

external authorities that Laodicea was pre-eminent in these latter respects. But the Letter to the Church in Laodicea shows that our author is familiar with some of the Christian literature circulating within it—such as St. Paul's Ep. to the Colossians (see note on p. 94 sq.), which, according to St. Paul's directions, was to be read in the Church of Laodicea.

My hypothesis, therefore, that the Seven Letters, which originally dealt with the spiritual conditions of these Churches, and knew nothing whatever of the impending world conflict between Christianity and the Imperial Cultus, were actually sent to their respective Churches, has much to recommend it.

## II. 1-7. THE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCH IN EPHESUS

1. τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας. The city of Ephesus lay on the left bank of the Cayster. In many inscriptions it is designated, ἡ πρώτη καὶ μεγίστη μητρόπολις τῆς Ἀσίας. It was, according to Strabo, the greatest emporium in Asia (xiv. 24, ἐμπόριον οὐσα μέγιστον τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου). Ephesus was the centre of Roman administration in Asia. As the Province of Asia was senatorial the governor was called pro-consul (Acts xix. 38, ἀνθύπατοι), and it was at Ephesus that he was bound to land and to enter on his office. As a free city it had a board of magistrates (στρατηγοί), a senate (βουλὴ), and a popular Assembly (ἐκκλησία).<sup>1</sup> Under the Empire the power of the popular Assembly, which in earlier days had really held the reins of power, had declined until its chief function was to approve of the Bills submitted by the Senate. It had its regular times of meeting, but no extraordinary meeting could be summoned except by the Roman officials. The business of the Assembly was apparently managed by the Town Clerk (γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως or τ. δήμου). The Senate, which in pre-Roman days had been elected annually by the citizens, came gradually, under the Roman sway, to be composed of a body of distinguished citizens chosen for life, which tended more and more to become a mere tool of the Imperial Government. Ephesus was the Western terminus of the great system of Roman roads—the great trade route from the Euphrates by way of Colossae and Laodicea, a second from Galatia *via* Sardis, while a third came up from the south from the Maeander valley. From its devotion to Artemis,

<sup>1</sup> Swete (p. lix) states that there were three assemblies: a council (βουλὴ) elected from the six tribes into which the population was divided; a senate (γερονσία) charged with the finance of the city and probably of public worship as well as with the care of the public monuments; a popular assembly (ἐκκλησία). Each had its γραμματεὺς.

Ephesus appropriated to itself the title Temple Warden (*νεωκόρος*, Acts xix. 35). But this word took on an additional meaning, and came most commonly to be applied to a city as a warden of a temple of the imperial cultus. The Ephesian Neocorate is first mentioned on coins of Nero. The first temple was probably erected to Claudius or Nero,<sup>1</sup> the second to Hadrian, and the third to Severus. A 2nd century inscription (Wood, *App. Inscr.* vi. 6, p. 50) speaks of Ephesus as being warden of two imperial temples as well as of that of Artemis (*δὲς νεωκόρος τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ νεωκόρος τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος*). Ephesus was also a hot-bed of every kind of cult and superstition. Its works on magic (*Ἐφέσια γράμματα*) were notorious throughout the world. Now it was at this city that Paul founded a Christian Church (50-55), whence proceeded a movement that led to the evangelization of the province (Acts xix. 10). Though of very secondary importance for a couple of decades, it must after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. have quickly risen into a position of supreme importance and become the chief centre of the Christian Faith in the East. Hence it is rightly named first in i. 11, ii. 1. It was the home of St. John in the latter part of the century; and tradition states that not only were Timothy and John, but also the Virgin Mary, buried at Ephesus. Judaizing and Gnostic teachers early showed themselves active, as we may infer from 1 Tim. i. 7 (*θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*), iv. 1-3, etc., and Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* vii. 1, *εἰώθασιν γὰρ τινες δόλω πονηρῶ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν, ἄλλα τινὰ πράσσοντες ἀνάξια θεοῦ οὓς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ὡς θηρία ἐκκλίνειν· εἰσὶν γὰρ κύνες λυσσῶντες, λαθροδῆκται, οὓς δεῖ ὑμᾶς φυλάσσεισθαι ὄντας δυσθεραπεύτους*. The presence of such elements testified to the danger of schism. See the articles on Ephesus in Hastings' *D.B.*, and the *Encyc. Bib.* with the literature there quoted.

*τάδε λέγει*. This clause occurs eight times in the N.T., seven of these being in ii. and iii. of our Book. *ὅδε* occurs only twice elsewhere in the N.T. This sparing use has been observed also in the *Κοινή*.

*ὁ κρατῶν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξίᾳ αὐτοῦ*. This clause has no organic connection with the letter to the Church in Ephesus, and, moreover, it is repeated in iii. 1 in a slightly different form. The use of *κρατῶν*, which here means to hold fast, while in i. 16, iii. 1 we have *ἔχων*, is strange. In the case of the Son of Man *ἔχων* expresses all that is needed. His character is a guarantee that the *ἔχων* contains the *κρατῶν*. If it were a man that was in question here, the use of *κρατεῖν* (cf.

<sup>1</sup> The temple dedicated to Augustus some time before 5 B.C. did not entitle the city to the Neocorate; for it was not an independent foundation, being built within the precincts of the temple of Artemis; and it was a dedication by the municipality merely, and not by the Synod of Asia (*κοινὸν Ἀσίας*).

ii. 13, vii. 1, "to lay hold of," xx. 2, and ii. 14, 15, 25, iii. 11 where both words occur) would be intelligible.

ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τ. ἑπτὰ λυχνιῶν τ. χρυσῶν. Christ's vigilance is not localized but coextensive with the entire Church. The idea of the λυχνιῶν returns in ii. 5, which may have occasioned the choice of the above title. That the former of these two divine titles was added by our author when editing his visions as a whole, see p. 25 sq., 45 sq.

2-3. These two verses appear to consist of three couplets.

2. οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου, καὶ τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν σου  
καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύνη βαστάσαι κακοὺς,  
καὶ ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν,  
καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς.
3. καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις καὶ ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου  
καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες.

Here the theme is τὰ ἔργα σου. These consist of τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν σου. These two subordinate themes are then rehandled, the κόπον in 2<sup>bcd</sup> and the ὑπομονὴν in 3<sup>ab</sup>. There are two paronomasias which cannot be accidental: τὸν κόπον and οὐ κεκοπίακες, and οὐ δύνη βαστάσαι and ἐβάστασας.

2. The phrase οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου recurs, but with the pronoun preceding the noun, in ii. 19, iii. 1, 8, 15. Abbott (*Johannine Gram.*, pp. 414, 422, 601-607) calls the latter the vernacular or unemphatic possessive. In ii. 19 we have a combination of both. See note. οἶδα. Christ knows everything (John xxi. 17) —alike the good (2-3, 6) and the bad (4-5) qualities.

τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν σου. The single pronoun links together the two preceding nouns. These two are the works of the Church in Ephesus—its severe efforts in resisting and overcoming false teachers (2<sup>bcd</sup>), and its steadfast endurance on behalf of the name of Christ (3<sup>ab</sup>). We might compare 1 Thess. i. 3, μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος, but here κόπος and ὑπομονή are coordinated with and not subordinated to ἔργον. κόπος with its cognate κοπιᾶν is closely associated with Christian work in the N.T. alike in our text (cf. also xiv. 13) and in the Pauline Epistles. ὑπομονή, as Trench (*Synon.* 191) points out, is used to express patience in respect of things, but μακροθυμία in respect of persons. But the patience is of a high ethical character "In this noble word ὑπομονή there always appears (in the N.T.) a background of ἀνδρεία (cf. Plato, *Theaet.* 177b, where ἀνδρικῶς ὑπομείναι is opposed to ἀνάνδρως φεύγειν): it does not mark merely the endurance . . . but . . . the brave patience with which the Christian contends against the various hindrances, persecutions, and temptations that befall him in his conflict with the inward

and outward world" (Ellicott on 1 Thess. i. 3, quoted by Trench, *op. cit.*, p. 190).

οὐ δύνῃ βαστάσαι. δύνῃ for δύνασαι occurs also in Mark ix. 22, 23; Luke xvi. 2. Though not found in Attic prose it is found in Attic poetry. The intolerance here commended is of evil-doers who claimed to be apostles. Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* ii. 18) well defines ὑπομονή as the knowledge of what things are to be borne and what are not (ἐπιστήμη ἐμμενετέων καὶ οὐκ ἐμμενετέων). The need of testing the claims of itinerant teachers who claimed to be prophets and apostles was early felt: cf. 1 Thess. v. 20 sq.; 1 John iv. 1. They were not to be acknowledged unless they brought with them "commendatory letters" (2 Cor. iii. 1).

That the Church in Ephesus shunned such false teachers we learn from Ignatius, *Eph.* ix. 1, ἐγνων δὲ παροδεύσαντάς τινὰς ἐκεῖθεν, ἔχοντας κακὴν διδαχὴν· οὐδ' οὐκ εἰάσατε σπεῖραι εἰς ὑμᾶς, βύσαντες τὰ ὄρα εἰς τὸ μὴ παραδέξασθαι τὰ σπειρόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν. In the Didache xi. 8, 10, the ultimate test of such teachers was conformity of their lives with that of Christ. In Hermas, *Mand.* xi. 11-15, the two types of teachers are contrasted, and in xi. 16 the excellent advice is given: δοκίμαζε οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῶν ἔργων τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν πνευματοφόρον εἶναι.

καὶ ἐπίρασας. The verb points to some definite occasion. πειράζειν may be compared with δοκιμάζειν in 1 John iv. 1.

τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν. The οὐκ εἰσίν is here a Hebraism for οὐκ ὄντας. (See note on i. 5<sup>b</sup>-6, p. 14 sq.)

ἀποστόλους. These persons have been identified: (1) with the Judaizers sent from Jerusalem (so Spitta): cf. 2 Cor. xi. 13 sq.; (2) with the disciples of St. Paul or even St. Paul himself (Volkmar, Völter, Holtzmann<sup>3</sup> (with reservations)); (3) with the Nicolaitans in 6 (Bousset). According to this view, 6 resumes 2. This explanation appears to be the best of the three. It also rightly differentiates the ἔργα in 2 (*i.e.* the vigorous action against the false teacher and the endurance under affliction) from the πρῶτα ἔργα in 5, which are identical with the ἀγάπην . . . τὴν πρῶτην, or brotherly love, in 4. The Church in Ephesus still hates, 6, the evil members, the false apostles which it had tried and rejected.

3. This verse returns to the positive element in the praise given in 2: it explains τὴν ὑπομονήν σου, and refers to τὸν κόπον in οὐ κεκοπίακες, "thou hast not grown weary." Here we have ἔχεις καὶ ἐβάστασας just as in the preceding verse, δύνῃ . . . καὶ ἐπίρασας. In both cases an ethical characteristic is brought forward which had manifested itself in some act of the immediate past.

4. But, though the Church in Ephesus has preserved its moral and doctrinal purity and maintained an unwavering loyalty

in trial, it has lost the warm love which it had at the beginning. The love here referred to is brotherly love: cf. 19; Matt. xxiv. 12 (διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγῆσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν), and 2 John 5-6. Some scholars see in our text a reminiscence of Jer. ii. 2, "the love of thine espousals," and interpret it of the love to God and Christ. The controversies which had raged in Ephesus had apparently led to censoriousness, factiousness, and divisions (cf. Acts xx. 29-30), and the Church had lost the enthusiastic love it had shown in the days of Paul (cf. Acts xx. 37).

ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ. Cf. 14, 20. Is this an echo of Matt. v. 23, Mark xi. 25?

ἀφῆκας. A common usage of this verb in John: cf. iv. 3, 28, 52, x. 12, etc.

5. The Church in Ephesus is bidden to recognize the spiritual declension that has taken place, to repent and do the works which characterized its first love. As Swete remarks, "μνημόνευε, μετανόησον, ποίησον answer to three stages in the history of conversion."

μνημόνευε οὖν. Cf. iii. 3.

εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί σοι, καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς [ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης]. Since the εἰ δὲ μή here declares that if the Church does not fulfil the triple command given in μνημόνευε . . . καὶ μετανόησον . . . καὶ . . . ποίησον, judgment will ensue, it is manifest that the clause ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης is really a weaker repetition of εἰ δὲ μή. This is not in keeping with our author's style. After εἰ δὲ μή we must understand μνημονεύεις . . . καὶ μετανοήσεις καὶ ποιήσεις. Accordingly εἰ δὲ μή or ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης must be excised as an intrusion; and clearly it is the latter, as a comparison of ii. 5 and ii. 16 shows. The necessity for this excision becomes obvious if we compare 16 and 22 in this chapter, where we have *separately* the two constructions occurring in this verse. In the first case we have a good parallel to our text here; for the same sequence of ideas, *though less full*, recurs μετανόησον οὖν· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ, καὶ πολεμήσω. Here there is no otiose repetition of the idea conveyed in εἰ δὲ μή. After εἰ δὲ μή here we have only to supply μετανοήσεις. In ii. 22 we have the second possible construction, ἰδοὺ βάλλω αὐτὴν εἰς κλίνην . . . ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσουσιν.

When the interpolated gloss is removed we find that 5 consists of two couplets, the second of which is

εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί σοι,

καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς.

ἔρχομαί σοι. Cf. ii. 16. The dative here may be the *dativus incommodi*, or an incorrect rendering of ἤ, as in Matt. xxi. 5 (so Blass, *Gram.* 113). ἔρχομαί σοι refers here as in ii. 16 to a special

visitation or coming, though reference to the final judgment is not excluded. ἔρχεσθαι is practically used as equivalent to ἐλεύσεσθα throughout the Apocalypse.

κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου, *i.e.* thy Church. That the Ephesian Church paid heed to this warning for the time being we learn from the Prologue to Ignatius' Epistle to Ephesus, where he calls it ἀξιομακάριστος: and in i. 1, where he declares, μιμηταὶ ὄντες θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ, τὸ συγγενικὸν ἔργον . . . ἀπηρτίσατε. Again in xi. 2 he expresses the wish that he "may be found in the company of those Christians of Ephesus who, moreover, were ever of one mind with the apostles in the power of Christ." That the threat in our text implies not degradation nor removal of the Church to another place, but destruction, seems obvious. Yet Ramsay (*Letters*, 243 sqq.) is of opinion that the threat is so expressed as to mean only a change in local position, and supports this interpretation by the statement that "Ephesus has always remained the titular head of the Asian Church, and the Bishop of Ephesus still bears that dignity, though he no longer resides at Ephesus but at Magnesia *ad Sipylum*." Nothing now remains on the site of Ephesus (*i.e.* Ayasaluk = ἄγιος θεολόγος) save a railway station and a few huts.

6. The Seer modifies the severe criticism in 4-5 by bringing forward the redeeming characteristic in the Ephesian Church, that they hated the deeds which Christ also hated.

τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν. These Nicolaitans have been identified from the time of Irenaeus (i. 26. 3, iii. 11. 1) and Hippolytus (*Philos.* vii. 36), who was dependent on Irenaeus, with the followers of Nicolaus the proselyte of Antioch (Acts vi. 5). Tertullian speaks apparently of a second sect (*Praesc. Haer.* 33, *Adv. Marc.* i. 29, *De Pudicitia*, 19), but Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxv.) deals with the Nicolaitans mentioned in our text. In Clem. Alex. (ii. 20. 118, iii. 4. 25), the *Constit. Apost.* (vi. 8, οἱ νῦν ψευδώνυμοι Νικολαῖται), and Victorinus an attempt was not unnaturally made to show that the derivation of this immoral sect from one of the seven Deacons was an error. According to Clement, Nicolaus taught ὅτι παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ, and according to Hippolytus (*Philos.* viii. 36), Νικόλαος . . . ἐδίδασκεν ἀδιαφορίαν βίου τε καὶ βρώσεως. A comparison of the text here with ii. 15-16 leads to an identification of the Nicolaitans and the Balaamites not only on the ground of our text, but also from the fact that they are roughly etymological equivalents, though Heumann (*Act. Erudit.*, 1712, p. 179) urged this as a ground for regarding the names as allegorical and not historical. That is, Balaam = בלע עַם = "he hath consumed the people" (a derivation found in Sanh. 105<sup>a</sup>, where בלע עַם is an alternative reading), while Νικόλαος = νικᾶ λαόν. Such a play on the etymo-

logy of words is thoroughly Semitic. There is, it is true, no exact equivalent to *νικᾶν* in Hebrew. Hence the above can stand. Furthermore a comparison of ii. 14 and ii. 20, which shows that the Balaamites and the followers of Jezebel were guilty of exactly the same vices, makes it highly probable that the latter were a branch of the Nicolaitans.

The works of the Nicolaitans, then, are those given in ii. 14, 20. They transgress the chief commands issued by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29).

7. ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω κτλ. Cf. Matt. xi. 15, xiii. 9, 43; Mark iv. 9, 23, etc. This formula introduces the promise to him that overcomes in the first three messages and closes it on the last four. Here the speaker turns from the individual Church to the whole Christian community. Since the Book as a whole was written to be read in public worship, such a larger reference was conceivable in and for itself.

This clause, which occurs seven times,—once in each Letter,—seems to have been added by the Seer when he incorporated the Seven Letters in an edition of his visions. The seven eschatological promises, ii. 7<sup>b</sup>, 11<sup>b</sup>, 17<sup>b</sup>, 26-27, iii. 5, 12, 21, appear to have been added at the same time. Such a phrase as *πάσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι* in ii. 23 is no evidence to the contrary.

τὸ πνεῦμα. Cf. the closing words of all the Letters; also xiv. 13, xix. 10, xxii. 17. The Spirit here is the Holy Spirit which inspires the prophets, but also the Spirit of Christ, since in ii. 1 Christ is the Speaker. The Spirit here has nothing to do with the seven spirits in iii. 1 [i. 4], iv. 5.

τῷ νικῶντι . . . τοῦ θεοῦ Added probably by our author when he edited the visions as a whole (see p. 45).

τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ. We have here a well-known Hebraism. Cf. LXX of Josh. ix. 12, οὗτοι οἱ ἄρτοι . . . ἐφωδιάσθημεν αὐτούς. It is found sporadically in the Κοινή, but the Κοινή usage is wholly inadequate to explain the frequency and variety of the Hebraisms in our author. For the occurrence of this idiom elsewhere in the N.T., see John vi. 39, vii. 38, x. 35 sq., xv. 2-5, xvii. 2; 1 John ii. 24, 27: cf. Abbott, *Gram.* 32 sq., 309. In ii. 26, ὁ νικῶν . . . δώσω αὐτῷ is more Hebraistic than the expression in ii. 7. *νικᾶν* is a word characteristic of our author, and is used of the faithful Christian warrior in ii. 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21<sup>a</sup>, xii. 11, xv. 2, xxi. 8; of Christ Himself in iii. 21<sup>b</sup>, v. 5, xvii. 14. In the remaining passages it is without this moral significance, vi. 2, xi. 7, xiii. 7. It is found once in the Fourth Gospel and six times in 1 John. Elsewhere in the N.T. only four times. Cf. 1 Enoch l. 2. The word *νικᾶν* implies that the Christian life is a warfare from which there is no discharge, but it is a warfare, our author teaches, in which even the feeblest saint can

prove victorious. But the word *νικᾶν* is not used in our author of every Christian, but only of the martyr who, though apparently overcome in that he had to lay down his life, yet was in very truth the one who overcame, "as I also have overcome," saith Christ, iii. 21 (cf. John xvi. 33). The participle *τῷ νικῶντι* is here, as elsewhere in our author, influenced by the use of the Hebrew participle, which can have a perfect sense or imperfect as the context requires (see p. 202 n.). In our author *ὁ νικῶν* = *ὁ νενικηκώς*. This warfare which faithfulness entails may be illustrated from 4 Ezra vii. 127 sq., "And he answered me and said: This is the condition of the contest which every man who is born upon earth must wage, that if he be overcome he shall suffer as thou hast said; but, if he be victorious, he shall receive what I have said."

*δώσω . . . φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς. δώσω . . . φαγεῖν* is a frequent construction in our author, occurring in all eleven times. In the Fourth Gospel it is found four times, and in the rest of the N.T. twenty times. Personal victory over evil is the condition without which none can eat of the tree of life. With our text we may compare xxii. 14. Test. Levi xviii. 11, *καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς: 1 Enoch xxiv. 4, καὶ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς δένδρον ὃ οὐδέποτε ὥσφρανμαι καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος αὐτῶν εὐφράνθη, καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ. ὅσμην εἶχεν εὐωδ-στέραν πάντων ἀρωμάτων, καὶ τὰ φύλλα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄνθος καὶ τὸ δένδρον οὐ φθίνει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα: xxv. 4, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ δένδρον εὐωδίας, καὶ οὐδεμία σὰρξ ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἄσασθαι αὐτοῦ μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης κρίσεως . . . τότε δικαίοις καὶ ὁσίοις δοθήσεται: 5, ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς εἰς ζωὴν εἰς βοράν, καὶ μεταφντευθήσεται ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ παρὰ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ.* Thus as early as the 2nd cent. B.C. it was held that the tree of life would be transferred to the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem—not apparently the Heavenly Jerusalem, but the earthly Jerusalem cleansed from all iniquity. That the earthly Jerusalem should give place to the Heavenly in this connection was inevitable. But the combination of the two ideas is of supreme importance as it prepares the way for the conception of our Seer, who places the tree of life in the street of the Heavenly Jerusalem (xxii. 2). That this *Heavenly* Jerusalem, to which belongs the tree of life (ii. 7, xxii. 2), is to be the seat of the Millennial Kingdom on the present earth before the Final Judgment, and is not to be confounded with the *New* Jerusalem, which is to descend from the new heaven to the new earth after the Final Judgment and become the everlasting abode of the blessed, I have shown at some length in the Introd. to xx. 4-xxii.

*τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς.* Cf. xxii. 2, 14. The tree of life is the symbol for immortality in our author. None can eat of it save

those who have proved victorious in the strife with sin and evil. The *ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς* is to be carefully distinguished from the *ὔδωρ τῆς ζωῆς*. The latter is a free gift (xxii. 17, xxi. 6), given without money and without price to every one that thirsteth for it. It symbolizes the divine graces of forgiveness and truth and light, etc. (cf. vii. 17). If a man is faithful to the obligations entailed by these graces he becomes a victor (*νικῶν*) in the battle of life, and thus wins the right to eat of the tree of life, that is, he enters finally on immortality. In the Fourth Gospel (iv. 10, 13, 14), on the other hand, only the one symbol is used—"the water of life," and this is given a significance that embraces the two symbols used by our author.

*τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*. In our author Paradise has become equivalent to the Heavenly Jerusalem, which is to descend from heaven before the Final Judgment to become the seat of the Millennial Kingdom. In Luke xxiii. 43 it is the abode of the blessed departed, and in 2 Cor. xii. 4 it is identified with the third heaven or with part of it. On some of the other meanings assigned to it and the localities identified with it, see my *Eschatology*<sup>2</sup>, 244, 291 sq., 316-318, 357, 473 sq.

### 8-11. THE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCH IN SMYRNA.

8. *ἐν Σμύρνῃ*. The ancient city of Smyrna was destroyed early in the 6th cent. B.C. and refounded on a new site under the Diadochoi by Lysimachus (301-281 B.C.). It has continued from that date to the present one of the most prosperous cities of Asia Minor. Smyrna proved itself a faithful ally of Rome from the period that Rome began to intervene in Eastern affairs and before it had established its claim to world supremacy. It openly supported Rome against Mithridates, Carthage, and the Seleucid kings. As early as 195 B.C. (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 56) it dedicated a temple to the goddess of Rome. Lying at the end of one of the great roads leading across Lydia from Phrygia and the east, and forming the maritime outlet for the whole trade of the Hermus valley, it became wealthy and prosperous. It was an assize town, and one of the cities bearing the name *μητρόπολις*. With Ephesus and Pergamum it strove for the title *πρώτη Ἀσίας*—a strife which continued till it was settled by the Emperor Antoninus (Philostr. *Op.* 231. 24, ed. Kayser); and of all the Asiatic cities that in A.D. 26 contended for the right of erecting a temple to Tiberius, Livia and the Senate, it alone secured this privilege and could henceforth claim the Imperial Neocorate. A second Neocorate was accorded to it by Hadrian (see, however, Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 467) and a third by Severus. Of the