words *might* mean, “perverting the grace  
of our God in the direction of, for the purposes   
of lasciviousness:” but the meaning  
of the verb used is simply to change, not  
to pervert: and we therefore must understand,   
as above, that they made the state  
of grace and Christian liberty into a state  
of [moral] licence and wantonness), **and  
denying** (see 2 Pet. ii, 1) **the only Master,  
and our Lord Jesus Christ** (in 2 Pet. ii. 1  
**Master** is used of Christ: which circumstance   
might tempt us to refer it to Christ  
here also. But probability seems to weigh  
on the other side. In every other place  
[Luke ii, 29, Acts iv. 24, Rev. vi. 10, Jer.  
iv. 10 in the Septuagint translation] **Master**   
is used of God: 2) the addition “*only*”  
seems to bind this meaning to it here:  
3) the denial of God by disobeying His  
law is the explanatory resumption of the  
last clause: 4) Master and Lord are  
hardly distinguishable, if both applied to  
Christ).

**5–7.**] *Examples of Divine vengeance.*

**5.**] *First example:* unbelieving  
Israel in the wilderness. See Heb. iii. 16  
–iv. 5. **But** (solemn contrast to the conduct  
just mentioned) **I wish to remind  
you, knowing as ye do** (better here than  
“although ye know,” on account of the  
term “*once for all*” which follows. The  
A. V. is altogether wrong) **once for all**  
(i.e. having once for all received the  
Knowledge of) **all things** (all that refers  
to that of which I am speaking: the clause  
carries with it a latent admonition, to  
apply other examples for yourselves), **that  
Jesus** (critical principles seem to require  
this remarkable reading. It is not entirely  
precedented by 1 Cor. x. 4: for there St.  
Paul uses not the personal human name,  
but “*Christ,*” in which there is no such  
difficulty. The only account to be given  
seems, that, the Person designated by the  
two names being the same, they became  
sometimes convertibly used in popular exhortation),   
**having saved the people** (on  
the fact, see Exod. xiv. 19, xxxiii. 20.23,  
xxxii. 2, Isa. lxiii. 9, in which last place  
however the Septuagint version has “*Out  
of all their affliction not an ambassador,  
nor yet an angel, but he himself named  
them”*) **out of the land of Egypt, secondly**  
(not as A.V., “*afterward,*” but it indicates   
a second deed of the Lord, His first-mentioned   
having been the deliverance out  
of Egypt) **destroyed them that believed  
not** (viz. by forbidding their entrance into  
the land of promise [see Heb. iii. 18], and  
slaying them in the wilderness. This example   
is not mentioned in 2 Pet. ii., but  
instead of it, the judgment of the flood).

**6.**] *Second example:* the rebel angels.  
See 2 Pet. ii. 4. **And** (the connexion with  
the foregoing is very close) **angels, those  
which kept not** (**angels** is probably indefinite,  
and then what follows designates  
those angels who are meant) **their own  
dignity** (some interpret as A. V., “*first  
estate,*” “original condition;” some again,  
“*the government which was over them,*”  
viz. that of God. But seeing that angels  
are often in the New Test. called “*governments,*”   
or “*powers,*” as they also were  
among the Jews, and that such meaning  
answers best to the parallel clause which  
follows, there can be little doubt that the  
rendering *government*, or *principality*, or  
*dignity*, is right. The fact alluded to is  
probably that which is obscurely indicated  
in Gen. vi. 2. See Introduction), **but left  
their own** [**proper**] **habitation** (viz. heaven),