

used here is unique among the Pauline Epistles; and if it had been the work of a forger, he would surely have been more careful to follow St. Paul's general usage, as it meets us in 1 Corinthians xvi. 21, or Colossians iv. 18. Whereas "if Paul wrote the words, they express his intention," as Dr. Drummond has pointed out, "and this intention was satisfactorily fulfilled if he always added the benediction in his own handwriting."¹

On the whole then, without any desire to minimize the difficulties surrounding the literary character and much of the contents of this remarkable Epistle, I can find nothing in them to throw undue suspicion on its genuineness; while the failure of those who reject it to present any adequate explanation of how it arose, or of the authority it undoubtedly possessed in the Early Church, is in itself strong presumptive evidence that the traditional view is correct, and that we have here an authentic work of the Apostle Paul.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE OF
JUDE.

IF we may judge from the number of 'primitive errors' suspected by WH in this short Epistle, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these thirty verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels. In what follows I give the text of WH.

v. 1. Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.

Here ἡγαπημένοις is supported by ABN, several cursives and ver-

¹ *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, etc.* (International Handbook to the New Testament), p. 13.

sions, Orig. iii. 607, Lucif. Cassiod. *al.*, while *ἡγιασμένοις* is read by KLP *al.* WH (in *App.* p. 576, and *Notes on Sel. Readings*, p. 106) say that "the text is probably a primitive error for τοῖς θεῶ . . . καὶ ἐν I. X." For the reading ἐν I. X. they cite Vulg. Spec. Syr. Bdl. Theb. Aeth. Orig. *Mt.*, Lucif. Cassiod.

The objection to the text rests on internal grounds. There appears to be no parallel either for ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοι, or for Χριστῷ τετηρημένοι, whereas the preposition ἐν is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to *Christ* as the members of His body. If Bishop Lightfoot is right in saying (on Col. 3. 12) that in the New Testament the word ἡγαπημένοι "seems to be always used of the object of God's love," it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase "Brethren beloved by God in God." Omitting the preposition we have the dative of the agent, as in Nehemiah 13. 26, ἀγαπώμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν. Nor does it seem a natural expression to speak of "those who are kept *for* Christ (so Alford, Spitta, B. Weiss, v. Soden, *al.*); rather believers are kept *by* and *in* Christ, as in 2 Thessalonians 3. 3, Apocalypse 3. 10. The easiest way of accounting for the error is to suppose that ἐν was accidentally omitted, and then corrected in the margin and inserted in the wrong place. Possibly the wrong insertion of ἐν may have suggested or facilitated the change from ἡγαπημένοις to ἡγιασμένοις. If this is so, it suggests that our MSS. are derived from an archetype which was a far from exact copy of the original autograph.

v. 5. ὑπομῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι εἰδόντας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. I quote Tregelles' notes with additions from Tischendorf in round brackets.

εἰδοτας "add. ὑμας 5 N. 31. KL, om. ABC² 13 Vulg. Syrr. Bdl. and Hcl. Memph. Theb. Arm.," and so Tisch.

In point of fact, however, B reads εἰδοτας υμας, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzi's photo-

graphic reproduction. The preponderance of authority is therefore in favour of this latter reading. The repeated *ὑμᾶς* emphasizes the contrast between the readers (“to remind *you*, you who know it already”) and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated *ὑμῖν* of *v.* 3.

ἀπαξ *Hic.* ABC. 13. 31. L. *vv.* Ante λαον **N.** (Syr. Bdl. Syr. Hcl. Sah. Cop.) Arm. Ante ὅτι K. Ante εκ γης Aιγ. Clem. 280 (and 997, Did. Cassiod.). Om. Lucif. 28.

παντα ABC**N.** 13 Vulg. Syr. Hcl. Memph. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the *App.* to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for παντας (cf. 1 John 2. 20) found in Syr. Bodl.]. τουτο] ε. 31. KL. Theb.

ὅτι] *add.* ὁ ε. C.² 31. KL. Arm. Clem. 280. Om. AB**N.** 13.
κυριος] **NCKL.** Syr. Hcl. Θεος C² Tol. Syr. Bdl. Arm. Clem. Lucif. Iησους AB. 13 Vulg. Memph. Theb. Aeth. [In *App.* to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, “apparently οτικ̄ (ὅτι Κύριος), and οτιῑ (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς) for οτιο (ὅτι ὁ).”]

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is *ὑπομῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδόμενος ὑμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος ἄπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν.* I see no difficulty in πάντα, which gives a reason for the use of the word *ὑπομῆσαι*, “I need only remind *you*, because *you* already know all that I have to say.” It was easy for the second *ὑμᾶς* to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word *ἄπαξ* might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after *εἰδόμενος*: the knowledge of the incidents, which are related in this and the following verses, is not a knowledge for good and all, such as the faith spoken of in *v.* 3. On the other hand, *ἄπαξ* is very appropriate if taken with *λαὸν σώσας* (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for *τὸ δεύτερον*, as in Theoph. *ad Aut.* ii. 26, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἄπαξ ἢ πεπληρωμένον ὅτε ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλῃ πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τὴν κρίσιν. On the other hand, *πάντας* seems to me inappropriate. Can it be

assumed that *all* who are addressed should be familiar with the legends contained in the Book of Enoch and the Ascension of Moses, to which allusion is made in what follows? It is surely much more to the point for the writer to say, as he does again below (v. 17), that he is only repeating what is *generally* known, though it need not be known to every individual. As to Hort's suggestion on the word *κύριος*, that the original was *ὄτι ὁ (λαὸν σῶσας)*, the difficulties in its way seem to be: (1) That such a periphrastic expression for God is unusual; (2) that the supposed corruptions are not very easily explained; (3) that a further difficulty is introduced if we suppose *θεὸς* or *κύριος* to have been accidentally omitted by the original scribe. Spitta considers that the abbreviations *ΙϞ*, *ΚϞ*, *ΘϞ* might easily be confused if the first letter was faintly written, and that the mention of *τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ι.Χ.* in the preceding verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer *ΙϞ*, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, *εἴρηται γὰρ πρὸ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἶη ἀληθινὸς θεὸς οὗτος ὁ μόνος δεσπότης ὁ κύριος Ι.Χ., ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωσέως*. Spitta himself, however, holds that *ΘϞ* is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter 2. 4, *ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφέλσατο*, and with Clement's paraphrase (*Adumbr. Dind. iii. p. 482*): "Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit." There is no instance in the New Testament of the personal name "Jesus" being used of the pre-existent Messiah, though the official name "Christ" is found in 1 Corinthians 10. 4, 9, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (*Dial. 120*), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis 49. 10, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, *τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα*,

and this use of the name was confirmed by the idea that the son of Nun was a personification of Christ (see Justin, *Dial.* 75; Clem. Al. 133; Didymus, *De Trin.* 1. 19, *Ἰουδᾶς καθολικῶς γράφει, ἅπαξ γὰρ κύριος Ἰησοῦς λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.*; Jerome, *C. Jov.* 1. 12; Lact. *Inst.* 4. 17, *Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari*).

v. 19. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

ἀποδιορίζοντες *add.* ἑαυτοὺς C. Vulg. *Om.* AB²NKL 13, etc.

This rare word is used of logical distinctions in Arist. *Pol.* iv. 48, *ὡσπερ οὖν εἰ ζῴου προηρούμεθα λαβεῖν εἶδη, πρῶτον ἂν ἀποδιορίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν ἔχειν ζῴον* ("as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common"), and I believe in every other passage in which it is known to occur. Schott, B. Weiss and Huther-Kühl would give it a similar sense in this passage, supposing the words *ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες* to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of *οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες*: "welche Unterscheidungen machen, *sc.* zwischen Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Unterscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten umkehrt." This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, *οἱ τὰ σχίσματα ποιοῦντες*; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (*παρεισεδήσαν*, v. 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (v. 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word *ἀποδιορίζω* could bear this sense. *ἀφορίζω* is used in Luke 6. 22 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be

applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικοί in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators, still we cannot use the same word over again to express Jude's "drastic" retort. This difficulty would be removed if we suppose the loss of a line to the following effect after ἀποδιορίζοντες:—

ψυχικοὺς ὑμᾶς (οἱ τοὺς πιστοὺς) λέγοντες, ὄντες αὐτοὶ
ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

We may compare Clement's paraphrase in the *Adumbrationes* (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483, more correctly given in Zahn, *Forsch.* iii. p. 85). *Isti sunt*¹ inquit *segregantes fideles a fidelibus secundum propriam infidelitatem redarguti*² et iterum [non]³ discernentes sancta⁴ a canibus.⁵ *Animales* inquit *spiritum non habentes*, spiritum scilicet, qui est per fidem secundum usum justitiæ.

[The authorities are two MSS. Cod. Laudun. 96, sec. ix. (L), Cod. Berol. Phill. 1665, sec. xiii. (M), and the Ed. Pr. of De la Bigne 1575 (P).]

Zahn endeavours to defend the reading *sancta a canibus* by quoting Clem. *Str.* ii. 7, τῶν δὲ ἀγίων μεταδιδόναι τοῖς κυσὶν ἀπαγορεύεται, which seems to me entirely alien to the general drift of the passage. Starting with the *carnibus* of the oldest MS., I think we should read *carnalibus*. If we retain *sancta*, I should be inclined to understand this in reference to the behaviour of the libertines at the love-feasts described in v. 12, which may be compared with 1 Corinthians 11. 29, ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως κρίμα ἐαυτοῦ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα. But perhaps we

¹ *Sunt* M, om. LP.

² *Redarguti* MP, *redargui* L.

³ *Non* inserted by Zahn (Mr. Barnard suggests *parum* for *iterum*).

⁴ *Sancta* L has the word between the lines.

⁵ *Canibus* MP, *carnibus* L ("wenn ich nicht die Variante übersehen habe").

should read *sanctos* and transpose the clauses as follows:—

Isti segregantes: fideles a fidelibus et iterum sanctos a carnalibus discernentes secundum propriam incredulitatem, redarguti, *animales spiritum non habentes*, the Greek being something of this sort: οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες. πιστοὺς τῶν πιστῶν, ἀγίους δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν ψυχικῶν διακρίνοντες κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπιστίαν, ἐλέγχονται ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

The opposition of *ψυχικοὶ* to *πνευματικοὶ* is familiar in the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist. The Church is carnal, the sect spiritual. So the Valentinians distinguished their own adherents as *pneumatici* from the *psychici* who composed the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James 3. 15), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. 15. 44), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. 2. 14), *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν . . . ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα*. The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (v. 4, *τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*), professing a knowledge of the *βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ* (1 Cor. 2. 12), though it was really a knowledge only of *τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ* (Apoc. 2. 24), and claiming to be the true *δυνατοὶ* and *πνευματικοὶ*, as denying dead works and setting the spirit above the letter. This explains the subsequent misrepresentation of St. Paul as a heresiarch in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.

v. 22, 23. (Text of Tischendorf and Tregelles) *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα*. (Text of WH and B. Weiss)

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα. In *App.* to WH it is added, "Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first ἐλεᾶτε an interpolation" (*Sel. Readings*, p. 107).

22. ελεγετε AC* 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm. Aeth. (Eph. Theophyl. Ec. *Comm.* Cassiod.). ελεατε BC² N Syr. Hcl. ελεειτε KLP (Theophyl. Ec. *txt.*), εκ πυρος αρπαζετε (hic) Syr. Bdl. Clem. 773.

διακεινομενους ABCN. 13. Vulg. Syrr. Bdl. et Hcl. Arm. Clem. 773.

διακρινομενοι KLP +

23. οὓς δε ANC. 13. KLP. Vulg. Syr. Hcl. Memph. Arm. Om. B., δε Syr. Bdl. Clem.

σωζετε ABCN. 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm. Aeth., εν φοβῳ σωζετε KLP +, ελεειτε Clem. 773 (quoted below). ελεατε αυτους εν φοβῳ Syr. Bdl.

εκ πυρος ABCCLKPN. 13. Arm. Om. σωζετε εκ πυρος αρπαζοντες Arm. ἀρπαζοντες οὓς δε ελεατε εν φοβῳ ABN. 13. Vulg. Memph. Arm., ἀρπαζοντες εν φοβῳ C. Syr. Hcl. ἀρπαζοντες KLP +

Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. *Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore.* Ar^e. *Et quosdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos.* Ar^p. *Et signate quosdam cum dubitaverint orbos (?) et salvate quosdam territione, abripite eos ex igne.* Aeth. *quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est (Aeth^{p.p.} propter peccatum eorum), et est qui et servabitur ex igne et rapiet eum, et est qui servabitur timore et poenitentia.* Arm. *Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et quosdam salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore judicando (? indicando).* Cassiodor.¹⁴² *Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis misereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execratione refugiant.* Commentaries of Theophylact and Eucumenius, *κἀκείνους δὲ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδύστανται ὑμῶν—τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι—ἐλέγχετε, τουτέστι φανεροῦτε τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν*

ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν· εἴτε δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορώσι, μὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλέῳ προσλαμβάνεσθε, σῶζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρὸς· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου.

In all these it will be observed that three classes are distinguished, as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A. οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, and N, οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δε ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in *Can. Apost.* vi. 4 (οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ) οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ (οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου), which occurs also, with the omission of the clause οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις in the *Didache* ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syr. Bdl. *Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, miseremini super eis in timore*, representing καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε αὐτοὺς ἐν φοβῳ. Syr. Hcl. *et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes, hos autem servate de igne rapientes in timore*, representing καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. *Adumbr. quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremini in timore*,¹ representing οὓς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 773, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε, implying that he was acquainted with two different recensions. With these we may compare the texts of B, followed by WH and B. Weiss, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σῶζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε

¹ The paraphrase continues, *id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doceatis ut semet ipsos liberent.* (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be inserted after *rapientes.*) *Odientes, inquit, eam, quae carnalis est, maculatam tunicam; anitmae videlicet tunica macula (read maculata) est spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalibus.*

διακρινόμενοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες.

St. Jude's predilection for triplets, as seen in *vv.* 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in *vv.* 5-7, and of sin in *v.* 11, is *primâ facie* favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and N to represent the original, consisting of three members, *a b c*, we find B complete in *a* and *c*, but confused as to *b*. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὓς μὲν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεᾶτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὓς δὲ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεᾶτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, "Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear." It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἐλεᾶτε was written in error for ἐλέγγετε, and οὓς omitted in error after διακρινόμενους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of Syr. Bdl. and Clem. *Str.* 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in *a* and *b*, but insert a phrase from *c* in *b*. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplication of ἐλεᾶτε in *a* and *c* (as in Cod. N) caused the omission of the second ἐλεᾶτε, and therefore of the second οὓς δὲ. The reading διακρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἀρπάζοντες, and seemed, to those who were not aware of the difference in the meaning of the active and middle of διακρίνω, to supply a very appropriate thought, viz. that discrimination must be used; treatment should differ in different cases.

The real difficulty, however, of the triple division is to arrive at a clear demarcation between the classes alluded to. "The triple division," says Hort (*App.* p. 107), "gives no satisfactory sense"; and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühn that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: "Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm

steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur *ἐλέγχειν* zu üben ist; aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind"; while the majority take Reiche's view of a climax: "a dubitantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur." My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of *ἐλεος*, any more than the Pharisees condemned by our Lord, as long as they persisted in their hostility to the truth. The admonition here given by St. Jude seems to be the same as that contained in the last verse of the Epistle written by his brother long before: *ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτὸν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου*. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, *διακρινόμενοι*, men still halting between two opinions (cf. James 1. 6), or we might understand the word of disputatiousness, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (cf. John 16. 9, *ἐλέγξει περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ*). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul's judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. 5. 5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

J. B. MAYOR.