idle, and their destruction slumbereth not." Κρίμα is the verdict, sentence, doom. It was pronounced of old in the case of many similar sinners; it is no dead letter, and will speedily be executed on these men also. Ἐκπαλαι, though not a classical word, is not uncommon in later Greek; see *Lobeck's Phrynichus*, p. 45 sqq.; *Blass*, p. 65 sq.

4. The First Instance. The Fallen Angels.

εἰ γάρ . . . τηρουμένους. "For if God spared not angels when they had sinned, but plunged them in hell, and delivered them to pits of darkness to be kept unto trial." The apodosis to εἰ may be found in οἶδε Κύριος, ver. 9, if it be thought necessary to make the sentence strictly grammatical. The absence of the article before ἀγγέλων gives the sense of "even angels." It may be implied that some of the False Teachers were men of considerable eminence. Σειρός or σιρός meant originally a kind of large jar used for storing grain; *Etym. M.* p. 714, 21, σιροί: τὸ ἐπιτήδειον ἀγγείων εἰς ἀπόθεσιν πυρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὀσπρίων. The note goes on to say that the first syllable was commonly pronounced long, but that *Euripides* in his *Phrixus* made it short. It is short also in an epigram of *Eratosthenes*, *Anth. P.*, Appendix, 25. 4. By the time of *Varro* the word was commonly used in the provinces for underground pits which served as granaries; see references in *Faccioliati, s.v. sirus*. In *Provençal* the word became *silo*, and in this shape it passed into our own language not many years ago.

Ν A B C and the Latin Fathers have *σειροῖς* or *σειροῖς*: K L P, the great majority of later MSS., the Greek Fathers, and the Versions *σειραῖς*. *Jude* has *δεσμοῖς ἀδίοις*. He may have found *σειραῖς* in his copy of 2 Peter and paraphrased it, or *σειροῖς* and misunderstood it. The textual critics (*Lachmann*, *Tischendorf*, *Tregelles*, *Westcott*, and *Hort*) are unanimous in favour of *σειροῖς*: and if they are right we have here a strong argument for the priority

of 2 Peter. If *σειραῖς* is correct, probability still inclines on the same side; for *σειρά* is a rare word, not found in the Greek Bible except in Prov. v. 22; Judg. xvi. 13; and "chains of darkness" is a harsh expression which a paraphrast would be tempted to soften and improve. See above, pp. 211, 216.

There is, however, another possibility, if we go back to the Apocrypha, which both writers have in view. *Enoch* x. 4 (ed. Charles), "Bind Azazel hand and foot, and place him in the darkness; make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudael, and place him therein"; x. 12, 13 (here we must give the Greek text), *καὶ ὅταν κατασφαγῶσιν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἴδωσι τὴν ἀπώλειαν τῶν ἀγαπητῶν αὐτῶν, δῆσον αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ἑβδομήκοντα γενεὰς εἰς τὰς νάπας τῆς γῆς, μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως αὐτῶν, μέχρι ἡμέρας τελειώσεως τελεσμοῦ, ἕως συντελεσθῆ κρίμα τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων.* We may think that this latter passage was actually in St. Peter's mind, for here we find in close proximity *ἀπώλεια*, the distinction between *κρίσις* and *κρίμα*, and the original of his phrase *εἰς κρίσιν τηρεῖσθαι*. Here also we have the "pits" and "binding." But we find also *Enoch* liv. 4, 5, "And I asked the angel of peace who was with me, saying, These chain instruments, for whom are they prepared? And he said unto me, These are prepared for the hosts of Azazel." Baruch (ed. Charles) lvi. 12, 13, "And some of them descended, and mingled with women. And then those who did so were tormented in chains." It is therefore just within the bounds of possibility that Jude derived his *δεσμοὶ αἰῶνοι* from an independent recollection of the Apocrypha.

ταρταρώ, "to cast into hell" is correctly formed on the analogy of the classical *καταποντώ*. It is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible, but occurs in a scholiast upon Homer.

It is most probable that St. Peter is here following the Book of *Enoch*; but he does so allusively and with discretion, in the manner of the First Epistle (see notes there on iii. 19, iv. 6). St. Jude expands and adds to the allusions, not always correctly (see notes on the parallel passages). St. Peter's comparative reserve in the use of Apocrypha may be interpreted in two ways. If we allow that the same feature is found in the First Epistle, it becomes an argument for the priority and authenticity of the Second. But many commentators regard the discretion (*Apokryphenscheu*) of our author as a sign that he wrote at a later period when the Apocrypha were viewed with growing disfavour. See Introduction, p. 222.

St. Peter does not specify the sin of the angels. There were two traditions on the subject among the Jews, one built on Gen. vi., the other on Gen. iii. and Deut. xxxii. 8 (see note on Jude 6). St. Peter is most probably following the former. According to *Enoch* vi., the first sin of "the sons of God," "the watchers," was lust; the second, that they taught their wives and children the use of magic, of weapons of war, and of articles of luxury. Their

punishment we have seen in the passages quoted above. This part of *Enoch* Mr. Charles considers to have been written before B.C. 170. See Salmond's note in Schaff's *Commentary*.

5. The Second Instance. The Deluge.

καὶ ἀρχαίου . . . ἐπάξας. "And spared not the ancient world, but kept safe Noah, a preacher of righteousness, with seven others, when he had brought the deluge on the world of ungodly men."

It is better, but not necessary, to carry on the εἰ with ἐφείσατο, κατέκρινεν, ἐρρύσατο. "Ὀγδοὺν αὐτόν would be more classic, but the αὐτός is sometimes omitted; Alford quotes Plato, *Laws*, iii. 695 C, λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἑβδόμος. Cf. δκτῶ ψυχαί, 1 Pet. iii. 20. This is the generally received explanation; but an old scholiast understood the words to mean "the eighth preacher of righteousness," ἐπτὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, Ἐνώσ, Καινάν, Μαλελεήλ, Ἰάρεδ, Ἐνώχ, Μαθουσάλα, Δάμεχ. The origin of this statement is unknown, and the series of names (which omits Adam and Seth) is arbitrary. But according to Gen. iv. Noah was the eighth from Adam. Jude, following Gen. v., or more immediately the Book of Enoch, makes Enoch seventh from Adam. But even so, if Methuselah and Lamech, who were alive in the time of Enoch, and were not apparently regarded as prophets (*Enoch*, chap. vi.) are omitted, Noah may have been traditionally considered as the eighth preacher. Again, Basil, *Ep.* 260. 5, counts seven generations from Cain to the Deluge. Thus, again, Noah may have been regarded as the eighth preacher who preached to the eighth generation. The absence of the article before κήρυκα may be significant; "a preacher," "because he was a preacher."

Δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος are used, as in 1 Peter, in the Old Testament sense. In the ἀπειθήσασι of 1 Pet. iii. 20 it is implied that Noah preached to the men of his time. This is not stated in *Enoch*, but may have been found in the *Apocalypse of Noah* (see Charles, p. 25). The belief was current in Jewish tradition; see Josephus, *Ant.* i. 3. 1; *Bereschith Rabba*, xxx. 6, "κήρυξ generationis diluuii, id est Noachus" (quoted by Alford from Wetstein); so also *Or. Sib.* i. 128 sq., Νῶε, δέμας θάρσιννον ἐόν, λαοῖσί τε πᾶσιν κήρυξον μετόνοιν. The insertion of this instance of mercy among the instances of wrath is quite natural. St. Peter wishes to mingle comfort with denunciation. He never forgets his pastoral office, and the mention of Noah here is in the same vein as the words which we shall find in iii. 9, 17. Further, it is to be noticed that St. Peter is probably thinking of *Wisd. x.*, where judgment and mercy are balanced against one another in the same manner.

6. Third Instance. The Destruction of the Cities of the Plain.

Here again St. Peter in his rapid narrative does not specify the sin of the cities, and mentions only Sodom and Gomorrhæ. St. Jude's expands and elaborates.

τεφρώσας. "Having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrhæ

to ashes, sentenced them to utter destruction." Τεφροῖν is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible, but it was known to the lexicographers (Suidas, τεφρώσας, ἐμπρήσας, σποδώσας: Bekker, *Anecdota*, 65. 5, τεφρωθὲν πῦρ ἀντὶ τοῦ καταμαρανθῆν). Κατέκρινεν καταστροφῆ, "condemned to destruction"; cf. Matt. xx. 18, κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ (the construction is not classical). The aorist participle marks the burning as antecedent to the sentence of overthrow. Hence Spitta takes καταστροφή to denote the sinking of the earth by which the Dead Sea was formed. But it appears to be highly doubtful whether there ever was any tradition that the cities were submerged by the Lake. Josephus (*de Bell. Jud.* iv. 8. 4) speaks of the traces of the Five Cities as still visible on land. All references in the Old Testament imply the same belief (Deut. xxix. 22; Isa. xiii. 19; Jer. xlix. 18, l. 40; Ps. cvii. 34; Amos iv. 11; Zeph. ii. 9; Wisd. x. 7; 2 Esdr. ii. 9). See article on *Sodom* in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. Nothing more need be understood from St. Peter's expression than that God destroyed the cities by fire, and sentenced them never to be rebuilt. By this contrast between the destruction of the Noachic world by water and that of the cities by fire, he is leading up to chap. iii. 7.

ὕποδειγμα is a late word for the classic παράδειγμα. See Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 12. Probably it means "a pattern," as in Jas. v. 10; Heb. iv. 11, not "a warning" or "example," though it may bear this sense.

μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν is equivalent to ἀσεβησόντων (cf. i. 12); for the omission of the article see note on ἀπιστοῦσι, 1 Pet. ii. 7.

7. δίκαιον as in vers. 5, 8. The mention of "just Lot" here is suggested by Wisd. x. 6, αὐτῆ δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο φυγόντα πῦρ καταβάσιον Πενταπόλεως. See note on Noah, ver. 5. Καταπονούμενον (Acts vii. 24), "worn down," "oppressed." Ἄθεομοι (cf. ἀθέμτος, 1 Pet. iv. 3), of rebels against the law not of Moses, but of nature and conscience. Ἀναστροφή is a favourite word in 1 Peter; and in this phrase we see again the correctness and ease with which the article is at times employed in this Epistle as in 1 Peter.

8. βλέμματι γάρ . . . ἐβασάνισεν. "God delivered righteous Lot, and why? Because (γάρ) by sight and hearing that righteous man, as he dwelt among them, day by day put his righteous soul to the touch by lawless deeds." The sight of the evil round about him was to Lot a trial or test; he emerged victorious from the ordeal, and therefore God delivered him. For οἶδε Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι. These words give the application. The godly to whom St. Peter is writing were tempted as Lot had been. Πειρασμός is here another name for βασανισμός. See note on 1 Pet. i. 7.

It must be allowed that elsewhere in the New Testament βασανίζω bears its derivative sense, "to put to the question,"

“rack,” “torment.” Hence the commentators and R.V. “he vexed” or “tormented his righteous soul.” But it may be argued (1) that *βασανίζω* in this sense is far too strong a word to express mental distress caused by the sight of evil; (2) that, though we could perhaps understand “his soul was racked,” “he racked his soul” is a strange expression; (3) that as 1 Peter, *πειρασμός* means not inward anguish, but outward suffering. The Lord delivered Lot not from the fascination of evil or from the anguish of pity for sinners, but from the constant annoyance of insult and ill-usage. By this he had been sufficiently tested, and the time had come for his rescue.

The Vulgate has “aspectu enim et auditu iustus erat : habitans apud eos, qui de die in diem animam iustam iniquis operibus cruciabant.” This appears to imply the text *δίκαιος ἦν κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ . . . ἐβασάνιζον* : but Tischendorf gives no trace of any such reading, except that B omits *ὁ* before *δίκαιος*. See Wordsworth and White on Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 44, xxii. 55; John v. 45, vi. 12, vii. 25, ix. 38, x. 16. These are cases in which Jerome’s version represents an unknown text.

The use of *βλέμμα* here has been objected to as a solecism (Chase, *Peter, Second Epistle*, in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 807; Field, *Notes on Translation of the New Testament*, p. 241). In the classics *βλέμμα* means not “seeing,” but “the expression of the eye.” The word occurs in this sense in Hermas, *Sim.* vi. 2. 5, τὸ *βλέμμα* εἶχε περίπικρον : *Test. Ruben*, 5, διὰ τοῦ βλέμματος τὸν ἰὸν ἐνοστέρουσι. The verb *βλέπειν* in classical Greek is used for *ὄραν* only by poets; but in the New Testament “to see” is far more frequently expressed by *βλέπειν* than by *ὄραν*. See Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, pp. 3, 56. Field thought that St. Peter should have written *ὄρασι*. But in the New Testament *ὄρασις* means either “a vision” or “outward appearance” (Apoc. iv. 3). *Ὀψις* again means “appearance” (John vii. 24; Apoc. i. 16), or “face” (John xi. 44). It is rash to assert that St. Peter’s expression is not in accordance with the vulgar use of his time.

9. *οἶδε Κύριος*. The words sum up the lesson of the two double-sided instances, the Flood and the Cities of the Plain. God can deliver His servants out of vexation (temptation), and will deliver you.

ἡμέρα κρίσεως recurs in iii. 7 in connexion with *τηρεῖν*, and forms one of the many little links of connexion between the two chapters. Jude does not use the phrase. For the “day of judgment” see Matt. x. 15, xi. 22, 24; 1 John iv. 17; *Test. Levi*, 3; and Mr. Charles’ note on Enoch xlv. 2. The phrase is used in different senses in Enoch; here it means the final judgment at the Parousia. Even in the interval the wicked dead are in a state of suffering (*κολαζόμενοι*), as the fallen angels are in Tartarus till the *κρίσις*. Compare the parable of Lazarus and Dives.

10. *μάλιστα δέ . . . πορευομένους*. “But especially them that

walk after the flesh in lust of pollution." With the word *μάλιστα* St. Peter turns directly to those libertine heretics who are the immediate object of his denunciation. *Ὅπισω σαρκὸς πορεύεσθαι* is a Hebraism. *Ἐπιθυμία μiasμοῦ* may be another (lust of pollution, meaning "polluting lust," as *αἵρέσεις ἀπωλείας* means "destructive heresies"), or *μiasμοῦ* may be taken as the ordinary objective genitive—"lust for pollution."

καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονούντας. "And despise lordship." *Κυριότης* is used by St. Paul as the name of a particular class in the angelic hierarchy, Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16; by Hermas, *Sim.* v. 6. 1, of the lordship of the Son of God; so also in the *Apostolical Church Order*, 12 (whence it is copied in *Didache* iv.), *ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν.* The first sense cannot be adopted here, as it is not possible to suppose that the False Teachers treated any particular class of Angels with contempt. We must therefore fall back upon the second. The False Teachers despised the power and majesty of the Lord. How they did so we must gather from the following words. The Angels, standing before the Lord (*παρὰ Κυρίῳ*), never forget the awful restraint of that dread presence. Yet these men, though they too speak *παρὰ κυρίῳ*, in the sight and hearing of God, give loose rein to their railing tongues.

τολμηταί . . . βλασφημοῦντες. "Self-willed reckless ones, they fear not to rail at dignities." *Τολμηταί* is a substantive, *ἀθάδεις* an adjective. The plural *δόξαι* occurs Hos. ix. 11; Wisd. xviii. 24; 2 Macc. iv. 15; 1 Pet. i. 11 in the abstract sense. In Ex. xv. 11, *τίς ὁμοίός σοι ἐν Θεοῖς, Κύριε, τίς ὁμοίός σοι, δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις, θανμαστός ἐν δόξαις*, it may have been taken to mean, "the glorious ones." Here, as in Jude 8, it is certainly concrete, and must mean personages invested with the *δόξα* of high estate, whether human or superhuman. With reference to the False Teachers it seems to denote the rulers of the Church. Jude so understood it; hence he is led to speak of Korah (ver. 11) who blasphemed Moses and Aaron.

Every possible diversity is found in the explanation given of *κυριότης* and *δόξαι*. The first is taken to mean God or Christ by Ritschl, von Soden, Wiesinger, Weiss, Kühl; the second, to denote good angels by Ritschl and von Soden, good and bad angels by Kühl, Spitta, Hofmann. Brückner explains both words of good angels; Schott both of bad angels. Hofmann makes *κυριότης* signify lordship or authority in general.

It is difficult to see how the False Teachers can have blasphemed angels of any kind. There were those at Colossae who exaggerated the respect due to these heavenly beings, but we read of none who spoke evil of them. Kühl thinks that the False Teachers blasphemed angels, because when they were told that they were servants of the Devil they laughed and denied his power; Ritschl, that they blasphemed them indirectly because they looked

on immorality as a right of those who are in the kingdom of God, and thought that the angels claimed and exercised the same right. The latter explanation is the more tenable of the two. A "self-willed reckless" reader of Gen. vi. (alluded to in ver. 4) might conceivably argue that either all angels are evil, or that lust is angelic. The same inference might be drawn by impure minds from the practice of women wearing their veils *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* (1 Cor. xi. 10), for fear of tempting the angels (cf. Tert. *de Virg. Vel.* 7 ; *de Orat.* 22). But the explanation is far-fetched ; there is no evidence that this reasoning was employed. Von Soden thinks that the words refer to the insults offered to the angels by the Sodomites ; but St. Peter says nothing about the angels in his allusion to the fall of Sodom. If we take the explanation given above, there is no difficulty. The rulers of the Church would naturally rebuke the False Teachers, and these would naturally reply in unmeasured language.

11. *ἔπου ἄγγελοι . . . βλάσφημον κρίσιν.* "Whereas angels, though greater (than the *δόξαι*) in might and power, bring not against them in presence of the Lord a railing judgment." The argument is *à fortiori*. Angels, also, complain of *δόξαι* (in this case the *δόξαι* are other and evil angels) ; but though they are greater than those of whom they complain, they dare not, in God's presence, use terms of condemnation or insult. They are like Christ, of whom it is said, 1 Pet. ii. 23, *παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως*. Whereas these men, though they are inferior to their rulers, abstain from no affront. St. Peter is probably referring to Enoch ix. Men complained of the evil wrought by the fallen angels and their children. The four great Archangels—Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel—lay their complaint before the Lord the King, saying, "Thou knowest all things before they come to pass, and Thou knowest this thing and everything affecting them, and yet Thou didst not speak to us. What are we to do in regard to this?" The sentence of God is, "Bind Azazel hand and foot" (quoted above on ver. 4). Here we have the Archangels who are "greater in might and power," a *δόξα*, Azazel, and the careful avoidance of a railing judgment "in the presence of the Lord."

At this point Jude has wrongly inserted the dispute between Michael and Satan, which did not occur *παρὰ Κυρίου*. (See note on the passage.) Hence he omits the words *παρὰ Κυρίου*, and hence again they are omitted here by A, many cursives, and versions. The reading *παρὰ Κυρίου* has very slight support, and, though it finds favour with Spitta, makes no tolerable sense.

12. *οὔτοι δέ . . . φθαρῆσονται.* "But these (the False Teachers and their victims), as animals without reason born of mere nature to be taken and destroyed, railing in matters whereof they are ignorant, shall in their destruction surely be destroyed." *Φυσικά* is practically equivalent to *ἄλογα*: they have physical, but not intel-

lectual life; they are no better than the brutes that perish. Ἐν οἷς = ἐν τούτοις ἄ. Καί here adds an emphatic asseveration, a not uncommon use of the word; there is a weak variant, καταφθαρήσονται for καὶ φθαρήσονται. It is barely possible to take the second φθορά of moral corruption, but the comparison to the φθορά of beasts, and the combination with φθαρήσονται make it almost certain that destruction is meant. Jude has rewritten this rugged sentence, and made it much more correct and much less forcible. We may observe, as indicating the priority of St. Peter—(1) that φθορά is one of his favourite words (it occurs also in i. 4, ii. 19, and, of the nine places where it is found in the New Testament, four are in 2 Peter); (2) that the repetition of the word is one of his mannerisms; (3) that the Hebraism ἐν φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται again is characteristic; cf. ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται, iii. 3. All these points disappear in Jude.

13. κομιούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας. "And shall receive the reward of unrighteousness." On the text see Introduction, p. 212. If we accept this reading, μισθὸς ἀδικίας means that destruction which is the final reward of injustice; cf. Rom. vi. 23. But immediately below (ver. 15) the phrase is used of the temporal profit of injustice, and it is difficult to see how it can bear two different senses almost in the same breath. What we should have expected here is "they shall be destroyed because they run, or ran, after unrighteous gain." As regards the participle, the better attested reading ἀδικούμενοι makes no tolerable sense. If we translate with the R. V., "suffering wrong, as the hire of wrong-doing," the difficulty about μισθὸς ἀδικίας remains; and, further, it is impossible to think that St. Peter would have spoken, even rhetorically, of sinners as "wronged" by God. If we translate with Tischendorf, "being deceived as to the wages of unrighteousness," we get the right sense for μισθὸς ἀδικίας, but go to wreck over ἀδικούμενοι. It is probable that neither reading is correct, and that in the MS. from which all our texts are derived the letters before -ουμένοι were illegible. All the following participles are in the present, and we may suspect that a present participle was used here also. The Syriac has a word which Tischendorf renders by *ementes*. If this represents *ονούμενοι*, it is a possible reading, and gives a barely tolerable sense, "they pay a high price for the gain of unrighteousness." But perhaps we ought to omit the participle altogether, and read φθαρήσονται, μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι, ἐντρυφόντες, "they shall be destroyed because they think pleasure the reward of unrighteousness; because, spots and blemishes that they are, they pursue their daylight revelry," etc.

ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν. There are many difficulties here. Ἡδονή in the LXX. and in the New Testament means always sensual gratification, never high or true or spiritual enjoyment. Τρυφή, on the other hand, may be used in a good sense of spiritual

joy or delight; so in ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς, Gen. ii. 15, iii. 23, 24; Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxxi. 9, 16, 18; cf. also Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 8; Prov. iv. 9. The word is used of sensual indulgence or luxury in Luke vii. 25. The verb ἐντρυφᾶν generally denotes wantonness. Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ cannot mean "daily" (as Oecumenius), but may mean "by day," or "in daylight" (so 3 Macc. v. 11, ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ), though this use is rare and incorrect. Generally ἐν ἡμέρᾳ means on, or in, a particular day. Revelling and drunkenness in the daytime were naturally thought worse than similar excess by night; see Facciolati, *s.v.* tempestiuus, and cf. 1 Thess. v. 7: *Assumptio Mosis* vii., "omni hora diei amantes conuiuia." On the other hand, *tempestiua conuiuia* was used also of banquets which began and ended in good time, that is to say in daylight, not in the night. Thus the same phrase was used of a drunken orgy, or of a sober feast, such as Cicero delighted in. See again Facciolati.

We cannot translate "counting their daylight revelry pleasure"; for it was pleasure, and they were right in so counting it. Nor again, "counting daylight revelry true pleasure"; for ἡδονή never has this sense. There seems nothing left then but to understand St. Peter to mean "counting our sober daylight joy (the Agape) mere vulgar pleasure." The Agape was dismissed before dark; *Canones Hippolyti*, 167 (ed. Achelis, p. 106), "missos autem faciat eos, antequam tenebrae oboriantur." This explanation may be strengthened by the remark that St. Peter is here possibly thinking of the *Song of Songs* vii. 6, τί ἡδύνης, ἀγάπη, ἐν ταῖς τρυφαῖς σου, words which, though not directly applicable, may have suggested the language which he here employs of those who turned the τρυφή of the Agape into ἡδονή. Clement of Alexandria speaks of ἡ ἐν λόγῳ τρυφή of the Agape, *Paed.* ii. 12, and distinguishes it very carefully from the ἡδονή of mere eating and drinking.

On this view the only difficulty is that τρυφή bears a good sense, while ἐντρυφῶντες, which immediately follows, must be taken in a bad sense. This, however, is only an apparent objection. There is very much the same relation in English between "joy" and "enjoy."

σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι. Cf. ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος, 1 Pet. i. 19. Σπίλος (for the accent see Liddell and Scott; Blass, p. 15), a disfiguring spot, is found also in Eph. v. 27, μῶμος, a blemish; this meaning is given to the word by the LXX. (Lev. xxi. 17 sqq.). See Dr. Hort's note on 1 Pet. i. 19. These men were spots and blemishes on the Agape, which they profaned by their licentious conduct. On the reading ἀγάπαις see Introduction, p. 212; it must certainly be retained here in spite of the MSS. Ἀγάπη is not used in the New Testament, in this sense of the Love Feast or Eucharist, except here and in Jude 12. On the history of the word see Lightfoot's note on Ignatius, *Smyrn.* viii.

συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, "while they feast with you." *Εὐωχία* is applied to the Agape by Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* ii. 1. 6. It would appear that the False Teachers and their followers had not separated from the Church. The abuses here referred to are the same as those which existed in the Church of Corinth.

14. μοιχαλίδος. Here, again, the MSS. are certainly wrong; see Introduction, p. 212; the sense absolutely requires *μοιχείας*. The phrase may have been suggested by Job xxiv. 15, *καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς μοιχοῦ ἐφύλαξε σκότος*.

δεδείζοντες (cf. Jas. i. 14; the word is repeated in the Petrine way in ver. 18 below), "catching with a bait," is commonly used in secular Greek in this metaphorical sense: cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 69 D, *ἠδονὴ κακοῦ δέλεαρ*. Philo is fond of the verb; see, for instance, *de congr. erud. grat.* i. 14 (i. 530), *τοῖς φίλτροις τῶν θεραπευιδῶν δειλασθέντες*.

καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες. "Having a heart exercised in, familiar with covetousness." The construction is found in Philostratus, *Heroi.* iii. 30, p. 688, *θαλάττης οὐπὼ γεγυμνασμένοι*: iv. 1, p. 696, *Νέστορα πολλῶν πολέμων γεγυμνασμένοι*: xi. 1, p. 708, *σοφίας ἤδη γεγυμνασμένον*. It is semi-poetic, and probably borrowed from the rhetoricians of the day. In Homer the genitive is frequently so used after participles denoting familiarity with anything, such as *εἰδώς*, *διδασκόμενος*.

κατάρας τέκνα. "Children of curse," "accursed" (not "accursed children"). For this Hebraism cf. *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς*, 1 Pet. i. 14; *τέκνα ὀργῆς*, Eph. ii. 3; *τέκνα φωτός*, Eph. v. 8. *Υἱός* is used in the same way 2 Thess. ii. 3, *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*; Matt. xxiii. 15, *υἱὸν γέννηης*; Luke x. 6, *υἱὸς εἰρήνης*; Eph. v. 6, *υἱὸς τῆς ἀπειθείας*.

15. εὐθειαν ὁδόν. Cf. 1 Kings xii. 23; 2 Esdr. viii. 21; Ps. xxvii. 11, cvii. (cvii.) 7; Acts xiii. 10, and elsewhere. The ways of the wicked are *σκολιαί*, Prov. ii. 15. Both *ὁδός* (see ii. 2) and *ἐξακολουθεῖν* (i. 16, ii. 2, not elsewhere in the New Testament) are among the favourite words of 2 Peter. The False Teachers followed the way of Balaam, because, like him, they loved the wages of unrighteousness—filthy lucre—the gifts of Balak; and because, again, they taught uncleanness. Cf. Apoc. ii. 14, *τὴν διδαχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκε τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθῦτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι*. Βοσόρ for Βεώρ, the name of Balaam's father, is probably a mere blunder, though it has the support of all the MSS. except B and partially *κ*. See Introduction, p. 212. Vitringa, however, endeavoured to explain it either as a Galilaean form of Beor (so also Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. p. 110), or as a paronomasia from *ἡψῆ* "flesh." Thus, son of Bosor he thought might mean "son of flesh" (*Observ. Sacrae*, i. p. 936 sqq., quoted by Alford). Such plays upon the names of people, who for one reason or another were hated by them, are

known to have been not uncommon among the Rabbis. But there appears to be no trace of this particular scorn-name, Bosor. Otherwise we might possibly have found here another reference to Jewish tradition in 2 Peter.

16. ἔλεγξιν. The word occurs in Job xxi. 4, xxiii. 2 for the classical ἔλεγχος. ἴδιος is a mere possessive. In 1 Pet. iii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 22 we may render it by "own"; here it is devoid of emphasis; see Blass, p. 169.

ὑποζύγιον in later vulgar Greek means specially "an ass." It is so used by the LXX., Theodotion, and Symmachus, in Matt. xxi. 5, in papyri, and here; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 158, Eng. tr. p. 160; Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*.

φθεγγάμενον. The verb is especially used of a portentous prophetic utterance; so Philo, *de conf. ling.* 14 (i. 414), introduces a quotation from Zachariah with the words ἤκουσα μέντοι καὶ τῶν Μωυσέως ἑταίρων τινὸς ἀποφθεγγαμένου τοιόνδε λόγον. Plutarch employs it of prophetic or ominous sounds uttered by animals, *de Pythiæ oraculis*, 22 (*Moralia*, 405), ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἐρωδιοῖς οἰόμεθα καὶ τροχίλους καὶ κόραξι χρῆσθαι φθεγγομένους σημαίνοντα τὸν Θεόν. Cf. Herod. ii. 57, ἐδόκειον δέ σφι ὁμοίως ὄρνισι φθέγγεσθαι, where, however, it means simply "to make a sound." Τοῦ προφήτου: the instance is peculiarly apt, if the False Teachers claimed to be prophets.

παραφρονία is a *vox nihili*. The derivative from παραφρονέω is παραφρόνησις (Zech. xii. 4), from παράφρων is formed παραφροσύνη, which is found in a few cursives. A few other cursives have παρανομία, which is probably the right reading; the repetition of the word being in its favour. Here again the great MSS. in a body are almost certainly wrong. See above, p. 213.

17. πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι. A Teacher without knowledge is as a well without water. There is considerable gnomic power in our author; a quality which is often dissociated from clearness and finish of style.

ὀμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι. "Mists driven by a squall." The words are poetical, and perhaps exhibit a trace of that Homerism which is found in the early *Sibylline Oracles* and in Philo (see Siegfried, p. 37), and became a marked feature in the style of the second century; see note on ver. 14. The special quality of a mist is that it baffles the sight. The mist is not borne (φερομένη, i. 21) by the gentle breath of the Spirit, but driven by the fierce gusts of ignorance and self-will, as by a demon (ἐλαύνεσθαι, Luke viii. 29).

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. "For whom the gloom of darkness is reserved." The phrase is extremely rugged; darkness is hardly an appropriate word to express the punishment of wells or mists. Jude here introduces the ἀστέρης πλανῆται, a great improvement in point of style. Would the writer of 2 Peter have rejected

this suitable image? The masculine οἷς refers, of course, to the persons; the relative comes here with great force, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

18. ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι. "For crying enormous words of vanity." For φθεγγόμενοι see note on ver. 16 above, and observe the characteristic repetition of this word and of δαλεάζειν. Ὑπέρογκος (in Deut. xxx. 11) is a classical word, expressing that which is overgrown or swollen beyond its natural size; cf. Plutarch, *Luc.* xxi., φρόνημα τραγικὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον, of a temper which is inclined to bombast and histrionic ostentation. In the description of the libertines in the *Assumption of Moses*, already referred to in the note on ver. 13, we read *et os eorum loquetur ingentia*, which is quoted *verbatim* by Jude 16; see note there. 2 Peter uses quite naturally words which he found in his Bible, and the verbal repetitions guarantee the originality of his expression. Jude was clearly familiar with the *Assumption*, and has worked quotations in. The γάρ here does not give the reason of the preceding sentence, but adds a new touch to the description.

ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας. The reading is very uncertain. A B, the bulk of the cursives and versions have ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας: **NC**, ὄντως ἀποφεύγοντας: K L P, ὄντως ἀποφυγόντας: Ephraem (see Tisch.), τοὺς λόγους ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς εὐθείς καὶ τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀποστρεφόμενους: apparently he found neither ὄντως nor ὀλίγως, but λόγους: here again there seems to have been an illegible word in the parent MS. ΟΛΙΓΩΣ and ΟΝΤΩΣ are all but identical in Greek capitals. The present ἀποφεύγοντας is clearly better attested than the aorist ἀποφυγόντας, yet the aorist is strongly supported by the ἀποφυγόντες, ver. 20. We must make our choice between ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας and ὄντως ἀποφυγόντας (cf. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 997).

Ὀλίγως, a rare word, is found in Aquila's version of Isa. x. 7. Τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους (governed by ἀποφεύγοντας) may denote either the False Teachers or the heathen. The latter is the better way, because, as Hofmann says, it is a little awkward to take this accusative as referring to the subject of the sentence, and because again the words seem to be explained by ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου. The former reading then may be translated, "those who were just escaping from them that walk in error," from Gentile vices, but as yet were not established in Christian virtue (the ψυχὰι ἀστήρικτοι of ver. 14).

The second reading must be turned, "those who had actually escaped from them that walk in error." In this case the last phrase must mean the Gentiles, not the False Teachers.

There is great passion in the words. Grandiose sophistry is the hook, filthy lust is the bait, with which these men catch those whom the Lord had delivered or was delivering.

The asyndeton ἐπιθυμίαι ἀσελγείαις is a feature of 2 Peter's style; cf. i. 9, 17. With ἐν πλάνῃ ἄν. cf. Cicero's *in errore versari*.

19. Ἐλευθερίαν . . . φθοράς. "Promising them freedom while they themselves are slaves of corruption"; a strong epigram. For ἔλευθερία, cf. 1 Cor. x. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13. In Rom. viii. 21 St. Paul contrasts freedom with the slavery of corruption as St. Peter does here; in Gal. v. 13 he warns the Galatians that freedom is not to be abused εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, because through love we are still slaves to one another. So in 1 Pet. ii. 16 freedom is not to be regarded as ἐπικάλυμμα τῆς κακίας. St. James regards freedom itself as a law (i. 25, ii. 12). Ἐλεύθερος is found Matt. xvii. 26; John viii. 32-36; but neither this word nor its cognates occur in Acts, Hebrews, the Pastorals, or Apocalypse (though in this book ἐλεύθερος is used in its literal sense).

Freedom may mean two distinct things—(1) freedom of the spirit from the flesh, of the intelligence from the desires; this is the sense which the word bears in philosophy, in Peter, James, and occasionally in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. vi. 15-22); in this sense freedom implies Law (cf. Ps. cxix. 32, 45): (2) freedom from Law; Law is an external obligation, and in all its forms is superseded and abolished for Christians by the inner voice of the Spirit. This is the general idea of St. Paul. On this last view the Christian conscience is absolutely supreme, and its aberrations cannot be corrected by any external standard. Where the Spirit truly is, there will be no aberrations, and the two theories will in practice coincide. But the Pauline theory leaves no weapon available against a man who claims to be a prophet; and it is evident from many passages in the New Testament that it might be, and was, grossly abused from the very first. History has often repeated itself on this point. See the accounts of the Ranters in Fox's *Journal*, or Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*, i. 519.

τῆς φθοράς. "Of corruption"; here of moral corruption, cf. i. 4, τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς. The two senses of corruption and of destruction are not easy to keep apart; in ii. 12 the word bears probably the latter meaning.

ὃ γὰρ τις ἠττηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται. I say slaves of corruption, "for by what a man is worsted, by the same is he enslaved." In classic Greek ἠττησθαι is followed by the genitive or ὑπό. For the use of the dative, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* i. 13. 15, ἠττᾶτο δὲ μόνῳ τῷ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς οἴκῳ: *Test. Ruben*, 5, αἱ γυναῖκες ἠττῶνται τῷ πνεύματι τῆς πορνείας. For the idea cf. Rom. vi. 16, viii. 21; John viii. 34. It is quite familiar also to heathen writers, especially to the Stoics; cf. Cic. *Verr.* iii. 22, "cupiditatum seruos"; Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* iii. pref. 17, "sibi seruire grauissima est seruitus"; Persius, v. 73 sqq.; Epictetus commonly uses ἀνδράποδον of the vicious man, ii. 20. 3, 22. 31.

20. εἰ γάρ. Here again γάρ is loosely used to introduce a new feature. For μίαισμα see Lev. vii. 8; Jud. ix. 2, xiii. 16; Ezek.

xxxiii. 31; 1 Macc. xiii. 50. It is a classical poetical word. These deluded victims had escaped the pollutions of the world (hence *ὄντως ἀποφυγόντας* is probably the better reading in ver. 18) by means of the knowledge of Christ; see i. 2, 8. The *δέ* after *τούτοις* may be understood as referring to a *μέν* which might have been inserted after *ἀποφυγόντες*: the dative *τούτοις* belongs to *ἤττωνται*. Ἐμπλακέντες, “noosed” or “fettered”: Soph. *O. T.* 1264, *πλεκταῖς ἐώρας ἐμπεπλεγμένη*: Arist. *Thest.* 1032, *ἐν δεσμοῖσιν ἐμπεπλεγμένη*. In τὰ ἔσχατα there is an allusion to the words of our Lord recorded in Matt. xii. 45. The whole passage is very similar in sense to Heb. x. 26, *ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν, μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία*. See note on i. 9 above.

21. *κρέιττον γὰρ ἦν*. “For it were better for them never to have known the way of righteousness (which is also the way of truth, ii. 2, and the straight way, ii. 15), than having known it to turn back from the holy commandment delivered unto them.” Better have remained heathen than thus fall into apostasy. For the omission of *ἄν* with the imperfect indicative, see Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, 49. 2, note 2; Blass, p. 206; cf. Matt. xxvi. 24, *καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ*: Rom. ix. 3, *ἠὲ χόμην*. For the singular *ἐντολή*, cf. Deut. xxvi. 13; Ps. xviii. (xix.) 8, cxviii. (cxix.) 96, 98; Prov. ii. 1, vi. 23, xiii. 13, xix. 16; Eccles. viii. 5. In the New Testament the singular appears elsewhere to mean a particular precept; in Rom. vii. 12, *ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία* is the tenth commandment; possibly 1 Tim. vi. 14 may be an exception. Here “the holy commandment” is the moral law which is still regarded as binding upon Christians, and was only reiterated and deepened in the Sermon on the Mount and in the teaching of the apostles. Spitta is probably right in thinking that Jude’s *ἡ ἀπαξ παραδοθεῖσα τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις* is suggested by this phrase of 2 Peter: if this is the case, the change of *ἐντολή* into *πίστις* and the insertion of the Pauline *ἁγίοις* are significant.

22. *συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας*. “The word of the true proverb has happened unto them,” has been verified in them. Alford quotes Lucian, *dial. mort.* viii. 1, *τοῦτο ἐκείνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὃ νεβρὸς τὸν λέοντα*. The first of the two proverbs may be found in Prov. xxvi. 11, *ὥσπερ κύων ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον*. The second is not biblical, and can hardly be derived from a Hebrew source. *Λουσαμένη* means “having bathed itself in mud”; cf. Aristotle, *περὶ τὰ ζῶα ἰστορ.* viii. 6 (Bekker, 595a, 31), *τὰς δ’ ὅς καὶ τὸ λοῦσθαι ἐν πηλῷ (παιίνει)*. 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 habit of swine was used as a moral emblem both in Greek—Wetstein quotes Michael Apostolius, 1910,

ὅμοιον τῷ Κράτητος· ὅς ἐν βορβόρῳ ἰλυσπᾶται : Epictetus, iv. 11. 29, ἀπελθε, καὶ χοίρω διαλέγου, ἵν' ἐν βορβόρῳ μὴ κυλίηται—and in Latin, Cicero, *Verr.* iv. 24, "in Verre quem in luto uolutatum totius corporis uestigiis inuenimus." Horace has both the dog and the sow in one line, *Éprr.* i. 2. 26, "Vixisset canis immundus uel amica luto sus." It has been noticed in the Introduction, p. 228, that the proverbs as given by St. Peter run very easily into iambs; in the first ἐξέγραμα is substituted for ἔμετος, and the introductory phrase (τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας) seems to show that he does not quote either of them as scripture. Probably he took them both from some collection of proverbs. But, as the first is certainly scriptural, we may guess that this collection was the work of a Jew, most likely an Alexandrine Jew, who to the Solomonic proverbs added others derived from Gentile sources.

ἐξερῶ is used in the sense of "to vomit" by the comic poets (see Liddell and Scott), and by Aquila in his version of Lev. xviii. 28. Κύλισμα is found in Symmachus' version of Ezek. x. 13; it ought to mean "something rolled round," "a cylinder," but is here used for κυλίστρα, "a rolling place," or for κυλισμός, "rolling"; B C and some cursives have κυλισμόν.

III. 1. ταύτην ἤδη . . . διάνοιαν. "This is now, beloved, the second letter that I write unto you; in each of which I stir up your pure mind by putting you in remembrance." Ἠδη is to be taken closely with the numeral, as in Soph. *Phil.* 312, ἔτος τόδ' ἤδη δέκατον. For διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει see i. 13. For διάνοια see 1 Pet. i. 13. Εἰλικρινής, εἰλικρίνεια occur 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. i. 12, ii. 17; Phil. i. 10. Εἰλικρινής διάνοια is used by Plato, *Phaed.* 66 A, of "pure reason," such as that which the geometer employs; *Phaed.* 81 C, εἰλικρινής ψυχὴ is opposed to ψυχὴ μεμασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος. Here in 2 Peter a "pure reason" is one which is not stained or warped by sensuality, that is to say, εἰλικρινής bears the sense which it has in Plato as an epithet of ψυχὴ, but not that which it has as an epithet of διάνοια. St. Peter has used philosophic words caught up in conversation and not quite accurately understood.

Commentators generally hold that the former letter here referred to is our 1 Peter. Spitta, however, maintains that it is not, on the grounds that (1) 2 Peter is addressed to Jewish Christians, 1 Peter to Gentiles; (2) Peter himself and others of the Twelve had preached to the recipients of 2 Peter, but apparently not to those of 1 Peter (cf. 1 Pet. i. 12; 2 Pet. i. 16); (3) the contents of 1 Peter are not accurately here described.

The first and second reasons have little force, if we take the view that 1 Peter was addressed to a mixed community. Nor is there anything, not even in ii. 18, to lead us to suppose that the readers of 2 Peter were all Jew Christians. Nor

need we force the repeated first person plural of the first chapter to imply that the apostles had laboured personally in these Churches. Nothing more need be meant than that the recipients knew perfectly well what the teaching of the apostles was.

The third objection is more serious. The language used in i. 12-21 may mean that the object of the apostle in writing to these Churches had always been the same, that of meeting error by insisting on the historical truth of the gospel; and here he says that in the former letter as in this (*ἐν αὐτῆς*), he had appealed to the testimony of the prophets and of the apostles. Now 1 Peter is not directly pointed against false teaching, nor are proofs alleged in the same way as in 2 Peter. It is highly probable that St. Peter wrote many Epistles, and quite possible that his first letter to these particular Churches may have been lost. And in the Address the word *διασπορά* is not used, nor are the names of the provinces given.

We cannot feel absolutely certain that 1 Peter is here referred to, any more than we say with confidence what particular Epistle of St. Paul is meant in iii. 15. Yet 1 Peter will satisfy the conditions fairly well. The prophets and evangelists are appealed to (i. 10-12), the Passion and Ascension of our Lord are laid down as the historical basis of the gospel, and the Parousia, in particular, is pointed to repeatedly. The last point is here of great weight. Upon the whole it may be held that Spitta's doubts are groundless, though they are enforced also by Zahn.

2. *μνησθῆναι . . . σωτήρος*. "That ye should remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles" (R.V.). There appears to be no doubt as to the MS. text; *ἡμῶν* for *ὑμῶν* has very slight attestation. The infinitive *μνησθῆναι* must be taken to denote purpose, but it is ungrammatical (Alford refers to a similar breach of rules in Luke i. 72), and is particularly awkward after the words *διεγείρω ἐν ὑπομνήσει*. The author here reverts to the end of chap. i., and repeats the appeal to his two witnesses, the prophets and the apostles. Both testified to the *δύναμις καὶ παρουσία* of Christ. Having exhausted what he had to say about the former point against those who denied the power of the Lord who bought them, St. Peter now turns to the second. The two divisions of his subject are marked by two repeated phrases, *διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει* and *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες*. The clause *τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος* has caused great trouble; the complication of genitives is very harsh. The A.V. reading *ἡμῶν* and making *τοῦ Κυρίου* depend upon *ἀποστόλων*, translates "the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour"; but this construction is difficult in any case, and becomes quite impossible,

if ἑμῶν is read. On the other hand, the rendering of the R.V., which differentiates the genitives, taking τοῦ Κυρίου to mean "of the Lord," and τῶν ἀποστόλων "through the apostles," seems even more objectionable. To some extent, indeed, we might meet the difficulty by supposing that the words τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος are added as an afterthought, and translating, "the command of your apostles, or rather, I should say, of the Lord"; but it may be suspected that the text is unsound. A good reason may be found for the use of the possessive, ἑμῶν. "Your apostles" are the men whom you ought to trust; do not listen to these false teachers, with whom you have neither part nor lot. It has been supposed that the forger of the Epistle here allows his mask to slip, and confesses that he himself was not an apostle; but this is quite a needless inference. The apostles are the Twelve. Some have thought that Paul, Silas, and Barnabas are intended, but it is highly doubtful whether the author would have called Silas and Barnabas, or even St. Paul, apostles. For ἐντολή, see ii. 21. Ἐντέλλομαι is frequently used of our Lord in the Gospels, Matt. xvii. 9, xxviii. 20; John xv. 14, 17; cf. Acts i. 2, xiii. 47; it belongs to the conception of our Lord as δεσπότης, 2 Pet. ii. 1. For ἀγίων προφητῶν, cf. Luke i. 70, and note on i. 21 above.

3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες. The phrase is used above, i. 20. The repetition is quite in the Petrine manner, but in the present place it is by no means free from difficulty. There can be no doubt that the accusative is required, and there is no reason why our author should not have used this case. Probably γινώσκοντες ought to be read in spite of all the MSS. The words ελεύσονται, κ.τ.λ., form a prophecy of St. Peter's own, and what he says is, Remember the words of the prophets and the command of the apostles, "knowing this first"—taking with you this preliminary caution from me—that mockers shall come (for the future see note on ii. 1).

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. "In the last days," in the time of distress which precedes the end. Cf. Heb. i. 2, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων: Jude 18, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τοῦ χρόνου: Jas. v. 3, ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. See note on ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων, 1 Pet. i. 20. Ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται is a strong Hebraism, cf. ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται, above, ii. 12: ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, Luke xxii. 15: κιθαρωδῶν κιθαρίζοντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις αὐτῶν, Apoc. xiv. 2. Ἐμπαίζω, "to mock," is classical; ἐμπαίκτης is found in the LXX. (in Isa. iii. 4), so also are ἐμπαίγμα and ἐμπαιγμός (also in Heb. xi. 36). Ἐμπαιγμονή is not found elsewhere, and is an impossible formation (if ἐμπαίγμων existed, ἐμπαιγμοσύνη would be the correct derivative; cf. πολυπράγμων πολυπραγμοσύνη, φράδμων φραδμοσύνη, ἴδμων ἰδμοσύνη). It is omitted by K L, by many other of the later MSS., and by some Fathers, because it was seen to be a vox nihili, or because it is

omitted by Jude. The true reading is probably *ἐμπαυμῶ*. See note on *παραφρονία*, ii. 16. For *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας* Jude (vers. 16, 18) has *κατὰ τὰς αὐτῶν* or *ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας*, avoiding the vulgar use of *ἰδίας*, for which cf. ii. 16, 22.

With these words St. Peter begins his attack upon the denial of the Parousia, the doctrinal error which underlay the moral extravagances of the false teachers. He has had the subject in view from the outset of the Epistle. The *ἐπαγγέλματα* of i. 4 are the *ἐπάγγελμα* of iii. 13; other connecting links are to be found in *ἡ αἰώνιος βασιλεία*, i. 11; *παρουσία*, i. 16, and the references to *κρίσις* and *ἡμέρα κρίσεως* in the second chapter.

4. *ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*. "Where is the promise of His Coming?" *Παρουσία* means the Second Advent, the coming of our Lord to judge, as in Matt. xxiv. 3. Notice the Hebraistic manner in which denial is expressed by a question, as in Mal. ii. 17; Ps. xlii. 3, lxxix. 10; Jer. xvii. 15; Luke viii. 25. "Where is it? It has come to naught; it is vain." Von Soden and Kühn would restrict the promise to that made by the prophets of the Old Testament, but we cannot exclude a reference to the prophecy of our Lord Himself, Matt. xxiv. 34. It is probable, as Spitta points out, that the denial of the Parousia arose out of these very words. As the men of "this generation" began to die away, doubt would immediately arise.

ἀφ' ἧς. "Since." The expression occurs also 1 Macc. i. 11; Acts xxiv. 11; Luke vii. 45. From the last passage we see that it has become a pure adverb. So, indeed, it is here, as the singular *ἡμέρας* would not suit the context. "Since the fathers fell asleep all things remain thus," as we see them, and as they have been "from the beginning of creation." Some understand "the fathers" of the fathers and founders of the Christian Church, and find in the phrase a sign that the Epistle was not written till more than one generation of believers had passed away. But no forger would have fallen into so obvious and fatal a blunder. The phrase is to be explained in the same way as *οἱ πατέρες* in Heb. i. 1; Rom. ix. 5, or *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν* in Acts iii. 13. The Church is one, as in 1 Peter, and "the fathers" belong to all Christians.

There must have been a strong Hebraistic colouring in the minds of the deniers as well as in that of St. Peter. Church and Scripture are so completely one that the Old Testament can be used to strengthen doubts as to the Christian shape of the doctrine of the day of judgment. St. Peter's answer rests mainly on the Old Testament, with a brief allusion to the gospel and a passing appeal to the authority of St. Paul.

Notice, again, the subtle, almost modern, character of the doubt. At Thessalonica men doubted only whether those Christians who had died before the Parousia would be permitted to live

with Jesus in His kingdom (1 Thess. iv. 13 sqq. See also Introduction, p. 239). In the Churches addressed by St. Peter the doubt rests upon reflexion of a scientific type, the long vista of the past, the apparent immutability of the world,—thoughts which in our time have become still more oppressive.

The doubt may have been suggested simply by the broad stretch of Old Testament history, but it was very possibly connected with the doctrine of the eternity of the world, which had been adopted from Aristotle by the Platonists and by the Jewish mystics of the time. This tenet is defended by Philo against the Stoic belief in the *ἐκπίρωσις*: see *de incorr. mundi*, 18 sqq. (ii. 505), and *de mundo*, 2 (ii. 604), where he rests his position in part on the everlasting law of the eternal God. Philo in these passages makes little use of the Old Testament, though he says that Moses taught that the world was *γενητόν καὶ ἀφθαρτόν*, *de mundo*, 8. The doctrine of the eternity of matter was found by the Rabbis, and possibly by the LXX. translators, in Gen. i. 1; see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 9. It is probable that the false teachers were Jews by birth and Christians by name, who knew more or less about these scholastic debates. The arguments which they would employ—they may be gathered from Philo—would sound to St. Peter very like “mockery.”

5. λαμβάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας. “For this they wilfully fail to see.” “Wilfully,” because they are *ἀθάδεις*, ii. 10. The antecedent to *γὰρ* is to be found in the assertion *πάντα οὐρα διαμένει*—this is untrue, “for scripture tells us that once already the world has been destroyed by water.”

ὅτι οὐρανοί . . . συνεστῶσα. “That from of old was heaven, and an earth subsisting out of water and by means of water.” For *ἑκπαλαι* see ii. 3. Jewish mystics distinguished seven heavens (Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 37); cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 10. *Οὐρανοί* is used in the New Testament frequently by St. Matthew (as in the Lord’s Prayer, vi. 9), not uncommonly by St. Mark, rarely by St. Luke, never by St. John (except in Apoc. xii. 12). In Acts it occurs twice (ii. 34, vii. 56). St. Paul uses the plural about as often as the singular. St. Peter in the First Epistle has the singular twice (i. 12, iii. 22), the plural once (i. 4); in the Second, the singular once (i. 18), where he is speaking of heaven as the abode of God, the plural five times, all in this passage (iii. 5–13), where he is treating of cosmogony. Generally, the plural seems to be a mere Hebraism, the Hebrew word being plural in form, and we need not suppose an allusion to the Rabbinical theory unless the context requires it. Hence here we ought probably to translate “heaven,” not “heavens.” Some commentators, however, prefer to keep the plural, and think that the seven heavens were in St. Peter’s mind.

Heaven is placed here before earth, as in Gen. i. 1. The order of creation was variously explained in the Rabbinical Schools. Shammai, relying on Gen. i. 1, distinguished *στερέωμα* from *οὐρανός*, and taught that first heaven and then earth were created on the first day. Hillel, relying on Gen. i. 4, ii. 4, identified *στερέωμα* with *οὐρανός*, and taught that earth was created on the first day, heaven on the second. Spitta thinks that St. Peter is here declaring his adhesion to the opinion of Shammai. This, however, can hardly be inferred from the text. St. Peter says nothing that a simple Jew could not have gathered from his own reading of Genesis.

There should be no comma after *ἐκπαλαι*: the words *ἦσαν ἐκπαλαι* apply to earth as well as heaven. Of earth it is said that it subsists

ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος. 'Εξ may be taken to denote the emerging of the earth from the waters (Gen. i. 9) in which it had lain buried, and the majority of commentators appear to adopt this explanation. But, combined as it is here with *συνεστῶσα*, the preposition seems rather to express the material out of which the earth was made (so Oecumenius, Hofmann, Kühn, Alford, Salmond). There appears to be no trace of a Jewish belief that water was the prime element of which earth was made, except in the later *Clementine Homilies*, xi. 24 (quoted by Dr. Plummer); yet it is a possible explanation of Gen. i. 2, where water exists at a time when earth is *ἀκατασκεύαστος*. Δι' ὕδατος again is very difficult. It can hardly mean "in the midst of water," as an island surrounded by the sea, for the preposition never bears this sense, though it is used of a mental state, in which we are, or rather through which we are passing (*δι' ἡσυχίας εἶναι et simm*; cf. *δι' ἐπομονῆς τρέχειν*, Heb. xii. 1). We must render "by means of water." Water is at once the material and the instrumental cause of the subsistence of the earth. It is made out of the sea below, and its life depends on the rain from above. *Συνεστάναι* means both to have been put together or made, and to subsist or endure; for the latter sense compare Col. i. 17.

τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ. By the fiat of God; cf. Heb. xi. 3, *ῥήματι Θεοῦ*. Here again there is no trace of speculation, though the Rabbis had much to say about the creative word. One type of theory is to be found in Philo, another refined upon the Ten Creative Words discovered in Gen. i. (see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 20).

6. *δι' ὧν*. The antecedent may be found in the two waters of which we have just read; the fountains of the deep spouted up from below and the rain streamed down from above (Gen. viii. 2), the matter of the earth was resolved into its original form and washed away. We may, however, suppose *δι' ὧν* to refer to *ἔδωρ* and *λόγος*, the two agents of creation co-operating in destruction;

and this view finds support in the following words, in which *λόγος* and *πῦρ* appear as the causes of the second catastrophe.

ὁ τότε κόσμος. *Κόσμος* may be taken, as by Spitta, to mean the universe. It is possible that in the view of St. Peter the first heaven and earth were absolutely destroyed and succeeded by the present (*οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ*), as these again will be replaced by a new heaven and earth (ver. 13 below). The same views may be found in the Book of Enoch, lxxxiii. 3-5, where Enoch is describing his dream of the Flood. "I saw in a vision how the heaven collapsed and was borne off and fell to the earth . . . and I lifted up my voice to cry aloud and said, The earth is destroyed." (See the passage in Mr. Charles' translation.) Cf. also Clem. Rom. ix., Νῶε . . . παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν, and Lightfoot's note there. Yet, on the other hand, this view, that the whole universe was resolved into water by the Flood, does not represent the obvious sense of Scripture, does not square very well with the language of ii. 5, where *κόσμος ἀσεβῶν* seems to mean simply the impious denizens of earth, and is hardly consistent with the preceding verse. For, if earth alone subsisted of water and by water, so earth alone, we might think, could be destroyed by water. Hence Oecumenius, Bengel, Hofmann take *κόσμος* here to mean the human race, or all living things.

We must make allowance for rhetorical colour. The author presses as far as he can the analogy between two cases which were not absolutely parallel.

7. οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ . . . πυρί. "But the heavens that now are and the earth are treasured up by the same word for fire." Τῷ αὐτῷ is the reading of A B P, some cursives, the Sahidic, Coptic, Armenian, and Vulgate; \aleph C K L, many cursives, the Syriac, and Aethiopian have τῷ αὐτοῦ. There is little or no difference in sense. There are many "words of God" in the Old Testament in which fire is spoken of as attending the final judgment, such as Ps. xcvi. 3; Isa. lxvi. 15, 16; Dan. vii. 9, 10; some of them might well be taken to signify an actual destruction of the world by fire, especially Isa. xxxiv. 4; Mic. i. 4. Hence the belief that, as the world had once perished by water, so it would again perish by fire, was possibly held, though it was certainly not universal, among the Jews in St. Peter's time. It may perhaps be found in a book of prophecies attributed to Adam; see Josephus, *Ant.* i. 2. 3, προειρηκότος ἀφανισμόν Ἀδάμου τῶν ὄλων ἔσεσθαι, τὸν μὲν κατ' ἰσχὺν πυρός, τὸν ἕτερον δὲ κατὰ βίαν καὶ πλεθρὴν ὕδατος. But on this subject see Introduction, p. 214.

Πυρί, "for fire," is the *dativus commodi*. The R.V. in the margin gives "stored with fire" as an alternative rendering for *τεθησαυρισμένοι πυρί*. But *θησαυρίζειν* means "to lay up a treasure," and no instance is given of its use with the dative in the sense required. What St. Peter has to tell us here is, not where the fire

is, but what it will do. Irenaeus, i. 7. 1, attributes to the Valentinians the doctrine that at the End "the fire which lurks in the world, shining and kindling and destroying all matter, will be burnt out with the matter and go into nothingness." The earth is "stored with fire," which will one day burst forth and consume everything. This, however, is purely Stoic doctrine, based upon the theory of Heraclitus that fire was the prime element. St. Peter cannot have meant that the post-diluvian world was made of fire, as the antediluvian world was made of water; no "word of God" could have led him to think thus. Yet it is possible that the Valentinians found a scriptural handle for their tenet in this passage of 2 Peter.

τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως. Note again this favourite phrase; cf. ii. 4, 9, and 1 Pet. i. 4. Ἀπώλεια is another word which 2 Peter repeats, see ii. 1, 3.

8. ἐν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς. "But do not you fail to see this one thing." The ὑμᾶς forms an emphatic antithesis to αὐτοῦς in ver. 5.

ὅτι μία ἡμέρα. "That in the Lord's sight one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." The phrase is suggested by Ps. lxxxix. (xc.) 4, ὅτι χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ἐχθὲς ἡγίς διήλθε. St. Peter is not quoting, but drawing an inference from, the Psalm. The desire of the Psalmist is to contrast the eternity of God with the short span of human life. What St. Peter wishes is to contrast the eternity of God with the impatience of human expectations. As Augustine says, God is *patiens quia aeternus*. The day of judgment is at hand (1 Pet. iv. 7). It may come to-morrow; but what is to-morrow? What does God mean by a day? It may be a thousand years.

This verse of 2 Peter (like i. 15) has a history, which is no longer easy to trace. From this peculiar adaptation of the words of the Psalm sprang Chiliasm. On this subject see Introduction, p. 213.

Observe that St. Peter says nothing about signs that should precede our Lord's Coming. Cf. the present passage with 2 Thess. ii. St. Paul appeals to his own prophecies on the subject. Certain events are to happen before the Parousia, and these must take a considerable time.

We may find here a sign of authenticity, if we remember John xxi. 18, 19. St. Peter had been warned that he should not live to see the Parousia (cf. i. 14). He could not therefore feel the difficulty which troubled the Thessalonians as to what would be the lot of those who died before the Lord's return; nor could he speak, like St. Paul, of "us which are alive and remain"; nor would he have any personal interest in the Signs of the End. It may be doubted whether a forger would have been so reticent.

Again, though this passage is the base, or one of the bases, of

Chiliasm, St. Peter makes no allusion to that doctrine. Here again we may discern a sign of great antiquity.

9. οὐ βραδύνει ὁ Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. "The Lord is not slow concerning His promise." The genitive is perhaps analogous to that used commonly after verbs of failing, or missing, such as ἀμαρτάνω, σφάλλωμαι, ἄσπερώ. Or, possibly, we may compare Soph. *El.* 317, τοῦ κασιγνήτου τί φῆς; *Phil.* 439, ἀναξίου μὲν φωτὸς ἐξερήσομαι, where the genitive alone has the sense of the case accompanied by περί: see Blass, p. 105. Bengel quotes Sirach xxxii. (xxxv.) 22, καὶ κρινεῖ δικαίως καὶ ποιήσει κρίσιν καὶ ὁ Κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνη οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. The Lord is certainly Christ; see ver. 15 below.

ὡς τινες βραδυτῆα ἡγοῦνται. "As some (the mockers) count slowness"; as if delay sprang from impotence or unwillingness to perform.

μὴ βουλόμενος. "Not because He wishes that some should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Some will perish (ver. 7 above), but this is not the purpose of God.

10. ἤξει receives emphasis from its position. "It will come, that day of the Lord." For ἡμέρα Κυρίου (from Joel iii. 4) see Acts ii. 20; 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 2. In Phil. ii. 16 we have ἡμέρα Χριστοῦ, cf. Luke xvii. 26, 31. Above, ii. 9, iii. 7, ἡμέρα κρίσεως: below, ver. 12, ἡμέρα Θεοῦ. The day of the Lord, of God, of Christ, of the Son of Man, are not distinguished.

ὡς κλέπτῃς. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 43; C K L add ἐν νυκτί, from 1 Thess. v. 2. Whenever it comes, soon or late, the day of the Lord will be sudden and unexpected, like the attack of a thief. There will be no time for repentance then. This is the essential point on which the wise teacher will dwell.

ροιζηδόν. Ροῖζος, ροιζέω, and cognates, are used of shrill rushing sounds, the hissing of a snake, the whirr of a bird's wings, the hurtling of an arrow. Here probably the roaring of flame is meant. The adverb is probably formed from ροιζέω, but it may come directly from ροιζος. Lucian, *Τίμων*, 3, uses three similar words, κοσκινηδόν, σωρηδόν, πετρηδόν, all formed from nouns.

στοιχεῖα. Στοίχος means "a row"; hence στοιχεῖα, "things arranged in a row," the letters of the alphabet, or the elements of Nature. In Heb. v. 12, τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, are the Christian alphabet, the first rudimentary lessons of the creed. In Gal. iv. 3, 9, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, are again rudimentary lessons; but these, in St. Paul's view, are laws, precepts, rites and ceremonies, distinguished from gospel freedom. So again, Col. ii. 8, 20, the word is used of precepts based upon philosophy, vain deceit, and the traditions of men; school lessons which are no longer good for enlightened men.

St. Peter is clearly speaking of physical elements. He may

mean—(1) The four elements, earth, air, water, fire (so Bede). This sense is common in Greek philosophy. The objection that fire cannot destroy fire is not serious, for earthly sensible fire might very well be thought of as destroyed by heavenly ideal fire. But this explanation is too scientific for St. Peter.

(2) The great parts of which the world is composed, sun, moon, stars, earth, sea. In this sense our passage seems to have been understood by the author of the second book of the *Sibylline Oracles* (ii. 206):

Καὶ τότε χηρεύσει στοιχεῖα πάντα τὰ κόσμου,
'Αἴθρ, γαῖα, θάλασσα, φάος, πῶλος, ἡματα, νύκτες.'

(3) The heavenly bodies, sun, moon, and stars. In this sense *στοιχεῖα* is used by Justin, *Apol.* ii. 5; *Trypho*, 23; Theoph. *Ant.* i. 4, 5, 6, ii. 15, 35; Athenag. *Suppl.* 16, and many Greek Fathers. In the Letter of Polycrates, Eus. *H. E.* iii. 31. 2, *στοιχεῖα* means "stars of the Church"; see note of Valesius in Heinichen. Hence the Latin Fathers not uncommonly called the stars *elementa*. Isa. xxxiv. 4 was quoted by the Rabbis to show that the stars will perish at the end of the world; see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 274. This is the most probable sense here (Bengel, Alford, Plumpré). The run of the sentence distinguishes the heavens and the elements (stars) from the earth and the works that are therein.

In *Test. Levi*, 4, there is a passage which Spitta (adopting a conjectural emendation of Schrapp's) quotes thus—*τοῦ πρὸς καταπήσσοντος καὶ πάσης κτίσεως καυσουμένης καὶ τῶν ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων*. Hence Spitta (followed by Kühn and von Soden) maintains that St. Peter means by *στοιχεῖα* not the stars, but the spirits, which were regarded as inhabiting and animating them. The same explanation of *στοιχεῖα* in Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, is given by Ritschl, Everling, Diels (*Elementum*, Teubner, 1899; reviewed by A. Deissmann in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Jan. 5, 1901). There was such a belief (see *Enoch* lx. 12, lxix. 22) among both Jews and Gentiles. But Mr. Sinkler's text of the *Testamenta* has *κλονουμένης* not *καυσουμένης*, and that careful scholar notices no variant. Nor, if we put on one side the disputed passages in the Pauline Epistles, is any instance of this peculiar use of *στοιχεῖον* quoted. It is not possible to find the star-spirits in the words of 2 Peter, though they may very well be meant by the *ἀόρατα πνεύματα* of *Levi*. Possibly the words of *Levi* may be a reminiscence of the present passage.

καυσούμενα. *Καῖσος* means a peculiar kind of fever, and *καυσῶσθαι* is used by medical writers of those who suffer from that special complaint. It is obvious that this sense will not suit the present passage, but *καυσῶσθαι* does not appear to be used in any other. It seems highly probable that *καυσούμενα* does not belong to *καυσῶσθαι* at all, but is merely a vulgarism for *καυσόμενα*. In

later Greek the middle future constantly assumes the Doric form; thus we find *νευσούμαι, πνευσούμαι, πλευσοῦμαι, πιούμαι, πευσούμαι*. In 2 *Clem.* vii. 5 we have *παθοῦμαι*. *Φευξούμαι* is commonly used even by the classics. See Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 30; Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 91; Moeris, *τίομαι*: Cobet, *Nouae Lectiones*, p. 617; Veitch, *καίω*.

κατακήσεται. Here again the text is corrupt. See Introduction, p. 213.

ἔργα are *opera naturae et artis* (Bengel).

11. *λυομένων* is used loosely for *λυθησομένων*. See Blass, p. 189, and compare *τήκεται* just below.

ποταπούς. "What sort of men." Both sense and spelling belong to later Greek; the classic word is *ποδαπός*, which means "of what country." See Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 56; Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 128.

ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις. "In holy behaviours and pieties" (Alford). Neither word is used in the plural elsewhere in the New Testament, but in 1 Pet. i. 15 we have *ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ*, "in every behaviour," which is practically a plural. 1 Pet. ii. 1 we find *ὑποκρίσεις φθόνους*: ii. 9, *ἀρεταί*: iv. 3, *ἀσελγείαις οἰνοφλυγίαις εἰδωλολατρείαις*: 2 Pet. ii. 2, *ἀσελγείαις*: ii. 14, *πλεονεξίαις* (*v.l.*). In both Epistles there is the same tendency to use the abstract noun in the plural.

12. *σπεύδοντας*. Not "hastening towards the coming"; this version would require a preposition, and yields no satisfactory sense. We may translate—(1) "Giving diligence about," "zealously guarding, the Coming." So Plato, *Protag.* 361 A, speaks of a man as *σπεύδων αὐτῷ ἐναντία*, "fighting for propositions that confute him." (2) "Hastening the Coming." The Church may be said to bring the day nearer when it prays "Thy Kingdom come." And not prayer only, but the "holy behaviours and pieties" of God's children, which promote the repentance of the ungodly (1 Pet. ii. 12), are a condition of the coming of the Kingdom, and prepare the Lord's way. It is possible that St. Peter may be referring to the Jewish belief that the sins of men prevented Messiah from appearing. In the Talmud it is said, "Si Judaei poenitentiam facerent una die statim ueniret Messias, filius Daud"; see Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. p. 224. If we follow this interpretation, we have here again a view different from St. Paul's; see 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7, *τὸ κατέχον*: ὁ κατέχων.

τήκεται. The present is used for the future. But CP, many cursives, the Vulgate, Armenian, and Syriac read *τακῆσεται* or *τακῆσονται*. For the verb, cf. Isa. xxxiv. 4, *καὶ τακῆσονται πάντα αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν*: Mic. i. 4, *καὶ αἱ κοιλάδες τακῆσονται ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρός*. The reader will observe the characteristic repetition of words and phrases in this passage.

13. καινούς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν. Cf. Isa. lxx. 17, ἔσται γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινὴ: *Enoch* xci. 16, "And the first heaven will depart and pass away, and a new heaven will appear"; Apoc. xxi. 1.

ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. "Has its home" (Acts vii. 48; Eph. iii. 17; Col. ii. 9). This beautiful phrase is probably St. Peter's own, but we may compare *Enoch* xlvi. 3, "the Son of Man, who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness."

14. προσδοκῶντες is repeated from ver. 12; σπουδάσατε from i. 5, 10, 15; ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι reminds us of 1 Pet. i. 19, ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος: 2 Pet. ii. 13, σπιλοι καὶ μώμοι. The dative αὐτῷ may be taken with the adjectives, "spotless and blameless in His sight," or with εἰρεθῆναι, "to be found by Him," as in Isa. lxx. 1 (quoted in Rom. x. 20).

15. καὶ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἠγεῖσθε. "And count the long-suffering of our Lord salvation." "Our Lord" must undoubtedly signify Christ, to whom alone the doxology in ver. 18 is addressed. His patience (cf. ver. 9) is not slowness, but salvation; the Lord delays in order that all men may have time to repent and be saved. Σωτηρία is used here in an unusual sense, of that which conduces to salvation. We might be tempted to regard it as the feminine of the adjective, if it could be shown that σωτήριος ever possessed more than two genders.

καθὼς καὶ . . . ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν. "Even as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, wrote unto you." St. Paul never calls St. Peter "our beloved brother Cephas." He is apparently represented as alive (λαλῶν not λαλήσας in ver. 16; but this is not conclusive, because the participle is contemporaneous with ἔγραψεν). St. Peter speaks of him with affection and respect, yet maintains the right to criticise. His words are not perceptibly stronger than those which he uses of Silvanus, 1 Pet. v. 12. Κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν may be understood as a commendation or as a caution. Ὑμῖν (see iii. 1) means probably the Asiatic Christians to whom 1 Peter was addressed, possibly some other Church or group of Churches. Whoever they were, they had received a letter (or possibly letters) from St. Paul. The substance of what St. Paul had written to them is more or less exactly indicated by the words of vers. 14 and 15.

We may suppose St. Peter to lay the main stress on ἄσπιλοι, ἀμώμητοι, ἐν εἰρήνῃ, and to be chiefly anxious for the correction of the moral disorders described in the second chapter. In this case any of the Pauline Epistles may be meant. Bengel selected Hebrews (he held the Pauline authorship of this Epistle); others have fixed upon Romans (Oecumenius, Grotius, Dietlein; see esp. Rom. ix. 22); Jachmann decides for 1 Corinthians; Augusti, for Galatians; Benson, for Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians

(see Col. i. 11 sqq. These three Epistles have the advantage of being addressed to Asiatics). Von Soden thinks that Ephesians may be meant (see Eph. i. 4-14, vi. 10-18). Clearly, if St. Peter only means "St. Paul, who has himself written to you, condemns licence and disorder as emphatically as I do myself," it makes little difference which Epistle we choose. Indeed, St. Peter goes on to say that all St. Paul's Epistles teach the same lesson.

If, on the other hand, the stress falls on the words *τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἠγείσθε*, and if we suppose the reference to be to an Epistle in which moral disorder was connected with difficulties about the Parousia, 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. Alford elects for 1 Thess., thinking that St. Peter actually refers to this Epistle in ver. 10 above (but see note there).

The reader must make his choice between more or less uncertain possibilities. If 2 Peter was not written to Asiatic Christians, Corinthians (see Introduction, p. 244) or Thessalonians may very well be meant. If, on the other hand, it was,—and this seems more probable,—then Galatians, Ephesians, or Colossians may conceivably be referred to. But if we judge both that the recipients of 2 Peter were Asiatics, and that the Pauline letter in question dealt explicitly with disorders arising out of doubts about the Parousia, we are forced to conclude that St. Peter is speaking of a Pauline Epistle which, like that to the Laodiceans, or that to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), no longer exists. This is the opinion maintained on various grounds by Pott, Spitta, Kühn, and Zahn.

16. *ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς.* This is the reading of A B C ; K L P have *πάσαις ταῖς*. "As also (he writes), in each and every letter (or in all his letters), speaking about these things." It is by no means necessary to see in these words, as some have done, a reference to a definite canonical body of Pauline Epistles. St. Peter tells us that he was acquainted with several letters of St. Paul's, but does not say how many, nor whether they were earlier or later in date than the letter or letters referred to in *ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν*. Nor, again, does he expressly say that these other letters were known to his readers, though this is probably implied in the following words of caution. In all these letters St. Paul speaks about "these things," the coming of our Lord to judge, and the need of being found spotless and blameless in peace. The doctrine of the two great teachers is for all purposes of the present Epistle the same.

There is nothing surprising in these words. Under the Empire epistolary communication was as easy as it is now, though the speed of conveyance was not quite so great. It is not only possible,

but probable, that St. Peter received every one of St. Paul's Epistles within a month or two of its publication. We cannot imagine that one apostle should have remained in ignorance of what other apostles were doing, and it is quite inconceivable that St. Peter should not have read Galatians and 1 Corinthians. See Introduction, p. 241.

ἐν αἷς. C K L P have ἐν οἷς.

δυσνόητα. In the Pauline Epistles there were passages which St. Peter regarded as hard to understand, difficult, obscure, capable of a right interpretation, but capable also of being wrested to a man's destruction. Alford reads ἐν οἷς ("in which matters"), and follows De Wette in thinking that the reference is specially to St. Paul's teaching about the Parousia, in particular to 2 Thess. ii. 1 sqq. But what St. Paul says there as to the signs of the End, though *δυσνόητον*, could not be so distorted as to endanger the reader's salvation. Clearly St. Peter has in view "utterances which could be so twisted that they might serve to justify moral laxity" (Spitta; so also von Soden, Kühn, Weiss, Wiesinger). Such are Rom. iii. 20, 28, iv. 15, v. 20, vii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 56; Gal. iii. 10, from which "the ignorant and unsteadfast" could (Rom. vi. 1), and in fact did, draw the false inference that morality is indifferent, and that the Christian is "free" from the Ten Commandments. Hofmann, however, is very possibly right in thinking that among the *δυσνόητα* are to be reckoned also those passages where St. Paul speaks of the spiritual resurrection of baptism (Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 12, iii. 1), which Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17) may have "twisted" into the sense that there is no other resurrection. St. Peter expresses himself with wisdom and moderation. St. James is more directly polemical, and comes very near to making St. Paul responsible for the erroneous interpretation which some had fixed upon his view of Faith and Freedom.

οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι. For *ἀστήρικτοι* cf. i. 12, ii. 14; 1 Pet. v. 10. *Ἀμαθής* (not used elsewhere in the New Testament), bringing out, as it does, the moral value of teaching, of trained habits of reflexion, of disciplined good sense, is highly characteristic of St. Peter. By teaching the Christian is established in the way of truth (ii. 2), and of justice (ii. 21), the straight way (ii. 15), the way which is substantially one and the same in the Old Testament and in the New.

ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς. "As they also wrest the other scriptures." We might translate "the scriptures as well," or "the scriptures on the other hand"; cf. Hom. *Od.* i. 132, *ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων μνηστήρων* (see Mr. Merry's note), where Odysseus is distinguished from the others, the suitors; Luke xxiii. 32, *ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι*: 1 Thess. iv. 13, where *οἱ λοιποὶ* means not "other Christians," but "other people who are not Christians": Deut.

viii. 20, *καθὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη*: here again "the other nations" are contrasted with Israel (this is a common phrase). In this case the Pauline Epistles are not here included in, but distinguished from, "the other scriptures." Yet it is possible that St. Peter speaks of the writings of his brother apostle as "scripture" in the full sense of the word. Scripture is the voice of the Spirit of Christ speaking through man (1 Pet. i. 11), that Spirit which St. Paul claims as his teacher (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13), and by which his *σοφία* was given. There can be little doubt that the apostles were regarded, and regarded themselves, as *ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*. Writing inspired by the Holy Spirit was "holy writing;" and was afterwards canonised, because it had from the first been so considered. The Pauline Epistles were read in church, and even in churches to which they were not addressed (Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27), just as scripture was. See Introduction, p. 240.

St. Peter has already warned his readers (i. 20) that all prophecy may be distorted by "private interpretations." Here he adds that the Epistles of St. Paul may be garbled in the same way.

Spitta rejects both the explanations given above, the second, on the ground that Peter cannot possibly have placed the Pauline Epistles on a level with the Old Testament; the first, mainly because the perversion of the *λοιπαὶ γραφαί* is mentioned incidentally, and, as it were, by-the-way, after that of the Pauline Epistles, as if it were a matter of less consequence. Hence he concludes that these "other writings" were Epistles written by the companions of St. Paul. But this objection is not serious. St. Peter had already said that prophecy might be misinterpreted, and he would hardly have said this unless he meant that the Libertines did actually misinterpret it. Hence, in the present passage, it is quite sufficient for him to throw in a passing reminder. "These men gloze St. Paul, as I have told you that they gloze the scriptures." Besides, the meaning of *γραφαί*, used in this way without the name of an author, is so fixed that it cannot here mean anything but scripture.

The most important question arising out of the present passage is whether, if St. Paul's Epistles are here spoken of as *γραφή*, this fact implies the existence of a settled Canon of the New Testament. If so, the date of 2 Peter might be held to fall somewhat late in the second century; and many commentators do so place it accordingly. The point must be taken in connexion with the other indications of date which are discussed in the Introduction. Here it is sufficient to say that there is nothing in the language of 2 Peter which implies the existence of a fixed and definite corpus of Pauline Epistles,—we should infer, rather, that St. Paul was still alive, and writing,—and that the use of the later technical terms "canon"

and "canonical" only confuse matters. What we are to ask is not whether the Pauline Epistles are here treated as "canonical," but whether they are regarded as possessing those qualities which a later generation made the standard of canonicity; whether, in other words, they are treated as apostolical and inspired. If we put the question in this shape, there is no reason why St. Peter should not have believed St. Paul's utterances to be the word of the Lord; and it is certain that St. Paul himself held them so to be. It does not necessarily follow that St. Peter placed his fellow-apostles on the same level with Moses and the old prophets; but he may very well have placed them even higher. St. Paul sets apostles before prophets (Eph. iv. 11); and, though he is speaking here primarily of Christian prophets, there is no essential difference between one prophet and another. And it follows from 1 Pet. i. 12 that the Christian evangelist was superior to the old prophets, as Christ Himself was greater than Moses.

17. ὑμεῖς οὖν. "Ye therefore, beloved, since ye know beforehand, be on your guard; lest, being carried away with the error of the lawless, ye fall from your own steadfastness (or foundation)."
 Προγινώσκοντες is equivalent to ταῦτα πρότον γινώσκοντες, i. 20, iii. 3; ἀθέσμων is repeated from ii. 7, πλάνη from ii. 18. For συναπαχθέντες cf. Gal. ii. 13. Στηριγμός (antithesis to ἀστηρικτοῖ) is not used elsewhere in the New Testament. Commentators generally render the word here by "steadfastness," but it more probably means "a strong foundation." Thus Longinus, *de Subl.* chap. 40, στηριγμούς τε ἔχειν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ ἐξερέσματα τῶν χρόνων, the words, in a passage of the *Antiope* of Euripides, do not rush on too fast, but have stays, or supports, or something that makes a pause in their connexion with one another. The sense of "a foundation" belongs, it is true, rather to στήριγμα, but verbals in -μα and -μος are confused in later Greek; see κύλισμα, 2 Pet. ii. 22, and ἀρπαγμός, Phil. ii. 6. The foundation is defined as χάρις καὶ γνῶσις, which are at once the solid base on which the Christian is established, and the root in or from which he is to grow. Ἴδιον is perhaps more than a mere possessive; you have your own foundation, which is not that of the Libertines, who, indeed, have none.

18. αὐξάνετε. The active voice is here employed where classical usage would require the middle, as is frequently the case in later Greek. With the whole phrase cf. i. 2, χάρις ὑμῖν . . . πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. The construction is not certain. We may translate, "in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord"; in this case τοῦ Κυρίου belongs as objective genitive to γινῶσει alone; or, "in the grace and knowledge of our Lord," our Lord being regarded as the giver of both gifts. If we take the first view, γνῶσις will be another name for the ἐπίγνωσις, cf. i. 2, 8. If the second, γνῶσις

is to be explained as in i. 5, 6. The latter course is preferable, because the words appear to mean different things, ἐπίγνωσις meaning that personal acquaintance with the Saviour which is the beginning and end of the spiritual life, while γνωσις is rather "understanding," "Christian instruction," and here forms an antithesis to ἀμαθείς. Γνωσις is the articulation of ἐπίγνωσις.

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα. The doxology is addressed to Christ (see notes on 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11), as indeed is natural considering the high Christology of this Epistle. Εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, "unto the day of eternity," is found only here in the New Testament; but see Sir. xviii. 9, 10, ἀριθμὸς ἡμερῶν ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ ἔτη ἑκατόν· ὡς σταγῶν ὕδατος ἀπὸ θαλάσσης καὶ ψῆφος ἄμμου, οὕτως ὀλίγα ἔτη ἐν ἡμέρα αἰῶνος, "the number of man's days at the most are a hundred years. As a drop of water from the sea, and as a pebble from the sand; so are a few years in the day of eternity." In Sirach "day of eternity" clearly means "eternity," in which years are lost as a drop in the ocean. So here, also, εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος is equivalent to εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Mr. Chase, in his *Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, does not comment on this remarkable phrase. But εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας becomes so immediately the ruling phrase that this Petrine doxology cannot have been written after liturgical expressions had become in any degree stereotyped. Contrast the doxology of Jude, which offers a strong resemblance to later forms, and is followed by the "Amen," which is not genuine here.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

§ I. TESTIMONIA VETERUM.

Jerome.

346-420.

De vir. ill. iv., "Judas frater Jacobi parvam quae de septem catholicis est epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia a plerisque reicitur: tamen auctoritatem vetustate iam et usu meruit et inter sanctas computatur."

Eusebius.

260-340.

H. E. ii. 23. 25, Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι νοθεύεται μὲν (he is speaking of the Epistle of James), οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μίᾳς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἐπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν, ὅμως δ' ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις.

Here Eusebius gives it as his own opinion that Jude was νόθος, on the ground that few of the ancients mentioned it, that is to say, quoted it by name. But he admits that some of the ancients had done so, and that it was regarded as genuine by very many Churches.

H. E. iii. 25. 3. Here Eusebius ranks Jude in the number of τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, and expressly distinguishes writings of this class from the νόθα.

H. E. vi. 13. 6, 14. 1. Clement quoted Jude and commented upon it in the *Hypotyposes*.

Didymus of Alexandria.

Died, 394 or 399.

Comments on Jude, and defends it against those who questioned the authority of the Epistle on the ground of the use therein made of apocryphal books. Migne, xxxix. 1811-1818; Zahn, *Forschungen*, iii. 97.

Synod of Antioch.

264, or perhaps the second synod held a few years later.

Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30. 4. The bishops speak of Paul of Samosata as τὸν καὶ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀρνούμενου, καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἣν καὶ αὐτὸς πρότερον εἶχε, μὴ φυλάξαντος. Some MSS. insert καὶ Κύριον before ἀρνούμενου: and if this reading could be guaranteed (it is rejected by Heinichen), we might find here a reference to Jude 4 where K L P have τὸν μόνον δεσπότην Θεὸν καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. But this reading again is doubtful.

Origen.

In *Matth.* tom. xvii. 30 (Lomm. iv. 149), after the words εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδα πρόσουτό τις ἐπιστολήν, proceeds to quote Jude 6.

Ibid. x. 17 (Lomm. iii. 46), καὶ Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολήν, ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανόθεν χάριτος ἔρρωμένων λόγων, ὅστις ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἶρηκεν Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ δούλου, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.

Again in *Matth.* tom. xv. 27 (Lomm. iii. 386); in *Joan.* tom. xiii. 37 (Lomm. ii. 70), he quotes Jude 6 without naming the Epistle.

In the Latin version of Origen, Jude 6 is quoted in *ad Rom.* iii. 6 (Lomm. vi. 192), v. 1 (Lomm. vi. 338, "quod apostolus Iudas in sua epistola dicit"); in *Ezech.* Hom. iv. 1 (Lomm. xiv. 58), and Jude 8 and 9 in *Epist. ad Alex.* (Lomm. xvii. 7, 8); *de princ.* iii. 2. 1 (Lomm. xxi. 303, "de quo in adscensione Mosis, cuius libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas").

Origen treats Jude much as he treats 2 Peter. He acknowledges that there were doubts, but does not appear to have felt them himself. He was attracted to the Epistle by that very feature which repelled others, its angelology. The title apostle is given to Jude only in the Latin version of Origen.

Clement of Alexandria.

Commented on Jude in his *Hypotyposes*. The substance of his commentary is still extant in the Latin *Adumbrationes*, which may be found in the edition of Dindorf or in Zahn's *Forschungen*. Dr. Westcott with justice regards the latter part of this *Adumbration*, from *immaculatus autem*, as an interpolation due to Cassiodorus, and in the former part the words "sic etiam peccato Adae subiacemus secundum peccati similitudinem" can hardly be genuine, but the rest is not open to suspicion.

In *Paed.* iii. 8. 44, Clement quotes Jude 5, 6 by name: in the next section, 45, Jude 11 is quoted, not by name.

In *Strom.* iii. 2. 11 he quotes by name Jude 8-16, giving, as he often does, the first and last words of the section.

Tertullian.

De cultu fem. i. 3, "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet." "His words seem to imply that the Epistle was known to his readers, and therefore current in a Latin translation." "It should be added that it has no place among the books contained in the Latin *antiqua translatio* referred to by Cassiodorus, *de inst. diu. litt.* xiv." (Dr. Chase, article on *Jude* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). The Epistle is omitted in the *Canon Mommsenianus*, an African catalogue of about 350 A.D.; see Introduction to 1 Peter above, p. 14, but is included in the list of canonical Scriptures set forth by the third Council of Carthage in 397; see Westcott, *Canon*, p. 542.

The Muratorianum.

Accepts Jude, but mentions it in a manner which implies that it was doubted by some; see Introduction to 1 Peter above, p. 14.

Theophilus of Antioch.

Died, 183-185.

ii. 15 *ad fin.*, οἱ δ' αὖ μεταβαίνοντες καὶ φεύγοντες τόπον ἐκ τόπου, οἱ καὶ πλάνητες καλούμενοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ τύπος τυγχάνουσιν τῶν ἀφισταμένων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Only in Jude (not in *Enoch*) are the planets a type of fallen man.

Athenagoras.

About 177 A.D.

Suppl. xxiv. (Otto, pp. 129, 130). The good angels ἔμειναν ἐφ' οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν καὶ διέταξεν ὁ Θεός, but others τῶν περὶ τὸ πρῶτον στερέωμα (these are the planets whose place is the first heaven below the ἀπλανῆς σφαῖρα) fell through lust. They are the angels ὧν δόξαι οὐ μικραί, xxv. (Otto, p. 136). Here there is a clear reference to Jude.

Polycarp.

Phil. address. Ἐλεος ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, cf. Jude 2.

Phil. iii. 2, οἰκοδομῆσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, cf. Jude 3, 20; only here do we find the figure of building on or into the faith.

Phil. x., "mansuetudinem Domini alterutri praestolantes." The Greek text may have been τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀλλήλοις προσδεχόμενοι, thus we should get the right word for *praestolantes*, cf. Jude 21; see, however, the notes of Lightfoot and Zahn.

Phil. xi. 4, "sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos reuocate,

ut omnium uestrum corpus saluetis. Hoc enim agentes uos ipsos aedificatis." The same two thoughts are found in juxtaposition in Jude 20, 23.

Martyrium Polycarpi.

xxi., in doxology, δόξα, τιμή, μεγαλωσύνη, cf. Jude 25.

Second Epistle of Clement.

xvi. 2, μεταληψόμεθα τοῦ ἐλέους Ἰησοῦ, cf. Jude 21.

Hermas.

Sim. v. 7. 2, μαιίνειν τὴν σάρκα, cf. Jude 8.

Clement of Rome.

xx. 12, ᾧ ἢ δόξα καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη.

lxv. 2, δόξα, τιμή, κράτος, μεγαλωσύνη.

Both these phrases occur in doxologies and may be liturgical. Sir. xviii. 5 has κράτος μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται, but it is still possible that the form is suggested by Jude 25.

Barnabas.

ii. 10, ἀκριβεύεσθαι οὖν ὀφείλομεν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ πονηρὸς παρείσδυσιν πλάνης ποιήσας ἐν ἡμῖν ἐκσφενδονήσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν, cf. Jude 3, 4. Παρείσδυσις does not occur in the Greek Bible; παρείσδυνω is found only in Jude. It is just possible that Barnabas was thinking of Jude.

There can be little doubt that Athenagoras knew Jude, and the references to Polycarp will bear some weight. Above that time it must be allowed that the evidence is scanty and shadowy. There is less to produce than in the case of 2 Peter, but Jude is less interesting and much shorter. The testimony of Athenagoras is sufficient to carry back the date of Jude as high as the early years of the second century; if we accept the witness of Polycarp we must proceed still further, and there is nothing to prevent us from ascribing the Epistle even to the first century.

The most serious points in the case against Jude are the omission of the Epistle by the editors of the Peshito, and the fact that its authenticity was doubted in the time of Origen. It is possible that the omission and the doubt are connected, and that both may be accounted for by the same reason, namely, the use made in the Epistle of apocryphal writings. Certainly this was one reason for its rejection, as we learn from Jerome and Didymus, and it may

very well have been the only one. We may consider this point in some little detail.

It has been maintained by Hofmann, Weisse, Volkmar, and others that *Enoch* did not exist, at any rate in its complete form, before the beginning of the second century A.D., and this contention has formed one of the main grounds for ascribing a still later date to the Epistle of Jude. Mr. Charles, however, in his admirable edition, explains and justifies the conclusion that of the six elements which may be distinguished in *Enoch*, not one is later than the Christian era.

Enoch was used by the author of the *Assumption of Moses*, writing about the time of the Christian era, in the *Book of Jubilees* (before 70 A.D.), in the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (not long after 70 A.D.), in 4 Ezra (between 81 and 96 A.D.), and in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. It was known also to many of the writers of the New Testament. Mr. Charles gives a list of passages which attest this fact. They abound in the Apocalypse, but they are to be discovered also in the Pauline Epistles, 1 and 2 Peter, Hebrews, Acts, and even the Gospels.

Barnabas cites *Enoch* three times, twice as scripture; and the book was used also by Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Clement. Irenaeus also knew *Enoch*, but it is to be noticed that on the crucial point he refuses to follow its teaching. The reason why the angels sinned, he tells us, must be left to God (ii. 28. 7). They sinned before they fell to earth (iv. 16. 2); hence lust was the consequence and punishment, not the cause of their fall. Origen doubted the inspiration of the book, but does not absolutely reject it; he was attracted towards it by its promise of mysteries, but he believed that the angels fell through pride. Somewhat later Anatolius of Laodicea (bishop in 269; Eus. *H. E.* vii. 32. 19) refers to *Enoch* for an astronomical point. From this time the book fell into disrepute. Chrysostom treated the account therein given of the fall of the angels as blasphemy (*Hom. in Gen.* vi. 1). Jerome called *Enoch* apocryphal. Augustine pronounced strongly against it on the ground of its angelology (*de Civ. dei*, xv. 23. 4), and Photius blames Clement of Alexandria in very severe terms for adopting its account of the angelic sin (Cod. cix.).

In short, at the time when Barnabas wrote, *Enoch* was held to be an inspired book; it retained this reputation more or less throughout the second century, and from that date onwards was more or less emphatically condemned. And the ground of condemnation was its attribution of carnal lust to heavenly beings.

More than one inference may be drawn from these facts. It is certain that the authors of 2 Peter and of Jude would hold much the same opinion of *Enoch*; both would regard the book with high respect. Hence it is impossible to fix the relative dates of the two Epistles by that *Apokryphenscheu*, or comparative reserve in the use

of Apocrypha, which some German scholars detect in 2 Peter. Indeed, if it could be admitted that the later of the two was likely to be more discreet in his use of *Enoch*, the fact would tell in favour of the priority of 2 Peter, who may be thought to adopt the objectionable interpretation of Gen. vi., while Jude rather avoids it (see notes on the respective passages).

Again, the offence of Jude was not so much that he made use of *Enoch*, as that he actually quoted the book by name. Some, like Tertullian, would regard this fact as canonising *Enoch*; others, again, would regard it as condemning Jude. There must have been many men of authority even in the second century who took the latter view. For the Enochian account of the fall of the angels was not only repulsive to devout minds, but lent itself with great facility to more than one of the Gnostic systems.

Here we may find a very probable reason for the rejection of Jude by the editors of the Peshito. It is precisely in Syria, where the extravagances of Jewish angelology were most familiar, that we should expect to find the strongest reaction against them. (On the subject of *Enoch* see especially Mr. Charles' edition, and Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Eng. trans., references in Index).

Jude's use of the *Assumption of Moses* also gave great offence, as we see from Didymus, not because of the source of what he says about the archangel, but because of its nature.

Finally, it may be said that the use of Jewish apocalypses forms a bond of relationship between 1 and 2 Peter and Jude. All three employ them in much the same way, a way that is different from that in which they are employed in other books of the New Testament, in order to give concrete details of our Lord's ministrations in the world of spirits, or of the history of the angels. If we compare their utterances with what we know from other sources of Jewish speculations on topics of this nature, we shall see that all three exercise great reserve. Jude goes slightly further than the other two, but there is no considerable difference. This feature may be taken as an indication that all three documents belong to nearly the same date, that the authors of all three were Jews who still bore legible traits of their Jewish education, yet at the same time exhibited that delicacy of spiritual perception which distinguishes the Church from the sectarians.

§ 2. VOCABULARY AND STYLE.

The words peculiar to Jude are ἀποδιορίζω, ἀπταιστος¹, γογγυστής¹, δείγμα, ἐξελέγχειν (v.l. in ver. 15)¹, ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, ἐπαφρίζω, μεμψίμοιρος, παρεισθύνειν, πλανήτης, σπιλάς, φθινοπωρινός, φυσικῶς.

The words marked (1) are found in one or other of the Greek versions of the Old Testament. *Ἀπαιστος occurs only once in the LXX., 3 Macc. vi. 39. Γογγυστής, in Sym. Prov. xxvi. 22; Isa. xxix. 24; Theod. Prov. xxvi. 20, but not in the LXX., though γογγύζειν, γογγυσμός, γόγγυσις are there found. Πλανήτης is found Hos. ix. 17 in the sense of "wanderers," but is not used in the Greek Bible of "wandering stars."

The use of the Old Testament in Jude is very similar to that in 2 Peter. Biblical words are used, and the facts of the ancient history are known, but there is no direct quotation. Dr. Chase goes too far when he says that the writer is steeped in the language of the LXX. Of the phrases which he cites, ἐμπαίκτης is borrowed from 2 Peter, θαυμάζειν πρόσωπα and λαλεῖν ὑπέρογκα are probably taken from the *Assumption of Moses*, and ἐνπνιάζεσθαι is used without the accusative ἐνύπνιον.

Many of Jude's phrases have a poetic ring about them, ἐπαφρίζειν, σπιλάς, φθινοπωρινός, κύματα ἄγρια, προκείσθαι δείγμα, δίκην ὑπέχεν. In this also he bears resemblance to 2 Peter.

He is, however, more correct. Thus he has σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι, ver. 3, for the vulgar σπουδὴν παρεισφέρειν, 2 Pet. i. 5. The introductory vers. 3, 4 are well written; this is true also of vers. 11 and 13, and of the concluding passage vers. 20-25, which is finely expressed. He corrects and simplifies 2 Peter in vers. 10 and 17, drops his awkward Hebraisms in vers. 10 and 18, and does not needlessly repeat words; the only striking instances of repetition are those of κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, vers. 16, 18, and of ἀσεβής, vers. 15, 18. Ver. 11 is sufficient to show how greatly superior he is to 2 Peter in command of language.

The ἔρρωμένοι λόγοι which Origen admired are to be looked for mainly in the denunciatory passage, where the style is affected by the model of 2 Peter. But Jude's own writing is strong, dignified, and sonorous.

The style and tone of the Epistle set before us a stern and unbending nature. There is no pathos in Jude, and he inclines always to a harsh view. See Introduction to 2 Peter, p. 221 sq. There is severity approaching to rigour in vers. 3, 22, 23. In this point 2 Peter bears a close resemblance to 1 Peter, but is very different from Jude.

Lastly, attention must again be drawn to the use of Pauline phraseology. In Jude's vocabulary ἅγιος means "a Christian," and, whether accidentally or not, the word does not carry this significance in either 1 or 2 Peter. Κλητός belongs to the same family, and the phrase used in ver. 19, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, is strongly Pauline. Peter could hardly have used πνεῦμα ἔχειν in this sense, of men who are guided by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and ψυχικός, carnal, is wholly incompatible with the Petrine use of ψυχή. Jude does not

employ the other crucial words *δίκαιος* or *δικαιοσύνη*, and we are therefore unable to say what signification he attached to them. But if *δὲς ἀποθανόντα*, ver. 12, means "dead first in trespasses and sins, and afterwards in apostasy," we have here another Pauline thought.

We must suppose either that a Petrine Epistle was recast by a friend of St. Paul's, or that a Pauline Epistle was adapted by a disciple of St. Peter's. The former seems much the easier of the two alternatives.

§ 3. INDICATIONS OF DATE IN JUDE.

Till recently it was held by many scholars that the Book of Enoch did not exist before the time of Barcochba. This opinion has now been generally abandoned, and with it disappears one strong argument for the late date of the Epistle.

Pfleiderer and others maintained that the false teachers denounced in Jude were the Carpocratians. If this were true, we should be obliged to place the Epistle somewhere about the middle of the second century. But it is not really a tenable view.

As to the date of Carpocratianism we only know that the sect was in existence before the time of Hegesippus (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22. 5) and of Irenaeus (i. 25, ii. 31-34). Carpocrates is said to have insisted on the unity of God, but to have taught that the world was made by evil angels. According to this statement of Irenaeus he was therefore a dualist, like all the Gnostics. It is possible, however, that Irenaeus did not rightly apprehend the precise form of his teaching on this point. At any rate the doctrine of his son, Epiphanes, was quite different. Epiphanes based his moral system on the state of nature, which is divine, yet neither chaste nor honest. "God," he said, "made the vines in common for all men; they reject neither the sparrow nor the thief." The same rule applies to difference of sex. In all things the divine justice is *κοινωνία μετ' ἰσότητος*. Human law violates this natural equality of right, makes the thief, and makes the adulterer. Nature is divine, but law is devilish. In the fragments from the work of Epiphanes on *Justice*, preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 2), we are not told expressly who was supposed to be the author of law, but it was probably the adversary, the Devil. Our Lord taught us that we are to "free ourselves from the adversary" (Luke xii. 58). This is to be done by breaking all his rules, and completing the cycle of experience which he forbids. Those who have not attained in this way to perfect emancipation must return again to life in other bodies till they have found freedom (Iren. i. 25. 4).

It is not difficult to reconcile Epiphanes and Carpocrates, and it may probably be true that the Carpocratian dualism opposed not

God and Nature, but Nature and Law. But Irenaeus tells us that according to Carpocrates the world itself was created by evil beings; and, though this may be a misconception, it is the view current among the Christian writers against Gnosticism, and would be that of Jude himself, if he lived at the time when this heresy was at work.

Some of the Gnostics did not desire to separate wholly from the Church, but this can hardly have been the case with the Carpo-cratians.

Whatever view we take of this extravagant sect, it is impossible to suppose that Jude had actually seen or heard of them. Carpo-cratianism was built on Stoicism (*ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν*) and on the *Republic* of Plato, but Jude says not one word about philosophy. The sect practised magic to show that they were masters over the evil spirits, believed in the transmigration of souls, possessed pictures or statues of Christ and the philosophers, which they crowned, or, in other words, worshipped, with equal honour. Some of them marked themselves with a brand on the right ear. They have nothing whatever in common with the men denounced by Jude except Antinomianism, and to find this error at work we have no need to look beyond the apostolic times.

Jülicher, however, is still unwilling to admit this. The opponents denounced by Jude, he says (*Einleitung*, i. 180), "are not simply vicious and characterless Christians, who had perhaps fallen away in the persecution (Jude 4, 16), or even Jewish revolutionaries, but Antinomian Gnostics." They are Gnostics because they call the catholics "psychic" (ver. 19), regard the God of the Old Testament and His angels either as evil or as far inferior to the true God (vers. 8, 10), treat the violation of the Decalogue as a duty, and even practise unnatural vices (vers. 8, 23). Hence we must regard them as Carpocratians, or as Archontics, or as "a school of Gnostics which afterwards disappeared."

Every word of this reasoning is disputable in the highest degree. But there is a sense in which we may accept the last of Jülicher's alternative conclusions. These people may be called Gnostics, at the cost of a slight anachronism, in so far as they set reason (or the inner light) against Scripture, and "they afterwards disappeared" in this sense, that these early Antinomian movements, which had in themselves no principle except a gross misconception of Pauline freedom, were finally lost in the developed Gnosticism of the second century.

Jülicher maintains, further, that the author of Jude is shown to be a man of late date by his stiff orthodoxy (vers. 3, 20), by his allusion to the time of the apostles as quite past (ver. 17), by his quotation of a Christian saying as written long ago (ver. 4), by his use of apocrypha, which is not in the apostolic manner. The general conclusion at

which he arrives is that Jude must have been written before 180 (on the ground of the external attestation), that we cannot fix the exact date between 100 and 180, but that it must have been rather early than late between these two limits, because the author evidently regards this outbreak of Gnostic godlessness as a new thing.

Here again every point is highly disputable. Jude's use of apocrypha is certainly not later than that of Barnabas, and one of the reasons for which Harnack and others place 2 Peter after Jude is that the latter employs apocrypha more courageously, that is to say, more in the primitive manner, than the former. Again, ver. 17 need not be understood to imply that the apostolic age was quite past. Jude tells us that he himself was not an apostle; and this counts in his favour, for Tertullian gives him the title, and a second century forger would probably have done the same. The writer of this Epistle knew that the brother of James was not one of the Twelve. For the rest he bids his disciples "remember the words spoken before by the apostles" (ver. 17). In 2 Peter the apostles appear as still active. From the words of Jude we may infer one of two things, either that they (or some of them) were dead, or that they were dispersed in such a way that their voice could not at the time be heard by those to whom the Epistle was directed. The latter supposition, as Dr. Chase thinks, will quite satisfy the requirements of the expression. Indeed it is hard to believe that a writer, who claimed to be the brother of James, yet was clever enough not to pretend to be an apostle, would betray himself by any very gross anachronism. Again, there is no reason for thinking that the words *οἱ παλαιοὶ προγεγραμμένοι*, in ver. 4, refer to a Christian document; if there were, there would be strong grounds for holding, with Spitta and Zahn, that 2 Peter is the document in question. This Jülicher would not allow, and his Christian document is a mere fiction of the imagination. As to Jude's orthodoxy, the same objective conception of "the faith" is found elsewhere in the New Testament, even in the Pauline Epistles (Gal. i. 23, vi. 10; Rom. x. 8); and, though Jude's language is stern, his belief in the exclusiveness of the Christian creed is readily illustrated (Acts iv. 12; John iii. 18; Matt. iii. 12; Apoc. xxi. 8; Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Eph. ii. 3; Heb. x. 29).

Dr. Zahn (*Einleitung*, ii. 83) infers from ver. 5 that Jerusalem had been destroyed at the time when Jude wrote; but this meaning can hardly be extracted from the passage. There is no allusion to persecution; at the time when the Epistle was written it is probable that none had occurred. Very little can be gathered as to the organisation of the Church. The writer clearly regards himself as responsible for the oversight of a group of communities; and as in 2 Peter, the *δόξαι* are probably the presbyters who have *κυριότης*: the same officials seem to be alluded to in the phrase *ποιμαίνοντες*

ἐαυτοῦς. This is the same state of things that we find in the Petrine Epistles, and it may be said with great confidence that, if Jude had been writing in the midst of the Gnostic controversy, he would certainly have said more about the position of the clergy. The adversaries whom he denounces are the same who appear in 2 Peter, and enough has been said about them in the Introduction to that Epistle.

Some help towards fixing the date would be gained, if we could settle the precise relationship of Jude to our Lord. Clement of Alexandria, following the very ancient tradition embodied in the *Protevangelium* of James, regarded him as the son of Joseph by a previous marriage (*Adumb. in Ep. Judae ad initium*). If we accept this view Jude was older than Christ, though possibly not by many years, as he is named last or last but one of the brethren. And this view is commended not only by the peculiar form of Jude's address,—he seems to shrink from calling himself the Lord's brother,—but by the fact that the brethren on more than one occasion appear to have claimed a certain right to interfere with our Lord's freedom of action (Matt. xii. 46; John vii. 3; indeed all the passages where the Lord's brethren are mentioned in the Gospels are most readily understood in the same way). But if this is so, and if Jude was born some six or seven years at least before the Christian era, we could not safely date the Epistle after 65 A.D. or thereabouts. Those who, while accepting the Epistle as authentic, would yet place it about 80 or 90 A.D., must face this as well as other difficulties.

Dismissing the theory that the Epistle is the work of a forger, we find the posterior limit of time in the probable duration of Jude's active powers. The anterior limit is given by 2 Peter. But there still remains a question as to the interval of time that may be supposed to have elapsed between the two Epistles.

It is not at all likely that this interval was considerable. In the first place, the circumstances which called forth the two Epistles are in all substantial features identical. But Antinomianism, or anarchism, is perpetually changing its shape. Even in its embryonic stage it is never the same for two moments together. We need only turn to the life of Luther, and read again the well-known history of his dealings with Carlstadt and Münzer for an illustration. Before very long this void and formless anarchy takes shape, enunciates definite propositions, forms a school or conventicle. But neither St. Peter nor St. Jude mentions any distinct persons, or facts, or doctrines. They do not give so many details about the errors which they denounce as Colossians, or the Pastoral Epistles, or the Apocalypse. It is quite certain that they would have done so, if it had been in their power. If they are vague, it is for the obvious reason that they are obliged to be vague. They deal with

this new heresy just as 1 Peter deals with persecution. There is as yet nothing very definite to lay hold of; the peril is inchoate, and their warning is like an alarm in the night; it is only known that there is an enemy. In five or ten years' time this state of things must have undergone a material change. Again, it is exceedingly difficult to believe that these moral disorders endured after the outbreak of the Neronian persecution:

“Hi motus animorum atque haec certamina tanta
Sanguinis exigui iactu compressa quiescunt.”

Nor, again, is it easy to understand how St. Jude came to make so free and yet unacknowledged a use of 2 Peter after a lapse of time. Can we think that the previous Epistle had been forgotten, that by some miracle precisely the same state of things had recurred, that Jude happened to possess a copy of 2 Peter, and adapted it to his purpose without saying what he had done? This is not a plausible hypothesis.

The same difficulty recurs whichever Epistle we put first, and it is greatly aggravated if we regard both as forgeries. Between such forgeries we could hardly allow a smaller interval than thirty years. But if we are to date Jude about 125-130 and 2 Peter about 155-160, how did the latter succeed in imposing upon the learned Clement?

By far the easiest and most probable explanation of the facts is that which has already been propounded, that the errors denounced in both Epistles took their origin from Corinth, that the disorder was spreading, that St. Peter took alarm and wrote his Second Epistle, sending a copy to St. Jude with a warning of the urgency of the danger, and that St. Jude at once issued a similar letter to the Churches in which he was personally interested. In fact, both Epistles may be samples of a circular that was addressed to many groups of Churches at the same time. In this way we get a perfectly natural explanation of Jude 3, a most significant verse. The writer had evidently received a sudden alarm, which had obliged him to write one thing when he was purposing to write quite another. The *ἀνάγκη* arose from the arrival of 2 Peter.

Thus also we find an intelligible explanation of the resemblance and of the difference between the two Epistles. In the second century a number of bishops sent round a circular against Montanism (Eus. *H. E.* v. 19), signed with their names. So the apostles in the early years of the Church sent round a circular in the matter of the circumcision dispute. Why should not the Corinthian disorders have called forth a similar manifesto? There may have been an apostolic meeting on the subject, or, if for any reason a meeting was not possible, a model epistle might be circulated, which each apostle or apostolic man would be at liberty

to modify, within reasonable limits, according to his personal inclination. This is certainly what would be done now, and common sense would dictate a very similar course at all times.

Thus we may conclude that Jude is practically contemporaneous with 2 Peter. Nor can the difference of tense between the *παρεισέδυσαν* of the one and the *ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* of the other be taken as a serious objection to this view. It is the nature of Jude to put things more forcibly. But the two Epistles were addressed to different Churches, and the danger which was imminent in one place may have been present in another.

§ 4. AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE. WHERE, AND TO WHOM WAS IT WRITTEN ?

In the Address the author styles himself "Jude, the slave of Jesus Christ, but brother of James." "Slave of Jesus Christ" means "faithful Christian," or "labourer in the Lord's vineyard" (see note); the second qualification marks him out as brother of that James who appears in Acts xv. xxi. as president of the Church at Jerusalem, who is called "the Lord's brother" by St. Paul, Gal. i. 19, and is commonly regarded as the author of the Epistle of James.

We may identify him with that Jude or Judas of whom we read in the Gospels as one of the Lord's Brethren. The list, as given by Matt. xiii. 55, is James, and Joseph (*v.l.* Joses), and Simon, and Judas; as given by Mark vi. 3, James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon. Both evangelists tell us that there were also sisters, and place Judas last, or last but one; and as the order which they follow is not an order of honour, for Joseph or Joses is unknown, we may probably infer that Jude was third or fourth of the sons in respect of age. What was the position of the daughters in the family sequence we cannot ascertain.

Jude is first expressly called "brother of the Lord" by Hege-sippus, and it is probable that neither he nor James used this title themselves. But it was freely given to them by the Church, as we see from 1 Cor. ix. 5. From this passage we gather also two important facts, that the brethren were well known in Corinth, a Gentile city, and that more than one of them were married. Hege-sippus tells us that two grandsons of Jude were brought before Domitian, the authorities having taken alarm at their claim of descent from David, and of relationship to Christ; but that when they had showed their horny hands, described the little farm which they held in common, and explained that the kingdom which they looked for was not of this world, they were scornfully dismissed (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 20). Hege-sippus further related that

both these descendants of Jude lived on into the reign of Trajan, and seems clearly to imply that they were old men when they died (Eus. *H. E.* iii. 32. 5). Beyond this we have no knowledge of Jude, except what we can gather from the Epistle itself.

It is perhaps possible to draw an important inference from this narrative. If these grandsons of Jude were middle-aged men in the time of Domitian, and old men in the time of Trajan, when was Jude himself born? Suppose that the grandson died in 105 A.D., about the middle of Trajan's reign, at the age of 70. He would have been born in 35 A.D.; his father could hardly have been born after 13 A.D., or his grandfather after 9 B.C. On the other hand, if we suppose Jude to have been one of the younger children of Joseph and Mary, he can hardly have been born before 1 A.D.; his son hardly before 24 A.D., or his grandson before 47 A.D. In this case the elder grandson would only have been 70 in the year of Trajan's death, and there would have been nothing surprising, if he or his younger brother had lived on well into the reign of Hadrian. If, then, we may regard the narrative of Hegesippus as based on fact, the natural conclusion seems to be that Jude was older than our Lord,—in other words, that he was the son of Joseph by an earlier marriage. Further, Hegesippus clearly believed that Jude himself was no longer alive in the reign of Domitian, who assumed the purple in 81 A.D. When Jude died we do not know, but, if he was born nine or ten years before the Christian era, we can hardly suppose that he retained the full enjoyment of his faculties much after 65 A.D. For further information on the complicated problems involved in the term "Brethren of the Lord," the reader must be referred to Bishop Lightfoot's well-known *Excursus*, or to the article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

It is probable, as has been already said, that Jude did not call himself "Brother of the Lord." But, then, why does he call himself "Brother of James"? James was the special patron of the Jewish Christians. Now, the Epistle of Jude is not Jewish in any special sense, either in language or in thought, nor is there any reason for imagining that the Churches to which it was addressed were composed, to any marked extent, of Jewish converts. The writer, therefore, can hardly have intended to conciliate his readers by putting himself, as it were, under the wing of his great brother. Those to whom the letter was sent must have known perfectly well who he was, and what was his authority. The true explanation is probably that suggested long ago by Clement of Alexandria. Though Jude was not in the habit of calling himself "Brother of the Lord," he knew that others were, and he deprecates this usage. "I am Jude," he says, in effect, "whom you call brother of Christ. Call me slave of Christ, *but* brother of James." "Brother of the Lord" was not an official designation, and, if

used by Jude himself, might seem to imply a claim to an authority above that of an apostle. There is no affectation of humility in its avoidance.

Most of the commentators, whether they regard the Epistle as genuine or not, would accept the foregoing explanation of the Address. There have, however, been other opinions.

Keil and others thought that the writer might be Jude the Apostle. Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13, may possibly mean "Judas the brother of James" (Blass, p. 95); and it is conceivable that if "James, the son of Alphaeus," was the same person as "James, the Lord's brother," his younger and less distinguished brother might be known as "James' Jude." But this identification is extremely doubtful; and if in St. Luke's list of the apostles we must translate Ἰακώβου Ἀλφαίου, "James, son of Alphaeus," it is almost or quite certain that Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου must mean "Jude, son of James." Further, it cannot be shown that any of the Lord's brethren, even James, was reckoned among the Twelve. Again, the author of our Epistle does not call himself an apostle in the Address, and appears clearly to imply in ver. 17 that he was not one. Tertullian, indeed, calls him so (see above, p. 307), and he is so called also in the Latin translation of Origen's works, but not in Origen's Greek text, and not by Clement.

Grotius conjectured that 2 Peter was written by Symeon the second, and Jude by that Judas who, according to Eusebius, was fifteenth and last of the Jewish line of bishops of Jerusalem. Before anyone can adopt this view he must persuade himself either that the words ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου are an interpolation, or that they form a standing title borne by all the successors of James in his episcopal chair; and no reason can be given in support of either alternative. It may be noticed, however, in passing, that this Judas, the fifteenth bishop of Jerusalem, is probably a real personage. It is true that the list of bishops given by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 5. 3) seems to have been unknown to Hegesippus, who says that Symeon, son of Clopas, the second bishop, lived to a great age, and suffered martyrdom in the reign of Trajan (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 11, 32. 1). But in the *Codex Marcianus* there is a note which professes to be derived from the fifth book of the *Hypotyposes* of Clement, and gives the places of sepulture of certain apostles and apostolic men (the text will be found in Zahn, *Forschungen*, iii. 70). Here we read "Simon Cleophas, qui et Judas, post Jacobum episcopus, cxx annorum crucifixus est in Jerusalem Traiano mandante." It seems clear that Clement had combined the statement of Hegesippus with another that made Judas bishop in Trajan's time. Hence we may infer that the ἑγγραφα from which Eusebius drew his list of bishops were older than 200 A.D.

The conjecture of Grotius has been recently revived with some

modification by Jülicher (quoted by Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 467), who thought at one time that Judas was probably the real name of the author of the Epistle, and that "brother of James" meant nothing more than bishop. But in his *Einleitung* (1901, i. p. 182) Jülicher has abandoned this view, and now thinks it most probable "that the author belonged by birth to that circle in which the memory of James was held in special honour; that he did not venture to foist his well-meant work on James himself, but contented himself with a member of his family. Perhaps Judas lived on after his brother, down to a time at which none of the apostles of the Lord survived in Palestine, and therefore could most easily be selected out of the men of the first generation as the announcer of the appearance of the prophesied abominations." But there is, as we have seen, some reason for thinking that Jude did not long outlive James.

Dr. Harnack thinks (*Chronologie*, p. 468) that the author was possibly named Judas, and that the words ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου were inserted in the Address at some date between 150 and 180 A.D. "in order to set this unknown Judas back into the apostolic time, and to secure respect for his piece, which, in days when Gnosticism flourished, must have appeared especially valuable." He was not the Bishop of Jerusalem, "for it is difficult, if not impossible, to suppose that such Jewish-Christian bishops gave anything to the Church at large." A bishop, though circumcised, may have been an eminent man, but the Epistle is certainly not what we should expect to have been written by an author of pronouncedly Jewish tendencies. Harnack's theory, however, would require us to believe that the Address was falsified in a very glaring way within the lifetime of Clement of Alexandria.

All these theories rest upon the presupposition that Jude must have been written in the second century, because it is directed against Gnosticism, and have no value for those who hold the opposite belief. The sum of the matter is that, if Jude belongs to Gnostic times, we know nothing whatever about the author, except that he was not what he calls himself.

The place of composition is unknown. Egypt or specially Alexandria, Palestine or specially Jerusalem, have been suggested. There is no reason whatever for selecting Alexandria, beyond the fact that the Epistle was known to Clement and Origen, who collected books from every quarter. Of any specially Egyptian or Alexandrine ideas it exhibits not the faintest trace. The other locality seems equally improbable. The death of James occurred probably in 62 A.D., and Jude, if he took any active part in the affairs of the Church, can hardly have lived in Jerusalem before this date. Even after his great brother's martyrdom he was not Bishop of Jerusalem, and can scarcely have had a fixed abode in the sacred

city. Nor should we be inclined to look for him in one of the smaller towns of Palestine. The brethren of the Lord were known to the Galatians and to the Corinthians. Who can say where they were not known, what places they had visited, or where they were usually to be found? We need not suppose that they stuck like limpets to the rock of Zion. Such little information as we possess gives quite a different idea.

Again, as to the Churches to which the Epistle was directed, we are left absolutely to conjecture. The only points which give us any kind of hold are the similarity of Jude to 2 Peter, and the similarity of the evils denounced to those of the Corinthian Church. But what conclusion can be built upon this slender basis? Corinth was a seaport town within a short sail of many places. In a limited number of hours an Antinomian missionary would find himself at any harbour in the Eastern half of the Mediterranean, at Thessalonica, or on the Asiatic shore, or at Alexandria. People were constantly going to and fro.

Dr. Chase thinks it probable that the Epistle was sent to the Syrian Antioch, and possibly to other Churches in that district. The reader will find his argument in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*. Dr. Chase relies chiefly upon three points: that the Christians addressed were mainly Gentiles, that they were men among whom St. Paul had worked, and that they had received oral instruction from the apostles generally, and, therefore, probably lived at no great distance from Jerusalem. We may say that no better conjecture can be proposed; but even this is far from certain. It seems most probable that the Churches addressed were mainly Gentile, though this is disputed; that they were acquainted with St. Paul's form of teaching is most likely, but St. Paul had laboured in many places; they knew the apostles also, but how many of them or in what way is doubtful. For it is not necessary to understand *ἔλεγον*, in ver. 18, of oral instruction alone, and in any case we need not imagine that more than one or two of the Twelve had visited the district in question. But there is really no clear light. We might be tempted to infer from the resemblance between the two Epistles that the Churches addressed in 2 Peter and in Jude lay in proximity to one another; but even this is perilous. Jude may have been addressed to almost any community in which Greek was spoken. The two Epistles must have been written at nearly the same time, but they may have been sent in very different directions.

As to the personal characteristics of Jude something has already been said, and what little remains will be found in the notes. Compared with 2 Peter he exhibits a certain hastiness and tendency to take things at their worst, compared with either 1 or 2 Peter a certain hardness. No document in the New Testament is so exquisitely tender and pastoral as the First Epistle of St. Peter, and

even in the Second Epistle, in the midst of the anger and indignation so naturally excited by the cruel wickedness of the false teachers, there are still beautiful phrases, steeped in sympathy and fatherly affection. Jude is undoubtedly stern and unbending. On the other hand, Jude is in closer intellectual sympathy with St. Paul. St. Peter commends the Apostle of the Gentiles in high terms, yet with qualifications. St. Jude speaks Pauline language, and inclines towards the Pauline mysticism, though to what extent it is impossible to say. The notable word *ψυχικός* is used also by his brother James in the same sense, and, though it belongs to the Pauline psychology, in which *ψυχή* was sharply distinguished from *πνεῦμα* or *νοῦς*, does not necessarily involve the Pauline conceptions of law or of justification. St. James was probably as mystical as St. Paul, yet he was a strong legalist. Like St. Paul, he held that whoever breaks one article of the law breaks the law as a whole (Jas. ii. 10; Gal. iii. 10). This view (it was held also by the Stoics) is highly metaphysical or mystical, but it led the two apostles to very different conclusions, the one to the necessity of perfect obedience, the other to the idea of a righteousness which was not of law at all. It is possible that Jude also belonged to the same type of Pharisaic mysticism as his brother. But in any case his ideas and language differ noticeably from those of St. Peter.

But here we touch upon a question which is unhappily among the obscurest of all the problems that surround the history of the early Church. Who can enumerate the countless modes in which the relation of law and gospel presented itself to the first believers? Many writers content themselves with the rough and unintelligent distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians, but this rests upon the mere accident of birth. The most Gentile of all teachers, St. Paul himself, was a Jew, and on either side there are endless shades and gradations. On the one extreme there are certain sects which we may call exclusively Jewish, or rather Oriental, but a Gentile Christian might be anything. Certainly there can be no greater error than that of using "Pauline" and "Gentile" as if these words were coextensive.

NOTES ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

1. ON the general form of Jude's Address see notes on 1 Pet. i. 1 ; 2 Pet. i. 1, and Introductions to 1 and 2 Pet., pp. 79, 219. Jude has, in common with 2 Peter, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, a similarly general description of those to whom the Epistle is directed, the verb πληθυνθείη, and the word εἰρήνη, which, however, is here combined with ἔλεος and ἀγάπη. If we suppose that 2 Peter is here copying Jude, we must also suppose either that he went back to 1 Peter for part of his formula, or that (as Professor Harnack thinks) he forged both addresses, but adopted a simpler and more archaic form than that of Jude. But the easier inference is that Jude followed Peter; indeed, this is a necessary conclusion, if it is allowed that Jude here uses Pauline phrases.

Five personages of the name of Jude occur in apostolic or sub-apostolic times. (1) Judas Iscariot. (2) The Apostle Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13; John xiv. 22; this "son of James" is commonly identified with Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus. (3) Judas, the Lord's brother, brother also of James, Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3, where he is named last or last but one. (4) Judas Barsabbas, Acts xv. 22-33. (5) Judas, the last Jewish bishop of Jerusalem in the time of Hadrian, Eus. *H. E.* iv. 5. 3.

The author of our Epistle gives two descriptions of himself—(1) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος: (2) ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου. The first does not mean that he was an apostle (see note on 2 Pet. i. 1), and ver. 17 is generally understood to mean that he did not so regard himself. His brother James also was not an apostle. The second identifies our Jude with the brother of the Lord.

But why does he not call himself the brother of the Lord? Clement of Alexandria in his commentary, which still exists in a Latin version, answered the question thus—"Judas, qui catholicam scripsit epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph exstans ualde religiosus et cum sciret propinquitatem domini, non tamen dicit se ipsum fratrem eius esse, sed quid dixit? *Judas seruus Jesu Christi*, utpote domini, *frater autem Jacobi*." Zahn (*Einleitung*, ii. p. 84) adopts this explanation, which is probably correct. The sense is, "Jude, the slave, I dare not say the brother, of Jesus Christ, but certainly the brother of James."

The description, "brother of James," cannot have been needed as an introduction or recommendation, for the brethren of the Lord were all held in high esteem (Acts i. 14). Certainly Jude must have been well known to the people whom he is addressing. Nor can the description be taken to show that he is writing to Churches of Palestine or to Jewish Christians, by whom St. James was held in special honour. For, apart from the fact that St. James would not need his help, the brethren of the Lord were known to the Gentile Churches, for instance, to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ix. 5), and may quite possibly have visited and preached in Corinth.

τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ . . . κλητοῖς. "To the Called, which in God the Father are beloved and kept unto Jesus Christ." The Father is our Father. Κλητοῖς is a substantive, as in Rom. i. 6; 1 Cor. i. 24. The word is not used by Peter in either of his Epistles, and belongs to the Pauline vocabulary; the same thing is true of ἅγιοι, ver. 3; ψυχικοί and πνεῦμα, ver. 19. Ἐν can hardly mean "by," for the preposition appears to be never used to denote the agent. Nor is it possible to translate "who in God are beloved by me and kept unto Jesus Christ," because both participles must be referred to the same agent. Yet again, there is no instance of ἐν Θεῷ being used in that general sense which belongs to ἐν Κυρίῳ or ἐν Χριστῷ in the Pauline Epistles (unless 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1 are in point), and, even if there were, the sense required, "who in God are beloved by God," is not obtained without difficulty. But this seems to be the meaning. In ver. 21 St. Jude has ἐάντους ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε. St. Peter does not speak of the love of God, and here again we may possibly detect the same affinity between St. Paul and St. Jude that has already appeared in the word κλητοῖς.

The variants τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ and τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγιασμένοις have very little support. The latter was probably suggested by the embarrassment of the text; the former shows that at an early date the recipients of the Epistle were thought to have been Gentiles.

The Epistle cannot have been meant for the Church at large. It is directed to some group of Churches in which St. Jude was personally interested, and called forth by definite and peculiar circumstances.

3. ἀγαπητοί . . . πίστει. "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write to you about our common salvation, I found it necessary to write to you exhorting you to do battle for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." With πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος compare the language of 2 Pet. i. 5, 10, 15, iii. 14. These repeated phrases have caught St. Jude's ear.

ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι is not used elsewhere in the New Testament; the preposition merely strengthens the verb, but the simple ἀγωνίζεσθαι

is as strong a word as could be found. For *παραδοθείση* cf. Acts xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xi. 2, xv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 21; Spitta thinks that the use of the word here is suggested by this last passage.

ἄγιοι. "The saints" is here another name for Christians, as in Acts ix. 13, 32, 41; Rom. xii. 13; Heb. vi. 10; Apoc. v. 8, but the word is not used as a substantive by Mark, Luke, John (in Gospel or Epistles), James, or Peter. See Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 56, 57. Ἡ πίστις, in defence of which men are to contend, is not trust or the inner light, but a body of doctrine, dogmatic and practical, which is given to them by authority, is fixed and unalterable, and well known to all Christians. It is "your most holy faith," ver. 20, a foundation on which the readers are to build themselves up. It combined intellectual and moral truth. See Sanday and Headlam on Rom. i. 17. It had been attacked by men who turned the grace of our God into lasciviousness, that is to say, by Antinomians; but these men were mockers, ver. 18, and, from the emphasis with which Jude introduces his quotation from *Enoch*, ver. 14, we may presume that they mocked at the Parousia.

Jude's language about the Faith is highly dogmatic, highly orthodox, highly zealous. His tone is that of a bishop of the fourth century. The character may be differently estimated, but its appearance at this early date, before Montanism and before Gnosticism, is of great historical significance. Men who used such phrases believed passionately in a creed.

Lachmann, and some of the older school of commentators, placed a comma after *ὑμῶν*, and took *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας* with *γράψαι*; but recent scholars generally reject this unnatural punctuation.

St. Jude says that he had been busy with, or intent upon, writing to his people *περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας*, an ordinary pastoral Epistle dealing with general topics of instruction and exhortation, but found it necessary to change his plan and utter this stirring cry to arms. Evidently he is referring to some definite and unexpected circumstance. News had been brought to him of the appearance of the false teachers; possibly he had just received 2 Peter; if so, we can understand the use which he makes of that Epistle.

De Wette, Brückner, Spitta, Zahn think that the writing referred to by the *γράψεν* was not an ordinary Epistle, but a treatise of some considerable length; but the age was hardly one of treatises, and there is nothing in the text to support the idea.

4. παρεῖδυσαν γάρ. "For certain men have crept in privily, who of old were appointed in scripture unto this doom." *Γάρ* introduces the reason of *ἀνάγκην ἔσχον*. For *παρεῖδυσαν* B has *παρεσέδυσαν*, a vulgar form; see Blass, p. 43. The aorist is here not distinguishable in sense from the perfect; as to the meaning of the compound verb, refer to note on *παρεσάγειν*, 2 Pet. ii. 1.

Πάλαι is most naturally taken to mean in the Old Testament, in the many denunciations of false prophets. The word, however, does not always denote a long interval of time; hence Zahn and Spitta would render, "who were some time ago appointed in a writing for this doom," and find here a direct reference to 2 Pet. ii. 3. But though the Greeks (more especially the poets; see references in Liddell and Scott) sometimes use πάλαι in a loose colloquial way, just as we use "long ago" of things that happened quite recently, we must not give the word this sense without good reason. Jude could hardly have spoken of 2 Peter as written πάλαι, unless he were looking back over a space of twenty or thirty years. Unless we are to suppose that the two Epistles were separated by such an interval as this, the explanation of Zahn and Spitta can hardly be adopted.

Nevertheless we have here a reference to 2 Pet. ii. 3. As used by Jude, κρίμα has no meaning, for he has entirely omitted to say what the doom is. The best explanation of this curious difficulty is that he was writing in haste, with 2 Peter fresh in his mind, and that his words are suggested by οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεῖ in the Petrine passage. If this be so, we have here one of the strongest proofs of the posteriority of Jude.

Some support for this view may be found in the weakness of the various explanations which have been found for κρίμα. Wiesinger, Hofmann, Schott find the key in παρεισέδυσαν, they have wickedly crept in, and this is their judgment. But, we must answer, the creeping in is their sin, not their punishment. Zahn also (*Einführung*, ii. 80) goes back for his solution to the main verb; they have crept in, and their appearance is a judgment, not on them, but on the Church, inasmuch as it will lead to a sifting out of bad Christians from among the good. Cf. John ix. 39, εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται: the reader may refer to Westcott's note upon this passage. But it seems evident that here the κρίμα is one which hangs over the intruders themselves. Huther found the explanation of κρίμα in the ἀπόλεσεν of ver. 5; but this verb stands much too far off, and does not directly apply to the evildoers in question; further, if this had been the writer's meaning, we should have expected γάρ, not δέ, after ὑπομνήσαι. Spitta finds it in the words ἀσεβεῖς . . . ἀρνούμενοι: their judgment is that they are impious and deny the Lord. But here again impiety and denial are sins, not sentences. It may be replied that sin may be regarded as its own punishment, but this idea certainly does not belong to Jude. Not one of these views is satisfactory. Each commentator destroys the opinion of others without establishing his own, and we are really driven to suppose that St. Jude, in his hurry, picked out St. Peter's word without observing that it required an explanation.

χάριτα. The grace is the πίστις, or the gospel (1 Pet. i. 10); it promises a freedom which these impious men turn into lasciviousness.

τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. St. Peter's phrase is certainly the finer, and is probably the original; it is marked by his favourite iambic rhythm; the ἀγοράσαντα explains and limits δεσπότην, and here, as in other passages to be noticed as we proceed, Jude has a tendency to exaggerate and harden the thought of St. Peter. Τὸν μόνον δεσπότην is so strong a phrase that it has been regarded as impossible. Hence K L P and several other authorities, followed by the *textus receptus*, insert Θεόν after δεσπότην: and many commentators, who do not accept this reading, yet translate in the same sense, "the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ." But this misrendering is needless. If Christ may be called δεσπότης, He may also be called μόνος δεσπότης in distinction not from the Father, but from all false masters. Cf. note on ver. 25.

5. ὑπομνήσαι. Cf. 2 Pet. i. 12, ὑπομνήσκων: i. 15, μνήμην ποιέσθαι: i. 13, iii. 1, διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει. See note on σπουδήν, ver. 3. Either Peter has caught up and reiterated certain unimportant words from Jude, or Jude had read the first chapter of the Petrine Epistle and adopts from it words which, from their iteration there, were likely to catch the ear. The latter is the more probable view. Jude exhibits manifest tokens of haste, abbreviation, and confusion. A glance back at the preceding Epistle will show that St. Peter uses "remind" quite naturally, where he is recalling to the memory of his readers lessons that they had certainly often been taught. Jude "reminds" his people of the instances of judgment, none of which belonged to the catechism, and some of which, at least the story of Michael, may have been quite new to them. The δέ also is difficult. Probably we must find the antithesis in ἀσεβείς and ἀρνούμενοι: they are impious and deny the Lord, "but" God punishes such men. Certainly the sense is more clearly unfolded in 2 Peter; and this is a remarkable fact, because Jude is the more skilful writer of the two.

εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα. "Though once for all ye know all things." But the things which Christians know once for all are those which are included in "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," not historical instances of God's wrath. Here again we have a confused reminiscence of *καίπερ εἰδότας*, 2 Pet. i. 12, where the words are quite intelligible.

For the comparison between the instances of Judgment as they are given in the two Epistles, see Introduction to 2 Peter, p. 221. The first instance, that of the destruction of the sinful Israelites in the desert, is peculiar to Jude. It reminds us of Heb. iii. 18-iv. 2; 1 Cor. x. 5-11. Its introduction here disturbs the strictly chronological order of the instances given in 2 Peter.

ὅτι ὁ Κύριος. "That the Lord, when He had brought the people safe out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them which believed not." By "the Lord" is no doubt meant Christ, cf. 1 Cor. x. 4, 9. With τὸ δεύτερον cf. δεύτερον, 1 Cor. xii. 28; ἐκ δευτέρου, Heb. ix. 28. Here it marks a strong contrast, and sharpens the point of the warning. "It is true that the Lord saved Israel from Egypt; yet notwithstanding He afterwards slew the faithless. So he has saved you, but so also He may slay you."

The text of the verse is uncertain. \aleph K L insert a second ἡμᾶς after εἰδότας. \aleph , many Fathers, and versions place ἅπαξ after Κύριος (Θεός). For πάντα K L and others read τοῦτο. K L and many others have ὁ Κύριος: \aleph C Κύριος: A B and many versions with Didymus and Jerome Ἰησοῦς, and there is some inferior authority for ὁ Θεός. The second ἡμᾶς is probably a mere slip; the transposition of ἅπαξ may be due to a desire to provide an antecedent for τὸ δεύτερον, though, if so, it involves a grammatical error, as ἅπαξ cannot mean "firstly." Τοῦτο for πάντα is again a slip, or an attempt at emendation. The variants Θεός and Ἰησοῦς for Κύριος are also emendations; the copyists did not feel quite certain what Jude meant.

6. ἀγγέλους. The Second Instance; the Fallen Angels.

"And the angels who kept not their own principality, but forsook their proper habitation, He hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Jude probably found σειραῖς in his copy of 2 Peter (see note on the corresponding passage), but it is just possible that he remembered to have read of "bonds" in *Enoch*. Αἰδιος (it is an Aristotelian word, while αἰώνιος is Platonist) occurs also in Rom. i. 20. The absence of the article with ἀγγέλους is of no consequence, the particular angels being defined by the following article and participles, cf. 1 Pet. i. 10.

The principality of the angels is the special government or province intrusted to them by God. The passage which lay at the foundation of Jewish belief on 'this point is Deut. xxxii. 8, ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἕστησεν ὄρια ἔθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ —where κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ represent Hebrew words which in A.V. and R.V. are rendered "according to the number of the children of Israel." The passage was taken to mean that God assigned the government of the several nations to guardian angels. Probably this view was older than the Septuagint, for there are many indications in the Old Testament that the gods of the nations were regarded as wicked angels. There was also another tradition that the seven planets were ruled by the seven chiefs of the angels of service. The planets, wandering stars (see below, ver. 13), were wicked stars, because they had broken loose from their appointed

station. Hence their angels were punished. *Enoch* xviii. 13 sqq., "And what I saw there was horrible—seven stars like great burning mountains, and like spirits, which besought me. The Angel said, This is the place where heaven and earth terminate; it serves as a prison for the stars of heaven and the host of heaven. And the stars which roll over the fire are they which have transgressed the commandment of God before their rising, because they did not come forth at the appointed time. And He was wroth with them, and bound them till the time when their guilt should be consummated in the year of the mystery." Cf. *Enoch* xxi. 2 sqq. Jude says that they are bound "till the judgment of the great day." This phrase also is suggested by *Enoch*, where we find *ἕως τῆς κρίσεως τῆς μεγάλης, μέχρις ἡμέρας κρίσεως τῆς μεγάλης* (ed. Charles, pp. 85, 86. See also Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 394; Harnack's note on *Hermas*, *Sim.* viii. 3. 3). According to these traditions the sin of the fallen angels was pride or disobedience. This is the view adopted by Origen, in *Ezech.* Hom. ix. 2 (Lomm. i. 121), "Inflatio, superbia, arrogantia, peccatum diaboli est; et ob haec delicta ad terras migravit de coelo."

By the side of these ran another stream of tradition based on Gen. vi., according to which the sin of the fallen angels was lust. Justin, *Apol.* ii. 5, combines both, *οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι, παραβάτες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξσειν ἠτήθησαν*.

St. Peter does not specify the sin of the fallen angels, but he is evidently referring to their *ἀσέλγεια*. St. Jude is not content with a passing allusion; he develops and confuses it. When he says that the angels forsook their proper habitation (came down from heaven to earth), he is thinking of Gen. vi.; when he says that they kept not their own principality, of Deut. xxxii. 8. Yet after all he has not made his point clear. For how could either the false teachers or their victims be said *μὴ τηρῆσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν*?

7. The Third Instance; the Cities of the Plain.

Jude omits the Deluge, and here does not mention Lot.

ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις. The other cities were Admah and Zeboim, Deut. xxix. 23; Hos. xi. 8. There were five cities of the plain, but Zoar was spared. *Τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις*, "like these fallen angels"; here at last the *ἀσέλγεια* is brought out. The compound *ἐκπορνεύειν* is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, but is used by the LXX. in Gen. xxxviii. 24 and elsewhere. The *ἐκ-* may, as Hofmann thinks, add the notion of going outside the moral law. In *ἀπελθούσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας* we have another illustration of the manner in which Jude used 2 Peter. The latter has (ii. 10) *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους*. Jude has caught up this phrase, but by adding *ἑτέρας* has made it refer to the sin connected with the name of Sodom,—a sin which, though horribly common in heathen Greece

and Rome, was never alleged against teachers who could in any sense be called Christians. The language of 2 Pet. ii. 6, 10 is greatly exaggerated here. Further, St. Peter does not fall into the error of saying that the sin of Sodom was like that of the angels, for the fallen angels could not be said ἀπελθεῖν ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας.

δείγμα (here only in the New Testament) properly means "a sample" or "specimen"; it is here used in the sense of the classical παράδειγμα or the later ὑπόδειγμα (2 Pet. ii. 6), "a pattern," or "example," or "warning." Πυρὸς αἰωνίου is best taken with δίκην: "they are set forth as a warning, suffering the punishment of eternal fire." Jude omits all mention of Lot, fixing his mind only on the divine vengeance, and here again sharpens and hardens the words of St. Peter, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς.

8. οὔτοι, the false teachers of ver. 4. Ἐνυπνιάζεσθαι, "to dream." Their dreams may be those of prophecy; these false teachers being also false prophets (2 Pet. ii. 1), who support their evil doctrines by pretended revelations; cf. Deut. xiii. 1, 3, 5. This explanation is favoured by von Soden and Spitta, and is much the best. Or possibly, as some hold, "dream" may be used in the sense of "vain imagination." The difficulty is that, though the Latin *somnium* is used in this sense, the Greek ἐνύπνιον is not. Nevertheless this is the interpretation of Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iii. 2. 11, ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι (ὃ γὰρ ἔπαρ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβάλλουσι). Ἐπιβάλλουσι most probably means "attack," and ὃ should be corrected to οὐ. So also *Adumbr. in Ep. Judae*, "hi somniantes, hoc est, qui somniant imaginatione sua libidines et reprobas cupiditates." The meaning involved in the "filthy dreamers" of the AV may be confidently rejected, because, as Alford points out, the participle belongs not only to σάρκα μαιίνουσι, but equally to κυριώτητα ἀθετοῦσι and δόξας βλασφημοῦσι.

σάρκα μαιίνουσι. Here Jude is adapting 2 Pet. ii. 10, and the passages should be carefully compared. Peter says, "the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of trial, and keep the unjust under punishment till the day of judgment, but especially those who walk after the flesh . . . and despise lordship. Self-willed daring ones, they fear not to blaspheme dignities." He has passed away from Sodom, and is speaking of the False Teachers; it is they who despise lordship and rail at dignities. Jude says that the false teachers are like the people of the cities of the plain in that they despise lordship and blaspheme dignities. But it is only by a great effort of exegesis that we can fasten these two charges on the people of Sodom. Jude has abbreviated and confused his text. For κυριότης and δόξα see notes on 2 Peter.

9. ὁ δὲ Μιχαήλ. "But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a sentence of blasphemy, but said, May the Lord

rebuke thee." That is to say, "may the Lord rebuke thee for thy blasphemy." Peter says that the angels will not bring against dignities "a railing accusation" (βλάσφημον κρίσιν), which is quite a different thing. See Introduction to 2 Peter, p. 217. Διακρίνεσθαι is used here in its proper sense, "to get a dispute decided," "contend with an adversary in a court of law." The dative διαβόλω is governed by διελέγето. For κρίσις see 2 Pet. ii. 11. Ἐπιτιμήσαι is, of course, optative.

The incident is taken by St. Jude from the *Assumption of Moses*, as we are informed by Clement of Alexandria (*Adumb. in Ep. Judae*), Origen (*de Princ.* iii. 2. 1), and Didymus. The passage as given, perhaps loosely, by a Scholiast on Jude (text in Hilgenfeld, *Nouum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum*, i. p. 128) runs thus: τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως ὁ ἀρχάγγελος Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα. ὁ μὲν οὖν διάβολος ἀντίχε θέλων ἀπατήσαι, λέγων ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ σῶμα ὡς τῆς ἄλλης δεσπόζοντι, ἦτοι διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον βλασφημοῦντος κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύσαντος: μὴ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ Θεός, πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἔφη. Here we see from ἀποστέλλεται that the dispute did not occur in the presence of the Lord; hence Jude omits St. Peter's παρὰ Κυρίῳ: again the meaning of βλασφημίας κρίσις comes out very clearly. Satan blasphemed Moses, claiming his body as that of a murderer. Michael would not tolerate his sin of blasphemy against the saint, yet abstains from openly charging him with blasphemy. The date of the *Assumption* is variously given; but as it was probably used by St. Paul in Gal. iii. 19, where Moses is called the μεσίτης of the law (the phrase in the *Assumption* as quoted by Gelasius Cyz. *Acta Syn. Nicaen.* ii. 18, p. 28, is τῆς διαθήκης μεσίτην: in the existing Latin version *arbitrè testamenti*), it is also probably considerably older than that Epistle. Hilgenfeld thinks that it was written after 44 A.D.; others place it as early as 2 B.C. It is possible that Jude refers to the *Assumption* again in ver. 16.

10. οὗτοι δέ . . . φθείρονται. "But these rail at whatsoever things they know not; and what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in these things are they destroyed (or corrupted)," R.V. The things that they know not are κυριότης, δόξα, and generally the world of spirit to which these conceptions belong; the things which they understand are fleshly delight. Jude has made the rough-hewn sentence of 2 Pet. ii. 12 much smoother and clearer; see also vers. 13 and 17. In particular he has corrected the awkward iteration of φθορᾶ, φθοράν, φθείρονται, which is so characteristic of 2 Peter.

11. οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς. Outside of the Gospels this phrase is used only in 1 Cor. ix. 16 and in the Apocalypse. It is rare in later writers, but occurs in a Fragment of Clement of Alexandria (Dindorf,

vol. iii. p. 492), οὐαὶ δὲ τοῖς ἔχουσι καὶ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνουσι, which is quoted in the *Didache*.

Jude's fourth instance is Cain, who is not introduced by Peter, and whose mention here has caused difficulty. De Wette and Arnaud thought that Cain here was a type of all wicked men. Schneckenburger, Spitta, von Soden, and Kühl (the last with some hesitation) appeal to the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. iv. 7, where Cain is represented as the first sceptic and sophist, and as saying, "Non est iudicium nec iudex, nec est aliud sæculum, nec dabitur merces bona iustis, nec ultio sumetur de improbis, neque per miserationem creatus est mundus, neque per miserationem gubernatur." The Targum is later than Jude; but the same idea is found in Philo, from whom it is possibly derived. See references in Siegfried. This explanation would give tolerable sense, but is much too artificial. The name Cain, standing as it does without qualification, must mean Cain the murderer. See Wisd. x. 3 (a passage which was probably in Jude's mind as he wrote ver. 7), where Cain is "the unrighteous man who fell away from her (Wisdom) in his anger, and perished himself in the rage wherewith he slew his brother." Hence Grotius, Oecumenius, and others rightly account for his introduction here by supposing Jude to mean that the false teachers murder men's souls. "Cain," says Grotius, "fratri uitam caducam ademit; illi fratribus adimunt aeternam." The same language has often been used in later times. We have before noticed the fiery zeal of Jude, and his tendency to exaggerate; see vers. 3, 7, 23.

The fifth instance is Balaam, who appears in 2 Peter also. Jude devotes less space to him, and again darkens the picture. Peter charges Balaam only with covetousness; Jude says that for the sake of money (*μισθοῦ*, genitive of price) the false teachers fling themselves into the *πλάνη* of Balaam—that is to say, into the sin of Baal Peor (Num. xxv., xxxi. 8; Apoc. ii. 14). Hence the verb *ἐξέχυθησαν*, which, like the Latin *effundi in*, is used of those who pour themselves out, fling themselves into sensual indulgence. Jude does not press the charge of greed and extortion so strongly as 2 Peter; he barely alludes to it here and in ver. 16; in his eyes the covetousness of the false teachers is as nothing in comparison with their uncleanness.

The sixth instance is Korah, who is not mentioned in 2 Peter.

Korah "gainsaid" Moses and Aaron (Num. xvi.) because Moses by God's command had restricted the priesthood to the family of Aaron. He despised not God's ordinances generally (as Huther, Ritschl, Alford, Kühl think), but this particular ordinance. Jude must mean that those of whom he is speaking defied the authorities of the Church, and claimed the right to make rules for themselves. So he speaks of them just below as *ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες*, in other words as making themselves their

own presbyters; cf. 1 Pet. v. 2. Here we find support for the explanation of δόξαι given on 2 Pet. ii. 10. The "dignities" whom these false teachers blaspheme were the rulers of the Church. We notice in this verse that Jude possesses a certain *coria uerborum*, three different nouns, δόξ, πλάνη, ἀντιλογία, are coupled with three different verbs, πορευθῆναι, ἐκχυθῆναι, ἀπολέσθαι. It is clear that he was a better writer than 2 Peter, and in particular that he dislikes needless iteration. See on this point Introduction to 2 Peter, p. 225 sq.

12. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες. "These are they who are spots in your love feasts." Ἀγάπαις is undoubtedly the right reading, though AC have ἀπάταις, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 13. Οἱ before σπιλάδες is given by AB L, but omitted by NK on account of the difficulty which it creates.

For the meaning of σπιλάς see Orpheus, *Lithica*, 614 (ed. G. Hermann), where the agate is described as κατάστικτος σπιλάδεσσι, "dappled with spots" (Tyrwhitt thought that this treatise was composed as late as the reign of Constantius, but there is no reason for suspecting that the author invented this use of the word); Hesychius, σπιλάδες· μεμιασμένοι. Thus the word is merely a variant for the σπιλοι of 2 Peter.

The R.V. translates "these are they that are hidden rocks," following the *Etym. Mag.*, which explains σπιλάδες by ὑφαλοι πέτραι. But in the *Anthology*, xi. 390, the two are expressly distinguished—φασι δὲ καὶ νῆσσοιν ἀλιπλανέεσσι χειρείους τὰς ὑφάλους πέτρας τῶν φανερῶν σπιλάδων, and in Hom. *Od.* iii. the σπιλάδες of 298 are the same as the λισσῆ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρῃ of 293. The epithet "hidden" therefore must be struck out, and with it the notion of a hidden danger. Further, σπιλάς means a rock, not only in the sea, or on the beach, but in land, see Soph. *Trach.* 678; Theocritus, *Epiqr.* iv. 6. Thus the word does not include an allusion to shipwreck, nor indeed to danger of any kind. Hence the statements of Suidas, σπιλάδες· αἱ ἐν ὕδασι κοῖλαι πέτραι, and of Hesychius, σπιλάδες· αἱ περιεχόμεναι τῇ θαλάσῃ πέτραι (this he gives as an alternative explanation), are not strictly accurate. Nor is the note of Oecumenius, αἱ σπιλάδες τοῖς πλείουσιν ὀλέθριοι, ἀπροσοκῆτως ἐπιγνώμεναι, to be taken for more than it is worth, as the expression of his own opinion.

σπιλάς is feminine, hence there is a difficulty in the masculine article οἱ. We must supply either ὄντες or κεκλημένοι, and translate "these are the men who are spots," or "these are the men who have been called spots." The insertion of the article seems to show that Jude had in his mind some definite passage where these men or men like them had been actually spoken of as "spots." Thus it becomes probable that he is here directly referring to 2 Pet. ii. 13. This is the opinion maintained by Spitta.

Dr. Chase dismisses this view with the remark that this (*οὗτοι* *εἰσιν* *οἱ*) is a regular form in apocalyptic literature. See for instances Zech. i. 10; Apoc. vii. 14, xi. 4, xiv. 4; *Enoch* xlvi. 3; *Apoc. Petri*, 4. 7. 9. 14. 15. 16. The remark is true, but does not meet the point. The form is not specially apocalyptic (see Matt. iii. 3, 17, and numberless other examples might be given from writings of all kinds). Either it points a reference to something that the readers know already, as in Apoc. xi. 4, *οὗτοι εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι*, "these are the two olive trees" that you have read of in Zech. iv. 3, or it answers the question, Who are these? identifying two known persons or classes of persons. But it does not convey fresh information about the persons. Thus *οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης* is "these are the men who blaspheme the way of righteousness" (*οὔτοι* is predicate), while *οὔτοι βλασφημοῦσι* is "these men blaspheme" (here *οὔτοι* is subject). Jude is quite aware of this difference, and uses both forms correctly; thus we have, ver. 16, *οὗτοι εἰσιν γογγυσταί*, "these men are murmurers"; and, on the other hand, *οὔτοι εἰσιν οἱ προγεγραμμένοι*, ver. 4, not *οὔτοι εἰσι προγεγραμμένοι*. Hence it is not probable that he would write *οὔτοι εἰσιν οἱ σπιλάδες* for *οὔτοι εἰσι σπιλάδες*. He must mean either "these are the men whom everybody calls spots," or "these are the men whom some particular person has called so." The latter is the more probable, and Spitta's opinion may therefore well be defended. An objection might be raised on the ground of Apoc. xiv. 4, *οὔτοι εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν, παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν· οὔτοι οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ*, where no question has been distinctly asked; but even this case falls under the rule. The meaning is not "these men are virgins," but "these men are the virgins," whom you knew in the Church. There may again be a reference to some well-known phrase, for the second clause contains an apparent allusion to the familiar words "follow thou me."

If we adopt the other rendering, "these are they that are rocks," we must still regard the words as an allusion to some well-known passage. But none can be found. *Περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναντάγησαν*, 1 Tim. i. 19, is much too vague.

συνευωχοῦμενοι. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 13, *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι, ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν συνευωχοῦμενοι ἑμῖν*. St. Peter means "while they share the feast with you." Jude's language may bear the same sense, but he seems rather to give *συνευωχοῦμενοι* a different turn, "while they carouse together," by themselves. We may possibly infer from *ἀφόβως ἐαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες* and *ἀποδιορίζοντες*, ver. 19, that these men drew together at a separate part of the table, or even that they kept an Agape of their own; and the words *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ἑμῶν* are not conclusive against the latter hypothesis, for they may mean "in the Agape of your community."

Certainly the language of St. Jude leads us to infer that the division was more clearly marked than we should gather from 2 Peter, and this point again makes in favour of the priority of the latter.

ἀφόβως ἑαυτοῦ ποιμαίνοντες. "Shepherding themselves without fear." **Ἀφόβως** must be taken with **ποιμαίνοντες** not with **συνευωχούμενοι**, with which it yields no good sense. **Ποιμαίνειν** is the verb which expresses the whole authority of Christ, or of the priest, over the flock. The instance of Korah, employed in ver. 11, shows that Jude is here thinking of the latter. These men defied the authority of their rulers, made themselves their own shepherds, and yet feared no harm. If we think of the way in which Balaam is mentioned in Apoc. ii. 14, it is tempting to suppose that one way in which they exhibited their lawlessness was by eating **τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα** at the Agape. Dr. Chase (article on *Jude* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) thinks there may be a reference here to Ezek. xxxiv. 2, **μὴ βόσκεισιν ποιμένες ἑαυτούς**;

νεφέλαι ἄνδρῶν ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι. Peter has **πηγαὶ ἄνδρῶν καὶ ὀμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλανόμεναι**. Jude, using only one figure, calls his opponents "Clouds which drop no water, and are blown past by winds." From teachers we expect the beneficent rain of doctrine and example: these men are like clouds which give no rain and only hide the sun; they are blown past and seen no more. There is a weak variant **περιφερόμεναι**, "tossed about," an image of instability; the word is possibly suggested by Eph. iv. 14.

δένδρα φθινοπωρινά. The epithet means more than autumnal. **Φθινόπωρον** means not autumn, the season of fruit (**τεθαλνῖα ὀπώρη**: *autumnus* from *augeo*), but the "fall of the year," the season just before winter, when growth has stopped, and the branches are bare. We may translate "trees in the fall," or even "trees in winter." **Ἄκαρπα** is probably suggested by **οὐκ ἄργους οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους**, 2 Pet. i. 8. **Δις ἀποθανόντα**, "twice dead," not only fruitless, but actually dead and incapable of bearing fruit; or not only dead, but uprooted; or, again, St. Jude may be thinking of these men no longer as trees, but as Christians; they were dead once in trespasses and sins, now again they have died by apostasy. If this last explanation is tenable, St. Jude may have been thinking of 2 Pet. i. 9, ii. 20, and strengthening the expression. **Ἐκριζωθέντα**, they are already cut off from their root; the root is either the Church (**ἀποδιορίζοντες**) or Christ.

13. κύματα . . . αἰσχύνας. "Wild waves of the sea, foaming up their own shames." The language is tinged by reminiscences of Greek poetry; cf. Moschus, *Idyll.* v. 5, **ἃ δὲ θάλασσα κυρτὸν ἐπαφρίζη**; Euripides, *Herc. Fur.* 851, **θάλασσαν ἀγρίαν**, but the image is probably suggested by Isa. lvii. 20.

ἀστέρες πλανῆται. See note on ver. 6. We find an allusion to the sin of the planets also in Isa. xiv. 12, where the king of

Babylon is compared to the Day-star, son of the morning, who fell through pride. St. Jude here gives a more correct turn to the imagery than St. Peter, who speaks of springs and mists as punished by darkness, though at the same time he has departed somewhat from *Enoch*, who saw the stars of heaven imprisoned in a place of fire.

14. προεφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις. "But Enoch prophesied to these men also"; his words strike them as well as others.

ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ. Gen. v.; *Enoch* lx. 8, xciii. 3; *Book of Jubilees*, vii. The quotation which follows is a combination of passages from *Enoch*. "And, lo, He comes with ten thousand of His holy ones to execute judgment upon them; and He will destroy the ungodly, and will convict all flesh of all that the sinners and ungodly have wrought and ungodly committed against Him," i. 9; "Ye have slanderously spoken proud and hard words with your impure mouths against His greatness," v. 4; cf. also xxvii. 2: the translation here given is that of Mr. Charles.

The earlier Fathers regarded this passage as showing that *Enoch* was inspired; Clement of Alexandria, *Adumb. in Ep. Judae*, "his verbis prophetiam comprobatur"; Tertullian, *de cultu fem.* i. 3, "eo accedit quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet." In the time of Jerome many viewed it as a proof that Jude was not inspired, *de uir. ill.* 4, "et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium a plerisque reiicitur." Augustine still held the more ancient and liberal view, *de ciuitate dei*, xv. 23, "scripsisse quidem nonnulla diuina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam negare non possumus, cum hoc in epistula canonica Judas apostolus dicat."

After inserting this passage from *Enoch*, which speaks so distinctly of the coming of the Lord to judgment, St. Jude may have felt that no more remained to be said on this point; and this may have been the chief reason why he omitted the third chapter of 2 Peter.

16. γογγυσταί. The substantive occurs here only in the New Testament. In the LXX. γογγύζειν and διαγογγύζειν are used of the Israelites who complained against God and Moses, Ex. xv. 24, xvii. 3; Num. xiv. 29. So here these false brethren murmur not against the trials of life, but against their superiors, God and the δόξαι.

μεμψιμοίρος (this word again is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον) means "complaining of one's lot," "querulous." But here again we must understand, not that the false teachers lacked the spirit of resignation, but that they were recalcitrant and grumbled against authority. Ἀμεμψιμοίρητος occurs, apparently in the sense of "uncomplaining," in a letter found on a papyrus of the second century B.C.; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 211; omitted in Eng. tr.

καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 18, ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φεγγόμενοι. Jude's phrase bears resemblance to Ps. cxliii. (cxliv.) 8, 11, ὧν τὸ στόμα ἐλάλησε ματαιότητα. But it is

probable that here again he is quoting from the *Assumption of Moses* vii. 21, "et os eorum loquetur ingentia" (the Greek text is not extant). Θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον (the phrase does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, though we find βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον, Matt. xxii. 16: λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, Luke xx. 21) may come from Gen. xix. 21; Lev. xix. 15, or from the *Assumption of Moses* v. 16, "qui enim magistri sunt doctores eorum illis temporibus erunt mirantes personas cupiditatum (Fritzsche corrects *nobilitatum*) et acceptiones munerum et peruendunt iustitias accipiendo poenas." It has been observed that Jude does not attack the covetousness of the false teachers except here and in the word μισθοῦ, ver. 11.

17. ὑμεῖς δὲ . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. "But ye, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ." Ὑμεῖς is placed in front of the sentence with great emphasis in opposition to the οἱ τοῦ of ver. 16. A comparison with 2 Pet. iii. 2 will show that either Peter has greatly complicated the expression of Jude, or Jude has greatly simplified that of Peter. The latter seems more probable; see ver. 10 above. The substance of this apostolic warning may be found in 1 Tim. iv. 1 (where the words τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει may introduce a prediction given orally by a Christian prophet); 2 Tim. iii. 1-5; Acts xx. 29. These passages show that similar admonitions were current. But the exact form of the prophecy, as it is here expressed, is found only in 2 Pet. iii. 3, and it is there given by an apostle as his own. Neither ῥῆμα nor the following λέγω need be taken to show that St. Jude was referring to mere words, for ῥῆμα is constantly used of scripture, and the phrase ἡ γραφὴ λέγει is familiar. But, even if the words are taken in their strict sense, the possibility of a direct quotation from 2 Peter is not excluded. St. Jude reminds his readers that the apostles had often said that mockers would come, and then proceeds to quote an apostolic document in which this saying was recorded in a particular shape. See Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 70.

St. Jude here distinctly tells us that he was not an apostle himself.

18. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου . . . ἀσεβειῶν. "In the last time there shall be mockers walking after their own lusts of ungodliness." There is considerable authority for the insertion of ὅτι before ἐπ' ἐσχάτου: it makes no difference in the sense, ὅτι in such a case being merely equivalent to our inverted commas; see Blass, pp. 233, 286. K L P have ἐν ἐσχάτῳ (τῷ) χρόνῳ. Τῶν ἀσεβειῶν is best taken as objective genitive after ἐπιθυμίας, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 10. The R.V. (text) translates "ungodly lusts," finding here the same Hebraism as in αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας, 2 Pet. ii. 1; but St. Jude does not use this idiom (κρίσιν βλασφημίας, ver. 9, is certainly not an instance), and it is needless to force it upon him here.

St. Jude's text differs from that of 2 Peter in the following points:—(1) He has ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου for ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. Cf. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων, 1 Pet. i. 20. Jude's phrase is less Hebraistic than that of 2 Peter, and better Greek than that of 1 Peter. (2) He has ἐμπαίκεται alone; here again he corrects the rugged Hebraism, ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται, as he had already corrected ἐν φθορᾷ φθορήσονται, 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10. (3) In κατὰ τὰς ἐαντῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι he corrects another vulgarity; 2 Peter has ἰδίας. (4) The genitive τῶν ἀσεβειῶν is redundant, and appears to be suggested by the ἀσεβής, ἀσεβεια, ἀσεβεῖν of the passage from *Enoch*. If we regard 2 Peter as the later, we must suppose that he first struck out the quotation from *Enoch*, though it suited his purpose admirably well, and then dropped the ἀσεβειῶν, because without the *Enoch* passage it was no longer easily intelligible. But this mode of procedure is too artificial to be probable. (5) St. Jude has left ἐμπαίκεται without any explanation. In 2 Peter the "mock" is defined quite easily and naturally by the following words, ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; If 2 Peter is here following Jude, it must be allowed that he has displayed great skill in his adaptation. All through this important verse it clearly seems far easier to explain Jude by 2 Peter than to reverse the process.

Among modern commentators there is a growing tendency to adopt this view; the reader may consult the arguments of Spitta, Kühn, Zahn. But the question is crucial as to the relation between the two Epistles, and it cannot be denied that a heavy weight of authority lies in the other scale. Jülicher settles the question in a very off-hand way. "It appears to speak in favour of the priority of 2 Peter, that Jude, ver. 18, quotes something as an apostolical prophecy which might be derived from 2 Pet. iii. 3, yet at bottom it is given there also as a generally known prophecy" (*Einleitung*, p. 186). But 2 Peter certainly gives the warning as his own, and, if we make him the later, we must suppose that he has here made a very serious alteration in St. Jude's text.

19. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιорίζοντες. "These are they that make separations." Ἀποδιорίζειν is found only here in the New Testament. C and some other authorities add ἐαυτούς, but the insertion is needless. Here again Jude uses the article as in vers. 4, 12, though he omits it when not required, as in ver. 16. He means "these are they of whom you have been told that they make separations," or "these are they who, as you see, make separations"; if we take the former sense we may find here a reference to the αἰρέσεις of 2 Pet. ii. 1. But in what sense did they separate? They may, as suggested on ver. 12, have kept a distinct Agape. Even this would not imply that they had definitely gone out from the Church. At a later date there were some who celebrated the Agape "without the bishop," yet did not regard themselves as

schismatics, though Ignatius strongly reproves their conduct as unlawful (*Smyrn.* viii.). Or they may have kept together at a separate part of the table. There was probably some visible sign of exclusiveness. But probably also the division would largely correspond to distinctions of class. The false teachers of whom Jude is speaking attached themselves to the rich (vers. 11, 16). But the rich would be in the main the educated. Thus we may see here a "separation" caused partly by wealth, displaying itself in insolent ostentation at the Agape; partly by social position, rebelling against the authority of officials who were not always men of much worldly consideration; partly by an assumption of intellectual superiority, of "knowledge." The same dividing influences were working at Corinth, and amongst those to whom St. James wrote, and sprang naturally out of the constitution of the Church, which was strongly democratic on one side, strongly aristocratic on another. In early days, before the Church was wealthy or educated, and before the tradition of her discipline had established itself, a rich Christian, unless he was a very devout man, must have found himself in a very trying position. It was out of this state of things that Gnosticism arose. Gnosticism was the revolt of the well-to-do half-educated bourgeois class.

Here again we may note a resemblance between Jude and the *Assumption of Moses*, which, after the words already quoted, "et os eorum loquetur ingentia," proceeds thus, "et super dicent Noli tu me tangere, ne inquines me in loco in quo uersor" (vii. 21; the text, however, is largely conjectural, and is followed by two or three lines which are quite illegible; see Hilgenfeld).

Ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. "Sensual, not having the spirit." **Ψυχικός**, opposed to **πνευματικός**, is a Pauline phrase resting on the peculiar Pauline psychology; see 1 Cor. ii. 14, xv. 44. The word is found in Jas. iii. 15, but could not be used by St. Peter, in whose vocabulary **ψυχή** means the religious soul (see note on 1 Pet. i. 9, and Introduction, p. 40). Nor is **πνεῦμα** used by St. Peter as it is here; to him **πνεῦμα** differs from **ψυχή** merely as ghost from soul. He speaks of the Holy Ghost as resting on man (1 Pet. iv. 14), but could hardly have spoken of true Christians as "having spirit," because in his view all men are **πνεύματα**. St. Jude has here introduced into 2 Peter an alien vocabulary and an alien psychology; see notes on vers. 1, 3.

St. Jude means simply what he says, that these men were psychic, not spiritual. He has been taken to mean that the people against whom he is writing called the catholics "psychic," as did the Gnostics and Montanists. Thus his words have been twisted into an argument for the late date of the Epistle. This, however, is quite gratuitous.

20. ἐποικοδομοῦντες . . . πίστει. 'Εαντοῦς represents ὑμᾶς

αἰτούς: see Matt. iii. 9, xvi. 8; Blass, p. 35. For the superlative, ἀγιωτάτη, see 2 Pet. i. 4. Here, as there, it is intensive ("most holy," not "holiest"); the true superlative being exceedingly rare in the New Testament; see Blass, p. 33. Πίστις is again *fides cui creditur*, as in ver. 3. We may translate "building yourselves up by means of your most holy faith," or "upon your most holy faith"; though, in this latter sense, ἐποικοδομεῖν is followed by ἐπί with accusative in 1 Cor. iii. 12, and by ἐπί with dative in Eph. ii. 20.

προσευχόμενοι is best taken with ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι: the believer prays in the Holy Spirit, as the prophet speaks in the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 3. It is possible to translate, with Luther, "build yourselves up by (or on) faith, in the Holy Spirit, through prayer."

21. ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε. God keeps them, ver. 1, yet they may be said to keep themselves; cf. 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. i. 27. The "love of God," coupled as it is here with the mercy of Christ, almost certainly means the love of God for man; they are to keep themselves safe within the covenant by obedience. Some commentators take the words to mean "love for God," as in 2 Thess. iii. 5. See note on ver. 1.

τὸ ἔλεος. Mercy is ascribed generally to God, as in 1 Pet. i. 3; in the addresses of 1 and 2 Timothy and of 2 John, to God and Christ; here to Christ alone. Here again there is a possible reference to *Enoch* xxvii. 3, 4, "in the last days . . . the righteous . . . who have found mercy will bless the Lord of glory, the Eternal King." They will bless Him for the mercy in accordance with which He has assigned them their lot. Εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον is by many commentators coupled with τηρήσατε. In this case, "keep yourselves unto eternal life" may be thought to correspond to "kept unto Jesus Christ," who is Life Eternal, in ver. 1. Others find the connexion in προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος, but it is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for εἰς either with the participle or with the substantive. With the former, it must be taken to mean "waiting until" or "waiting with your eyes fixed upon," with the latter, "mercy that leads to"; and none of these renderings is easy.

22, 23. The text of this passage is extremely uncertain. Some of the authorities give only two clauses, some have three, and there are variations in details. (1) Those which give two clauses are—(a) Clement of Alexandria, who twice quotes the verses, giving a different text each time, *Strom.* vi. 8. 65, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε: *Adumb. in Ep. Judae*, "Quosdam autem saluate de igne rapientes, quibusdam uero miseremini in timore" (καὶ οὓς μὲν σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ). (b) C, οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ. (c) K L P, οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινομένοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες: Peshito, "et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes (διακρινομένους), hos autem seruate de igne

rapientes in timore.” (*d*) Jerome, *Ezek.* 18, “et alios quidem de igne rapite, aliorum uero qui iudicantur miseremini” (οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, οὓς δὲ διακρινομένους ἐλεεῖτε). (*e*) The Bodleian Syriac, “et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite, cum autem resipuerint miseremini super eis in timore” (οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ). Those which make three clauses are—(*a*) A, οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ: so the Vulgate, Cassiodorus, and Theophylact. (*b*) **κ**, οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ. Between the two classes stands B, οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεεῖτε ἐν φόβῳ. This text of B cannot be correct. If we translate “those, whom you pity when they dispute, save and snatch from the fire, but some pity in fear,” we must give οὓς μὲν one sense and οὓς δὲ another, which must be wrong. It is clear that the scribe of B has either omitted οὓς δὲ before σώζετε, in which case he agrees with **κ**, or wrongly inserted ἐλεεῖτε διακρινομένους. The confusion is clearly very ancient.

Most of the textual critics and commentators, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Brückner, Wiesinger, Schott, Keil, Alford, Spitta, adopt the text of A. Translate, “Some confute when they dispute, some save snatching them from fire, on some have mercy in fear.”

In this case we have διακρινομένους used in that sense which is borne by the verb in ver. 9. This is the proper sense of the verb, and it is hardly likely that Jude used it in any other. But is it possible that there were originally three clauses? in other words, can Jude be recommending three distinct courses of action towards three distinct classes of people? It is extremely difficult to distinguish them. Who are the “some who dispute,” who are neither to be saved nor pitied? Surely but two classes of opponents are in view. All would dispute, some would recant their error, some would not. The authority for three clauses is limited to A **κ**, the Vulgate, Armenian, and Aethiopic.

Some follow the text of **κ**, reading ἐλεεῖτε (ἐλεεῖτε) for ἐλέγχετε. Thus the R.V. renders, “On some have mercy who are in doubt; and some save, snatching them out of the fire; and on some have mercy with fear.” This reading is supported by one MS. only, and compels us to give διακρίνεσθαι a meaning which it bears in Matthew, Mark, Acts, Romans, James, but not in Jude. Again, the repetition of ἐλεεῖτε is not in Jude’s manner, and is objectionable in point of sense. Lastly, the difficulty about the three clauses still remains unbroken.

The *Textus Receptus* and A.V. follow K L P, translating, with Luther, “Of some have compassion making a difference; and others save with fear.” But διακρινόμενοι cannot possibly have this mean-

ing. We must certainly correct the nominative, and read *διακρινομένων*.

Weiss adopts the text of B, upon which Westcott and Hort remark with justice that it "involves the incongruity that the first οὖς must be taken as a relative, and the first ἐλεᾶτε as indicative. Some primitive error evidently affects the passage. Perhaps the first ἐλεᾶτε, which is not represented in Syr-Bod Clem Hier is intrusive, and was inserted mechanically from the second clause."

The knot of the whole difficulty is to be found in B, the text of which is either conflate or erroneous. The most probable solution is that the scribe of B, or of B's archetype, meant to give a two-clause text, that by accident he wrote down the second clause first and then corrected himself, but did not delete ἐλεᾶτε *διακρινομένων*, and fell into another slip by omitting the participle in the second clause. Out of the confused text thus produced arose the readings of A &.

We may thus believe that there were originally but two clauses, but the order of these two is doubtful. We are left to choose between οὖς μὲν ἐλέγχετε (ἐλεείτε) *διακρινομένων*, οὖς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, with K L P (corrected) C and the Peshito, and οὖς μὲν σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὖς δὲ *διακρινομένων* ἐλεείτε ἐν φόβῳ, which would fairly represent Clement, the Bodleian Syriac, and Jerome. If the ἐλέγχετε of C is the right reading, the former seems preferable, for "confutation" would naturally come first; otherwise, the latter, for "pity" would naturally come last. As ἐλεείτε is upon the whole the better attested, we may take our stand upon the latter.

Translate then finally, "Some save, plucking them from fire; some, who dispute, pity in fear." Ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες is probably suggested by Amos iv. 11, κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ Θεὸς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα, καὶ ἐγένεσθε ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρὸς: or by Zech. iii. 2, καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς τὸν διάβολον Ἐπιτιμήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοὶ διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοὶ ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ· οὐκ ἰδοὺ τοῦτο ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρὸς; The former passage might well be recalled to St. Jude's mind by ver. 7, the latter by ver. 9. Ἐν φόβῳ, "in fear of contamination." "Pity them, yet fear, lest the same doom overtake yourselves." The faith once for all delivered to the saints, ver. 3, most holy, ver. 20, is the one way of salvation; those who reject it are rooted out, ver. 12, and doomed to the fire. Cf. Mark xvi. 16, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας (τῷ κηρύγματι) κατακριθήσεται. We might possibly find here an argument in favour of the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, which were rejected by ancient critics merely because the words ἀναστὰς δὲ πρῶτῃ πρῶτῃ σαββάτων were thought to contradict those of St. Matthew, ὁπὲρ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων. See Eusebius, *Quaest. ad Marinum*, and Victor, quoted by Tischendorf, eighth edition, p. 405.

μισούντες . . . χιτῶνα. "Hating even the tunic spotted by the flesh." St. Jude may be thinking of the garment that is infected with leprosy, Lev. xiii. 47, though the word there used is ἱμάτιον. The χιτῶν was worn next to the skin, and therefore peculiarly liable to contamination. All contact with these moral lepers was to be avoided. Dr. Chase, however, finds here an allusion to the "filthy garments," ἱμάτια ἑνπαρά, of Joshua the high priest in Zech. iii. 3; and this explanation would be possible, if we could be sure that the figure of the brand plucked from the burning is borrowed from this chapter. It may be questioned whether St. Jude contemplates only sorrowful avoidance of the company of these men, or actual excommunication (1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20), but his language is very strong.

24. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ . . . ἀγαλλιάσει. "Now to him that is able to guard you without stumbling, and to make you stand before the presence of His glory without blemish in exceeding joy." The dative depends upon the attribution implied in δόξα, κ.τ.λ., in ver. 25; but as the attribution refers at once to past, present, and future, it is not possible to supply any definite verb. The doxology in Rom. xvi. 25 begins with the same words, τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ: cf. also Eph. iii. 20. Ἀπταίστους, "surefooted," is used of a horse which does not stumble, Xen. *Eq.* i. 6, and of a good man who does not make moral stumbles, Epictetus, *Frag.* 62; M. Antoninus, v. 9. The word is probably suggested here by οὐ μὴ πταισῆτέ ποτε, 2 Pet. i. 10. Στήσαι, "to make you stand," is probably more than "to present," though we may compare παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 22, or Acts vi. 6, οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων. But we seem to have here the notion of standing in the judgment, cf. Eph. vi. 13. For δόξης and ἀγαλλιάσει, see 1 Pet. iv. 13.

25. K L P and the *Textus Receptus* insert σοφῶ before Θεῶ, probably from Rom. xvi. 27; the same MSS. make the same addition in 1 Tim. i. 17. K P and Oecumenius omit διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: the clause, though so familiar in the late doxologies, is found only here, Rom. xvi. 27, and (in substance though not exactly in form) 1 Pet. iv. 11, and may possibly have been inserted with σοφῶ from Romans. On the other hand, Jude may be quoting Romans, or both St. Paul and St. Jude may be using a current form. K P again omit πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος. These words remind us of the later "ut erat in principio," and are not found in any other apostolic doxology. N, three cursives, and the Coptic omit πάντας. L, four cursives, and some Latin MSS. have αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Two cursives and Cassiodorus omit ἀμήν. The text has clearly been affected by liturgical influence.

μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτήρι ἡμῶν. Σωτήρ is used of God eight times in the New Testament, Luke i. 47; 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. i. 3,

ii. 10, iii. 4, and here. Of these instances six are in the Pastoral Epistles. The word is used of Christ in fifteen places, of which five are in 2 Peter, five in Luke, John and Acts, one in Philippians, four in the Pastoral Epistles. Both uses are found in the ancient Hebrew documents used by St. Luke (i. 47, ii. 11). For *μόνος Θεός* see John v. 44, *δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε*, where, in spite of the antithesis to *παρὰ ἀλλήλων*, the words appear to mean "the only God"; Rom. xvi. 27, *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ*, "to the only wise God"; here the first attribute qualifies the second, "to God who alone is wise"; 1 Tim. i. 17, *μόνῳ Θεῷ*, "the only God," "who alone is God." In the present passage it is open to question whether Jude means "to the only God," or "to God alone," but the commentators seem to be unanimous in preferring the former rendering. "The only God" is, as Spitta points out, an expression directed against the polytheism of the Gentiles. A close parallel in sense is to be found 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. We must take such passages in connexion with others such as John i. 1; Rom. ix. 5; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 4, 21, or the doxologies addressed to Christ, or the uses of *Κύριος* or of *Σωτήρ*.

Kühl, Schott, von Soden, Spitta connect *σωτήρι* with *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "God who is our Saviour through Jesus Christ," but this construction is unexampled and barely possible; we should have expected *τῷ σώσαντι ἡμᾶς*. The use of *διά* in the doxologies is strongly in favour of translating, "Glory to God through Jesus Christ."

δόξα is ascribed to God or Christ in all the doxologies except 1 Tim. vi. 16: *μεγαλωσύνη* (a late word which occurs also in Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, and several times in *Enoch*, v. 4, 9, xii. 3, xiv. 16; see Dr. Chase's article on *Jude* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) only here; for *κράτος* see 1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11; Apoc. i. 6, v. 13. Compare the doxologies of Clement of Rome and of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* given in the Introduction. *Ἐξουσία*, which generally signifies subordinate and delegated authority, is used of the power of God, Luke xii. 5; Acts i. 7. *Πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος*. "Before all eternity" glory was to God through Jesus Christ, and "now" is, and "to all the eternities" will be. Words could hardly express more clearly Jude's belief in the pre-existence and eternity of Christ.

ἀμήν. See note on 1 Pet. iv. 11.

INDICES.

I. SUBJECTS AND NAMES.

(The names of modern scholars and commentators are not included.)

- Abraham, his significance to St. Peter, 42, 115.
 Abstract nouns, plural of, 225.
 Acceptable, 143.
 Acts, date of, 87.
 of Paul and Thecla, 243.
 Adam, prophecies of, 215.
 Address of I Peter; Dr. Harnack's view, 78.
 Heathen and Christian types of, 88.
 Adoptionism, 35.
 Advent, Christians forbidden to fix a date for the Second, 43, 45, 47.
 Agape at Antioch, 62.
 dismissed before dark, 282.
 Aidan assisted by King Oswald as interpreter, 6.
 Alexander, a Montanist, condemned for brigandage, 177.
 Alexandria, Jewish poets at, 227.
 was Jude written at? 320.
 Allegorism, 265.
 Alphaeus, 319.
 Amen, use of, by our Lord and in liturgical formulæ, 176, 344.
 Andronicus and Junia, 65.
 Angels, 166, 221, 274, 279, 328.
 Anthropologies of Messianic prophecy, 20.
 of Greek poets, 227.
 Antinomians, v, 238, 315.
 Antioch, Paul goes up from Antioch to Jerusalem, 58.
 Peter at, 59.
 synagogue at, 71.
 two churches at, 44, 62.
 Antioch, dispute between Peter and Paul at, 62.
 prophets at, 44.
 Antiochenes fond of nicknames, 179.
 Aorist imperative, 4, 142.
 indicative, 111, 153.
 participle, 161, 267, 299.
 subjunctive, 170.
 Apocalypse of John, 22, 28, 76.
 of *Peter*, in *Muratorianum*, 14.
 tinged by reminiscences of Virgil, 207.
 probably composed in the West, 209, 243.
 of Baruch, 76.
 Apocrypha, Biblical, well known to Peter, 3.
Apokryphenscheu, supposed, in I Peter, 222, 275.
 Apollos party at Corinth, 64.
 Apostle, as description and as title, 64.
 use of the title in 2 Peter, 290.
 Jude not an Apostle, 306, 314.
 Apostolic, as title of Epistles, I, 245.
 Aquila, 19, 93, 132, 269.
 Arabia, St. Paul's retirement to, 56.
 Churches in Arabia which had no presbyters, 186.
 Archangels, 111, 280.
 Archontics, 239.
 Aristotle, met a Jew in Asia, 70.
 on colour, 268.
 on habits of swine, 287.
 on nature of happiness, 258.
 on short-sight, 259.
 on value of external goods, 257.

- Ark of Noah, 164.
- Article, use of, in 1 and 2 Peter, 4, 225.
omitted with single nouns that may be regarded almost as proper names, *Κύριος*, 124; *γραφή*, 130.
with noun coupled with another noun in attribution, *ἀγιασμός Πνεύματος*, 92; *λόγος Θεοῦ*, 123; *λόγια Θεοῦ*, 174.
with noun and adjective, *ἄγιον Πνεῦμα*, 111; *ποικίλη χάρις*, 174; *ἀρχαῖος κόσμος*, 225.
- Ascension, its significance to St. Peter and to St. Paul, 55, 91.
- Asceticism among Gnostics, 239.
- Asia, 60, 68, 73.
Jews in Asia Minor, 70.
Christians in Asia Minor, 72, 74.
St. Paul forbidden to preach in, 73.
Antinomians in, 245.
- Assumption of Moses*, 120, 217, 222, 282, 285, 306, 310, 311, 331, 337, 339.
- Atonement, connected with Blood of Christ, 93.
with sinlessness of Christ and Lamb, 119.
with ideas of Ransom and Buying, 118, 234.
of Sin-offering and Example, 145, 147, 159.
- Authority, conception of, in Pauline and Petrine Epistles, 42.
- Authorities, Angels of, 166.
- Auxiliaries, use of, in vulgar Greek, 187, 263.
- Avarice charged against Gnostics and Montanists, 273.
- Azazel, 275.
- Babes, in Peter, Paul, and Hebrews, 42, 125, 127.
- Babylon, 22, 75, 197.
- Balaam, type of covetousness, 283.
of uncleanness, 332.
- Baptism, in Pastoral Epp., 21.
in 1 Peter, 41, 49.
Apostles did not baptize, 65.
of proselytes, 71.
regeneration in, 99.
different figures for, 164.
in 2 Peter, 234.
repentance after, 260.
- Barnabas, 57 sqq., 65, 80.
Epistle of, quotes St. Matthew's Gospel as Scripture, 241.
- Basilides, pupil of Glaucias the interpreter of Peter, 5, 12.
- Baucalis, church of, at Alexandria, 83.
- Baur, 34, 246.
- Bede, 6.
- Benediction of God, 16, 96.
- Bereshith Rabba, 163, 276.
- Bernice, 168.
- Bishop, as description and as title, 21, 49, 150, 185.
bishops of Jerusalem, 319 sq.
- Bithynia, 68, 73.
- Blindness, cure of, by vicarious suffering, 133.
- Blood of Christ, 93, 119.
- Blood-soul, the, 94.
- Body, the One, figure not used by Peter, 18, 20.
- Boycotting, against the Roman law, 27, 137.
- Brethren of Lord, known at Corinth, 60.
older than our Lord, 315, 317.
- Bristol, in Fox's time like Corinth, 46.
- Brotherhood, 49.
- Butler, Bishop, 37, 254, 258.
- Buying, idea of, in doctrine of Atonement, 118, 234, 272.
- Caesar, a human institution, 139.
- Caesarea, prophets at, 44.
St. Peter at, 55.
- Cain, type of murderer not of sceptic, 222, 232.
- Cairo, Old, 75.
- Calling, 90, 114, 234, 253, 261.
- Canon, of N.T., 302.
Canon Law, 55, 61.
- Canonic, as title of Epistles, 2.
- Cappadocia, 68.
- Carlstadt, 315.
- Carpocrates, 239.
nature of his doctrine, 312.
- Casuistry, not found in N.T., 142.
- Catechism, 127.
- Catholic Epistles, not addressed to church at large, 2, 238, 321.
their treatment in the *Muratorianum*, 14.
and in the Peshito, 245.
- Cephas, meaning of the name, 54, 89.
- Chiliasm, 214, 295.
- Christian vocabulary, 3.
origin, form and date of the name, 35, 49, 179.
- Christology, 35, 109, 158, 235.

- Church, word not used in Peter, 3.
 nor in its technical sense in
 Hebrews, 48.
- Chrysis, 267.
- Cicero, 137, 144.
- Circumcision, dispute concerning, 41,
 57.
- Cities of Plain, 221, 276, 329.
- Collection, the great, 61.
- Collections of Epistles, 240.
- Commandment, used in the singular
 for the whole moral law, 287.
- Compromise made by Council of Jeru-
 salem, 63.
- Conduct, good, 38.
- Conscience, 144.
- Conservatism of St. Peter, 41, 49.
- Constantine, Novatians and Mon-
 tanists in reign of, 35.
- Continuity, 37, 42, 153.
- Conversion of St. Paul, 53.
 character of sudden conversions,
 46.
- Conviction, its relation to faith, 39.
- Corinth, prophecy at, 45.
 probably visited by St. Peter, 59.
 parties at, 61, 64.
- Corrupt text of 2 Peter, 211.
- Court, the Imperial, 84.
- Crimean Inscriptions, 70.
- Criminal, not sharply distinguished
 from immoral in Roman law, 140.
- Criticism, method of ancient, 245.
- Crown, 189.
- Ctesiphon, Jews at, 75.
- Cyprus, 81.
- Day of the Lord, 295 sq.
 Rabbinic opinions as to its dura-
 tion, 213.
 of Judgment, 209, 278, 295, 296.
 of Christ, 296.
 of Visitation, 138.
 great Day, 329.
 of Eternity, 304.
- Deacon, not mentioned by Peter, 49.
- Dead Sea, 277.
- Decree of Jerusalem, first monument
 of Canon Law, 55.
 St. Paul's attitude towards it,
 61.
 a compromise, 63.
 probably mark of the Petrine party
 at Corinth, 64, 66.
- Deliverance, 102.
- Deluge, a type of Baptism, 164.
 an instance of judgment, 176.
- Deluge, does Peter mean that the whole
 universe was destroyed? 293 sq.
- Demand, the Baptismal, 165.
- Demiurge, the Gnostic, 239.
- Demons, delight in blood, 94.
- Demoniacal possession, 51.
- Deposits, sacredness of, 182.
- Descensus ad Inferos*, 10, 11, 13, 163,
 170.
- Devil, author of persecution, 192.
 dispute with Michael, 217, 331.
 his sin, 329.
 worship of devils, 137.
- Diaspora, 67 sqq.
- Dickens, Charles, falls occasionally into
 blank verse, 228.
- Different types of Christianity, 50.
- Disciplinarianism, viii, 37, 48, 74, 234,
 and *passim*.
- Divine Right of kings, idea not to be
 found in Peter, 139 sq.
- Divorce, how treated by St. Peter and
 by St. Paul, 43.
- Docetism, 243.
- Doxology, Hebrew type of, 96.
 Christian types, 175, 195, 304,
 343.
- Dualism of Epiphanes, 312.
 constant trait of Gnosticism, 239.
- Dudael, 275.
- Ebionites, 245.
- Ecstasy, the form of prophecy, 46, 51.
- Egypt, Babylon in, 75.
 tomb of St. Mark, 83.
 Barnabas in, 83.
 2 Peter thought to have been
 written in, 243.
- Elder, see Presbyter.
- Election, 90, 234, 261.
- Element, 293, 296.
- Eli, Eli, the cry from the Cross, 243.
- Elkesaites, 245.
- Empedocles, 94.
- End, 102, 172, 235; see Advent,
 Eschatology, Revelation, Signs.
- Enoch*, the Book of, 111, 163, 166,
 294, 299, 309.
- Enthusiasm, 46.
- Epicharmus, 191.
- Epictetus, 136, 177.
- Epiphanes, 312.
- Epistles, collections of, 241, 301.
- Eschatology, favourite theme of pro-
 phecy, 47.
- Etacism, 180.

- Eternity, day of, 304.
of creation, 240, 292.
- Eucharist, 49, 95.
- Eupolemus of Alexandria, 16.
- Evangelicalism of St. Peter, 39, 40.
- Exaltation of Christ, 121.
- Expectancy, characteristic trait of St. Peter, 39, 55, 100.
- Exultation in the midst of suffering, 102 sqq.
in the Revelation, 176.
- Ezekiel of Alexandria, 227.
- Faith, Pauline and Petrine view of, 38.
in 1 Peter, 101, 193.
in 2 Peter, 234, 257.
in Jude, 325.
- Father, God and Father of Jesus Christ, 36, 96.
our Father, 116.
St. Peter probably a father, 54, 243.
See also 235, 266.
- Fatherly jurisdiction of Roman magistrates, 140.
temper of St. Peter, 6.
- Fear, a disciplinarian idea, 37.
of God, 117, 142, 234.
- Fire, destruction of the world by, 214.
- Flesh, hardly bears an ethical sense in 1 Peter, 40.
ethical sense of the word derived from the Stoics, 136.
- Foreknowledge, 91, 120, 133.
- Forgery, beginning and end of 1 Peter supposed to be a, 79.
difficulty of, 233.
Pauline Epistles forged, 240.
ancient forgeries, 242.
Petrine forgeries, 243.
possibly suggested by 2 Pet. i. 15, 215, 265.
- Fox, George, 37, 46, 286.
- Freedom, differently understood by St. Paul, St. Peter, the author of Hebrews, and the Antinomians, 42, 74, 141, 286.
- Gabriel, the archangel, 112, 280.
- Galatia, 68.
- Galilaean dialect of St. Peter, 5.
- Galilee, not under the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin, 25.
- Garland, 173, 189.
- Gentile churches, 62, 72.
admission of the Gentiles into the Church differently regarded by St. Peter and St. Paul, 42, 91, 101.
- Ghost, denotes personality, 40.
the Holy G., 109, 152, 235.
ghost of man, 40, 161.
- Glaucias, said to have been employed as interpreter by Peter, 5, 12.
- Glaucus, son of Epiccydes, 182.
- Glory, the Spirit of, 39, 177.
Revelation of, 176, 187.
of the Transfiguration, 254, 266.
a paraphrase for God, 266.
glory and suffering, 101, 177.
- Gnostics, in Hayti, vi.
belonged to the half-educated middle class, 339.
rejected Fear as a motive, 117.
Gnostic controversy strengthened the hierarchy, 233.
sects of, 239.
tampered with Scripture, 242.
- Goodness of God, 115.
- Gorgippia, 70.
- Gospel, relation of 1 Peter to the Gospels, 23, 49, 187
of 2 Peter, 230.
essence of the, 101.
preached to the dead, 162, 170.
St. Paul's knowledge of, 53.
of St. Mark, 82, 206, 213.
of St. Matthew quoted as Scripture in Barnabas, 241.
date of St. Luke's, 98.
of Hebrews, 243.
of Peter, 243, 248.
- Grace, different conceptions of, 37, 39.
not same as Light, 42.
use of the word, 143.
- Greek, vulgar, vi, 3, 105, 108, and notes *passim*.
poets quoted in N.T., 141, 227.
- Growth of Christian excellence, 257.
- Harmonising, danger of, 34.
- Harrowing of Hell, see *Descensus ad Inferos*.
- Hayti, Gnosticism in, vi.
- Heavens, the seven, 292.
- Hebraisms, 3, 112, 113, 168, 223, 338.
- Heresy, 271.
- Hermas, nature and tests of prophecy in, 44, 47.
- Hierarchy, strengthened by Gnostic controversy, 233.
the angelic, 166, 279.
- Hippolytus, Canons of, 282.
- Hiram of Tyre, 16.
- Holiness, Ritschl's view of, 115.
imparted by the Spirit, 92.

- Holy, epithet of Ghost, 111.
 of Christians, 43, 217, 311.
 of prophets, 270.
- Homer, author of *Apocalypse of Peter*
 acquainted with, 207.
- Homerism, 228, 283.
- Hope, importance of, in 1 Peter, 39,
 100.
 not in 2 Peter, 235.
- Horace, 137.
- Hospitality, 173.
- Humility, a beautiful robe, 191.
- Iambic rhythm in 2 Peter, 227.
- Idolatry amongst Jews, 169.
- Ignatius, a prophet, 47, 50.
- Ignorance, 24, 114.
 how cured, 133.
- Immanence, a mystic idea, 37, 39, 41.
- Imputation, doctrine of, not in Peter,
 41.
- Incarnation, Ruprecht's view of the,
 93.
- Inheritance, 100.
- Inherited sin, 41, 234.
- Inner Light, 37; see Grace, Freedom,
 Prophecy.
- Inns, little used in apostolic times,
 173.
- Interpolation, 216.
- Interpreter, office of the, 5.
 St. Peter used an, 5.
 possibly more than one, 199, 247.
 Josephus used Greek scholars to
 correct his style, 6.
 prophecy needs an, 269.
- Intoxication of false prophecy, 112.
- Irving, 240.
- James, St., 52, 58, 62, 65, 317.
 Epistle of, 23, 104, 125, 173, 301.
- Jerusalem, destruction of, 76, 314.
 bishops of, 319.
- Jews, lax morality of, 168.
 idolatry not unknown amongst,
 169.
- Joppa, some suppose 1 Peter to have
 been written from, 75.
- Josephus used interpreters, 6.
 quoted book of Adam, 215.
 on destruction of the Five Cities,
 277.
- Jubilees*, Book of, 117, 166.
- Judaizers, 58, 246.
- Judgment, day of, 209, 235, 278, 295,
 296.
- Juvenal, 137.
- King, used of Caesar in the East, 139.
- Kingdom of God, 23.
 of Christ, 262.
- Kiss, 197.
- Knowledge, in St. Paul a mystic
 phrase, 46, 47.
 not so in Peter, 154, 258, 303.
- Lamb, 119.
- Last time, 102; see Day, End, Perse-
 cution.
- Laud, William, a disciplinarian, 37.
- Law, William, 53.
- Law, Pauline and Petrine views of
 the, 41.
 dispute about the, 60.
 doctrine of Epiphanes, 312; see
 Freedom.
- Legion, my name is, 51.
- Leptogenesis*, 210.
- Letter, not contrasted with spirit by
 Peter, 40.
- Light, the inner, 37.
 grace not light, 42.
- Livia, the columbarium of, 83.
- Lord, use of the title in the N.T., 97.
 in 1 Peter 124, 127, 158.
 in 2 Peter, 236.
 in Jude, 327, 328, 340.
 Lord's Prayer, 117, 298.
- Luke, date of his Gospel, 98.
- Macrinus, the Emperor, his opinion of
 rescripts, 32.
- Maran, Mari, 97.
- Marcion taught that the Patriarchs were
 not saved, 13.
- Mark, 63, 74, 80; see Gospel.
- Marriage, 17, 43, 77.
- Menander, 141, 227.
- Mercy, 99, 340.
- Milk, the food of babes, 43, 125.
- Millennium, 240; see Chiliasm.
- Miltiades, 51.
- Mission, the Pontic, 69, 74.
 the Antiochene, 44.
- Mockers, the, in 2 Peter, 216, 223,
 291, 292.
- Monnica, 151, 153.
- Most High God, of Christ, 9.
 in Crimean Inscriptions, 70.
- Münzer, 315.
- Muralorianum*, 14.
- Mystical names for places, 76.
- Mysticism, viii, 37.
- Myth, different senses of the word,
 265.

- Name, Christians persecuted for the, 29.
 above every name, 99.
 of Christ, 176.
- Nazoraean, a Jewish nickname, 35, 179, 271.
- Nebuchadnezzar, 76.
- Neoplatonism, 138, 160.
- Nero, persecution of, 28.
- Noah, 10, 13, 229, 276.
- Obedience, 39, 92, 113.
- Ocellus Lucanus taught eternity of creation probably before time of Peter, 240.
- Optative mood, 157, 159.
- Oracles*, the Sibylline, 76, 205, 214, 242, 297.
 or *λόγια* in the sense of "Scripture," 174.
- Order of books in the N. T., 2.
- Oswald, King, helped Aidan as interpreter, 6.
- Our God, 221, 251.
- Pamphylia, 69, 73.
- Participle, coupled with verb requiring different construction, 105, 138.
- Paschal Lamb, 119.
- Paul, his education, conversion, visions, 52, 53.
 in Arabia, 56.
 his first visit to Jerusalem, 56.
 the second, 57; the third, 58.
 meeting with Peter at Antioch, 62.
 when recognised as Apostle? 64.
 extent of his labours in Asia, 73.
 Paul and Mark, 81; and Silvanus, 85.
 his persecutions, 25.
 his encouragement of prophecy, 45.
 his difference from Peter not dogmatic, 35; but practical, 37.
 mentioned in 2 Peter, 241, 299.
- Pauline Epistles, forged in the Apostle's own lifetime, 240; regarded as Scripture, 241; collected, 241.
 words in Jude, 311.
- Payment of clergy, 188.
 of prophets, 51, 274.
- Perpetua, 47, 146.
- Persecution in N. T., 25.
 Nero's, 28.
 Trajan's, 30.
 caused by the devil, 192.
- Peshito, 13, 245.
- Peter probably used an interpreter, 5.
 possibly more than one, 199, 247.
- Peter, personal traits in his style, 6.
 especially repetition of words, 225.
 his life, name, character, training, 54.
 agreed with St. Paul in dogma, 35, 67.
 differed from him as disciplinarian from mystic, 37.
 more evangelical than St. Paul, 23, 39, 49.
 does not speculate, 41, 262, 293.
 does not speak of Christian prophecy, 43.
 personal relations with St. Paul, 54.
 at Antioch, 59.
 probably visited Corinth, 59, 62, 86.
 possibly Galatia, 86.
 at Rome, 76, 80, 86.
 did not baptize with his own hands, 65.
 his wife, 77; wife and daughter, 243.
 his personal appearance, 243.
 relations with Mark and Silvanus, 80, 84.
 death, 85.
- Petrine party at Corinth, 64.
- Pharisaic mystics, 52, 322.
- Philo of Alexandria, 94, 127, 128, 240.
- Phoenix described by Ezekiel, 227.
- Phrases as marks of date, 211.
- Pilgrimage, 6, 90.
- Planets, 307, 311.
- Pliny, despatch of, to Trajan, 29.
- Plotinus, 149, 160.
- Plutarch, 136.
- Polycarp, how he became a prophet, 50.
- Pontus, 68.
- Portraits of Christ, 243.
 verbal portraits of Peter and of Paul, 243.
- Possession, of heathen prophecy, 51.
- Post-apostolic prophecy, 51; see also Hermas.
- Predestination, 133.
- Pre-existence of Christ, 109, 120.
- Presbyter, 49.
 in N. T. generally, 183.
 in synagogue, 184.
 exercised spiritual functions, 185, 187.
 not necessarily a collegiate office, 189.
 age only in a limited sense a qualification, 190.
 how related to bishops, 150, 185.

- Priesthood, sacrificial, of the brotherhood, 134.
- Prophet, in Gospels, 43.
in Acts, 44.
form and themes of prophecy, 45, 50.
not to be confounded with teacher, 47.
tests of false prophets, 51.
his place in the Church, 184.
- Proselytes, 71.
- Proverbs, 228, 287.
- Rabbi, meaning of the title, 97.
doctrines of the Rabbis, 94, 163, 206, 213, 215, 293, 297, 298.
scorn-names used by the Rabbis, 283.
- Race, Christians a third, 134.
- Ransom, 118, 120.
- Raphael, the archangel, 112, 280.
- Redemption, 118, 120.
- Regeneration, 21, 99, 122.
in the Taurobolium and in Isis-worship, 99.
- Repentance after Baptism, 260.
- Repetition of words in 1 and 2 Peter, 225.
- Republican tendency of Peter, 139.
- Rescripts, effect of, 32.
- Resurrection, doctrine of the, 47, 121, 181, 240, 301.
- Revelation, the form of prophecy, 46, 58.
of Glory, 176, 187.
of Jesus Christ, 112.
related to study and discovery, 108.
- Revels, nature of conversation at, 168.
- Rhythm, iambic, in 2 Peter, 227.
- Righteousness of God, 115, 250, 252.
of man, 41, 157, 181, 276.
- Ritschl, Albrecht, 34, 115.
- Rome, meant by Babylon, 76.
St. Peter in, 80, 87.
Apocalypse of Peter probably written in, 209.
- Sabellianism, 35, 99.
- Sacrifice of Christ, 95, 145, 147, 159.
of the Church, 129.
- Saints, 43, 325.
- Salvation, see Deliverance.
- Sanctification, 92.
- Sanhedrin, its constitution and jurisdiction, 25, 184.
St. Paul not a member of the, 52.
- Sarah, 229.
- Saviour, 236, 251, 344.
- Scillitan martyrs, 33, 241.
- Scripture, pattern for Christian conversation, 43, 174.
degrees of inspiration in, 241.
needs an interpreter, 270.
- Severians, 239.
- Shepherd, of Christ, 43, 149.
of Christian pastor, 43, 187.
- Signs of the End, 172.
St. Peter not interested in, 295.
- Silas, Sili, Silvanus, 84.
- Silo, the agricultural term, 274.
- Simon Magus, 51, 66.
- Sin, inherited, 41.
- Sinlessness of Christ, 119.
- Sin-offering, 145, 147, 159.
- Slave of Christ, 249.
- Socinianism, 160.
- Son of Man, 23.
- Soul, 40, 311.
- Spirit, 40; see Ghost.
- Sprinkling, 92.
- Stars, 223, 297, 328, 335.
- Stoics, 38, 52, 136, 257.
- Stratonicean Inscription, 257.
- Suetonius, 137.
- Suffering and glory the essence of the gospel, 110.
of Christ, 95, 160.
value of the believer's sufferings for himself, 167.
for others, 138, 177.
a sign that the last time has begun, 181.
work of the devil, 192.
- Superlative, use of the, 255, 340.
- Tacitus, 137.
- Talitha cumi, 89.
- Tarsus, 52, 57, 67.
- Taurobolium, 99.
- Teacher, not to be identified with prophet, 47.
- Temptation, 40, 103, 278.
- Ten words of creation, 293.
- Theodotion, 19, 93, 132.
- Third race, the Christians a, 134.
- Thymele, 83.
- Trajan, his correspondence with Pliny, 29.
- Transcendence of God, a leading disciplinary idea, 37, 41.
- Transfiguration, 231.
- Trinity, the Holy, 91, 235.
- Tübingen School, 34, 246.

- Type, 164.
 Tyre, prophets at, 44.
- Vatinius, 137.
 Vaudoux, vi.
 Vengeance, when a duty, 140.
 Vespasian, 76.
 Virgil, influence of, on the author of
 the *Apocalypse of Peter*, 207.
- Virtue, 134, 234, 254, 258.
 Visitation of God, 138.
 Visions of St. Paul, 53.
 of St. Peter, 55.
 of prophets, 47, 50.
 Vulgar Greek, vi, 3, 105, 108.
- Wesley, John, 42, 286.
 Works, good, 38, 322.

II. LATIN WORDS AND PHRASES.

- alieni speculator*, 178.
arbiter testamenti, 331.
benedictus, benedicendus, 96.
christianus, 137.
coercitio, 30.
cognitio, 31.
comissari, 168.
conscientia, 144.
contumacia, 30.
conuersatio, 116.
cultus, 152.
de plano, 140.
decur, 83.
dies irae, 215.
effundi in, 332.
elementum, 297.
familia, famuli, 142.
flagitia, 29, 31, 137.
hereditas, 100.
histrion, 178.
hoc nomine, 180.
honestus, 136.
iudex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur,
 160.
- leno*, 178.
magnalia, 135.
manu tentans, 260.
mathematicus, 178.
mediae, 200.
mundus, 152.
nomen ipsum, 29 sq.
occultus, 51.
ornatus, 152.
patrimonium, 100.
ponentes faciem deorsum, 51.
praestolantes, 307.
renatus, 99.
rex, 140.
sacer, sanctus, 122, 134.
salutaris, 50.
sane, 14.
somnium, 330.
Sullani et simm., 179.
taurobolium, 99.
tempestiua conuiuia, 282.
ustio, 12.

III. GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES.

- ἄλλοτριεπισκοπος, 177.
 ἀμαράντινος, 189.
 ἀμαρτία, 41.
 ἄμωός, 119.
 ἄμωμος, ἄσιλος, 119.
 ἄν, 5.
 ἀναγεννᾶν, 99.
 ἀναφέρειν, 147.
 ἀνάχυστις, 169.
- ἀντίτυπον, 164.
 ἀνώθεν, 99.
 ἀπογίγνεσθαι, 148.
 ἀπολύτρωσις, 118.
 ἀρετή, ἀρεταί, 135, 254.
- βασιλειον, 134.
 βασιλεύς, 139.
 βιώσαι, 167.

γάλα, 127.
 γνώσις, 154, 258, 303.
 γράμμα, 40.

διά, 5, 163, 195, 293.
 διάβολος, 192.
 διακρίνεσθαι, 331, 340.
 διάνοια, 41.
 δοκίμιον, 103.

ἐγκομβοῦσθαι, 190.
 ἔθνος, 134.
 εἰδώς, construction of, 194.
 εἰς, 100, 196.
 ἐλπίζειν, 112, 153.
 ἐν Χριστῷ, 159, 198.
 ἔννοια, 41.
 ἐξέραμα, 288.
 ἐξουσία, 17, 21, 166.
 ἐπερώτημα, 165.
 ἐπιθυμία, 41.
 ἐπικάλυμμα, 141.
 ἐπίσκοπος, 49, 150, 188.
 ἐπιτελείσθαι, 194.
 ἔραυνᾶν, 107.
 εὐλογητός, 16, 96.
 εὐρεθῆναι, 104.

ἡγεμών, 140.

θέμις, 169.
 θρόνοι, 17.

ἴδιος, 150, 254, 269, 291, 303.
 ἰερεὺς, 134.
 ἴνα, 4.

καιρός, 102, 192.
 κακία, 125.
 κακοποιός, 136, 140.
 καλεῖν, 114.
 καλύπτειν, 173.
 καταβολή, 120.
 κανουόμενος, 297.
 κληροί, 188.
 κληρονομία, 100.
 κόσμος, 40, 152, 193, 294.
 κυρία, 77.
 Κύριος, 97, 124, 127, 158.

λόγια, 174.
 λογίζεσθαι, 195.
 λόγον διδόναι, ἀποδιδόναι, 170.
 λύτρον, 118.

μακάριος, 157.
 μάρτυς, 78, 186.
 μή, 105.

Ναζωραῖος, 35.

ξενίζεσθαι, 169, 176.
 ξύλον, 147.

ὄνομα, 176, 180.
 οὐ, 105.

παραδίδναι, 146.
 παραθήκη, 182.
 παρακύπτειν, 111.
 παρεισεδύθησαν, 325.
 παρέκστασις, 51.
 παροικία, 118.
 πειρασμός, 103.
 περί, 145, 159.
 περιέχειν, 130.
 πίστις, 38, 122, 193.
 πιστός, 121.
 πνεῦμα, 40, 92, 109, 111, 128, 152.
 ποιμήν, 149, 187.
 πρεσβύτερος, 182, 190.
 προμαρτύρεσθαι, 107.

ῥάντισμα, -μός, 7, 92.

σάρξ, 40, 136.
 σκεῦος, 154.
 συνειδήσις, 144.
 σώζειν, σωτηρία, 101.

ταχυγράφος, 6.
 τρίτον γένος, 134.

ὑπέρ, 145, 159.
 ὑπέρτης, 80.
 ὕψιστος Θεός, 9, 70.
 ὑπογραμμός, 145.
 ὑπογραφεύς, 5.
 ὑπολιμπάνειν, 145.

φιλαδελφία, 123.
 φιλόξενος, 173.
 φιμοῖν, 141.

χαίρειν, 88.
 χάρις, 39, 113, 143, 155, 194.
 χάρισμα, 39, 173.

ψυχή, ψυχικός, 40, 107, 149, 339.

ὤς, 4, 141, 154, 174, 176.