

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY  
ON THE  
EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

A

CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY  
FRANCIS S. SAMPSON, D. D.

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LITERATURE IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY, PRINCE EDWARD, VA.

EDITED FROM THE MANUSCRIPT NOTES OF THE AUTHOR,

BY  
ROBERT L. DABNEY, D.D.

NEW YORK:  
ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS,  
BROADWAY.

M.DCCC.LVI.

1856

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856,

By ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern  
District of New York.

JOHN F. TROW,  
PRINTER AND STEREOTYPER,  
Nos. 377 & 379 Broadway.

## EDITOR'S PREFACE.

MY colleague, Dr. Sampson, at his lamented death, left in manuscript a Commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the fruit of many years' careful study. It was prepared at first as notes for his lectures to his classes, in the routine of his duties as a professor. Having received the successive additions of his studies and reviews for twelve or fifteen years, and having been for the third time re-written with unusual care and accuracy by his own hand, it had reached such size and completeness that it was his purpose to prepare it for the press and commit it to the public the summer of the year in which he died. Many things concurred to make the friends of his reputation and of Zion unwilling that this, the only fruit of his eminent talents, industry, and learning, which was mature enough for the press, should die with him. It was known that he had expended his critical abilities and industry peculiarly on this Epistle. The second time he re-wrote his notes, thirty hours of research and study were expended on each of the short portions (of twelve to twenty verses), which he gave his

class for a lesson. But the copy which was left at his death was the still more perfect result of a third review. The uniform testimony of his pupils has been, that these notes, as explained by him orally, formed a more judicious and instructive commentary on 'the Hebrews' than any which were accessible to them; and they have concurred in urgently requesting their publication. While several able and learned commentaries on this Epistle exist in the Latin and German, and even in the English languages, it is the common remark that there is no one which meets the views and wants of Presbyterian scholars, in its orthodoxy, critical ability, learning, and good judgment. Moved by these reasons, I have yielded to the requests of Dr. Sampson's friends and of many others, and have undertaken to prepare for publication the materials which he left.

Justice to the reader, to Dr. Sampson's memory, and to myself, requires that I shall state with entire candour the condition of those materials, and the nature of my agency in their publication. The notes left by the author are in part a fully written commentary, and in part a full and accurate syllabus, together occupying two hundred and forty-five manuscript pages. The whole *Introduction*, all the *Analyses* of sections, and many of the more interesting and important discussions of the Commentary itself, such as that on chap. 6:4-6, were written out fully. All of these I have copied *verbatim*; so that the reader is certain of possessing, in those parts, the author's meaning in his own words. The remainder, which bears rather the character of a full *syllabus* than of a regular composition, I have expanded in my own words, but always with the ruling purpose of simply unfold-

ing the intent of the author as he designed it to be apprehended. Not only are the notes which indicate the train of thoughts faithfully followed, but the references given by Dr. Sampson along with those notes, are employed in the manner indicated by him. So that in those passages where the words are my own, the discussion is strictly the author's. In addition to this, I have endeavoured to conform all such passages in style, and in spirit and temper, to his. *Any thing which has seemed to me an omission, I have not presumed to supply*, any farther than to give so much of amplification to the meaning which I found distinctly indicated in the notes and references, as was necessary to make it intelligible to the reader. This is an assurance which the critical scholar will perhaps feel more conducive to his satisfaction in reading the work, than any other which I could give him. If any one should desire any other warrant that he is truly reading Dr. Sampson's work and not mine, I can only give it by saying, that I feel sure I have, in every case, apprehended and stated the author's meaning, not indeed *as well*, but *substantially such as* he would have unfolded it, had he lived to edit his own book. The grounds of this assurance are, first, the fulness, excellence, accuracy, and perspicuity of his notes, even in their briefest and minutest passages and citations, and the steady guidance derived from the *Analyses*, which, as I have said, are all wholly of his own composition; and next, my long and intimate acquaintance with the beloved author, and with his modes of thought and exegetical opinions; the opportunity which I enjoyed, as his pupil, of hearing *these notes* expounded by him orally with the greatest fulness, in a course of critical lectures on the Epistle,

and my habitude of using similar notes as the guides to my own lectures. With this assurance as to the substance of the discussions, the reader must judge for himself how far the value of the work has been diminished by the style I have used in those parts which were not sufficiently unfolded by the author.

But whatever may be the injury which this work has sustained from the premature death of its author, it gains this small advantage, that I am permitted to assert his eminent fitness for such a task, in terms which his modesty would forbid to himself and friends, if he were yet alive. His general education at the University of Virginia was extensive, long continued, and thorough; and was pursued with admirable diligence and method in study. It is the concurrent testimony of those who knew him at the University and elsewhere, that there was no better educated man in our commonwealth. The last sixteen years of his life were devoted with equal zeal and perseverance to the study of the various departments of Biblical literature; and during nearly the whole of this time he studied and expounded the Epistle to the Hebrews, along with other parts of the Old and New Testaments. His knowledge of both the Greek and Hebrew languages was accurate and profound, had been extended by study in Europe, and had set him in the front rank of instructors in these departments. The extensive research and laborious study which he expended for many years on the Epistle explained in the present work, have been already indicated. His Commentary has had a longer suppression, and more frequent revisals, than were enjoined by Horace on his brother poets, in his well-known rules. Not only his

learning and diligence, but the qualities of his mind, eminently qualified him to be a profound and reliable expositor of Scripture. "Dr. Sampson could not be called a genius. He was what is far better, a man of high talent. His mind presented nothing that was salient or astonishing. But this was not so much because there was not power, as because it was power symmetrically developed. His was just one of those excellent minds which grow most and longest by good cultivation. In wide and adventurous range, his speculative powers were not equal to those of some other men; but in power of correct analysis, in soundness of judgment and logical perspicuity, he was superior to all we have ever known except a very few. Indeed, when a speculative subject was fully spread out before his mind for consideration, his conclusions seemed to be guided by a penetration and justness of thought almost infallible. This consideration was deliberate, and his decision was very rarely expressed with haste, or even with promptitude. Hence, his writings and conversation never exhibited any of that paradox, or that bold novelty and dangerous originality, which are too often mistaken for greatness. His talents, if they had less to awaken empty astonishment, were more reliable and more useful. It was hard for any thing sophistical or unsatisfactory to escape detection under his steady gaze. He was particularly free from that common fault of many minds of large grasp; the adopting of *major* propositions so large that they will contain the conclusion which the reasoner desires to derive from them; but at the same time so shadowy, that they contain he knows not how much more. In his powers of arrangement he was superior to any man I have ever



known. In his mind, the elements of thought seemed to group themselves always, and spontaneously, into the most philosophical order possible, with a regularity like that of the atoms of limpid water, when they crystallize into transparent ice."

Several peculiarities in the following work demand a word of remark. The first of these which will strike the learned reader, is the brevity and simplicity of the *Introduction*. It has become fashionable with modern critical commentators to begin their labours by submitting the inspired author of whom they propose to treat, to a process of learned torture which fills, in some cases, a large part of their volumes. Dr. Sampson has, in his Introduction, gathered for his readers all the best fruits of wide research and mature deliberation, on those points which are necessary to be understood in order to approach intelligently the study of the Epistle, and has expressed them without parade of learning. His opinion was, that when an intelligent view of those points was gained, for the rest, the best introduction to the Epistle would be the study of the Epistle itself. The reliable data for the settlement of the questions usually discussed in these compositions are to be chiefly found in the inspired text itself; so that their discussion in advance often involves both an inconvenient anticipation and repetition.

It may be remarked concerning the whole work, that the design, both of the author and editor, has been to give the results, rather than the processes, of learned inquiry. The page will be found encumbered with comparatively few learned names. The opinions advocated or opposed are not usually accompanied by a long array of supporters from

among previous commentators. The conclusions reached are often stated with little argument, because it is supposed that they will be seen to be just in their own light, or that the obvious reasons for their support will suggest themselves to the thoughtful reader. The design has been to save words, and to study directness, simplicity, and a suggestive brevity.

The Analyses of the sections have been the result of careful, protracted, and intense consideration on the part of the author. Every thing pertaining to the order and connexion of the ideas in them, every word used to express them, is intentional, and has been maturely weighed. The reader who would correctly apprehend the author's meaning should study them intently; and to such a one they will prove by themselves a valuable commentary, when coupled with a careful consideration of the text.

It was a peculiarity of the author's teaching in the Scriptures, that he always attached great importance to those logical connectives, or conjunctions, which the Apostle Paul especially uses so frequently. Dr. Sampson endeavoured continually to induce his pupils to weigh and appreciate their meaning, as indicating the connexion and dependence of the thoughts in the mind of the inspired writer, instead of regarding them, with many, as but little more than aimless expletives, or interpreting them upon loose and fickle grammatical principles. In his view, the only honest and sensible theory for the expositor was to assume that the inspired writer meant something by all that he said; and that it is our business to endeavour to understand the whole of that meaning. If these connectives had not been intended to

convey a valuable meaning, they would not have been introduced. The reader will find, therefore, that they receive great attention throughout this Epistle. The successful study of their meaning has contributed not a little to the luminous view which the author has given of the Apostle's discussion. Dr. Sampson's criticism is throughout characterized by this, *that it is founded on an accurate and honest application of grammatical principles.* His effort is to arrive at the author's meaning by a faithful but enlightened observance of those principles; and when it is thus reached, to accept it submissively, and to seek to understand it just as the language of the sacred author gives it. It is this spirit which has made Winer his favourite among all the modern critics of the language of the New Testament, together with his high estimate of the learning and accuracy of that scholar's work on the New Testament Idioms. The rigid grammatical principles, the honest and Saxon good sense, and critical fidelity of this learned German, commended themselves exactly to his tastes and mental habitudes. The reader will consequently find that Winer is referred to more frequently than any other authority. The edition of his Idioms of the New Testament used in this work, is the English translation of Agnew and Ebbeke, published by Robert Carter and Brothers, New York. But the references are so given, as to be available for any edition.

I have judged it an improvement to introduce into the Commentary the Greek text of the Epistle, in the manner in which Calvin inserts his Latin translation. The edition followed is that of Vater, the one always used by Dr. Sampson, and made by him the basis of this Commentary. The addi-

tion thus made to the size, and consequently to the expense of the book, is trivial; and I am convinced that every reader will be pleased to gain, at so small a cost, the advantage of having the text under discussion in convenient proximity to the Commentary, and of dispensing with the labour of handling several books constantly in connexion with the reading of one. It may be here stated, that I have not attempted to give a new translation of the text into English, as is common in modern critical commentaries. Dr. Sampson has given no continuous version in his notes; and although I might have attempted to construct one in strict conformity to his exposition, it would not have been so truly his, as to possess any value in the reader's eyes, when he, as well as I, had that exposition in his hands.

I have also usually inserted the passages cited for illustration, so fully as to enable the reader to understand their bearing and use, without the fatigue of hunting them up. Such fatigue is often evaded by many readers, to the injury of their apprehension of the subject. The bulk of the volume is somewhat swelled by this means; but I am persuaded that the pleasure with which it will be read is more than proportionably increased.

I need scarcely remark, that as I have not taken the liberty to modify or to add to the views which Dr. Sampson has expressed in his notes, I am not willing, and am not justly liable, to be held responsible for all of his opinions, nor for his omissions. While I candidly prefer these notes to any other commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, for their accuracy, sound judgment, taste, orthodoxy, and profound insight into the mind of the sacred writer, my agency

about them should not be understood as indicating whether I do or do not assert their completeness and the accuracy of their views in every particular.

Had their lamented author published them himself, it is possible that, notwithstanding the maturity and completeness to which he had brought his work, he would have supplied much which is left wanting, and would have reconsidered some views. Doubtless he would have given to the work a perfection of detail, and, in many respects, a value, which it cannot receive from others. It is not asserted that the work is as good as if it had gone to the press from his hand. It is frankly confessed that, in the loss of his editorial supervision, there has been a subtraction from its value which is irreparable. But it is made as perfect as my utmost fidelity and most diligent care could make it, under the circumstances.

My labours in this undertaking have been attended with the consciousness that whatever of merit this work may be found to possess, will be attributed, as it should be, to its author; while whatever blemishes may be found in the mode of its execution, will be imputed to me. If this be so, I shall not complain.

No one could have a friend more worthy to receive such disinterested and self-sacrificing service from those who loved him, than the dear brother whose posthumous work I have given to the world. And no one can be more magnanimous than he would have been, to render similar labours joyfully in behalf of his friend. My laborious agency upon this work cannot win for me from the public any other reward than that of seeing my friend known and appreciated

by the Church more as he deserved to be, and, above all, of making a contribution, which would otherwise have been lost, to the means of understanding and loving the word of God, and the theory of redemption. If these objects are secured, it will be enough.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PRINCE }  
EDWARD, VA., *January*, 1856. }



# INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

ON THE

PROPER QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CRITICAL INTERPRETER OF THE  
SACRED SCRIPTURES.



THE great enemy of truth, of Christ, and of souls, has long been at work. His hate and his skill have only increased with his age and experience.

When Christianity was first set up, Satan held the world fast bound in paganism. It had been so for many long ages of darkness,—ages of ignorance, and superstition, and sin. To this huge system, the great facts and the simple and sublime doctrines of Revelation, too deep for the discoveries of natural reason, had to be opposed. With the Bible in hand and a sound reason at command, aided by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, it devolved upon the *Christian Philosopher* to sustain the conflict for the interests of souls, and of Christ's kingdom. Satan was unequal to the contest ; paganism fell, and Christianity triumphed.

The great enemy next entered the Christian camp. Unable to oppose paganism to Christianity, he determined to baptize it with Christian baptism. He endeavored to smother the Church with idolatry, and brought in formality like a flood. Under the guise of piety, he set up in the Church, in



the name of Jesus Christ, a vicar for himself, and found a human and formal substitute for every divine doctrine and for every Christian virtue. He took away from the people the word of God, and gave, in its place, the decrees of councils and of popes ; he destroyed the spirit and simplicity of Christian worship, and substituted the more imposing but lifeless ceremonies of man's invention in their stead. He seemed to have gained the victory. But the *reformers*, like good soldiers of Jesus Christ, with the word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit, burst his bands, gave him battle, and broke his power. True, spiritual Christianity, almost dead, revived and flourished.

Satan saw himself foiled, and again resolved to marshal his forces from without. Free from the shackles of blind devotion and ignorant superstition, it was easy to run men into the opposite extreme of infidelity. 'The wily skeptic and bold blasphemer thought to reason or shame religion from the earth. The God of retributive justice was mocked. His word a forgery ; His ministers deceivers ; and His people hypocrites. Revelation was a dream, and reason was God. *Christian logicians*, mighty men of God, and mighty in the Scriptures, joined issue, and the enemy was defeated. Infidelity ran mad, and Christianity prevailed.

But the arch enemy, though cast down, was not destroyed. His next stratagem was a master-stroke. In the dark ages, paganism had served his purpose well : in an age of light, he saw the need of something more subtle. Paganism had fallen when opposed to the Church, but had well nigh prevailed, when embraced in her bosom ; so infidelity, though defeated without, yet when intrenched within her pale, might prove her ruin. He baptized paganism then ; now he resolves to baptize infidelity. The great agents by whom he would vex and destroy the Church, are infidel theologians and commentators

on the Scriptures. In the former case he took away the Word of God : now he would mangle and pervert it. The worst enemies of the truth and of the church, are professed friends within her own pale ;—theological professors and preachers, at heart infidels, doing what they can to undermine the foundations of faith,—to unsettle the canon of Scripture and the interpretation thereof. The *critical interpreter* of the Scriptures, therefore, under the great Head of the Church, who has always given the victory, must sustain the brunt of the present conflict.

I have deemed it not unsuitable to discuss briefly here *the proper qualifications of the critical interpreters of the Sacred Scriptures*. In pursuance of this subject,—

I. The first qualification which I shall mention is, *that he have a thorough conviction that the Scriptures are indeed the Word of God* : in other words, that he be a firm believer in the plenary inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures.

By this I do not mean that it is to be maintained that every word of the text is now just what it was, as the text came from the hands of inspired prophets and apostles ; but that the text, as it came from them originally, contained the very matter, and in the very words which God designed to constitute the Revelation, and rule of our faith and duty. We may, indeed, admit different kinds or degrees of inspiration ; but, impossible as it is to determine, in any particular case, what degree of supernatural aid and control may have been needed to lead the writer to record just what he did, and in the very words that he did, and to guard him against all error, either of doctrine or of fact, we must hold firmly to the result that, in every case, such supernatural aid and control was vouchsafed, as was requisite to secure against error, and to make the Revelation, both as to matter and form, just what God designed it to be ; and that, since its

completion, no such corruption has crept into the text, as to invalidate its claim to be an authentic and, of course, authoritative revelation of God's will to man.

We know, indeed, that since the sacred Scriptures were written, through the unavoidable casualties of transmission by frequent transcription, manifold trifling variations and discrepancies are to be found in the documents which furnish us the text. But, making full allowance for these, no man acquainted with the subject will, at this day, dare affirm, that the text has by this means so far lost its original purity as to invalidate, in the slightest degree, the authority which originally pertained to its teachings. To question the original integrity of the text, would be to suppose that God would give to man a rule of faith and practice, originally imperfect and faulty ; that here there was a departure from what was true in regard to all else that came from his hands,—“ Behold it was very good ! ” It is, indeed, sometimes said, that since God has not seen fit, by a perpetual miracle, to preserve the original text free from all corruption, accidental or designed, we cannot assert, that in its original composition he preserved the writers of the sacred Scriptures absolutely free from all error. But, to say nothing of the claims of the sacred writers themselves, it violates our natural ideas of the perfections of God to say, that he would inspire men at all to write a revelation, and yet leave them liable to write down errors or untruths for our instruction. It is consistent with the perfections of God to form the fair fabric of the world, and create perfect moral creatures to occupy and enjoy it ; and yet, to allow these rational and moral creatures to sin, and incapacitate themselves for such occupation and enjoyment. But it would be utterly inconsistent with his perfections, to create a world originally marred with deformities and disorders, and still more to people it with rational and moral

creatures, corrupt and perverted in their rational and moral natures. If God create a moral being at all, he must, by the very necessity or law of his own holy, wise, and beneficent character, create him a holy and happy being, free from all taint or corruption, perfect in his kind. And so in regard to a revelation. He may devolve on man the responsibility of its preservation, or he may withhold one altogether. But if, in divine compassion, he condescend to give one to man for his instruction and guidance, he must give him one concurring, in all respects, with the perfections of its glorious Author, and adapted to meet the wants, and command the confidence, of him for whom it was intended.

These conditions are by no means fulfilled, if we hold merely to the *substance* of the Scriptures as inspired of God, while we admit that the words, either through lack of original inspiration, or through careless and irreverent transmission, are without authority. The substance of the Scriptures is contained in their words ; except by the latter we had not known the former ; and we receive the substance because we believe the words which contain it came from God. Destroy reverence for the authority of the text, and you soon destroy all due regard for the authority of the matter. Admit that the text was originally mixed with error ; that the writers were sometimes so far left to themselves that they recorded what was not true ; or that, since the Scriptures were written, corruption has come in to such an extent as to affect the doctrines and duties inculcated, or to invalidate the proper integrity of the text ; and we not only admit a derogation from the Scriptures, which is incapable of proof, and opposed by many valid arguments, but we at once allow a liberty which man has never yet known how to use. Where inspiration stands, and where inspiration fails ; in other words, where we have the teaching of God, and where the teaching

of man ; or, stronger still, where we have truth, and where we have falsehood, we can have no certain means of ascertaining. Every man must be allowed to separate for himself ; and the prevailing rule will be, to receive that as from God which is agreeable to human philosophy and caprice, and to reject all which conflicts with them. Nothing short of inspiration itself could make the proper separation.

It may not be said that, inasmuch as the text, as we now have it, is, by admission, in manifold, though generally exceedingly trivial instances, corrupt, *therefore* the very liberty which we fear to allow has to be continually exercised. There is a wide difference between the stand-point of the mind which holds, in any particular case of various readings, the surrounding text to be all firm, and, from amongst the various readings, endeavors to select that which, like it, proceeded from the pen of inspiration, and that of the mind which is altogether at sea as to the metes and bounds of surrounding inspiration, and which feels at liberty to question the inspiration of the whole. In the one case, we are endeavoring to restore to inspiration what the want of it has lost or taken away ; in the other, we question whether there be any inspiration, and, if there be, where it is. In the one case, we hold to the body, and seek to restore a lost or wounded member, however small ; in the other, we not only question which is the proper member, but we doubt if there be any body at all.

The belief of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, in the sense which I have defined, is necessary, to inspire the interpreter with a proper regard for the word of God as such ; to restrain him from handling it deceitfully, or with presumption and lightness ; to stimulate to due diligence and care, and dependence on God in eliciting the true meaning of its

words, and to induce a ready submission to its authoritative teachings.

On this important subject, the history of Biblical interpretation in modern Germany furnishes most instructive lessons. Here we have the disastrous effects of the rejection of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures exhibited on a scale which is appalling to the devout mind. We know, indeed, that the great apostacy in Germany began in the heart. The long barren discussions which succeeded the reformation terminated, in the eighteenth century, in the utter prostration of vital piety. But the first outward demonstrations were against the authority of the sacred Scriptures, against the canon and the text. The discussions of the previous century had disclosed the fact, that the Scripture text had been subjected to the same casualties of transmission as the text of other books. But when further investigation had demonstrated that the changes which had crept in from this source could never invalidate its claims as an authentic text, it only remained to question the authority of its teachings; and this could be done only by denying its plenary inspiration. This done, and philosophy had full sweep, and boldly asserted her assumed prerogatives. Miracles and prophecies were pronounced to be impossible things; and of course full liberty was felt to explain away the account of them in the Scriptures. The former were put on the same level as Grecian and Roman myths; the latter were mere shrewd conjectures of near events, or histories *post eventum*, or dim and uncertain visions of the remote future. The wildest and most forced interpretations were put upon words, in order to sustain foregone conclusions of philosophy and science, falsely so called; and when the plain grammatical interpretation forced out the true meaning, that meaning ceased to be binding, because not inspired of God, and not equal to the

present advanced state of human thought and human inquiry.

It need scarcely be added, that the ground occupied by such interpreters is essentially infidel. From them we are not to expect fair dealing with the text, or reverential expositions of its meaning. And yet it seems not to be understood by some, that there is no firm middle ground between the opinions of those who regard the very words of the Scriptures as originally sanctioned, where not dictated by the Spirit, and consequently free from all errors, and of those who regard the whole as of human origin, and consequently from the beginning more or less mixed with error. The Bible is of God, or of man ; all of God, or all of man ; consequently all authoritative as from God, or none demonstrably so. A mixed revelation (so to call it) would, as we have already intimated, require another purely divine one to enable us to determine what in the former was from God, and what from man.

II. The next essential qualification of the interpreter of the sacred Scriptures which I shall mention is, *that he be truly enlightened and regenerated by the Spirit which gave them.*

The necessity for this qualification lies in the deep-rooted depravity of the human heart, and its consequent natural insensibility and aversion to the spiritual truths of the sacred Scriptures. All history testifies to this enmity of the heart to the truth of God. Unsanctified minds seldom treat of the word of God, except to pervert or to ridicule it. "The natural man," say the Scriptures themselves, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

It is not to be expected, or believed, that a man, who is prejudiced at heart against any system of truths, shall be able fully to understand them, or fairly to expound them. Still

less can this be expected in the present case, where the truths are of such a character as to aim directly at the correction of the whole man. Pride of intellect, as well as of heart, must be subdued ; wicked passions must be restrained and mortified ; and the whole current of feeling, and thought, and action, run in a direction which has no congeniality with the selfish and carnal desires of the natural heart. Where such is the conflict between the interpreter and the sacred writings which he undertakes to expound, there must often be gross misconceptions, as well as gross perversions, of their meaning. The temptations to this may even be all the stronger, according to the respect which the interpreter has for the binding authority of the Scriptures. The necessity of an adjustment of the conflict is felt to be the more urgent ; and it is far easier for corrupt and blinded man to relinquish and pervert the truth, than it is for him to give up his own views, and principles, and practices. In such a case, error has greatly the advantage over the truth. The whole strength of our natural opposition to the truth is enlisted on its side ; and precisely because the Scriptures are acknowledged to be an authoritative rule, the desire is felt so to expound the rule as to make it easy and acceptable to unhumbled reason and unsanctified affections. Where lower views are entertained of the binding authority of the Scriptures, the interpreter may feel no such strong temptation wilfully to pervert their meaning. He may feel free to exhibit the doctrines, and duties, and facts of the Scriptures, and yet be equally free to maintain his own views and practices. Still, in either case, the interpreter's subjective incapacity for the truth, his natural want of spiritual apprehension of it as light and life to the soul, must often exclude correct and luminous views, and spread darkness over the sacred page.

The exposition of the Scriptures, therefore, is safe and



edifying only in the hands of him who, to a profound reverence for their divine authority, unites a heart and understanding in unison, by virtue of the operations of the Spirit, with the spiritual truths which they inculcate. In him only is found the spiritual discernment and love for the truth which places the mind in the proper attitude for the right apprehension and exhibition of it.

Here again Germany furnishes instructive lessons for our admonition. It was the decline of piety, as we have already stated, which prepared the way for those loose views of the authority of the sacred Scriptures which have, in that country, been so destructive of a correct and reverential treatment of them. The men there, and their followers in other countries, who deny the possibility of miracles and prophecies, and who treat the word of God scarcely as they would the word of man, are not the men, whatever may be their private amiability and worth, who set the highest value on the power of inward godliness and outward piety, and who do the most to promote them ; and when this power of an inward life, generated by the Spirit of God, has taken possession of the heart, it has been followed generally by a more or less total renunciation of former philosophical difficulties. We have, indeed, in entire accordance with what we have already said, some quite remarkable instances of expository tact in minds of skeptical views and of doubtful piety. But even the best of such commentators do much to unsettle the foundations, and do little for the advancement, of true religion. Happily the course of theological controversy and scriptural exposition in that *distracted* country, gives us much hope that the victory will ultimately decide for those who have hid the word of God most deeply in their hearts, and who bow with most reverence and obedience to its authoritative teachings.

III. The third qualification, which I mention as essential

to the critical interpreter of the Scriptures, is *a thorough knowledge of the original languages in which they are written, as well as a good knowledge, at least, of their cognates.*

It is well known that the original languages of the Scriptures are the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek; and that these are properly now all dead languages. The immediate cognates of these, a knowledge of which may be regarded as indispensable to the accomplished interpreter of the Scriptures, are Arabic, Syriac, and Ethiopic for the first two, and the Latin for the last.

That a thorough knowledge of the original languages of the sacred Scriptures is absolutely necessary to the interpreter, will hardly be denied at the present day, by any one who is competent to judge. All allow that our best translations are imperfect; and were these as perfect as they could be made, it would, in a multitude of cases, be impossible for the student of these merely to investigate the possible interpretations of the original, or to ascertain the full meaning of the true one. The truth is, that whilst the great doctrines and duties taught in the Scriptures are taught in a variety of form and connection, which ought to leave no dispute as to what they are; yet, in respect to the doctrines, at least, saving a few—happily the most fundamental—there is, amongst Christian interpreters and theologians, a wide diversity; and in the minuter details of interpretation, particularly, there is a diversity, and often a contrariety, which is to be ascribed, not merely do dogmatic prejudices and to deficient knowledge in general, but especially to a defective knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures. Whoever considers the ease and certainty with which we understand those who speak and write our own vernacular tongue, must be sensible of what we lose in the interpretation of the Scriptures, by the want of a thorough acquaintance with the languages in which they are

written. We make full allowance for the influence of dogmatic prejudices, where these may operate, for the embarrassments of an imperfect knowledge of antiquity generally, and for the imperfection and ambiguity of language, even when best known and correctly written : and yet we hesitate not to say, that the diversities that we meet with in the minutiae of interpretation are such and so numerous, as to prove incontestably that the prolific source from which they spring is the want of a thorough acquaintance with the original languages themselves ; such an acquaintance as those who thought and spake in them possessed. It is the want of easy familiarity with the original languages of the Scriptures, indeed, which has always constituted the greatest difficulty in the way of interpreters, and has most powerfully tempted to the easier and more seductive methods of allegorizing, so common with the fathers, and catenating and compiling, so much practised by their successors down to the present day.

In order to this thorough acquaintance with the original languages of the Scriptures, so indispensable, it is all-important to the interpreter, that he be well acquainted with their nearer cognates. In these he finds the usages which so often fail him, by reason of insufficient remains, in the case of the Hebrew especially ; and the most useful helps for the interpretation of both the Old Testament and the New. It is only by the diligent study of all these, both the original and the cognate languages of the Scriptures, that the interpreter can so appropriate and appreciate the forms of thought, the idiom, force, and spirit of the sacred writers, as to feel independent and at home in his work. I may be allowed to introduce here, the testimony of a veteran in Oriental literature, taken from the preface of the latest edition of his famous Hebrew grammar. "There are two ways," says he, "to pursue the Hebrew. The one is to consult the Hebrew grammars and

Lexicons that are at hand ; by way of supererogation to spell a little Arabic and Syriac ; to take in hand some other helps that lie in a couple of bye-ways ; to compare a half or a whole dozen of commentaries ; and then believe that one understands Hebrew, and can, as a learned man, expose the true sense of the Old Testament. This attractive way have thousands marched, and never will it cease to be the most admired ; but upon what sandbanks and cliffs it conducts, we should at last universally perceive. The other is first to lay the Hebrew entirely aside, and, with true toil and devotion, appropriate a hundred talents, in regions which lie quite far from the Old Testament, and which, in Germany, yield no bread ; for example, become in all Shemitic literature first perfectly at home, and then perhaps return again to the old Hebrew, in order to recall it for ourselves, piece by piece, from death to life, and so apprehend what it really says to us and teaches us." This extract, certainly savours of Germany ; more than is here meant is indispensable to the devout and successful interpreter : but what piety and a sacred regard for the authority of the text can do, and will do, without the knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures, we may learn from the almost universal allegorizing of the fathers and dogmatism of the dark ages, and from the many commentators of later times, who have done little more than collect and digest the statements and criticisms of others who have preceded them, and sometimes have done this in a very superficial and unscholarlike way.

The qualification of which I am speaking is so obvious and so generally admitted, that I deem it unnecessary to enlarge. I must add, however, before dismissing it, that the church has need at the present day of Scripture interpreters, who possess this knowledge of the original languages, and of the helps to the right understanding of them, in a very high

degree. Never was this department of sacred literature more sedulously and more successfully cultivated ; and never were the fruits of lingual investigations applied with more zeal to the unsettling of the canon and perverting the meaning of the Scriptures. Their authority is attacked with an array of erudition and learned authority, that must confound the simple ; and to be maintained, they call for men of at least equal and less sophisticated lore.

IV. But not only is a thorough knowledge of the original and cognate languages of the Scriptures necessary to the interpreter ; he has need, in the fourth place, of *a very extensive and often minute acquaintance with various collateral knowledge.*

There is no department of real knowledge that does not help to the better understanding and illustration of the Scriptures. There are expressions in them which have for ages been misunderstood, or correctly apprehended only since the clear discoveries of modern science. It is, to give a simple example, familiar to every reader of the Scriptures that the rising and setting of the sun, so frequently mentioned in them are, as in our own language, only a conformity to the ordinary usages of language to express an ordinary phenomenon as it appears in nature, without teaching any thing as to the real manner of its occurrence, although they may at first have originated in conceptions of a mode conformed to the appearance.

But far more important than all modern science, strictly so called, to the right interpretation of the Scriptures, is a good knowledge of history, and an intimate and correct knowledge of antiquity. The Scriptures contain a long succession of revelations and records, made originally for the benefit of a particular chosen people, but intended ultimately for the benefit of all the nations of the earth. They contain

throughout innumerable allusions to the geographical, historical, political, social, moral, philosophical, and religious relations of the chosen people, and the country which they inhabited, as well as of all the surrounding nations and countries with which they were in various ways connected. Here a wide field is thrown open for the biblical student ; and many rich results have been afforded by the diligent researches of modern inquirers. The more our knowledge advances of Jewish, Roman, Grecian, Egyptian,—indeed, ancient and oriental antiquities generally, the more thoroughly are the Scriptures understood in all their varied and multiplied allusions ; and their coincidence with ancient facts and relations, thus ascertained from other sources, constitutes an increasingly powerful and conclusive argument for their genuineness and authenticity. Difficulties, indeed, which, in some cases, seemed to be glaring discrepancies, and constituted for the infidel strong objections to the credibility, and of course to the genuineness and inspiration of the Scriptures, or of particular parts thereof, have been completely solved, and added to the general mass of archæological coincidences which serve so triumphantly to maintain and verify the inspired record.

We are far from believing that this source of knowledge for the confirmation and better understanding of the Scriptures is completely exhausted. We believe, on the contrary, that the most valuable results are to flow from the persevering and thorough investigation of the original languages of the Scriptures, and the antiquities with which they stand connected. The facilities and inducements to such investigations were never greater than at the present time, nor the promise greater to religion and science.

The Bible challenges investigation. It professes to give knowledge which shall make men wise unto salvation, and

demands to be studied and understood. It courts the light, and never avoids it. It stimulates to mental activity, and never stifles lawful inquiry. It shines brightest in the midst of surrounding light, and has always gained by every advance in real knowledge. It claims science as its handmaid, and wages eternal war upon all darkness in the soul. We doubt not that, in the end, all real knowledge and all true science will pay it due homage and render it good service. It is a striking and significant fact, that while the boasted theories and alleged discoveries of modern science are boldly set up as conflicting with the Scriptures, the facts of antiquity that are almost daily brought to light are clearly demonstrating their truth, and illustrating their meaning. It is precisely the newest of the sciences which, like untutored children, show the most undevout hostility to the Scriptures; the more established our knowledge, the more it accords with and confirms them. The whole past history of the progress of true science authorizes the unwavering belief, that the more thorough and accurate our knowledge is of all things, ancient and modern, the more clearly will the truth of the sacred Scriptures appear, and the more accurately and thoroughly will they be understood and appreciated. At a day like this, when infidels in disguise are doing all to subvert and pervert the Scriptures, the critical interpreter may not neglect any of their defences, but should give diligent heed to them all.

V. The next requisite to the interpreter of the sacred Scriptures which I shall mention is, *a thorough and comprehensive acquaintance with the Scriptures themselves.*

Scripture truths are not given systematically. They were not written by one man in one age, but by many men during a long succession of ages. The facts, doctrines, and duties which they contain are taught in almost every variety of form and connection. But the writers, however diverse or widely

separated in time and space, were animated and directed by one and the same unerring Spirit. They were the inspired religious teachers and rulers of the ages in which they lived, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and taught the truth in the measure and forms in which it was communicated to them. The revelation at any given period of its progress, though not yet finished, possessed a certain completeness. At every period it might be said, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting (or restoring) the soul." The seeds of the whole system, so to speak, were there; the first and great germs of saving truth were clearly discernible; and in every age the humble believer knew enough for the life of his soul. The word as it then existed was suited to his wants. The very first *part*, that which Moses wrote, contained the history of facts which were fundamental in their character, and above all the philosophy of the ancients; and, besides the moral law, numerous significant types which shadowed forth good things to come, and many exceeding great and precious promises and prophecies, which addressed themselves to the faith, and attracted the study and meditation, of all the devout worshippers of Jehovah. It was precisely because this perfection characterized the Scriptures at every period, that, far up on the stream of revelation, we hear their praises chanted in the most enraptured strains: and Old Testament saints, in respect to zeal and love for the word of God, lose nothing by comparison with the New.

It follows from these remarks that the Scriptures, as we have them, constitute a complete and finished whole; and that every part, as it derives light from all the remaining parts, in its turn sheds light upon them. There is throughout a harmony and unity of design which can only be discerned and felt by him who thoroughly studies the whole; which unity and harmony undiscerned and unfelt by the interpreter,



he can scarcely fail not only to misunderstand, but to do violence to, holy writ. What sad havoc has been made, in modern Germany, of the Old Testament types and prophecies, by severing the two grand divisions of the Scriptures, and interpreting them separately, as though they were not indited and composed by one and the same Spirit, is known to all who have attended at all to the course of scripture interpretation. Like disastrous results attend the separation of one book from another, and interpreting each part as though it sustained no common relation to all the rest. This mischievous error is most injurious in the hands of those who, like too many interpreters of the present day, entertain low views of the inspiration of the sacred writers. To them, indeed, it ought to be confined. Those who regard the Scriptures as proceeding from men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, must, if they will be consistent, interpret every part of the whole volume by the light of all the rest. So we interpret the product of any other, though it be but a man's spirit: how much more, when we believe that we are interpreting words given or sanctioned by the infallible Spirit of God, the spirit of light and the spirit of truth?

The truth is, that the Old and New Testaments are the counterparts and complements of each other. We may compare them to the morning dawn and to the splendor of mid-day. The morning dawns and the mid-day shines, only because of the approach and presence of the great monarch of light. And as we would catch his earliest rays, if we would bear the heat and brightness of his meridian glory; so if we would fully comprehend the sublime and saving light of the New Testament, we should come to it through the obscure dawn of the Old. Either shines at all only because of the approach or the presence of the great Sun of Righteousness. The light which they shed is one and the same, only differ-

ing in degree. They come from the same source, and they direct to the same end. It is ever the same Spirit speaking in them ; and whether the subject-matter be history, or type, or precept, or promise, or prophecy, whatever it be, the great object of the Spirit speaking in the Old Testament is, to meet the spiritual necessities of *that* generation of the covenant people of God, and *chiefly* by pointing them to, and preparing them for, the coming and redemption of the great Son of God and man, so clearly set forth in the New Testament. The necessities of God's people in every age are essentially the same ; the great remedial system the same ; the experience of his people and the principles of his providential dealings with them the same. Where such is the unity of design and harmony in the subject-matter of revelation, it must needs be that all the parts stand intimately and mutually related, and confirm and illustrate one another. He best understands the Old Testament, who has learned the New aright ; and he best interprets the New, who has most thoroughly studied the institutions and weighed the very expressions of the Old. So true is this, that we may say, had the New Testament never existed, the Old had remained an unintelligible enigma ; and had the Old Testament never existed, the world had scarcely furnished the language that could have accurately and certainly conveyed the glorious revelations of the New. The interpreter therefore needs not only an acquaintance with the general scope of the Sacred Volume, but a minute acquaintance with the whole Scriptures ; so that in the consideration of any passage or phrase that needs elucidation, he may be able at once to collect the light that streams from various other parts of the harmonious whole.

VI. The last qualification of the interpreter of the sacred Scriptures which I shall mention, is, *that he possess correct principles of interpretation, and have the skill and judgment to apply them.*

The proper object of all language is to express the operations of the mind. Whether used by God or man, it is intended to communicate to others his thoughts, and feelings, and will ; and of course is properly designed to be understood. For this end it is obviously necessary, that, as far as possible, it be used in the ordinary acceptation of its words and phrases. No system of interpretation therefore can, in general, be just, which does not aim to get at the meaning which the words fairly and legitimately convey, when construed according to the ordinary usages of language.

These general remarks apply in full force to the Scriptures. They are professedly a revelation of the will of God to man. As such, they were intended not only for the learned ; but for the common people. They demand no recondite system of rules, known only to the initiated, in order to be understood ; their object is to make men, learned and unlearned, wise unto salvation, by communicating the saving truths of God, so that all who will may understand. For the accomplishment of this object, they must conform to the ordinary and legitimate usages of language. A revelation in unintelligible language is, in this regard, no revelation at all ; and language is never surer to be misunderstood, or not understood at all, than when it is employed contrary to its established meaning and laws. Such a revelation, to be understood, must carefully reveal the method of its right interpretation.

The Scriptures contain for themselves no such peculiar or special method of interpretation. They demand to be searched ; but by the help of no special light, save that of the Great Spirit of truth. They do, indeed, teach us that there are types, and parables, and prophecies, and, as I believe, cases of *double sense* ; but we contend, that here there is no violation of the nature or the legitimate use of language, so long as we follow the sure guidance of Revelation

itself, and proceed not arbitrarily in the interpretation. We have already contended that the Scriptures are a complete whole, and that one part is to be interpreted by the help of the rest ; this common-sense rule we apply in the interpretation of all other instruments. What we further contend for here is, that allowing whatever may be fairly due to the nature of inspiration, and to the nature of the subject of the revelation, we must adhere to the principle, that the language employed teaches us, respecting that subject, whether past, present, or future, whether common or miraculous, above us or below us, and whether in figurative, typical, parabolic, or allegorical form, what, when interpreted by the ordinary laws and usages of language, it naturally and plainly means. It is in this sense that I would understand the famous maxim of the judicious Hooker:—"I hold for a most infallible rule in expositions of the sacred Scriptures, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst."

What is commonly known, therefore, as the historico-grammatical system of interpretation is, we believe, the only just system, always allowing what the very nature of a revelation from God and the subject of which it speaks may fairly demand. In this last qualification, we only allow what, in strict accordance with the true nature of language, is allowed to all writings,—that they be interpreted according to themselves and according to the nature of the subjects of which they treat.

Every period of the church has furnished abundant illustrations of the prime importance of the possession of correct principles of interpretation, by those who undertake to expound the Scriptures. Before the reformation, first the allegorical, and then the dogmatical, prevailed. Since that period, a purer and more fruitful method of investigation

has been vigorously prosecuted; but often upon principles contrary to all sound and rational criticism, however pretending to both characteristics, and, of course, derogatory to the true dignity of the Scriptures as a revelation from God, and subversive of their true meaning. It is a common fault of all these systems, that they exalt the human and depress the divine. The dogmas of the church, the prolific fancies of exuberant minds, the prejudgments of human reason, the dicta of human philosophy, the analogies of false religions and heathen mythologies, and the pretensions of modern science, have all prevailed to pervert the Scriptures, and to add to and abstract from them. It is thus, that even in protestant churches, since the reformation, we have had interpreters, who could expound the sacred Scriptures, manifestly controlled by the church symbols which they had embraced; who could see in the histories and prophecies of the Scriptures types and adumbrations of all the great political and ecclesiastical events of subsequent times; who could treat as trivial all that was not, in the judgment of reason, directly conducive to the moral amendment of mankind; who could add to the sacred narratives, or take from them, so much as was necessary to make them credible to their philosophy or conformable with it; who could explain the doctrines of Christ and His Apostles as mere accommodations to Jewish prejudices and the opinions of the age in which they lived; who could find in all that was miraculous and prophetic absolute impossibilities, except so far as sheer jugglery or shrewd conjecture might attain; who could resolve plain and sober history into sublime poetical and mythical epics; in fine, who could every where subject the *supra-natural* to the *natural* or the *rational*, thus reducing the whole of Revelation and of religion into the powerless abstractions of deism and pantheism: and where this could

not be done, could groundlessly impugn the integrity of the text, or flatly deny the truth of the record.

These astounding results we ascribe in part to the systems of interpretation adopted, because, though in general they have proceeded from the subjective views and feelings of their authors, they have been adopted by acknowledged teachers of theology and expounders of the Scriptures in different churches and universities of the world, but especially of Germany, and have been the guiding principles in the application of the critical apparatus employed to explain away what was offensive and to elicit what was desired. It is gratifying to know, that there is a gradual return from these monstrous excesses to more sober and correct views of the office of the interpreter of the sacred Scriptures. Whilst some still run mad in their license, others, who have done large havoc to the Scriptures, have had their eyes opened in a measure to the reckless and ruinous results of their principles; and the necessity is beginning to be felt of coming back to a devout application of those common-sense principles of interpretation, which men ordinarily employ to ascertain the meaning of written language. Where these have been combined with learning and tact at exposition, we have had valuable contributions to the right interpretation of the Scriptures, even from men whose philosophic views allowed them to reject or oppose the doctrines which they inculcate.

The time is fully come when the church of Christ has need of men in this department, who thoroughly understand their business. The great enemy was never wider awake nor harder at work. Vast erudition is arrayed against her very foundations and surest bulwarks. The great champions of damning delusions at the present day are in the church, and hold high places and occupy strong holds. Error has on its side all the corruptions of man and all the powers of hell.

Already we hear, from different quarters, some stifled sounds of jubilation. But on the side of truth is He that is greater than all. The Spirit of the Lord has set up His standard against them ; and if we will not be recreant to His cause, we will prepare ourselves for the conflict. The heat of the battle has called forth even in Germany noble champions for the truth, who contend with mighty skill for the faith of the saints. We have already said that there we see some signs of giving way in the ranks of the enemy. America, the refuge of all nations and the protector of all creeds, may yet be the scene of a heavier conflict. The truth will doubtless prevail. The time will come when philosophy and science shall act their parts as the handmaids of religion, and not her mistresses. But let it be remembered, that her triumphs will not be achieved by the power of ignorance and supineness.

## COMMENTARY

ON THE

# EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

Six questions present themselves preliminary to the exposition of this Epistle.

1. To whom was it addressed?
2. By whom was it written?
3. In what language?
4. When was it written?
5. To what danger were the Christians peculiarly exposed, who are here addressed; and why?
6. What then was the author's design; and how does he aim to accomplish it?

The introductory matter will then be concluded by giving, in the 7th place, a *General Analysis* of the Epistle.

I. Various opinions have been entertained as to the



persons addressed in this Epistle. Its epistolary character has even been doubted; but this point will be fully established by the passages which we adduce to show its particular destination. It does not need, therefore, a separate investigation.

*The Epistle was manifestly addressed originally to Jewish Christians.* So all ancient testimony, and the whole scope of the Epistle prove. For particular passages, the reader may consult chap. 2: 1, which, with its context, shows that the persons addressed were Christians, and implies that they were also Jews. In 3: 1, they are addressed as "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling;" by which words their Christian profession is plainly described. And the invitation to "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house;" implies in them a familiarity with Mosaic institutions. In 3: 6, the writer says: "But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we," &c. They were, therefore, members of the Christian family. In 3: 12, the writer calls them "brethren." In 5: 12, it is said: "When for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God;" where the time which had elapsed since their profession of Christianity, is plainly intended. The whole of the well known passage in 6: 1-10, evidently applies to Christians by profession. In 10: 19, it is said: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into

the holiest by the blood of Jesus," &c. Here believers in Christ only can be described. And in 10: 23, "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering." The evidence that Jewish Christians are addressed rather than Gentile, is to be further sought in all those numerous places, where a familiar acquaintance with, and attachment to Mosaic institutions, are presumed in them by the author. Instances need not be cited.

But to what Jewish Christians was the Epistle written? Some say, to *Jewish Christians in general*. But this is refuted by sundry passages, which cannot be understood of Jewish Christians in general. Chap. 5: 12, "For, when for the time ye ought to be teachers, *ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God.*" 10: 32 to 34, "But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, *ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly whilst ye were made a gazing stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly whilst ye became companions of them that were so used. For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.*" 13: 18, 19, "Pray for us: for we trust, &c. . . . But I beseech you the rather to do this, *that I may be restored to you the sooner.*" 13: 23, "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, *I will see you.*"

Hence most critics assign a locality to the persons

addressed; and Asia Minor, Galatia, Corinth, Thessalonica, Spain, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Palestine, have been designated by different writers.

Of these, *the most ancient and the most generally received opinion is that they lived in Palestine.* Internal evidence favours this opinion. Only Jewish Christians are addressed. No allusion is made to their being in contact with, or in danger from heathenism; but they are addressed as in great danger from Judaism, and as intimately acquainted with the Jewish ritual. These circumstances are more particularly applicable to Jewish Christians residing in Palestine. The reference too, in chap. 10: 25 and 37, to the destruction of the Jewish polity (for which the reader may consult the comment on those passages), is the most applicable to them: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, *as ye see the day approaching.*" "For yet a little while, *and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.*" From chap. 6: 10 ("For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister"), it appears that they were able to do works of charity; and from 12: 4 ("*Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin*"), that they had not suffered fatal persecution. It has been hence inferred that not Jerusalem Christians, but those in Cæsarea Palestina, are primarily addressed. But this is a very doubtful inference, as will appear from the commentary on the passage.

II. The authorship of the Epistle has been much disputed. Some refer it to *Barnabas*, as Tertullian. Some attribute it, in part at least, to *Luke*, as Clement of Alexandria; who thinks *Paul* the author and *Luke* the translator. Some ascribe it to *Clement of Rome* (Origen refers the matter to *Paul*, but mentions that some ascribed the writing of it to *Luke*, and some to *Clement of Rome*). Some refer it to *Sylvanus*, as a few moderns; others to *Apollos*, among whom are Luther and others. *The most ancient and generally received opinion ascribed it to Paul*, at least in its matter.

It was certainly received as Paul's, for substance, by the celebrated Alexandrian school. First, *Pantænus* seems to be clearly indicated as stating so much, by Clement of Alexandria, as quoted by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. B. VI. c. 14): "A little after this he (Clement) observes: 'But now, as the blessed Presbyter used to say: since the Lord, who was the Apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, *Paul*, by reason of his inferiority, as if sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews; both out of reverence for the Lord, and because he wrote of his abundance to the Hebrews, as a herald and Apostle of the Gentiles.'" After him, *Clement of Alexandria* thought that Paul wrote it in Hebrew to the Hebrews, and that Luke translated it into Greek. (See Euseb. Eccles. Hist. B. VI. c. 14.) After him Origen, the next master of this school, says, *Εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστόλην ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη*

*εὐδοκίμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Οὐ γὰρ εἶκη οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι.* This testimony runs back very near to apostolic times. He also habitually quotes it as Paul's, and includes it in his catalogue of Paul's *fourteen Epistles*. (See Euseb. Eccles. Hist. B. VI. c. 25.) Similar testimony is borne by their successors.

The Eastern Church universally received the Epistle as Paul's. No reputable author has been cited to the contrary. Justin Martyr and Ephrem Syriac<sup>us</sup> received it as Paul's. Eusebius ascribes *fourteen* epistles to Paul (Eccles. Hist. B. III. c. 3, *Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες ἐπιστόλαι, κ.τ.λ.*) and places this Epistle to the Hebrews among the *ὁμολογοῦμενοι*, in common with the Epistles of Paul (see Eccles. Hist. B. III. c. 25; compare B. VI. c. 13), although he says that some, after the example of the Romans, rejected Hebrews, *αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες*. He also habitually quotes it as Paul's, in his Commentaries and other writings.

In the Latin Church, it was generally received till the close of the second century, as appears from the extensive quotations of Clement of Rome, and from its having a place in the old Latin versions. Clement, however, after his usual manner, never mentions the author when he quotes it. Its canonical authority was doubted from the time of Tertullian and Caius, A. D. 200, to that of Jerome and Augustine. But all the Latins did not concur in these doubts, as appears from the statements of Jerome. After his time it was again

universally received. Its rejection during this period is ascribed to the use which the Montanists and Novatians made of chap. 6: 4 to 8, and chap. 10: 26 to 31, to justify their severe and unpopular rules as to the perpetual exclusion of certain classes of backsliders from the church. Thus the Revelation was rejected by some through opposition to the Chiliasts, who perverted its concluding chapters to their support.

It deserves also to be noted, that in some of the catalogues and most ancient MSS. (as the Codex Alexandrin. Vatican, Ephræmi. Coislinian, &c.), this Epistle occurs immediately after 2d Thessalonians, in the very midst of the Pauline Epistles. Such is the state of the external evidence.

Different critics estimate very differently the internal evidences of a Pauline original. Origen says: 'Ο χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου; κ.τ.λ. Ἄλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ σύνθετε τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικώτερα, παρ' ὃ ἐπιστάμενος κρινεῖν φρασέων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσειαν. . . . . εἶποιμ' ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστὶν; ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντος τινὸς τὰ ἀποστόλικά, καὶ ὡσπερὶ σχολιογραφῆσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. "The character of the diction of the Epistle written to the Hebrews, does not possess the verbal peculiarity of the Apostle," &c. "But the Epistle is *too Greek* in the composition of its diction. Every one who knows how to distinguish styles, would acknowledge the differences . . . . I would say that the

thoughts are the Apostle's; but the style and composition are the work of some one who has narrated from recollection apostolic (doctrines); and, as it were, has written scholia upon what was told him by his teacher." (See Euseb. Eccles. Hist. B. VI. c. 25.) Imitating him, the most part admit that the style is more easy, flowing, and rhetorical, and even classical, than that of Paul generally; though some profess to find a resemblance to it in his speeches before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa. (These, however, are reported by Luke.) It is also said that Paul's mode of thinking and reasoning are absent from the Epistle. But good critics have ventured to question the accuracy and taste of Origen in the Greek style and idiom. Bloomfield says: "The feeling of my own mind as to the composition now in question, after repeated and most attentive examinations of its contents, is, that none but St. Paul could have written it, and consequently, that none but St. Paul *did* write it. In it, in short, we have all the peculiar and prominent features of St. Paul's style and manner," &c. The labours of Stuart in answer to Bertholdt, Schultz, Seyffarth, De Wette, Boehm, and Blük, go far to show that, if we settle this question by an appeal to the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, the *ἅπαξ εἰρημένα*, and the *ἅπαξ λογιζόμενα* which may be found in it, to the hebraizing or classical expressions which it contains, or to such like arguments, we shall do it upon grounds which some of the objectors themselves have relinquished, and which will either determine that this is a production of Paul, or that there are none such in the

sacred Canon. It may be remarked, too, that such is the Pauline cast, that if we may infer any thing from the signal failures of many early attempts at imitation of this and other apostles, we may believe with Origen, "that not without reason did the ancients hand it down as Paul's." One thing is certain; that so many are the circumstances which serve to modify style and thought, that nothing in the present case can be inferred from this source, against the positive external testimony which has been adduced. Let it be remembered in this connexion, that the Apostle was inspired, that the subject was unique, that this was among the last of his Epistles, that he was writing to his own countrymen, that he was subject to like passions with ourselves. All these circumstances might well modify here his diction and modes of thought.

III. All to the original language of the Epistle, two opinions have been entertained: first, that it was written or dictated in Hebrew and translated into the Greek; and second, that it was originally written in the Greek as we have it. The ancients inclined to the former opinion; the later commentators adopt the latter. Though addressed to Hebrews, it was best adapted to common use in Greek; as the Apostle manifestly judged in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, which was addressed to Latins. It has the air of an original, and nothing of the stiffness of a translation. It quotes from the Septuagint: a thing very unlikely, if it had been written in Hebrew; and it translates Hebrew



words; (though here we should judge cautiously.) There is no evidence that a Hebrew original was ever in existence; but one has only been inferred to account for supposed departures from Paul's style in other epistles. And in conclusion, the Greek Epistle was in early and universal circulation.

IV. The Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem; for the Apostle did not live so long. And it appears from chap. 9: 9, and 13: 10, not to say from the whole scope of the Epistle, that the temple was still standing, and its worship maintained. (*ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότι, καθ' ὃν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται, κ.τ.λ.*, which should be translated: "Which *is* a figure for the approaching time, for which both gifts and sacrifices *are* offered." And *Ἐχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηπῇ λατρεύοντες.*) But it could not have been written very many years before that destruction, since we learn from a passage already quoted (chap. 5: 12), that they had long been Christians. The words of chap. 13: 7, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end (*ἐκβασιν*) of their conversation," seem to show that their first teachers were already dead. A comparison of chap. 10: 25 with 10: 37, will also discover an allusion to the near approach of the catastrophe: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, *and so much the more as ye see the*

*day approaching.*" "For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."

After all that has been said, the canonical authority of the Epistle cannot be doubted; and there can be little doubt that Paul was the author. It is found in the old Syriac or Peschito version, in the old Latin versions, and in *twelve* out of the fourteen ancient catalogues; and is quoted, as we have seen, by the Fathers generally.

V. The Jewish Christians addressed, were peculiarly exposed to apostacy from Christianity to Judaism, for several reasons. 1. From old prejudices and early education; Judaism had been the religion of their fathers from immemorial generations. 2. From the splendour of the Temple and temple-service, which appealed continually to their senses, and which would be asserted by their enemies to stand in splendid contrast with the bald simplicity of the Christian worship. 3. From the influence of social relationships; their relatives, neighbours, friends, countrymen, were Jews. 4. From the odium attached to the cross, than which there was, to a Jew, no greater stumbling block. 5. From persecutions, which, though not yet unto death, were severe.

VI. The author aimed, therefore, first and mainly, to confirm them in the Christian faith against apostacy to Judaism. To this design the first twelve chapters are devoted. In chapter thirteen he exhorts them to various Christian duties. He seems, however, never to

lose sight of his great design, while, of course, other collateral ends are subserved.

VII. To comprehend the analysis of the Apostle's argument, it should be noted, that the claims of the Jewish system were rested on these grounds: 1. Its introduction by the ministry of Angels. 2. Its having Moses, the greatest of Prophets, for its divinely appointed Head. 3. Its divinely instituted Ritual and Priesthood. The author therefore argues:

I. Christ's superiority to Angels, chaps. 1 and 2, proving Him to be divine in chap. 1, and explaining the reasons of his becoming man in chap. 2, v. 5 to end.

II. His superiority to Moses, chap. 3, v. 1-6.

III. The superiority of his Priesthood to the Levitical, in all respects, chap. 5, v. 1-10, and 7-10: 18.

Each of these arguments is followed or interrupted by exhortations, the scope of which is generally against apostacy; as in chap. 2: 1-4; 3: 7 through 4: 5: 11-6. 10: 19 through 12.

The biblical student is referred for fuller details on *the Introduction*, to Horne's Introduction, Vol. II, pp. 349-357. Stuart's Commentary on Hebrews, Vol. I. Bloomfield on the Epistle, in his New Test. Lardner, Hug, Kuinoel, Michaelis, &c., and to Whitby's preface to the Epistle in his Commentary.

*For Commentaries*, the following may be consulted. Stuart, Bloomfield (in his *Recensio Synoptica*, or Crit-

ical Digest, and New Test.), Jas. Pierce, Hammond, Owen, Whitby, McKnight, Clark, Barnes.

Calvin, Kuinoel, Rosenmüller, Mathæi, Poli Synopsis, Wetstein, I. A. Ernesti (Lectiones in Ep. ad Hebræos).

From these sources the materials of this work have been chiefly drawn.

## CHAPTER I.

### ANALYSIS.

THE author commences with a comparison of the revelation made to the Fathers, and that made to themselves, in v. 1. He does this with an evident view to the application of his argument in chap. 2: 1-4. He then appropriately introduces his subject by declaring the exalted character of Christ, vv. 2, 3, concluding with the assertion of his superiority to angels, v. 4. This is the first proposition to be proved, as at once laying a solid foundation for his own argument, and undermining a pillar in the Jewish faith. This superiority he argues,

1. From the *title* bestowed on him. He is called *Son* in a sense in which that term is never bestowed on angels, v. 5.

2. The angels are commanded to worship him, v. 6.

3. The angels are represented as servants, like the winds and lightning, v. 7, but the Son is addressed as God, seated on an everlasting throne, swaying a sceptre of righteousness, the Founder of the earth, and Maker of the heavens, who, after creation itself had waxed old and changed, should remain forever and unchangeably the same, vv. 8-12. The whole argument is, of course, from the Jewish Scriptures.

A supplement to this last argument, establishing the main proposition, adduces a passage which represents Christ as exalted till all enemies are subdued; whereas the angels are sent forth to minister to his people. vv. 13, 14.

---

*Title of the Epistle:* Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους Ἐπιστολή.

These words are possibly not Paul's. They are not in the Apostle's manner, nor like the introductions of his epistles generally, as will be seen by a reference to their commencements. But it may be urged, on the other hand, that an epistle would hardly be sent without any direction or address; and as the Apostle has omitted the usual introductory address, for some unknown reason, he may have prefixed this direction. Eusebius (in his Eccles. Hist. B. VI. c. 14), quotes Clement of Alexandria as saying: "It is probable the title, 'Paul the Apostle,' was not prefixed to it. For as he wrote to the Hebrews, who had imbibed prejudices against him and suspected him, he wisely guards against diverting them from the perusal, by giving his name." He also represents Clement as saying after Pantænus, that the omission of an introduction as 'Apostle of the Hebrews,' was out of reverence to our Lord, and because, being the Apostle of the Gentiles, he wrote out of his abundance to the Hebrews. It is easier for us to account for Paul's prefixing such a title, than for his dispensing with the usual introduction.

The title is certainly very ancient; it is found in all the MSS. which contain the Epistle (with some variations, which may be seen in Scholz' New Test.); it is found in the Syriac, and the Latin versions before Jerome; and the Fathers of the second and third centuries constantly refer to the Epistle as that to the Hebrews. Examples may be seen in Eusebius' Eccles. Hist. B. III. c. 38. VI. c. 14. 25.

But who are particularly defined by the term *Ἑβραῖοι*? We find it in the New Test. only in Acts 6: 1. 2 Cor. 11: 22. Philip. 3: 5. In the first of these we read: *ἐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους*. Here *Ἑλληνιστῶν* and *Ἑβραίους* are manifestly opposed; and whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the former, the critics almost all agree that the latter, in this passage at least, means Hebrews residing in Palestine proper, and speaking the vernacular language of that country. Thus say the Lexicons, as Bretschneider, Wahl, Robinson; and the commentators on that passage of Acts. In the second place cited we read: *Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; καὶ γὰρ Ἰσραηλιταί εἰσι; καὶ γὰρ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* And in the third: *περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος. ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, Ἑβραῖος ἔξ Ἑβραίων, κ.τ.λ.* In each place it is plain that the Apostle means to affirm himself a Hebrew, or an Israelite in the strongest sense of that term. Yet we see, from his case, that an actual birth in Palestine was not required for this distinction. Further, the words *Ἑβραῖοις*, in Luke 23: 38, *Ἑβραῖδι* in Acts 21: 40, 22: 2, and 26: 14, and

*Ἑβραϊστί*, in John 5: 2, 19: 13, 17: 20, and Rev. 9: 11, 16: 16, all denote the Hebrew-Aramæan or Syro-Chaldaic, which was the proper tongue of the Jews in Palestine at that time. In Josephus, Bell. Judaic. B. VI. c. 2. §1, *Ἑβραϊζῶν* means 'speaking in Hebrew,' i. e. in Syro-Chaldaic. Many of the Fathers, understanding this Epistle, and also Matthew's Gospel, to have been written to Jews in Palestine, designate in the same way both them, and the language in which they suppose that the Apostle wrote. The persons intended by this title seem plainly, therefore, to be Hebrews then residing in Palestine, or, if foreigners by birth, educated in Palestine in the religion and customs of their fathers, and speaking their vernacular tongue. And if so, the title, if Paul's, certainly determines the persons addressed; or if early prefixed by other hands, it shows the opinion of the early church on this point. See Stuart's Com. on Hebr. 2nd ed. pp. 35-38.



## COMMENTARY.

- 1 Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάσαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας  
 τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν  
 2 ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ὃν ἔθηκε κλη-  
 ρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν,  
 3 ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς  
 ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι  
 τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμόν ποιη-  
 σάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ  
 4 τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς· τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων  
 γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσω διαφορώτερον παρ'  
 αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

V. 1. *Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, means literally: "In many parts, and in many ways:" referring to the various revelations at different times, and the various modes in which they were given. So, in substance, are the words rendered by Calvin, Stuart, and Whitby. De Wette renders them, "Vor zeiten vielfältig und auf vielerlei Weise." Others regard them as mere euphonic synonymes, to denote the variety of doctrines and matters revealed through the prophets. So Grotius, Kuinoël, Dindorf, Bloomfield, understand them. But where then is the antithesis between these revelations, and those of "these last times?" If, with the New Test. Lexicons, we translate, "in diverse manners" (in multis modis) merely, whence do we rightfully derive such a sense for *πολυμερῶς*? *μέρος* has properly

no such meaning. The ancient interpreters were in like manner divided. Both words occur in the New Test. only here. It seems to us best, therefore, to adhere to the meaning first announced.

*προφήταις* literally means in Greek, "a foreteller." In the Septuagint and New Test. it is used not in its etymological sense, but in that of the Hebrew *נָבִיא*; one who speaks under divine authority and inspiration, it might be to exhort, instruct, or rebuke, as well as foretell. Here the reader may compare Gen. 20: 7, where God informs Abimelech, king of Gerar, that Abraham is a prophet, i. e. an inspired man; Exod. 7: 1, where Moses, when sent on his mission to Egypt, is told that he "shall be as a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron his brother shall be his prophet," i. e. his messenger; and Psalm 105: 15, in which the Israelites are called God's prophets, in the sense of his anointed, holy, and chosen people. See also Alexander on Isaiah, Introduc. pp. ix-xii.

V. 2. *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* (Textus Receptus gives various reading, *ἐσχάτων*) *τῶν ἡμερῶν*. Either reading gives the same sense. Both occur in the Septuagint for *אַחֲרֵי־יְמֵי־הַקְּדָמִים*. Literally, it denoted the future, and for the most part, the remote future; as in Gen. 49: 1 (where Jacob foretells his sons what shall befall their descendants "in the last days"), Numbers 24: 14, and Dan. 10: 14. But the phrase came technically to designate messianic times as opposed to ancient times (*πάλαι*). In this sense Isaiah (2: 2) says: "It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the

Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains," &c. Hosea (3: 5), distinctly describing a time after the end of the ceremonial dispensation, says: "The children of Israel . . . shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." Micah (4: 1) repeats the words of Isaiah, and in the same sense. In the New Test. the phrase is frequent under different forms of equivalent meaning, in all of them designating messianic times, but referring more particularly to different periods of it. Thus, in Acts 2: 17, Hebr. 1: 1, and 1 Peter 1: 20, it refers to apostolic times; and in 2 Tim. 3: 1, James 5: 3, 2 Peter 3: 3, to later times near Christ's second coming. See Robinson's Lexicon of New Test.

*ἐν νιῶ.* The article is omitted before this word, as also in 5: 8 and 7: 28 below. This is not unusual with proper names. It is worthy of remark that the name *Χριστός* is almost uniformly preceded by the article in the Gospels, and is most usually without it in Paul's and Peter's Epistles. So *Κύριος* often wants the article, especially after prepositions. (See Winer's Idioms New Test. §17. 8, p. 98. §17. 4.)

The manifest antithesis between the several members of this verse should be noticed. But we are not to strain it so far as to infer that Christ was not the Divine Person manifested "to the fathers." For we see in John 12: 41, that Isaiah "saw his glory, and spake of him." Compare Isaiah 6: 1, 10; and 1 Cor. 10: 4, 9, assures us that the old Israelites "drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock

was Christ;" and forewarns us, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted."

*κληρονόμον*. Christ is thus called because he is a *Son*, exalted by his *Father* to the mediatorial throne, with all the power and judgment in his hands, and the promise of universal dominion as his inheritance. The meaning is well illustrated by the 2nd Psalm, throughout, but especially by vv. 6-9. It is worthy of note that the Latins used *hærus* in the sense of *dominus*. An illustration of the author's idea may also be found in Gal. 4: 1, Ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὢν. The word πάντων, annexed in the text, certainly gives to κληρονόμος the meaning of universal dominion. In the same sense, doubtless, Acts 2: 36 says: "God hath made that same Jesus . . . both Lord and Christ." Acts 10: 36 asserts that "He is Lord of all" (κύριος πάντων). And Eph. 1: 22 says that God "gave (ἔδωκε) him to be Head over all things to the Church."

*δι' οὗ*. Grotius renders these words (which in our version are translated, "by whom also he made the worlds") "on account of whom." This is contrary to the general usage of the preposition *διὰ* with the genitive (see Winer's Idioms New Test. §51, i; p. 304. Compare §53, c; p. 308); and it is peculiarly contrary to its usage in this Epistle. Let the reader turn, for instance, to the examples nearest at hand; vv. 3, 9, 14 of the first, and 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 14, &c., of the second chapters, and he will see that *διὰ* is uniformly employed with the accusative to mean "on account of," and

that when placed before the genitive, it signifies instrumentality or agency. The sense given by Grotius is equally opposed to the parallel sentiments of 1 Cor. 8: 6, "One Lord Jesus Christ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα;" of Col. 1: 16, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, κ.τ.λ. . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται; and of John 1: 3, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. The meaning therefore is plain; that the Son was the agent in this work.

τοὺς αἰῶνας. This word here signifies "the world," "the universe." This is the sense in which it is used in chap. 11: 3 infra, and in 1 Tim. 1: 17. Its usage may be illustrated by that of עוֹלָמִים in Chaldee and in the later Hebrew. This word is often used in the singular, respecting both the present world (הַעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), and the future (הַעוֹלָם הַבָּא, ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων vel ἐρχόμενος). Instances of such use may be seen in Matt. 12: 32; Mark 10: 30; Luke 18: 30; Wisdom 4: 2; Matt. 13: 22, 40, 49; 28: 20; Eph. 1: 21. Its uses may also be compared in 1 Cor. 10: 11; Eph. 2: 7; Hebr. 9: 26, and perhaps 6: 5. These passages plainly reveal two senses as attaching to the words αἰὼν, αἰῶνες in New Test. usage. In the one class of citations, it is "the universe," in the other, the later dispensation as contrasted with a previous. The former sense is most appropriate to this text. It is worthy of notice that Hebr. 2: 5, when speaking of our world as not put in subjection to the angels, employs the word οἰκουμένην, the word usually employed to describe the habitable globe.

V. 3. ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. "The

shining forth of his glory." De Wette renders these words, Ein abglanz seiner Herrlichkeit: "*A reflection of his glory.*" The glory of God here can only mean the divine perfections, and not his declarative glory merely; as is sufficiently evident from the connected and parallel clause, which is translated by the English version, "the express image of his person." For if it is only meant by the former clause, that Christ or his work manifest the declarative glory of God, it may be answered, so does the humblest saint; yea, sinners and devils. There would be a glaring incoherency between the poverty of the first, and the strength of the latter clause. And we have illustrative usages of this word in other places. In Romans 1: 23, the heathen changed "the glory of the incorruptible God (*τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ*) into an image made like to corruptible man," &c. Acts 7: 2, "The God of glory (*ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης*) appeared to our father Abraham." Eph. 1: 17, "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory (*ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης*), may give unto you the spirit of wisdom," &c. In the first of these passages the meaning evidently is, "the divine perfections or attributes;" in the second and third it is, "the God, the Father, who is possessed of divine perfections." The text then asserts that Christ was a bright exhibition to men of the divine perfections. In 2 Cor. 4: 4, he is called *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. In Col. 1: 15, *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀοράτου*. In Isaiah 63: 9, אֱמָלֵךְ אֱלֹהֵי, 'the Angel of his (God's) presence.' In John 1: 1, he is *ὁ Λόγος*, at the same time *Θεός*, and in v. 14 it is

said *οὐρανὸς ἐγένετο*; and then, v. 18, "No man hath seen God at any time; *the only begotten Son*, he hath revealed him, *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς.*" John 12:45, Christ says of himself, "He that seeth me seeth Him that sent me;" and in 14:9, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The assertion, especially when taken in its connexion, is exceedingly strong, as will be seen by reading from vv. 8-11. Hence in 2 Cor. 4:6 we read: "Ὁς (sc. Θεός) ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πρὸσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ." All these scripture parallelisms abundantly prove that this passage designates Christ as, in his own person and nature, the splendid representation to men of divine perfections. The attempts made by those of the Fathers tinctured with Neo-Platonism, to find in this expression a proof for their doctrine of *emanation*, will need no answer after the illustrations of its meaning given above.

*καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.* These words we may translate, "The image, or impression of his being, or substance." De Wette translates, "Abdruck seines Wesens—the impression of his being." *χαρακτήρ*, which occurs only here in the New Test. must have here the secondary sense given to it, for its first sense of *mark* is inapplicable; and the parallelism requires it. The other word *ὑποστάσεως* only occurs in four places besides this; in 2 Cor. 9:4, 11:17, and Hebr. 3:14, 11:1, in all which it *may* mean *confidence*. (But for the last two the reader is referred to the commentary on the passages.) Here it can only have the meaning

of "being," "substance," in which all the Lexicons agree, as do the old Syriac and Vulgate versions. The former of these writes it  $\alpha\zeta\delta\zeta\iota$ , and the latter, 'figura substantiæ ejus.' The meaning "person" it cannot bear; as it does not occur in this sense till the fourth century, when Athanasius used it in distinction from *οὐσία*; affirming of the Trinity one *οὐσία*, three *ὑποστάσεις*. The phrase then teaches that *Christ was the representation of very God*, so to speak; and finds its best parallel and illustration in Col. 1: 15, which has been already adduced, *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου*.

*φέρων τε τὰ πάντα, κ.τ.λ.* The original signification of the participle here is that of "bearing;" indeed, we see in the English word the cognate consonants b, r, showing its kindred. From this sense *φέρων* naturally comes to mean "upholding and governing;" both which ideas are included here. "God's works of providence are, his most holy, wise and powerful *preserving and governing* all his creatures, and all their actions." (Shorter Cat.) In Numb. 11: 14, and Deut. 1: 9, the Septuagint translates  $\text{נָשָׂא}$  by *φέρω*, in both which places, Moses' whole work, as the ruler and guardian of Israel, is meant by it: "I am not able *to bear* this people alone." In later Greek writers it occurs in the sense of 'to govern or rule.' Thus, Plutarch's Lucul. 6, *Κέθηγον ἀνθρόντα τῇ δόξῃ τότε, καὶ φέροντα τὴν πόλιν*. So say Wahl and Robinson, following Passow. The reader may also compare Col. 1: 17, *τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε*.

*τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* we will render:



“by his omnipotent word.” So that the rendering of the English version, “upholding all things by the word of his power,” may be adopted as entirely good, if we give to upholding the ideas of sustaining and governing.

*καθαρισμὸν... τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.* This expresses the “purification,” not only of the moral pollution, but also of the guilt of sin. This double work is every where through this Epistle ascribed to Christ, and the understanding of it is the key to the meaning of many passages. Chap. 9: 14, “The blood of Christ . . . shall *purge your conscience* from dead works *to serve the living God.*” v. 26, “He hath appeared *to put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself.” 10: 10, “By the which will *we are sanctified* by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” v. 14, “For by one offering he hath *perfected* forever them that are *sanctified.*” All these and many more passages are made luminous by the idea that the author has ever before his mind the double consequence of Christ’s sacrifice, pardon of guilt, and deliverance from the power of sin. That the word *καθαρισμὸς* will bear the sense of “atonement,” is manifest from the Septuagint use of it as a translation for כִּפּוּרִים in Exodus 29: 36 and 30: 10. And in Job 7: 21, וְיָמָה לְאַחַשָׁא פְּשָׁעִי וְתַעֲבִיר אֶת עֲוֹנִי is translated *διὰ τὸ οὐκ ἐποίησω τῆς ἀνομίας μου λήθην, καὶ καθαρισμὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου;* The propriety of the same translation is also proved by the use of the verb *καθαρίζω* in this sense in 1 John 1: 7, *καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας,* “cleanseth us from all sin.” See also a similar use of

the verb in Hebr. 9 : 22, 23, καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον . . . Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ ἐπουράνια κρείττωσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας : where the purifications alluded to are the well known sprinklings and sacrifices of *atonement* so fully described in the Levitical law. That a true, *vicarious expiation of guilt* is the leading idea in the text under discussion, is plain from the adjunct δι' ἑαυτοῦ ; which is abundantly shown to be equivalent to "by the sacrifice of himself," from a comparison with the parallel expressions in Hebr. 9 : 12, 14, and 26. Thus, v. 12, "Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood (διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, blood offered in a sacrificial sense corresponding to that of its types), he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us;" v. 13, 14, "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying (καθαρότητα) of the flesh ; how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . purge your conscience" (καθαριεῖ), &c. ; v. 26, "But now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin, *by the sacrifice of himself*" (διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ). This putting away of sin is the καθαρισμὸς of the text, and the διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ is but a fuller expression of its phrase δι' ἑαυτοῦ. The meaning may also be illustrated by 1 Peter 2 : 24, ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν. Here we have

the clearest possible expression of the idea of a vicarious atonement ("He bare away our sins, in his own body on the tree"); and at the same time, a clear reference to the second part of Christ's double work, deliverance from the power of sin. That we are correct in rendering *καθαρισμὸν* by atonement (in its true vicarious sense), is also evident from the fundamental nature of this work, as it is described in all the Scriptures, and especially in this Epistle. The passages above referred to, are sufficient specimens of this, and especially the last cited. In accordance with this are the best Biblical Lexicons. Wahl's *Clavis* gives to the word under discussion, as its fourth leading sense, *Expiatio*, and cites 2 Peter 1: 9, Hebr. 1: 3. Bretschneider's *Lex. Manuale*, N. T. gives: *De purgatione a peccato, et liberatione ab ejus culpa per sanguinem facta*, and cites in support the same texts. We sum up this discussion, then, by saying: we claim the meaning of a *proper atonement* for *καθαρισμὸν*, and its kindred words, on the ground, first, of its clear Septuagint usage in this sense; second, of the force given to it by its adjuncts and contexts in the passages cited; third, of the fundamental nature of the work, which is thus defined by the whole tenour of Scripture; and fourth, of the testimony of the Lexicons. We have thus carefully settled the proper meaning of this, which is a leading word throughout this Epistle, at this its first occurrence, in order that we may be able to assume our conclusion without further discussion, whenever it recurs. In conclusion, the author manifestly uses it

here, in the comprehensive introduction of his treatise, as embodying the sum and substance of Christ's redemption. It includes all that work, which, when finished, left him nothing more to do, but to "sit down at the right hand of the majesty on high."

In the words *ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης*, &c., we have an instance of the frequent substitution of the abstract for the concrete. Nearly the same words occur in chap. 8: 1, "He hath set down on the right hand of Him who is majestic." To illustrate the proper force of this expression we may cite Ps. 110: 1, "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool;" Hebr. 10: 12, "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool;" and Hebr. 12: 2, "Is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." To sit on the right hand of a throne denotes, in Bible usage, honour, approbation, and reward, conferred by the monarch. Thus Bathsheba was seated by her son king Solomon; and in this sense the saints are elevated to Christ's throne. But in a higher sense it signifies participation in authority and dignity. This is its meaning here. It should be borne in mind, that the Scriptures always attribute this exaltation to Christ incarnate, the Mediator, never to the *Λόγος*, in his original nature. It is not his original divine authority; but a conferred exaltation and authority, the reward of his humiliation. (See Stuart on Hebr. Excursus 4.) In his divine nature simply considered, the Son cannot be

exalted. He was already infinite in majesty. And had our Mediator been a mere creature, he could not have shared thus in the divine glory and government. If further confirmation is desired, of the meaning claimed, the reader may consult Acts 2 : 33, 36, Eph. 1 : 20, 22, Phil. 2 : 6-11, 1 Peter 3 : 22. He is made head over all things; and all powers, principalities, authorities, are subject to him. These places settle the meaning in others, where the context is not so strong.

V. 4. *ἡρείτων* may be best rendered "superior." This superiority of Christ over angels is both in nature and dignity; as appears from the Apostle's previous words, and subsequent arguments. He has already declared Christ to be the bright manifestation of very God, the heir, creator, upholder, and governor of all things; and the son of God. He is about to prove him superior to angels, not only in his nature but his functions. The translation of *ἡρείτων* by "superior" may be justified by a reference to Hebr. 7 : 7, "Beyond all contradiction the less (*τὸ ἕλαττον*) is blessed of the better" (*ἡρείτερος*), where the sense, and the antithesis to *ἕλαττον* plainly require it to be translated "the superior." 9 : 23, "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (*ἡρείτεροι θυσίαι παρὰ ταύτας*)—"superior sacrifices." 10 : 34, "Knowing that ye have in heaven a better (*ἡρείτερον*, superior) and an enduring substance."

*γενόμενος*. "Being superior *in his mediatorial*

*character;*” for in this He is considered throughout this Epistle, and the passages which the author now proceeds to quote, were all applied originally to Him as Mediator. The divine nature, however, is not excluded from consideration, for it is at the foundation of his mediatorial work, and of all these passages.

Here, then, is the first point to be proved: *Christ's superiority to angels in his mediatorial work.* The first argument for this proposition is, that he has inherited or received a more excellent name than they.

*παρὰ* is often used with the accusative in the sense of comparison, as in this clause. Similar examples may be seen in v. 9, chap. 2: 7, 9, 9: 23, 11: 4, 12: 24, and in Luke 3: 13, 13: 2, Rom. 1: 25, 14: 5. The usage is fully recognised both by classic and New Test. grammarians. (Winer's Idioms New Test. §53, z. p. 321.)

*κεκληρονόμηκεν* we will simply translate “received;” for so the application of the name, in the passages which the author cites, requires us to understand it. Yet we conceive there is a reference in the term to the relationship existing between the Father and the Son. This relationship is recognised in Ps. 2: 7, as the basis, so to speak, of the formal deed or covenant announced in the succeeding verse. Since he is God's Son, he will give him ‘the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.’ The verb *κεκληρονόμηκεν* seems to be used here in allusion to *κληρονόμον* in v. 2, and may receive a similar illustration. And the first citation of the author, which is from Ps. 2: 7, confirms our correctness in ex-

plaining from that passage the reception of the superior name by Christ.

The word *ὄνομα* is by some rendered "title;" and by some, "dignity." The former is the more correct; for the argument is plainly from the title to the dignity. The title conferred shows the dignity imparted. But yet the latter is implied, of course; for the Apostle would not argue from an empty title. It is a *διαφόρω* *τερὸν ὄνομα*; different in its nature and excellence. Compare Hebr. 8: 6.

---

5 *Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων· "Υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε;" καὶ πάλιν· "Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς*  
 6 *υἰόν;" "Ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότο-*  
 7 *κον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει· "Καὶ προσ-*  
 8 *κνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ." Καὶ*  
 9 *πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει· "Ὁ ποιῶν*  
 10 *τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λει-*  
 11 *τουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα." πρὸς δὲ τὸν*  
 12 *υἰόν· "Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*  
 13 *τοῦ αἰῶνος· ῥάβδος ἐνδύτητος ἢ ῥάβδος τῆς*  
 14 *βασιλείας σου. Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ ἐμί-*  
 15 *σησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ*  
 16 *θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιᾶσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετό-*  
 17 *χους σου." Καί· "Σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν*  
 18 *γῆν εἰθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἶδὼν*  
 19 *οἱ οὐρανοί. Αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις·*  
 20 *καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται, καὶ*  
 21 *ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἐλίξεις αὐτούς, καὶ ἀλλαγῆσον-*  
 22 *ται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ*

13 ἐκλείψουσι.” Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰρηκέ  
 ποτε. “Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς  
 14 ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου;” Οὐχὶ  
 πάντες εἰςὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν  
 ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν  
 σωτηρίαν;

V. 5. The first quotation by which the writer sustains his position is from Ps. 2 : 7. The Father there acknowledges the relationship between himself and the Son, and accordingly *deeds* to him an inheritance, the authority over all nations and all things. The transaction was one *ab eterno*; and therefore the relation is as eternal. It was not first constituted by his incarnation; nor by his subsequent exaltation. Not by the former, for his mediatorial power conferred in virtue of his sonship began to be exercised long before his incarnation. The voice from heaven, saying, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matt. 3 : 17), was but an acknowledgment before men of the Son, now incarnate, and thus visibly manifested to them as the Son of God by the miraculous conception of his human nature by the power of the Holy Ghost. And this meaning we may properly give to Luke 1 : 35, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” The miraculous birth of his human part did not constitute him the Son of God, but evinced him to be such. Nor was the sonship constituted by his exaltation; for the apostles conjointly apply the cir-



cumstances of this Psalm to the persecutions which Christ suffered prior to his resurrection (and therefore to his exaltation), beginning with the attempts of Herod the Great to destroy him, and ending with his sufferings under Pilate. See Acts 4: 24-28. Nor may any thing be inferred to the contrary from the use which Paul makes of this passage from the second Psalm in Acts 13: 33, "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" for a careful examination of the Apostle's speech on that occasion, will show that he used the passage to prove the fulfilment of the promise made to the fathers. Compare vv. 23 and 32. And this was a promise not of Christ's resurrection; but that he should be raised up as a saviour to Israel. Our translators have there rendered *ἀναστήσας* = "raised up *again*," gratuitously; for the meaning of the promise is, that God would *rear a saviour* for Israel. In proof of this, the Apostle *afterwards* proceeds, in v. 34, to raise his resurrection as a separate point ("Ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, κ.τ.λ."), and to support it, quotes a passage altogether different, but appropriate. When thus explained, Paul makes the same primary and special application of the second Psalm, in Acts 13: 33, which the other apostles do in Acts 4: 24-28, viz.: to the period of the Son's incarnation; and the passage quoted proves the sonship of Christ not only in, but *previous to* his incarnation.

The phrase *σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, confirms that

interpretation which understands here an allusion to the eternal sonship of Christ. The explanation: "This day I have constituted thee king," is inadmissible, because, first, it is by no means established that the kings, even Jewish ones, are ever as such, called "sons of God." Certainly there is no instance where one is addressed as "son of God." Gesenius refers us to Ps. 2: 7, which we have already repeated; to Ps. 82: 6, "I have said, ye are gods, and all of you children of the Most High;" to Ps. 89: 27, "Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth;" and to 2 Sam. 7: 14, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son," &c. See the places in their context. The first and last of these passages are here applied to *Christ*, by our Epistle; and this excludes them from the argument. In 1 Chron. 28: 6, the last sentence quoted by Gesenius is indeed applied to Solomon: "Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts; for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father;" but it is in a different sense from that in which the Apostle here applies it to Christ, or his argument is vain. And as applied to Solomon, it does not mean, "I will make him king," but, "when he is king, I will be his patron." The passage in Ps. 82: 6, is addressed to the theocratic judges collectively, not individually. And Ps. 89: 27, is manifestly, from the context, to be referred to David's greater Antitype, the Messiah. Let the reader consult vv. 28, 29, 36, 37. Second: the phrase, "I have begotten thee," is nowhere else applied by God to any king, in any sense, certainly not in the sense of

making him a king; and such language as God's begetting, wherever employed in the Scriptures, means more than a mere moral relationship between the persons concerned. In Jer. 2: 27, "They, their kings, their princes, and their priests and their prophets, say to a stock, Thou art my father; and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth." But this is only an idolatrous ascription of *creative* attributes to a stock or a stone; and is made equally by idolatrous Jews of royal and of lower rank. In 1 Cor. 4: 15, the Apostle professes himself instrumentally the author of the spiritual existence of the Corinthian Christians: *Ἐν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα*; that is, Christ had, through the Gospel, spiritually regenerated them, by his instrumentality. The phrase expresses a relationship much more than moral between them and Christ; and this the Apostle designs to express, as the means of magnifying his own claims upon them, as the instrument of bringing it about. Third: if the language, "This day have I begotten thee," expresses only the making of the person referred to a king, why the boundless inheritance promised? "I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." This question applies with especial force to those who understand only a temporal monarchy to be meant. If all this effort to lower the sense of the passage is designed to make it applicable to a David or a Solomon, then they are but temporal, local monarchs; and the application of the next clause becomes impracticable.

*Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων.* No angel was ever thus called, "the Son of God," "the begotten of God." They are called "sons of God," as in Job 1: 6, 2: 1, 38: 7. With these may be compared Ps. 29: 1, and 89: 7, in the original (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים). But so is Adam called in Luke 3: 38, "Which was the son of God," and in the same sense. And God's people are often called "sons or children of God." Gen. 6: 2, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair." 1 John 3: 1, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!" And the passage has already been cited from 1 Cor. 4: 15, where the Apostle represents his converts as the spiritual progeny of God, through his instrumentality. While the title of sons has thus been given to angels, our first father, and saints, the argument of this fifth verse compels us to conclude that it is in a sense entirely distinct from that in which it is given to Christ. They are God's offspring, as they are his creatures, or regenerated by him; Christ, as he is only-begotten, and of the same nature.

*καὶ πάλιν· Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, κ.τ.λ.* This quotation is from 2 Sam. 7: 14. (The reader is requested to consider carefully the context from vv. 12-16.) The promises there made were to the seed of David, viewed as a unit: hence the singular number is used. V. 12, "I will set up *thy seed* after thee . . . and I will establish *his* kingdom. *He* shall build a house for my name," &c. This collective promise was to be fulfilled partly in one, and partly in another of

his posterity. Some parts, as the Apostle's quotation now under discussion, were designed to apply, in an inferior sense, to Solomon as the type. "He shall build a house for my name," was directly true of Solomon. A reference to the parallel passage in 1 Chron. 28: 6, 7, makes this equally manifest. But even these parts apply in a fuller and higher sense to Christ as the Antitype. So we find David, in 1 Chron. 22: 9, 10, reciting this promise, and in v. 11, applying it to Solomon. And Solomon also is seen, in 1 Kings 5: 5, and 8: 19, applying it to himself. But while a part of the promise can be applied in a lower sense to Solomon, vv. 13, 14 (first clause), and also 16, evidently look much farther than to him: "I will establish the throne of his kingdom *forever*." "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." "And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established *forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever*." David manifestly understood that a part of the promise was to be extended much farther; for he says in v. 19, "But thou (Jehovah) hast spoken also of thy servant's house *for a great while to come*." Nor can the expressions of duration here, גַּד כּוֹלֵם, &c., be degraded, as Grotius does, to mean only a comparatively long duration. For their meaning is fixed by the parallel passages in Ps. 89, where the promise is repeated, and the expression is explained, v. 30, by כִּימֵי שָׁמַיִם and לְעַד; and in Ps. 72, where there is a reference to these promises, and in v. 17, the duration of the kingdom of this seed of David is said to be לְעַד לְעַד שְׁמַשׁ. It is very frequently the case that in pro-

phesies a whole family or race is viewed as an individual; and then whatever belongs to the different members is ascribed to him. Examples may be seen in the promise to Abraham's seed, as explained by Gal. 3: 16, and the blessing of Jacob, Gen. 49.

If, therefore, the Apostle seems to any to have misapplied this quotation to the Messiah, it is only because he had a deeper and truer insight into the messianic meaning of the passage than superficial readers. While there are parts of the prophecy which terminate on Solomon, or other human descendants of David, there are others which can only have their proper application to his Divine seed, the "root and offspring of David." Among these is the passage quoted. In the light of the seventy-second Psalm, whose pious raptures seem to have been inspired by these very promises, it becomes most manifest that the throne, kingdom, and sonship are, in their full sense, only those of Christ; and to him were the praises of the Psalmist directed by the Holy Ghost, perhaps unconsciously to himself. "A greater than Solomon was there."

V. 6. "Οταν δὲ πάλιν, κ.τ.λ. πάλιν may here mean "alio tempore," "on another occasion." So Bretschneider (whom Stuart follows), supporting his definition by reference to John 1: 35, "Again the next day after John stood," &c. (Τῆ ἐπαύριον πάλιν); John 8: 12, "Then spake Jesus again unto them," &c. (Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν), &c. Or, more probably, it may mean "again," not as qualifying the verb εἰσαγάγη, but as connecting what the writer proceeds to

add relating to the same subject: "Again, I would add another consideration, viz.," &c. Thus it is used in Matt. 13: 44, 18: 19, Luke 13: 20, to introduce additional illustration by parable: "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field;" *Πάλιν ὁμοίᾳ ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ., &c., &c.* In like manner it is used in Hebr. 2: 13, 10: 30, to add farther quotations. And accordingly, it may be used to introduce an additional argument (for the *ratio usûs* is the same), which is its sense here. De Wette renders, "Und abermal, werm er," &c.

*εἰσαγάγη* is 2 aor. subjunctive. The aorists subjunctive are currently used with *ἄν* in the New Test. for a simple future. See Mark 8: 38, *ὅταν ἔλθῃ*, "when he shall come." Rom. 11: 27, *ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι*, "when I shall take away their sins." So Winer, §43, 5. But it must be confessed that some indefiniteness of time is expressed in all these instances. Here we are compelled to translate the phrase as substantially indicative; and to confess that, as such, it is not strictly classic. The nominative to be supplied is *Θεός*.

But the question now arises: What introduction of Christ is here intended? Whitby, Grotius, Wetstein, Tholuck, answer: "His re-introduction at his resurrection and exaltation." Stuart urges against this view, that no *first* introduction had been spoken of before; an objection which is not in itself decisive, because the text does not lay the stress upon the fact that this was a second introduction, even if understood as Whitby, &c., do. But there lies the further objection, that such a

phrase is a very unique and unnatural mode of expressing the fact of Christ's resurrection and exaltation. And this is an event very often mentioned by the sacred writers, and especially by Paul, but always in different phraseology. Others, as Calvin and Kuinoël, say, the words signify Christ's introduction at his birth; and to support this, refer to the chorus of angels (Luke 1: 28-35, 2: 8-14) which celebrated that event. But there is no evidence that the injunction to worship the first-begotten, was given on that occasion. And furthermore, the conditions of the argument in Hebrews require the apostle to argue only from Old Test. Scriptures, as he does in all the rest of his citations. The common interpretation regards these words as a reference to some passage in the Old Test. which represents the succeeding command to worship the Messiah as addressed to the angels, on his introduction into the world. And such a reference may receive some illustration from the fact that it is a current usage of the Old Test. to represent the prophet as *doing* that which he only predicts. See Isaiah 6: 10, Jer. 1: 10, Micah 2: 12. So the introduction of Christ here may be taken, possibly, to mean the prediction of his introduction. But, merely saying that the common interpretation looks in the right direction, we will proceed to explain the next word, before undertaking the more definite settlement of the reference.

*τὸν πρωτότοκον* is a title of honour, obviously designating Christ (and bestowed, perhaps, not without reference to his being the only-begotten Son of his



Father). It is given to him also Col. 1: 15, as before, and at the head of, all creation: *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*; v. 16, *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, κ.τ.λ. δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται*. The meaning is fully defined by v. 17, "And he is before all things; and by him all things consist." Not that Christ was produced in time, as creatures were; only he was the first production. But the phrase asserts his simple and absolute preëxistence. In like sense he is called, Rev. 3: 14, *ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "the chief," &c. In Rom. 8: 29 he is called *πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*. It is true, that in Hebr. 12: 23 the same distinction is extended to his believing and glorified people, *ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων*. In Col. 1: 18, and Rev. 1: 5, Christ receives this title, as the first to rise from the dead, *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*. By weighing all these instances, we shall be convinced that the *priority* expressed in the *πρῶτος* is as much one of dignity in the nature of his birth, as of time of its occurrence. Not only is he the first of God's offspring in time, but the chief, the preëminent one, of God's begotten, in the dignity of the relation. Used absolutely, as in this passage, it must be so understood. In Ps. 89: 27, it is applied to the Messiah, and is the translation for the Hebr. term *בְּכוֹר*. The Rabbins, according to Michaelis, called God himself "the first-born of the world."

But whence has the Apostle taken his quotation? The Septuagint translation of Deut. 32: 43 gives the very words. But all the copies of the Septuagint do

not concur in this, for a few omit, and one varies the reading. It is also wanting in the Hebrew, and all the ancient versions. Nor does it suit the context. And if it is properly a part of the text, it refers not to the Messiah, but to God; and there is no reference to any introduction of the object of the worship at that time. In Ps. 97: 7 we read *כָּל־אֲלֹהִים יִשְׁתַּחֲוֹּי־לוֹ*, which the Septuagint renders *Προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*. Thence it is now generally conceded the Apostle quoted; and the differences between this translation, and the words as they stand in our text, *καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ*, are not too great to admit the probability of such a quotation, when we remember that the New Test. writers often do not quote the Septuagint verbatim. Kimchi says that the Rabbins expounded this Psalm, as well as all from Ps. 93–101, of what should come to pass in the days of the Messiah. Although there may not be enough in the Psalm to compel us by internal evidence to regard it as messianic, certainly there is nothing to forbid it. We may refer it, as it seems probable the Jews of Paul's day did, to the regal inauguration of the Messiah in the world; and then the citation is appropriate. And whatever the critics may say, the translation of *כָּל־אֲלֹהִים* by *ἄγγελοι*, here made by the Septuagint and Paul, can be abundantly sustained by the examples of Ps. 8: 5 and 138: 1.

The Apostle's argument then is, that Christ is superior to angels, because God has ordained that they shall be worshippers, He the object of their worship.

V. 7 contains an antithesis, indicated by its *πρὸς μέν*, to the *πρὸς δὲ* of v. 8. The preposition may here be best rendered, “concerning” the angels; *λέγει*, “saith,” i. e. the Scripture, or rather, God speaking in them. The following words, *Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, κ.τ.λ.*, are evidently from the Ps. 104: 4, *עֲשֵׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחַוּת מְשַׁרְתָּיו אֵשׁ לִהְיוֹת*. The sentiment evidently is, “He maketh the angels as the winds (viz. his servants), and his ministers as the flaming fire,” i. e. the lightnings. So the Apostle’s argument requires. This meaning the parallelism favours; and such is the natural meaning of the Hebrew, as may be evinced by a comparison with the words *הַשָּׁם עָבִים רְכוּבוֹ* in v. 3: “who maketh the clouds as his chariot.” Nor is there any thing in the context to forbid this meaning. It is indeed objected, by Hengstenberg and Alexander, that since the context refers wholly to inanimate objects, it forbids the introduction here of the spiritual or intelligent. But referring to Ps. 18: 10 (in the Hebr. 11), we read, in a similar connexion with the inanimate elements, “He rode upon a cherub and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind.” And in Ps. 148: 1, 2, 3, &c., all the angels and hosts of God are associated with sun and moon, stars, heavens, waters, dragons, deeps, &c., &c., in the duty of praising God. Besides, the interpretation, “He maketh the winds his messengers, and the flaming fires his ministers,” makes the first clause of this verse substantially a repetition of the last clause of the preceding one, “who walketh upon the wings of the wind.” As to the idea which has been

urged, that the sense we have above given would be inapposite to the Apostle's argument, it is founded on a misapprehension of his scope. He does not intend a comparison of angels and Christ, in respect to their faithfulness, but a contrast between the manner in which they are spoken of (*viz.*, as being God's servile ministers, like the winds and lightnings), and that in which He is addressed as a divine monarch, seated on an eternal throne. When the Apostle's argument is properly apprehended, it is seen at once that our sense is by far the more apposite.

Vv. 8, 9, present a quotation from Ps. 45: 7, 8. The first *ὦ Θεός* in v. 9, is in the vocative, as is אֱלֹהִים, in the original. So it is rendered by all the ancient versions. The reader may here consult with advantage, Hengstenberg's *Christol.* p. 91, on Ps. 45, to which he is referred for a solid proof of the messianic character of this Psalm. His argument here leaves no doubt as to the Apostle's understanding of the original: כְּסֶמֶךָ וְיָדֶךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד, &c. De Wette, who in the *Psalms* translates, *Dein Thron Gottes stehet immer und ewig, &c., darum salbte dich Gott, dein Gott mit Freuden-* del, &c., in his commentary on the *Epistle* translates: *Dein Thron o Gott stehet, &c. &c., darum hat dich, o Gott, dein Gott, &c. &c.* Here we see operating the strongest dogmatism.

In the passage, the Messiah is addressed as a divine being, in his mediatorial capacity—God manifest in the flesh, elevated to the highest dignity above all principality and power. The proper and full description of

this dignity may be seen in Eph. 1 : 20, 21, "And set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, *οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.*" "He is superior to, and has authority over, all in the lower creation, and in heaven." Stuart needlessly concedes that, in these passages, the term *Θεός* is applied to Christ in his kingly, not in his divine nature. (See Stuart *in loco.*) Indeed, this is a concession ruinous to the argument for Christ's divinity, if his difficulties be carried out. For these difficulties would apply to almost all, if not every passage which affirms divinity of Christ. They are all removed by the obvious remark, that the two natures were united in one person; so that in the same context, or even the same clause, the attributes of both may be mentioned. Thus are the attributes of the divine and human mentioned in the same breath, in Zech. 13 : 7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd; and *against the man that is my fellow.*" See also Isaiah 9 : 6. We could not have expected otherwise, unless, in his mediatorial character, he had been only human or only divine. In Isaiah 7 : 14, he is born of a virgin; and at the same time he is properly named "God with us." In Isaiah 9 : 6, 7, he is a "child born," a "son given," "upon the throne of David;" but at the same time he is the "mighty God, the everlasting Father." Zech. 13 : 7, he is "a man," God's "shepherd," and yet, his "fellow." In John 1 : 1, 14, he is God made flesh, and dwelling among us. In Rom. 9 : 5, he is "of the fathers, as con-

cerning the flesh;" and at the same time, "he is over all, God blessed forever." See also Rom. 1: 3, 4.

V. 9. *ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιᾶσεως*. The quotation is still continued from Ps. 45: 8. These words are a translation of *יִשָּׁחַ יְהִי*. This is not an anointing of consecration to kingly office, as is supposed by Stuart. For it is the consequence of the righteousness and benevolence of his rule, not the introduction to that rule; and the scope of the Psalm shows that the occasion of it is rather a nuptial than a coronation solemnity. The anointing is, therefore, one of festive honour and enjoyment. Such anointings with medicated oil were a special part of Israelitish hospitalities and honours. Thus David, Ps. 23: 5, representing himself as God's guest, says: "Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anointest my head with oil." In Luke 7: 46, our Saviour says, "My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment." Consult Jahn's *Archæol.* §148. As a reward for his mediatorial work, Christ has been endued by his Father with spiritual honours and joys above his fellows.

*παρα τοὺς μετόχους σου*. Literally, "Beyond thy sharers." Perhaps the best comment on these words is that which we have already seen in Eph. 1: 20, 21, or that which we may find in Rev. 19: 16, "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

VV. 10-12, are obviously quoted from Ps. 102: 26-28. With a slight difference in order, they are an

exact quotation of the Septuagint. Since the Apostle here so clearly applies the words to Christ, we must suppose the Psalm to be messianic, or run into infidelity. Having established the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament, we are absolutely bound by their interpretations of the Old Test. Scriptures; and we cannot stop to discuss with German infidels the character of a Psalm which they apply to Christ. The Spirit speaking by the apostles has a right to be his own interpreter of what he has said by the prophets. But laying this aside, it would be a position not a little arrogant for us to assume, to say that a passage cannot with propriety admit of an application to Christ, because it seems to us to contain no decisive reference to him, while at the same time it contains nothing incompatible with such a reference; when Jews, with all their superior knowledge of Jewish modes of thought and language, and current interpretations, so apply it. But let the reader of the Bible study thoroughly those passages of the Old Test. whose application to the Messiah is easily demonstrable from their own internal evidences, irrespective of the inspired expositions of the New Test. Let him thus learn how familiar messianic ideas were to the writers. Let him then pass on to those passages where the internal evidence of a messianic meaning is less, though still satisfactory. And let him thus see the manner in which Jewish Christians introduced and expressed those ideas. He will then have no difficulty in believing that those ideas are to be found in passages where the marks are not sufficiently strong

to enable us certainly to prove, or even to discern them, without the guidance of New Test. inspiration. That guidance we must implicitly follow. But we may properly claim that there are at least plausible internal evidences in the Psalm 102, of its messianic character. It is not unnatural to suppose that the complaint of vv. 1-11, is addressed to the mercy seat, through that "Daysman," with whose offices and divinity Old Test. saints are known to have been familiar. And if we also suppose that the prayer and hope of the petitioner looked forward particularly to that era and work, in the fulness of time, which are the source of all the help and redemption of God's people, we shall easily believe that "the set time to favour Zion," v. 13, is the era of the Messiah's ministry. The Jehovah who would then arise, and have mercy on her, would therefore be Jehovah Christ. And to this well agree the predictions of the conversion of the Gentiles, in vv. 15, 18, 22. When was this glorious access of heathens expected by the prophets to occur? Indisputably, after the coming of Christ. And the close resemblance, if not intentional allusion of Isaiah 61: 1, 2, &c., to vv. 19, 20, gives a still stronger argument. For Christ, in Luke 4: 21, expressly ascribes that passage to himself. We cannot make, with Stuart, the admission that the Apostle's use of the passage is appropriate, even though all messianic meaning be denied to the Psalm.

The words and phrases of the quotation need little explanation. *ἐλίξεις αὐτούς, καὶ ἀλλαγῆσονται* are the Septuagint translations for the verbs *יְהַלֵּךְ* and *יִתְּנֶה*,



the one Hiphil and the other Kal from פָּלַךְ = 'to pass away.' The Apostle simply follows the Septuagint. The translation of the former verb conveys a stronger figure than is fairly expressed in the original (to *roll together*, like a garment which is to be henceforth disused, instead of simply *to change*). But the general sense is the same. The whole quotation clearly asserts for its subjects, the work of creation of both heavens and earth, and the attributes of immutability and immortality. And since the Apostle applies them to the Son, he must be truly divine. The work of creation, particularly, is the highest evidence of divinity which the Scriptures can present. See Hebr. 3:4, "But he that built all things is God." Here, then, the Apostle offers the climax of his arguments, and asserts for Christ that infinite exaltation which he had briefly intimated in v. 2.

V. 13. The quotation of this verse is from Ps. 110:1. The rendering of the Septuagint is exactly followed. That the Messiah is the subject of this Psalm, is clearly demonstrated by Hengstenberg, *Christology* (pp. 107-117, Keith's transl.), and the critical reader is referred to his discussion. While it is unnecessary to consume space by reciting his arguments, we will add, for the benefit of those who may not have access to such works, that there is no Psalm whose messianic character is so abundantly proved by the New Test. In Matt. 22:41-46, Christ expressly applies it (and indeed applies the verse here quoted) to the Messiah; and the Pharisees do not dare to dispute the application. In the parallel place of Mark (12:36), we find the same

statement, with the addition that David then spoke by the Holy Ghost. Peter, in Acts 2: 35, 36, applies it to Christ; and Paul, in 1 Cor. 15: 25, 28. The Apostle's argument here is elliptical: "To which of the angels hath God ever said this? But he hath said it to Christ; witness Ps. 110: 1. Therefore, Christ is superior to angels."

V. 14. *Οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, κ.τ.λ.* This does not seem to be a direct quotation, but the foundation for the assertion is laid in many Scriptures of the Old Test. Ps. 91: 11, for instance, may be cited ("For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways"), and Ps. 103: 21 ("Bless the Lord, all ye his hosts; ye ministers of his that do his pleasure"). In the Sept. *λείτουργοι αὐτοῦ, ποιοῦντες, &c.* It is to this passage that the Apostle most probably alludes. The terms sufficiently prove the correctness of our interpretation of v. 7 above.

"Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to a service," *διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας, κ.τ.λ.?* This we render, in accordance with the regular usage, "*on account of those who are to inherit salvation.*" Christians, in virtue of their union with Christ, are sons of God, and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ. See Rom. 8: 17, Gal. 4: 7. This verse carries on the Apostle's demonstration. While Christ is a triumphant king, and the saints not only his subjects, but his Father's heirs, sharers of his glory, and assessors on his throne, angels are ministers to the welfare of those saints. How inferior are they then to Him? This truth also gives a most con-

soling and awakening view of the privileges of believers as enjoying the unseen protection of these pure, loving, and powerful spirits.

The Apostle thus triumphantly demonstrates his point. But he also gives us an irresistible argument for the proper divinity of Christ. If he whom the Scriptures represent as being in Himself a bright exhibition of divine perfections, and the exact image of very (and invisible) God, whom they call *Son of God* in a sense proving him higher than the angels; if He whom they further represent as worshipped by angels, and as (properly) called God, who sitteth upon an everlasting throne, swaying a sceptre of righteousness, creating, upholding, governing all, and subsisting amidst all the revolutions of nature unchangeably and forever the same; if He is not the true God, whom then can they teach to be such?

## CHAPTER II.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle interrupts his argument for a moment, in order to apply the truth he has now established, to the confirmation of his readers, vv. 1-4; and then resuming the argument, after briefly showing that Christ's humanity argued no inferiority, vv. 5-9, he exhibits the reasons of his becoming man, vv. 10-18.

To be more particular: on account of what he had said and proven (*Διὰ τοῦτο*), they ought more carefully to attend to the things which they had heard of Christ, v. 1. For if transgressors of a covenant ministered by angels were certainly and justly punished, those who neglected the dispensation of Christ, which effected so great a salvation, and was wonderfully confirmed by divine seals, could not escape, vv. 2-4.

The resumption of his argument is logical. How shall we escape the punishment due to such neglect? For (*γὰρ*) not to the angels has God committed this dispensation, v. 5, but to one whom David foresaw and foretold, as human it is true (vv. 6-8), but in terms which teach his infinite exaltation (vv. 6-8); an exaltation, of course, above angels. For (*γὰρ*) universal subjection is promised, the fulfilment of which is seen only in Christ. (Of course, more than the supremacy of man merely over the lower creatures in this world

is meant, v. 8, for we see, in process of fulfilment, a higher and more literal accomplishment in Christ.) He having been made a little lower than the angels on account of the suffering of death, has been crowned with glory, that he may extend the benefits of his death to all his people, v. 9.

The *rationale* (γὰρ) of all this ensues. It became God, in saving his people, to perfect the author of their salvation, i. e. to bring him to his glorious end (τελειῶσαι) through sufferings; for in the nature of the case, the Redeemer and the redeemed are (or must be) in all proper respects one: hence he condescends to call them brethren; like them he puts his trust in God, and he claims them as the children whom God had given him, vv. 10–13. Since, then, the children partook of flesh and blood, He took part of the same: first, that by his own death he might frustrate and destroy the power of Satan, whose captives they were by nature, and deliver those who, in fear of deserved death, were all their lives in bondage, vv. 14, 15. For (γὰρ) He did not undertake for the angels (then, indeed [δῆτον], he might have appeared in a different nature or form), but for the seed of Abraham (i. e. in the faith), who were flesh and blood: wherefore, second, He must, in all proper respects, be like them, in order that He may be a *compassionate* and *faithful High-Priest* for them in matters pertaining to God, to make propitiation of their sins. (Such a High-Priest he is;) for having been tried to the extreme, he can succour those that are tempted, vv. 16–18.

## COMMENTARY.

1 Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως ἡμᾶς προζέχειν τοῖς  
 2 ἀκουσθεῖσι, μήποτε παραρῶμεν. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι'  
 ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος, καὶ  
 πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοή ἔλαβεν ἔνδικον μι-  
 3 σθαποδοσίαν· πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύ-  
 της ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα  
 λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων  
 4 εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ  
 σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι  
 καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ  
 θέλησιν.

V. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο looks back to chap. 1: v. 1, and the argument which follows. "Seeing that God hath spoken to us by so exalted an Internuntius," we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which have been heard. Τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι represents all that the Christians of Palestine had heard, whether from the Lord at first hand, or from the eye-witnesses of his ministry, concerning Christ and his kingdom, his nature, work, offices, and doctrine. The obligation drawn from the majesty of this divine messenger does not limit itself to those who were personal spectators and objects of his ministry, but embraces all who have sufficient evidence that such a Prophet has spoken to them.

παραρῶμεν has been interpreted in three different ways: 1. Chrysostom and Theophylact render it by ἀπολώμεθα, ἐκπέσωμεν, and appeal in justification

to Prov. 3: 21, which the Septuagint renders, *ὄψις, μὴ παραρροῦσῆς*; our version, "My son, let them not depart from thine eyes." Consult Wolfii curæ Philolog. This sense of the verb wants the confirmation of sufficient usage. 2. From the primary sense of the verb, "to flow by," Stuart (as also Robinson in his Lexicon), gets the meaning, "to pass by," "to neglect," "to transgress," and appeals also to Prov. 3: 21. But the Hebr. there is *בְּנִי אַל־תִּרְלָזֶנּוּ מִמַּעֲיָנֶיךָ נֶצֶד הַיְשָׁרָה וּמִזְמָרָה*. Gesenius gives for the verb, *לָרַז*, the meanings, "to turn away," "to depart." The Septuagint have omitted *מִמַּעֲיָנֶיךָ*, but by rendering *παραρροῦσῆς*, "to let pass," "depart," or "slip," as our translators have done in the passage before us, the sense of the original is pretty well expressed. Besides, many critics suppose the true reading of the Sept. is *παραρροῦσῆ*; so that this passage hardly proves the sense of Stuart rather than that of our translators. (The translation which Symmachus gives of Prov. 3: 21, *אַל תִּרְלָזֶנּוּ מִמַּעֲיָנֶיךָ, μὴ παραρροῦσάτωσαν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν σου*, is certainly not more favourable to Stuart's interpretation.) The word under discussion does not elsewhere occur in the Septuagint or the New Test. 3. The verb is often used to express the passing of things out of the mind, and by a natural transition, it may mean "to let pass out." Thus, for illustration, we find Terence saying: "Plenus rimarum sum, hac et illac *perfluo*:" a mode of speaking common to all languages. Wahl translates the word, "præterlabi, vel elabi patior." Bretschneider: "ne præterferamur, ne in oblivionem demus promissa." Cal-

vin well remarks, “Potius consideranda est antithesis inter attentionem et profusionem. Nam attenta mens similis est vasi bene obstructo: vaga autem et ignava, perforato.” The following context furnishes little help, as a ready antithesis is found for either of the senses. The one last stated seems to us preferable.

V. 2. ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος. What word was this? In Acts 7: 53, Stephen says: οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων. In Gal. 3: 19, Paul says: ὁ νόμος . . . προσειέθη . . . διαταγῆς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. In Psalm 68: 18 we read: רָכַב אֲלֵהֶם רַבְתִּים אֲלֵפִי שְׁנַאן אֲדָנִי בָּם סִינִי בְּרַךְ. Rosenmüller may be consulted *in loco*. In Deut 33: 2, . . . שְׁרָךְ מִרַבְּבֵי הַתְּהִלָּה . . . אֶף מִסִּינַי הִתְהַלַּךְ, on which the same commentator may be consulted. Jewish tradition uniformly asserts the presence of the angels at the giving of the law from Sinai. Thus Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, B. xv. c. v. 3, *Τῶν μὲν Ἑλλήνων ἑσθροῦς καὶ ἀσύλους εἶναι τοὺς κήρυκας φημενῶν, ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων, καὶ τὰ ὀσιώτατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νομοῖς δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθόντων.* The ministry exercised by the angels in this case is not understood, nor is their presence at Sinai mentioned in the accounts of the giving of the law in Exodus ch. 19 and 20. But these traditions and testimonies make it certain that they were present, and were in some sense the assistants or instruments of the revelations given there to Moses, and that his system was the λόγος δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς. These institutions of Moses were firm, inexorable; and their violation was



visited with certain fixed and inevitable temporal penalties.

V. 3. *τηλικαυτης . . . σωτηρίας*. Here seems to be a metonymy of the effect for the cause: not introduced, however, without design; but to express the greater guilt of refusing a system which was so fruitful of good to themselves. To reject Christ, or neglect what had been preached concerning Him, was to add ingratitude to rebellion, and insensibility to insult. The particular sense in which the Apostle uses the word *σωτηρίαν* may be illustrated by Acts 13: 26, *ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλη*. One of the elements of superior authority in this gospel system is, that it began (under the new dispensation) to be spoken by the Lord in person.

*ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*. Many have hence argued that Paul was not the author of this Epistle, by comparing it with Gal. 1: 12, *Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. But it might with just as much fairness be argued that the expression of Hebr. 1: 1, *ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν νιῶ*, is in contradiction to this text, as that Paul could not consistently be the author both of this text and of Gal. 1: 12. And it might be argued also that ch. 1: 1 proves that *both* the author of the Epistle and the persons addressed, had been eye-witnesses of Christ's ministry. But in truth, there is nothing here but a common *κοινῶσις*; and the Apostle is not necessarily included among his hearers. Thus, Eph. 4: 14, *ἵνα μηκέτι ὤμεν*

*νήπιοι.* Does the Apostle imply that he also was still but a spiritual infant? 1 Thess. 4: 17, *ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ Κυρίου.* Does the Apostle here signify that he expects to be himself living on the earth at the final resurrection? Or did he expect that any of his immediate readers would be? This none but infidels will believe. In the passage before us there is the less difficulty, because in the whole context the first person plural is used.

V. 4. *συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι.* These last three terms are often employed to denote the various miracles and wonderful signs wrought for the confirmation of religion. All three are used in Acts 2: 22, in reference to the proofs of the Saviour's mission: *ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, οἷς ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεός.* In 2 Cor. 12: 12 the same words are used to describe the similar proofs of Paul's apostleship: *Τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατεργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ, ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασι καὶ δυνάμεσι.* They are used in 2 Thess. 2: 9 of the lying proofs offered by the Man of Sin for his pretensions: *οὗ ἔστιν ἡ παρουσία, κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους, &c.* In the two passages from Acts 2: 22 and 2 Cor. 12: 12, the parallel words seem to be accumulated in order to construct a more comprehensive expression. But in our text, as perhaps in the case of *πάσῃ* with the singular in the third

citation, the use and position of *ποικίλαις* militates against such a construction; because, in itself, it gives sufficient extent to the meaning. It would seem, therefore, that the words *σημείοις καὶ τέρασι* fulfil this purpose of amplification (as in John 4: 48, Acts 6: 8, 7: 36, and in the Septuagint for *σημείων καὶ τέρατων*). Then *δυνάμει* may mean “miraculous powers,” as in Rom. 15: 19, “Christ wrought by me . . . ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος (θεοῦ); Acts 10: 38, ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν (Ἰησοῦν) ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει; 1 Cor. 2: 4, ὁ λόγος μου . . . (ἐγένετο) ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως. And, in connexion with *πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς*, it may designate the powers connected with the various distributions or gifts of the Spirit—a connexion sanctioned by the passages just quoted. We find the verb *μερίζω* used for the different distributing or apportioning of spiritual gifts in Rom. 12: 3; compare Hebr. 7: 2. An illustration of what the Apostle means by these “varieties” and “dividings” of gifts may be seen in 1 Cor. 12: 4–11. It should be noted, however, that in this sense of miraculous *power*, the singular only is used (*δυνάμει, δυνάμεως*) in the passages cited; and the plural is frequently used for miraculous *acts*, though in Mark 9: 39 the singular is used in this sense.

---

5 Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλ-  
 6 λουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν. Διευμαρτύρατο δὲ που-  
 τὶς, λέγων· “Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκη  
 αὐτοῦ· ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπη αὐτόν;

7 Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους· δόξῃ  
καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανώσας αὐτὸν [καὶ κατέστησας αὐ-  
8 τὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου]· πάντα ὑπέταξας  
ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ." Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι  
αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον.  
Νῦν δὲ οὐπω ὀρώμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτετα-  
9 γμένα· τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμέ-  
νον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου  
δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ  
ὑπὲρ παντὸς γένηται θανάτου.

V. 5. The practical exhortation being concluded, the Apostle now resumes his argument. As was stated in the Analysis, this resumption not only carries us back into the main line of his discussion (to prove the superiority of Christ as a mediator), but aims particularly to refute just here a possible objection from his humanity. The logical connexion of the γὰρ is therefore with vv. 2, 3, and not with ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα, κ.τ.λ., as Kuinoël supposes. "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, how much more this new word? For (γὰρ) not to angels has God committed this dispensation" (but to one greater than angels). As above, in ch. 1:4, 5, the γὰρ introduces the *ground* of the proposition to which it refers. And throughout the Epistle we shall observe the same, in passing from argument to exhortation, and from exhortation to argument.

τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν. The classic usage of οἰκουμένην gives it the sense of "the inhabited earth," especially as settled by Greeks. By people of

the Roman empire, it was currently used to express that empire (as in Luke 2: 1, ἀπογοργασθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην), by a sort of arrogant exaggeration, as though the empire embraced the whole world. In later usage we find the word meaning “the world,” in the sense of all the inhabitants of the world (as in Acts 17: 31, κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ). And hence, it is used tropologically as equivalent to αἰῶν. Buxtorf’s Lexicon Chald. Talmud, Rabbin. 1620, says: “*Mundum futurum*, sive ܡܢܕܘܢ ܕܩܝܡܐ; quidam intelligunt mundum qui futurus est post destructum hunc mundum inferiorem, et post resurrectionem hominum mortuorum, quando animæ cum corporibus suis rursus conjungentur. Quidam per ܡܢܕܘܢ ܕܩܝܡܐ intelligunt ܩܝܡܬܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ dies Messia, quibus scil. venturus Messias, quem Judæi adhuc expectant, quod in hac mundo temporaliter regnaturus sit.” It is very evident that the words τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν are here used in the latter sense, as equivalent to αἰῶνα μέλλοντα, and mean “the gospel dispensation.” The succeeding words, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν, compel us to this opinion; for what else except the Christian or new dispensation can be understood as the subject of the Apostle’s discourse? The reader may compare τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. 10: 11), meaning gospel times, μέλλοντος αἰῶνος (Hebr. 6: 5), and συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων (9: 26).

V. 6. The particle δὲ is here plainly adversative. “Not to the angels, *but to Christ.*” The Psalmist (“But one in a certain place testified”) had taught

that it was to a greater man, this world was put in subjection. The periphrastic mode of expressing the antithesis by this quotation suggested the difficulty which seemed to arise against the Apostle's argument from the humanity and humiliation of Christ; but it at the same time furnished the means of obviating it. For the quotation represents human nature, which at first, as exhibited in Adam unfallen and afterwards in Christ, was little inferior to angels, exalted in Him to infinite dignity. The quotation, extending from v. 6 through the first sentence of v. 8, is from Psalm 8:5-7.

V. 7. *παρ' ἀγγέλους*. "In comparison of angels." Compare this usage of *παρὰ* with 1:4 supra. That the original *אֱלֹהִים* will bear this translation of angels, is clear from the Septuagint rendering of the passage, and of Ps. 97:7, quoted above in 1:6. It is also clear from the use which the Apostle makes of the passages. The Chaldee Targum also so renders it in Ps. 8:6. The Septuagint so translates it in Ps. 138:1, and in Job 20:15 gives the same rendering to *אֱלֹהִים*.

V. 8. *γὰρ* here introduces the reason for the implied application of the passage to the man Christ Jesus; or perhaps the connexion of thought may be more accurately stated thus: *γὰρ* adduces this fact, that the passage quoted ascribes to the subject of it universal dominion, as the ground of the declaration that this dispensation was not committed to the angels: "This later dispensation whereof we speak, was not put in subjection to the angels; *for*, in that he put *all* in subjection under *Him* (this man infinitely ex-

alted), he left nothing that is not put under him." But if *all* is under Him, without exception, a part cannot be under the angels. Consult Winer's Idioms N. Test. p. 352.

We have passed over this quotation without more exposition than is necessary to show its adaptation to the Apostle's purpose in this place. It requires but little stretch of faith to believe that a passage which so easily admits of the application here made, is so applied, not *by accommodation* merely, but in consistency with its proper original meaning.

*Νῦν δέ.* Here *δέ* is again adversative. "Such was the declaration of universal dominion. But now we see not yet all things put under him," The fulfilment of this promise is not seen as yet, except in its lowest and most imperfect form, in the dominion of man over the lower creatures in this world; a thing which by no means satisfies the high and universal terms of the passage. But its fulfilment will be seen in the crowning of Jesus with glory and honour.

*ἀντὶ τὰ πάντα . . . ὑποταγμένα,* scil. to Him who is the *ἄνθρωπος*; of the quotation.

V. 9. *τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον.* The Hebrew for *βραχύ τι* is *עַזְזָה*. Both words admit of the rendering, "a little while." The original most naturally requires the meaning given in our English version, "a little lower," "somewhat lower;" and nothing in the context forbids it. Christ incarnate on the earth was a perfect man (as Adam was made by his Creator), and therefore, in his human nature, little

inferior to angels; but yet he was in condition somewhat inferior. This is proved by the fact that they ministered to his necessities, Matt. 4: 11, and in the garden of Gethsemane strengthened him in his anguish.

*διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου.* It is very difficult to determine whether these words were intended by the author to depend on *ἠλαττωμένον*, or *ἐστεφανωμένον* below. The position of the words would admit either construction, but perhaps rather favours the latter, and the sentiment on either construction is common in the Scriptures: Christ condescended into the human condition in order to suffer death for man. See this sentiment expressed below, vv. 14, 17. And again, Christ's exaltation has been bestowed on him on account of the sufferings and humiliation he freely underwent. This is fully expressed in Phil. 2: 8-11; because "he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death . . . God also hath highly exalted him." It must be said that the latter construction gives to the preposition (*διὰ*) a sense somewhat more accurately consonant to its usage with the accusative;\* and it is also favoured by the preceding context, which is still evidently in the thought of the author. The exalta-

---

\* The usual force of *διὰ* with accus. is to express *ground* or *reason* (ratio); seldom, if ever, design. Winer (Id. N. Test. §53. c. p. 318) says never. But see John 12: 27, *διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην.* To see how closely the two senses border on each other, compare John 1: 31, 1 Cor. 7: 2, 1 Tim. 1: 16, Hebr. 9: 15. Upon the other construction, too, even for the purposes of emphasis, the more natural position of *Ἰησοῦν* would be after *διὰ τὸ πάθημα.*



tion of the God-man foretold in the Psalm, is still his topic; and this somewhat favours the opinion that the dependent clause is in his mind connected with this. But the succeeding context strongly favours its connexion with *ἡλαττωμένον*; for the "fitness" referred to in the next verse seems to reproduce a kindred idea to that, which would be thus obtained: *ἔπρεπε γὰρ* . . . "It was fit to make the captain of our salvation perfect through sufferings." The matter may perhaps be best summed up by saying that either sense is admissible and good.

*ὅπως* must have the sense "that," "in order that." It cannot be properly translated "when," as Stuart. And we may make *ὅπως* depend on *ἡλαττωμένον*, putting the middle clause into a parenthesis, as is preferred by Carpazow, Böhm, Cramer. Or, dispensing with the parenthesis, we may more naturally connect *ὅπως* with *ἐστεφανωμένον*. The sense which the passage would bear, with the former construction, is obvious: "We see Jesus made a little lower than the angels . . . in order that he might, by the grace of God, taste death for every man." With the latter construction, the meaning would be: "We see Him exalted, that he may secure for all his people the benefits of his death." We are unable to sympathize with the difficulty which Stuart experiences in this interpretation. It finds its illustration in Phil. 2: 9-11. For the sense of *ὅπως*, see Winer's Idioms New Test. §57 end.

*ὑπὲρ παντός*. "That He may taste death for every man." In all such expressions, and they are numerous,

we must fix limitations by other passages which serve to define them. Thus we ascertain the persons thus indicated to be 'all of every age and nation who should believe on him.' Compare the use of πάντες, 3:16 below.

γεύσεται θανάτου. This figure may be illustrated by the Rabbin. expression *מיתם מיתה*. In Matt. 16:28, Mark 9:1, Luke 9:27, John 8:52, the phrase is used to mean simply dying—"may die for all." The evidence for the vicarious nature of Christ's death, which is contained in the force of the preposition ὑπὲρ ("in the room of," equivalent to ἀντί), should not be overlooked. See Winer's Id. New Test. §51. 9, p. 294.

- 
- 10 Ἐπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ  
 πάντα, πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, τὸν  
 ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων  
 11 τελειῶσαι. Ὁ, τε γὰρ ἀγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἀγιαζόμε-  
 νοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται  
 12 ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, λέγων· "Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ  
 ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας  
 13 ὑμνήσω σε." Καὶ πάλιν· "Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς  
 ἐπ' αὐτῷ." Καὶ πάλιν· "Ἴδου ἐγώ, καὶ τὰ παιδία,  
 14 ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός." Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κοι-  
 νῶνῃκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλη-  
 σίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου  
 καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου,  
 15 τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸν διάβολον, καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους,  
 ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι  
 16 ἦσαν δουλείας. Οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβά-  
 νεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.

- 17 Ὅθεν ὄφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆ-  
 ναι, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ  
 πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας  
 18 τοῦ λαοῦ. Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθεὶς,  
 δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι.

V. 10. Ἐπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ. These words are thus paraphrased by Stuart: "As all men are, by the universal arrangement of a wise and overruling Providence, subjected to trial, so it was proper or becoming in God, that Jesus should be subjected to trial in our nature, before he was advanced to glory in it." This seems to us to give a sense too superficial. The Apostle looks deeper. It was a transaction which concerned Him "on account of whom, and by whom, are all things." In it the glory and majesty of God were involved. The "fitness" which must be consulted in the mode of redeeming rebellious men, was that which concerned His attributes, rights, and honour. This the author afterwards developes.

γὰρ introduces the ground or reason of what he had just said concerning Christ. He received this humiliation and this exaltation, because God's own nature and rights required Him to make the captain of his people's salvation perfect through sufferings.

ἀγαθόντα is by many construed with ἀρχηγόν. But evidently the sense is far better, not to say necessary, which refers it to αὐτῷ (God), and construes it as the accusative before τελειῶσαι. Stuart unreasonably objects that such *anacolutha* of the participle (as

he considers this would be) are not to be found, all the cases of such irregularities which are produced by the critics being in the nominative; and this nicety he thinks Kuinoël, who agrees with us, has overlooked. But the case is hardly to be considered as an *anacoluthon*. It is a construction that frequently occurs. See Kühner, §307. 1. 2, especially Rem. 2. 3, pp. 453, 454, where just such constructions as we have supposed this to be, are declared to be very frequent; and among others the following instances of it are given. Herod. 3. 36, ἐντείλατο τοῖσι θεραποῦσι λαβόντας μὴν ἀποκτείνειν. Xenoph. Anab. 1. 2. 1, Ξενία ἤκειν παρήγγειλε λαβόντα τοὺς ἄνδρας. In the New Test., Luke 1: 74, τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν . . . ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν ὀυσθέντας, λατρεύειν αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ. Acts 15: 22, Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις . . . ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κ.τ.λ. Consult also v. 25. Acts 26: 20, τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ . . . καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις . . . καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἄξια τῆς μετανοίας ἔργα πράσσοντας. 1 Peter 4: 3, Ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ παραλελυθὼς χρόνος τοῦ βίου τὸ θέλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατεργάσασθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, κ.τ.λ. Compare also Kühner's Gr. Gram. §310. 3, Rem. 2, p. 460. Winer's Id. New Test. §63. 3 (b), p. 396. We are therefore abundantly justified in construing ἀγαγόντι with the subject of τελειῶσαι (God). The fitness to be consulted was then what became God in the great work of 'bringing many sons to glory.'

ἀρχηγόν is used here, and in 12 : 2 below (τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν), and most probably in Acts 3 : 15 (τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε), in the sense of *author*. In Acts 5 : 31, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα ὑψωσε τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, and perhaps in the passage quoted from Acts 3 : 15, it means *prince*. But even there the sense is included, that he is one who dispenses the benefits of his redemption. Thus, in Acts 5 : 31, it is added, ὑψωσε . . . δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. And so in our passage it may not be amiss to attribute to the word the combined sense of leader and dispenser: Christ leads our way; he protects, he governs, he originates our graces, and bestows justification.

τελειῶσαι is used frequently in this Epistle, and throughout, it bears the original sense of "bringing to a full end, perfecting," though modified in different connexions to suit the subject. It is used of the work of the law (denying its ability to give perfection) in Hebr. 7 : 19, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος; 9 : 9, δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα; 10 : 1, ὁ νόμος . . . οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι. It is used affirmatively of the work of Christ in 10 : 14, Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἀγαυζομένους. The noun τελειώσις is used in a similar sense in 7 : 11, Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελειώσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν. The verb is used of Christ as exalted and glorified, in the passive voice, 5 : 9, καὶ τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ αἴτιος σωτηρίας

αἰωνίου; and 7:28, ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὀρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον (καθίστησιν ἀρχιερέα) υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. Once more it is used, in the passive, of the saints glorified and perfected in heaven, in 11:40, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι, and 12:23, πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων. The idea in all these cases is evidently that of *something which is brought to the completeness of its proposed condition*; whether a condition of complete justification, as in the cases of the Levitical and New Test. sacrifices, or of complete sanctification, as in the case of the saints, or complete glory and exaltation, as in Christ's. The meaning here, therefore, may be safely taken as this: "to complete the mediatorial work and glorification of the captain of our salvation, through sufferings."

V. 11. γὰρ introduces the ground or reason of the fitness asserted in ἔπρεπε above. It should not be made to refer to v. 5, as Stuart does; for the Apostle's scope is not to show that "Christ had a *human* instead of an *angelic* nature." The objection already answered supposed this, as the answer also concedes it. The Apostle does not argue in the 5th verse that "this dispensation was committed not to angels, but to man." But he argues that "it was committed to one who, though the Son of Man, was above all, angels included." It gives to the Apostle's scope an exceeding triviality to suppose that he is thus formally reasoning out what needed no proof, because it was fully conceded and understood on all hands. "There was a fitness arising out of the nature of God, which required that our Re-

deemer should receive his complete mediatorial functions and glory through sufferings. For (the ground of that proposition is :) there is a necessary oneness between redeemer and redeemed."

*ἀγιάζω, ἀγιαζόμενοι*, we will translate redeemer and redeemed. On the proper rendering of this word, which is so frequent and important throughout this Epistle, the reader is referred to what was said in the Commentary on 1: 3, under the term *καθαρισμὸν*. The sense we have given to *ἀγιάζω* is fully sustained by its use in 10: 10, 14, and 13: 12 below, *Ἐν ᾧ θε-  
λήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ  
σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ. Μιᾶ γὰρ προσ-  
φορᾶ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκῆς τοὺς ἀγιαζομένους.  
Διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος  
τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθεν*. In these places the adjuncts *προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ*, and *διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*, plainly determine that the work expressed by *ἀγιάζω* was one of redemption. Its other current sense, that of sanctification, is here out of place, according to the uniform sense of Scripture. The Holy Spirit sanctifies; the sufferings of Christ atone, and thus redeem. Wahl thus defines the word (*β*), "Purum reddo a culpa peccati, i. e. expio, Deum propitium reddo alicui; and farther refers to 1 Cor. 1: 2, 6: 11, Eph. 5: 26, Jude 1. But in these passages this sense is less manifest. The word is also used in the Septuagint as the translation of *כִּפֶּה*, where it has the sense of expiating. The context here further demands this sense. The two ideas, of atonement and sanctification

or consecration, are so closely associated, that it is natural that words which primarily denoted one or the other, should come to be used of either, or to carry a sense combined of both. To the mind of a Hebrew, the two ideas of redemption from condemnation, and sanctification, would be associated with peculiar nearness; because in the  $\text{קִדְּשׁ}$ , the thing consecrated to destruction, the loathsomeness and uncleanness, both moral and ceremonial, were as prominent as the condemnation. Its dedication to destruction *was* a dedication to a use unclean and abhorrent: hence, its redemption from that condemnation was a true setting apart to a sacred use. In order to bring many sons to glory, God must both secure their justification and sanctification. "By the one offering he hath perfected" this work "forever." (Hebr. 10: 14.) And this, we conceive, is the  $\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$  of the Epistle to the Hebrews—*complete redemption*.

The ellipsis after  $\epsilon\acute{\xi} \epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  has been variously supplied by different critics, so as to read  $\epsilon\acute{\xi} \epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma \sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma, \alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma, \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma, \varphi\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma, \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma, \&c.$  scil. Adam, Abraham, God, &c. But the objection to all these suppositions is that they supply, and thus make definite, what the Apostle purposely left general. His object was to include all the respects in which it behooved that the Redeemer should be one with his people. Perfectly consistent with this is all the following context. The Apostle there proceeds to show that it was a oneness not only in race, but in sufferings, and temptations, and sympathies: "on account of which



oneness, he is not ashamed to call the redeemed his brethren." The Apostle then proceeds, in

V. 12, to support this, by a quotation from the Ps. 22: 22 (in Hebr. and Septuagint v. 23). The words of the Septuagint are used, except that the Apostle substitutes ἀπαγγελω for διηγῆσομαι. For the messianic character of this Psalm, see Hengstenberg's Christol. vol. i. pp. 130-148, where it is clearly proved that the Messiah is the speaker in the passage quoted, and throughout the Psalm; and therefore the Apostle's application of it is legitimate, and so distinct as to need no exposition. For the reader of less research, it may be sufficient to point out, that Christ on the cross used the very words with which this Psalm begins: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" (Matt. 27: 46.) Verses 7, 8 of the Psalm were accurately verified in the conduct of the Jewish nobles towards the dying Messiah, Matt. 27: 41-43. V. 16, "They pierced my hands and my feet," a mode of torture unknown among Hebrews before, was wonderfully fulfilled in Christ. See Luke 24: 39. And above all, v. 18 is by the Evangelist John (19: 24) expressly applied to Christ. So that we have abundant inspired exposition, independent of the text under consideration, to prove that the speaker in this Psalm is the Redeemer.

V. 13 contains two quotations. The first, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ, is doubtless taken from Isaiah 8: 17, where יִשְׁרָאֵל יִקְרָא is translated by the Septuagint into these very words, as the same phrase is

also in 2 Sam. 22: 3. Some have attempted to find the quotation in Ps. 18: 3, *ἐλπῶ ἀντῶ*, or in 2 Sam. 22: 3, but incorrectly. The second quotation, *Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, καὶ τὰ παῖδιά ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός*, is from Isaiah 8: 18, where these words occur exactly in the Septuagint, and unlike the Engl. version, have a full stop after *θεός*, making the sentence end there, as the Apostle does in our passage. In this reference the critics generally agree. It is nothing to the contrary that the words *καὶ πάλιν* intervene. They do not necessarily imply that the Apostle was citing a different place. Compare the quotations from Deut. 32: 35, 36, in Hebr. 10: 30 below, and from Habak. 2: 3, 4, in Hebr. 10: 38, where the Commentary may be consulted for explanation.

To see proofs that the whole context from which these quotations are taken, has a reference to the Messiah, the reader may read Hengstenberg's *Christol.* (vol. i. particularly p. 348, compared with pp. 319, 320); Stuart's *Excursus X*, and Alexander on Isaiah, ch. 8. vv. 16–18. (The last, like many others, understands the Messiah to be the speaker, and thus avoids an *unnecessary* double sense. The strongest marks that there is a messianic reference in the whole passage, are undoubtedly to be found in the two passages of the context, 9: 1, 2, and 9: 6, the former of which is explicitly applied to the Messiah in Matt. 4: 15, 16, and the latter is restricted to him by many indisputable signs. If we do not adopt the higher interpretation, with Alexander, we will not, with Stuart, suppose

here an *argumentum ad hominem* or an *argumentum e concessis* (as in Luke 11:19). The author of the Epistle evidently uses the words, as in some proper sense the words of the Messiah. Isaiah and his sons, whose names were significant, were signs of deliverance for Israel from their enemies; and represented, in a typical manner, the Redeemer and his children.

The two quotations are evidently designed to illustrate, and consequently confirm from the Old Test. Scriptures, the assertion made in the former part of v. 11, as expressing a great truth necessarily belonging to the divine scheme for the redemption of the race. Hence the Apostle had already intimated, in v. 10, that the redeemed were *υιόυς*, sons. The oneness of condition between Christ and his people is now further indicated in this: that He, like them, professes trust in his heavenly Father. (So Calvin, Stuart.) Trust implies dependence, and this again a nature inferior to God; for the Infinite is sufficient to himself. So that the glorious Messiah of the Old Test. is found using the language of humiliation. Again, having called his redeemed, brethren, he now, in accordance with the figure of Isaiah 53:10, calls them children. God hath given them to him. (See John 6:37, 39, 10:29.) The father and the son share a common nature—a oneness is implied in the relationship.

V. 14. *Ἐπεὶ οὖν* introduces an illation from the preceding statements and facts: 'it was necessary for the Redeemer to suffer; He must be one with his redeemed people. This He acknowledges in the Old

Test. calling them brethren and children, and acknowledging in himself a dependence on God similar to theirs. Since, then, they were flesh and blood, He must appear in the same nature.' The object of his assumption of them is now stated.

ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κρέατος ἔχοντα, κ.τ.λ. The verb *καταργήσῃ* is seldom used in the classics, but often in the New Test. It finds its best illustration here, or in Rom. 6: 6, "Our old man is crucified with Christ, ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ;" or in 1 Cor. 15: 24, speaking of Christ's winding up his mediatorial reign, the author says, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν, κ.τ.λ.; or in 2 Tim. 1: 10, "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφιδαρσίαν," κ.τ.λ. Hence we infer for this place the meaning, "to make of no effect," "to nullify," "to subdue, or destroy."

τὸ κρέατος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τὸν διάβολον. In John 8: 44 Satan is called the *father* of unbelievers (ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ.), whose will they do. He is "a murderer from the beginning;" an expression which may be explained by Gen. ch. 3, where we read that he was the procurer of spiritual and bodily death to our race, from its origin. In John 12: 31 he is called ὁ ἀρχὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, where it is also said, νῦν ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω. Thus also, in Luke 10: 19, he is called "the enemy," scil. of Christ's cause and Church. In John 14: 30 he is "the prince of this world," and in 2 Cor. 4: 4 "the god of

this world," who blinds the minds of them that believe not (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου). In Eph. 2: 2 he is called 'τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, who now worketh in the children of disobedience.' Compare also Eph. 6: 12, *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, κ.τ.λ.* In 2 Tim. 2: 26 the impenitent are said to be in the snares of the devil, *ἐξωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.* In 1 Peter 5: 8 he is represented as one who *περιπατεῖ, ζητῶν τίνα καταπή.* Hence there is a parallel to our passage in 1 John 3: 8, *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ. εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου.* Compare with this John 12: 31, which has been already cited. In Acts 26: 18, Paul was called into the work of the ministry *τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ . . . τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν.* From a comparison of these passages, we learn that Satan is 'the prince of darkness and spiritual death,' wielding immense and destructive power over the ungodly, who are his children and servants. The clause under discussion simply asserts that Christ, by his death, struck the deadly blow at his power. He became man in order that he might die, and thus lay the foundation for the destruction of Satan's power and kingdom. Here, again, the full benefits of redemption are included in the Apostle's meaning.

V. 15. *καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους.* This verb evidently expresses a deliverance from bondage—a bond-

age to Satan, sin, and guilt. This is shown by what precedes and what follows. For illustration, compare John 8: 31-36, *πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστι τῆς ἁμαρτίας . . . Ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε.*

*ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου.* Here *θανάτου* must denote, as so often in the Scriptures, 'the penalty due to sin,' including of course temporal death, and every other penal evil. As instances in which the word *must* have this general meaning, see Genesis 2: 17, "*In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*" That which occurred on the day of Adam's transgression was not actual bodily death, but his spiritual death, with his subjection to bodily death, and all the sorrows of life. In Ezek. 18: 4 it is said, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." In Rom. 5: 12, *διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος*; 6: 23, *Τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας, θάνατος.* In this passage it is set in antithesis to *ζῶν αἰώνιος*, which "is the gift of God by Jesus Christ." The fear of death, therefore, from which believers are delivered through Christ's death, is something much more extensive than the mere animal fear of the dissolution of the body. It includes that sense of guilt, and dread of divine wrath, which the natural conscience inspires in all, and which spiritual convictions produce, in the most pungent degree, in those who are brought to Christ.

*ἔνοχοι δουλείας.* This construction is common either with the genitive or dative. The bondage may be, as Calvin and others say, to guilty and dreadful

fears. But if we understand it thus, there is a repetition of sense which we cannot impute to the Apostle: 'Those who, through fear of the consequences of guilt, are all their lifetime subject to the bondage of guilty fears.' Such would be the tautology. The words seem rather to mean the bondage in which sinners are held by Satan, which is a bondage of sin, and consequently of just exposure to punishment by God. So the antithesis of the members of the sentence seems to demand. Fearful and guilty anticipations are a strong element in the bondage of the sinner; and this is expressed by the words *φόβῳ θανάτου*.

The verse then strongly expresses the full benefits of redemption; the undoing of Satan's kingdom and power, and the doing away of guilt, with the dreadful sense of it. According to prophecy, it is a redemption from captivity.

V. 16. The verb *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* would most naturally mean, 'to take hold of,' for any purpose. In Matt. 14: 31 (*Εὐθέως δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἐπέλαβετο αὐτοῦ*), it means to take hold of, in order to help. In Luke 14: 4 (*καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπέλυσε*), it signifies to take hold of, to heal. These passages sufficiently illustrate the meaning here: "For he does not take hold of angels (for the purpose of redemption), but he takes hold of the seed of Abraham." Calvin is not here to be imitated in his rendering, 'Nusquam enim Angelos assumit.' The present here can hardly be rendered for the præterite tense; it is rather to be understood as an

instance of the narrative present for the past; a usage so common in Greek. Winer's Id. §41. 2. c.

*γάρ*. The reference of this particle in the 16th verse may be compared to that which it has in the 5th. There, its force, as was explained, is this: "How shall we escape if we neglect this salvation, spoken by one greater than angels; (*γάρ*) *for*, not unto angels did he subject the coming dispensation of which we speak." Here its force is, "He partook with the children of flesh and blood (v. 14), (*γάρ*) *for*, he does not take hold of the angels, but of the seed of Abraham." At the same time, the 16th verse is prospective in its connexion, and prepares the way for the next reason, v. 17. Hence that verse is introduced by the illative particle *ὅθεν*.

*σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ* must signify Abraham's spiritual seed, believers; for Christ's help was not confined to his lineal descendants, the Jews, nor did all of them share it. This use of the expression is most distinctly established by the definitions of the Apostle himself. See Gal. 3: 7-9, *Γινώσκετε ἄρα, ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ, κ.τ.λ.* Rom. 4: 11, *καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας . . .* v. 12, *καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς, τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστία πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ.* Rom. 9: 6, 7, *Οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· οὐδ' ὅτι εἰς σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλά, κ.τ.λ.* Still, while the words indicate Abraham's spir-



itual children, the argument shows that the idea of their humanity, of their participation *σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος* (v. 14), is prominent.

V. 17. *ὁθεν* may be rendered "wherefore." Since he undertook for the seed of Abraham, it became him to be made, in all (*suitable*) respects, like them. We now have a more definite amplification of that oneness between Him and His people which was asserted in v. 11.

*ἵνα* expresses the *purpose for which* He must become like his people, i. e. must become a man, under law, and liable to all human temptations and sufferings: *in order to be a suitable priest.*

*ἐλεήμων καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς.* A high-priest fully fitted for his work, able to sympathize, and faithful to mediate in behalf of his people. Such he could not be, without becoming man. While we must believe that the divine omniscience, without an incarnation of the Son in human nature, would see and fully appreciate all the trials of the saints, and while we must believe that the divine mercy and pity are not less tender than those of a perfect man, since the divine is the source and pattern of the human; yet every believer feels how much more familiar and consoling is the sympathy of a Redeemer who is both God and our brother. The Daysman lays his hands upon *both parties*. He must be not only adapted to reconcile a justly offended God to man, but to allure man, full of guilty fears and doubts, to God. And in the atoning part of his priesthood it was equally neces-

sary that Christ should partake of human nature, both in order to suffer, and in order to ground a proper imputation by which his sufferings might avail for us.

*εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι* expresses the *purpose for which* Christ became *ἐλεήμων καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς*. This is a well known and frequent usage of this preposition with the infinitive. See the Lexicons. Winer's Id. New Test. §45. 6, p. 259. Examples of the same use of *εἰς* with infin. may be seen in 1 Cor. 10: 6, *Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς καὶ κεῖνοι*. 2 Cor. 7: 3, *προεΐρηκα γάρ, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἔστε εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζῆν*. In 2 Cor. 8: 5 we have an instance of the same construction, carrying the sense of *result*; one kindred to the former, *ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ· εἰς τὸ παρακαλεῖσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, κ.τ.λ.*, "*Insomuch that we urged Titus,*" &c. *ἰλάσκεσθαι* is in the middle voice, and may be translated "to appease," "propitiate." It is used in this sense, connected with *τοῦ θεοῦ*, in Josephus, Antiquities, 6. 6. 5, and Xenophon, Oec. 5. 20 (*τοὺς θεοῦς*). Thence it naturally obtained the meaning, "propitiate," as to sin; that is, "to make propitiation for sins," because in Scripture view the divine anger is only caused by sins. In Psalm 65: 4, *מַחֲשֵׁב הַחַטָּאִתְּנוּ וְיִמְחָקֵם* is rendered in the Septuagint, *τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ἰλάσῃ*: "Our transgressions, thou shalt purge them away," i. e. forgive them. The compound verb used by the Septuagint in 1 Sam. 3: 14 is far better adapt-

ed to express the exact sense of our passage: ὡμοσα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰησῆ, εἰ ἐξηλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἴκου Ἰησῆ, ἐν θυμιάματι, καὶ ἐν θυσίας, ἕως αἰῶνος; where the Hebrew is, אִם יִתְקַצֵּר עוֹן בֵּית יִשְׁרָאֵל, &c. Both the sense and construction of the text are well illustrated by Dan. 9: 24, a part of the well known prophecy of seventy weeks, in which the atoning work of Christ is foretold: "Seventy weeks are determined upon," &c.: τοῦ ἐξηλάσασθαι ἀδικίας; in the Hebrew, וַיִּלְכַּשֵּׁר עוֹן.

V. 18. Ἐν ᾧ. Hebrew, בְּאִשֶּׁר; English, "In that." A similar use of the phrase may be seen in 1 Peter 2: 12 and Rom. 2: 1, 8: 3. γὰρ gives the *ground* or *reason* for the *propriety* asserted in the 17th verse, suggesting at the same time the rationale of the matter. The same idea is illustrated more fully in 4: 15, 16. It is true that almighty power and infinite wisdom would be, in themselves considered, adequate to our succour, without an incarnation; but the adaptation of Christ to our help depended, in the economy of God's government, on his partaking in our sufferings and temptations.

Thus the Apostle shows that the incarnation and humiliation of Christ, which the Jews used as an argument of his inferiority, were foretold in their own Scriptures, and were the necessary grounds of his redeeming functions, and of our comfort in believing.

## CHAPTER III.

### ANALYSIS.

FROM the views of Christ just presented, the author takes occasion again to commend Him to the diligent attention of the Hebrew Christians, v. 1 ; claiming for Him the faithfulness in his commission, which he concedes to Moses in the station he occupied, v. 2 ; and thus he introduces a comparison between the two (which is the second main topic of the Epistle), vv. 2-6. In this comparison, with a view to sustain his exhortation (*γάρο*), and to secure the great object of his writing the Epistle, he demonstrates the superiority of Christ over Moses ; declaring, 1st, that the comparative honour due to Moses was to that due to Christ, as the honour due a house is to the builder or founder of it ; for (*γὰρ*) Christ was the divine Disposer of all things (see, in proof of this, ch. 1), including the ceremonial dispensation in which Moses was a minister (*ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*), vv. 3, 4 ; and declaring, 2nd, that Moses was merely a steward, or minister (*θεροάπων*) in the economy (*ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ*) to which he belonged, while Christ was a Son (*υἱὸς*) over (*ἐπί*), or at the head of His dispensation, vv. 5, 6 ; in which dispensation both the author and his readers had saving interest, if they held firm to the end, v. 6.

(*Διό.*) Hence he again exhorts them against apostacy, vv. 7-19 ; reminding them, by a quotation from

the 95th Psalm, of the conduct and end of their fathers, when in the wilderness they tried the goodness and forbearance of God, by disaffection and distrust, till they provoked the curse of exclusion from his rest, vv. 7–11; he admonishes them against like unbelief and apostacy, and to exhort one another daily against a like hardening by the deceitful workings of sin; telling them again, for their incitement ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), that perseverance in the faith was the proof of an interest in Christ; and urging them by no means to tread in the footsteps of their fathers, vv. 12–15; for ( $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$ ) they all, with few exceptions, grieved God, and perished in the wilderness, and thus were cut off from the promised rest, by sin and unbelief, vv. 16–19.

## COMMENTARY.

1 Ὅθεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι,  
κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμο-  
λογίας ἡμῶν, [Χριστὸν] Ἰησοῦν· πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ  
2 ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ  
3 αὐτοῦ. Πλείονος γὰρ δόξης οὗτος παρὰ Μωϋσῆν  
ἠξίωται, καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ  
4 κατασκευάσας αὐτόν. (Πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευά-  
ζεται ὑπὸ τινός· ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας,  
5 θεός.) Καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστός ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ  
αὐτοῦ, ὡς θεράπων, εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησο-  
6 μένων· Χριστὸς δέ, ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ·  
οὗ οἴκος ἐσμὲν ἡμεῖς, ἐάνπερ τὴν παρόρησίαν καὶ  
τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν  
κατάσχωμεν.

V. 1. The introductory particle, ὅθεν, evidently refers to the scope of the previous chapter, especially of its conclusion; in which Christ is represented as having come in our nature, in order to make atonement for our sins, and sympathizing with us in all our trials, to deliver us from bondage, and bring us back to God.

ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι. The use of the word ἀδελφοὶ to denote church members, or fellow professors of Christianity, by the primitive Christians, is too well known to need remark. The Apostle applies the term ἅγιοι to them, 1st, as consecrated, or set apart to the service of God. In this sense it is common in the Old Test.

(Hebr. *קֹדֶשׁ*, translated by the Septuagint *ἅγιος*) as well as in the New Test.; and is applied to persons (not spiritually holy), places, days, and material and inanimate things. Instances in great numbers will suggest themselves to every diligent Bible reader; and any of the New Test. Lexicons will give a sufficiently accurate definition of this sense. An interesting example may be seen in 1 Cor. 7:14, where the children, either of whose parents is a believer, are said to be holy, i. e. consecrated to God, as subjects of his visible kingdom. But, 2nd, the term is applied to Christians as sanctified by the Holy Spirit, of which they are made partakers. In this sense of moral holiness, it is more commonly to be understood, when we find it in the New Test. applied to persons. In Mark 6:20, John is called *ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον*. A good definition of these senses may be seen in Hodge on Rom. 11:16. Of course, when such terms are applied generally to a class of persons, by a sacred writer, they do not assert moral purity of each individual. They are to be taken as proving no more on this point, than that such holiness ought to be the usual trait of Christians. Neither does the application of the term determine the degree of sanctification; all are *ἅγιοι*, in whom the Holy Spirit works savingly, though they be but babes in Christ.

*κλήσις ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι*. *κλήσις* in the New Test. always means *the Christian call* (except perhaps in 1 Cor. 7:20); often the effectual call by the Spirit; sometimes merely the outward by the word (see Matt.

20: 16, πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί). Compare with the passage under discussion, Eph. 4: 1, "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called" (ἄξιοι τῆς κλήσεως). It is called κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου, both because it is a call that comes from heaven, and because it summons us heavenward. Kindred is the expression of Paul in Phil. 3: 14, to this latter idea, "I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, "the call upward"). And these ideas recur twice in our Epistle below. Thus 11: 14 and 16, Οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἐμφανίζουσιν, ὅτι πατριδα ἐπιζητοῦσι . . . νυνὶ δὲ κρείττονος (πατριδὸς) ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐπουρανίου. And 12: 25, He who claims the service of Christians is one λαλῶν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν. The idea of separation from the world and consecration to God is prominent in the New Test. κλησις. The called are *called out* from the world; hence ἐκκλησία. Hence also the Apostle twice (Rom. 1: 7, 1 Cor. 1: 2) connects with it the word ἅγιος, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, which the Engl. version renders, 'called to be saints.'

ἀπόστολον. In the great majority of cases, this word is used definitely to describe "the Twelve." In Acts 14: 14 it is used of Paul and Barnabas, on the occasion of the proposed idolatrous sacrifice to them by the people of Lystra: Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος, κ.τ.λ., where two interpretations present themselves; either to render it 'missiona-



ries' (sent by the Antiocheian Church, Acts 13 : 3, 4), or to regard it as applied in its proper official sense to Barnabas, making him equal with the Twelve. When found connected with adjuncts other than the names of our Lord (as οἱ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀπόστολοι), it means simply the "messengers," conveyers of the alms of the Churches. This is undoubtedly the sense in Phil. 2 : 25, where it is applied to Ἐπαφρόδιτον—ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον, and 2 Cor. 8 : 23, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν. The passage in Rom. 16 : 7 (οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις), is most probably not to be understood as saying that Andronicus and Junia (the latter most likely a woman) were ἀπόστολοι in any sense ; but as meaning that they were highly esteemed by the apostles. See Hodge *in loco*. The expression in John 13 : 16 is instructive, as showing the transition from the general to the particular signification : Remember that the persons here addressed are the Twelve, 'οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν.' The passage under discussion presents the only instance where it is used of Christ, although the references are very frequent to that 'mission' by the Father, which is the ground of the application of this term to Him. John 20 : 21, καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ, ἀγάθ' ὑμᾶς, &c. In John 3 : 34 He is ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός. John 10 : 36, ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἠγάπησεν, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. As here applied to Christ, the term ἀπόστολος seems to have reference to the comparison with Moses which immediately ensues, and is grounded upon the fore-

going exhibition of Christ, as the one to whom was committed the second dispensation (see 2:5), who first preached the gospel to us (2:3), who took our nature (2:10-18), who died for our sins (2:9, 14, 17), and who was exalted over all to extend the benefits of his redemption to all believers (2:9, 18). The use of the word *ἀπόστολος* for Christ, hints, therefore, at the same reference which is contained in the introductory word of the sentence, *ὁθεν*. Stuart illustrates it by regarding it as an imitation of the *שְׁלִיחַ הַצְּבִיר* of the Jewish synagogues; but this seems to us unnatural and not plausible. Moses was the *ἀπόστολος* of the first dispensation (see how often his "mission" is spoken of in Exod. 3:10 seqq.); Christ of the second.

*ἀρχιερέα* seems in like manner to be introduced by the author, to connect the foregoing context with the other great view of Christ (scil. as a Priest) which remained to be taken, from ch. 4:14 to 10:18. In calling Christ a priest, there is a manifest reference to 2:17, 18, where his priestly character and atoning work had been stated. And the prominent statement of this function here, is no doubt intended to suggest that comparison which is run in the subsequent context, between Christ and the Aaronic priesthood. And thus, as the author had passed easily and naturally from argument to exhortation, he now slides, in like manner, from exhortation back to argument. The character of Christ which is here properly introduced in the exhortation, as that of *ἀπόστολος καὶ*

*ἀρχιερεύς* combined, is not again stated in the ensuing comparison. Calvin well observes, on the 2nd verse, “*Omissa paulisper sacerdotii mentione, de Apostolatu hic disserit.*” The foundation for the statement of both these in the exhortation is laid in the previous chapter. In the ensuing argument, they are properly treated separately.

*ὁμολογίας* occurs thrice in the New Test. out of the Epistle to Hebrews, and thrice in it. In 2 Cor. 9: 13 we have, *ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Engl. version, “For your *professed subjection* to the Gospel of Christ.” 1 Tim. 6: 12, *ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν*, “Having professed a good profession;” and 1 Tim. 6: 13, *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν*, “Witnessed a good confession.” In Hebrews, it occurs in the verse under consideration, in 4: 14, and 10: 23; *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας*, “Let us hold fast our profession,” and *κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, “Let us hold fast the profession of our faith.” The *verb* *ὁμολογῶ* often occurs in the sense of confessing Christ (though sometimes applied to other things), as may be seen by consulting the common New Test. Lexicons. This sense of “confession” or “profession” of something evidently suits all the passages cited; and applying it here, directly and literally, we have about this meaning: ‘The Apostle and High-Priest whom we have professed.’ This is nearest the exact usage of the word in 4: 14 below. Or else, if we suppose a

very natural metonymy, substituting for the profession the thing professed, we have the meaning, 'The Apostle and High-Priest of Christianity,' or the new dispensation.

We may therefore represent the Apostle's meaning in this introductory verse as substantially this: "Such, holy brethren, being the character and functions of the Messiah (as in ch. 2), let us farther contemplate Him; and since the proselyting boast of the Jews is in the dignity of Moses, the God-appointed apostle of their economy, and the venerable sanctity of the Aaronic priesthood, the officers of its sacrifices, let us especially consider Jesus Christ in the same aspects, as the Apostle and High-Priest of *our* economy; in the first character superior to Moses, and in the second, to the Aaronic family."

V. 2. τῷ ποιήσαντι. This must be rendered here, "To Him that *appointed* him" (Engl. version). A similar use of the verb may be found most clearly in Mark 3: 14, καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα, "And he appointed twelve" (apostles), &c. Compare also 1 Sam. 12: 6, הַשֵּׁמֶט־רַשָּׁ הַשָּׁהָ שָׁשָׁ הָיָה (הָיָה), which the Septuagint renders, "The Lord (is witness) ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀάρον;" Engl. version, "Who advanced Moses and Aaron," i. e. to their offices. The corresponding word is used in the sense of appointing in all languages. Thus we say, one is "made" a judge, a general, &c.

ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. The origin of this expression is to be found in Numb. 12: 7,

לְאֶ־יְהוָה עֲבָדֵי מֹשֶׁה בְּכָל־בֵּיתֵי נְאֻמָּן הוּא. In this passage, as in our Epistle, the word “house” is used figuratively for the dispensation or economy of the Church of God committed to Moses, as in v. 6 below the new was committed to Christ. Calvin connects *ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ*, not with Moses, but Christ. But to do this is to overlook the distinction of the Apostle in vv. 5, 6, where Christ’s “house” is most clearly set in antithesis to Moses’ house. Besides, the position of the words favours the ordinary construction. While the commission of the first dispensation to Moses is so spoken of, in v. 2, as to point the reader forward to the commission of the second to Christ, in v. 6, the figure is extended by anticipation as it were, in v. 4, in virtue of the force of the argument, to embrace “all things,” *τὰ πάντα*; for such is the true extent of Christ’s stewardship. Still, there is special reference to the dispensations, as will be seen below, on v. 4.—To return: the word *οἶκος* is often used elsewhere in the Scriptures, for the Church, without reference to different dispensations. 1 Tim. 3: 15, *ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ . . . ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος*. Thus, Eph. 2: 19, 20, 22, believers are spoken of as *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ*, “and built on the foundation of the apostles,” &c. *ἐποικοδομηθέντες*. 2 Tim. 2: 20, 21, the Church is compared to “a great house,” *μεγάλη οἰκία*; and in 1 Pet. 2: 5, to a spiritual building, *οἶκος πνευματικός*. Calvin, losing sight of the foundation for the usage here, which is to be seen in Numb. 12: 7, and in the context, understands by *οἴκῳ* in our text, simply “the

Church of God." Stuart renders it, "*family*," "household." As to the sense, we may render it "house" or "household," for either is figurative. If we take the former, the latter must be included, as is clear from vv. 5, 6, for, of course, the little community inhabiting the house, and not the building, is the subject of its master's instruction and government. For this sense of "household," compare Luke 10: 5, *εἰρήνην τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ* (Engl. version, "house"), and Acts 10: 2, 11: 14, 16: 15, 1 Cor. 1: 16, 2 Tim. 4: 19. The word is used figuratively for the Church, in 1 Tim. 3: 15, 1 Peter 4: 17, Hebr. 10: 21, in addition to the passages cited above. But in our context *two houses* are spoken of, Moses' and Christ's. God has had but one Church. Hence, and out of regard to Numb. 12: 7, we here clearly prefer to render the word as signifying the "two economies."

The comparison between the apostles of the two economies is quietly introduced in v. 2, in a form the least odious to Jewish prejudices, by conceding to Moses fidelity to his stewardship, while it is directly asserted for Christ also. But in the next point of comparison, Christ rises infinitely superior.

V. 3. *γὰρ* cannot be well referred to the proposition immediately before it. It rather refers to the exhortation of v. 1, *κατανοήσατε, κ.τ.λ.* "He is worthy of consideration in comparison of his type, Moses, (*γὰρ*) for he is more glorious than Moses." The sense of the passage extending from v. 3 to 6 is well conceived by Calvin: "Admonet quanto

(Christus) sit (Mose) excellentior: idque duobus argumentis probat: Quia Moses sic præfuit Ecclesiæ, ut tamen pars ejus et membrum esset: Christus verò architectus est, toto ædificio superior. Ille, alios regendo, simul regebatur, quia servus: hic tamen, quia Filius est, principatum obtinet."

It should be observed, on the rendering of this passage, that οἶκος primarily means "house," "dwelling;" that the terms of the original (e. g. κατασκευάσας, v. 4) are throughout selected with reference to this primary sense; and that, therefore, whether we understand the conception to be of a house, or a household, we should, as faithful *translators*, render by the former. In like manner our Engl. version uses "house" for "household." Acts 10: 1, 2, "Cornelius . . . feared God with all his house." Acts 11: 14, "words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."

Vv. 3, 4. From the context, κατασκευάσας may be most naturally taken in the sense of building, of course figuratively. In Hebr. 9: 2 the same verb is used in a literal sense of constructing the tabernacle, in 11: 7 of constructing the ark, and in 1 Peter 3: 20 of the same subject. In v. 4 the idea of the verb is enlarged naturally, and the figure extended to the universe; and here the act of constructing is less a figurative one than in v. 3.

In these verses, as in the two following, the Apostle is evidently setting forth the superiority of Christ to Moses. Here we have the first argument, or we would rather say, *statement*, to this effect. (For the

apostles were inspired, and could teach authoritatively, although there might be nothing in Scriptures previously given, which would evince to our view the truth of their teachings; and commentators sometimes give themselves causeless trouble, by leaving this out of view, and hunting for arguments where the apostles only meant to give authoritative assertions.) “He is more honourable than Moses, as the builder is than the house; for (γὰρ) every house is built by some one: but he who built all things, i. e. Christ, is God; of course, infinitely above Moses.” It is here assumed by the Apostle, as is proved by the Old Test. Scriptures, cited in ch. 1, that Christ created all things; and he virtually affirms that Christ and Moses were related as creator and creature. The comparison of v. 3 illustrates this idea, and it is logically developed in v. 4. The author does not here aim to *prove* at all that Christ made all things, or that He established both dispensations, or that He was God. All these are directly asserted or implied in what he says, and are designed to illustrate what he does aim to teach, viz. that Christ is more honourable than Moses, as the builder is than the house (v. 3). The very mode of statement in v. 2 (*Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὄλῳ τῆ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*) had put Moses *in* the house, and of course under the *κύριος*; or son of it. And it was natural, in clearing up or expounding the statement of v. 3, to add that of v. 4: “Every house is built by some one; the dispensation to which Moses belonged (in what capacity the author will show directly) had a *κύριος* who estab-



lished it; He, i. e. Christ, who established all things,\* the old and new economies as well, and all the other arrangements of the universe, is God." If any thing is assumed, it is this postulate of what had already been shown in ch. 1, that "Christ is the framer and disposer of all things." And if to any the argument seems *flat*, we would remind them that it was suited to the obtuseness which exalted Moses above Christ; not to say that it is virtually the one which is employed in ch. 1 to show Christ's superiority to the angels. But this difference must be admitted, that there, as we have already intimated, the author really argues from Old Test. Scriptures, while here he rather seems authoritatively to teach.

V. 5. *καὶ* introduces the second argument. We find it thus used, in the additive sense ("again," "in addition"), in ch. 1 : 7 and 10, and 10 : 38.

*ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ*. The preposition *ἐν* is manifestly antithetical to *ἐπὶ* in v. 6. Moses belonged to the house, though the subordinate ruler of it.

*αὐτοῦ*. It is difficult here, as well as in v. 6 and v. 2, to settle the particular personal reference of this pronoun. The manuscripts vary greatly (as is common in such cases) as to the breathing. According to

\* If any one should prefer to understand *τὰ πάντα* of the two dispensations impliedly referred to, we should have no contention with him. Instances are not wanting where the word *πᾶς* is used in a sense not universal, but to be limited by the context; so as to mean "the whole" of the matters in hand. See 1 Cor. 12 : 6, Phil. 3 : 7, 8, Col. 3 : 8.

the stricter usage of the pronouns, the reflexive pronoun *αὐτοῦ* would signify, in v. 5, Moses' house, and in v. 6, Christ's. The pronoun with the smooth accent, *αὐτοῦ*, as it is in the text, would indicate, in v. 5, the house of some one else than Moses, and in v. 6, of some one else than Christ. But this usage is not authoritative; for, consulting Kühner's Gr. Gram. §302. 5, and Winer's Id. New Test. §22. 5, the reader will discover that *αὐτός* is often used in place of the reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτοῦ* (contracted *αὐτοῦ*); and always where the member of the sentence containing the pronoun is regarded as proceeding from the mind of the speaker or author, and not from that of the subject. So that even if we were certain that the Apostle, in his protograph, wrote *αὐτοῦ* (with the smooth breathing), we should still be at sea as to its reference. Nor will Numb. 12 : 7 enable us to decide, though God there says, "*My* house;" since the author, inasmuch as he is not directly quoting, but only alluding to the passage, might still refer, by *αὐτοῦ*, to the immediate subjects, *Μωϋσῆς*, *Χριστός*. The argument is not materially affected by either reading. We have above employed the one last indicated, as entirely admissible, not as evident.

*θεράπων*. Thus the Septuagint render עֲבָדֵי, in Numb. 12 : 7; and this is the word usually employed by them for Moses, when he is called עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה, and for the ministers of Pharaoh, in Exod. 7 : 10, 20, 8 : 29, 31, &c. The *θεράπων* is not *δούλος*, for he might be, and generally was, *ἐλευθερός*. The word is in the

Old Test. opposed to *κύριος*, *βασιλεύς*, as here to *υἱός*, who is also, in v. 6, *κύριος*. Compare chs. 1, 2. The Engl. version here renders well by "servant," i. e. minister, and not by "slave," which is every where the proper rendering of *δοῦλος*.

*εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων*. These words may be best understood as expressing the object of Moses' being a *θεράπων*, i. e. to make known what God should declare to the people. Others, with less judgment, explain *τῶν λαληθησομένων* of the future things of the second dispensation.

V. 6. *Χριστὸς δέ, ὡς υἱὸς ἐπί, κ.τ.λ.* This clause is evidently opposed to *θεράπων ἐν*, of v. 5. In this light, the argument of these two verses is plain: Moses, whatever his dignity and fidelity as an *ἀπόστολος*, was but a servant *in* his house, a part himself of the subject body. Christ is Lord over his economy. (See Analysis.)

*οὐ οἰκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς*, only expresses, suitably to the prevailing figure, the sentiment that they, the author and his readers, had an interest in this gospel economy, if they held it fast unto the end. The carrying out of the figure in this manner is not unusual to the New Test. writers. Thus, Paul says to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 3: 9, *θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε*; and the idea is strikingly amplified in the succeeding verses. 1 Pet. 2: 5, *καὶ αὐτοὶ (ὕμεῖς) ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε, οἶκος πνευματικός, κ.τ.λ.*

*παρρησίαν* is from *παρρησις*, meaning, most literally, "free-spokenness," and hence "boldness;" and

hence again, "*confidence*." The word occurs thrice in our Epistle besides here. In 4:16 we have, *Προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, κ.τ.λ.*, "Let us come boldly." In 10:19, *ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*; and in 10:35, *Μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ.* These instances sufficiently show that the word is used substantially in the meaning of the *believer's confidence*, founded on his faith in Christ.

*ἐλπίδος* seems to depend both on *παρρησίαν* and *καύχημα*; and the meaning, "confidence and exultation of hope," is equivalent to "confident and exulting hope." Or it may, without violence, be made to depend on *καύχημα* only, and the meaning would then be, "Our confidence and exulting hope." The three ideas of confidence, joy, and hope, are here intimately associated: of the several possible internal relationships between them, we cannot certainly determine which the Apostle designed. But the meaning is obvious, and is little varied on either supposition. We now return to the conditional particle which introduces the phrase, *εἰάνπερ*, "If indeed we hold firm," &c. Perseverance in faith and hope unto the end is the test of a true membership in the "house" of Christ. Compare v. 14 below, *μέτοχοι γὰρ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν*; and more especially, 1 John 2:19, "They went out from us," &c. *εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν,*

κ.τ.λ. A future of continued perseverance in faith is the necessary test of our present interest in Christ. Notice that the primary tenses are used: οὗ οἶκος ἔσμεν, "Whose house we (*now*) are, provided we hold firm," &c.; μέτοχοι γὰρ γεγόναμεν, "We *have become* sharers, provided we hold fast unto the end," &c. If this root of infallible future perseverance is not in us, then we are not now members of Christ. Such is the plain inference from the Apostle's statements. It may be objected, if a future of perseverance is the evidence of a present interest in Christ, then the believer can never enjoy a present assurance of hope; for he cannot foreknow. The answer is, that his present assurance of hope is not founded on his foreknowledge of his own stability (if it were, it would be an assurance of apostacy), but on his confidence in the faithful and omnipotent grace of God, covenanted to him.

---

7 Διό, καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, "σήμερον,  
 8 ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς  
 9 καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, κατὰ  
 10 τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὗ ἐπεί-  
 11 ρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν· ἐδοκίμασάν με, καὶ  
 12 εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου, τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη· διὸ προσ-  
 13 ὄχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εἶπον· ἀεὶ πλα-  
 14 νῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς  
 15 ὁδοὺς μου· ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου· εἰ εἰσελεύ-  
 16 σονται εἰς τὴν κατάπανσίν μου"· βλέπετε, ἀδελ-  
 17 φοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἐν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ  
 18 ἀπιστίας, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος·

13 ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῆτε ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας.

V. 7. With this verse the Apostle again passes from argument to exhortation. Διό, "In view of which truths," "Wherefore." The exhortation is drawn, as usual, from the doctrine, "Since Christ is such, and we partake of his benefits only by persevering, therefore . . . (v. 12), see to it, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief," &c. According to the view of one class of interpreters, among whom is Bloomfield, the Apostle adopts the exhortation of the Psalmist as his own (v. 8, μὴ σκληρύνητε), and διό then connects with this verb. But there is a strong objection to this: the Apostle introduces the passage with a formality unusual for him (καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), as not his own words, but those of the Old Test. inspiration. He obviously suspends, by the καθὼς, the sense which he was about to introduce by the διό. And since v. 8 is as much a part of the quotation as v. 7, it is a violent construction to suppose that he makes its words *his own* in any different sense from the whole quotation. It seems every way fair and natural to suppose that the suspension of sense made by the parenthesis (καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.) continues during the whole quotation introduced by that parenthesis. The Apostle's own exhortation, therefore, is resumed where the quotation ends, at v. 12. He quotes for confirmation and admonition.

The words (v. 7-11) extracted, are evidently from Psalm 95: 7-11, whence they are taken, in the exact phrase of the Septuagint (Ps. 74: vv. 8-11), with a few trivial exceptions. The Holy Ghost, by the Psalmist, solemnly admonished *that* generation not to harden their hearts after the example of their fathers in the wilderness, who perished by their obduracy and unbelief. The Apostle now brings this admonition to apply again to God's people of his day; just as its example applies to every age of the Church, because God is the same, in his forbearance, mercy, justice, and jealousy, in his government of the Church in all ages.

V. 8. *παρὰ πικρᾶς μῦθου* is the Septuagint translation for מְרִיבָה. The word is not found in classic Greek. We are, more than in usual cases, therefore, justified in passing wholly over into the Hebrew, to seek for the proper sense in which the Apostle understood it here. This sense is obviously that of "strife," "contention" (verbal), not unaptly rendered in the Engl. version, "provocation." The remark may be made here, as also applicable to all the other quotations of our author from the Scriptures of the Old Test., that his manner of referring to them implies a tribute to the familiar knowledge of the word of God possessed by the Jews, which we would do well to emulate. He seems to assume that it is unnecessary to refer to chapter and verse; but wherever he introduces Old Test. words, with any indicative phrase, as "It is written," his readers will recognise them without dispute,

and will be able to refer to them. It is worthy of remark that the same method prevails throughout the New Testament.

Some introduce a colon after ἐρήμῳ, the end of the 8th verse in the Hebrew. Others, with more reason, place it after οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, corresponding with אבותיכם in the Hebrew. "The trial in the wilderness" (τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ), is clearly defined by the succeeding clause (οὐ ἐπείρασάν με) to mean, the trial made of God's patience by the unbelief of Israel.

V. 9. καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου. ("They tested me), *although* they saw my works." The conjunction corresponds with the Hebr. וְ (see Gesenius, Hebr. Lex. *sub voce* §4). From the simple additive sense "*and*," grow other related senses; as an addition of a consequence, or inference. Thus, in v. 19 below, καὶ βλέπομεν, κ.τ.λ., "*And so*, we see, they could not enter in because of unbelief." In this place it signifies an addition of contrast and aggravation: "*And yet*, they saw my works."

τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη are joined in the Hebr. with what follows (אַרְבָּעִים). (Note that the particle διό, immediately following, is not in the Septuagint, nor is there any word in the Hebrew corresponding to it.) And when the Apostle quotes the same clause again, in v. 17, he connects the forty years with the succeeding verb likewise (Τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη;). So they are connected in the Septuagint. The colon introduced in our Greek text after ἔτη, should therefore be removed.



V. 10. *πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ* (Hebr. *לָּבָבִי יָבֵטוּ*). "A people that turn away their hearts" from God. This is not ill expressed by the Greek: they 'rove,' 'wander deviously' in their heart.

*οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς μου.* They disliked his dealings—considered them not with that reverential approbation proper for God's people.

V. 11. *ὡς ὤμοσα.* "So that I swore." The particle here has the sense of *result* and not of likeness, or comparison. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §57. 6, p. 359.

*εἰ εἰςελύσονται* presents us with the abridged form of the Hebrew oath, the imprecation being omitted; which gives to the condition of it the sense of a strong negation. "If they shall enter," is then equivalent to "They shall *not* enter." The full form of the oath may be seen in 1 Sam. 3: 17, or 2 Sam. 3: 35, or 2 Kings 6: 31, *כִּי־יָבֵטוּ־הַלְוִיִּם לְכַלּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם וְיָבֵטוּ־לְכַלּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם*. Gesenius, *Hebr. Lex.* may be consulted, art. *כָּס*, c. 1. This usage of the text may be illustrated by Mark 8: 12, *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον,* and by the Latin form, "*Moriar, si habeo.*"

*τὴν καταπαυσίν μου.* "They shall not enter into *my* rest," i. e. God's. This is a higher and spiritual rest, of which the rest in Canaan was but a type, as will appear more fully in our examination of ch. 4. But by the language here, we learn that the curse which excluded the unbelieving Hebrews in the wilderness from Canaan, also excluded them from God's true rest. The dark and stubborn state of heart which

unfitted them for the lower, much more disqualified them for the higher rest. But yet, we would fain hope that while this sentence was passed upon their unbelief, and was inexorable as to the earthly penalty, the gate of repentance, which is ever open, was not shut against their souls. It is evident that the transaction referred to in all this quotation was that recorded in Ex. 7 : 7. The same names, מִפֶּה and מִרִּיבָה, recur.

V. 12. Here the Apostle, having strengthened his grounds by this solemn admonition, begins his own direct exhortation : *Διὸ . . . βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἐν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας.* Winer (in his *Idioms New Test.* §30. 4, p. 157) renders these words, "a heart wicked (in respect to) unbelief," or "of unbelief." Their meaning seems to be about this: "a wicked, viz. unbelieving heart." The truth is most manifest in the words, that unbelief is a guilty state of the heart. "Man is responsible for his belief."

*Θεοῦ ζῶντος.* God is often so called, in both Old and New Testaments, as in our Epistle, 9 : 14, 10 : 31, 12 : 22, to distinguish him from dead idols. In Acts 14 : 15, which contains the remonstrance of Paul and Barnabas against the superstition of the Lystrans, this opposition is distinctly expressed : "that ye should turn from these vanities (*ματαιῶν*) to serve the living God." The phrase also doubtless contains a reference to God's self-existence and eternity. Some suppose that in this place it refers specifically to Christ. Some countenance for such an application may be found in John 5 : 21, 26, "For as the Father raiseth up the

dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." And again, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." If this sense were adopted here, it would seem somewhat more apt to the Apostle's object, which is, to prevent apostacy from Christianity. But if God commissioned Christ, and sanctioned the new dispensation, apostacy from it is desertion of God. Such an apostacy would be an exhibition of a wicked, unbelieving heart, similar to that exhibited by the ancient Israelites; because God had given to believers of gospel times evidences of Christ's mission more illustrious than those given by Moses.

V. 13. *ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας.* This refers not merely to seductions from Judaism, but to sin working within and without. There is an evident allusion to the exhortation of the Psalmist, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts;" and the words of the Apostle are an unfolding of the sense of the Psalm. That from which God's voice recalls us, is sin. If we refuse his voice, and indulge in the sin, its deceitfulness will harden our hearts. It is to the perverted understanding that the treacherousness of sin addresses itself, steeling the heart against the impressions of right, through the instrumentality of erroneous opinion. And thus mind and heart, when apostate from the fear of God, act and react to their mutual depravation. This passage is full of matter for the practical expounder of the Scriptures.

- 14 (μέτοχοι γὰρ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἴνπερ  
 τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν  
 15 κατέσχομεν,) ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι· “σήμερον, εἴν  
 τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς  
 16 καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ.” Τίνας  
 γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν; Ἄλλ’ οὐ πάντες  
 17 οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωϋσέως; Τίσι  
 δὲ προσώχθισε τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη; Οὐχὶ τοῖς  
 ἀμαρτήσασιν; ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.  
 18 Τίσι δὲ ὤμωσε μὴ ἐις ἐλευσέσθαι εἰς τὴν κατὰ-  
 19 παυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν; Καὶ βλέ-  
 πομεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν ἐις ἐλθεῖν δι’ ἀπιστίαν.

V. 14. μέτοχοι γάρ, κ.τ.λ. The reference of the conjunction γὰρ is in this place to the admonition of v. 12: “Guard against apostacy; for perseverance in the Christian profession is the condition of our interest in Christ.” The proposition introduced by γὰρ is here evidently intended to support the exhortation, as in v. 6 the same truth was designed to prepare the way more effectually for it. The whole sentiment, in its connexion, is this: “We are interested savingly in Christ, if we persevere in our first faith even to the end; otherwise, we are, of course, excluded from all saving interest. Let us, then, not be seduced from Christ; for (γὰρ) He profits us nothing, we have no saving interest in Him, unless we hold to our faith.” Calvin well states the connexion of thought thus: ‘Verum si fide possidetur (Christus), in ea perstandum est, ut nobis perpetua maneat possessio. Ergo hac lege se nobis fruendum dedit Christus, ut eadem,

qua in ejus participationem admissi sumus, fide tantum bonum conservemus usque ad mortem.'

*μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ* means literally, "sharers of Christ." It expresses such union with Christ as secures to us the benefits of His redemption. Believers are often said to be "in Christ." Rom. 8: 1, *Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.* 2 Cor. 5: 17, *εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις.* In John 17: 21, 22, believers are said to be one in Him, and He in them. There is here a metonymy of Christ for His benefits.

*τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως.* "The beginning of our confidence," for "our first confidence." The phrase may be compared with *τὴν πρώτην πίστιν*, in 1 Tim. 5: 12. We here give the meaning of "confidence, well-founded trust," to *ὑπόστασις*, as that which is our *sustaining foundation* (*ὑψίστημι*, to place under, sustain). This sense it has also in 2 Cor. 9: 4, *κατασχυρθώμεν ἡμεῖς . . . ἐν τῇ ὑπόστασει ταύτῃ*, and, if the marginal rendering of our English version be adopted, in the well known passage, Heb. 11: 1, *πίστις ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις.* Giving to it this sense of 'confidence' in the text under discussion, we find a parallel expression below in 10: 35, where the same grace is called *παρόρησιαν*.

V. 15. *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, σήμερον, κ.τ.λ.* *ἐν* is often found with the infinitive as a dative, in a temporal sense, "while." Thus, in Luke 2: 6, we read, *ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ*, "whilst they were there." The same construction may be found in Luke 5: 1, 17: 11, and Matt. 13: 25. In Luke 24: 51 it seems to be

used in a temporal sense, looking somewhat towards the completion of the time and action expressed by the dependent verb: *Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτούς, διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, "When he blessed them," &c. In Luke 1: 21 the same construction is expressive not only of the time in which, but the ground for which, an action occurs: "And the people waited for Zacharias, *καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ*." They wondered *while* he tarried, and they wondered *in that* he tarried, in the temple. So here, *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι* may be rendered, "while it is said, or as it is said." Bloomfield interposes a period or a colon at the end of v. 14, *βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν*· and he, as well as Stuart, Kuinoël, and others, limit the quotation to the following words, *σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε*, and understand the remainder, *μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ*, to be an exhortation of the author in the words of the Psalmist. An analogous instance of the curtailment of a longer passage previously quoted, into the mention of its initial words, is supposed to be found in Hebr. 8: 13, *Ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινήν, πεπαλαίωσε τὴν πρώτην*. But this severance is certainly harsh; and it seems wholly unwarrantable to decide that all the words quoted, after a certain word, are *adopted* by the author in a sense different from that in which he adopts the previous words, when there is nothing in the passage itself to indicate such a "break." If, with Theophylact, we could feel authorized to translate *ἐν τῷ λέγε-*

*σθα* as equivalent to *κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον*, then the whole of the quotation might be taken as the accommodated words of the Apostle, who availed himself of the Psalmist's language to repeat the ground of his exhortation. Calvin remarks on the phrase, *Ἐν τῷ λέγεσθα*, "perinde valet acsi dixisset: Quandoquidem loquendi finem nunquam Deus facit, non satis fuerit prompto animo fuisse amplexus ejus doctrinam, nisi eadem docilitate eras et perendie illi nos obsequentes præbeamus." Bretschneider (in his *Lexicon*, *sub voce*, 2, which the reader may consult) adopts a connexion not unlike that of Calvin, referring the words *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθα* to *μέχρι τέλους* in v. 14: "... if we hold our first confidence steadfast unto the end, whilst it is said" (i. e. while the exhortation still repeats, as it will repeat to all, to the end of their course), "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts," &c. This seems to us, upon the whole, the best construction, and most natural sense to place upon the passage.

V. 16. *γὰρ* connects what follows with the preceding exhortation, as an additional ground or reason. For this purpose the attention of the reader is called to the mournful extent of the destruction in the wilderness, and its cause. The pronoun is not the indefinite *Τινές*, but the interrogative *Τίνες*. So say Chrysostom and the Syriac version. The clause then will be rendered, as an interrogation, "For who (how many), when they heard, provoked God?" The conjunction *ἀλλ'*, then, is equivalent to the Latin *imo, vero*, "nay." So Stuart construes and translates. But

if, like the English version, we read the first two clauses without interrogation, then ἀλλὰ will have its common adversative and corrective meaning of 'but,' 'yet.' "Some, when they heard provoked, yet, not all," &c. But the sense is more animated, as well as more suitable to the context, and to the facts of the history, with the interrogative meaning. And even adopting this interrogative form, the common and proper adversative meaning may be retained in ἀλλά; for still there is at bottom an antithesis, corrective of an imagined erroneous answer to the question of the first clause, "Who provoked? (a few only?) But was it not all that came out of Egypt?" A similar use of ἀλλὰ may be seen in Luke 17: 8, "Which of you having a servant ploughing, or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, 'Go and sit down to meat?' ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· ἐτοίμασον τὶ δειπνήσω, and will not rather say, make ready that I may sup," &c. See Winer's Id. N. T. §57, p. 346.

πάντες. This word we are not obliged to translate as absolutely universal. We may except Caleb and Joshua. Let the reader compare John 3: 26, πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν (Ἰησοῦν). John 12: 32, πάντας ἔλκυσσω πρὸς ἑμαυτόν. Matt. 2: 3, πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐταράχθη. Matt. 3: 5, πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περιχορος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (ἐβαπτίζοντο). In none of these places can universality be understood. This use of the word may be seen well illustrated by Hodge on Romans 5: 18. Examples were also cited by us above, on ch. 2: 9. The passage in Exod. 17: 7,



to which the 95th Psalm seems to refer, contains no statement that God then swore none of the murmurers should enter Canaan. That terrible sentence is first recorded at a subsequent provocation, when the people at Kadesh-Barnea refused to go up and conquer their inheritance, in obedience to the divine command. See Numb. 14: 23. But the Holy Ghost, in the 95th Psalm, begins by referring to the first noted instance of their rebellions, and then points to the doom in which their course of provocations ended. The actual extent of this doom may be seen by referring to Numb. 14: 24, 30, 26: 65, 32: 11, 12, and Joshua 14: 6-8. Caleb and Joshua are there alone excepted. And here we see how unnaturally feeble is the reading which would put the indefinite *Τινές*, "some" ("for some, when they had heard, did provoke," Engl. version), for the whole of a nation of several millions except two individuals. Calvin, on v. 17, remarks as follows: "Porro quaeritur an Moses et Aaron ac similes in hoc numero comprehendantur. Respondeo; Apostolum de universo magis corpore, quam de singulis membris loqui. Certum est, complures fuisse pios, qui vel communi impietate non fuerunt impliciti, vel mox resipuerunt. Mosis quidem semel tantum concussa fuit fides, idque ad momentum. Quare in verbis Apostoli est synechdoche, cujus satis frequens est usus, quoties de aliqua multitudine aut corpore populi habeter sermo." We present this as, upon the whole, the obvious connexion of thought in this v. 16. In the preceding context, the general idea is, "Beware, brethren, of

apostacy, in view of the dreadful doom of the ancient rebels in the wilderness. (And (v. 16) the extent of that doom makes this admonition more startling;) for (γάρο), who were they, who, when they heard God, provoked him? nay, was it not *all* that came out of Egypt through the instrumentality of Moses? If unbelief and disobedience wrought so wide a ruin then, beware of them now."

Vv. 17, 18. In these two verses we have the two expressions, *Οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασι*, and *τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι*, used as parallel. The latter word is currently used in the New Test. in the sense of *unbelievers*. Its primary sense, indeed, is "to be unpersuadable," and hence "disobedient;" but hence it derives the sense of unbelief, which it doubtless bears here. Though *ἁμαρτήσασι* and *ἀπειθήσασι* are not synonymous, the one being general, and the other specific, the reasoning implies that unbelief was the essence of all their sin. We have here another instance of the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the wickedness of unbelief. Compare v. 12.

*κῶλα*. Whose "limbs" fell in the desert. This is the translation given by the Septuagint for פֶּנֶךָ, "carcass," in Numb. 14: 29, 32; an instance of a common synecdoche.

*κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ*. When we refer to the history of this divine oath, for instance in Numb. 14: 23 and Deut. 1: 35, we find mention made only of the promised land, as that from which Israel excluded himself by unbelief: "Surely they shall not see the

land which I swear unto their fathers." "The Lord was wroth, and swore, saying, Surely there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land, which I swear to give unto your fathers, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh." But upon adding to these passages the inspired construction of them in Ps. 95: 11, and considering the view developed by the Apostle in ch. 4 below (to the Commentary on which the reader is referred), we gather that the heavenly as well as the earthly rest was included in the promise and in the curse.

V. 19 contains the Apostle's closing deduction from the narrative: *Καὶ βλέπομεν*, "And so, we see, that, on account of their unbelief, they could not enter in." *Καὶ* is, in almost all its usages, parallel to the Hebr.  $\gamma$ , and in its primary sense is strictly copulative. But thence other senses arise, out of the nature of the connected clauses; hence, in this place, the idea of *connected* result, "And so." Consult Winer's *Id. New Test.* §57. 1, 2. Analogous uses of the word may be seen in Acts 7: 43, Rom. 11: 35, Hebr. 12: 9, and (if the reading were genuine) in 1 Cor. 5: 13. In these places the logical dependence of the added clauses is easily seen.

## CHAPTER IV.

### ANALYSIS.

(1—13.)

THE author exhorts his readers against like failure of the rest, v. 1, which he proves is promised to believers of every age—a true spiritual rest, vv. 2–10; and then resumes the exhortation, vv. 11–13. More particularly :

In view of the example of our fathers (*οἱ πατέρες*), we should fear lest we come short of the promised rest, v. 1; for (*ἐλάττω*), the promise is to us as well as to them, though from want of faith they were not profited, for (*ἐλάττω*), *believers do enter into rest* (that is, God's spiritual rest promised also to the fathers, who came short of it as they did of the type). This is manifest, 1st, from the oath as expressed through David, Psalm 95 : 11 (compared with Numb. 32 : 11, 12, Deut. 1 : 35), in which God declares that *unbelievers* are excluded, calls the rest from which he had excluded their unbelieving fathers *His rest*, and speaks for the instruction of *that* (David's) *generation*, to whom by implication the promise was still held forth, and to whom it was of course only a spiritual promise, since they were already in possession of the types, vv. 2, 3. These points, which are clear from the terms and circumstances of the oath, are elucidated in the following verses. This oath we have (as announced through

David, still holding out God's rest to believers), although His works (*καίτοι*) were finished from the foundation of the world; for (*γάρ*), we read concerning the seventh day (Gen. 2: 2,) that on it God rested from all his works; and then here, in the oath, we have God's rest represented as forfeited by the fathers through unbelief, and still offered to believers through David. God's rest, therefore, after the creation, was not one which had no relationship to men, but one into which God intended to admit believers, vv. 3-5. And thus we see the explanation of the exhortation by David. (Compare Numb. 32: 11, 12, Deut. 1: 35.)

The leading truth of the passage is manifest, 2nd, from the following view. Hence (*οὖν*), seeing that (*ἐπεὶ*) some must enjoy God's rest, and they to whom it was first offered, did not, through unbelief; again, a long time after, speaking by David to a generation then enjoying the type, He straightly charges them 'to-day to hear his voice, and not to harden their hearts' as their fathers did, and thus exclude themselves from it; which plainly supposes a spiritual rest still remaining for believers, vv. 6, 7. For if (*Εὶ γὰρ*) the earthly Canaan of which Joshua had instrumentally given them possession, had been all the rest that was promised, God would not, after that, have given an exhortation which implied a rest not yet possessed, and liable still to be forfeited, v. 8. There remains, therefore (*ἄρα*), for the people of God a rest, of which the earthly are but types, a true spiritual rest with God; for (*γὰρ*) he that hath entered upon it hath

ceased from his labours, as God did from his, vv. 9, 10. Hence (*οὐ̄ν*), he continues his exhortation to zealous endeavours to enter into this rest, lest (*ἵνα μὴ*) we perish after the example of the unbelieving in the wilderness; for (*γὰρ*) the word of God by which we are to be tried is living, powerful truth, probing the very heart, searching out its sins, analyzing its thoughts, and motives, and desires; nor is there any thing concealed from the view of Him to whom we must account, vv. 11–13.

*As a summary.* There are two steps in the argument. 1. From the oath, v. 3, confirmed and illustrated in vv. 3–5. 2. From the accompanying admonition, vv. 6, 7, confirmed in v. 8. Conclusion, v. 9, further illustrated, v. 10. The particular internal logical connexion of the thoughts must be sought in the particles.

## COMMENTARY.

- 1 Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, μήποτε, καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, δοκῇ τις  
 2 ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι. Καὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι· (ἀλλ' οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους, μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ  
 3 πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν·) εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἶρηκεν· “ὡς ὄμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου· εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου”· καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ κατα-  
 4 βολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων· εἶρηκε γὰρ που περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης οὕτω· “καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐ-  
 5 τοῦ”· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν· “εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς  
 6 τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου”· ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται τιναὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσεῖλθον δι' ἀπειθείαν· πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, “σήμερον,” ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον (καθὼς προεῖρηται) “σήμερον, εἰάν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε  
 8 τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.” Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν· οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα  
 9 ἡμέρας· ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ  
 10 τοῦ θεοῦ. Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ θεός.

V. 1. Φοβηθῶμεν. On this word Calvin remarks: “Hic nobis commendatur timor, non qui fidei certitudinem exequat, sed tantam incutiat sollicitudi-

nem ne securi torpeamus." It is ever the teaching of the Scriptures, that while we exercise an implicit and triumphant confidence in the fidelity of God, we should exercise a jealous watch over the treachery of our own hearts. These ideas are here also by implication: "The promise abides (firm)," *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*; it is we who may "seem to come short."

*οὐν*. The illation expressed by this particle, as was stated in the Analysis, is from the example of their fathers' unbelief, ch. 3: 19, *οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν*. Calvin remarks: "Illativa particula significat aliorum lapsu nos ad humilitatem et vigilantiam erudiri: quemadmodum et Paulus loquitur Rom. 11: 20, 'Isti per incredulitatem corruerunt: tu ergo noli superbire, sed time.'"

*καταλειπομένης*. Some translate this participle, "neglected," which is nearly the sense of Calvin, who renders it by '*derelecta*.' The sense of the verse would then be, "Let us therefore fear lest any of you seem to come short, because the promise of entering into his rest is neglected." It is allowable to attach such a meaning to a participial construction; but the whole following context requires for *καταλειπομένης* the other sense, "being left," or "remaining" to us. Indeed, vv. 2, 6, 7, 9, below, assert distinctly such a remaining or abiding of the promise, and make it the leading idea. The author would imply that the earthly Canaan was not all the promised rest.

*δοκῆ* some represent as pleonastic; and they cite, in illustration, Mark 10: 42, *ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν*



τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν; Luke 22: 24, Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τό, τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων; 1 Cor. 11: 16, Εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνηκος εἶναι. But Winer (in his *Id. New Test. Append.* §67. 4. c. p. 451), rightly repudiates the idea of the regular pleonastic use of any class of verbs, and shows that, in all the supposed cases, there is a real addition to the accuracy and fulness of the sense, which we may see if we look with sufficient care. Thus, in the passage first cited, the meaning is, "Those who are regarded, or admitted to be masters of the gentiles, exercise lordship," &c. In the second, "There was dispute which of them is acknowledged to be greatest." In the third, "If any person has the reputation of being disputatious," &c. Most commentators say that *δοκῆ* is used here, in a sense adopted in some passages by Robinson (in his *Lexicon New Test. sub voce*, b), to soften the assertion, in conformity with the urbanity of the Greek manner. They refer for illustration to 1 Cor. 7: 40, *δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν*. But it seems to us more proper to take it as expressing a constituent part of the Apostle's idea, 'lest any of you be judged to have come short,' i. e. in the verdict of God. Compare, for instance, the question of Christ to the lawyer, at the close of the parable of the wounded man and Samaritan: *Τίς οὖν τούτων τῶν τριῶν δοκεῖ σοι πλησίον γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστὰς*; Here the sense is obviously that of a deliberate judgment: "Which of these three *do you conclude* was a neighbour," &c.? Luke 10: 36.

*ὑστερηκέναι* is translated by Bretschneider and Wahl, "to have come too late;" with reference to *σήμερον* of the previous exhortation. But the word is found with this sense nowhere else in the New Test. It is better to give it its customary tropical signification, "to have come short," "to have failed." We can hardly believe that the sense is not substantially the same with that of *ἵνα μὴ τις πέσῃ*, in v. 11, where the same admonition is repeated. The verb *ὑστερέω* occurs in our Epistle in 11: 37, "the saints wandered about in sheepskins," &c. . . . *ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι*, "destitute," &c.; and in 12: 15, *ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "looking diligently, lest there be any one who comes short of the grace of God." In the former place the meaning is, "to be behindhand," in the sense of "lacking;" and in the latter, "to come short of." In the text it is, very obviously, to have come short (scil. of the offered rest).

V. 2. *γὰρ* here evidently refers to the proposition implied in *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*, and presents the ground of confirmation for that assertion. And here we find additional evidence for the correctness of the meaning which we gave to these words, on v. 1; for if we rendered them "because the promise was neglected," the connexion of the propositions would by no means be so lucid and natural.

*εὐηγγελισμένοι* is here used in its general and also classical sense, of "having good tidings preached," though there is doubtless an allusion to the gospel.

Theologically considered, every promise comes through Christ; and especially this one of a share in the spiritual rest of God. In Matt. 11: 5, and the parallel passage in Luke 7: 22, we read, *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*, "The poor have the gospel preached to them." In the active voice, it is construed with the dative or accusative of the persons who are the objects of the good news. See, for instance, Rev. 14: 6. In Rev. 10: 7 the various readings give both the dative and accusative. The meaning of the sentence is now obvious: "God's gracious promise of a spiritual rest is extended to believers now, as well as to them" (believers of Moses' and David's time).

*ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς* may be best translated, "the word heard." The genitive often serves as the qualifying or defining adjunct. This was seen in the exposition offered, on 3: 1 above, of the words *ἀρχιερεὶ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν*.

*συγκεκραμένους* presents a various reading. Some, as Vater, prefer *συγκεκραμένους*, in the accus. plural, and there is some Ms. authority for its support. It must then be construed with *ἐκείνους*; and the words *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* must be taken in the sense of *ὑπακούσασιν*, which they are asserted sometimes to bear. The sense of the sentence would then be, "But the word heard did not profit them, inasmuch as they were not mingled (associated) by faith with the obedient." The accus. plural is certainly the more difficult reading, and has therefore the support of that canon of the critics which enacts, that, when we are

compelled to choose between two readings, we must conclude that the one which is more plausible and natural was invented or introduced by transcribers. But, by taking the reading of the Textus Receptus, the nominative, the sense is better and more natural. An analogous use of the verb may be found in Isaiah 19: 14, which is rendered by the Septuagint, *κύριος γὰρ ἐκέρασεν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα πλανήσεως*. Calvin renders our text thus: "Non cum fide conjunctus in iis qui audierant;" a rendering which we adopt.

V. 3. The author now proceeds to offer the ground of his last assertion: "Unbelief prevented the offer of God's rest from profiting them; for (*γὰρ*), it is *we* who *believed* that enter into the rest." And this assertion, again, is plainly implied in the language of God.

*καθὼς εἶρηκεν*, "According as He (God) said," &c. Calvin correctly apprehends the nature of this inferential argument: "Argumentum est a contrariis. Sola incredulitas arcet; ergo fide patet ingressus." The oath excluding unbelievers implies the free admission of believers. The circumstances and terms of the oath, indeed, prove all that is contained in the proposition: 'A spiritual rest remains to believers of all ages.' The rest is called, for instance, God's rest. The offer of it is renewed to believers of David's day, who were already in possession of the earthly rest. It was that spiritual rest, '*τὴν κατάπαυσιν*,' the rest, into which God entered after the six days' work of creation, and which he offered first to the fathers, then to

believers of a later day, and, consequently, to believers of every age. But the true nature of the Apostle's point is determined by v. 9; for there he states it explicitly in the form of a conclusion, at the end of this branch of his discussion: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." This therefore is what he purposes to argue.

*καίτοι* is translated by Stuart, Bloomfield, Kuinoël, and others, 'nempe,' 'to wit;,' and this meaning would seem possible from a consideration of the elements of the word, though the examples given by Stuart after the authority of Hoogeveen do not prove it. The sense derived by such a translation would also be easier. The word occurs only here in the New Test.; but with *γε* annexed (*καίτοιγε*), which only increases its force, it occurs in John 4: 2, Acts 14: 17, and Acts 17: 27, and in all of the three places it manifestly has the sense of "although," "though in fact." This is undoubtedly its common signification; to which we adhere in the passage before us. For, according to the rareness of a given sense is the strength of the improbability that the writer has departed from the common one, unless the context manifestly compels us to suppose such a departure. Such is not the context here. *καίτοι* limits, or qualifies by a concession, the foregoing sentiment, *καθὼς εἶρηκεν, κ.τ.λ.* (which is the force of the word in the other examples cited), and is here designed to call attention to a fact which makes the proof contained in the oath, for the spiritual and perpetual nature of the rest, more manifest. Calvin

remarks thus on the sentence: "*Tametsi operibus, &c.* Ut definiat qualis sit nostra requies, revocat nos ad id quod refert Moses, Deum statim a creatione mundi quiescisse ab operibus suis." The Apostle's drift is this: to direct our close attention to the fact that God uses in his oath the very significant language, "if they shall enter into *my rest*." And the significance of the words appears the more in this, that God thus speaks of believers sharing *His rest*, although (*καίτοι*) His was a rest from works finished from the foundation of the world. Of course, then, it was a rest different from that of Canaan, enjoyed by God before Canaan was ever selected and promised to the patriarchs as the holy land, and therefore still held out to believers after Canaan was possessed, as well as to the fathers journeying to Canaan. A (*spiritual*) *rest* remains therefore for believers.

Vv. 4, 5. εἴρηκε γὰρ σου περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης, κ.τ.λ. These verses are designed to illustrate and confirm what was just stated: "And this is so; that God did rest on the seventh day, and offers this rest long after to believers, impliedly, in the oath excluding unbelievers." Calvin thus explains: "Hoc probat quia Deus, qui quiescisse dicitur, longo post tempore incredulis requiem suam negat, quod frustra faceret, nisi exemplo suo fideles vellet quiescere. Ideo dicit, *reliquum fieri ut quidam ingrediantur*. Nam si non intrare poena est incredulitatis, ut jam dictum est, creditibus ingressus patet." The comparison of the two quotations, which the Apostle wishes his readers to

view side by side, evinces this fact, that *God's rest* (concerning which the implied offer is made through David to believers), is the same with the rest of the seventh day, which immediately succeeded creation; and from this fact it is plain that the rest offered to believers is like that which God enjoyed—perpetual and spiritual.

V. 6. *ἐπεὶ οὖν* makes an illation from what goes before (*οὖν*), together with what is now to be added (*ἐπεὶ*); this addition itself being generally involved in what preceded. A similar arrangement of propositions and use of particles may be seen in 2: 14 above, where also the *apodosis* is first in the sentence. The illation here is, *πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, κ.τ.λ.* The ellipsis here made by Stuart seems to us very harsh, making the illation an implied one; viz. "Since therefore it remains, &c. . . it follows that a rest remains for believers." It would be hard to conceive how a writer could seem to express his own illation more certainly than the Apostle does here; and if the supposed exigencies of the sense and context authorize us here to understand an ellipsis, where there is nothing in the arrangement of the words to indicate it, we do not see where an interpreter *may not* intrude an ellipsis.

*ἀπολείπεται, κ.τ.λ.* "It remains that some enter into it:" because the oath making unbelief the ground of exclusion, revealed his will that some should enjoy his rest. The reasoning is well unfolded by Calvin's exposition of vv. 4, 5, already cited.

V. 7. *πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν.* Again He *limiteth a certain day*, i. e. in the exhortation addressed to believers through David, when he said, “*To-day* if ye will hear his voice,” &c. The Apostle, by this particularity, directs attention to the strictness of the divine admonition, which showed that God’s mercies might not be forever abused, and his promises rejected with impunity. It was also designed to prepare the way for the explanatory argument in v. 8, *οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας.*

We are now prepared to understand the full scope and meaning of vv. 6, 7. It having been shown, in vv. 3–5, that believers are admitted into God’s spiritual rest, the design of these verses is, by means of the exhortation which accompanies the oath, still further to confirm what had been argued from the oath itself; that there was a spiritual rest for believers in every age. This appears from v. 8, where the deduction is strengthened, and further grounded. Thus Calvin: “*Si nobis nihil promitteretur, an locum haberet haec admonitio? ‘videte ne vobis idem quod patribus contingat.’*”

V. 8. *γάρον*, as has been already indicated, here introduces what strengthens and illustrates the argument in vv. 6, 7. That argument is, “Since some must enter God’s rest, and those to whom the offer was first made did not, a long time after we find Him by David offering it to others; a spiritual rest, therefore, and not the earthly Canaan: for (*γάρον*), if Joshua had given them (the Israelites first evangelized) the rest,



God would not have spoken concerning another day after these transactions." If the rest promised had been Canaan and nothing more, then, under Joshua the promise would have been fulfilled, and the whole transaction would have been a completed one; but inasmuch as the Holy Ghost speaks of the promise as still open, and the transaction still suspended, to the believers of a later day, there is something more than Canaan implied in it. The rest of Canaan was not indeed excluded; as Calvin well remarks, "Non vult negare quin per requiem David terram Canaan intelligat, in quem Joshua populum induxit; sed hanc fuisse ultimam requiem negat, ad quam aspirant fideles, quae illius etiam saeculi fidelibus nobiscum fuit communis." The translation we have given above is in strict accordance with the usage for past tenses of the indicative in conditional sentences. The *ἄλλης ἡμέρας* is obviously the *σήμερον* of David.

V. 9. *σαββατισμός*. This word only occurs here in the New Test., and the only instance of its use in classic Greek which has been noticed, is in Plutarch de Super. V. c. 3. It evidently means here "a sabbatizing," a "keeping of rest or sabbath." Perhaps, as Stuart suggests, the word was coined by the author, for this place, from the Hebrew word *שָׁבַט*, with a Greek termination. It contains an evident allusion to God's rest, Gen. 2:2, to a participation in which the Apostle's whole argument proves that the faithful are invited. This reference to God's rest is distinctly avowed in v. 10: "He that is entered into his rest, he

also hath ceased from his own works, *as God from his;*" and alluded to in vv. 3-5. V. 9 obviously concludes the argument, and states its result. But the conclusion, after it is drawn, yet receives in v. 10 one more touch from the author's hand, in the form of an additional confirmation and illustration.

V. 10. *γὰρ* introduces this confirmation: 'He who hath entered into His (God's) rest, hath ceased from his own works, as God also ceased from His,' when, at the end of the six days' creation, he reposed in divine and holy complacency, in the contemplation of the perfect world which he had built. The "works" from which the glorified believer rests, are those labours and sufferings which make up the toils of his militant state; including, doubtless, the great labour of self-denial, or mortification of self, and self-righteousness, but not limited to it, as Calvin indicates: for such a sense would suit much better to a description of the believer's regeneration, than to his glorification. When he embraces Christ, then he ceases from the labour of self-righteousness. There is peculiar appropriateness in the verse, as we have explained it, to the persecuted condition of the Hebrew Christians. Doubtless the prospect of such a repose would be most soothing to the true Christian of that day, oppressed with constant dangers and exertions in the maintenance of a good confession. The believer's rest is 'God's rest,' in that it is like God's. Glorious as is the exaltation, in comparison with the believer's person and deserts, he need not fear to embrace and triumph

in its vastness. In like manner he is said to share the peace of God (Phil. 4: 7), or of Christ (John 14: 27, "My peace I give unto you").

Some readers may perhaps feel that they need the solution of one more question, in order to a satisfactory apprehension of the Apostle's scope in this discussion. Why does he *here* so labour a point which all Hebrews, except Sadducees, might be supposed to admit most fully and unhesitatingly? What is the relevancy of so laborious a discussion of this point, to the great object of his Epistle, which was to prevent apostacy from Christianity to Judaism? The answer is to be found in the peculiar and exclusive construction which the Jew put upon God's national covenant with Israel. The more scriptural and intelligent Jew, the Pharisee, for instance, by no means limited the privileges of his nation to temporal things. He expected a future state of spiritual blessedness and immortality in heaven: but he tied the type, which was Canaan, too strictly to the antitype, heaven. He taught that the only way to enter the spiritual covenant, was to become a member of the national covenant; that none but the Jews, heirs of the earthly Canaan, were to share the heavenly; and therefore the only path to salvation was to become a proselyte to Judaism. Against this exclusive view, the Apostle's discussion seems tacitly directed: "We which have believed do enter into rest" (v. 3), not we who are Jews. It is unbelief which excludes from the spiritual rest (3: 19), not uncircumcision. A whole

generation of circumcised people failed of it, because of the single obstacle of unbelief. Another whole generation of circumcised people (in David's reign), who were in the actual possession of the earthly rest, and whose membership in the national covenant was most prosperous and indisputable, are addressed as being in danger of coming short of the spiritual rest, through similar unbelief. It is to *the people of God*, therefore, that the divine sabbatism remains (v. 9), not to Jews; for the Apostle had long and clearly taught that all are not Israel who are of Israel; and that they who have Abraham's faith, though uncircumcised, are the seed of Abraham.

- 
- 11 Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατά-  
 παυσιν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ  
 12 τῆς ἀπειθείας. Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ  
 ἐνεργῆς, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δι-  
 στομον, καὶ δῆκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς  
 [τε] καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, καὶ  
 13 κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας· καὶ  
 οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανῆς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ  
 γυμνὰ καὶ τετραηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐ-  
 τοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.

V. 11. Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν, κ.τ.λ. The exhortation, as usual, is logically resumed: "Since there is such a prize before us, and that prize may be forfeited by unbelief, let us labour to enter in." Both hope and fear are enlisted.

ἵνα μὴ . . . πέσῃ, "Lest any fall," in the sense of "perish." Thus, in Rom. 11 : 11, we read the following question : Μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσι ; "Have they stumbled that they should fall?" where the sense is, obviously, a final fall—a perdition. Calvin, referring to the words τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδείγματι, says, 'Ergo, cadere pro perire accipitur, vel, ut clarius dicam, non pro peccato sed pro pœna.'

ἀπειθείας is obviously dependent on ὑποδείγματι : "Lest any one perish by the same pattern of unbelief," or, "perish by unbelief of the same pattern." The separation of the genitive from its governing word, by an interposed word or phrase, is by no means unusual in the New Test. Examples exactly similar to this may be seen in Phil. 2 : 10, 1 Tim. 3 : 6, Hebr. 8 : 5.

V. 12. ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is here understood, by most of the recent commentators, of only the minatory portions of God's word. But there is, to say the least, no necessity for such limitation. The word of God *promising and threatening* (as in the preceding context), the law and gospel, may well be thus described, and be held up *in terrorem* to apostatizers, or to guard against apostacy. God's word, the rule of our life and future trial, may not be contemned. It brings every thing into judgment, and in that day promises no less than threats will aggravate the condemnation of unbelievers.

V. 12. Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος. This attribute is ascribed to ἐλπίδα, 1 Pet. 1 : 3 ; it is ascribed to θυσίαν, Rom. 12 : 1, and to λίθον, 1 Pet. 2 : 4. In these

places, "living" must be understood from the subject and context. Peter, by a "living hope," evidently means an enduring hope, one that does not pass away. In the other two places, the participle has its proper sense, "possessing animate, intelligent life." In John 6:51 we have ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, in the sense of "life-giving bread." In 1 Pet. 1:23, believers are "born of an incorruptible seed, διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος," where, if we construe ζῶντος with λόγου, after the example of our Engl. version, it will have the sense of abiding, or "enduring word," that which does not cease its efficacy. This is probably the sense in our text: "For the word of God is enduring, and effective; and trenchant above every double-mouthed sword (τομώτερος). The word of God is often compared to a sword, as in Eph. 6:17, τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶ ῥῆμα θεοῦ.

ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος. The distinction made by these two words is not to be pressed. Compare 1 Thess. 5:23, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved," &c. The words are obviously used, in accordance with the usual classification of the day, to express the whole man. Here they seem related to each other more as *anima* and *animus*. The Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy distinguished between the animal and the rational soul, the ψυχῆ and the νοῦς, with which latter the πνεῦμα is by many supposed to be the same. The former embraced the senses, appetites, desires, &c., the latter, the higher and intellectual faculties which dis-

tinguish man from the brutes. The Scripture philosophy puts all these in the one soul, *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχῆ*, or *animus*. And if here there is an allusion to the heathen philosophy, it is only popularly, in order to express the scrutinizing power of the Word after sin. Among the numerous instances in which *ψυχῆ* is used obviously in the general sense of "soul," man's spiritual part, the reader may consult Hebr. 6 : 19, 10 : 39, and 13 : 17, "Hope . . . τὴν ἄγχυσαν τῆς ψυχῆς;" "We are of them that believe, εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς;" Church officers "watch for souls, ἀγρουπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, as they that must give account." In these places the sense of the Platonic *ψυχῆ*, the animal life, as distinguished from the rational spirit, would be preposterous. Both *ψυχῆ* and *πνεῦμα* are often used of the *animus* and *anima*, as well as in other senses. In the text under discussion it seems necessary to distinguish them. Calvin well remarks: "Nomen *animæ* sæpe idem valet quod *spiritus*, sed quum simul junguntur, prius comprehendit sub se, affectus omnes: posterius facultatem quam vocant intellectualem significat. Ita Paulus: 1 Thess. 5 : 23, nihil aliud sibi vult, quam ut intellectu et voluntati externisque actionibus, puri et casti mancant." Calvin then cites Isaiah 26 : 9, "With my soul (נַפְשִׁי) have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit within me (רוּחִי) will I seek thee early;" and adds, "Scio alios secus interpretari: sed mihi facile omnes sani, ut spero, assentientur."

*κρητιχός*. This adjective is connected, by the reg-

ular structure of the sentence, with *λόγος*. The first natural breach or change of structure is at the words *καὶ οὐκ ἔστι*, &c. of v. 13. The reference to God in the words *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, v. 13, can scarcely necessitate the supposition of a change of structure, in order to introduce God as the subject (as Stuart argues), when we have God named expressly at the beginning of the sentence, in connexion with its leading subject, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and that subject continues the prominent one before the reader's mind to the close of the construction at *καρδίας*. What structure can be more fair and easy than this? "*God's word* is enduring, and effective, and trenchant, . . . and piercing, . . . and discriminative of the passions and thoughts; and in his (God's) sight there is no creature that is not manifest." The classes of mental states distinguished by *ἐνθυμύσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν*, refer obviously to the *θυμὸς* (emotive principle) and *νοῦς* (rational power), i. e. the passions and purposes, or intents.

V. 13. *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*. The reference is to God, as is evident from the sentiment, "*All things* are naked and opened," and from the phrase, *ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ τετραχηλισμένα* contains the idea, "laid bare," like the neck of the sacrifice for the knife.

*πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*. The simplest rendering is, "To whom is our account," "reckoning." In Luke 16: 2 we have, *ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου*, "Give the account, reckoning, of thy stewardship." Rom. 14: 12, *ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ*. 1 Pet. 4: 5, *οἱ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον τῷ ἐτοίμῳ*



ἔχοντι κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. And 13:17 below, "They watch for your souls, as they that must give account" (ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες). Others have translated the word, 'negotium,' or "commercium," quoting in support the Septuagint translation of Judges 18:7, μακρᾶν εἰσὶ (the people of Laish or Dan) Σιδωνιῶν καὶ λόγον οὐκ ἔχουσι πρὸς ἄνθρωπον. And again, v. 28, καὶ λόγος οὐκ ἔστι αὐτοῖς μετὰ ἄνθρωπον. Here the Hebrew is וְדָבַר אִינְיָנֵהֶם עִם־אָדָם, Engl. "They have no business with any man." De Wette says, "nichts zu thun." To this translation the English version seems to lean, in the text under consideration, "Him with whom we have to do." De Wette renders, "mit dem zu thun haben." Either sense is allowable, and consistent with the context.

## CHAPTER IV. 14—V. 10.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle here takes occasion to exhort his hearers to a persevering and confiding adherence to Christ as our great High-Priest, vv. 14–16, thus introducing the third leading topic of the Epistle, viz. His priesthood in comparison with that of the Old Testament dispensation; upon the discussion of which he now enters, 5:1–10; which discussion he continues, with a single appropriate interruption (from 5:11 to 6:), to 10:18. Or, more particularly, he proceeds thus:

Having then (*οὐ̅ν*) a most exalted High-Priest, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast, for (*γα̅ρ*) He can sympathize with us in our infirmities, having been tried as we are, but without sin. Let us therefore (*οὐ̅ν*) come with holy boldness to God through Him for mercy and seasonable grace, 4:14–16.

These exhortations he sustains (*γα̅ρ*) by the development of Christ's priestly character which he proceeds to make. He commences by laying down the leading characteristics of the high-priest of the old dispensation: 1st, He was appointed to minister between God and man, at the altar, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin, v. 1; 2d, He is able, by reason of his own infirmities, to compassionate those of the people; and for the same reason, must offer sacrifices for

himself as well as for them, vv. 2, 3; 3d, He receives his appointment from God, as Aaron did, v. 4. Comparing Christ, in the inverse order, the author shows, 1st, That He assumed not the office to himself, but received his appointment from the Father, vv. 5, 6; 2d, That, by reason of the frailties and trials to which His human nature exposed Him while on earth, He had learned by experience the sufferings incident to obedience, though he was the Son of God, vv. 7, 8; and 3d, That, having been perfected in heaven, He became the author of salvation to all who obey him, being, by the appointment of God, a High-Priest after the order of Melchizedek, vv. 9, 10.

This third and last statement involved several important points: as the dignity of the priest and the priesthood, the sanctuary in which he officiates, the nature and efficacy of his services, which the Apostle purposes more fully to unfold; but he here stops, to reprove the dulness of his readers, and to exhort them to higher attainments. This exhortation occupies 5: 11-14 and 6: 1-20.

## COMMENTARY.

- 14 Ἐχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοῦς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν  
 15 τῆς ὁμολογίας. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ  
 16 δυναμένον συμπαθεῖσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν,  
 πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα,  
 χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. Προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρ-  
 ῥήσιας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεον,  
 καὶ χάριν εὐρωμεν, εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν.

V. 14. Ἐχοντες οὖν, &c. While this sentence introduces a new topic, the priesthood of Christ, it is yet of the nature of a conclusion from the general scope of what has been said. Hence the writer introduces it by οὖν. He has led his readers, now, over the following train of thoughts: Christ is higher than angels (ch. I.); He became man in order to sympathize with and suffer for us, as our High-Priest (ch. II. compared with ch. III. 1); He is greater than Moses, even when the latter is viewed as the internuntius of God (ch. III.), while God by Him still offers a glorious rest to believers (chs. III. and IV.); and He will hold us to a strict and heartsearching account for the improvement we make of his offers. "Let us *therefore* (οὖν) hold fast of our profession" (κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας). Such seems to us the best and most natural view of the connexion, making the conjunction deductive from the general sum of what has been established

in all the previous discussion, and also from the point last established. This view gives to *οὖν* its most customary sense, and presents a consistent meaning. Others regard *οὖν* here as a mere particle of transition, indicating merely a passage from one topic to another. Others, as Stuart, consider it as a particle of resumption (“as we were saying,” “accordingly”), pointing back to ch. III. 1. Better perhaps than these is the sense here attributed to it by Hoogeveen, as an inceptive particle (“now then”), indicating merely the taking up of a distinct topic. But the proper illative sense, first indicated, is best.

*ἀρχιερέα μέγαν.* The Apostle evidently calls the High-Priest of the new dispensation “great,” in view of what he had said, and was about to say, of his comparative glory and dignity. There is a reference to the same heads of thought, from which the particle *οὖν* draws its deduction. The idea that the author was compelled to qualify *ἀρχιερέα* by *μέγαν*, merely to signify that he meant a high-priest proper, and not one of the chief priests, because at that time the word *ἀρχιερεὺς* was used among the Jews for any ex-high-priest or head of a course, most unnecessarily emasculates his meaning. Would not that meaning be sufficiently indicated by using the word, as it is here used, in the singular number? This was judged sufficiently discriminative by Matthew (26 : 57), Mark (14 : 53), Luke (22 : 54), and John (18 : 13).

*διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,* “Who hath passed through the heavens.” This expression seems founded

on the dignity of Christ, who, in his mediatorial and priestly character, is gone to minister for us in the presence of God within the heavenly sanctuary. The use of *οὐρανοῦς* in the plural is doubtless in imitation of the Hebrew *שָׁמַיִם*; and, like the Hebrew word, it is used to describe sometimes the lower, or visible, sometimes the higher heaven, where God holds his spiritual court. In the latter sense we find it in 2 Cor. 12: 2, *ἀρπαγέντα . . . ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ*, and in Hebr. 9: 24, *εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς . . . εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν* (not into the holy places made with hands, *ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*). But in Eph. 4: 10 we have an example of the former meaning, *ὁ καταβάς, αὐτὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα*. And in Hebr. 7: 26, Christ is *ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος*. When, therefore, we interpret the Apostle as referring to Christ's ascension *through* the visible heavens, to reach the upper sanctuary (as Owen, Kuinoël, and others), we are in strict accordance with the idea repeatedly developed in subsequent parts of the Epistle.

*ὁμολογίας*, "The confession, or profession," viz. of our faith in this High-Priest. The usage and proper translation of this word in our Epistle was sufficiently illustrated on ch. 3: 1 above. There seems to be in this verse a very noticeable reference to the phraseology and ideas of that passage. Christ is there called the "Apostle and High-Priest of our profession." Here, we are told, "Since we have this great High-Priest, let us hold fast our profession."

V. 15. *καθ' ὁμοιότητα*, "Tempted (tried) as to all things after a similitude" (i. e. to us, his believing people). But the nature of these trials is guarded and defined by the additional words, *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. They were all such trials as implied nothing sinful in their source, and resulted in no sin in the manner in which they were borne. We may correctly translate *καθ' ὁμοιότητα*, '*similarly*.' Thus, in 9: 5 below, we have *κατὰ μέρος*, meaning '*particularly*' (*περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος*, "of which we cannot now speak particularly"). The *ἀσθενείαι* with which Christ is here said to sympathize, are sufficiently defined, by the connected idea, to signify not merely the natural, external sufferings of our humanity, as cold, heat, hunger, pain, but in addition, the trials and sorrows of the mind. Christ bore similar *ἀσθενείαι*, yet without sin. They are therefore those painful affections which are usually accompanied with sin, in our fallen nature. How the divine Son could be better adapted for this work of sympathy, by his incarnation, has been explained above on ch. 2: 17. Calvin remarks, "Non quia opus talibus rudimentis habuerit Filius Dei, sed quia nos aliter, quam de salute nostra curam gerit mente, apprehendere non possumus." The connexion of thought between this verse and the previous one is not difficult: "We have a *great* High-Priest, such a one that we should hold fast our profession of faith in Him; and we can thus prove His value, because (*γὰρ*) He is a sympathizing High-Priest."

V. 16. *Προσερχώμεθα οὖν*, "Let us come *there-*

*fore*" (because He is a sympathizing, and at the same time a great High-Priest), *μετὰ παρόρησίας*: "with holy confidence or boldness," "with confiding freedom." The proper sense of this word has been sufficiently explained above, in ch. 3 : 6.

*τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος* expresses God's throne, converted by Christ from a throne of judgment against sinners, to one of mercy and grace, to which believers have boldness and freedom of access. It is every way probable that the author here has in his mind a reference to the mercy-seat in the old tabernacle, over which the glorious symbol of the divine presence sat, and to the intercession of the Jewish high-priest, which he so fully discusses below. Perhaps he would here suggest the contrast between our throne of grace, and the old mercy-seat; for, to the latter none dared come but the high-priest, and he but once a year (an idea which the Apostle explains in 9 : 7, 8 below), while to our mercy-seat every believer may come with holy freedom, at all times. The Apostle gives a similar exhortation also at the close of this argument, 10 : 19–22.

*ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεον, κ.τ.λ.*, "That we may receive mercy, and find grace." Since sin stands between us and every communication of the divine favour, the bestowal of any grace or help implies an exercise of mercy, of compassion and forgiveness towards our guilt. Whenever we seek for help, therefore, and not only when we seek the pardon of sin, we tax the divine mercy. Hence the next clause, *εἰς ἔγκαιρον βοήθειαν*, defines the end of both the preceding verbs.



The preposition here expresses the end of the actions preceding, and should be translated "for," or "in order to;" not with Stuart, "with respect to." "That we may receive mercy, and find grace for timely assistance."

V. 1 *Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περικείται ἀσθένειαν· καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὀφείλει, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὕτω καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. Καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ [ὁ] καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καθάπερ καὶ [ὁ] Ἀαρών.*

V. 1. *γὰρ* has here its usual causal force, which is easily perceived. As was stated in the Analysis, the author, having drawn an exhortation from the preceding topics, sustains it further by the subsequent development of Christ's priestly character, which he presents: "The previous exhortation is reasonable; *for* Christ has the following characteristics as a High-Priest." Such seems to be the force of the connective in this place.

*Πᾶς ἀρχιερεὺς.* These words plainly intend Levitical high-priests, as is evident from the defining phrase, *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος*, and also from the description of vv. 2, 3, 4. He is one who *καὶ αὐ-*

τὸς περικεῖται ἀσθενείαν: he is under obligation to bring a sin-offering for himself, as well as for the people; and he does not take the honour to himself, but receives it from God, like Aaron. Ἀρχιερεῖς is often, in the Gospels, employed to designate the heads or chiefs of the twenty-four classes into which the Aaronic priests were distributed. Thus in Matt. 2: 4, "Herod . . . gathering together πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, inquired of them where Christ should be born." Matt. 26: 3, Τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ. Mark 14: 1, Καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν. And in Mark 14: 53, above quoted, we have the word used in the singular of the high-priest, and in the plural of the chiefs of courses. Sometimes also it is used of those who had held the office of high-priests, but, in consequence of the anarchy of the times, had ceased to exercise it; or of such as were substitutes. Such was Annas, possibly both an ex-high-priest and a substitute, at times, for his son-in-law, Caiaphas. In Luke 3: 2, we find that John began to preach "when Annas and Caiaphas were high-priests" (ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα). In John 18: 13, Caiaphas is said to be the *high-priest for that year*; and Annas is his father-in-law. In Acts 4: 6, Annas is called high-priest (in the same year), on an occasion when Caiaphas was present. But properly it denotes, as here, the head of the whole Aaronic ministry, הכהן הגדול. This officer "is constituted in the

stead of, or on behalf of, men (*ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων*), for those things that relate to God," *τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*.

*ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν.* *ἵνα* here points out the purpose of the high-priest's appointment. The two words *δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας* embrace all kinds of offerings. The former, as distinguished from the latter, denotes unbloody offerings; such as the first fruits, the dough of the first reaped corn, &c. In this place, of course, as the other word is expressly added, *δῶρα* has its more limited and definite sense. But it is often general in its signification, including all "offerings," as in ch. 8 : 4 below. *Θυσία* (from *θύω*) properly denotes bloody sacrifices, and is generally so used when its sense is not figurative. For instance, Luke 2 : 24, the mother and reputed father of Jesus brought him up to Jerusalem to offer a sacrifice, according to that which is said in the law of the Lord (*δοῦναι θυσίαν*). In Hebr. 13 : 15, 16, we have an instance of its figurative use, where we are directed to "offer through Christ the sacrifice of praise to God continually, even the fruit of our lips;" and doing good and communicating are called "sacrifices well-pleasing to God." But sometimes, also, *θυσία* expresses generally all kinds of offerings, as in Mark 9 : 49, *πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλ' ἀλισθήσεται*. Referring to Leviticus 2 : 13, we learn that such is its meaning in this passage of Mark; and that the Septuagint have used it in that place, as the translation of the Hebr. מִנְחָה. The words *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν*, in the verse we are discussing, must be understood of course as depending on

*θυσία* alone: inasmuch as *δῶρα* here signifies those gifts which were not proper "sin-offerings."

V. 2. *μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος*. This verb, according to the classic usage, signifies "to moderate one's passions," and designates the Platonic *ἀπαθής*, as distinguished from the Stoic. This verse is the only one in the New Test. in which it occurs. In Josephus, Jewish Antiq. lib. 12, c. 3, §2, it occurs in describing the privileges offered to the Jews, after their rebellions began: "One may well be astonished at the generosity of Vespasian and Titus, that, after so great wars and contests which they had from us, *they should use such moderation.*" The meaning in the place under discussion seems to be, "to be kind or compassionate." Calvin says, "idem valere puto, acsi dictum est, accommodare se ad *συμπαθεῖαν.*"

*τοῖς ἀγνοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις*. The former of these participles is used by the Septuagint for *אָפְּ* in Levit. 5: 18, and in Levit. 4: 13 for *הָפְ*. The latter, *πλανωμένοις*, is used by them chiefly for *הָפְ*. The two words, as used here, seem designed to carry a sense more comprehensive, like our modern phrase, "spiritually blind and erring." Man by nature is darkened and depraved; and hence he needs an intercessor who can be kindly to him in these defects of his nature.

*ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περιέκειται ἀσθενεῖαν*. The verb is here used in a passive sense, "is surrounded," and the accusative expresses the remoter object affected by its action. Verbs which in the active take two objects,

one more direct and immediate, of the person affected, in the accusative or dative, and another of the thing, in the passive retain the latter. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §32. 5, p. 179. Kühner's *Gr. Gram.* §281. A similar instance of this construction occurs in Acts 28: 20, *τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περιέκειμαι*, "I am encompassed as respects this chain." (In the active sense it would be written, *τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περιέκειταιί με*, "He puts around me this chain." A like construction of the accus. with a passive participle, may be seen in Hebr. 10: 22, *ἐξόρυσισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς*, "sprinkled, as respects our hearts, from an evil conscience."

V. 3. *καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὀφείλει, κ.τ.λ.* *ταύτην* evidently points out *ἀσθενεῖαν*, which is to be supplied to it; and the succeeding part of the verse as clearly defines this *ἀσθενεῖαν* to be moral infirmity, or sin; for, on account of it, there was necessity for sin-offerings: *περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ . . . καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ*, "*As on behalf of the people, so also on behalf of himself.*" The force of this preposition here is equivalent to that of *ὑπὲρ* in similar constructions. From its primary sense of "around," easily comes the tropical sense, which it has almost every where in Greek prose, of "about," i. e. the object about which as its causal point, or centre, the action concerns itself; and hence the nearly allied senses of "on account of," "on behalf of." Let the reader consult John 11: 19, *ἵνα παραμυθήσονται αὐτὰς περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν*, "that they might console them about their brother." Rom. 8: 3, "God

sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and *for sin* (καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας), condemned sin in the flesh." 1 Pet. 3: 18, περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἔπαθε (Χριστός). Acts 8: 15, προσήνυξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν, "who (the apostles) prayed *on their behalf*" (i. e. of the Samaritan converts). See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §51. e & l. The account of these offerings for the high-priest's own sins may be seen in Levit. ch. 8, and ch. 16: 6, 11, 17. The greatest care is not superfluous in fixing the sense which Scripture usage gives to these prepositions, because it is by them that the ideas of substitution and atonement are taught, in many important passages.

V. 4. Καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τὶς λαμβάνει, κ.τ.λ. The author has in mind the requisitions of the law. No one lawfully assumes the honour to himself. The Apostle has not in mind those cases, so frequent in the later days of the Jewish commonwealth, when priests illegally intruded into the sacred office. They are tacitly set aside, as being of course no priests in the eyes of any intelligent and consistent Jew. There is, therefore, no need to attribute to λαμβάνει here, a subjunctive sense, as does Kuinoël. The law appointing to the priesthood may be seen in Exod. 28: 1.

ὁ καλούμενος . . . ὁ Ἀαρών. In many critical editions of the New Test. the articles are expunged before these two words, on the authority of many Mss. The sense is little affected by their retention or rejection. The doctrine is that every high-priest must, like Aaron, receive his appointment from God. The Levitical institution derived all its authority from Him.

- 5 Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν·  
 “υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε”·  
 6 καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει· “σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν  
 7 αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ”· ὅς ἐν ταῖς  
 ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἰκετη-  
 ρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανά-  
 του, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρῶν προση-  
 ενέγκας, καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας·  
 8 καίπερ ὢν υἱός, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαυε τὴν ὑπα-  
 9 κοήν, καὶ τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν  
 10 αὐτῷ πᾶσιν αἴτιος σῶτηρίας αἰωνίου, προσεγο-  
 ρευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν  
 Μελχισεδέκ.

V. 5. *γεννηθῆναι*, “to be,” “to become,” in the sense of “to be appointed;” which is a most familiar usage in many languages. Thus: Col. 1: 23, *εὐαγγελίου . . . οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος*, and v. 25, (*ἐκκλησία*) *ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος*.

*ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν· υἱὸς μου, κ.τ.λ.* The quotation of this verse is from Ps. 2: 7. Some, as Calvin, understand it as a proof here, of Christ's appointment by God to his high-priesthood. But this seems not to be the design of the author, nor fairly contained in the quotation. (Indeed, the subject of the whole second Psalm is rather Christ's kingly office than his priesthood.) The quotation is rather a *periphrasis*, to express, rhetorically, Him who did appoint Christ, i. e. God. A similar periphrasis may be seen in v. 7, *πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.* In such a case

there is always some appropriateness in the attribute or work, which is periphrastically put for the subject, with respect to the matter the speaker has in hand. Thus, upon these words (v. 7), Calvin remarks: "His verbis significat rite eum orasse, quia ad unum Deum Liberatorem confugerit." And so, in the verse under discussion, the author uses the circumlocution with design to call attention to the fitness of the thing, in that it was the Father who conferred this honour upon the Son. The construction should be thus completed: "Christ did not glorify himself to be made a high-priest, but He glorified him (with this appointment) who said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." The proof that God did confer this appointment is presented in the following verse.

V. 6. *καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἐτέρω, κ.τ.λ.* The author now proceeds to establish his point, by this citation from Ps. 110: 4. He uses the very words of the Septuagint. The reader will not be detained with any discussion of the propriety of a messianic application of this Psalm, which is most indisputably referable to Christ, of all the Psalms. Hengstenberg may be consulted upon it. The Apostle's use of the two citations is as though he had said, "He who had first acknowledged Christ as his Son, conferred on him the priesthood; of which last point here is the proof: that he hath accordingly said to him, in another place, 'Thou art a Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek.'"

*κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.* The sense of this peculiar expression will not here be insisted on, inas-



much as the Apostle both explains and urges it below in the seventh chapter. It is a translation of the Hebrew עֲלֵי־בְרִיתָי. Thus the third trait of a high-priest is proved of Christ.

V. 7. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.* These words evidently express the days of his incarnation and humiliation on earth. The whole connexion evinces this.

*δεήσεις τε καὶ ικετηρίας* may be most safely explained as synonymes, used thus to give the intensive sense of most urgent prayers. Thus in v. 2 we saw the two words *ἀγνοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις* used in a similar way, and here *κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων.* The agonizing supplications here instanced by the Apostle, were doubtless those which are related in Matt. 26 : 38, 39, 42, 44, and Luke 22 : 42, 44, when the Saviour prayed repeatedly, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt;" and perhaps we may also include that recorded in Matt. 27 : 46, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

*καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.* Some commentators translate these words, "And was heard on account of His reverence (or piety)." It must be conceded that these critics have countenance in assigning such a sense to *ἀπό.* We find it used to express the reason (why or wherefore) of an action in Luke 19 : 3, *Καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστι· καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου,* "and was not able because of the crowd." In John 21 : 6, *Ἐβαλον οὖν, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὸ*

ἐλκῦσαι ἰσχυσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων,  
 "They were not strong enough to draw it, *because of*  
 the quantity of fishes;" and in Acts 22: 11, Ὡς δὲ οὐκ  
 ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου, "When I  
 saw not, *because of* the glory of that light," &c. And  
 the Vulgate renders the phrase under discussion, *pro*  
*sua reverentia*. εὐλαβείας also has the sense of rever-  
 ence or pious fear in Hebr. 12: 28 below, which is the  
 only other place in the New Test. where it occurs.  
 And this sense is not unusual in classic Greek. The  
 verb εὐλαβέομαι is used only in Acts 23: 10, Πολλῆς  
 δὲ γενομένης στάσεως, εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλιάρχος, and in  
 Hebr. 11: 7, Νῶε . . . εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κιβω-  
 τόν, &c., in the former of which places, certainly, and  
 in the latter most probably, it has the sense of mere  
*natural fear*. On the other hand, the adjective εὐλα-  
 βῆς occurs in Luke 2: 25 of the venerable Simeon, in  
 Acts 2: 5 of the devout Jews, and 8: 2 of the pious  
 persons who buried Stephen; in each place evidently  
 in the sense of "devout," "God-fearing:" so that this  
 rendering could be sufficiently sustained by the usage  
 and syntax of the New Test. Greek, and is not in itself  
 inappropriate.

The larger number of interpreters, among whom  
 are Stuart, Bloomfield, and Calvin, interpret εἰσακου-  
 σθεὶς as a 'constructio prægnaans,' in the sense of  
 "was delivered," and εὐλαβείας as natural fear, put by  
 metonymy for 'the thing feared.' This sense of the  
 participle is illustrated by reference to Ps. 22: 22 (in  
 Engl. vers. v. 21), "Save me from the lion's mouth;

for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns," where the verb הוֹשִׁיעֲנִי is placed to express the parallelism to מִקַּרְנֵי רִמְיִם עֲנִיחֵנִי. Calvin remarks, "Primum, simpliciter ἐὺλαβείαν ponit; non suam: Deinde, est ἀπὸ non ὑπέρ, aut aliquid simile, quod causam designet." (This reason, however, is hardly valid, as may be seen by the places cited where ἀπὸ expresses "why or wherefore.") "Quum igitur ἐὺλαβεία Græcis plerumque sit metus aut sollicitudo, non dubito quin significet Apostolus, exauditum fuisse Christum ex eo quod timebat, ne scilicet, malis obrutus succumberet, vel morte absorberetur." In this sense of *natural fear*, ἐὺλαβεία is often employed in the Septuagint and later classics; and such a metonymy as is proposed, is not impossible. This, perhaps, is one of the cases in which either of the senses proposed is so consistent with the context and with usage, that it is both unnecessary and difficult for the critical student to decide between them. Stuart (in his Excursus XI.) remarks that the true point of difficulty is in the question, "What was it, which was the object of Christ's fear at this time, and from which he was delivered in answer to his prayer?" He was not delivered from the pangs of the vicarious death he expected, either bodily or spiritual; for he bore them to the full. And this difficulty, he adds, has been met by few or none of the interpreters. The answer he gives, in accordance with the rendering adopted by him, Calvin, and many others, is, that the subject of Christ's petitions here was his fear lest the weakness of human nature should

sink under his agonies, before his crucifixion was accomplished, and so the plan preordained for his death should be disappointed; that he besought deliverance from this premature failure of his human powers of endurance, and that the answer is to be seen in the fact noted Luke 22:43, "And there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him." In a similar strain Calvin remarks, "*Sed quomodo exauditus fuit Christus e suo metu, quum mortem quam horrebat, subierit? Respondeo; finem timoris spectandum esse. Cur enim mortem refugiebat, nisi quod in ea cernebat maledictionem Dei, quod cum scelerum omnium reatu, ipsisque inferis luctandum erat? Hinc trepidatio et anxietas, quod Dei iudicium plus quam formidabile est. Ergo, quod volebat obtinuit, ut e mortis doloribus victor emergeret, ut salvifica Patris manu sustineretur, ut post hoc certamen de Satano, peccato et inferis gloriosum triumphum ageret.*"

It may here be remarked, that we are not compelled to find some particular in which the prayer of the Redeemer was distinctly answered, in order to satisfy the meaning of the Apostle: for, first, to one who candidly reads the passages above cited from the Gospels, and here evidently referred to, we think it will seem much the more natural sense, that Christ's human nature shrank from the dreadful task he had piously undertaken, and that he prayed, yet submissively, that, if there were any proper way to evade it, he might be permitted to do so. Of his human nature it was true, as he remarked of his disciples, though true

of him in a higher and sinless sense, that, "while the spirit was willing, the flesh was weak." Second, if we adopt the first interpretation above explained, 'He was heard because of his pious reverence,' we are not compelled to suppose that his prayer was answered at all. The prayer of the pious man is often "heard," and accepted, but never directly answered, when the objects of his desire are temporal, and such as may or may not be agreeable to the better will and wisdom of God. Many a follower of Christ has prayed, like his divine Master, for deliverance from calamity (see 2 Cor. 12: 7, 8), and God has affectionately received his prayer, because it was offered in faith, love, and submission; and yet has not directly answered it, but has given instead the better gift of grace to endure the calamity. It was from the overlooking of this truth, that the supposed necessity arose, which these commentators endeavour to meet. The question might plausibly be asked, whether such submission in Christ, to the enduring of a death which he had besought leave to evade, was not the *ὑπακοή* which we are told, in v. 8, 'he learned from what he suffered.' "He, in the days of his incarnation, offered supplications and prayers, with strong crying and tears, to Him who was able to save him from death (the object of his fear, and the thing from which he prayed to be saved), and while he was heard on account of his reverential piety, yet, though Son of God, he was taught submission from the things which he suffered." Such, we would offer, with diffidence, as the fairest and most natural

paraphrase of this vexed passage. It has the advantage, at least, of retaining for the prayers of Gethsemane, that sense which has usually been accepted as the obvious one, by God's people, in their un-critical reading of the passage, by the light of common sense.

V. 8. *υἱός* is here used without the article, as in 1:1 above. His sonship to God is here obviously intended, for God is the person addressed by his prayers.

*ἔμαθεν* should be construed with *ὄς* in v. 7, as its nominative. To press such a phrase to the refinements of its meaning, would be uncritical. We are to take it in the light of the Apostle's scope. We are by no means to understand him as teaching that Christ learned submission by his sufferings, in the sense that he was *unsubmissive* before; and yet, we are authorized by Luke 2:52 ('Jesus increased in *wisdom* and stature, and *in favour with God* and man'), to believe that, though the human nature of the Redeemer was entirely holy from its beginning, there was a progress and growth in its knowledge, and in the strength and beauty of its graces; even as there is in "the spirits of just men made perfect." The Apostle's intent may be seen by referring to v. 2 above. The priest among men is one who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity. And now, in developing the resemblance of Christ to his type, he should be simply and popularly understood as declaring, that Christ, though he was *υἱός*, condescended to suffer, to submit his human will to God's, and thus to

know from experience what were the trials of obedience to which his people were subjected. The Apostle, proceeding to take up the points of analogy between the Jewish high-priest and Christ, in the inverse order to that of their first statement, thus establishes the second. (See Analysis above.) In vs. 9, 10, he now proceeds to the third point, which was the first in his description of the human priest. This point is, that the priest from among men is one whose function is to minister between God and man at the altar, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. In the light of this fact, the succeeding verses will be easily understood.

V. 9. *τελειωθεὶς* is translated by Calvin (who perhaps looks at this whole passage too practically), *sanctificatus*. Its proper force is, "perfected, or glorified in heaven," having finished his work on earth. Referring to the remarks on *τελειώσαι* in 2: 10 above, the reader will remember that the general idea found in this verb was this: the bringing of an object to a state of completeness appropriate to its proposed condition, whatever that might be. The context there is exactly similar to that of the text now under discussion. There, the Captain of our salvation was perfected through sufferings; here, it is by learning obedience from what he suffered.

Vv. 9, 10. These verses declare that Christ, now glorified in heaven, procures salvation for all his people, acting, by the appointment of God, as a High-Priest forever after the order of Melchisedek. This third and last statement involves so many important

points of resemblance or contrast to the Levitical priesthood, that the author occupies from ch. VII. to X. 18, in developing them. They include the dignity of the priest and the priesthood, the sanctuary in which he officiates, and the nature and efficacy of his services.

V. 10. *προσαγορευθείς*. There seems to be in this word an allusion to Ps. 110: 4, which has been already quoted by the author in proof of his position. We understand it in the sense "appointed;" since, in the nature of the case, for God to call him High-Priest, or salute him as such, is to appoint him to that office.



## CHAPTER V. 11—VI. 12.

### ANALYSIS.

THE author delays the discussion by stopping to reprove the dulness of those whom he addressed, 5: 11–14, and to incite them to make higher attainments, 6: 1–12.

Concerning Christ as a Priest he had much to say, and difficult on account of their dulness; for ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ) whereas they ought to be teachers, they needed to be taught the very elements of the oracles of God, and to be fed on milk, not strong food, vv. 11, 12. Thus were they dull; for ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), (to make an appeal to a general truth, which confirmed his complaint in their particular case), those that fed on milk were unskilled in the word, for ( $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$ ) they were babes; but strong food was for the mature, who had senses trained by habit to discern good and evil, vv. 13, 14.

Hence ( $\Delta\iota\omicron$ ) he exhorts them to leave the elements, and go on to higher attainments, not always working at the foundation only, ch. 6: 1, 2. And (in order to point them to their dependence on God as the source of all grace, and prepare the way for the first incitement which he offers), he adds: "This will we do if God permit." For ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), 1st, there are spiritual advantages and privileges, from which if men apostatize, it is utterly impossible (in the economy of the grace of God, who has thus ordained), to bring

them again to repent; for ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), speaking figuratively, the well-watered and fruitful ground is blessed of God; but that which, in spite of good culture and watering, bears only thorns and briers, is rejected of Him, to be cursed and burnt, vv. 3-6, 7, 8. But 2d ( $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ), for their encouragement, though he thus spake, he was persuaded of better and saving things concerning them. For God would not forget their love shown unto His name in both past and present services, vv. 9, 10. But yet ( $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ) he adds, he would have them show this same zeal to be fully assured of their hope unto the end; that they might be, not sluggards in the faith, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises, vv. 11, 12.

This last idea he proceeds, 3d, to illustrate and enforce, in the remainder of the chapter.

## COMMENTARY.

- 11 *Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος*  
 12 *λέγειν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γέγονατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. Καὶ*  
*γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον,*  
*πάλιν χρεῖαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, τίνα τὰ*  
*στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ*  
*γέγονατε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς*  
 13 *τροφῆς. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος, ἄπειρος*  
 14 *λόγου δικαιοσύνης· νήπιος γὰρ ἐστὶ. Τελείων δὲ*  
*ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἔξιν τὰ αἰσθη-*  
*τήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν κα-*  
*λοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.*

V. 11. *Περὶ οὗ.* This relative refers not to Melchisedek, the nearest noun preceding it, but to Christ, the ἀρχιερεὺς mentioned just before, who has been all along the leading subject of discourse. This is shown by all the following argument in chapters 7 to 10: 18.

*δυσερμήνευτος* means here, "hard to expound." This difficulty arose not from the intrinsic nature of the discourse the Apostle was about to hold, but from their dulness of spiritual apprehension, as is distinctly indicated by the Apostle in the next clause.

*λέγειν* is by some made to depend on *λόγος*, as Stuart. They suppose an instance of 'trajection' of words similar to some of those explained by Winer (Id. New Test. §65). Others make it depend on *δυσερμήνευτος*, as Calvin, who translates, "difficilis expli-

catu." The latter construction is certainly to be preferred, for the reason that we are never to impute to a writer any difficulty or irregularity of construction, where the more natural and easy one will stand. A trajection is certainly such an anomaly, though not ungrammatical. Our construction makes the phrase a somewhat redundant one, though not more so than the other. It is favoured not only by the position of the words, but by the reason closely conjoined, *ἐπεὶ*, &c.

*νωθροί*. The meaning of this adjective and its defining words, is sufficiently indicated in the following context. They who should have been teachers, had need to be taught the rudiments of Christianity. *ἀκοαῖς* is evidently put for "perceptions," for it is by the hearing we get our perceptions. The sense is, "dull of perception." In ch. 6:12 below, we have the word *νωθροὶ* used in the somewhat different sense, of dulness as to Christian activities and the exercise of gracious affections.

V. 12. *εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον*. *διὰ* here indicates the ground or reason, just as it does in v. 14, *διὰ ἕξιν*. "Yea; for you, who, on account of the time (you have been professing Christianity), ought to be teachers, have again need of some one's teaching you," &c.

*τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς* mean "first elements." The usage of *στοιχεῖα* in this sense is frequent. (See Gal. 4:3, 9.) What these elements or rudiments were, may be seen in 6:1-3 below; namely, repentance from dead works, faith upon God, the doctrine of bap-

tisms, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment. We have rendered ἀρχῆς as equivalent to an adjective. According to this Hebraizing usage, the property or quality of a noun which would usually be expressed by an adjective, is often in the New Test. expressed by a genitive. Thus, in Luke 16: 8, we have οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, for *unrighteous steward*. We have seen two similar examples also in our Epistle. In 3: 1 we had ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, for “high-priest professed by us;” and in 4: 2, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, for “the word heard.” So στοιχεῖα ἀρχῆς for “first rudiments.” See Winer’s Id. New Test. §34. 2.

τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ. These words (the oracles of God), are used in Acts 7: 38 (ὅς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν), and in Rom. 3: 2 (Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ), to express the Scriptures of the Old Test.; and here, and in 1 Pet. 4: 11 (Εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ), they indicate the Scriptures in general, including the New Test.

V. 13. Πᾶς γάρ. This verse is designed to enforce and confirm the statements of v. 12, in which the Apostle had argued the justice of the reproach he had brought against them in verse 11, as being *νωθροί*. The charge was, “Ye are dull of perception.” The proof of this charge (introduced by γάρ) in v. 12 was, ‘that when they were old enough Christians to be teachers, they still needed to be taught the elements, and were in a condition like that of infants, which cannot eat strong food, but must still be nourished with

milk. And such a state of things does prove the justice of the reproach of v. 11; for, says v. 13, (*γὰρ*) all persons whose spiritual condition is thus like the bodily condition of little infants, nursed at the breast, are *ἄπειροι λόγου δικαιοσύνης*: they are spiritually *νήπιοι*. Ignorance is the characteristic of infants, together with feebleness of perception for what is not simple.' V. 13 therefore contains the *major* of the syllogism. In such cases the illustrative force of *γὰρ* is so prominent (where the argument is carried on by an illustrative figure), that it may be well translated by our particle 'now,' assumptive of a premise admitted. This comparison of an immature Christian to an infant, and of elementary truths to milk, may be found also in 1 Cor. 3: 1, 2, and 1 Pet. 2: 2.

*λόγου δικαιοσύνης*. Many commentators (as Abresch, Wahl, Ernesti, Kuinoël) understand these words as intended to form an antithesis to *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς*, &c., and give them the same force with the phrase *τὴν τελειότητα*, 6: 1, which is contrasted with *τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον*. So Calvin reads it: "Justitiæ sermonem, justitiæ nomine perfectionem intelligens." Again: "Accipit hoc nomen pro integritate cognitionis, quæ nos ad perfectionem ducit." This seems to us an incorrect refinement, if pushed too far. No antithesis is necessary to preserve the consistency of the sense; for even if we should so exclude all antitheses, and so lower the sense of *λόγου δικαιοσύνης*, as to make it the *same* in sense with *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς*, &c., the Apostle might still say of them

that they were unskilled (*ἄπειρος*) in it. Had he not already said that ‘they again needed to be taught the rudiments?’ The phrase, “word of God,” often has similar adjuncts. In Eph. 1: 13 it is called *τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας*, as well as in 2 Tim. 2: 15. In Phil. 2: 16 it is called *λόγον ζωῆς*. In Acts 20: 32 it is *τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*, as also in Acts 14: 3. This last sense some commentators give to *δικαιοσύνης* here. In these cases, we decidedly prefer to regard the genitive as objective, so that the force of the expressions is, “*The word revealing truth, life, grace;*” and here, “*The word revealing righteousness.*” And in this sense, righteousness may be taken in its widest meaning. Or if any prefer to consider these genitives as simply attributive, the sense obtained will be “righteous word,” like our modern phrase ‘holy word,’ “holy scriptures,” denoting its perfect, excellent, and truthful character. Thus a sense would be reached, not very different from that of Calvin.

*νήπιος*. The sense here intended is sufficiently defined by the context. It is here manifestly opposed to *Τελείων* in v. 14, and is illustrative of *ἄπειρος λόγον δικαιοσύνης*. It may be illustrated by a reference to 1 Cor. 3: 1, *Καὶ ἐγώ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς, ἀλλ’ ὡς σαρκικοῖς, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ*, and to Eph. 4: 14, *ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας*. The Hebrew Christians were ‘as an infant in spiritual strength and knowledge.’

V. 14. *Τελείων*, as was remarked, is the antithe-

sis of *νήπιος*, and is defined in the same verse to mean 'those who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.' The student may compare 1 Cor. 2: 6, *Σωγίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις.* 14: 20, *μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν· ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθε.* Eph. 4: 13, *καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες . . . εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον,* and Phil. 3: 15, *Ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν.* A comparison of all these places will show that it refers to the knowledge of the Christian rather than to his moral state, and that it signifies, not absolute perfection, but Christian maturity.

*διὰ τὴν ἔξιν*, 'On account of habit,' 'habitual use.' This noun is formed with this sense from *ἔχω*, just as the Latin '*habit*' is from *habeo*. The force of the preposition *διὰ* here, has already been illustrated on the words *διὰ τὸν χρόνον*, v. 12.

*αἰσθητήρια*. This word has primarily the meaning of 'sensorium,' and thence, 'the faculty of perception.' Calvin remarks upon it, '*Nec contentus mentem uno verbo dicere, sensus omnes ponit, ut ostendat nunquam cessandum esse, donec undique verbo Dei instructi armatique ad pugnandum simus, ne qua suis fallaciis Sathan obrepat.*' The word is here used in the plural, as we say "senses," for the perceptive powers.

*γεγυμνασμένα* is well rendered, in our English version, "exercised." Thus we find it used in Hebr. 12: 11, 'No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness, *τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς*



γεγυμνασμένοις.' 1 Tim. 4: 7, "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness," *Γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν.* 2 Pet. 2: 14, *καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες.* The reference is to the training of the *γυμνασία*.

*πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*, "to the discrimination of the good and the evil," i. e. of moral good and evil. This phrase is evidently intended to express a high degree of spiritual discrimination. This must embrace a perception both of that which is evil and of that which is good. Calvin well remarks: 'Neque enim aliter in veritate rite edocti sumus, quam si ejus præsidio muniamur adversus Satanæ mendacia.' There is a striking resemblance between this phrase and the one in Gen. 3: 5, by which Satan described the enviable state which he falsely promised to Eve, on her eating the forbidden fruit: 'Ye shall be as gods, *יְהִי כִּם אֱלֹהִים*.'

---

VI. 1. *Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερόμεθα· μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν*  
 2 *ἔργων, καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν, βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν, καὶ*  
 3 *χορίματος αἰωνίου. Καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν, ἐάνπερ*  
 4 *ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός. Ἀδύνατον γάρ, τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρα-*  
 5 *νίου, καὶ μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου,*  
 6 *καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε*  
 7 *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας πάλιν ἀνα-*  
 8 *καινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς*

7 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας. Γῆ  
 γὰρ ἡ πιούσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις ἐρχόμενον  
 ὑετὸν, καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὐθετον ἐκείνοις, δι'  
 οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ  
 8 τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους,  
 ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρως ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς  
 καῦσιν.

Ch. VI. v. 1. Διό, 'Wherefore.' The exhortation to go on unto perfection is in view of their *νωθρότης*, and consequent *νηπιότης*, which disqualified them for the ready discernment of the *στερεὰ τροφή* with which the author wished to instruct them, and kept them back from the state of *τελειότης* to which he wished them to attain.

*ἀφέντες*. Many commentators render this, "omitting," "passing by," understanding the author to propose to proceed to the discussion of higher doctrines than the elementary ones mentioned, which he accordingly does. This is the opinion of Kuinoël and Bloomfield, the latter of whom then makes the sentence, *Ἀδύνατον γάρ, &c. v. 4*, depend on *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον βαλλόμενοι, κ.τ.λ.* As though the Apostle reasoned, 'Let us not lay again the foundation of repentance, &c. because it is impossible to renew to repentance those that fall away after,' &c.! Bloomfield further says *ἀφέντες* can only mean "prætermittentes," "passing over" (for the present); an assertion which seems very strange, since, besides this sense, it means "leaving," not only often in the physical sense, but not

unfrequently in any of the metaphorical senses of our English verb, 'to leave.' A reference to any of the Lexicons will establish this. Thus, as examples of the primary and physical sense, see Matt. 8 : 15, *καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός.* (So in Mark 1 : 31, Luke 4 : 39, John 4 : 52.) Matt. 5 : 24, *ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου.* John 4 : 3, *ἀφῆκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.* Matt. 4 : 11, *Τότε ἀφήσιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος.* v. 20, *ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα.* As examples of the meaning to quit, or leave, in a metaphorical sense, see Rom. 1 : 27, *ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας.* Matt. 23 : 23, it is used in the sense of "neglecting:" "Ye tithe mint," &c. . . . *καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου.* In Rev. 2 : 4, it is used in the sense of relinquishing: *τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφήκας.* This simple sense of leaving we think more suitable to the context here, which seems to require the hortatory interpretation of the passage: "Leaving first principles, let us go onward to higher attainments." It should be remembered, however, that it is through the truth we are sanctified; through the Scriptures we are made wise unto salvation. The exhortation is to a higher knowledge *as a means* of more grace. The two go inseparably connected; and this is the true idea of the *τελειότητα* which the author recommends below. Calvin remarks here: "Jubet autem omitti ejusmodi rudimenta, non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est hærendum . . . Nam in extruenda domo nunquam a fundamento discedere oportet; in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare

ridiculum, . . . Similis est Christianismi ratio; nam in rudimentis quasi fundamen; sed continuo post sequi debet altior doctrina, quæ ædificium perficiat." We do not conceive that the Apostle's meaning could be more accurately expressed, or made plain by a more apt illustration.

This exhortation to leave first principles, not so as to forget them, but to go on to add to them higher attainments, was suited to the state of the Hebrew Christians, and the occasion; and is enforced by the considerations presented in the following verses, 4–12. The unsuitableness of these considerations to the other interpretation is not obviated by referring Ἀδύνατον γὰρ (v. 4) to μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον, κ.τ.λ. (v. 1), which, with v. 3 intervening, is certainly very unnatural. The obvious reference of the sentence Ἀδύνατον γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. is to the purpose announced v. 3, τοῦτο ποιήσομεν. And it is equally obvious that the thing which the Apostle engages here that he and his readers will do, is expressed by ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερόμεθα, in v. 1. The exposition of vv. 3, 4, below, will further evince this.

τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον. These words mean, substantially, 'the first elements of Christ.' Calvin renders them 'prima tirocinia.' They may be compared with τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς, "first elements," in 5: 12, as they are obviously intended to express the same idea. λόγον τοῦ Χριστοῦ is, 'discourse about, or doctrine of Christ,' and ἀρχῆς is a genitive attributive, giving the sense 'initial doctrine.'

*τελειότητα* is the state of the *τελειοι* in 5: 14; signifying an advanced state of spiritual knowledge, the ultimum of which is, of course, perfection in knowledge, and in the holiness which the truth produces.

*γερώμεθα* is to be regarded as in the middle voice. The Apostle exhorts, 'Let us bear ourselves on;' in substance, "go on," unto completeness.

*μη̄ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, κ.τ.λ.* The sense in which the Apostle would not have them lay again this foundation, has been already stated in the remarks of Calvin, quoted on the preceding pages. The Apostle evidently designs to offer the specifications which follow, as specimens of those *στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς*, and of that *τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον*, which he has mentioned above. It deserves to be noted that the specimens are in pairs; and some peculiar relationship will be seen to exist between the members of each couplet. Repentance and faith, baptism and imposition of hands, the resurrection and the judgment, are kindred topics. The commentators generally remark of these specifications, that the doctrines concerned in the acts mentioned, and not the acts themselves, are intended by the Apostle. This certainly applies to the last four, with all of which *διδασχῆς* may be construed. In the first two there seems to be something more *actual*. The spiritual discernment described in 5: 14, implies a high degree of grace as well as knowledge. Spiritual knowledge and grace are inseparably connected ("Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God," 1 John

5: 1). They are both included in *τελειότητα*, though knowledge is more prominent. And in the following context, the idea of the *exercise* of the actual graces or their opposites, certainly prevails, rather than that of a mere comprehension of their doctrine.

*μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καί, κ.τ.λ.* The repentance and faith, therefore, are to be exercised, as well as understood, in order to their becoming a part of the *Θεμέλιον*. The words here indisputably describe saving faith, and evangelical repentance. Two meanings are assigned by the different commentators to *νεκρῶν ἔργων*; that the acts of the impenitent man are so called because they proceed from the spiritually dead, or because they terminate in death. Either or both of these ideas may be adopted.

V. 2. *βαπτισμῶν*. This word only occurs here, and in Mark 7: 4, 8 and Hebr. 9: 10. In the last three places it describes the Jewish baptisms or washings of vessels, &c. In Josephus' Jewish Antiq. L. 18. c. 5. §2, it is used of John's baptism. (The usual word in the New Test. is *βάπτισμα, βαπτισμάτων*.) But this is no sufficient reason for denying its applicability here to Christian baptism, as is done by Schleusner. For the context here almost demands this meaning; since, as Stuart well observes, it would be hard to see what Jewish ablutions have to do with the rudiments of Christian character. And against this meaning there is nothing in the word itself. While a reference to Christian baptism cannot be excluded, the Jewish and John's baptisms are most probably to be also in-

cluded; for the discrimination of the two latter is necessary to the understanding of the former. Hence, most probably, the plural is used, and the apposite adjunct, διδασχῆς: the *rationale* of these different baptisms being, as we may readily suppose, elementary in the primitive Church. Others explain the use of the plural here, as one of the frequent instances of the plural for the singular. Thus, in Hebrew, we have מִן, מִן; and in John 1:13, οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων . . . ἐγεννήθησαν. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §27. 2. 3.

διδασχῆς belongs doubtless to βαπτίσμων. Some interpreters separate it, and translate it "elementary instruction," so as to read thus: "Not laying again the foundation . . . of baptisms, doctrine, and imposition of hands," &c. But the word thus explained is too *general* to suit the design of the author in this place; which is, to specify particularly the first rudiments of Christianity which he wished his readers to have mastered, so as to pass on to others. The three, baptism, instruction, and laying on of hands, may however be taken separately, thus forming a triplet, which would correspond with the other pairs of specifications. But, for the reason given, the first construction is preferable. This subject of Christian baptism, like the graces of faith and repentance, must be understood, and the duty involved performed by the intelligent convert, at the outset of his Christian life. It is therefore called properly one of the 'first elements.'

ἐπιθέσει; τε χειρῶν. This form had long been known among the Jews, in pronouncing blessings

(Gen. 48: 14), and was still practised with this meaning in New Testament times. (See Matt. 19: 13). It was also the form in ordinations, as may be seen in many familiar instances: and the apostles, at or after baptism, frequently, though not uniformly, imposed hands to communicate supernatural gifts. This is most probably the thing intended here; and it was supposed that the disciples would early become familiar with it, because some Christians usually received these supernatural gifts, at the first planting of the churches by the apostles.

*χρίματος αἰωνίου.* These words doubtless refer to the general judgment; and it is called eternal, because it is held in that world, and its results are everlasting. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is here too plainly indicated by *ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*, to need any remark. We have in these two verses an interesting indication of the topics which formed the first instructions of the primitive preachers. A change of circumstances has doubtless rendered some of them less important as first elements than they then were.

V. 3. *τοῦτο ποιήσομεν.* The Apostle speaks in the first person, by a courteous *κοινωνίᾳ*: in order both to convey an encouraging assurance of his confidence in his readers' future improvement, and to express a gentle exhortation. *τοῦτο* refers to what was enjoined in the first verse: "We will go on to *τελειότητα*. Upon the foundation of faith and repentance, and the other great, elementary doctrines and duties mentioned, we will go on to build complete Christian



character, 'perfecting knowledge and grace,' in the fear of the Lord." Hence the relevancy of—

*ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός.* It was well to connect with the expression of such a purpose, an acknowledgment of dependence on divine help; both to remind them of the necessity of seeking it, and to introduce the awful truth by which the purpose is enforced. Calvin well says, "Ita fulminat Apostolus, ne Judæi, dum sibi nimium indulgent in sua oscitantia, Dei gratia illudant: acsi diceret; non esse hic procrastinandum, quia non semper futura sit propediendi opportunitas. Neque enim hoc in manu hominis positum, ut quoties libuerit, a carceribus ad metam transiliat; sed singulare esse Dei donum cursus nostri confectionem."

V. 4. *Ἀδύνατον γάρ.* We have here the first reason (introduced by *γάρ*) for compliance with the exhortation just addressed to his readers. The conjunctive particle points back to *τοῦτο ποιήσομεν.* (See Analysis.)

*Ἀδύνατον* is used in verse 18th of this chapter (*ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν*), in 10: 4 below (*Ἀδύνατον γάρ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀγαγεῖν ἀμαρτίας*), and in 11: 6 (*χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον ἐνδραστηθῆσαι*), in the sense of *absolute impossibility*. It has the same sense in Matt. 19: 26 (*Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστι*), and in the parallel passages, Mark 10: 27 and Luke 18: 27. A similar instance of its use may be found in Rom. 8: 3. In all these cases it is neuter, and predicative; and is employed in an impersonal phrase. When used as a

qualificative adjective, it denotes impotency, physical or spiritual, and assumes, like any other adjective, the 'accidents' of its noun. Thus in Acts 14: 8 we read, *Καί τις ἀνήρ ἐν Λύστροις ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσὶν ἐκάθητο.* In Rom. 15: 1, we find it used in the sense of spiritual weakness, *Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν.* There is no reason for departing, in the place under discussion, from the usage first stated. The reason of the impossibility must always be sought in the nature of the case. Here it is found, not in any natural contradiction and impossibility, such as that 'a part cannot be equal to its whole,' but in the unchangeable ordination of God as to the dispensation of His grace. He can restore from any apostacy, or subdue any obstinacy; but the Apostle teaches us that there are defections which God will not heal, but leave to terminate in merited perdition. The truth here taught is similar to that more generally stated in the following passages: Gen. 6: 3, "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." Prov. 29: 1, "He that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy." Matt. 12: 31, "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." 1 John 5: 16, "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he (the sinner's Christian brother) shall pray for it." And Hebr. 10:

26, 27, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, which shall devour the adversaries." A long and peculiarly stubborn resistance of known duty, may cause God to fix a righteous limit to his forbearance, beyond which no saving influence of his grace will come to the sinner; and though his life be still continued beyond it, he is only awaiting a sure and sudden destruction, either in a state of fatal indifference, or of guilty but obdurate dread. And while a peculiarly stubborn perseverance in the customary sins of partially convinced unbelievers may bring men, some sooner, others later, to this fatal limit, there is one sin (Matt. 12 : 31, 1 John 5 : 16), which at once, whenever it is committed, places the sinner beyond it.

*φωτισθέντας*, "Enlightened." This word is used, in the New Testament, of moral and spiritual illumination. In some cases it seems to intend a saving illumination; but in some it does not. Of the former we have examples probably in Hebr. 10 : 32 (*τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ἀθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παιδημάτων*), and Eph. 1 : 18 (*πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ.*). Of an illumination *not saving*, expressed by this word, we have examples in John 1 : 9 (*Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον*), and Eph. 3 : 9 ("To me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach, &c.

... καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας, τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου," κ.τ.λ.).

γευσάμενους, "Experienced." The same verb is used 2: 9 above, where it is said that Christ "tasted death for every man." There, as here, it is construed with the genitive; in John 2: 9 with the accusative: ἐγεύσατο ὁ ἀρχιτεράκλινος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον. The two constructions seem to offer no difference in sense.

τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου. Some commentators think that this heavenly gift is Christ, and cite his words to the Samaritan woman, John 4: 10, *Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, κ.τ.λ.* Others interpret it as meaning the Holy Spirit, especially in his extraordinary or miraculous influences; and cite the words of Peter to Simon Magus, Acts 8: 20, "Thy money perish with thee, *ὅτι τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνόμισας διὰ χρημάτων κτᾶσθαι.*" Stuart interprets the phrase as meaning "the blessings or privileges of the gospel," "the privileges or means of grace which the new religion afforded;" and compares, as a similar expression, the words *κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι*, in 3: 1 above. Calvin interprets it as 'Evangeliæ cognitionem,' which is, probably, nearly correct.

μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου. The introduction of these words would seem to refute the second of the interpretations offered above for *δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου*. The manifold operations of the Holy Spirit are most probably here meant, ordinary (so to speak) and miraculous. Stuart limits the meaning to

the last. These influences, whether we suppose the ordinary or extraordinary, are not necessarily saving. We have already seen, from Gen. 6 : 3, that the Holy Spirit strove with the condemned generation which was destroyed by the flood ; Balaam was a truly inspired prophet ; Christ represents some as saying to him, in the judgment, " Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name ? and in thy name have cast out devils ? and in thy name done many wonderful works ? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you ; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7 : 22, 23. One may " speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and not have charity." 1 Cor. 13 : 1.

V. 5. *καλὸν γευσάμενους Θεοῦ ῥήμα.* Stuart, Bloomfield, and others, understand by the good word of God here, especially the promises ; but there seems to be no sufficient reason for such a limitation. The figure of *tasting* the word of God is not uncommon in the Scriptures, to represent the *reception* of it. Matt. 4 : 4 (quoted from Deut. 8 : 3), contains a similar expression : " Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Here, again, we have not a necessarily saving trait. Many are spoken of in the Scriptures, as *receiving* God's word, who were no true saints. Matt. 13 : 20, 21, " But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it, yet hath he not root in himself," &c. The same expression is found, in substance, in the parallel passage, Mark 4 : 16, 17 ; and in Luke 4 :

22 we read that when Christ expounded, in Nazareth, Isaiah's prophecy concerning Him, "all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth."

*δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. Some interpret this expression ('the powers of the world to come') of 'miracles, and miraculous powers.' Others, among whom are Kuinoël and Bretschneider, of 'the riches or consolations of the gospel dispensation.' Stuart explains it, taking *μέλλοντος αἰωνίου* in its sense of 'the later dispensation,' as including all gracious gospel influences which are not set down in the foregoing particulars. Bloomfield, Scott, and others, take it for the powerful motives and supports drawn from a future state. The first interpretation is the one most accordant with the common use of *δυνάμεις*, and of the phrase *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. The reader is referred, for proof of this, to what is said on 2:4, 5 above, and 9:26 below. It is there shown that *δυνάμις*, in the singular, must usually be taken to mean miraculous power, and in the plural miracles; and that *αἰὼν ὁ μέλλον*, and kindred phrases, must most probably be taken as equivalent to the Jewish expression for the coming messianic economy *אֵת הַבְּרִית הַבְּרִיאת*.

V. 6. *καί*. This connective seems here to have the force of "and yet." In the remarks on 3:19 above, it was pointed out that *καί*, in addition to its simple copulative force, often carries an additional meaning, derived from the connexion of thought.

*παραπεσόντας*, 'Falling away.' This word is used

only here in the New Test. The Septuagint use it for  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$ , in Ezek 18: 24, which is rendered in our English version, "But when *the righteous turneth away* from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity," &c. In the passage under discussion, it denotes *apostatizing* from the Christian faith and walk. The corresponding expression in that passage, 10: 26–29 below, which is so analogous to this, is, "If *we sin wilfully* after we have received the knowledge of the truth," &c. Calvin remarks, "Atque ut hoc melius intelligatur, subaudienda est antithesis inter Dei gratias quas recensuit, et hunc lapsum. Labitur enim qui deficit a verbo Domini, qui lucem ejus extinguit, qui se gustu doni cœlestis privat, qui participationem Spiritus deserit. Hoc autem est in totum Deo renuntiare. Nunc videmus quosnam a spe veniæ excludat, nempe Apostolas qui se a Christi Evangelio quod prius amplexi erant, et a Dei gratia alienârunt; quod nemini contingit, quin peccet in Spiritum Sanctum."

$\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$  qualifies  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ . The primary and local meaning is "back." The derived, temporal meaning is "again." It here properly implies restoration to a former state, and may be rendered by a combination of the two meanings, "back again."

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  presents the meaning "renew," or 'restore,' with the idea of upward motion tropically implied by  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$ , because a backsliding or apostacy is, by a very natural figure, conceived of as a sinking downward, and the restoration from it as a raising up. This is the only place where the verb occurs in the

New Test. The Septuagint employ it as a translation for  $\text{שָׁחַח}$  in Ps. 104: 30 ('Thou (God) renewest the face of the earth'), and for  $\text{שָׁחַחַחַח}$  in Ps. 103: 5 ('so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's'). This infinitive here is properly governed by  $\text{Ἀδύνατον}$  as its *subject* (not object; see Kühner's Gr. Gram. §306. 1. c.), "To renew unto repentance those who, &c. . . is impossible."

$\epsilonἰς$  with the accusative is properly used of the state into which any thing passes; the meaning assigned it in this place by Winer, *Id. New Test.* §53. a. ( $\beta$ ). p. 317. It is used tropically of any object or aim. Here it means, 'into a state of repentance.'

$\muετάνοιαν$  must be here understood of *genuine gospel repentance*, according to its uniform usage in the New Test. This usage is more fully explored in the comment on 12: 17 below, to which the reader is referred.

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  is used only here in the New Test. The common word in the Scriptures, for crucify, is  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$ . Hence many commentators translate the compound verb here, 'to crucify again, afresh,' as our Engl. version; taking  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$  in the sense of *repetition*, which it often carries in compounds. But in classic Greek,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  is the common word for 'crucify,' and  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  is used for driving stakes or pales. Hence many translate  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$  here, simply 'to crucify,' attributing to  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$  (as in this verb among the classics) the idea of the lifting up which accompanied crucifixion. The first sense is preferable on



the ground of New Test. usage (though *ἀνα* certainly does not always denote repetition in composition, by any means), and it coheres best with the sense. The Apostle's meaning is not, as Bretschneider represents, "that they make it necessary, in order to the atonement of their sins, that Christ should be recrucified;" but they virtually incur the guilt which would attach to his crucifixion a second time; since they act under the same feelings as those who first did it—unbelief, rejection, contempt, and enmity to his righteous authority and holiness. Hence the pronoun *ἐαυτοῖς* is introduced. We prefer to take this as a *dative incommodi*; a construction which is explained in Winer's *Id. New Test.* §31: 1. A strong example of this construction may be seen in Matt. 23: 31, Ὡστε μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς (ye witness *against* yourselves), ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστέ τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας, "They crucify again, to their own condemnation, the Son of God." Calvin with less accuracy says, 'Quantum in se est.'

*παραδειγματίζοντας* means first 'to make an example of,' and then, 'to expose to ignominy.' In the New Test. it is used only here and in Matt. 1: 19, where it is said that Joseph, being a just man, was not willing to make Mary a public example (*παραδειγματίζειν*) for her seeming infidelity. The Septuagint employ it as a translation for *הִקְיָה* in Numb. 25: 4. After the sin of the people with the daughters of Moab, "The Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads (leaders) of the people, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun." It is used also in Jer. 13: 22

and Ezek. 28: 17, in the sense of 'exposure to shame.' This is undoubtedly its meaning here. The Apostle expresses intensely the implied meaning of the act the Hebrew Christians would commit in deserting Christ. It would imply that they had found him an impostor, and now left him, as such, to all the popular scorn which so vast and impious a cheat deserved.

The Apostle here incites his readers to onward progress in the divine life, by admonishing them of the ordination of God in the sovereign dispensation of His grace, by which He leaves those who apostatize from certain distinguished privileges and influences, to perish in their sins. On this Calvin remarks: "Tamen si durum hoc videtur, non est tamen cur Deum insimulet crudelitatis quisquis talem dat defectionis suæ pœnam. Neque hoc pugnat cum aliis locis Scripturæ, ubi Dei miseracordia peccatoribus offertur simul atque ingemuerint. (Ezek. 18: 27.) Illic enim requiritur pœnitentia, qua nunquam vere tangitur qui Evangelio prorsus semel defecit. Tales enim Dei Spiritu privati, ut mereatur, conjiciuntur in sensum reprobum ut Diabolo mancipati ruere in suum exitium pergant. . . . Denique admonet Apostolus, pœnitentiam non esse in hominis arbitrio, sed iis a Deo solis dari, qui non prorsus exciderint a fide. . . . Rursum *crucifigentes* sibi. Hoc quoque addit, ut Dei severitatem vindicet ab hominum calumniis. Est enim indignum ut Deus ignoscendo defectoribus Filium suum ludibris exponat." The degree of these spiritual advantages is not determined; God only knows, as He has the right

to judge, how to apply the rule. We are persuaded that those expositors who endeavour to fix and clear up the exact meaning of all the conditions specified in vv. 4-6, misapprehend the design of the Holy Spirit. He has not intended to define exactly the line beyond which we may not go without finally transgressing His forbearance, in order that the uncertainty may produce a more salutary fear; while he has given us abundant warning of such a danger, and of the direction in which it lies. The general scope of the instruction here is this: "Go on unto perfection, lest God, provoked by your sloth, leave you, justly, to fall away and perish." To professors, not yet fully assured of their hope, it ought, as the Apostle designed it, to be peculiarly stimulating. That such was the exact condition prevalent among the persons addressed, is implied in v. 11: "We desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end." The following verses, 7, 8, serve to illustrate the warning.

Many infer, from vv. 4-6, that true Christians may fall from the grace of God, and perish in their sins. On this we submit the following observations.

I. Concede that true Christians are meant, and that the passage does teach that they may fall away and perish; it is much more certainly taught, then, that they cannot be brought again to repentance. To render *Ἀδύνατον* "very difficult," is to violate usage, and dilute the sense too much for the context. The qualifying phrase of v. 3, 'If God permit,' supposes a

contingency in which God would withdraw His grace, and further spiritual progress become consequently impossible. The illustrations in vv. 7, 8, are of the same import. It would follow then, on this interpretation, that such are the methods of God's grace, that lapsed Christians cannot be restored. This doctrine is more than the Arminian is willing to believe. It can only be avoided, by supposing that the spiritual advantages mentioned were peculiar, perhaps even to the apostolic age; and then by drawing the inference that if *such* might fall, much more might ordinary Christians now, to whom, it might be said, the impossibility of restoration would not at least necessarily apply, on that supposition. We deny that this supposition is capable of proof from the terms employed. There is amongst the commentators, both Arminian and Calvinistic, the greatest diversity of opinion as to their real import, when severally considered.

II. Allowing to this supposition, however, all that it can justly claim, and still conceding that true Christians are described in the passage, we deny that the admonition which it contains necessarily supposes that true Christians could in fact finally fall away.

1. It is not credible, in the first place, that the Apostle would teach contrary to the doctrine of the Saviour, of the other inspired writers, and of himself; of himself even in this Epistle. The well-known words of the Saviour in John 10: 27-29, we hold can never be tortured into any other sense, than that His true

sheep are infallibly preserved from total and final apostacy: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." It is the doctrine also of the other inspired writers, in both dispensations. (Ps. 37: 23, 24), "The steps of the good man are ordered by the Lord, and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." (1 John 2: 19), "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." It is the doctrine of Paul himself (Rom. 14: 4), "Yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand." See also the well-known passage in Rom. 8: 35-39. It is Paul's doctrine even in this Epistle: 3: 6, "Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence," &c.; where it is implied that perseverance to the end is the test which decides whether we were true members of the household of faith. The same idea is repeated in 3: 14, and implied in 10: 39.

2. The affirmation that if they fell away, they could not be renewed unto repentance, does not necessarily teach that they could fall away. It is the doctrine of both the Old and New Testaments, that if a man keep the law, he shall live by it. (Levit. 18: 5,

Gal. 3:12.) It is equally the doctrine of both, that no man can or will keep it and live.

3. God's purposes embrace the means of their accomplishment, and establish the efficiency of those means. And though both purposes and means are, in the divine arrangement, certain, they are in themselves (so to speak) contingent; and the end is, by the appointment of God, dependent on the means. Language may properly be used of them in accordance with this mutual dependence of means and end. For example: in Paul's voyage to Rome, it was revealed to him that the lives of all the men in the ship should be saved, but the ship lost. The result was *certain* in the divine purpose and foreknowledge; the means to effect this result were equally determined in the divine mind; yet when the crew were about to flee out of the ship, Paul said to the centurion and the soldiers, "Except *these* abide in the ship, *ye* cannot be saved." In themselves, humanly considered, the crew might flee out, and consequently, the centurion, soldiers, and prisoners be lost; but as a matter of fact, it was certain, in the ordination of God, that they would remain; as much so as that the whole company would consequently be saved. Surely Paul, by his contingent exhortation, meant to teach nothing to the contrary; and if not there, why does he necessarily imply any thing here contrary to the certain perseverance of true believers? This object is secured by God, in part at least, through the means of motives. Believers are not kept in a state of grace by irrational constraint,

as a wild beast is chained to a post, or confined in a cage; but God makes use of hope and fear, a sense of self-interest, and conscience of duty, with them, as rational beings, to continue freely and spontaneously in his service. Now the addressing of this hope and fear to their minds implies, of course, that God shall speak to a true Christian as though there were danger of *his* apostatizing, and falling into perdition. Yet it is the purpose of God to employ the fear of that danger (which, in the nature of things, and apart from the divine determination, is actual), certainly to cause his continuance in well doing. God's addressing warnings of apostacy to believers, as though they might fall, does not therefore imply that any such actually will fall. Now, the persons here addressed by the Apostle were *professors of a Christian hope*. They entertained at least some hope of their own gracious state; many of them, in the judgment of charity, might be presumed to be true saints. It was proper, therefore, that when spoken to collectively, they should be addressed as believers. Yet, if any among them were self-deceived, as was every way probable, it was possible (both according to human nature and the divine ordinations), that they might apostatize and be lost; and therefore it was reasonable to warn them of this danger, upon the principles of the Calvinist.

III. But it is not only incapable of proof that true Christians are here contemplated as actually capable of falling (though we admit that all classes are em-

braced in the admonition), but there are strong reasons to the contrary.

1. There is nothing said of their being regenerated, justified, sanctified. The terms employed are of general and undefined import, implying high privileges, it is true, but nothing necessarily or certainly that is saving. The only phrase apparently to the contrary is, 'to renew them again to repentance.' As the repentance here named is indisputably true, evangelical repentance, the *πάλιν* seems to some to imply that persons in a truly penitent state are here intended. But the phrase 'to renew them *again*' finds a sufficient explanation in their former profession and acknowledged standing; while the latter clause, 'to renew them' "*unto repentance,*" designates a limit to which their renewal cannot reach; but it does not assert that they had ever attained to that limit.

2. The illustrations of vv. 7, 8, seem to distinguish very clearly between those who, being in a gracious state, enjoy the favour and blessing of God, and those who, being spiritually destitute and barren, are cast off and destroyed. The unfruitful ground there certainly represents and corresponds to the apostatizers here, against whom the admonition is directed. But they are strange Christians, who bring forth only "thorns and briers!"

3. The persuasion which the Apostle expresses concerning the Christian state of his readers, in connexion with the grounds of it, bears strongly the same way. "Better things" distinguished them in his esti-



mation, 'even things belonging unto salvation.' The grounds of this good opinion are past and present good works, which God would remember, vv. 9, 10.

It may not be said that, if the persons in question were only formalists and hypocrites, they ought to fall away; the Apostle exhorts them all, professors of Christ as they were, to hold on and press forward.

To conclude: We have only to consider the present actual state of things in any of the churches, to see the propriety of the exhortation before us. Many are deceived, few are assured; all have partially corrupt hearts, and are surrounded on every side by spiritual enemies and adverse influences. Such was the state of the Hebrew Christians. (See Introduction, p. 5, and compare v. 11, below.) Well then may the Apostle exhort them collectively to lay off sloth, and go on to perfect knowledge and holiness in the fear of the Lord; admonishing them of this fearful principle in the administration of His grace, by which apostacy from certain distinguished privileges seals the destiny of the soul forever. Many, like Calvin, think that this danger is only imminent over those who commit *the sin* against the Holy Ghost; and this sin many confine to the apostolic age. But we profess not to know certainly what the sin against the Holy Ghost is, any more than we can define the precise degree of spiritual illumination, gifts, and influences, from which a man may not apostatize without fixing his eternal doom. Besides: the apostle John speaks (1 John 5 : 16) of

‘a sin unto death,’ which is no more understood; and every sinner who perseveres in impenitence, fills up his measure by death, if indeed many do not long before reach the point where God says of them, ‘My spirit shall not always strive;’ ‘Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone.’ From a comparison of these passages with Prov. 29: 1, “He that being often reprovèd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy,” it seems that there are other ways of coming into a state of eternal, inexorable condemnation, this side of death, besides that of ‘sinning against the Holy Ghost.’ We can therefore only say, in the spirit of the Apostle’s admonition, ‘Let us not be sluggards, but fear.’ We may pass the fatal limit before we or any one is aware. Let us improve our privileges of grace, lest God withhold his aid, and leave us to perdition.

V. 7. *Γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα, κ.τ.λ.* To resume the Commentary: the verses 7, 8 are intended to illustrate, and thereby confirm the solemn admonition which we have considered. Hence *γὰρ* introduces them, with the sense of “for,” or “for instance.” Here the fruitful ground represents those hearers who receive the word into good hearts; hearts made good, of course, by the grace of God. Upon these his grace and blessing abide. The unfruitful ground represents the class against whose sin and doom the Apostle is admonishing his readers, viz. those who, however fair their professions, and however highly favoured with privileges, bring forth nothing but dead works, and,

being rejected of God, are overtaken with a destruction swift and terrible, like that of fire.

*βοτάνην* is used here only in the New Testament. But the sense of the verse sufficiently defines it to be any kind of vegetation *εὐθροτον γεώργους*. The Hebrew word, *בצק*, exhibits a similar use. In classic Greek usage of the word, 'bread grains' are excluded; and it expresses plants other than the 'cereals.'

*δι' οὗς* is rendered in the English version, 'by whom;' which is an unwarrantable departure from the regular usage of *διὰ* with the accusative. We render it, 'on whose account,' 'for whom,' it is tilled. The sense is more natural and easy, especially when we remember that, in the author's day, the farm-labour was generally done by other hands than those of the proprietor himself, for whom the crops were reared; and when so fair a sense is obtained, we are not authorized to obtain a different one, by departing from the usual force of the construction.

*μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας, κ.τ.λ.*, 'Participates in blessing from God.' The figure must not be too literally pressed. Good ground, under God's providential favours, yields abundantly; it is cherished by the husbandman, and the smiles of God seem to rest upon it. Here is sufficient ground for the figurative application, in the mind of a pious Hebrew, which was both agricultural, and devout, in all its turns of thought. With the diversified and artificial occupations by which human sustenance is now earned, and the less reverential and simple spirit which characterizes the civilized races

of men, we at our day can scarcely appreciate that affectionate and direct sense of the divine hand in his harvests, which was felt by the ancient Hebrew farmer. The Apostle's allusion here is doubtless to this simple and devout feeling of the fathers, as it is expressed, for instance, by Isaac, Gen. 27: 27, "See; the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed."

V. 8. ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους,  
 'Thorns and thistles.' These are fit emblems, as contrasted with valuable and edible plants, of the dead works of souls still spiritually dead. The blossoms may be fair, and even the fruit may seem attractive externally; but they are, so to speak, God's curse upon the earth for man's sin. Thus (Gen. 3: 18) we read that a part of the curse pronounced upon the ground for Adam's sake, was, "Thorns also, and thistles, shall it bring forth to thee." So apostates bring forth, in the sight of God, only evil fruit: the 'tree is evil.' In this illustration which the author gives of his intent, we have strong evidence that the character above described was not that of a truly regenerate man. While the character opposite to it yields good fruit, this produces just that spurious fruit which the Saviour had used to illustrate the works of the self-deceiver or hypocrite: 'Men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles.' How strange is such fruit from a tree at one time good!

ἀδόκιμος is applied in the classics to coin assayed and rejected. Its accurate meaning seems to be, "that

cannot bear the test," "that fails of passing muster," and hence, "rejected." This seems to be the sense in all the passages of the New Test. except, perhaps, Titus 1: 16 (*καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι*). Refer to Rom. 1: 28, 1 Cor. 9: 27, 2 Cor. 13: 5, 6, 2 Tim. 3: 8. The expression, 'nigh unto cursing,' is the contrast to that in the parallel part of the illustration, 'receiveth blessing from God.'

*ἦς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν.* This expression is generally explained as a Hebraism, like the phrase *הָרַק לְבָרַךְ*, which we find for instance in Is. 44: 15, translated by the Septuagint, *ἦ εἰς καῦσιν*. Here, again, we must not press the figure unnaturally. The ground must be taken for the vegetation which grows upon it. Unfruitful, thorny ground, which, in spite of good seed, careful cultivation, and seasonable showers, bears only noxious weeds, is cast out of tillage, and burned over, in order to destroy the pests it has produced. Thus it seems not to have the blessing of Providence or the favour of man attached to it. Thus will God treat those men, who, after enjoying abundant privileges, and showing at first plausible but delusive appearances of holiness, finally yield the fruits of a sinful life. They are given up to sin, and finally, at some unexpected hour, utterly destroyed; in order that their evil fruits may not be propagated farther.

---

9 *Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοί, τὰ κρείττονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτω λαλοῦμεν.*  
 10 *Οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου*

ὑμῶν καὶ [τοῦ κόπου] τῆς ἀγάπης, ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε  
 εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἀγίοις καὶ  
 11 διακονοῦντες. Ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ, ἕκαστον ὑμῶν  
 τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληρο-  
 12 φορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους· ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ  
 γένησθε, μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακρο-  
 θυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.

V. 9. *Πεπεισμεθα δέ, κ.τ.λ.*, “We persuade our-  
 selves.” This phrase, as with us, often expresses the  
 surest conviction. Thus, in Rom. 8:38, “For I am  
 persuaded (*πέπεισμαι γὰρ*) that neither death nor life,  
 &c. shall be able to separate us from the love of God,  
 which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Rom. 14:14,  
 “I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus (*Οἶδα,  
 καὶ πέπεισμαι*), that there is nothing unclean of itself.”  
 2 Tim. 1:12, “For I know whom I have believed, and  
 am persuaded (*καὶ πέπεισμαι*) that he is able to keep  
 that,” &c. In other cases, the verb imports only a  
 conciliatory persuasion or confidence, based on good  
 grounds, as in this instance, for the encouragement of  
 those respecting whom it is expressed. This seems to  
 be the meaning in Rom. 15:14 (“For I myself also  
 am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are  
 full of goodness,” &c.), 2 Tim. 1:5 (“the unfeigned  
 faith . . . which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois,  
 and thy mother Eunice, and I am persuaded that in  
 thee also”), and in this place. We are, then, to under-  
 stand here not an infallible conviction, but a strong  
 persuasion, based on good reasons given in v. 10. And

the Apostle should most probably be understood as expressing this persuasion of the body, and not of particular individuals.

χρείττονα, 'Better things.' That is, better things than such an apostacy and such an end. This is defined to be the meaning, by the explanatory words added, καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, which is very properly rendered by the lexicons generally, "things that (hold of) pertain to salvation." Things having a *certain connexion* with the salvation of the soul are obviously intended.

εἰ καὶ would literally mean, 'if also;' hence 'although.' This sense attaches similarly to our English expression, 'and if.' Thus: "*And if I do speak thus, still I am persuaded better things of you,*" &c.; where the sense is, 'although I speak thus.'

V. 10. Οὐ ἄδικος ὁ θεός. Some interpreters translate this adjective, "God is not unkind," and refer, for support, to such a supposed meaning in the Hebrew אֲדִיָּקָה, and in δίκαιος, Matt. 1: 19 (Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν παραδειγματίσαι), and 1 John 1: 9 (Ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν· πιστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, &c.). But it may be doubted whether it has the sense of "unkind," in either of the passages quoted. In the latter it is connected with πιστός (a connexion which compels us to give it its proper meaning of 'just'), and the sentiment is the antithesis of the one before us. As God's fidelity and justice are concerned, and not his mercy only, in the

pardon of sin, since pardon has been promised on certain conditions, and purchased by the work of Christ, which is imputed to us; so here, his justice, as well as his goodness, prompt him not to forget the affectionate and sincere services of his children. As sinners, we deserve nothing from God but wrath; but He is faithful and righteous to fulfil His covenant with His people in Christ. The act of a benefactor in entering into engagements with his beneficiary may be wholly gratuitous; and yet, out of that act, rights may grow up to the beneficiary. The advantages thus acquired are not the less gracious, because they have become rights; for they originated in free grace. Yea, the free grace is enhanced by this very trait, that it does not merely make the beneficiary a tenant by sufferance, but generously gives a *perfect right* to the advantages conferred. Here it is asserted of God that he *will not* do the injustice which would be implied in the breach of his gracious covenant with his people.

τοῦ κόπου. These words are wanting in several ancient Mss. and most of the ancient versions of the New Test. Critics who reject the words account for their presence in the other numerous Mss. by supposing that they were interpolated by some early copyist, from 1 Thess. 1: 3 (*ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, &c.*). But it is more easy and natural to suppose that the various reading has arisen from the liberty which has been taken in transcription to prune a supposed pleonasm, than from such an interpolation from a passage which has no particular



resemblance likely to be suggested by this place, except in these words alone. We therefore retain the words, as in the *Textus Receptus*, and render them as equivalent to ‘affectionate labour,’ in accordance with the use of the genitive attributive frequently seen. True, Christian, and not natural affection, is of course intended; the ἀγάπη of 1 Cor. 13; as is proved by the succeeding words, ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Their good works were done out of a love to God in his people.

διακονήσαντες καὶ διακονοῦντες. These participles, the one past and the other present, are correctly translated in our Engl. version, ‘in that ye have ministered to the saints and do minister.’ Good works in past time, still persevered in, were the visible ground of the Apostle’s good persuasion concerning them. They might possibly be deceptive in some cases; but he was judging by the Master’s rule: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” (See Matt. 7: 15–20.)

V. 11. Ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ. The Apostle here farther asserts his zeal for their Christian perseverance and final salvation, and adds, as a more grave stimulus to the encouraging opinion which he had just expressed of them, the implied truth that these promising labours of Christian benevolence must be continued to the end of life, with persevering industry, in order to inherit the promised reward. It is as though he had said, “While I thus console you under a necessary rebuke, and cheer you on, by admitting the encouraging promise of your Christian character in this re-

spect, let me not be understood as though you might now relax your zeal and repose on your rewards; for it is only by persevering and growing in similar labours to the end, that an assured hope is properly sustained, and the reward finally secured. This is now the object of my Christian anxiety for you."

*τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδὴν*, 'Exhibit the same zeal,' which they had shown in the labours of Christian benevolence referred to. Calvin remarks on these words, "Sedulo, ne dēessent hominibus vestra officia, laborastis: sed non minore studio incumbere vos decet ad fidei perfectionem, ut firmam plenamque ejus certitudinem approbetis Deo."

*πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*. We here translate *πρὸς*, "respecting;" indicating the design, or end to which the will is directed. This is the sense assigned it in this place by Winer, *Id. New Test.* §53. h. (b), 'Exhibit the same zeal towards the *full assurance* of hope,' &c. The noun *πληροφορίαν* occurs below in 10:22, and in 1 Thess. 1:5, Col. 2:2, in the same sense. It is not found in the classic Greek writers.

*ἄχρι τέλους* is dependent on *ἐνδείκνυσθαι*, 'Exhibit unto the end' (scil. of your life, or Christian probation). It thus makes the verb more emphatic.

V. 12. *νωθροὶ* conveys prominently the idea of being 'slow,' 'sluggard.' The Apostle would have them set full assurance before them, as a point sedulously to be striven after, 'in order that (*ἵνα*) they

might not be slow, dull Christians, but imitators of those who inherit the promises *διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας*.

*τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* is put by metonymy for 'the thing promised;' the heavenly rest.

## CHAPTER VI. 13—VII. 10.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle, in his exhortation to higher advances in the divine life, had just held up for imitation, "those who, through faith and patience, inherit the promises" (v. 12). To illustrate and enforce this ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), he selects the example of Abraham, who received the promise confirmed by an oath (vv. 13, 14), and accordingly ( $οὐ\tau\omega$ ), after patient expectation amidst trials and discouragements, obtained the fulfilment (v. 15). He thus, in the selection of his *example*, brings to view at the same time the *certainty* of the promise, as an additional incentive to his readers. This he confirms by unfolding the rationale ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ) (v. 16) of the divine transaction in the matter: Men swear by Him that is greater, and the oath establishes the point; wherefore ( $\epsilon\nu\ \bar{\phi}$ ) God, in order to show to the heirs of the promise the immutability of His will, interposed with an oath, that by a double assurance, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to the hope which He holds out (vv. 16–18); a hope, he adds, which we have as an anchor to our souls, and which embraces heavenly things in the sanctuary above, whither Jesus has gone before us, and for us, being a High-Priest forever after the order of Melchisedek (vv. 19, 20). And thus he is brought back to his argument, at the point where

he left it (compare on 5: 9, 10), and in terms which prepare the way ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ) for the logical assumption of it.

The statement (6: 20) that Christ was, after the order of Melchisedek, a High-Priest forever, claims for Him a priesthood superior to the Levitical. This superiority he proceeds to illustrate and establish in ch. 7, first, by explaining Melchisedek's typical priesthood, and comparing it with that of Aaron (vv. 1-10). The connexion may perhaps be better exhibited thus: "Jesus is High-Priest forever after the order of Melchisedek (6: 20); for this Melchisedek, king of Salem, a priest of the most high God (who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, and whose name being interpreted is king of righteousness; and king of peace), being without father, mother, beginning of days or end of life, because a type of Christ, abideth a priest forever." (7: 1-3). The Apostle therefore commences by detailing the historic circumstances of the type, explaining the name of Melchisedek, and his being king of Salem, as, in important senses, typical; and by declaring that his standing, in the historical account of him, without genealogy, without origin or end, but made like (i. e. a type of) the Son of God, was designed to constitute him (though only in a typical sense, of course,) a priest forever (vv. 1-3). He then directs attention more fully to the type, in view of other historical circumstances, and in comparison with the Levitical priesthood, and shows his superiority (vv. 4-10).

1. (*α*) How great was he to whom Abraham, the

patriarch, paid tithes? The Levitical priests indeed, in virtue of *their office*, receive tithes of *their* brethren, although descended equally with themselves from the loins of Abraham; but here, one that had no genealogy (to boast), tithed Abraham himself, and furthermore, ( $\beta$ ) blessed him who had the promises: and without controversy, the less is blessed of the greater (vv. 4-7). 2. In the one case, men that die receive tithes, but in the other, he who, according to the account, still liveth (v. 8); and 3. We may say that through Abraham, even Levi, who receives tithes, was tithed, for he was yet in his father's loins when Melchisedek met him (vv. 9, 10).

## COMMENTARY.

13 *Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγελιάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ  
κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μείζονος ὁμόσαι; ὅμοσε κατ'*  
14 *ἑαυτοῦ, λέγων· “Ἦ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε,  
15 καὶ πληθύνων πληθύνῶ σε.” Καὶ οὕτω μακρο-*  
*θυμίας ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.*

V. 13. *γάρ.* The force of this connective in this place has been indicated in the Analysis. It may be regarded as related to *ἐνδείκνυσθαι* or to *μὴ τοῦθ' οὐ γένησθε μιμηταὶ δὲ* of vv. 11, 12; for they both express nearly the same proposition, the one affirmatively, and the other negatively. And the conjunction now introduces the illustrative reason for persevering in zeal, which is found in the history of Abraham: 'I desire each one of you to be persevering, faithful, and patient; for (*γάρ*), it was by such a course that Abraham obtained the promise confirmed to him by the oath of God.'

*εἶχε . . . ὁμόσαι.* The former of these verbs here expresses an external, or objective ability: 'Since he had not to swear,' in the sense of 'could not swear.' It is equivalent to *ἐπεὶ οὐδενὰ μείζονα εἶχε κατ' οὐ ὁμόσαιε*, for which it may be considered as an ellipsis. The reader may compare Matt. 18: 25, *Μὴ ἔχοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι*, 'But he not being able to pay.' John 8: 6, *ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ*. 2 Pet. 1: 15, *ὑμᾶς ἔχειν τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιῆσθαι*, 'that you

may be able to recollect these things.' In all the instances of this construction, ἔχω is followed by the infinitive. The usage is a classic as well as a biblical one.

καθ' ἑαυτοῦ. In this construction the force of κατὰ is usually 'down upon,' and hence simply 'upon,' as in Mark 14: 3, καὶ συντριψασα τὸ ἀλάβαστρον, κατέχευεν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς. So in Josephus, B. J., B. 2. c. 3, §2. In Isaiah 45: 23 and 2 Chron. 36: 13, the same construction is used for 'swearing by God,' as a translation for בִּי יְהוָה בְּרִי.

V. 14. ἡ μὴν is often used in the classics, in serious, emphatic affirmation.

εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω ('Blessing, I will bless thee'). This construction is of course Hebraistic here, as it is a quotation from Gen. 22: 17, where the Septuagint, as in many other places, has imitated the use of the Hebrew infinitive absolute. But it was also not uncommon in the classic Greek writers, as in Herod. B. 5. §95, φεύγων ἐκφενγει. The participle undoubtedly expresses, in most cases, an additional emphasis: 'I will richly bless thee, and greatly multiply thee.' See Winer's Id. New Test. §46. 8, p. 277.

V. 15. Καὶ οὕτω refers to the faithfulness of the promise, as confirmed by the oath: 'In accordance with this promise and oath, Abraham obtained the thing promised.'

μακροθυμίας expresses, 'to be long-suffering,' and thence 'to be patient,' or, 'patiently to wait for.' This sense we see in James 5: 7, 8, Μακροθυμήσατε



οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου... μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς, στηρίζατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, &c. "And thus, when (or because) he waited patiently, he obtained," &c.

τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. This is used by metonymy for the fulfilment, or the thing promised; viz. a seed (Isaac) in whose posterity the promise was fulfilled.

- 
- 16 Ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσι, καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν  
 17 ὁ ὄρκος. Ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιδειξαι τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἀμε-  
 18 τάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, ἵνα διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον πεύσασθαι θεόν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος·  
 19 ἦν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ  
 20 καταπετάσματος, ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσηλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

V. 16. εἰς βεβαίωσιν. These words should be construed as dependent upon ἀντιλογίας πέρας, rather than ὄρκος, as our English translation renders it. Had the latter been the construction which the writer intended, the arrangement of the words would have been, according to general usage, ὁ εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὄρκος. By adopting the former construction, also, the proper force of the article before ὄρκος is more easily

preserved: “*The* oath is the end of all controversy unto confirmation.” *εἰς* here expresses the end or issue. The connectives *μὲν γὰρ* introducing this verse, refer to *ᾧμοσε καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ* in the previous; for the scope of the verse is to give an explanatory confirmation how it was that *God* ‘swore upon himself.’ It was because an oath among men gives certainty to the point sworn to; and God wished to give the heirs of the promise the comfort of a similar, and even greater certainty.

V. 17. *Ἐν ᾧ*. Bretschneider’s *Lex.* and Winer’s *Id. New Test.* (§52. 3, p. 311) translate these words literally, ‘*qua in re,*’ Calvin, ‘*in quo.*’ Robinson’s *Lexicon* renders them “wherefore.” Kühner, in his *Gr. Gram.* §289. 1. (3.) (c.), gives some countenance to such a sense, by saying that *ἐν* is used ‘to denote conformity;’ a sense which would give here about this rendering: ‘In accordance with which fact’ (the effect of an oath among men), ‘God interposed with an oath,’ &c. But it is abundantly established by the grammatical authorities that *ἐν* is not unfrequently used of the ground, occasion, motive, &c. So here, *Ἐν ᾧ*, ‘In regard of which,’ ‘wherefore.’ With such a rendering, it is easy to comprehend to what the relative refers, viz. to the fact stated in v. 16. But with the sense of Bretschneider, &c., it would not be easy to give it a natural reference to any thing in the context.

*ἐμεσίτευσεν*. This word carries primarily the simple sense of ‘mediated,’ whence, without straining, it derives the sense ‘intervened,’ or ‘interposed,’ with an

oath. In illustration of the word Bretschneider compares Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* B. 4. c. 6. §7, ταῦτα ὁμνόντες, ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὧν ὑπισχοῦντο ποιοιμένοι. The translation of the common English version, ‘and called God for the arbitrator of what they promised,’ is only *ad sensum*. According to this example from Josephus, the phrase under discussion would seem to mean, ‘He *made some one* a mediator, by the oath.’ As God is the Saviour, of course he can bring in no higher, and accordingly he must interpose *Himself* as a mediator. So that, at any rate, an intransitive sense is acquired to the verb. The English version can scarcely be justified; and the sense first assigned is undoubtedly the preferable one.

V. 18. διὰ δύο πραγμάτων. What are these two transactions? Almost all the critics answer, correctly as we think, they are the promise and the oath. These are both ‘unchangeable,’ ‘incapable of being changed,’ or ‘set aside.’ Stuart very unnaturally makes one of the two things the promise of v. 14, ‘Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee,’ and the other, the promise of 5:6 above, “Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek,” or even that of 3:11, “So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.” The opinion of Storr must be considered equally unnatural, if indeed he concurs in this interpretation. The references to chapters 5:6, and 3:11, may justly be said to introduce a *far-fetched* idea, both literally and tropically. But Stuart argues that the ordinary interpretation is inapposite. “For

the writer here states, that what is sworn to, even among men, must be regarded as fixed and established. More surely, what *God* has *once* solemnly declared, can never be annulled." His drift seems to be that the Apostle could not mean to represent the promise as one immutable thing, and the oath confirming that same promise as another immutable thing, because the promise, when once declared, by the God of truth, was already as certain as it could be made. But this is shown to be wholly irrelevant by the matter of fact, that God did, in condescension to our weakness, not only promise, but confirm it with an oath; and that the author, in the immediate context, represents the oath as superadded to the promise, in conformity to the usages of men. That the promise without the oath, would have been as immutable as the oath could make it, surely does not disqualify it for being one of *the two* immutable things!

*παρακλήσιν*. This word is translated by Stuart, 'persuasion or inducement,' and is so taken as to make *κρατήσαι* depend on it: 'That we, who have sought a refuge, might have strong persuasion to hold fast the hope which is set before us.' But this is forbidden by the arrangement of the words, which obviously makes *κρατήσαι* dependent on *καταφυγόντες*. And the thing is more conclusive, especially because the natural order makes so good a sense. There can be no objection to giving *παρακλήσιν* the meaning of 'comfort,' or 'consolation,' which is so common in the New Test. It is not found, perhaps, in the classic use of

the word ; but is nearly allied to the sense of ‘encouragement,’ which is one of its current meanings. Bretschneider even gives the meaning ‘comfort,’ below in 12 : 5, καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως (rendered in the English version, ‘exhortation’). A sense similar to this is found in the word, in ch. 13 : 22, where also it is rendered in our version, ‘exhortation :’ ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως.

ἐλπίδος. This indicates the hope held out in the promises. It seems scarcely necessary to suppose a metonymy in this word, taking it, as Calvin does, for *the promise* on which hope rests (the effect for the cause), or, with Kuinoël, Bloomfield, Stuart, for the thing hoped for. The reason of this remark will be seen anon. But yet, it is certain that the mention of the hope, refers to the promise on which that hope depends. If we adopt the natural view of the author’s words, the promise here referred to is the one to Abraham, mentioned in the 14th verse above. The hope of the author, and other New Test. believers, is fortified by two immutable things, the promise and oath. But it is in this transaction with Abraham, that the two are found to concur. We learn, therefore, that the promise to Abraham was not a Jewish and national, but a Gospel covenant, and that not only Abraham, but all believers may trust in it. The blessing covenanted was not only the Holy Land, and a multitudinous posterity, but redemption through that divine Seed, who was to come of Abraham according to the flesh. These truths the Apostle here assumes ; he had

explicitly stated and argued them in Rom. 4: 9–17, and Gal. 3: 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17. The understanding of them is necessary, to perceive fully the coherency of the ideas in the passage under remark.

V. 19. ἦν, scilicet ἐλπίδος. Here all the commentators concur in the conclusion that there is no metonymy; for it is evidently more natural and appropriate to represent the mental affection, hope, as an anchor to the soul, than the promise, or the thing promised. If we should say that the promise of God, or the thing promised by God, is an anchor to the soul, the meaning would be less direct and literal than when we say the hope which rests on the promise, and looks to the object, is our anchor. It is *through the affection of hope* that the promise and the object affect our souls. But if there is no metonymy in the relative, why suppose one in its antecedent? That which we represent as the anchor of the soul, may, with equal propriety and directness, be represented as laid hold of by the soul. It should be noted that in both these propositions, there is a *metaphor*, not in the subjects, but the predicates. The participle εἰσερχομένην is obviously to be construed with ἦν.

τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος. These words denote, in a figure drawn from the Jewish tabernacle, the heavenly sanctuary; that is, heaven itself. In the tabernacle, the part within the veil was the holy of holies, into which none but the high-priest entered; and that on the day of atonement alone. In the true tabernacle, of which the Levitical was the copy, our

divine High-Priest has gone into the highest heaven, before the immediate presence of God; and there is our anchor fastened. That is, our hope embraces objects in heaven itself, and therefore glorious, holy, immovable. The hope therefore partakes of the nature of its object, and is “*ἀσφαλιῆς τε καὶ βεβαία.*”

V. 20. *ὅπου ὁ πρόδρομος,* “The forerunner.” As has been well pointed out by Bloomfield, this word in the New Test. generally, if not always, expresses not only the idea of precedency in time, but of a preparation made by the *πρόδρομος* for those who are to follow. The latter is more fully expressed by the addition, *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, ‘on our behalf.’ Both these ideas concur in Christ. He went before us, “and became the first-fruits of them that slept.” (1 Cor. 15: 20.) And he went “to prepare a place for us,” John 14: 2. The terms and phraseology employed in this conclusion, are all seemingly selected with a view to a natural return to the author’s immediate subject. He had approached it, as was above stated, and had propounded it in ch. 5: 5–10; but had digressed at the threshold of his discussion, to rebuke and stimulate his readers. He now passes from his admonition to his discussion, by a most skilful transition. The example of Abraham, cited for confirmation of the command to persevere and progress, suggests the promise on which he and later believers alike trusted. This suggested the hope, of which that promise, oath-confirmed, was the object, this again the heavenly home on which that hope fixed itself, and this the Mediator, who has gone

before and now reigns, on our behalf, in that upper sanctuary. Christ the Priest being thus again propounded, the Apostle repeats the proposition which is next to be considered: 'That He is appointed a High-Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek.' Let the reader observe, also, how each added idea, while it leads the mind forward to the desired transition, also points backward, giving a topic of confirmation to the exhortation.

VII. 1 Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ [τοῦ] ὑψίστου ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραάμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν βασιλείων καὶ  
 2 εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτον μὲν ἐρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ,  
 3 (ὃ ἐστὶ, βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης,) ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

V. 1. γὰρ. We here also assign to this connective its proper logical relation between the proposition preceding it, and the one introduced by it. Stuart very lightly dismisses the connexion of thought by remarking only: 'γὰρ is here the sign of resuming a topic which had been suspended.' We incline, with Winer (*Idioms of New Test.* §57. 4. & 6, pp. 348, 352), to reject, in all cases, all such suppositions of anomalous and feeble senses for the word, and to seek for it



its proper force. It is always most safe and honest, to assume that the author means what he says; and not to measure his meaning arrogantly, by our ability to perceive it. If we are unable, as yet, to see distinctly that logical connexion of ideas, which the writer's words indicate he intended, our business as interpreters is rather to confess our ignorance, and to seek a more thorough insight into the author's intent, and into the true bearings of his thought, than to elude a difficulty, by inventing unusual and unnatural senses for leading words.

An attentive consideration will leave little difficulty here, in assigning to the connective its usual force. Let us premise that *Οὗτος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ* is to be construed as the subject of *μένει ἱερεύς*, in v. 3, all that intervenes being parenthetical. (Thus it is construed by the Engl. version, Stuart, Winer, and most critics.) Calvin introduces the substantive-verb after *οὗτος*, translating 'Hic enim erat Melchizedek, rex Salem.' *γὰρ* then introduces the proposition: 'This Melchisedek . . . remaineth a priest forever,' as confirmatory and illustrative of the preceding statement; 'Christ (was) appointed a High-Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek' (ch. 6: 20). A connexion of thought precisely similar, even as to the expressing of the precedent proposition by a participle, is made by *γὰρ* between 1: 4 and 1: 5, above. See Commentary, p. 15. From the connexion of the first proposition of the 7th chapter with the last of the 6th, the author so introduces his statement of the type, as to

make it serve as an argument for the eternity of the priesthood of Christ.

Various opinions have been held of Melchisedek. The Hieracitæ believed him to be the Holy Spirit; the Melchisedeciani, a Gnostic sect, to be one of the *δυνάμεις*, who emanated from God; some of the Christian Fathers, the Son of God, the Logos; Origen held him to be an angel; Hulsius believed that he was Enoch raised from the dead; the Targums, Jonath. and Jerus. that he was Shem, the son of Noah; and some moderns have attempted to identify him with Job. We know of him nothing more than is contained in the narrative of Gen. 14: 18–20. The only rational sense to put upon that simple and natural statement is, that Melchisedek was a righteous and peaceful king, a worshipper and priest of the Most High God, in the land of Canaan, a friend of Abraham, but elevated above him in rank, and illustrious for his piety amidst surrounding corruptions and idolatry.

*βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ.* The reference here can only be to מֶלֶךְ, in the narrative of Melchisedek, Gen. 14: 18. To make any thing else of the phrase, than a natural and simple recitation of the historical fact so explicitly stated (מֶלֶךְ מִלְּךָ) seems to us in the highest degree fanciful. (Yet the providence of God had a typical design in the name of the locality where he reigned, as is explained in the second verse.) Stuart and others have supposed that Σαλήμ is not the name of a locality, but descriptive only. Other commentators have

almost universally taken this Salem as the same with Jerusalem, on the authority of Josephus, Jewish Antiq. B. I. c. 10. §2. Strong confirmation is found for this in Psalm 76 : 2 (in Hebrew, v. 3), "In Salem also is his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion."

V. 2. The Apostle, in interpreting the names of Melchisedek and of the seat of his kingdom, plainly from the context assigns to them a spiritual and typical import. It would be strange, indeed, if these characteristics were designed to teach merely that Melchisedek was a 'righteous and peaceful king.' The history, the analogy between the type and antitype, and the significant import of names and circumstances in patriarchal times, justify the opinion that, in his personal character, he was such a king. But then, as is intimated in this concession, the type would thus only be the more complete, the better adapted to the design of foreshadowing the antitype. In the latter we must seek suitable characteristics, and when the terms are applied to Him, we must understand them in the largest sense. Thus, of the characteristics of the Messiah as foretold in Isaiah 9 : 6, 7, among the most prominent are these : that his name should be called 'The Prince of Peace,' that he should 'establish his kingdom with justice and judgment,' and that it should be 'from henceforth even forever.'

*ἐρμηνευόμενος.* The features of the type here exhibited, set forth the kingly character of the antitype. He is the king of righteousness and peace, in the truest and highest sense. It lies on the very surface

here, that the author meant to have his readers receive the impression (as they will do, unless there is a positive effort made to avoid it), that, as the type united the priestly and regal character, so did the antitype; and it is equally evident that this was designed to show, in part, the higher order of this priesthood. It is done as it were, *en passant*, but must not therefore be overlooked; while the great distinguishing feature is more prominently stated in v. 3, viz. the eternity of the dignities.

V. 3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος. The last of these three words should be understood as explicative of the two former; so that we have here a general, after a particular, affirmation. Calvin, we apprehend, has best exhibited the sense: "*Sine patre*. 'Ita malo, quam *ignoti* (vel non sacerdotalis, he might have added) patris. Expressius enim quiddam voluit dicere apostolus quam genus Melchizedek obscurum fuisse vel ignotum. . . . Eximit ergo ipsum Melchizedek a communi nascendi lege, quo significat eternum fuisse, ut recens ejus origo in hominibus quærenda non sit. Certum quidem est, a parentibus fuisse progenitum; sed hic de eo tanquam privato homine Apostolus non disputat; quin potius illum induit persona Christi. Itaque nihil aliud sibi in eo intueri permittit, quem quod Scriptura docet. Nam in omnibus quæ ad Christum pertinent tractandis, ea adhibenda est religio, ut nihil sapiamus nisi ex verbo Domini. Nunc, cum Spiritus Regem sui temporis præstantissimum inducens, de ortu ejus taceat, nec postea mentionem ullam faciat mortis,

nonne hoc perinde valet acsi accommodata esset ejus æternitas? Quod autem in Melchizedek fuit adumbra- tum vere in Christo exhibitum est. Ergo, hac medio- critate contentos esse nos decet, quod, dum Scriptura Melchizedek talem nobis proponit, quasi qui nunquam vel natus sit vel mortuus, velut in pictura demonstrat nullum Christo esse nec principium nec finem. . . . Atqui Melchizedek non hic in privata (ut aiunt) quali- tate, sed quatenus sacer est Christi typus, consideratur. Nec vero fortuito, vel per incogitantiam id videri omissum debet, quod nulla illi cognatio tribuitur, nul- lus habetur de morte sermo; verum id potius consulto fecit Spiritus, ut nos supra vulgarem hominum ordinem attolleret."

*ἀφωμοιωμένος.* This word is used only here in the New Test. The Lexicons generally translate it, 'likened to,' 'made like.' With this meaning, the clause contains obvious confirmation of Calvin's inter- pretation above given. The antithesis indicated by δὲ following *ἀφωμοιωμένος* is not to be neglected. The sense runs thus: "Melchisedek . . . without father, without mother, that is to say, having no genealogy as a priest, having (in his priestly capacity) no fixed termini to the duration of his office; *but* (unlike the Aaronic priests) assimilated to the Son of God (in these respects), remaineth a perpetual priest." Calvin here remarks: "*Assimilatus.* Nempe quoad ferebat significandi ratio; semper enim analogia inter rem et signum tenenda est." Stuart gives to *ἀφωμοιωμένος* a weaker sense, 'like to,' or 'being compared to,' and

supposes that if the sense adopted by us, by Calvin, and the English version, were adopted, we should be compelled to admit a *ὑστέρων πρότερον*. He urges that, in this view, it was Christ who was made like to Melchisedek (Ps. 110: 4, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek"), and not the latter that was made like to Christ. It is true that "the Apostle is not here labouring to show that Melchisedek *was made like to Christ*," but he is expounding the type; and he here declares that the particulars just mentioned, were true of Melchisedek, *because he was made like to Christ*; in other words, because he was a type of him. It was an expedient to represent, by a mortal type, the eternity of the antitype. It is true that the royal priest of Salem preceded Christ in time; but Christ was first in the divine design. The reason why the divine Providence gave to Melchisedek, in his name, residence, character, and the peculiar historical record left of him, these particular characteristics, was, *that he might be fit* for a type to represent the Saviour to come. So that it is literally true, Melchisedek was *made like* that divine King and Priest, whose official character had been, from eternity, shaped out in the divine intention, although it was not actually exhibited in the flesh till many generations after Melchisedek.

*εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.* On these words remarks Küttneri Hypomn. New Test.: 'Nusquam sacerdotium amississe fertur; plus in typo exprimi non potuit.' The word is only found in the Hebrews, of all the books in the

New Test., viz. 10: 1, below: *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (here it should be rendered 'perpetually,' and does not signify an actual eternity); 10: 12, *αὐτὸς δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (where it signifies clearly an actual eternity); and 10: 14, *Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους*. In this last passage, also, a duration positively unending may be understood. It is properly remarked, therefore, by Stuart, that *διηνεκές* in our text does not, in the absolute sense, assert eternity of the priesthood of Melchisedek, but only signifies that it was not, like Aaron's, limited to a *definite* period. There is a sense in which Christ's mediatorial functions also will end. See 1 Cor. 15: 24–28. *διηνεκές* is used by Symmachus, in Ps. 48: 15, as a translation for *עַד עַד*.

- 
- 4 Θεωρεῖτε δέ, πηλίκος οὗτος, ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, ὁ πατριάρχης!  
 5 Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες, ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβρα-  
 6 ἀμ· ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας  
 7 εὐλόγηκε. Χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας, τὸ ἔλατ-  
 8 τον ὑπὸ τοῦ χρηϊττονος εὐλογεῖται. Καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνουσιν,

9 ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ. Καί, ὡς ἔπος  
 εἰπεῖν, διὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Λευὶ ὁ δεκάτας λαμβά-  
 10 ρων δεδεκάτωται· ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς  
 ἦν, ὅτε συνήνησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ.

V. 4. *ἀκροθινίων*. This word is from *ἄκρον* and *θιν*, *θις*, a heap. In classic Greek writers it is used to express the top of the heap of spoils (thrown together in order to division), which was devoted to the gods, and placed in the hands of the priests. It was also used by them of the first fruits of the earth, which received the same destination. This is the word used, by Philo and Josephus, of the *spoils* taken by Abraham from the five kings. The reader may consult, for these items, Bretschneider's and Wahl's Lexicons. Hence some critics render the word in this place *spoils* (a part being taken for the whole, the peak of the heap for the heap itself), and others, *the best of the spoils*. The former is the more probable, because it is almost certain that Abraham gave the tenth of the whole, and not a tenth of a small picked portion (ver. 6, *δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ*). The argument of this verse needs little illustration. It is plain that the recipient is greater in rank than the payer of tithes; and in oriental tribes the rank of the patriarch is superior to that of any branch or individual descended from him, because he is considered as representing the collective dignity of the whole nation proceeding from him. Melchisedek, therefore, is greater than Levi.

ὁ πατριάρχης. This noun, accordingly, receives



an article and a position intended to make it eminently emphatic. This emphatic position doubtless has reference to the argument, as it is unfolded below: 'to whom Abraham gave a tenth of the spoils; yes, the patriarch!' Winer's *Id. New Test.* may be consulted, §65. 3, p. 416.

Vs. 5, 6, are designed to strengthen the argument from the consideration just presented in v. 4. In these three verses (with the 7th as a summary appendix), we have presented the first of the three arguments by which, as was stated in the Analysis, the superiority of the order of Melchisedek to the Levitical priesthood is proved. This first argument subdivides itself into two kindred ones: ( $\alpha$ ) that Melchisedek tithed Abraham; ( $\beta$ ) that he blessed him; - both of which imply superiority. These verses are designed at the same time to obviate any counter argument that might be drawn from the fact that the Levitical priests received tithes of their brethren. The scope of this part of the Apostle's language is: 'The priesthood gave the Levites this pre-eminence over their brethren descended equally with them from the loins of Abraham: a greater priesthood must his be, who, though having no genealogy from them (in fact, having no genealogy whatever to confer distinction on him), tithed and blessed Abraham their father, and the receiver of the promises.' Calvin thus unfolds the scope: "*Quum Leuitis Deus concessit jus exigendi a populo decimas, ita Israelitis omnibus eos præfecit, tametsi in eodem parente essent omnes simul progeniti; atqui*

Abraham, qui omnium pater est, sacerdoti aliegnæ solvit decimas. Ergo huic sacerdoti omnes posterii Abrahæ subjecti sunt.”

In judging of this argument, we must remember the pre-eminence given by God to Abraham, in that he made him the father of the faithful. We must remember, too, that the receiving of tithes, or pronouncing of blessings, belonged to official or natural superiors. The superiority of the Levites over their brethren, in virtue of which they tithed and blessed them, was only official. Melchisedek boasted no such technical and official superiority derived from mere regularity of genealogy, and yet he tithed and blessed the patriarch who was both the natural and official superior, both of Levi and all his equal brethren. It may even be suggested with plausibility, that there is this meaning in the periphrasis for the Aaronic priesthood, οἱ μὲν τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες, ‘they that received the priest’s office;’ and in the statement, ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ‘they have a command to tithe the people according to the law;’ together with the antithetic statement, ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ. These may possibly warrant the idea that the Levitical priesthood was wholly *derived* in its functions and immunities, while Melchisedek’s, without genealogy, and under no law, combining the regal and priestly character, exhibits a priesthood of a higher order, and typifying that of Christ, who, in virtue of his divine nature, has authority in himself to tithe and

bless. But here we may be referred to 5: 5, 6 above; for in that place it is stated that Christ was like the Aaronic priesthood in this very particular, that he received his office *by appointment*, and ‘did not glorify himself to be made a priest.’ This is true; but yet Christ did not derive his priesthood from a genealogical descent, and exercise its powers, *as one of a class, in virtue of a regular institution*. And it should be remembered, also, that Christ was not only man, but God, independent, and assuming his mediatorial functions of his own good pleasure.

*μὴ γενεαλογούμενος*. This word occurs only here in the New Test. But it is evident that it should be rendered, ‘not being reckoned of them,’ i. e. not being of their genealogy. The use of the indirect negative *μὴ* with this participle, should also be noticed. It does not here express a negation less complete than *οὐ*, but shows that the truth expressed by this clause is not before the mind of the writer directly as a subject of narration, but indirectly, as a conception of the mind bearing on the narration: “But this man, *though not reckoned* genealogically of them, tithed Abraham.”

*ἐπαγγελίας*. The promises made to Abraham are here named in the plural, as being repeated on different occasions, and really containing different items, not one only. We do not recognize the necessity for introducing here a Hebraizing *pluralis excellentiæ*, as is done by some, inasmuch as there is a fair and natural sense, fitted to the shape of the expression, without it.

V. 7. τὸ ἕλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται.

Some critics say that *τὸ ἔλαττον* presents an instance of the use of the neuter for the masculine. John 6: 37 may be compared, *Πᾶν, ὃ δίδωσί μοι ὁ πατήρ, πρὸς ἐμὲ ἤξει*, and 1 Cor. 6: 11, *Καὶ ταῦτα τινὲς ἤτε* (i. e. *κλέπται, πλεονέκται, &c.*). We would prefer to say that the author here uses the abstract for the concrete. It is well known that the Greek neuter sometimes carries this sense (compare Winer's *Id. New Test.* §27. 4, p. 146). The author announces a general proposition, containing a principle certainly fit in itself, and strictly accordant with facts under the patriarchal and Mosaic economies. A similar instance of the neuter in general statements may be seen in 8: 13 below. Speaking of the *διαθήκαι*, the Apostle says, *τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀθανασμοῦ*. In support of the fact that blessing is the act of a superior, Calvin very justly points out that there are two kinds of blessing: the one mutual, where God's people invoke his favour on each other reciprocally, where no superiority is implied; the other official, where the agent speaks as God's minister and legate. Here the reciprocity is out of the question. Such was the blessing given by Isaac to Jacob, Gen. 27: 27; by Jacob to the sons of Joseph, Gen. 48: 15; that which the priests were authorized to confer on the people, Numb. 6: 23; and the blessing of the apostles by Christ, Luke 24: 50. In such cases, it is God's blessing which is pronounced; it is by authority, and is efficacious. In all these cases the superiority of him who pronounces it is manifest.

V. 8. ἀποθνήσκοντες. ‘Men who die’ here receive tithes: consequently their office is temporary. The same point of contrast is taken up and more fully unfolded in vv. 23, 24 below.

μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ. The subject of this clause is to be construed with the verb to be supplied, viz. “received tithes:” “But there, he who is certified to that he liveth (received tithes).” Calvin here says well: “Silentium de morte . . . pro vitæ testimonio accipit. Non valeret hoc quidem in aliis, sed in Melchizedek, quatenus imago est Christi, merito valere debet. Nam quia hic agitur de spirituali Christi regno et sacerdotio, nihil loci humanis conjecturis relinquitur; nec scire aliud fas est, quam quod scripturis proditum legimus.” That is to say, The type is described as having no end; the order of priesthood which it represents, is therefore eternal.

V. 9. ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ‘Ut ita dicam,’ ‘so to speak,’ a qualifying or softening formula, common in the Greek writers. There are but two cases in the New Test. where this exegetical infinitive is introduced with ὡς, this passage, and Acts 20:24, where it is manifestly equivalent to ὥστε. The construction with ὥστε is more frequent. In all cases, the relation of these infinitives to the leading verbs of the sentence is very lax; and here it seems to stand wholly without regimen. Some critics have translated it, “Ut breviter dicam.’ De Wette translates it, ‘so zu sagen.’ Krebsius translates thus: “Ὡς ἔπος (ἐν) εἰπεῖν, Ut verbum tantum unum dicam—ut breviter dicam.’ Fischer and

Kypke render: *Ut ita dicam, dixerim fere.* Küttneri Hypomnem., *Ut dicam quod res est.*

It is not easy to see how Levi's being in the loins of Abraham at the time of this transaction, proved the Aaronic priesthood, instituted long after, to be subordinate or inferior to that of Melchisedek. Hence some understand the argument as addressed particularly to the Jews, whose views of Abraham as their progenitor and covenant-head would make them feel its force. Such an *argumentum ad hominem* might be admitted in a context requiring it. We find an instance of a similar one used by our Saviour himself, in Matt. 12 : 27, "And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges;" where Christ argues upon a supposition which he did not mean to affirm, and argues fairly, because it was affirmed by his opponents. But it is by no means clear that here *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν* so dilutes or modifies the argument; on the contrary, admitting the qualifying force of the phrase, the argument is still propounded in such a way, as to lead us to believe that the Apostle meant to ascribe to it some force upon other principles than those of mere Jewish bigotry and mistaken pride. This ground of argument we may perhaps find in the fact that Abraham *was truly* the covenant-head of his posterity in the line of Isaac and Jacob, in whose descendants the promises made to him were fulfilled. It was in virtue of this covenant with Abraham, that the Jews inherited their distinguished privileges as a nation. It was

the transaction with Abraham which brought them into the relation of a "peculiar people" to Jehovah; and hence, in his patriarchal character and acts, he stood forth as the representative or federal head of the sacerdotal nation, so far as all the promises, privileges, and institutions of that Judaical covenant were concerned. He was thus both their natural progenitor and their covenant-head, by the appointment of God. We must remember that He was concerned, through His providence and promises, in all this business. Therefore, when Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedek as priest of the Most High God, and received a blessing from him, it was a historical fact intentionally introduced by God's providence, with a view to its becoming a feature of the type (so to speak) which Melchisedek, in his history and functions, was fore-ordained to present, of the supreme and eternal High-Priest. This providential incident prefigured and represented, by the divine intention, the supremacy of the antitype; and in it Abraham acknowledged the official superiority of the type, not only over himself, but over his posterity then in his loins, represented by and acting in him; and this though he was a patriarch, and inheritor of the promises. See vv. 4-7.

The objection obviously arises to the Apostle's argument: 'If this transaction proves the inferiority of Levi to Melchisedek, why does it not equally prove it of Judah, of the line of David, and of Christ?' The answer presented by Calvin (*Commentary in loco*) is conclusive: Christ's divine nature and extraordinary

generation exempt him from the comparison: he was not in the loins of Abraham, at the time of the transaction, in the sense in which Levi was. We may apply here the solution which is implied for our Saviour's question in Matt. 22: 45, "If David then call him *Lord*, how is he his son?" There was a sense in which he was David's *Lord*, far higher, more enduring and important, than that in which he was his son. And besides, the fact that Melchisedek was designed to stand, in this transaction, as the type of Christ, of itself renders such a logical opposition an absurdity. It places the antitype at once on a higher grade. "Quod subordinatur non pugnat."

V. 10. ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ, κ.τ.λ. ἔτι is translated by Bretschneider, Schon, Robinson, by 'even,' 'already.' They refer, for illustration of this meaning, to Luke 1: 15, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, where, Bloomfield remarks, ἔτι might be correctly replaced by ἤδη. Stuart translates by 'etiam nunc,' 'etiam tunc,' 'even then,' 'already.' The rendering of the English version, 'yet,' 'still,' seems, at first view, not to be accordant with the Apostle's scope in the passage, although it is far the easiest and most defensible on grounds of usage and etymology. It would make the author say, 'Levi was *as yet* unbegotten;' whereas the exigencies of the argument seem to require the statement that Levi was *already* (in a certain sense) in existence, i. e. in his progenitor's loins. This is the sense preferred by Stuart. But it may still be questioned whether the Eng-



lish version would not appear strictly accordant with the author's scope, if we looked at it from a point of view more strictly *Jewish*. The Apostle does not wish to establish the assertion that descendants as yet unborn were representatively in existence in their patriarchal and covenant-head. That any Jew would dispute this, was not the danger; it was an idea too congenial to Jewish modes of thought. On the contrary, the point the author would set forth is this: that Levi *as yet had no other than* a representative existence; his personal existence had not yet begun; and therefore he cannot be exempted from the condition of inferiority which the act of his representative implied. Let the reader ponder the natural connexion and scope of the passage with an eye cleared of pre-conceptions. It needs scarcely to be remarked, in conclusion, that the author does not intend to assert the existence of Levi, in his ancestor, in a physiological sense, but only to teach that Levi and his descendants were affected in their ceremonial rights and dignities by all these federal transactions, as though they had been present; and this on account of the representative nature of Abraham's acts.

## CHAPTER VII. 11—28.

### ANALYSIS.

HAVING argued the superiority of Christ's priesthood to the Aaronic, from the superior order of the type, vv. 1-10, the author continues the same argument, by a more direct comparison, to the end of the chapter, vv. 11-28.

1. The raising up of a priest after the order of Melchisedek, different from that of Aaron, which was the basis of the old dispensation, showed that perfection (*τελειώσις*, see Commentary) was unattainable by the Levitical priesthood; and the more, since a change of this priesthood inferred a change of the whole economy, vv. 11, 12. There has been such a change; for (*γάρ*), First, He, i. e. Christ, of whom these things were said (as in Ps. 110: 4), was of *a tribe that had nothing to do at the altar*, which was manifest (v. 14, *γάρ*) from the notorious fact that our Saviour was sprung from Judah, to whose tribe Moses gave no priestly functions, vv. 13, 14. Second, it is yet further manifest that there has been such a change of the priesthood, and consequently of the economy, if a priest of *a different order* has been raised up, not according to a carnal institute, but by virtue of a life that is indissoluble, which is plain from the oath of institution (*γάρ*), vv. 15-17. For (*γάρ*, v. 18), there is thus the abrogation of the first ordinance on account

of its weakness and inefficiency (for the law brought nothing to perfection); and by the substitute, there is the introduction of a better hope, even one by which we are brought near to God, vv. 18, 19.

2. The institution of Christ's priesthood with the solemnity of an oath, which was wanting at the appointment of the Aaronic, argues Him a sponsor of a better dispensation (compare v. 11), vv. 20–22.

3. In the one case there are many *successive* priests, because they die; but Christ, who continues forever the same, holds the priesthood without succession, and therefore can save to the uttermost, since He lives always to intercede for His people, vv. 23–25.

4. For (*γὰρ*) such a High-Priest became (was needful for) us, who finally was spotlessly pure and exalted to heaven; who thus had no need, as the Levitical high-priests have daily, to offer sacrifices first *for their own sins*, then for those of the people; for He hath offered himself *once only for the people*, vv. 26, 27: the *rationale* of all which is, (*γὰρ*) that the law makes weak and sinful men priests, but the oath succeeding the law, and superseding it, appoints to the priesthood the Son, glorified forever, v. 28.

## COMMENTARY.

- 11 *Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν, (ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο·) τίς ἔτι χρεία, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἕτερον ἀνίστα-*  
 12 *σθαι ἱερέα, καὶ οὐ "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρῶν" λέ-*  
 13 *γεσθαι; Μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἐξ*  
 14 *ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται. Ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα, φυλῆς ἐτέρας μετέσχηκεν, ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκε τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· πρόδηλον γάρ, ὅτι ἐξ Ἰουδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης Μωϋσῆς ἐλάλησε.*  
 15 *Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίότητα Μελχισεδέκ ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτε-*  
 16 *ρος, ὅς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς γέγονεν,*  
 17 *ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύνναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. Μαρτυρεῖ γάρ· "Ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν*  
 18 *τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ."* Ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγοῦσης ἐντολῆς, διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ  
 19 ἀνωφελές, (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος·) ἐπει-  
 αγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ.

V. 11. *Εἰ μὲν οὖν, κ.τ.λ.* The particles *μὲν οὖν* here, as often elsewhere, carry little more meaning than that of transition; introducing a continuation of the discussion. Calvin renders them by *Porro*. Such a sense must be assigned to them in Hebr. 9: 1, *Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιοῦματα λατρείας, τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν*, and in Acts 26: 4, where Paul, after com-

pleting the exordium of his discourse before Agrippa with the words, "Wherefore I pray thee of thy clemency to hear me," passes on to his direct discussion, by saying, *Τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, κ.τ.λ.* (See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §57. 4, p. 347.) Our English illative *then*, which in its stronger use is equivalent to *therefore*, affords us an apt illustration of this use of *οὖν*. In passing to a further topic of discourse, we would most naturally say, '*And then*' (to add another ground of argument), 'if perfection had been by the Levitical priesthood,' &c.

*τελείωσις*. The general idea expressed by this word and its kindred verb, has been before explained to be, throughout this Epistle, the bringing of a thing to the completeness of the condition proposed for it. If we would see its exact meaning here, we must consider what was the object proposed to be attained by a *ἰερωσύνης*, for its worshippers. It is redemption from the consequences of sin. A *τελείωσις* then, in this connexion, would be a *perfect redemption* (not perfection of moral character only), including 'justification and sanctification, a fitting for and raising to glory in heaven.' This will be evident from a comparison of v. 19 below, *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος*: of 9: 9, *θυαῖα μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα*: of 10: 1, *ὁ νόμος . . . οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προξερχομένους τελειῶσαι*: and especially of 10: 14, where the meaning of the word, in connexion with priestly offerings, is most clearly exhibited, *Μιᾶ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές τοὺς ἁγιαζομέ-*

νοῦς. This perfecting, then, is that thing which is procured for the *ἀγιαζομένους*, the redeemed, by the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, i. e. a complete redemption. We are, in this connexion, enabled to understand the meaning of the phrase of 12:23 below, *δικαίων τετελειωμένων*. It signifies justified souls who are already in the fruition of a complete redemption. The reader may profitably refer to the Commentary on 2:10 above.

*ἐπ' αὐτῇ* (scilicet *ἱερωσύνης*) *νενομοθέτητο*, "Upon it the people received the law." Here it is evident that the *νόμος* received in *νενομοθέτητο*, must be explained as the same with the *νόμου* of v. 12. And this must be understood as the Mosaic economy, i. e. the whole ceremonial institution of Moses. The same thing is named in v. 18 below, *προαγωγή ἐντολῆς*, and is said to be *ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἀνωφελῆς*. The clause under discussion is parenthetical, and is designed to add force to the argument implied in the interrogatory. This seems to be the Apostle's scope: 'The establishing of a priesthood of a new order implies the inferiority and imperfection of the old. (For if the old were completely efficient, why abrogate it?) And this is the more evident, because the abrogation of the priesthood carries along with it the abrogation of the whole ceremonial economy based upon it. Hence, the abrogation of the priesthood shows also the inefficiency of the economy which came in with it.' The passing away of the economy along with its priesthood is rather hinted in the parenthesis, than asserted; but in

v. 12, what was before intimated is more fully brought out. The implication is, that the Mosaic institution was based on the Aaronic priesthood. Calvin remarks, “tenendum est axioma, nullum foedus inter Deum et Homines firmum ratumque esse, nisi sacerdotio fulciatur.” He translates ἐπ’ αὐτῆι by “*sub eo.*” Others, in substantially the same sense, render it “*sub conditione ea.*” We would not depart materially from this, preferring to render it, “*in dependence on this.*” The γὰρ may be best referred to the emphasis given to the preceding words, *Λευιτικῆς ἱερωσύνης*, ‘If a perfect redemption had been *through the Levitical priesthood (through the priesthood, I say; for on this were based all the ceremonial institutions which the people received),* what need was there still?’ &c. When the Levitical priesthood was proved imperfect by its being supplanted by another, the whole Levitical economy was proved similarly imperfect, for (γὰρ) it was based on that priesthood.

V. 12. *Μετατιθεμένης γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.* This conjunction is regarded by Stuart as a ‘*γὰρ confirmantis,*’ introducing a ground which sustains something before said; and he refers it to the assertion, *οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών, κ.τ.λ.* The sense he attributes to the author would therefore be substantially this: ‘The new priest who arose was not after the order of Aaron, for (γὰρ) when the priesthood was changed, there is also of necessity a change of the law of succession.’ This is a misapprehension of the connexion of thought. It affixes to *νόμου* too narrow a meaning for the scope

of the whole passage. It supposes that the *difference of order* between Christ's priesthood and Aaron's, was a thing to be proved; when in truth it was a *datum*, disputed by no one, and used by the Apostle to prove something else. It reduces v. 12 to a tautology; for a change of the priesthood (in the sense of the whole passage), is nothing else than a change of the rule of succession. The conjunction γάρ, therefore, is to be understood as referring to the proposition implied in the interrogation of v. 11, and strengthened in the parenthesis. The Apostle's scope is to be thus apprehended: 'Does not the substitution of a new and different priesthood imply the imperfection of the old, and of the whole of the old sacerdotal economy (for that old economy was based on that old priesthood)? Yes; it does. For (v. 12, γάρ), when the priesthood was changed, there is made necessarily a change of the economy (νόμου).' As has been indicated above, Stuart says, "Νόμου here means specially . . . the statute which determined that the priests must all be of the descendants of Aaron and of the tribe of Levi." The incorrectness of this is manifest from the intention of the whole passage, as unfolded above. It becomes still more evident when this verse is compared with 10:1 below, where the author re-states with great clearness the leading idea of the former passage: "For the law, having a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect (τελειῶσαι)."



What law is this? That one which had *a shadow* of good things to come, which had *continual sacrifices*—the ceremonial law of Moses. The *νόμος* of v. 12 is the same. Calvin says, “Summa est, non minus temporale fuisse Mosis quam Aaronis ministerium; ideoque abrogari Christi adventu utrumque oportuisse, quia alterum sine altero stare non potuerit. *Legis* nomine intelligimus quod proprie ad Mosen spectabat. Lex enim et regulam bene vivendi, et gratuitum vitæ fœdus continet, illicque passim occurrant multæ insignes sententiæ, quibus tum ad fidem, tum ad timorem Dei instituimur. Horum nihil abolitum fuit à Christo, sed tantum pars illa quæ cum veteri sacerdotio implicita erat.”

V. 13. *γάρ*. The Apostle now proceeds to the proofs of that change of priesthood which was the basis of his argument in vv. 11, 12. The first proof, contained in vv. 13, 14, is drawn from the *tribe* out of which the new priest came. The conjunction *γάρ* refers obviously to *Μετατιθεμένης τῆς ἱερωσύνης* in v. 12: ‘(The priesthood was changed;) for He concerning whom these things are said (scilicet, the promises of Ps. 110: 4, &c.), pertained to another tribe (than Levi’s), of which no member had to do with the altar.’ This statement needs no remark.

V. 14. *πρόδηλον γάρ*. This verse is an appeal to the well-known *fact* of our Saviour’s origin from Judah, confirming v. 13. The use of the verb (*ἀνατέταλκεν*) which expresses his arising, is worthy of remark. It is used most frequently of the rising of

heavenly bodies or the light; and then, of the springing up of plants. Its application to the arising of the Messiah out of Judah, is probably in imitation of this sense. Thus, Zech. 3: 8, "For behold, I will bring forth my servant *the Branch*," in the Septuagint is rendered, *διότι ἴδου ἔγω ἄγω τὸν δοῦλον μου ἀνατολήν*. And the words of Jeremiah, 23: 5, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch," are written, *ἀναστήσω τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολήν δικαίαν*.

V. 15. *Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.* This is the second argument by which the author establishes the abrogation of the old priesthood by the new, vv. 15–17. The proof is drawn from the new and superior order of the latter. Calvin remarks, "Alio argumento probat abolitam esse *Legem*. Prius à sacerdotis persona rationatus est: nunc à natura sacerdotii, et à ratione qua institutum fuit." The thing which is here declared to be "yet more abundantly manifest," is undoubtedly the statement made in v. 12; that the old priesthood (and with it the economy) was changed. The structure of the sentences and the verbal allusion would seem to indicate that the *πρόδηλον* of v. 14, and the *κατάδηλον* of v. 15, have the same subject. But this would make the Apostle argue, in v. 15, that it is yet more manifest that Christ is of the tribe of Judah, because he is a priest after the order of Melchisedek! It is therefore uncritical to infer an allusion too certainly from such a resemblance in the verbal forms. *κατάδηλον* is the predicate, not of the same subject with its cognate ad-

jective above, but of the leading proposition to which that is subordinate.

*εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα*, is rendered by our English version, “*for that* after the similitude of,” &c.; a translation for which no sufficient reason can be seen. No clear instance can be shown in which the particle *εἰ* has this meaning. There is no reason why we should not give it the conditional sense which it usually has with the indicative, implying that if the condition is true, that which results from it is to be regarded as real and certain. (Robinson’s Lex. New Test. *sub voce*, I. §2.) The sense is, ‘And it is yet more abundantly manifest (that the priesthood hath been changed), if another priest ariseth after the likeness of Melchisedek: (But such a one has arisen.)’

V. 16. *κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς*. Both *νόμος* and *ἐντολή* are capable of a general and a specific sense; as is stated in the common Lexicons. Here, one must be general, and the other specific; and since *ἐντολῆς* stands in the construction of a defining noun, it is most reasonable to give to it the general sense. It matters little, as to sense, whether we render the words, ‘according to a law (*νόμον* general) of a carnal commandment,’ or, ‘according to a statute of a carnal law or dispensation’ (*ἐντολῆς* general). The former sense is more difficult, the latter much easier. We find *ἐντολή* used in a collective sense, for God’s commandments, in Mark 7: 8, 9, where Christ is rebuking the traditions by which the Pharisees evaded duties:

Ἀφέντες γὰρ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ. In like manner, we find the word *δικαιώματα* used, in Rom. 2: 26, for the precepts of the moral law in general (Ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσει), and yet applied to ceremonial precepts in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Apostle here means by *νόμον ἐντολῆς*, the law or statute instituting the Aaronic priesthood with carnal ordinances, as anointing, clothing with peculiar vestments, sprinkling with blood, and such like, and investing that priesthood with power to remove temporal sanctions and ceremonial uncleannesses by various outward rites. These rites are called in Hebr. 9: 10, 11, *δικαιώμασι* (in the various reading *δικαιώματα*) *σαρκός*. The comparison of the sense in which the two words *ἐντολή* and *δικαιώμα* are used, without *σαρκός*, in the places above cited, and of the meaning which *δικαιώμασι* has here, when thus defined, throws much light on the meaning of the phrase *ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς*. The *ἐντολή* or *δικαιώμα* above, was the moral law, reaching the soul; but the carnal commandment is the code of external, merely ceremonial precepts, affecting the outward demeanour and ritual acts. The word *σαρκικῆς* also intimates the temporary and inefficient nature of the priesthood. Thus, in 2 Cor. 10: 4, it is said, τὰ γὰρ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικά, ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ: where the opposition is between the *carnal* and the *powerful*. That which is carnal is feeble; that which is spiritual is mighty.

This meaning is also intimated by the phrase which is set in contrast with ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς, in this passage; viz.

κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. That priesthood instituted under a carnal system of rites, is in contrast with the one which was according to the *power* of an indissoluble life. In the latter there is efficiency: this implies that the former is feeble. In this description of the nature of Christ's priesthood, there is evident allusion to the terms in which the type is represented in vv. 3 and 8 above, as "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," and as one "of whom it was witnessed that he liveth;" unlike the mortal priests who, under Moses' law, tithed the Jews. The allusion is also manifest to the terms of the oath in Ps. 110: 4, which is quoted immediately after: σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The Apostle then thus expresses the superior nature of Christ's priesthood, as being *according* to a *type of perpetuity*, and comporting with the exalted nature of the incumbent, which is also set forth in the type. Calvin remarks here, "Non Moses, homo mortalis ipsum consecravit, sed Spiritus Sanctus; id que non oleo, nec sanguine hircorum, nec externa vestium pompa, sed cœlesti virtute, quam hic Apostolus infirmis elementis opponit."

V. 17. Μαρτυρεῖ γὰρ, "For God witnesseth (to Christ): Thou art a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedek." The conjunction γὰρ relates to the proposition ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, and offers the ground of evidence for that assertion. The quotation intro-

duced by it is the proof on which rests the argument of vv. 15, 16.

V. 18. Ἀθέτησις μὲν is the antithesis of ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, in v. 19. This our English version seems to have overlooked; for it improperly closes the sentence at ἀνωφελές, and makes ἐπεισαγωγὴ the opposite of ὁ νόμος. "The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did" (perfect something). This translation misses the author's true intent. It is true that the Christian priesthood did perfect the redemption of believers, which the ceremonial law never did; but this is not the point before the Apostle's mind just here. His main object here is to assert the annulling of the one priesthood, and the introduction of another in its place, as an evidence that the one introduced is more excellent.

γὰρ seems here to have a *conclusive* sense, and is best understood as connecting vv. 18, 19 with vv. 15–17: 'If such a High-Priest has been ordained, of a different order, tribe, efficiency, and perpetuity, as is plain from the quotation of v. 17, then a *change of priesthood* is further manifest; for there is made an abrogation of the preceding institute, on account of its weakness and unprofitableness, but an introduction of a better hope.'

προαγούσης ἐντολῆς. These words are understood by some, as Kuinoël and Bloomfield, as meaning the former dispensation. They seem rather to denote the Aaronic institute (on which indeed that dispensation

was founded). It is certainly far better to retain for *ἐντολῆς* just the sense which we assigned it in v. 16, than to introduce a variant one so close to the former. That the whole Mosaic economy, so far as it was temporary, was abrogated, when the institution of the human priesthood in the Aaronic family was repealed, is very true. The latter act is the one of which the author is here speaking.

*διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές.* Here is the reason of the *ἀθέτησις*. The institute was weak and unavailing to accomplish the *τελείωσις* of a believer. This reason for its abrogation is intimated in the question of v. 11 above; and it strongly argues the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood. Calvin here remarks, “Nam ut ad Christum referebantur figuræ omnes, ita ab eo mutuabantur vim suam et effectum: imo per se nihil poterant vel agebant, sed tota vis à Christo uno pendebat.” A similar expression in Gal. 4: 9 may be compared: *πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, κ.τ.λ.* It may be asked, perhaps, ‘If the Aaronic institute was thus feeble and unavailing, why was it given to the Jews at all, and why perpetuated for so many centuries?’ As a type of the Messiah, to which it pointed, it had its use. To that use it was not worthless and unavailing, but wisely adapted and efficient. But that typical character implied its ultimate cessation when the Antitype came, and it implied that its efficiency in bringing the believer to *τελείωσις*, or perfect redemption, depended on its being used to lead his faith forward to Christ.

When depended on *in itself*, as a final and sufficient system (which was the view of the bigoted Jew), the Aaronic institute lost its significancy, and became worthless. We may say that it was worthless only through the perversion of its erring advocates, as the Apostle, in Rom. 8: 3, says that "the law was weak through the flesh," to give justification to men.

V. 19. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος. These words are a parenthesis, thrown in both to illustrate and confirm (as γὰρ indicates) the statement that the ἐντολή was ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς. The sentence asserts substantially of the whole Mosaic dispensation (ὁ νόμος), what had just been said of that priesthood upon which it was based. The relation between the two was indicated by the Apostle in vv. 11, 12, where the giving of the dispensation is said to depend on the Levitical ἱερωσύνη, and the change of the dispensation accompanied its change. This parenthesis explains to us in what sense the dispensation was unavailing. In itself it secured perfect redemption to none; it pointed to a better hope to come.

ἐπειξαγωγή δέ, κ.τ.λ. To this nominative γίνεται is to be supplied from the *protasis* in v. 18, according to the exposition there given.

κρείττονος ἐλπίδος. This "hope" stands in antithesis to the προαγούσης ἐντολῆς of v. 18. The "better hope" is put by metonymy for that which produced it, viz. the institution of Christ's priesthood, whose power and efficacy are thus exhibited in contrast with the ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς of the Levitical



priesthood. And this contrast is further exhibited in the concluding words of the verse, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ. By the Messial's priestly work, believers truly and spiritually approach God; they are reconciled to him, their prayers are accepted, and his Spirit is communicated as a medium of communion. By the Aaronic priesthood, the believer was only brought to the material tabernacle and mercy-seat, the symbols of the true.

---

20 Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, (οἱ μὲν γὰρ  
 21 χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες· ὁ δὲ  
 μετὰ ὀρκωμοσίας, διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν·  
 “ὥμοσε κύριος, καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται· σὺ  
 ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισε-  
 22 δέξ”·) κατὰ τοσοῦτον κρείττονος διαδήκῃς γέ-  
 23 γονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. Καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονές εἰσι  
 γεγονότες ἱερεῖς, διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παρα-  
 24 μένειν· ὁ δὲ, διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,  
 25 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην· ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν  
 εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους δι'  
 αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν  
 ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

Vv. 20-22. These verses contain the author's second distinct head of argument, to show the superiority of Christ's dispensation. The institution of his priesthood with the solemnity of an oath, which was wanting to the appointment of the Aaronic, shows that his was a more important appointment, and there-

fore, that his was a better testament. Human beings attach the solemnity of oaths to the more important of their transactions. God's word is of itself as infallible and immutable as any oath can make it. But God accommodates himself, to a certain extent, in his dealings with his Church, to the more infirm and human modes of thought to which our imperfection confines us. Hence, we understand that God intended to intimate the supremacy of the Messiah over all other priests, when he announced his appointment with these solemn words. The fact that the Apostle, an infallible expositor, draws this argument from this circumstance, favours the highest theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It seems to indicate that we are to consider every trait of the sacred language, every phrase, every word, as placed on record by a divine intention, and as having its meaning.

*Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας.* These words form an elliptical member of the period. We must supply from the correlative member of the sentence, *γέγονεν ἕγγυος Ἰησοῦς*, 'And in so far as Jesus hath been made sponsor not without an oath-taking, . . . so far hath he been made sponsor of a better covenant.' All which comes between this *protasis* and *apodosis* is parenthetical, and is introduced to confirm the assertion of the first member, that Christ, in his appointment, was honoured with the peculiar formality of an oath.

*οἱ μὲν γὰρ* is the antithesis of *ὁ δέ*, "For *they* (Aaronic priests) were made priests without swearing,

but He (Jesus) with swearing." And this is again confirmed by the same quotation from Ps. 110: 4. This quotation has before been used by the author to prove that Christ's priestly office possessed the peculiarity of Melchisedek's: it is now used to show the other point.

**ἔγγυος.** This word occurs only here in the New Test. and is of rare occurrence in the classics. Its etymology is obscure (some deriving it from *ἐν γυῖον*, and some supposing an affinity to the adj. *ἔγγυς*), but its usage, and still more, the usage of its kindred words, *ἐγγύη*, *ἐγγύησις*, *ἐγγυάω*, &c. fix its meaning as "a surety." A surety is one who *engages for another*, so as to secure the performance of that for which he is bound, with the understanding that he shall perform for him, where he fails. Christ is our surety to God, to pay the debt both of obedience and suffering which we owe. To any covenant there are two parties; and when the sponsor or surety of that covenant is spoken of, the question arises, for which of the parties he engages, or whether for both. Thus (if the unworthiness of the illustration may be pardoned), in a bet, the stakeholder is alike surety to both parties in the covenant. It has been discussed whether Christ is also a surety for God to his people, to secure to them the promises. It must be answered that, in the sense of making good to Christians God's deficiencies, he is not. For God's faithfulness, grace, and mercy, are entire in themselves, and cannot fail, or be made more secure. But the Scriptures do clearly hold forth

the idea that Christ is a pledge to His people of God's faithfulness to fulfil his promises in all their amplitude. Rom. 8 : 32, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" 2 Cor. 1 : 20, "For all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him amen, unto the glory of God by us." The context here shows that the first is the proper sense of the word in this place. Christ is here called our surety, to pay our debt to God. The author is here magnifying the priestly office of Christ, of which, sacrifice *for* the people, and intercession based thereon, are the essential parts. The meaning of *διαθήκη*, "dispensation," may be seen well explained in the usual Lexicons.

V. 23. This verse introduces the Apostle's third consideration showing the superiority of Christ's priesthood; the perpetuity and eternity of it, and the consequent advantage his people derive from it. Here again we have an antithesis between *οἱ μὲν* (the Aaronic priests) on the one hand, and *ὁ δὲ* (Christ) on the other hand. Calvin's translation of *οἱ μὲν πλείονές εἰσι γεγονότες ἱερεῖς*, is preferable to Stuart's. The former renders, "Et illi quidem plures facti fuerunt sacerdotes;" the latter, "Those priests, also, are many." The position of words in the original indicates that the author's meaning is substantially this: 'Again, these, *a number of them*, were made priests on account of their being prevented by death from continuing.' The succession of Aaronic priests is here intended, and not the number of cotemporary priests at

any one time. This is manifest from the reason assigned for their number, *διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*. There were many priests cotemporary with each other; and it is also true that the whole Aaronic institute is embraced in the mind of the Apostle, when he contrasts the Jewish priesthood with the Christian; for as a whole it all prefigured Christ. But yet, the Jewish high-priest was more specially the type of the Messiah, and is here more particularly in the view of the Apostle. It is the long and numerous succession of these priests, a succession the result and evidence of their mortality, and therefore of their feebleness, which he contrasts with the glorious permanence of a priesthood in which the incumbent is eternal and indefectible.

V. 24. *ὁ δέ, διὰ τὸ μένειν, κ.τ.λ.* These words we regard, with Kuinoël, Bloomfield, and others, as indicating the perpetuity of Christ's life simply, and not his priesthood. The latter idea is a true one, and it is expressed in the subsequent clause; which would create a tautology if we supposed it also expressed in the first. And the language of the 25th verse, where the idea of the 24th is amplified, clearly shows that the reference of *μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* is to Christ's existence simply. There, his ability to save unto the uttermost is said to arise from the fact that he is *πάντοτε ζῶν*. Nor is it necessary to suppose a reference to the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood in the former clause, in order to carry out more fully the antithesis with v. 23, as is urged by Stuart; for we are not at all

obliged to understand the clause *διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*, as meaning that the Jewish priests were prevented by death from *continuing priests*. The meaning of that verse is, that this priesthood exhibited a numerous succession, because death forbade individuals to remain (in existence).

*ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην*. Christ, on account of his eternity, "*holds the priesthood untransmitted.*" It is a priesthood which does not pass down through successive hands. Theophylact explains it by *ἀδιαδόχον*, Calvin by *immutabile*, and the English version by '*unchangeable.*' The meaning first given is the correct one. The Apostle's argument here for the superiority of Christ, is substantially the same with that by which he proved the superiority of His type, Melchisedek, in v. 8. There, it was argued that the Jewish tithe-receivers were mortal; but of this royal and peculiar one it '*was testified that he liveth.*' Here the same contrast in Christ's favour is expanded.

V. 25. *ὁθεν*. The author now carries the argument farther than it could have been extended in the case of the type, for he has dropped the type and expressly introduced the substance, Christ. He shows that this unfailing existence and perpetual priesthood of Christ, imply the all-sufficiency of his offices for his people. This is the crowning stone to the structure of the third argument for His superiority.

*εἰς τὸ παντελές* is by some made to qualify *σώζειν* ("He is able to save completely"), as Calvin, Stuart, and the English version. Others, as Kuinoël, regard

it as qualifying *δύναται*, deriving thus the sense, 'He is forever able to save.' The classic usage of the phrase *εἰς τὸ παντελές* (as well as that of the New Test. which is limited to this verse, and Luke 13 : 11), favours the sense of completeness as to degree ('completely,' 'entirely'), rather than that of unending duration. Bloomfield refers the phrase as a qualificative to both the verbs, to *σώζειν* in the sense of 'entirely,' 'completely,' and also to *δύναται* in the sense of 'forever.' To us, it seems more natural to attach it to the former, and in its usual sense of 'completely,' or in that almost identical sense of the English version, "to the uttermost;" which is, etymologically, an apt and correct representation of *εἰς πᾶν τέλος*. But adopting this sense, we by no means lose the implied truth that Christ ministers a never-ending salvation. A *complete* salvation for an immortal being, is of course unending. Its completeness implies this.

*τοὺς προσερχομένους τῷ θεῷ.* This phrase expresses the believing on Christ as our surety and mediator with God. Its sense is abundantly illustrated by such passages as John 5 : 40, *οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε.*

*πάντοτε ζῶν.* These words are correctly rendered by the English version ("seeing He ever liveth"), as a case of that Greek idiom which expresses by the participle, construed with the noun of the leading proposition, the dependent proposition which states the ground or reason of the former.

*ἐντυγχάνειν.* The simple and primary meaning

of this verb is 'to meet.' Thence it has the sense of 'meeting to supplicate one.' In some instances of the New Test. usage of the verb, this supplication is *for* the third person, viz. Rom. 8 : 26, "The Spirit itself maketh intercessions for us (*ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*) with groanings," &c. ; 8 : 27, "He maketh intercession for the saints" (*ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἀγίων*) ; 8 : 34, "Christ . . . who also maketh intercession for us." In other instances, the supplication is *against* the person who is the object of it ; as Acts 25 : 24, "Ye see this man (Paul) about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me (*ἐνέτυχόν μοι*), both at Jerusalem and here ;" Rom. 11 : 2, "Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias, how he maketh intercession to God against Israel?" (*ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.*) Hence the verb came to mean specifically, 'to intercede for,' 'to act as advocate for one.' This office is ascribed to Christ here, in 9 : 24 below, in Rom. 8 : 34, in John 14 : 16, and by implication in 1 John 2 : 1. The office is applied to the Holy Spirit in John 14 : 16, 15 : 26, 16 : 7 (*ὁ παράκλητος*), and in Rom. 8 : 26, 27. The reader may, if he pleases, consult Hodge on the passage last cited ; Knapp's *Scripta Varii Argumenti*, and *Biblical Repertory*, vol. i. pp. 237-264.

---

26 Τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος·



27 ὅς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιε-  
 ρεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἀμαρτιῶν θυσίας  
 ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ  
 28 ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνερέγκας. Ὁ νόμος  
 γὰρ ἀνθρώπου· καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἔχοντας  
 ἀσθένειαν· ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὀρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ  
 τὸν νόμον, υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

V. 26. *Τοιοῦτος γάρ.* Both the pronoun and the conjunction point to v. 25, and afford a graceful and easy transition to the Apostle's fourth argument, drawn from the sinlessness of Christ. *γάρ* introduces a ground or reason for the character asserted of Christ in the previous verse: 'He was thus (better than the Aaronic hierarchy) an ever-living and complete Saviour, *for* such a High-Priest became us.' But the author, while he points back to the traits of Christ's character by *τοιοῦτος*, proceeds to add other traits, even in the same sentence, which are new grounds of proof for his pre-eminence.

*ἔπρεπεν.* This verb here signifies a moral fitness and necessity. We have already seen, in ch. 2: 10 above, an instance of its similar use: "It became Him . . . in bringing many sons unto glory," &c. The Apostle here intimates, for purposes hortatory as well as argumentative, that Christ was perfectly adapted to the exigencies of our condition, adding, as other requisites in which He differed *toto cælo* from the Aaronic priests, that He was without taint or sin, removed from sinners in his purity (but not in his intercourse or sympathies), exalted above the heavens, needing no

sacrifice for himself like Aaron and his sons, but offering one perfect and sufficient for his people.

*κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν.* The preceding words, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, state the particulars in which Christ was separated from our sinful race. The latter phrase is inclusive of the former: "He is holy, harmless, undefiled, distinguished (in these respects) from those for whom he intercedes." Calvin here remarks: "Membrum istud, 'segregatus a peccatoribus,' reliqua comprehendit. Fuit enim aliqua Aaronis sanctitas, et innocentia, et puritas, sed non nisi ad exiguum duntaxat modulum; multis enim maculis fœdatæ erant. Christus autem, qui exemptus est e vulgo hominum, solus est a peccato immunis. Ideo vera sanctitas et innocentia in eo solo reperiuntur. Neque enim segregatus a nobis dicitur, quod nos a societate sua repellat: sed quia hoc habet præ nobis eximium, ut vacuus sit omni immunditia."

*ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος.* This phrase seems to imply not merely exaltation above all creatures, for this is argued throughout the whole of ch. 1, and in ch. 2: 6-9; but it seems to have special reference to the fact, that while the Aaronic high-priest ministered on earth, Christ has gone on our behalf into the heavenly sanctuary. This idea is in many places made prominent in this Epistle. In ch. 4: 14 it is said, "We have a great High-Priest, that is passed into the heavens." In 8: 1, 2, "We have such a High-Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctu-

ary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." In 8: 4, "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest." In 9: 11, "Christ . . . is a High-Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle," &c. And in 9: 24, "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself." It seems therefore more reasonable to understand these words in the same sense. And this is especially confirmed by the language of 8: 1, 2, "Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum," &c. Christ's being at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens, in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man, is one of the points taught in the preceding chapters. What words in any chapter before the eighth, more naturally express this idea than the words under remark?

V. 27. *καθ' ἡμέραν*. Some understand these words in a loose and popular sense, as not meaning literally every day, but only 'repeatedly,' 'with considerable frequency;' and they refer to Mark 14: 49, and Acts 16: 5, as similar instances: "I was daily with you in the temple, teaching, and ye took me not" (*καθ' ἡμέραν*); "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily." This is the sense adopted by Kuinoël. But some others, among whom is Stuart, adopt this view: that daily sacrifices were offered, not by the high-priest *in propria persona*, but by his subordinate agents, for the sins of the whole people, among whom the high-

priest himself was included, and that this is the sense in which there was a sacrifice for his imperfections every day. But the phraseology evidently excludes this idea, refers to the ritual of the great day of atonement (see Levit. 16 : 3-34), and implies that it was the personal act of the high-priest himself, which is here described: 'He offers sacrifices, *first* for his own sin (*τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν*), *then* for those of the people.' Philo is cited as saying, ἀρχικρῆς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, εὐχας δὲ καὶ θυσίας τέλων καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν. We incline strongly to regard this as one of the frequent instances of historical license, indulged by the Jewish writers of Philo's age. The law, which he says commanded this (*κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*), is certainly silent concerning it, so far as we now can see. Hebr. 9 : 6, 7 seems to imply that the common priests performed all the offices of common days, and the high-priest only sacrificed in person on the day of atonement. We would therefore give to *καθ' ἡμέραν* a sense somewhat different from both those proposed above. It signifies the stated recurrence of an act on *its* recurring day. This does not signify that that is every day. After we have said that the high-priest performed these rites 'day by day,' it still remains to be settled which days and how many were appropriated periodically to them. The sense is that of a *periodical repetition* simply. It may be illustrated by Matt. 27 : 15, Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἓνα τῶ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον, κ.τ.λ. "Now at that feast the governor was wont (annually) to release unto the people a prisoner." We might

with propriety translate this, "*From feast to feast* the governor was wont," &c. And yet it is not every feast which is intended.

V. 28. Ὁ νόμος γάρ, κ.τ.λ. The νόμος here intended is the general law instituting the Mosaic economy, the same which is intended in v. 18 above. The particle γάρ introduces this statement as the ground or reason of the assertions of v. 27: 'Aaronic high-priests were thus compelled to offer sacrifices for themselves, before offering for the people, because the law constituted *imperfect beings* high-priests; but Christ had no such necessity, because the word of the oath-swearing (Ps. 110:4), which was after the (Mosaic) law, constituted the Son High-Priest, who hath been perfected forever.'

τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον. Christ's appointment was announced with solemn oath, *after* the Mosaic institutions, as to time. The author seems here to intimate, that this fact contained a proof that Christ's priesthood was designed to supersede the Levitical. Thus, as was indicated in the commentary on v. 11 above, the introduction of a new and different priesthood argues the inefficiency of the previous one. And this is still more distinctly urged in vv. 15-19, where the abrogation of the Aaronic institute on account of its weakness and unprofitableness is clearly asserted, and its replacing by a better hope, that of Christ. The words μετὰ τὸν νόμον are therefore introduced here to make an intimation of this fact in passing.

τετελειωμένον. This word is rendered by the

English version, "consecrated" ("who is consecrated forevermore"). In the Analysis we have rendered it "glorified." We shall apply here the general sense fixed for this word in the comment on ch. 2:10, and so often cited, in that phase of its meaning which this context requires. Christ is here declared to be brought to the completeness of that condition which was proposed in this case. The matter in hand is his priesthood. His 'perfecting' is, therefore, his receiving all those powers and graces which are proper to a perfectly efficient high-priest, and that forever—his eternal glorification as a complete High-Priest.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### ANALYSIS.

HAVING given many reasons for the superior order of Christ's priesthood, and his superior qualifications for the office, the Apostle proceeds further to show the superior excellence of this priesthood in view of the higher sanctuary in which it is exercised, vv. 1-5, with functions corresponding to the better dispensation with which it is connected, vv. 6-13.

Of the *matter in hand*, the chief thing is, that we have so excellent a High-Priest, who is seated at the right hand of God, *a minister in the sanctuary of the true, even the heavenly tabernacle*, vv. 1, 2. *A minister or officiator*, for (γάρ, v. 3) every high-priest is appointed to make offerings; *in the heavenly sanctuary*, for (γάρ, v. 4) He could not exercise the office upon earth, since there were priests (to whose tribe and order he did not belong) appointed by the law, who served in the tabernacle which was but a type of the heavenly, as we learn from the charge to Moses when about to build it, vv. 3-5. But (δέ) now, instead of officiating upon earth, in the type which Moses caused to be built (compare μέν, v. 4), He hath obtained a more excellent ministry, *corresponding to the superior dispensation of which He is the mediator*, v. 6. The superiority of this dispensation he proves, (γάρ) by the fact that, the first being faulty, a place

was sought for a second, v. 7. This he shows by a quotation from Jer. 31 : 31–34, in which the first dispensation is repudiated because the people did not keep it, and God was displeased with them ; in other words, under it they continued rebellious and God's anger still burned ; while a second is promised, which shall have the effect to write the law of God on their hearts, and to unite them and Him in the closest covenant ; under which the knowledge of God shall be universal, and sins shall be wholly remitted, vv. 8–12. Upon this quotation the author remarks : In calling this dispensation *new*, he represents the first as old, and therefore (by general analogy) near its dissolution, v. 13.



## COMMENTARY.

VIII. 1 *Κεφάλαιον* δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις· τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ  
 2 θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν  
 3 ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. (Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται, ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον,  
 4 ὃ προσενέγκη.) Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεὺς, ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ  
 5 τὸν νόμον τὰ δῶρα, οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιαῖ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς, μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνὴν· “ὄρα γάρ, φησί, ποιήσης πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει.”

V. 1. *Κεφάλαιον*. This word we will not translate ‘recapitulation’ or ‘summary,’ for there is none in this chapter. Calvin seems to take the word in the sense of ‘sum,’ ‘substance.’ “Pergit quidem, in eodem argumento; sed quia variis rationibus pugnat, ideo hanc admonitionem inseruit, ut intentos ad scopum lectores teneret.” But the most and best of the commentators, ancient (as Suidas, Theophylact, Theodoret), and modern (as Stuart, Michaelis, Storr, &c.), translate the word, ‘the chief, or principal point.’ This is better sustained by the context, for the point here introduced has not before been insisted on in this Epistle, though glanced at in several places. Such passing

allusions may be seen in 4: 14 ("A great High-Priest that is passed into the heavens"), 6: 20 (Christ "the forerunner is for us entered within the veil"), and at the conclusion of the preceding chapter. The adjunct, *ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*, also requires the meaning assigned above to *κεφάλαιον*, for it does not bring the idea of something before stated and now to be recounted, but of something additional. Virgil (*Æneid* I. 341, 2), uses *summa* in this sense most obviously; for it is at the beginning of the recital. A recapitulation must be at the end:

Longa est injuria; longæ

Ambages; sed summa sequar fastigia rerum.

*ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*. *ἐπὶ* seems here not only to denote 'addition' (in the sense of *præter*, which is assigned to it by the Lexicons), but to refer to the superior importance of the point now introduced for discussion, over and above the rest. Hence the matter so added is termed *κεφάλαιον*. *τοῖς λεγομένοις* may be understood as referring to the whole previous discussion from chap. 5 onward; or possibly the words may be understood more specifically as meaning the points laid down in 5: 1-4; viz. the qualifications of a priest in general. But the fact that the participle is in the *present tense* is less favourable to the latter view, for the author thus indicates that he intends matters of present discussion by the phrase. The sense first stated is therefore the easier and more ap-

propriate one: 'Over and above the matters we are speaking of, this is the chief thing, that we have such a High-Priest,' &c.

*τοιούτον ἀρχιερέα.* Some refer *τοιούτον* to what precedes: 'We have such a High-Priest as has been described in ch. 7, one of a different order from Levi, and superior even to Levi's great progenitor, Abraham; one consecrated with the solemnity of an oath; one who is eternal and without cessation or succession in his functions; and one who is personally spotless and needs no personal atonement.' But this exposition would give to *κεφάλαιον* substantially the meaning of a recapitulation, which, as we have seen, is not its proper sense. It is better to understand the demonstrative pronoun as pointing to what follows: 'We have such a High-Priest, viz. one who hath set down at the right hand,' &c.

*τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* We have here the abstract for the concrete, 'the majesty' for 'Him who is majestic.' The whole phrase is identical with that in ch. 1:3, to which the reader is referred for exposition of it.

V. 2. *ἀγίων.* This word undoubtedly signifies 'the most holy place;' a sense equivalent to 'sanctuary,' which is the English version. Its usage in other parts of the Epistle settles this. In 9:8 it can have no other sense consistently with the context, *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἀγίων ὁδόν*, for the reference is to the fact that none but the high-priest, and he but once yearly, could enter within the veil. In 10:19

we read, Ἐχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρόρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ. In 13:11 it is said, εἰσφέρεται . . . τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. In 9:3 it is called ἅγια ἁγίων. It is used, as appears from the places cited, sometimes for the type, and sometimes for the anti-type; in this place for the latter.

καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς. These words may be understood as only explicative of the preceding: 'A minister of the holy place, *even* of the true tabernacle.' Or else we may, with more propriety, explain them as truly additional, giving καὶ its usual additive meaning, so that the expression will constitute a hendiadis. The adjective ἀληθινῆς may then be conceived as qualifying both σκηνῆς and ἁγίων, the former more immediately, but the latter also more remotely. The defining clause, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, is evidently constructed with reference to the structure of the lower and typical sanctuary. This was a tent pitched, or set up. Hence God, the creator of the highest heaven, is said to have pitched it also, only in allusion to the former.

V. 3. Πᾶς γάρ. The most obvious and natural connection of thought here, is that which regards γάρ as referring to λειτουργός, as is indicated in the Analysis. The Apostle proves that Christ *does actually perform the functions of a priest* at the spiritual altar: 'Christ has a sacerdotal ministry; for every high-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices.' The whole of v. 3 may with propriety be treated as a

parenthesis, as is done in Vater's edition, which is introduced in this Commentary.

V. 4. *Εἰ μὲν γάρ.* Here *γάρ* evidently introduces the proof of the other branch of the Apostle's statement in v. 2, as to the place in which Christ's sacerdotal ministry is exercised: 'It is in the true, heavenly sanctuary; for if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.' Such is evidently the Apostle's drift. This is, so to speak, the main line of thought, and hence the propriety of making v. 3 parenthetical, inasmuch as it is only subordinate in the present context. Vv. 9 and 10 exhibit a parallel use of the particle *ὅτι*. In vv. 8, 9, two points are presented in the author's statement concerning a change of covenant between God and his church, as foretold by Jeremiah: first, that the old covenant was adjudged faulty, and second, that a new and different one was substituted. The ground of the first statement is introduced by *ὅτι* (v. 9, last clauses, *ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, κ.τ.λ.*), and that of the second is also introduced by the same particle, in v. 10: *ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν διαθήσομαι, κ.τ.λ.* Such a connexion of sentences can only be made easy by placing the first ground, which stands between the second point and its ground, in a parenthetical position.

*ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων, κ.τ.λ.* The words *τῶν ἱερέων* are wanting in some important ancient manuscripts, the Vulgate, and other versions. The sense is not made worse or less distinct by its omission. The scope is

obvious: 'If Christ were on the earth (if this were the scene of his ministerial functions), he had not been a priest, since there are (persons) who offer gifts according to the law.' This mere, earthly, typical, inferior priesthood has been already provided for, its rules are fixed, and the order of men defined who fill its functions; and according to those rules, Christ Jesus could not be one of them, not being of the right tribe. The fact, therefore, that he has priestly functions, a fact before proved, shows that his priesthood is in a different sanctuary.

V. 5. *οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι, κ.τ.λ.* While the Apostle excludes Christ from the earthly tabernacle, he asserts and proves that this is only a type and shadow of the heavenly.

*ὑποδείγματι.* This word is used in Hebr. 4: 11, and 2 Pet. 2: 6, in the sense of 'example' ("after the same example of unbelief"—"making Sodom and Gomorrah an example unto those that after should live ungodly"). In the verse under remark, and in 9: 23, it has the meaning of type; and in 9: 24, the succeeding verse, the word *ἀντίτυπα* is used as its synonyme. Aquila's version of the Old Test. employs it as a translation of *תְּבִיטָה*, in Deut. 4: 17, "*the likeness of any beast that is on the earth.*"

*καὶ σκιᾷ.* By this word is intended 'a shadow,' an 'adumbration.' In Col. 2: 17 it is contrasted with *σῶμα*, "Holy days, new moons, sabbath-days . . . are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." In Hebr. 10: 1 it is opposed to *εἰζων*, "For the law

having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," &c.

*ἐπιτελεῖν*. This verb includes both the ideas of 'finishing,' 'making,' and 'performing.' In 9:6 below it is used in the sense of 'performing,' without the idea of completion prominently presented: *οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες*. The same phase of meaning is seen in Luke 13:32, *ἰάσεις ἐπιτελῶ*. But in Phil. 1:6 the idea of completion is the prominent one: *ὁ ἐναρξάμενος . . . ἐπιτελέσει ἄχρις ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The meaning in this passage is nearest *akīn* to the first two.

*κατὰ τὸν τύπον, κ.τ.λ.* This language does not determine the *modus* of the exhibition which was made to Moses, of the shapes and arrangements to be adopted in the tabernacle and its furniture, when he was forty days in Mount Sinai. It only assures us that such an exhibition was then distinctly made. It may have been by direct inspiration, by verbal description, or by figure. The latter is certainly the most natural import of the words. The Hebrew word rendered *τύπον* in Exod. 25:40 (whence the Apostle here quotes), is *תְּבִלָּת* (from *תָּבַן*). Stephen, in his discourse, Acts 7:44, employs language equivalent to that of Exodus: "That he should make it according to the fashion (*τύπον*) that he had seen." In 1 Chron. 28:12, 19, it is said that David gave Solomon "the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit;" and that David said, "All this the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of

this pattern." The mode of exhibition here indicated was probably different. But this is an inquiry more curious than useful. The words of the Apostle and of Exodus by no means imply that the heavenly sanctuary is material; they only teach that the forms which were exhibited to Moses, after which he built the tabernacle, were a type of the heavenly.

- 
- 6 *Νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης, ἣτις ἐπὶ*  
 7 *κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐξη-*  
 8 *τεῖτο τόπος. Μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει·*  
*“Ἴδου, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος, καὶ συντε-*  
*λέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα*  
 9 *διαθήκην καινὴν· οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβο-*  
*μένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ*  
*γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ δια-*  
*θήκῃ μου, καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει κύριος·*  
 10 *ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ*  
*Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας, λέγει κύριος,*  
*διδούς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ*  
*ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι*  
*αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν.*  
 11 *Καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν [πολίτην]*  
*αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος, τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων·*  
*γινῶθι τὸν κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, ἀπὸ*  
 12 *μικροῦ [αὐτῶν] ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν. Ὅτι ἴλωσ*  
*ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*  
*αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ*



13 ἔτι." Ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινὴν, πεπαλαίωσε τὴν πρῶτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ.

V. 6. *Νυνὶ δέ*, "But now," i. e. in Christ's present exalted state. The particle *δέ* here introduces the antithesis to *μὲν* in v. 4: 'If, on the one hand, he had been upon earth, he had not been a priest; but now, on the other hand, he hath had allotted to him a more excellent ministry,' &c., viz. one in the heavenly sanctuary. We give to *διαφορωτέρας* its derived sense of 'better,' 'superior,' as in 1: 4 above, where it is said of Christ, *διαφορώτερον κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. λειτουργίας* is genitive, according to the customary usage of *τιγχάνω*. The object of comparison is the priestly ministry in the earthly sanctuary.

*χρείτερος διαθήκης*. The dispensation of Christ is called *better*, as having "better promises." The former dispensation, by its carnal ordinances, removed certain civil penalties and legal impurities, but did not reach the penalties of the divine law and the corruptions of the heart. Its services had no avail to avert the wrath of God as final Judge, nor to sanctify the sinful nature of man. For these purposes, it was in itself *ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἀνωφελῆς*, as was asserted in 7: 18.

*μεσίτης*. This important word is by some etymologists derived from *μέσος* — *εἶμι*, 'a go-between,' and by others from *μέσος* alone, the syllables *ιτης* being regarded as merely the nominal termination. Whether the active idea of 'going' is in the word or not, little

affects its primary sense, which is obviously that of ‘one who stands between parties to act for both,’ ‘a mediator.’ The sense in which it is here used is sufficiently manifest from its use in other places, and from the context. In Gal. 3: 19, 20, Moses is called the *μεσίτης* between God and the people under the ceremonial law, in the sense of *internuntius*. In the passage under remark, in Hebr. 9: 15, 12: 24, and 1 Tim. 2: 5, it is applied to the Lord Jesus Christ, and most manifestly in each case with the special sense of a *sacerdotal mediator*, intervening with sacrifice and intercession, for the reconciliation of God and sinners. In 9: 15 we read, “And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament (*διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης*); (viz.) ὅπως, θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας.” His priestly work is here stated as the very purpose of his mediation. In the passage next cited it is said, “Ye are come to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling,” &c.; where his sacrifice is again made prominent in connexion with his mediation. And in the last, “There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.” The meaning of the phrase under remark may also be illustrated by the parallel expression of 7: 22 above, *κρείττονος διαθήκης ἕγγυος*. As was there seen, the *ἕγγυος* is one who pays the liabilities of those for whom he stands. In the case of Christ’s people, a part of these

liabilities is sacrifice for sin. The sacerdotal character of Christ's mediation is clear.

ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις. The nature of this superiority has been explained above, in the remarks on κρείττονος διαθήκης. The preposition here employed shows the *fundamental nature* of these promises, *upon which* the better dispensation "hath been instituted." There is here a parallelism of expression to 7: 11 above. There, it was said that the people had received its institutions ἐπ' αὐτῇ (viz. διὰ Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης). That priesthood was the basis on which rested the enjoyment of whatever carnal and external benefits the people derived from Mosaic institutions. In Hebr. 10: 28 it is said, "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, ἐπὶ θυτῶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν." The sentence rested on the testimony, as its basis. So, the new dispensation is founded on these better promises. What the promises are, may be discovered in vv. 10–12 below, viz. that God will put his laws into our minds and write them in our hearts, will enter into the covenant relation of a Father to us, and mercifully forgive our sins. They are summed up in *justification* and *sanctification*; and, more briefly, in *redemption*. These are the blessings which the new dispensation was designed to secure.

νενομοθέτηται. In the New Test. this word occurs only here and in 7: 11 above. The difference of subjects gives the verb in the two places a slightly different phase of meaning. In 7: 11 the nominative is λαός, 'the people were instituted,' in the sense of

‘being provided with a set of institutions.’ Here, the nominative is *διαθήκη*, ‘the dispensation hath been instituted,’ in the sense of ‘laying down as law,’ ‘giving law.’ Hence we should not object to render it, with Calvin, ‘promulgatum,’ or with others, ‘established,’ ‘sanctioned.’ The idea of the passage seems to be, ‘that the new dispensation was established upon the basis of better promises :’ these were the end to be accomplished, the reason of its institution, *the ground of its establishment*, without which it would never have been given, and with which it is essentially superior to the old dispensation, which had no efficacy in itself (see 7 : 18), and was chiefly valuable as adumbrating this.

V. 7. *Εἰ γὰρ*. The conjunction *γὰρ* here introduces the proof of the inferiority of the first dispensation, which is implied in v. 6 : “He (Christ) hath obtained a better ministry, and is mediator of a better dispensation, founded on better promises.” That is, the Aaronic was worse ; ‘for (*γὰρ*), if it had not been, it would not have been substituted by a second.’

*ἄμεμπτος*. The Apostle intends by this word, ‘blameless,’ being ‘without defect for the great object or aim of securing redemption.’ In this sense, the one in which bigoted and perverse Jews persisted in supporting it, it was not blameless : it was chargeable with defect. But we are not to understand the Apostle as saying that God had instituted a dispensation which was faulty for the purposes He had in view. For those purposes, which were typical, it was well adapted.

ἐξητεῖτο τόπος. The phrase is pregnant, and implies that room was made for the second, by the abrogation of the first, on account of the superiority of the former to the latter.

V. 8. Μεμφόμενος γάρ. Here follows the proof that the first dispensation was not ἄμεμπος. The force of the connective, as introducing this proof, is easily seen. The evidence is a gospel prophecy from Jer. 31: 31-34. It also contains the proof that room was sought for a second and better covenant.

αὐτοῖς. This pronoun belongs more properly to λέγει than to μεμφόμενος, with which it is construed by the English version, and Calvin. Μεμφόμενος is used in evident allusion to ἄμεμπος, and therefore finds its object, by a natural ellipsis, in αὐτῇ, to be supplied by the reader, and referring to διαθήκη, which is obviously the subject to ἄμεμπος. The meaning therefore is, 'Charging defect upon that first dispensation, God saith to them' (the Israelites of Jeremiah's day), &c.

διαθήκην καινὴν. In this passage we clearly see the use of διαθήκη to express those arrangements of God with his people, which we call the *old and new testaments* or *dispensations*. In v. 10 we have the sense of the word very clearly manifested, as it flows from its etymology, διαθήκην ἢν διαθήσομαι ('the institution which I shall institute'). Compare Aristoph. Om. 439. The proof which this quotation presents that the former dispensation was charged with defect by God, is in the fact that a new one is to be intro-

duced, unlike the old, and that the old did not secure the obedience of the people to God, nor the favour of God to them.

V. 9. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου, κ.τ.λ.* These words are a translation of *בְּיוֹם הַחֲזִיקֵי בְיָדָם* in the Hebrew; and are the same with which this clause is rendered in the Septuagint. The whole quotation contains several unimportant variations from the Septuagint rendering (which is to be sought in the 38th chapter of that version), 'In the day of my taking their hand,' &c. The construction should rather be accounted a Hebraism, than an anacoluthon; for it is a strict imitation of the original. See Winer's *Id.* §64, p. 406. The word *ἡμέρα* is to be understood in the general sense of 'time,' 'juncture,' 'era.' If we should give it its literal sense, the only institution whose commencement could be plausibly fixed on the very day the people left Egypt would be the passover. But the whole of the Aaronic dispensation is intended, of which we may say, with general accuracy, that it was instituted at the exodus.

*ὅτι.* This conjunction is here not demonstrative, but causal. It introduces the reason for God's making a 'new arrangement,' not like the old: *οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσι.*

*οὐκ ἐνέμειναν.* The Hebrew is, *אֲשֶׁר הִפְּסָה הַפָּרָה*, 'because they broke,' 'violated, my arrangement.' The Septuagint employs the same translation for this verb.

*καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν.* This also is the Septuagint rendering for *בְּאֶזְבְּחֵי בָעֲלֹתַי בָּם*. It is worthy of note

that the Syriac version gives the same sense. Our English version of Jeremiah improperly translates, "which my covenant they brake, *although I was a husband* to them." Gesenius, in his Hebr. Lex. very accurately states the meanings of *בָּזַל* to be, 1. 'To be Lord,' 2. 'To become a husband,' 3. 'To look down upon;' and hence, 'to disdain, contemn or reject.' The last sense is nearly that given by the Septuagint and our Epistle. Others translate this passage, "I was their Lord." Gesenius also translates the passage in Jer. 3: 14, *כִּי אָנֹכִי בָּזַלְתִּי בְכֶם*, "For I rejected you," which the English version renders, "Turn, oh back-sliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married to you." The sense we have given to the citation above, is certainly more accordant with the scope of the author.

V. 10. *ὅτι* is here rather illustrative than causal. The 'new dispensation' had been promised in v. 8; and its nature is here explained. This explanation does indeed present somewhat of support or ground for the assertion that it was new, and unlike the previous one; but yet the force of the connective is rather illustrative than logical.

*διδούς, κ.τ.λ.* This participle presents a peculiarity of construction, which has been very variously explained. The Hebrew of which it is a translation is *נִתְּתִי*. This the Septuagint renders *διδούς δώσω*. It has been supposed by some, though without sufficient evidence, that it may be explained as a Hebraism, in imitation of that Hebrew construction of the infinitive

with a finite tense, where the latter has been left understood, so that the former stands alone to express a finite meaning. This construction may be seen in its full form in Gen. 22 : 17, where God says to Abraham, "In blessing I will bless thee," &c. בְּרִכָּה אֲבָרְכְךָ; and in Heb. 6 : 14 it is imitated without ellipsis, in the Greek thus: εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, κ.τ.λ. But it seems doubtful whether the phrase under discussion can be a shortened form of this construction, especially as the Hebrew of which it is a translation is different. Stuart and others consider διδούς as here used for the finite verb δάσω: and there seems, at the first glance, to be countenance for this supposition in such passages as John 5 : 44, Πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρ' ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε: and Eph. 1 : 20, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δέξια αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. where λαμβάνοντες and ἐγείρας seem to fill the place of finite verbs. But these are rather anacolutha. The idea that one part of a paradigm is explicitly used *for another*, is always unreasonable, and in the teeth of the very notion of regular forms in language. What do we mean by calling διδούς a *participle*, and δάσω a *finite tense*? We mean that a certain termination, in this case *-ους*, is conventionally agreed upon for the sole purpose of indicating a certain phase of meaning, which is different from another phase conventionally indicated by *-σω*. How arbitrary is it to say that the termination *-ους* is sometimes used to express a finite-tense action, when the only purpose of its invention



and use was, to show that the sense expressed was different from that of a finite tense? Kuinoël and Bloomfield supply *εἶμι* or *ἔσομαι*: an explanation which receives some countenance from Kühner, §313. Rem. 1. But the most rational and natural view is that suggested by Winer, *Idioms of the New Test.* §64. 2. b. (p. 408), that *διδόνς* presents only an instance of *ἀνακολούθου*, prompted by a desire to give prominence to the second thought, which is expressed by the subsequent clause, *καὶ . . . ἐπιγράψω, κ.τ.λ.*: *διδόνς* then is simply a participle, construed with the subject of *διαθήσομαι*, and if the construction had been regular, we should have had *ἐπιγραφῶν* in the same construction: "This is the arrangement which I will institute with them, *placing* my laws in their mind, and *writing* them upon their hearts." But the emphasis desired to be thrown on the idea of 'writing them on the heart,' changed the second participle, in the process of the sentence, into a more definite form, the future.

*εἰς θεόν . . . εἰς λαόν.* This is a construction exactly similar to that of *Hebr. 1: 5*, and both passages are in close imitation of the Hebrew. In the present instance it is *אֲנִי אֶל־הֵם . . . אֲנִי*, 'I will be to them in the relation of a God, and they shall be to me in the relation of a people;' i. e. my peculiar people.

The exact meaning of this important verse is now apparent. These are the characteristics of the new dispensation; that it will secure to its objects that enlightening of the mind in the spiritual knowledge of

God's word, and that renewal of the heart, which constitute a true, spiritual regeneration; and it will institute between God and his people the unchangeable covenant relation of gracious ruler and protector on his part, and affectionate, obedient subjects on theirs.

V. 11. *πλήσιον*. Some ancient and many more recent manuscripts read here *πολίτην*, instead of *πλήσιον*. Several versions and Fathers, among the former of which is the Septuagint, give the same reading. The Hebrew is *אִישׁ אֶת רֵעֵהוּ*. The general sense is not affected, as it is only a substitute of the word 'fellow-citizen' for 'neighbour.'

*ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, κ.τ.λ.* *ὅτι* here is causal, and introduces the reason why one should not, under this new dispensation, teach another to know the Lord, viz. because all, of every grade and condition, would already do this. To "know the Lord" here, is to recognize, own, and practically obey Him as God. The promise does not therefore mean that, in the maturity of the new dispensation, religious instruction by human means will wholly cease; for fulness of instruction is one of the glories of this dispensation, and revealed truth will always be the instrument of sanctification; but that there will no longer be any occasion to perform the work of reclaiming our fellow-men from idolatry, or from a life of practical irreligion. None of the subjects of that dispensation will then remain in these extreme conditions of ignorance and sin, in which so many Jews continued, under the Mosaic dispensation.

V. 12. *Ὅτι ἔλεως ἔσομαι, κ.τ.λ.* The conjunction here also is causal, though the connexion of thought is not so immediately obvious. *Ὅτι* introduces the great and fundamental blessing of the new dispensation, complete and free forgiveness, not only as completing the enumeration of those blessings, but as showing the cause or ground for the bestowal of those before mentioned. It is as though it were said, ‘I will bestow, under this new dispensation, spiritual enlightening, regeneration, a covenant-union to myself by adoption, the universal knowledge and fear of God; and these *because* (*ὅτι*) I will bestow one thing more, the merciful forgiveness of sins.’ It is because we are justified in Christ, that we are adopted, renewed, sanctified, and glorified. If the guilt of our sins remained upon us, it would forever bar the bestowal of these gifts by a just God. It is of course implied in this passage that the old dispensation did not, by its inherent power, bring these blessings to the people. It only had power to foreshadow them.

*οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ.* This construction is the same with *οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν* in v. 11, and we have therefore postponed remark upon it till now. Many critics (as Kühner, §318. 7) resolve it into some such ellipsis as this: *οὐ φόβος ἔστι μὴ μνησθῶ*, ‘It is not to be feared that I will remember,’ &c. Winer (*Id. New Test.* §60. 3, pp. 388, 389) seems to favour a similar resolution; remarking, that “the intensive *οὐ μὴ* is used of that which in no way is, or can happen;” as though the full construction were something such as this:

οὐ κίνδυνος μὴ μνησθῶ. It throws doubt over these explanations, that while the expression is very frequent, no instance of its supposed full form is cited. It is perhaps sufficient for us to remark that the construction is equivalent to the most emphatic and direct negative. A few instances occur in which the verb following μὴ is in the future indicative, and one even in which it is in the present tense of that mood. But the most frequent tense employed is the aorist subjunctive, as the force of the moods would lead us to expect. Grammarians have endeavoured to discriminate between the meanings of those cases where the future indicative and those where the aorist subjunctive is used; but wholly without success. The usage, at least in the New Test. is not guided by a settled principle of syntax. The particle ἔτι gives to this precious promise peculiar value; it shows that the forgiveness is complete and final. Compare Micah 7: 19, last clause; Ps. 103: 12.

V. 13. πεπαλαίωσε, 'He hath made old,' in the sense of 'representing as old.' It may be illustrated by the Latin expression, *antiquare legem*. The perfect tense is employed, because the act, though past, is referred to a present time, and in effect was still continuing at the time of writing. See Winer's Id. New Test. §41. 4, pp. 213-216. God's calling the second dispensation new, implied that the first was old.

τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, κ.τ.λ., 'But that which is antiquated and is growing old, is near its disappearance.' The Apostle here employs an infer-

ence drawn from analogy. As old age, in all plants and animals, announces the approach of dissolution, so in this institution. The gracious promise of the prophet implied that the approach of the new dispensation would antiquate the old. Hence there was ground to expect that the full establishment of the new would destroy the old.

## CHAPTER IX. 1—14

### ANALYSIS.

HAVING shown the superior order of Christ's priesthood and priestly character, ch. VII. the superior sanctuary in which it was exercised, that is, the heavenly, and its superior functions, comporting with the superior dispensation to which it belonged, ch. VIII. the author now enters upon a more particular consideration and comparison of the nature and value of the services of the two priesthoods; exhibiting the typical and temporal character of those performed by the Levitical priests, and the efficacious and all-sufficient character of those rendered by Christ, chs. IX.—X. 18.

He begins by reciting the leading arrangements of the ancient tabernacle, and the disposition of its furniture, ch. IX. vv. 1—5, and the principal daily and yearly services that were performed in it, vv. 6, 7. This perpetual exclusion of all but the high-priest from the holy of holies, and even of him except on a single day in the year, and his entrance on that day with special sacrifices for himself and the people, the author declares, imported that, while the former tabernacle stood, the way was not yet opened for free access to God. That is, the Aaronic sanctuary had no power, by its services, to procure such access: it was a mere type until the time then present. Its offerings and sacrifices, still presented, could not perfect the con-

science of the server, and were only imposed, with other carnal ordinances, till the new dispensation should take effect, vv. 8–10. On the other hand ( $\delta\epsilon$  being opposed, in v. 11, to  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  in v. 1), Christ, the High-Priest of the good things to come, had done a more excellent and efficacious work; ( $\alpha$ ) He had entered through the tabernacle that was better and more perfect, ( $\beta$ ) not with the blood of goats and calves, but His own, ( $\gamma$ ) once for all into the heavenly sanctuary, ( $\delta$ ) having effected a true redemption, vv. 11, 12. This last crowning result he argues ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), from the superior nature of the sacrifice: if the blood of bulls, goats, &c. removed certain temporary, penal liabilities under the theocracy, how much more would the blood of Christ, who with an eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, free us from the pollution and condemnation of dead works, unto the service of the living God? vv. 13, 14.

## COMMENTARY.

IX. 1 Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη [σκηνὴ] δικαιο-  
 2 ματα λατρείας, τό, τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν. Σκηνὴ  
 γὰρ κατασκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ἣ ἢ τε λυχνία καὶ  
 ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἥτις λέγεται  
 3 ἅγια. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ  
 4 ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμια-  
 τήριον, καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκα-  
 λυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ἣ στάμνος χρυσοῦ  
 ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστή-  
 5 σασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· ὑπεράνω δὲ  
 αὐτῆς Χερουβὶμ τῆς δόξης, κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλα-  
 στήριον· περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος.

V. 1. Εἶχε μὲν οὖν. μὲν introduces the protasis, whose apodosis is introduced by δὲ of v. 11. οὖν we will render "now." De Wette renders it by *nun freilich*. As was remarked on its occurrence in 7:11 above, it carries here little more force than that of a particle of transition.

καί. This conjunction here manifestly has the force of 'also,' and qualifies ἡ πρώτη. It seems to have been employed by the author, because of the silent comparison which still existed in his mind between the first and second dispensations.

ἡ πρώτη. This word should have supplied to it διαθήκη. This is plain from the context, in several parts of the last chapter. Thus, v. 7, we have ἡ πρώτη



ἐκείνη, where the pronoun evidently points to διαθήκης in v. 6. The Textus Receptus supplies σκηνή. This is wanting in many manuscripts, among which are some of the most ancient, in the Syriac, Vulgate, and other versions, and in the quotations of many Fathers. Some manuscripts supply ἐκείνη (probably in imitation of 8 : 7), and some διαθήκη. The reading of the text we follow is most probably the accurate one.

δικαιώματα λατρείας. δικαιώμα signifies, first, a righteous act, and second, the precept or ordinance enjoining such an act. λατρείας here, though in the genitive, is truly the objective word of the sentence, and we might express the meaning of the two words by 'prescribed worship.' With this may be compared 1 Tim. 6 : 17, μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλόγητι. "nor trust in *uncertain riches*." This usage of the genitive is explained by Winer (Idioms of New Test. §34. 2, p. 184) as a Hebraism, arising from the scarcity of adjectives, and the emphatic use of nouns in their stead, in the language imitated. Although the Greek would have furnished an appropriate adjective or participle, which might have been used to qualify λατρείας, while that noun might have assumed the case proper to the *object* of the sentence, a Hebrew writer would prefer to use the genitive construction, both in imitation of the older language, and in order to give to the idea expressed by δικαιώμα more prominence than an adjective would have done. Or else, we may consider this generally as an instance of the wider defining relationship of the genitive, and give to the

words the sense 'worship-ordinances.' 'The first dispensation, too, had on the one hand its precepts, viz. of that particular class which pertain to forms of worship.' Similar instances of the use of the genitive may be seen in v. 10 below (*δικαιώματα σαρκός*, 'carnal precepts'), and Rom. 2: 26 (*δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου*, 'legal precepts').

*τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν.* There has been great dispute which of these two words is the object, and which the attributive. Those who are curious of such debates may see more abundant details in Bloomfield. The context certainly favours that construction which makes *ἅγιον* the noun and object, and *κοσμικόν* the attributive. The latter is an adjective; of rare occurrence, indeed. To show that it may be a substantive, cases have been produced where *τὸ κοσμικόν* is so employed. It is urged, that, for *ἅγιον* to be the noun and object, the order should be *τὸ κοσμικόν ἅγιον*, or *τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κοσμικόν*. But it might be also, *ἅγιον τὸ κοσμικόν*. Either of these orders, according to Kühner, indicate an implied comparison in the attributive between its object and others of the same general class. It is most indisputable, that where such an implied contrast is not intended, but the intention of the adjective or other qualifying phrase is simply to attribute to its object a particular quality, the usages of the language permit a different order, such as that in the text. We have instances of the same order in 1 Cor. 10: 3, *καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον*, κ.τ.λ. Gal. 1: 4, *τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονη-*

ροῦ. 1 John 5: 20, ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος (although it must be admitted that, in the last instance, some copies omit the article). Classic Greek exhibits similar instances. In Philostrat. Apoll. 7: 16, we find ἐν τῷ νήσῳ ἀνύδρω. Kühner cites from Xenophon's Memorab. 4: 7. 7, Οἱ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου καταλαμπόμενοι τὰ χρώματα μελαντέρα ἔχουσιν. Thucyd. 1. 49, says, Ἐνέπηρσαν τὲ τὰς σκηναῖς ἐρήμους, καὶ τὰ χρήματα διήρπασαν. Other passages might easily be accumulated. Winer observes, on 1 John 1: 20, that later writers began, in such cases, to omit the article. See his Id. New Test. §19. (a), p. 113; Kühner's Gr. Gram. §245. 3. (a) (b), pp. 316–318. It is evident that an argument from the mere order of the words cannot be pressed. Greek writers did not conform themselves with regularity to so trivial a rule of composition as this; and criticisms founded upon it are too minute to be reliable. We therefore unhesitatingly regard τὸ ἅγιον as the noun and object; meaning in this place, not the holy of holies particularly, but the whole Levitical tabernacle. κοσμικὸν is defined by Robinson's Lex. as the opposite of ἐπουρανίου, 'terrestrial,' as opposed to celestial. It here evidently describes the Jewish sanctuary as opposed to that heavenly one of v. 11, which is οὐ χειροποιήτου, οὐ ταύτης κτίσεως. The distinction may be illustrated by vv. 23, 24 below, where the parts of the one are said to be τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, but the other, αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια, the one χειροποιήτα ἅγια, the other αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν.

V. 2. *Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατασκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη.* The conjunction *γὰρ* introduces the confirmation of the statement in the first verse. The idea of the writer seems to be, 'For a tabernacle was constructed, (I mean) the first; in which was the lamp,' &c. This is the outer half of the sacred tent; called here first, not as distinguished from the heavenly into which Christ afterwards entered, but from the hinder half. It was first (foremost) in position. The author here gives only a cursory glance at the tabernacle and its furniture, for this was all his purpose required; and we need not, therefore, wonder that he omits some things, as the altar of incense.

*καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων.* Some explain this expression in the manner indicated in our remarks on *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, in v. 1, as the genitive of the object. If thus understood, it would be equivalent to *οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως*, which is the form of the expression for 'shew-bread' in Matt. 12: 4. And a parallel expression might be found in Exod. 40: 23, where *מִן הַלֶּחֶם הַקֹּדֶשׁ* ('the ordering of the bread') exhibits the leading word in regimen to that which seems properly its qualificative. But there is, nevertheless, good ground to doubt whether such a view fully expresses the meaning of the author. It is safer and more consistent with sound principles of criticism, to seek a meaning more strictly accordant with the particular arrangement of the words here, and to believe that the author meant something by that arrangement. We will rather hold, then, that if the Apostle had meant only

οἱ ἄρτοι προθίντες, he would have said so; and that as he has used the form ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, he intended to make prominent the πρόθεσις, as the subject of thought. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §34. 2, p. 184.

ἦτις λέγεται ἅγια. This outer, or front (πρώτη) part, is what was called the holy place. That is, when accuracy of language was intended, the phrase *holy* was restricted to the outer, and *holy of holies* to the inner tent. But in a looser sense, the whole tent was called *holy*, or *the sanctuary*, and sometimes no higher phrase was employed to express the holiest of all.

V. 3. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, 'Behind the second veil (or after passing the second veil) was the tent called *holy of holies*.' The first veil was that which closed the front of the outer tabernacle, a description of which is given in Exod. 26:36. A description of the whole tabernacle may be seen at large in that place.

ἅγια ἁγίων. The plural form of this expression is worthy of note. If we supposed σκηνην were properly to be supplied to ἅγια, making the latter feminine and singular, the form would be easily intelligible. And this would seem to receive some countenance from the occurrence of the feminine immediately before, ἦτις λέγεται ἅγια. But it can scarcely be doubted that the phrase is imitated from the Septuagint, where it is always neuter. In Exod. 26:33 the outer sanctuary is called in the Hebrew שֶׁבֶט, and in the Septuagint τοῦ ἁγίου, while the inner (שֶׁבֶט הַקִּדְשִׁים) is called τοῦ ἁγίου τῶν ἁγίων. In 1 Kings (Sept. 3 Kings) 8:6,

the latter is rendered τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, the words in Hebrew being the same as above; and in Hebr. 9: 8, 25, 13: 11, the inner sanctuary is called τὰ ἅγια. We must therefore explain the neuter plural which occurs in the most of these cases (τὰ ἅγια), as an instance of the *collective sense* which that form often expresses. The reader will remember that it is so prominent that the neuter plural always takes a verb singular. The attaching of the genitive ἁγίων to it, gives a superlative force, according to a usage prevalent in both the Hebrew and older Greek. See Wiener's Id. New Test. §37. 2, p. 195.

V. 4. χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον. Some commentators, among whom is De Wette, will have this to be the altar of incense. They argue, in proof of this, that Josephus, in his Jewish Antiq. L. III. ch. 6, §8, as well as Philo, calls the altar of incense θυμιατήριον: that the altar is omitted in the enumeration of the furniture of the outer tabernacle which is given above; and that if we render the word 'censer,' we then meet the difficulty that Moses says nothing of such a censer belonging to the holy of holies. It is asked, moreover, 'If it was deposited there, how was it gotten for use on the day of atonement?' To account for the fact that the Apostle here says that the altar of incense was in the most holy place, while Exod. 30: 6, 7 clearly put it without, they either assume his ignorance, or suppose that the altar was carried into the most holy place on the day of atonement.

But while Josephus calls the incense-altar θυμια-

τήριον, he expressly places it, as Exod. 30 : 6, 40 : 5, 26, between the candlestick and the table of shewbread, in the outer tabernacle. And although Moses makes no mention of a special censer for the inner sanctuary, we know that there were several מִזְבֵּחַ, by a reference to Exod. 27 : 3 and 38 : 3. And it is in itself probable that there was one which belonged to the service of the inner sanctuary, and that it was golden. This is confirmed by the fact that Solomon (1 Kings 7 : 50) caused golden censers to be made for the sanctuary, and that the angel who offers incense before the altar, in Rev. 8 : 3, used one of the same material. The symbolical vision doubtless took its shape from the usages of the Jewish sanctuary. If kept in the holy of holies, which it is not *necessary* to suppose, it may have been taken out by the high-priest, who entered several times on the day of atonement, as will appear by a reference to the observations on v. 27 below. Or, the fire may have been carried to the most holy place in another vessel. De Wette says, 'It is not likely that the altar would be passed by, and the censer mentioned.' But that such an omission is not incredible, is shown by the fact that it is made in Exod. 26, as he himself notices, in the whole of which chapter there is no description of the altar, though the enumeration of the objects in the tabernacle is otherwise minute. It is not till the 30th chapter that the altar is described. It is incredible that the author of Hebrews should have misplaced the altar of incense from ignorance—and this aside from his inspi-

ration; for no intelligent Jew could fail to know these details concerning a sanctuary and a worship so prized by him. It has no little weight, also, that the Septuagint use the word *θυσιαστήριον* for the altar of incense, not *θυμιατήριον*, and employ the latter for the Hebrew *תְּרָפֶטֶת*, 'censer,' in two passages, 2 Chron. 26: 19, Ezek. 8: 11. As is well observed by Stuart, in his *Excursus XVI.* the silence of the Pentateuch concerning this golden censer is not a contradiction of the Apostle. Until it is proved that the priests may not have had one among the several censers, which was kept in the holy of holies, and used only for its services on the day of atonement, surely Paul's learning, minute acquaintance with religious affairs, and inspiration, are sufficient to secure credit to his assertion on this point.

*ἐν ἡ στάμνος, κ.τ.λ.* The pot of manna and the rod of Aaron were laid up *in* the chest, and not by, or beside it. In 1 Kings 8: 9, and 2 Chron. 5: 10, it is stated very explicitly that there was nothing in the ark at Solomon's day, except the two tables of stone. But the Apostle is now describing the tabernacle as it was arranged by Moses, in its perfect order and conformity to the divine pattern, and not in any subsequent state. In Ex. 16: 34, it is stated that the pot of manna was laid up before the Lord, and in Numb. 17: 10, that the rod was laid up 'before the testimony,' i. e. the tables of the law. These were in the ark; and it is far most reasonable to suppose that the others were also within it, especially when we re-



member the frequent removals of the tabernacle and its contents. The *στάμνος* is not said to be golden, by Moses, but it is so rendered by the Septuagint, Exod. 16: 33; and it is every way probable in itself, inasmuch as all else pertaining to the ark was of that metal.

V. 5. *Χερουβίμ δόξης*. Stuart renders these words the splendid cherubim; and supposes that the reference is to the brilliance of the gold, of which they were made. It is far more natural to regard them as so called because of the divine glory which shone between them. It was here that the divine presence made its visible manifestation to Moses, as we learn from a comparison of Exod. 25: 22 and Numb. 7: 89, "There will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims," &c. "Moses heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of testimony, from between the two cherubims." It is in allusion to this that Ps. 80: 1 says, "Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth."

*τὸ ἱλαστήριον*. This is the word adopted by the Septuagint for the rendering of כַּפֹּרֶת, which is the name given to the covering or lid of the ark, in Exod. 25: 17-22, and often elsewhere. The name is derived originally from כָּפַר, 'to cover,' whence כִּפֵּר, to cover sin, or make atonement, expiation. The name of 'mercy-seat,' or place of expiation, was given to the lid of the ark, because here the blood of atonement

was annually sprinkled by the high-priest on the great day. See Levit. 16: 14, 15. The word *ἱλαστήριον* also occurs in Rom. 3: 25, in the sense of 'propitiatory sacrifice,' as is manifest from the demands of the context. But that it is here used in the Septuagint sense of mercy-seat, is obvious.

*κατὰ μέρος.* The meaning of these words may be well represented by 'particularly.' Upon comparing such phrases as *καθ' ἓνα, κατὰ δύο, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, καθ' ἡμέραν, &c.*—'one by one,' 'two by two,' &c. the distributive force of this preposition is manifest. *κατὰ μέρος* accordingly is, 'part by part.' See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §53. (d), p. 319. The Apostle here declines entering upon a minute exhibition of the uses and symbolical import of the furniture and arrangements of the tabernacle. The general views which he proceeds to give answer his purposes.

---

6 *Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατασκευασμένων, εἰς μὲν τὴν*  
*πρώτην σκηνὴν διαπαντὸς εἰσίσαισι οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς*  
 7 *λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες· εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ*  
*τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος,*  
*ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοη-*  
 8 *μάτων· τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ*  
*ἀγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν,*  
 9 *ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν· ἥτις παρα-*  
*βολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, καθ' ὃν δῶρά*  
*τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ*

10 *συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα· μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, καὶ διαφοροῖς βαπτισμοῖς [καὶ] δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα.*

V. 6. *διαπαντός*, 'At all times.' This may be continuously, 'always,' in the sense of that which is without interval, or at stated and frequently-recurring times. The latter is the meaning here. Examples of this meaning may also be seen in Luke 24: 53, "And were continually (*διαπαντός*) in the temple, praising and blessing God;" Acts 10: 2, where it is said Cornelius "prayed to God always" (*διαπαντός*), and Hebr. 13: 15, "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise unto God continually" (*διαπαντός*).

V. 7. *ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*. These words we should render not 'once during the year,' but, 'on one occasion during the year.' The opposition of the term is to *διαπαντός*. "Speak to Aaron thy brother that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail." Levit. 16: 2. From Levit. 16: 12-15, it appears that on the great day of atonement, the high-priest made several entries; first, to burn incense; second, to sprinkle the blood of the bullock, unless this was done at the first entry; third, to carry in the blood of the goat, just killed by him. Jewish testimony on the subject is contradictory. A tradition has been stated, on the authority of Philo, that if the high-priest went in oftener than twice, he was put to death; but doubt exists whether this author is cor-

rectly represented as asserting this. A tradition in the Talmud says that the high-priest went in four times.

*οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος.* The passage just cited from the 16th chapter of Leviticus, and especially v. 12, shows that this is not to be pressed too literally. The high-priest must carry sacrificial blood, not each time he went in, but on each annual occasion.

*ἀγνοημάτων.* This word occurs only here in the New Test. The participle *ἀγνοοῦσι* is used, in a sense which serves to illustrate this, in Hebr. 5: 2. It is used as the rendering for *הֶעֱשָׂה*, "oversight," in Gen. 43: 12, by the Septuagint. But here it must be understood to embrace all sins, and not only those of inadvertence and ignorance; for, in Levit. 16: 16–22, we are most distinctly informed that the sacrifices of the great day of atonement had reference to all the sins of the whole nation, including the priests. He who disobeys, though it is a law well known, fails to retain in his mind the cognizance of it: he 'ignores' it.

V. 8. *τοῦτο, scilicet μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν.* This then is the object of *δηλοῦντος*. The Holy Spirit indicated this fact ('that the way into the holy places was not yet manifested while the former tabernacle was standing'), by instructing Moses to perpetuate this symbolical ritual. It is the teaching of the Holy Ghost, because He taught Moses the ritual. And all this part of the Levitical ceremonial showed the impotency of its offerings and services to secure free access to God. It pointed to the better sacrifice and services which would secure this result,

but it showed that the Aaronic dispensation did not furnish the effectual offering. It pointed to Christ, who had not yet died.

*τῶν ἁγίων.* This word here undoubtedly means the heavenly sanctuary where God truly dwells, adumbrated by the earthly holy of holies, in which his visible presence was manifested. To this there was no access but by the high-priest—that once a year, and then with special sacrifices.

*ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς, κ.τ.λ.* The meaning here is, ‘while yet the first tabernacle stood by the divine appointment.’ For surely the access to the true sanctuary through Christ was not to be closed, as long as the perverse bigotry of the Jews chose to perpetuate the tabernacle worship, contrary to God’s will. There is a clear implication in these words, that when once the way into the true holy place, heaven, had been opened by the divine High-Priest, the first sanctuary would no longer stand: ‘the way into the holy place was not manifested while yet the first tabernacle stood.’ Therefore, when the true sanctuary is opened up by Christ, we expect the first to fall. And its fall implies the cessation of the whole ceremonial economy connected with it.

V. 9. *ἥτις παραβολή.* This noun means literally, ‘a placing side by side,’ and hence generally, in the gospels, ‘a parable.’ The meaning here is, ‘a symbol,’ ‘a type.’ There is a parallelism between the type and antitype, as there is between the parable and the truth embodied in it.

*εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα.* The English version, "for the time then present," does not represent the proper sense of these words. The particle 'then' is improperly introduced. It is best to give *εἰς* the most primary sense which it usually has with the accusative, that of *terminus ad quem*. *Ἐνεστηκός*, or *ἐνεστώς*, occurs in Rom. 8:38, Gal. 1:4, 1 Cor. 3:22, and elsewhere; and always with the evident sense of 'instant,' 'present' ('that which *hath come* upon us'). The phrase means, 'until the time present,' i. e. the incoming of the new dispensation. *Until* that juncture, the tabernacle subserved its symbolical use.

*καθ' ὃν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται.* Here, also, the English version unwarrantably renders the verb as a past tense, misapprehending the Apostle's idea. *καθ' ὃν* should be rendered, 'during which' (time, i. e. this season of the new dispensation). Let the reader consult Robinson's *Lex. New Test. sub voce*, II. 2. The tabernacle 'was a symbol until the time that has now come (New Testament times), during which both gifts and sacrifices are (still) offered, which are not able (or, though they are not able) to make the worshipper perfect with regard to his conscience.' That the temple and Levitical service still continued at the time this Epistle was written, is clear from the allusions in 8:13, "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (has not yet vanished); 10:25, "Exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching;" and 13:10,

“We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle.”

*μη δυνάμεναι.* The participle is here made feminine, as agreeing with *θυσία*, the nearer and more important noun, and the one uppermost in the writer's mind. Winer's *Id. New Test.* §35. 2, p. 188, or Kühner's *Greek Gram.* §242. 1, may be consulted for confirmation.

*κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι,* ‘To perfect the offerer in his conscience.’ These sacrifices were not able to bring those who offered them to a complete peace of conscience, nor fully meet its demands for pardon and sanctification. They could secure ultimate exemption from neither guilt nor pollution. We have a similar assertion in nearly the same form in 10: 1, *οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προξερχομένους τελειῶσαι.*

V. 10. This verse contains great difficulties of construction, and, in addition, a much contested various reading. We will proceed to unfold that construction which appears on the whole most reasonable, without dwelling on all the grounds which support it; trusting that its consistency with itself and the context will be the best proof of its truth. We regard the adverb *μόνον* as qualifying the concluding phrase of the sentence, *μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπιχειμένα.* *ἐπὶ* should be rendered, not “in,” as the Engl. version, but “in addition to,” “besides.” This additive meaning proceeds very naturally from its primary meaning of “upon,” for what is added is naturally conceived of as superposed, as in the material process of raising a

heap or pile of any solid substance; and it is a very frequent meaning. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §52. c, p. 314. Instances may be seen in Matt. 25: 20, 22, Luke 3: 20, 16: 26, "I have gained *besides them* (ἐπ' αὐτοῖς) five talents more." "Behold, I have gained two other talents *besides them*" (ἐπ' αὐτοῖς). "Herod added yet this *above all* (ἐπὶ πᾶσι), that he shut up John in prison." "And *besides all this* (καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τουτοῖς), between us and you there is a great gulf fixed," &c.

*βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι*, 'Eatings and drinkings,' i. e. 'meats and drinks.' These words refer to the ceremonial distinctions between meats clean and unclean, and the regulations pointing out what might be eaten and drunk by the priests and their families only, and what by the worshippers. The *διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς* refer to the various ablutions required of priests, and persons who had become ceremonially unclean. The same word is used here and in Hebr. 6: 2, where the doctrine of baptisms is mentioned as one of the "principles of the doctrine of Christ." The Bible reader needs scarcely to be reminded that these *διαφόροι βαπτισμοῖ* of the Levitical law were chiefly by affusion.

*δικαιώμασι*. The conjunction standing before this noun in the *Textus Receptus* is wanting in several ancient and some more recent manuscripts, the Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, and other versions; and is expunged in the editions of Griesbach, Scholz, Vater, and Hahn. The weight of authority is in favour of its rejection: *δικαιώμασι* is then left in apposition with *βρώμασι*,



πώμασι, καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς. If the conjunction is retained, we must give it the explicative sense ‘even;’ ‘meats, drinks, divers baptisms, even carnal ordinances,’ &c. Some manuscripts of high authority write *δικαιώματα* (nominative), and this reading is adopted by Scholz and Hahn. This noun would then be in apposition with *δωρά τε καὶ θυσίαι* of the preceding verse, yet embracing the whole of the ceremonials named, in its general sense. But great difficulty is then thrown in the way of any fair construction of the whole sentence; for the position of the words would then render it extremely harsh to regard *μόνον* as the qualificative of *ἐπικείμενα μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως* below: whereas, if we read *δικαιώμασι*, in apposition with *βρώμασι*, &c. the whole forms one qualificative clause to *ἐπικείμενα*, &c. and as such, may be with entire propriety interposed between *μόνον* and the phrase qualified by it. The reading of the English version, “gifts and sacrifices . . . *which stood* only in meats and drinks,” &c. is inadmissible, because it does not appear how sacrifices consisted in meats clean and unclean. In the ambiguity of the manuscript authority, we will therefore retain the dative, which is the reading of the Textus Receptus and Vater.

*σαρκός*. This word has here its primary or material meaning, and not its derived sense of ‘carnality.’ It defines the nature of these ordinances. They prescribed outward observances, which were concerned not with the soul and its guilt and depravity (except as symbols), but with material substances and the

bodies of the worshippers, and which removed only temporary and carnal liabilities. Thus, in 7: 16, they are said to be "after the law of a carnal commandment;" and in 9: 13, "the blood of bulls and of goats . . . sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." These ordinances of the flesh also are temporary because of their inefficiency, as has been indicated in the observations on 7: 19, and as it is afterwards stated in 10: 4-9.

*μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως*, 'Until the time of reformation,' i. e. the removing of the old and the setting up of the new dispensation. Up to that juncture, these gifts and sacrifices were truly incumbent (*ἐπιχειμένα*) duties of God's people; but *only* (*μόνον*) up to that time. The Apostle teaches, therefore, that, though still offered, these carnal ordinances were destined to cease upon the establishment of the better thing which they shadowed forth.

*ἐπιχειμένα*. We have already indicated that we regard this participle as belonging to *δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι* above. Its gender (neuter) has been supposed by some critics to present a reason for retaining the reading *δικαιώματα* in the nominative, because *θυσίαι*, the nearer of the two nouns to which we attach it, is feminine. The general principle was pointed to, that where an adjective or participle is attached to two connected nouns, it follows the feminine rather than the neuter. But consulting Kühner's Greek Gram. §242. 1, we see that this rule only holds strictly of proper nouns; and that with common nouns, the qualifying

adjective is often neuter, without respect to the gender of its subjects. See, for example, Herod. 3, 57, ἦν ἡ ἀγορὰ καὶ τὸ πρυτανήϊον Παριῶ λίθῳ ἠσκήμενα. Xenoph. Mem. 3. 1. 7, λίθοι τὲ καὶ πλίνθοι καὶ ξυλὰ καὶ κέραμος ἀτακτῶς ἐρρήμενα οὐδὲν χρήσιμα ἐστίν. The same usage prevails in other good writers.

The meaning which we conceive the Apostle to express is therefore this: 'Gifts and sacrifices are (still) offered, (though) not able to give complete peace and purity of conscience to the worshipper, which are only incumbent, in addition to distinctions of clean and unclean meats, and drinks, and divers ablutions, ordinances (merely) carnal, until the time of reformation (of the typical dispensation.)'

- 
- 11 Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, (τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ-ταύτης  
 12 τῆς κτίσεως,) οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ  
 13 εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν ἐυρόμενος. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων, καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους, ἀγιάζει πρὸς  
 14 τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα· πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσῆνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ, καθαρᾶι τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι!

V. 11. *Χριστὸς δέ.* The adversative particle here introduces the apodosis to v. 1. There is here an antithesis between the tabernacle and services of the ancient dispensation, introduced by the words *ἡ πρώτη . . . μὲν* of v. 1, and the sanctuary and offering of the new, which is here introduced by *Χριστὸς δὲ παραγε- νόμενος.*

*ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν.* The same phrase occurs in 10: 1, *σκιᾶν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν.* The participle, according to the sense illustrated in the remarks on 2: 5 above, refers to the second dispensation, which had so long been spoken of as the future one, that a Jew would naturally call it 'the one to come,' even after its introduction had begun. The good things (*ἀγαθῶν*) are the benefits of redemption, secured and ministered by Christ (the *ἀρχιερεὺς*), but only typified, not obtained (*σκιᾶν τῶν μελλόντων*), by the Levitical institutions. Christ is the priest of the new dispensation with its benefits. From 11: 13, 39, 40, below, we learn that these benefits, though future as yet, and only pre-figured, were apprehended by the faith of Old Testament believers.

*διὰ τῆς μίζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς.* *διὰ* is here employed in its original sense of 'through.' The arrangements of the typical sanctuary lead the writer to conceive of Christ as making a sacrifice of himself in the court, as it were, on earth, and then passing through the heavens as the vail separating the outer from the inner sanctuary of this better tabernacle, to

sprinkle his own blood on the mercy-seat in heaven. The whole clause is therefore to be regarded as qualificative of *εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια* in the succeeding verse. This interpretation is sustained by 4 : 14 above, where Christ is called a great High-Priest who hath passed through (*διεληλυθότα*) the heavens. In 6 : 19, 20, it is said that Christ our forerunner has entered for us within the veil, &c.; the veil (the lower heavens) must be penetrated, to reach a position within it; 7 : 26, He is "made higher than the heavens;" and in vv. 24-26 below, He is said to have gone into heaven itself, or very heaven, to appear before God on our behalf.

*οὐ χειροποιήτου.* These words express briefly the same idea contained in 8 : 2, "The true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." The parallelism of the sentiment is obvious. It does not seem necessary, therefore, to extend the meaning of *οὐ χειροποιήτου* to the sense of 'immaterial and uncreated.' The Apostle does not say, in the next clause (*οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*), that it was not created at all; but that it was not a part of *this* creation. It was not uncreated; it is only asserted that it was not, like Moses' tabernacle, the work of human hands. The place where the triune God unfolded his glories, and held communion with holy angels before the creation and blight of *our* world, the place where the human part of Christ glorified, and angels and redeemed souls, now abide, is undoubtedly intended. About its position, direction, or nature, we know nothing; ex-

cept that Christ, to reach it, penetrated our visible heavens.

V. 12. *διὰ αἵματος . . . διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.* *διὰ* here may be best explained as expressing the equipments, or attendant circumstances and relations, under which the act is done; a meaning assigned to this preposition by Winer, *Id. New Test.* §51. (i), p. 306. Its derivation from the primary local meaning of 'through,' is obvious: first, 'through,' second, 'means through which a result is effected,' because the efficiency is conceived as passing from the agent to its object through the instrumental means; and third, 'surrounding circumstances attending the action,' for here also the act is conceived of in a looser sense as put forth through (i. e. surrounded by) those circumstances. Clear examples of *διὰ* in this sense may be found in Rom. 2: 27, where the author calls the Jew *τὸν διὰ γραμμάτων καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου*, 'one whose transgressions are attended with a knowledge of the written word of God, and the practice of circumcision;' in Rom. 14: 20, where eating meats offered to idols is said to be *κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι*, 'sinful to that man whose eating is attended with offence to his brethren;' and in 1 John 5: 6, *Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*, "This is he who came with water and blood." This sense is certainly more consistent with the scope than that of 'the instrument,' which is given to *διὰ* by our English version, "neither by the blood of bulls and goats, but by his own blood." Christ can hardly

be said to have procured admission for himself to heaven by his blood, for he always had access to it in his own right; and the position of the words compels us to regard this clause as qualifying *εἰς ἠθά*. His blood was, rather, the instrument for "obtaining eternal redemption for us."

*λύτρωσιν*. This word occurs in the New Test. only here, and in Luke 1: 68, 2: 38. In the last two places it is applied by Zacharias and Anna to Christ's work on earth. Its meaning is 'redemption' from some obligation, such as that to a creditor, master, captor, or to law, by the payment of a ransom (*λύτρον*). Bretschneider renders it, *Redemptio soluto pretio*. The gospel redemption is from the bondage of moral corruption, and the obligation to punishment for sin. The price (*λύτρον*) paid by Christ is his blood.

*εὐρόμενος*. This is a later Alexandrine form of the 1 aorist middle, occurring not seldom in Josephus, the Septuagint, and other writers of that school. Its full form is *εὐρησάμενος*. Here, as often in the New Test. it means simply 'to obtain,' without the idea of accidental and unexpected acquirement. Thus, Hebr. 4: 16, "Let us come boldly to the throne of grace . . . that we may find grace" (*χάριν εὐρωμεν*), &c.; Hebr. 12: 17, Esau "found no place for repentance" (*τόπον οὐχ εὔρε*). We employ our verb 'find' in the same sense when we say, 'the labourer has found the reward of his labours,' &c. .

V. 13. *σποδὸς δαμάλεως*. Much difficulty has

been experienced by commentators on account of the supposed masculine gender of *σποδός*. Bretschneider, Wahl, Robinson, Grove, Jones, and Stuart in his Commentary, make it masculine. I was formerly inclined to account for the feminine gender of the participle (*ῥαντίζουσα*), by supposing that the subject was conceived of as a sort of compound feminine, 'heifer-ashes,' the gender of the animal prevailing over that of *σποδός*. But the true explanation is most probably to be found in the fact that *σποδός* is both masculine and feminine. Passow, Liddell and Scott, and Donnegan, make it feminine. We find it of this gender in the Septuagint translation of Numb. 19:9, *τὴν σποδὸν τῆς δαμάλεως*, in Homer's Od. 9. 375, *ὑπὸ σποδοῦ πολλῆς*, and in Herod. IV. 172, *τῆς χάμαθεν σποδοῦ*. The ceremonial here alluded to is described in Numb. 19:2-9. The use of *κεκοινωμένους* to describe those ceremonially defiled, needs no remark.

*ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*. The verb, by a customary rule, is made to agree in number with the nearer subject, *σποδός*. But *αἷμα* is also its subject, not sprinkled like the ashes and water on the offerer, but poured out at the altar for his behalf. These 'removed legal or ritual uncleanness.' They also atoned, so far as the secular penalty was concerned, for certain offences against the secular laws of Moses. Their purifying efficacy was only external, corporeal, temporary. The Apostle now employs an argument '*a minori ad majus*.' 'If this comparatively worthless sacrifice had so much efficacy, much more



will the infinitely precious sacrifice of Christ's blood cleanse the conscience from sin.'

V. 14. *διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιου*. This is a vexed passage among critics, who understand variously the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*. First, some interpret it as meaning 'His divine spiritual nature.' Second, some understand it as the Holy Spirit dwelling in him and making him *ἄμωμον*, and refer for confirmation to such passages as Isaiah 42 : 1, "I have put my Spirit upon Him; He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles;" Matt. 3 : 16, "The heavens were opened unto Him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him;" and John 3 : 34, "For God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him." Third, some understand by it "the eternal nature or principle developed in 7 : 16." And fourth, others explain it as meaning his 'eternal glorified state.' See Stuart's Excursus XVIII.

The commentators are mostly divided between the first two opinions. Of these, the first seems to me preferable on the following grounds. First, the superiority of the sacrifice of Christ, so suitable to the scope and argument, is more obvious and more directly in contrast with the nature of the Levitical victims. They were irrational, perishing brutes; He, a divine and eternal being of infinite glory. Second, it was, in fact, the divine nature which gave dignity and efficacy to the sacrifice of Christ. Third, the Holy Spirit, though mentioned in such a multitude of places, is nowhere else thus designated, *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*. And

this would be the more remarkable, if the author intended the Holy Spirit here, because the common epithet applied to Him, ἅγιον, would be more expressive for that interpretation. Fourth, this mode of designating Christ's divine nature corresponds well with that employed in Rom. 1: 4, πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης, as opposed to κατὰ σάρκα of v. 3, where Christ's divine nature is obviously intended. (See Hodge on Romans, *in loco*.) And the same word, πνεῦμα, is employed in 1 Tim. 3: 16, and 1 Peter 3: 18, to express Christ's divine nature when contrasted with his corporeal: θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι. Χριστὸς . . . θανατωθεὶς ἐν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι. Fifth, either of the above senses weakens the contrast between Christ's blood and that of bulls and goats, unless the third of the interpretations enumerated be meant to embrace the divine nature. Sixth, Christ is often, in this Epistle, referred to in His exalted, glorified state, but nowhere in such terms as these. Let the reader consult Hebr. 1: 3, 4, 2: 9, 4: 14, 5: 9, 7: 26-28, 8: 1, where He is described as the brightness of the Father's glory and express image of his person, sitting on the right hand of his majesty, crowned with glory and honour, passed into the heavens, author of eternal salvation to the obedient, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens. The preposition διὰ will have here, if the first interpretation be adopted, the same sense which was given to it in the phrase δι' αἵματος, v. 12. This, then, is the argument:

The sacrifice of the shedding of Christ's blood was accompanied with an eternal divine nature. Since the offering of the blood and life of a brute beast had some outward and temporary efficiency, much more shall this blood and life of infinite worth have a true spiritual efficiency.

*καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν, κ.τ.λ.* The phrase *νεκρῶν ἔργων* has been already illustrated in the remarks on 6: 1 above, as meaning works proceeding from a heart spiritually dead, and deserving the penalty of the second death. The 'conscience' is that faculty of the soul which takes cognizance of its own merit or demerit. The sense of the whole phrase is, therefore, 'to remove pollution and guilt from the soul.' The contrast is to be observed with the words *ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*. The one purification is outward, the other inward; the one carnal, the other spiritual.

*εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν, κ.τ.λ.* This is the result to be attained by putting away our pollution and guilt from the sight of God. Atonement and justification result in sanctification, and both are necessary before we can be admitted into His presence and service in heaven.

## CHAPTER IX. 15—28.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle continues his exhibition of the relative value of the offerings and services of the two priesthoods.

On account of the superior nature and efficacy of the offerings of Christ (*διὰ τοῦτο*, v. 14), He was made mediator of a new dispensation, that He might, by means of His own death, availing even to the remission of sins under the first, secure to all who are called, the everlasting inheritance, v. 15; for, after the law of testaments generally, to which this transaction bears some strong points of resemblance, it was His death which gave it all its validity, vv. 16–18. Wherefore, the first dispensation, that it might as a type set forth this great, fundamental fact, was not ratified without blood; for Moses sprinkled with it the book, the people, the tabernacle, &c.; and under the law almost every thing was purified by blood, and without the shedding of blood there was no remission, vv. 19–22.

It was then necessary,—befitting the nature of the two dispensations and the ends in view,—that the types be purified by such means as these, but that the heavenly and true be purified with better; for (as has been already shown, 8: 4–6), Christ hath entered, (1), not into the sanctuary built by hands and type of

the true (where indeed such sacrifices would have answered), but into heaven itself, to appear now before God in our behalf; (2), not to offer himself often, as the high-priest entered the inner sanctuary every year with the blood of victims; for then, in the first place, contrary to notorious facts and the meaning of the type as already given in v. 8, must He often have died since the foundation of the world; but now once for all, at the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; and in the second place, as it is appointed to men *once* to die, and then is the judgment fixing the destinies of all, so Christ having once been offered up to bear the sins of His people, shall appear again, not to bear iniquity, but for salvation to those who look for Him, vv. 23–28.

After the consideration of the type, then, vv. 1–10, the superiority of Christ's sacrifice, as developed in this chapter, appears, 1st, in its nature and efficacy, vv. 13, 14; 2d, in its fundamental relationship to the new and better dispensation of which the first was but typical, vv. 15–22; 3d, in that His blood, so to speak, was sprinkled in the heavenly sanctuary, vv. 23, 24; and 4th, in that it was offered only once for all, vv. 25–28.

## COMMENTARY.

- 15 Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως, θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. Ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθεμενος· ὄθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται. Ἀληθείης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων, μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐξῆράντισε, λέγων· “τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς ἐντείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός·” καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκευὴ τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐξῆράντισε· (καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς αἵματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις·)

V. 15. *διὰ τοῦτο.* *τοῦτο* refers to the superior nature and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, which was stated in v. 14. *διὰ* with the accusative expresses the ground or reason; and this is strictly according to ‘the analogy of faith’ here. Christ was appointed the mediator of the new covenant, out of a (prospective) regard to the virtue of the sacrifice and mediation he was to make.

διαθήκης καινῆς, 'New arrangement,' 'dispensation.' The adjective καινῆς here is emphatic; and hence the article is omitted. In this whole phrase it is strongly implied that the old dispensation was set aside for its unprofitableness: 'Because He was provided with a sacrifice which was spiritually efficacious, He is made the mediator of a new dispensation; the old therefore is no longer useful, and is no longer retained.'

μεσίτης. The derivation, usage, and meaning of this word have been already illustrated, in the remarks on 8: 6 above. The word, in its original meaning of 'go-between,' is general; signifying sometimes a mere *internuntius*, which is the sense in which Moses is called a mediator in Gal. 3: 19, 20; sometimes an umpire, as in Job 9: 33, where the Septuagint use it as the translation of מוֹדֵי (Engl. "daysman"). The use of the verb ἐμεσίτευσεν, in Hebr. 6: 17, may also be compared: 'God interposed with an oath.' It is here applied to Christ in its more special sense, as mediating between God and man, and particularly as effecting reconciliation by his own death.

ὅπως. This particle here expresses the end or object, 'that,' or 'in order that.' See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §57. 5, p. 349. The object introduced by it is λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι, κ.τ.λ. But the subordinate θανάτου γενομένου is not excluded. The ultimate end of Christ's becoming mediator was the redemption of the called; the mediate end was the making of the sacrifice of his blood, which was in order to the other object: 'In order that, His death

having occurred (or more accurately, 'by the occurrence of His death') for the redemption, &c. the called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.'

*ἀπολύτρωσιν*. This word first and properly signifies 'redemption by a ransom,' which in this case is the death of Christ. It is also used to express the simple idea of 'deliverance,' without reference to the means of effecting it. This is obviously its meaning in Hebr. 11 : 35, "Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance" (*οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν*). Luke 21 : 28, "For your redemption" (deliverance) "draweth nigh." But whenever it is applied to the work of Christ, in effecting deliverance from sin and its consequences (as in Rom. 3 : 24, "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus"), it has its proper meaning of 'redemption by payment of a ransom.' That this is its meaning here is obvious from the preceding words, *θανάτου γενομένου*, 'His death took place *for, in order to* redemption of transgressions.' And we may remark, in general, that wherever it is used of Christ's work for us, connected words prove that it is not a deliverance effected by power or wisdom only, but by a ransom. In addition to the passage from Romans, consult, in evidence, Eph. 1 : 7, Col. 1 : 14.

*τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων*, 'The transgressions under the first dispensation.' *ἐπὶ* here has the meaning of conjunction or concurrence of time (see Winer's *Id. New Test.* §52. 3. c, p. 314), as though it expressed sins occurring *cotemporarily with* the



first dispensation. It is in several places taught that the true and spiritual redemption of the believers under the Aaronic dispensation was effected by Christ's sacrifice. Thus, in Rom. 3: 25, "God set forth (his Son) . . . to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past" (*διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*). Sins committed before God set forth his Son are intended. The same retrospective operation of His sacrifice is implied in v. 26 below, *ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. The implication is, that if the one sacrifice of Christ had not been of perpetual efficacy, it would have been necessary to repeat it constantly ever since the foundation of the world, in order to redeem believers of the earliest ages of the world; for that was a part of its design. The same truth is also taught in Acts 13: 38, 39, "By Him *all that believe* are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses;" all those who lived under the law of Moses, as well as subsequent believers. But this passage does not except the redemption of more recent believers from the object of Christ's sacrifice; for it gives us grounds of an argument *a fortiori*: If the transgressions committed under a former dispensation were atoned for by this Priest of the new, much more will He cover the sins of his people under his own dispensation.

*οἱ κεκλημένοι*. Two kinds of calling are signified by this family of words, *καλέω*, *κλήσις*, *κλητός*, in the New Test.; one outward, the other inward and effect-

ual. Of the former, we have examples in Matt. 20: 16, 22: 14, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι ἐκλεκτοί. Of the latter calling, we had an obvious example in Hebr. 3: 1 (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου). Others equally obvious may be found in Rom. 8: 30, Οὓς προῶρρισε . . . καὶ ἐκάλεσε . . . καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν . . . καὶ ἐδόξασε, and in 1 Cor. 1: 9, 24. κекκλημένοι here evidently signifies the effectually called; the whole tenour of Scripture and the passages quoted (as Matt. 20: 16) prove that none but those who experience the spiritual and regenerating call of the Spirit, do "obtain the promise of eternal inheritance," justification, adoption, and a home in heaven.

VV. 16, 17. "Οπου γὰρ διαθήκη. γὰρ introduces the ground of the statement, that it was the mediate intention of Christ's mediatorship *that his death should take place*, and through that, the redemption of his people: 'He was made mediator in order to die, and by his death to redeem; *for*, where there is a testament, the death of the testator must precede, to give it validity.' In this passage commentators are greatly divided as to the meaning of διαθήκη, some translating it 'covenant' and some 'testament.' Its proper meaning (from διατίθημι) is 'an arrangement,' 'a disposition,' of some affair. Hence it is used among the classics, for the most part, in the specific sense of 'will,' 'testament,' which is embraced in the Latin '*dispositio*.' In the Septuagint, διαθήκη is often used as the translation of בְּרִית, meaning covenants between man and man, as for instance that between David and

Jonathan, 1 Sam. 18: 3. In Gen. 15, 18 it is used to signify the Abrahamic covenant, and in Exod. 24: 6-8, to express the Mosaic covenant, which sense it also has in Hebr. 9: 20 (which is a quotation of the passage from Exodus to which we have just referred), and in Deut. 5: 2. It is used to express the new covenant promised under the Messiah, in Jer. 31: 31-34, already cited in 8: 8-12 above. There is one instance, at least, found among the classics (Aristoph. ornithes. 439), where it seems to mean 'covenant,' ἢν μὴ διαιδῶνται γ' οἶδε διαθήκην ἐμοί. In the cases last quoted from the Scriptures, we have only different forms or dispensations of the same covenant; and in the cases of the Mosaic and Christian, perhaps it would be better generally to translate the word 'dispensation' instead of 'covenant.' The former rendering is still more to be approved than 'testament,' the one which our translators have used. This use of διαθήκη to express, as is done habitually in this Epistle, the Mosaic and Christian economies, comes near the original import of the word; the adjuncts severally used, πρώτη, δεύτερα, νέα, καινή, κρείττων, αἰώνιος (as in 13: 20), serving, with the context, to define what economy is meant. In Gal. 4: 24 we have both dispensations spoken of at once, δύο διαθήκαι.

Under the first economy, which was typical, teaching the substance under shadows, Christ could not, from the appointment of God and the nature of the case, make the offering of himself. This is evident from a comparison of Hebr. 8: 4, 5, and 9: 8-10. The pres-

ence of the type implies the absence of the antitype, because the very nature of a type is to symbolize visibly an absent and unseen reality. When the time was come for Christ's offering of himself to take place, the former dispensation must give way to a new economy possessing the substance. So, the author asserts in v. 15 that, on account of the superior nature of Christ's sacrifice, inferring a superior efficacy which never belonged to the blood of bulls and goats, He was made a mediator of a new dispensation, that He might by dying secure to His people, living under both economies, the everlasting inheritance.

The *διαθήκη* (dispensation or economy) of Christ, thus conceived and expressed (as to its means, *θανάτου* (τοῦ Χριστοῦ), and its ends, *τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας*), resembles, in some of its general and important features, a testament among men; by which I understand the Apostle to illustrate the subject in the verses before us. The foundation of this comparison is laid in v. 15, where the new *διαθήκη* is made to derive its efficacy *from the death of the μεσίτης*, to whom it belonged; and through this death it confers, on all who are called, a title to an *everlasting inheritance*. And the transition was more natural, because of the common usage of *διαθήκη* to denote a *testament*.

The signification of "*covenant*," however consonant to Septuagint and New Test. usage, is philologically incapable of being carried through vv. 16, 17, even though we admitted that the context would limit the statement in v. 16 to such covenants as were ratified

by slain victims; a supposition by which some attempt to sustain that rendering. First: if *διαθήκη* means covenant, *διαθεμένου*, by the most natural correspondence of terms, would mean *covenanter*. (Let the reader compare the construction in 9:16, with that of the citation from Aristophanes, on a previous page.) But the *ὁ διαθέμενος* did not die; for He was God the Father. This difficulty becomes insurmountable when we remember that *διαθέμενος* is used of *testators*, but never of victims slain to ratify covenants. Second: the word *νεκρός* (in the masculine, v. 17) is often used of dead men, but never, except as a qualifying adjective, of dead animals. In this adjective sense, it is applied to the works of unregenerate men, in a metaphorical sense; *νέκρα ἔργα*, in Hebr. 6:1, 9:14; to *ἁμαρτία* in Rom. 7:8; and to *πίστις* in James 2:17, 20, 26. Even of its application as an adjective to beasts, I can find but one example, Eccles. 9:4, *ὁ κύνων ὁ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρον* (Septuagint). The interpretation, therefore, however it may ease the sense, violates common usages of the language, and assumes a usage for itself without support from examples. Third: even admitting that the context naturally suggests covenants which are ratified by the slaying of victims, still the language of these verses seems too general for limitation to such special covenants, and the law is too generally laid down for the known usages in ratifying covenants. And if it be said that the context limits us to the conception of covenants ratified by the blood of victims, it may be said

with equal plausibility, on the other side, that it limits us to the conception of dispensations or dispositions that take their force from the death of the disposer. But what kind of dispositions are these among men? Obviously, testaments. The only difficulty in the way of the view which we have given, is this: that it may seem unwarrantable to suppose the author using the same word in two unlike significations in so near a proximity. This does not appear insuperable; for nothing is more certain than that a multitude of words do bear different senses in different contexts; and where the context changes, even though it be in the compass of two sentences, it is not impossible that a change of sense may take place in the leading term, even as it does when the two differing contexts are far asunder. No one seems to have made the obvious reflection, that the *aspect* of the διαθήκη must needs change, as the point of view is changed from which it is seen. In v. 15 (διαθήκης πατρὸς μεσίτης), it is contemplated as the dispensation of the Father; in v. 16, it is viewed as the Son's. Now as it is God the Father's, it is 'a dispensation;' but as it is the transaction of the dying Mediator, it is a 'last will and testament.' In vv. 15 and 16 the Apostle passes from the one to the other point of view.

V. 16. φέρεσθαι. This phrase is translated by Wahl, *nesse afferri testimonium de morte*, &c. taking death (θάνατον) in the sense of 'news of his death.' Bretschneider translates it *ferrī sermone* ('that his death be related'), i. e. *constare oportet*; and thence

he would derive the sense 'be brought forward,' 'ad-duced,' 'shown.' Kuinoöl translates *φέρεσθαι*, *insequi*, 'to ensue.' The sense given by Bretschneider corresponds best with the context and the usage of the verb. Let the student consider the derivation of the English verb '*relate*' (in the sense of recount) from the Latin.

V. 17. ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, 'A testament is of force over the dead.' The force of ἐπὶ here may be illustrated by a comparison with ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο (7:11). Consult also Winer's *Id. New Test.* §52. c, p. 315. The sense seems to be nearly that of '*sub conditione*.' 'A testament is of force on condition of the death of the testator.'

ἐπεὶ μήποτε, κ.τ.λ. The use of μήποτε, instead of the direct negative οὐ, seems here to require some explanation. The latter is certainly the negative commonly used after ἐπεὶ. See *Hebr.* 10:2. Böhme conceives that μὴ is here employed to give to ἰσχύει a stronger and more general negation than οὐ would convey. It is more probable that it is employed because the writer considered the case generally and hypothetically, and not individually. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §59. 5, pp. 375, 376. The words may at any rate be translated with great certainty, 'Since it (a testament) is never binding whilst the testator lives.'

V. 18. ὁθεν. The illation expressed by this word was clearly stated in the Analysis, to which the reader should recur. The testamentary nature of Christ's re-

deeming covenant was so prevalent, as to imply necessarily the death of Him, its mediator, in order to the valid enjoyment of its benefits by his heirs. Therefore it was that the first dispensation was not sanctioned or instituted without blood. The force of this inference is in the fact that the first dispensation was typical of the second; and therefore ought to bear an accurate resemblance to it. The blood, by the shedding of which Aaronic institutions were sanctioned, is understood as implying, of course, the death of the typical victims. The blood-shedding was a shedding of the life. "The blood is the life thereof."

*ἐγχεχαίνισται.* This verb is found in the Septuagint in three senses. First, it is employed in 2 Chron. 15: 8, for *שָׁמַר*, 'to repair,' scilicet the altar; second, it is used to translate *קָדַשׁ*, 'to dedicate or consecrate' a house, as in Deut. 20: 5; third, it is used in the sense of 'ratifying,' 'sanctioning,' as in 1 Sam. 11: 14, for *שָׁמַר*: "Let us go to Gilgal, and ratify (Engl. version writes 'renew') the kingdom there." Wahl translates the verb, *instituo, sancio*. This third meaning is to be preferred in this place. In Hebr. 10: 20, *ἣν ἐνεχαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδοὺν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν*, we are almost compelled to adopt the sense of "consecrating;" and it is therefore best to adopt it in the text under discussion also. The reference of the Apostle here is therefore particularly to the sacrifices by which, as we read in the 8th chapter of Leviticus, Aaron, his sons, and the tabernacle, were set apart.

V. 19. *κατὰ νόμον.* The 'law' here mentioned



is, doubtless, a command enjoining upon Moses this recital of the precepts of the moral and ritual law to the people. Such a command is nowhere recorded, but it was no doubt given; for we find in Exod. 24: 3, 7, that such a recital was made. The events to which reference is here made by the Apostle, were undoubtedly those related in Exod. 24: 4-8. In this passage there is no mention of the blood of goats specifically (but only of burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings of oxen), nor of the water, nor of the scarlet wool and hyssop, nor of the sprinkling of the book. So likewise, in the 40th chapter of Exodus, where the pitching of the tabernacle is related, there is no account of the sprinkling of it and its furniture, which is stated in v. 21. None of these things are improbable in themselves. The last is mentioned by Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* 3. 8. 6. Moses' narratives are not all full in their details. The account of these circumstances had probably been handed down by tradition; and, as Jude could judge with regard to the tradition of Enoch's prophecy, and Michael's contest for the body of Moses, the Apostle here was enabled to decide infallibly concerning the accuracy of these particulars. Moses' silence is no proof that these circumstances did not occur; the Apostle's assertion is authoritative that they did.

V. 20. *τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα, κ.τ.λ.* These words are evidently intended as a free quotation of Exod. 24: 8, to which they agree in all substantial respects.

V. 22. This verse is improperly placed in parenthesis by Vater. It is properly additional to the fore-

going; indeed, it is but a general summing up of preceding particulars, and a statement of the induction from them. In its connexion it is important, as showing the typical and spiritual import of the Levitical purifications and sacrifices. Because in the true, spiritual, and efficacious dispensation of the antitype, all depended on His death, so in the foreshadowing dispensation of types, almost every rite was attended with a sacrificial death or blood-shedding. And especially was this true of *all* those parts of the typical dispensation, where release from ceremonial guilt was bestowed. In every case such ceremonial atonement was only procured through blood-shedding; the Holy Ghost foreshadowing thereby this great truth, that there can be no pardon of sin in the perfect and absolute government of God, without an adequate atonement by the death of the sinner or his substitute. The 22d verse is therefore to be regarded as a part, yea, the main part, the sum, of the illation introduced by *ὅθεν* in v. 18. Thus, all the bloody sacrifices of the Levitical rites go to prove the necessity of an atoning or sacrificial death by Christ.

---

23 ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς  
οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρῖζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ  
24 ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. Οὐ  
γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστός,  
ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρα-  
νόν, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ

- 25 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· οὐδ', ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν,  
 ὡςπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια καὶ  
 26 ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, (ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν  
 πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου·) νῦν  
 δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέτησιν  
 ἁμαρτίας, διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται.  
 27 Καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ  
 28 ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις· οὕτω [καὶ] ὁ  
 Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθὲς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνε-  
 νεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρ-  
 τίας ὀφθῆσεται, τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς  
 σωτηρίαν.

V. 23. *ἀνάγκη οὖν*, κ.τ.λ. For the meaning and connexion of thought, see the Analysis. The logical inference of *οὖν* is from the relationship-just developed between the two dispensations. Because the first is typical of the second, and the second is one which necessarily implies the sacrificial death of its surety, they both *required their respective sacrifices*; the foreshadowing dispensation its typical sacrifices, and the true dispensation its better victim.

*ὑποδείγματα*, 'Patterns.' The same word is used for nearly the same idea in 8: 5 above, and needs no more illustration here. It embraces also the *τὰ σκεύη* of v. 21.

*καθαρίζεσθαι*. This verb belongs both to the types, *ὑποδείγματα*, and to the antitypes, *αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια*: but it must be understood suitably to their respective natures. The human priest, being sinful, needed to have his person and his official acts cleansed

from guilt by a ceremonial atonement. The very tabernacle in which, and utensils with which, he ministered, being the work of sinful, human hands, and their materials the gift of sinful men, needed, in a sense, a similar purification. And every worshipper who came into this tabernacle, through this priest, obtained remission, was cleansed from guilt, only through blood. So, in a manner not exactly similar, but analogous, Christ was cleansed, not from personal, but imputed guilt, by the sacrifice of his human part. He has now carried the virtues, so to speak, of this atoning sacrifice, into the heavenly sanctuary in our behalf, and has thus prepared the way for our peaceable approach to God. We have thus "a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh." Hebr. 10: 20.

V. 24. *γὰρ*. The connexion of thought here indicated by this conjunction, seems not to be a proof that the heavenly sanctuary needed better sacrifices, from the fact that Christ has entered it with his blood. It is rather a proof that, inasmuch as Christ ministers in the true sanctuary to make atonement for sins before God, therefore he must have a better sacrifice; since the case requires it. In other words, we must conceive the *γὰρ* as relating rather to *κρείττοσι* (*θυσίας*) than to *ἀνάγκη*. The *ἀνάγκη* is inferred by *οὖν* (v. 23) from the foregoing; in *κρείττοσι θυσίας* is an assertion of the superiority of the sacrifices for the heavenly sanctuary, implying the superiority of Christ's sacrifice who had entered into it. So that *γὰρ*

clears up the implication: 'Therefore Christ's sacrifice is better, for he did not enter into a sanctuary made with hands, the types of the true, but into heaven itself.' This best comports with the whole scope of the context.

*ἐμφανισθῆναι*. This is a forensic term, signifying 'to appear in court,' as a plaintiff or advocate. In the former of these senses, it is used for the appearance of the chief-priests, elders, and Tertullus against Paul, in Acts 24: 1 and 25: 2, 15. In the latter sense it is used here. Christ appears before the bar of God, *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, 'on our behalf.'

*τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*. So the Septuagint translate *פְּנֵי לְפָנָיו* in Ps. 42: 3, and *יְיָ* of Ps. 95: 2. The divine presence intended by the Psalmist in such expressions is that of Jehovah manifested in the temple or tabernacle. Christ has presented himself before God in that highest sense, of which this is but a shadow.

Vv. 25, 26. . οὐδ', *ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν . . . , ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν, κ.τ.λ.* The reasoning here is easy and obvious: it is less easy to account for the syntax of the sentence. The words *ἐπεὶ ἔδει, κ.τ.λ.* are evidently an appeal to fact in proof of the negative assertion, οὐδ', *ἵνα πολλάκις, κ.τ.λ.*: 'Had the sacrifice of Christ been such as required repetition, like the yearly offerings of the Jewish high-priest, then must Christ have suffered many times already since the origin of the human race. But we know that this has not been so; on the contrary (*γὺν*

δὲ ἀπαξ, κ.τ.λ.), the fact is, that Christ has been manifested recently, and that but once, to put away sin by offering himself.' It would seem that ἔδει expresses the latter clause or *apodosis* of a conditional sentence of which the *protasis* is left to be supplied, and in which the condition is implied to be already definitely decided. In such a construction, the past tenses of the indicative would be regularly used, but the conditional meaning would usually be marked by ἄν, which is not here present. If the ellipsis were supplied, the sentence would stand thus: ἐπεὶ, εἰ πολλάκις προσέφερεν ἑαυτὸν, ἔδει ἄν αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. But referring to Kühner, §260. 2. Rem. 3, p. 354, we learn that it is not unusual to find ἄν omitted, especially with a class of verbs of which ἔδει is one, in such elliptical, conditional expressions.

συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων. This phrase, with the difference that the genitive singular, αἰῶνος, is used, occurs in Matt. 13: 39, ὁ δὲ θειρισμὸς, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐστίν; 13: 40, 49, οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος; 24: 3, τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας, καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου; and 28: 20, καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Perhaps in all these cases the meaning is the end of the world, or of the present state of things. But the phrase is here plural; and as the Jews were accustomed to distinguish the old and new dispensations, the Mosaic and the Messianic, מִצְוָה וְעֵת and מִצְוָה וְעֵת, some understand by the expression here, *the juncture of the two dispensations*, equivalent to,

'*in media mundi ætate,*' '*in confinio veteris et novi Test.,*' '*in confinio sæculorum.*' Thus Küttneri Hypom. Others translate the phrase, 'in the last of the dispensations,' that is, in the last of the ages of the world. Compare Winer's Id. New Test. §52. c, p. 314: '*sub finem mundi.*' Others, among whom are Stuart and Bloomfield, render it, 'at the close of the Mosaic economy.' The expression may be illustrated by 1 Cor. 10: 11, ἡμῶν, εἰς οὗς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήγγησεν. The second is the more probable sense, both on account of the plural form of the phrase, and the consideration that the Jews regarded the messianic not only as the last dispensation, but as the completion of all the previous ones.

διὰ τῆς θυσίας. Some translate this preposition here, 'with;' giving it a sense similar to that which we attributed to it in vv. 12, 14, οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων . . . ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν, as signifying one's 'equipments, or the circumstances and relations under which he does something.' But it is far better to give it its customary force with the genitive, that of instrument or means, and refer it to αἰθέτησιν: 'He was manifested for (with a view to) the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of himself.'

V. 28. πολλῶν. The proper force of this adjective has been sufficiently explained in the remarks on 2: 10 above, to which the reader is referred.

ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας. This passage clearly proves the substitutionary character of Christ's death. εἰς τὸ ἀνενεγκεῖν is undoubtedly the infinitive of the object:

'Christ was once presented *in order to* bear away,'  
'*with a view to* bearing away the sins of many.' To  
bear the sins of any one is to sustain the guilt and the  
punishment of it. Let the reader compare the lan-  
guage of 1 Pet. 2 : 24, ὅς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς  
ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον· and of  
Isaiah 53 : 12, נָשָׂא עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ בְּחַבְלֵי מָוֶת, which the Septuagint  
render, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν. Stu-  
art's XIXth Excursus may be consulted.

*χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.* This is the antithesis of *προ-  
ενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας.* Some  
understand by it that Christ shall come the second  
time 'without sin-offering;' giving to it the sense of  
the Hebrew מִצַּדִּיק and מִצַּדִּיקָה. But the sense is better  
understood by comparing the phrase with 2 Cor. 5 : 21,  
Τὸν γὰρ μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν  
ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν  
αὐτῷ. The freedom from sin at his second coming is  
the contrast of his sin-bearing at his first. In both  
cases it is imputed sin which is intended. At his sec-  
ond coming he will bear no imputed guilt; for, agree-  
ably to the analogy of man's *one* death and judgment,  
He hath by one sacrifice cleansed all imputed guilt  
away.

*εἰς σωτηρίαν.* These words depend on *ὀφθῆσεται.*  
As v. 26 assumed that in past time Christ had not *often*  
suffered, so vv. 27, 28 seem designed to show that, ac-  
cording to the established constitution of things, He  
cannot die again in future. When He comes again it  
will be to the judgment, and to award salvation.



## CHAPTER X. 1—18.

### ANALYSIS.

THE author finishes the comparison of the sacrifices under the two dispensations, showing the insufficiency of the former, and the efficacy of the latter, and thus, the necessity or reason of the offering of Christ. More particularly :

As was prefigured by the types, Christ had made an offering of Himself more excellent than they (ch. 9), for (*γὰρ*) the offerings under the law, being but shadows of future good things, were wholly unavailing to perfect those who presented them. Otherwise, 1st, would they not have ceased to be offered, having accomplished the work of purifying the worshippers? vv. 1, 2; 2d, instead of this, however, there was a recognition of sins by them year after year, v. 3; for, 3d, it was not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins, v. 4. Hence, 4th, the Old Test. predicting the coming of Christ into the world, represents Him as declaring that these sacrifices could not satisfy God, and that He himself was come to render that satisfaction, vv. 5-7, thus abolishing them as ineffectual, and substituting Himself as all-sufficient; by which will of God setting them aside, and substituting Him, we have been redeemed by the once offering of Christ, vv. 8-10; 5th, moreover the Levitical priests all stood day after day offering their unavailing sacrifices; but

Christ having offered His sacrifice once, had forever set down on the right hand of God, awaiting the consummation in due time of the glorious results. For by one offering He has forever secured the perfection of all the redeemed, vv. 11-14; 6th, thus the Holy Spirit witnesseth in the Old Test. Scriptures; for, to the announcement of a new dispensation the Lord annexes a promise to rectify the hearts and forgive the sins of His people; thus plainly implying the perfection of the offering, vv. 15-18.

This closes the third and last great topic in the general argument: the rest of the Epistle is chiefly practical and hortatory.

## COMMENTARY.

- X. 1 Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηγεκέξ, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους  
 2 τελειῶσαι· ἐπεὶ [οὐκ] ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους;  
 3 Ἄλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν.  
 4 Ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα τρώων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας.

V. 1. Σκιὰν γάρ. To perceive the force of γάρ as a connective here, we must bear in mind the contrast between the old διαθήκη and the new, between the offerings of the old and those of the new, which runs throughout the latter part of the last chapter. See, for instance, 9: 15, 18, 23, 24, 26 (νῦν ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων), and 28. The idea of 'the two dispensations with their respective offerings' is still prominent in the writer's mind, as it continues to be to the end of the discussion. Thus, in 10: 1, we have ὁ νόμος, implying a contrast with the gospel; in v. 5 we find εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, where the newly incarnate Redeemer is tacitly contrasted with the ceremonial system which had been so long in possession of the Church. In v. 9 we have προσφοράν, κ.τ.λ. αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται, offset against the

offering of Christ which supersedes them. In v. 9 also, τὸ πρῶτον is explicitly set against τὸ δεύτερον. In v. 16 it is said with emphasis, αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ('this is the covenant'), as distinguished from the previous one. The conjunction γὰρ therefore introduces the assertion of the shadowy and ineffectual character of the Old Test. offerings, as the ground or reason for that inferiority to Christ's offering which was the general idea running through the previous passage. It is only in respect of these that the comparison is made: 'The old dispensation by its offerings, which were merely typical, accomplished nothing towards satisfying the claims (the θέλημα of vv. 7, 9, 10) of infinite justice and mercy; Christ, having come into the world, effects the perfect work by offering himself.' Such is the general statement introduced by γὰρ, as the ground of that assertion which constitutes the scope of the 9th chapter.

Σκιὰν . . . οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα. These words indicate a shadow or outline, an imperfect representation, and not 'the very image.' Wahl, in his definitions of εἰκών, says, it is *effigies expressa et solida*. In Col. 2: 17, σκιά is contrasted with σῶμα, shadow with substance; ἃ (viz. σαββάτων, νομηνίας, ἑορτῆς, κ.τ.λ.) ἐστὶν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This may assist us in understanding the meaning in the passage before us.

τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν. These words have already been seen, occurring in 9: 11 above; and were there interpreted as meaning the benefits of redemp-

tion, secured by Christ, and called 'future' (*μελλόντων*), because they were typified and not secured by the Levitical institutions. Thus, in Hebr. 11: 13, 39, 40, these good things, still future to the saints of the Mosaic dispensation, are called *ἐπαγγελίας*, which they saw afar off, embraced by faith, and hoped for. These blessings and benefits of the gospel dispensation include, of course, the means by which they were secured, the work of Christ.

*τελειῶσαι*. As was stated when this word first met us in 2: 10 above, and as has been indicated frequently since, the completing or perfecting has reference to the proposed condition to which the subject in hand is to be brought. Here it evidently describes the complete work of justification and sanctification, the *complete redemption*, which the *προσερχόμενοι* are presumed to seek through their offerings. As has been well said by another, it signifies "to supply them with all they need, and advance them to all of which they are capable." The meaning is the same in v. 14 below.

V. 2. *οὐκ*. In most of the ancient Mss. and many others; some Fathers, some Mss. of the Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and other translations, and almost all the early editions, this word is found. Those critics therefore who omit it do so against the current of authority. If it is omitted, the sentence must be read without an interrogation; and a sense is thus reached substantially the same.

*ἅπαξ κεκαθαρισμένους*. In this verse we see how

fundamental and complete the atonement of Christ was, as securing the sanctification of all who should be justified; putting away sins not only from the sight of God, but from the heart. The worshippers are represented as so cleansed, when once the effectual offering is made, that they have no more conscience of sins. There could not be a good conscience (*μηδεμίαν συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν*), so long as the heart remained corrupt. A corrupt nature was an essential part of the original curse for sin. This whole curse is removed by the atonement of Christ; the guilt by the merit of his blood, and the corruption by that spiritual influence which He purchases for us. It is instructive to notice how directly this double purgation is traced up to the blood of Christ as its means, in many places of this Epistle. In 3: 1 we read of Christ's purgation of sins (*καθαρισμόν ἁμαρτιῶν*), as made by himself (*δι' ἑαυτοῦ*). In 9: 14 it is said, "The blood of Christ shall purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God;" where the result of the purgation, our serving the living God, plainly shows that it is sanctifying as well as justifying. In 10: 1, 2 this purgation is the gospel *τελείωσις*, a work which, we have abundantly proved, is a complete redemption: and in 10: 14 we read that "by one offering He hath perfected forever those that are redeemed" (*τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους*). All of redemption, therefore, justification, sanctification, is secured in the offering of Christ; for this offering meets and remedies the whole of the curse of the fall.

V. 3. *Ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις, κ.τ.λ.* These words present an idea opposed to *οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμενα*. As in 9 : 8 above, the author teaches that while the Levitical sacrifices typified that of Christ, in due time to be offered, they showed, by their continued repetition, their own inadequacy to make the requisite atonement. For typical purposes, they were allowed to remove certain temporal penalties; but they could not satisfy eternal justice. This is explicitly declared in the following verse.

V. 4. *ἀδύνατον γάρ.* Let the reader compare 7 : 18 above, where it is declared that there was "a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." The Apostle seems now, in v. 4, to make a simple appeal to the natural judgment of his readers, and the principles of religion, to settle this point. It is not possible that the blood of irrational animals can truly atone for the sins of rational souls. This truth is obvious in its own light. There is, in the nature of things, no relevancy or adaptation of the means to the end. But the Apostle proceeds to show that this assertion is agreeable to the tenour of the Old Test. Scriptures.

---

5 *Διὸ ἐξερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, λέγει· "Θυσίαν*  
*καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω*  
 6 *μοι, ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδό-*  
 7 *κησας· τότε εἶπον· ἰδοὺ ἤκω, (ἐν χειρὶ βιβλίου*  
*γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ,) τοῦ ποιήσαι, ὁ θεός, τὸ θέ-*

8 λημά σου.” Ἀνώτερον λέγων · “ὅτι θυσίαν καὶ  
 προσφορὰν καὶ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας  
 οὐκ ἠθέλησας, οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας” (αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν  
 9 νόμον προσφέρονται,) τότε εἶρηκεν · “ἰδὸν ἤκω  
 τοῦ ποιῆσαι [ὁ θεὸς] τὸ θέλημα σου”· ἀναιρεῖ  
 10 τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ· ἐν ᾧ θελήματι  
 ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος  
 [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ.

V. 5. *Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος, κ.τ.λ.* Διὸ may be re-  
 garded as referring to v. 4, “The blood of bulls and  
 of goats cannot take away sin: wherefore Christ, com-  
 ing into the world, saith,” &c. Or we may, with per-  
 haps greater propriety, refer it to the whole scope of  
 vv. 1-4, which is, that the ceremonial law, being  
 shadowy and prefigurative, not substantially effica-  
 cious, could not by its offerings perfect the worship-  
 pers. For this reason, Christ comes and substitutes a  
 more efficacious offering, His ‘obedience unto death.’

The reference of vv. 5-7 is to Psalm 40: 6-8.  
 This passage presents one of the most vexed questions  
 among interpreters, both as to the propriety of the  
 Apostle’s reference of this Psalm to the Messiah, and  
 as to his adoption of the obviously erroneous translation  
 of the Septuagint, *σῶμα κατηγτίσω μοι*, for *לִי קָרְיִתָּא זָנְזָה*  
 (mine ears hast thou opened [or bored]) in v. 7 of the  
 Psalm. It may be remarked, in advance, that the  
 author strictly follows the Septuagint in his whole  
 quotation, except in the substitution of *εὐδόκησας* for  
*ἤτησας* at the end of v. 6, and in connecting *τοῦ ποιῆ-*  
*σαι* with *ἤκω*, in v. 7. A fuller discussion of the



proper messianic character of this Psalm than would be appropriate here, may be seen in Hengstenberg's *Christol.* Vol. I. and in Stuart's *Excursus XX.* To the reverent believer in inspiration (and we would repeat, that it is only in this character we are willing to approach the exposition of Scripture at all), the sufficient proof is that an inspired author has here ascribed the words of the Psalm to Christ. All that the *onus probandi* demands of us, therefore, is to show that such an application of the Psalm to the Messiah is possible, yea probable, by removing the objections which skeptical interpreters have urged to this interpretation, from the contents of the Psalm itself. It has been objected that this application is a mere blunder of the Apostle, arising out of his following the mistranslation of the Septuagint above mentioned. But the words so mistranslated are not the ones essential to the messianic application, nor does the Apostle lay the stress upon them, as will be shown; and while the exact meaning is not preserved by the Septuagint, the scope of the sense is retained with sufficient accuracy. It is objected, again, that there is no station in the Messiah's life where all the language of the Psalm can be made appropriate to him; for if we suppose it uttered at his incarnation (*εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον*), it is inconsistent in speaking of deliverances and triumphs as past, Ps. 40: 2-5, which were not yet experienced; and if after his resurrection, it is equally inconsistent in referring, in vv. 11, 13, to troubles still to come. The answer is twofold. The objection overlooks the

well-known dramatic structure of messianic prophecies (so obvious, for instance, in Ps. 2 and Is. 53), by which the speakers or their stations are changed during the progress of the discourse. And it is an unwarrantable restriction to confine the era indicated by the words *εἰσερχόμενος, κ.τ.λ.* to the point of Christ's incarnation. It may as well mean His introduction to his public ministry, and it may indicate any part of that ministry; some point in it, for instance, when many snares and sufferings had already been surmounted, and yet the final struggles remained to be endured. Again, it is urged, a sinless being could not use the words of Ps. 40: 12, "Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me." But it is well known that *עֲוֹנוֹתַי* may mean 'the punishments of iniquities,' 'calamities,' 'sufferings;' scilicet, in this case, the vicarious sufferings of Christ for the sins of others. Let the reader see, for instance, 2 Sam. 16: 12. And last, it is objected that the imprecations of vv. 14, 15 of the Psalm are inconsistent with the spirit of forgiveness shown by the Saviour on the cross. But why, we ask, are they more incompatible with the Saviour's forgiveness, than the woes denounced in Luke 11 against the Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers, or the doom, "depart accursed," which Christ the Judge will pronounce on all his enemies, or the "wrath of the Lamb" from which the unbelievers will seek to hide themselves under falling rocks and mountains? The holy denunciations of Scripture are not vindictive; and there is no inconsistency between them, as uttered against incorrigible offenders, and the

tender mercy of Christ towards sinners who are invited to repent.

ὁἰμα δὲ καταγρίσω μοι. These words, though not a literal translation of the Hebrew, are sufficiently accurate as a translation *ad sensum*, and do no violence to the scope or sense of the passage: on the contrary, the meaning they give harmonizes well with it. The exact sense of the Hebrew is, "Mine ears hast thou dug out," i. e. "opened;" which can only mean, 'Thou hast made me obedient.' Let the reader compare the similar expressions in Isaiah 50: 5, פָּתַח לִי אָזְנוֹ (the Lord God) "hath opened mine ear," which is parallel to the succeeding words, וְאָזְכִּיר לֹא מְרִירָהּ, "and I was not rebellious;" and Job 36: 10, וַיִּגְלֵל אָזְנוֹם לְמוֹסֵר, "He openeth also their ear to discipline." When these words are understood of the Messiah, the incarnation is even implied; and we might elicit the meaning, 'Thou hast given me the form and the spirit of a servant.' The Septuagint translation admits of the same sense. It is plain, however, from vv. 8, 9, that the Apostle lays no stress upon this clause; for when he proceeds there to apply the evidence which he purposes to derive from his quotation, he expressly omits these words, and reasons from the general scope of the passage. His argument would be valid though this clause were altogether omitted. He does not attempt to prove his point (which is, that the Aaronic offerings were inefficient, and Christ's, a truly efficient one, is substituted for them), by citing the prediction of His incarnation. But he proves it by citing the prophetic

language where the Messiah announces his *coming and obedience*, in accordance with the Scriptures, as a more acceptable thing to God than offerings, whole burnt-offerings, and sin-offerings. Nor may it be inferred that the Apostle here intended to make the idea of the incarnation the prominent and essential one in his argument, from the fact that *σώματος* occurs in his summing up in v. 10. This may have originated *in the fact* of Christ's having suffered in the body, and would naturally have occurred in this place, though the author had used a literal translation of the clause in question. Christ's offering was made in a body; and hence it is very natural, that wherever it is alluded to, this feature of it should be alluded to, though not necessary to the point in hand. As instances of this, see Rom. 7 : 4 and 1 Pet. 2 : 24, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law *through the body of Christ*." "Who his own self bare our sins *in his own body* on the tree." And yet, we may admit that the introduction of *σώματος*, in v. 10, originated in the author's having just before employed the peculiar rendering of the Septuagint, without in the least affecting the validity of the argument from the passage. It would not be necessary to alter a single word in the argument, though the disputed clause had been wholly omitted. And now, inasmuch as the Apostle quotes from that common version of the Old Test. which was currently used by his readers, and from which he and all the other New Test. writers commonly quoted, as well known and sufficiently accu-

rate, and inasmuch as he does not particularly endorse this inaccurate translation by arguing specially from its words, or attaching any importance to them in his argument, it was not to be expected that he should turn aside to correct the translation. His readers knew perfectly well whence the translation came, and how much authority the Apostle regarded it as having; and he was justified in using it for what it was worth, inasmuch as it was correct enough for his purpose in its general scope. He does not, on the one hand, pause to make an unnecessary and irrelevant correction in it, nor on the other does he endorse any minor inaccuracy in the version quoted.

V. 6. καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. This is the Septuagint rendering for  $\text{וְעַל\ הַחַטָּאִים}$ . The expression is of course elliptical, implying some such word as *προσφόροι*, *θυσία*, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*.

V. 7. τότε, Heb.  $\text{וְעַתָּה}$ . This is properly a particle of time. But as introductory to something accompanying, and consequent upon something else, it may be translated 'thereupon.'

*γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ*. The Hebrew here is  $\text{כָּתוּב\ עָלַי}$ , which is capable either of the rendering *prescriptum est mihi*, or of that given to it by the Septuagint and our author. A clear instance of the former meaning may be seen in 2 Kings 22:13. Either rendering, however, might be made to suit the Apostle's argument. The one adopted by him is most agreeable to the analogy of other New Testament passages, as John 5:39, 46, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye

think ye have eternal life; *and they are they which testify of me.*" "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, *for he wrote of me.*"

In joining *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* with *ἦκω*, the author follows neither the Septuagint nor the original; but the scope of the passage remains substantially the same. As it is fully expressed, it is, "I come; (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will I delight, oh my God." Arrest the quotation where the Apostle does, and 'I come . . . to do thy will' expresses likewise a hearty acquiescence in that will.

*τὸ θέλημα σου.* The special will of God here, is that by which He desires the salvation of His people through an adequate satisfaction to the divine law. Upon this condition alone can He will their salvation. Hence He rejects the offerings of bulls and goats, and demands that of Christ, as alone sufficient to the exigencies of the case. Hence, in v. 10, God's will is said to secure the redemption of His people by the offering of the body of Christ.

V. 9. *τὸ πρῶτον . . . τὸ δεύτερον.* The context evidently compels us to refer these two adjectives immediately to the sacrifices of the two dispensations, the old and the new. But by implication these dispensations may be meant, as embracing their respective offerings. The dispensation is *for the offering*. The offering is the *git*, or essence of it, for the presenting of which the dispensation is maintained. And therefore, as was indicated under v. 1, we would not here exclude the idea of the contrast of the two dispensa-

tions, which runs through the whole passage. The employment of the neuter gender here, when neither *διαθήκη* nor *προσφορά* is neuter, is to be explained in the same manner as its occurrence in 7:7 and 8:13 above. In the former of these passages, the writer, speaking of Abraham and Melchisedek, says, *τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται*. In the latter, speaking of the two *διαθήκαι*, he says: *τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ*. The neuter is employed because the general and abstract is asserted.

V. 10. *ἐν ᾧ θελήματι*. What this will is has been already stated, under v. 7. The present verse explicitly confirms the correctness of the explanation there given; for it directly asserts that it is that will by which we have been redeemed by the once offering of the body of Christ.

*ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν*. This verb we have rendered 'redeemed.' The reasons for doing so were stated in our remarks on 2:11 above, and need not be now repeated. In 13:12 below, an exactly similar use of the verb occurs: *διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγίασῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, κ.τ.λ.* Here, as in the passage last cited, the adjuncts determine the sense, and show the justice of the remarks which were made on *ἅπαξ κεκαθαμένους* in v. 2. The work described by *ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν*, is that work which is wrought 'by the offering of the body of Christ.' It includes, then, the result of the atonement, that is, deliverance from guilt and condemnation. But at the same time, the

very employment of a verb which so necessarily carries the sense of sanctification, shows that it includes also deliverance from the power of sin. The use which the popular expositor should make of this phrase, wherever it occurs in our Epistle, is to show his charge how intimately, yea inseparably, justification and sanctification go together; and thus how far the grace of God is from encouraging licentiousness.

- 
- 11 Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἔσθηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας·
- 12 αὐτὸς δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν
- 13 εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος, ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ
- 14 ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Μιᾶ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους.
- 15 Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· μετὰ
- 16 γὰρ τὸ [προ]ειρηκέναι “αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας” λέγει κύριος· “διδούς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω
- 17 αὐτούς, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι.” Ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκέτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

V. 11. Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἔσθηκε, κ.τ.λ. Here a new argument is introduced, showing the ‘weakness and unprofitableness’ of the old offerings, and the effi-



ciency of the new. The former are *never* able to take away sins (*οὐδέποτε δύνανται*), however often repeated, or however multiplied. One presentation of Christ's offering was all sufficient; as is shown by the fact that after it was once made, He sat down forever at the right hand of God, having no more sufferings to bear, or sacrificial work to perform, but awaiting, in a glorified state, the completion of the triumphs which were to reward his priestly functions. The contrast, showing the weakness of the Jewish and the efficiency of the Christian sacrifice, seems to lie mainly in the fact, that the priests in the former case stood ministering *every day*, by the perpetual repetition of their offices confessing that they had not accomplished the atoning result; but Christ, having made his one offering, was done; thus showing the perfection of its result. The Apostle's argument here is thus from the results, and is not a repetition of his reasoning in 9: 25, 26. Yet the proof here is but an amplification and completion of that which is suggested there. The reasoning is then confirmed in the following verses.

V. 14. *τετελείωκεν*. The force of this verb has been so fully illustrated under 2: 10 and 10: 1, that no further remark is needed. This verse, and its logical connexion (by *γάρ*), fully substantiate the view which we have just given of the Apostle's argument, as one from *the results* of the two offerings. The conjunction may be regarded as referring specially to *εκάθισεν* above; and as introducing the reason why, after the

one offering, Christ passed at once into a state of glorified rest. But it refers also generally to the main scope of the passage, which is to assert the superior efficiency of Christ's sacrifice in its result. We of course give to *ἀγιαζομένων* the same meaning, 'the redeemed,' which we have so often asserted for it. This verse contains the materials of an entire refutation of all those doctrines of purgatory, justification by works, and sacramental merit and grace, with which papists and prelatists have disgraced Christ's plan of redemption. Their application is too obvious to need further illustration for the learned reader.

V. 15. *Μαρτυρεῖ . . . τὸ πνεῦμα*. This quotation (from Jer. 31:33) has already been seen in 8:8 above. There it was used to prove the superiority of the new dispensation; but here, from the same effects, to show the superiority of Christ's sacrifice. And thus it appears that all the excellency of the new dispensation depends upon the offering of Christ. It is to be noted that these words are said to be the witnessing of the Holy Spirit; but immediately after, in v. 16, it is 'the Lord,' *κύριος* (in Jer. 31:33, יהוה) who utters them. The Holy Spirit is therefore Lord and Jehovah.

V. 18. *οὐκέτι προσφορά*, 'There is no more an offering to be made for sin, this offering of Christ having accomplished the needed work.' What is that work? The quotation from Jeremiah tells us that it is the writing of God's law upon the heart, and the remission of the sins of His people. And thus we see

again the fundamental relationship of the death of Christ to the dispensation which secures these blessings. Thus also we are justified in having said that these two results compose the *καθαρισμός*, the *ἁγιοσύνη*, which are so often stated in this Epistle as the consequence of Christ's offering.

## CHAPTER X. 19—39.

### ANALYSIS.

HAVING finished the argument, the author proceeds to exhortation; the scope and aim of which is a faithful, persevering, and patient adherence to the profession and practice of the gospel: to enforce which he suggests a variety of considerations. These are, 1st, the nature and excellency of the offering and the priest, securing freedom of access to God, vv. 19–22; 2d, the faithfulness of Him that hath promised the gospel blessings, v. 23; 3d, the near approach of the day of trial, vv. 24, 25; 4th, the awful condition and prospects of those who reject Christ, vv. 26, 27; 5th, the divine vengeance on those who contemn Him and His blood, and insult the Spirit of Grace, vv. 28–31; 6th, their former patience under afflictions and trials for the sake of the gospel, vv. 32–34; 7th, the great reward of persevering to the end, vv. 35, 36; which reward, finally, Christ would speedily come to adjudge to the faithful, while he visited his displeasure on apostates, vv. 37, 38. And in this connexion, and for the same end, the Apostle expresses again his goodly persuasion concerning them, v. 39.

## COMMENTARY.

19 Ἐχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον  
 20 τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν  
 ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ κατα-  
 21 πετάσματος, (τοῦτ' ἔστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,) καὶ  
 22 ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ· προσερχώ-  
 μεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ  
 πίστεως, ἐρῶντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδή-  
 23 σεως πονηρᾶς, καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι  
 καθαρῷ, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος  
 ἀκλινῆ· (πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγελιάμενος·)

V. 19. *παρρησίαν*. This word has been already remarked as it occurs in 3: 6 and 4: 16 above: it will also be met again in v. 35 below. As was remarked, its literal meaning (from *παρ*, *ρησις*) would be, 'entire freedom of utterance.' Hence the meaning of 'boldness,' 'confidence,' which it has in all the four places cited. It is a confidence founded on the complete efficacy of the offering made for us by our mediator, who hath entered in 'for us,' coupled of course with the free and faithful gospel offer of the benefits of that sacrifice to all believers. The conjunction *οὖν* introduces the statement that we have a right to such confidence, and may come with a true heart in the full assurance of faith, as an inference from what precedes. The illation may be conceived as drawn from v. 18, or from the whole scope of the previous passage as it is

summed up in v. 14, "By one offering He hath perfected forever the redeemed."

*τῶν ἁγίων.* The commentators usually interpret these words as meaning *the heavenly sanctuary*, in accordance with their meaning in 9: 12, 24. But when do believers enter into that sanctuary? After death only. Yet we can scarcely believe that the Apostle in this place only intends to exhort us to exercise this believing confidence in view of the one occasion of our passage into the spiritual world after death. He doubtless has in view our daily approaches to the throne of grace, as is evident from the exhortation *προσερχάμεθα, κ.τ.λ.* in v. 22. We must then understand this *εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων*, as a figurative approach, made by faith only, to the presence of God in heaven. Or, more probably, as the universe is God's temple, and He is every where present, we may understand simply our daily approach into His presence in the acts of worship.

V. 20. *ἦν.* This pronoun very clearly refers to *εἴσοδον*, and is in apposition with *ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν*: 'This access or entrance Christ hath ratified for us, viz. a new and living way.'

*ἐνεκαίνισεν.* This verb has been already explained, under 9: 18 above, as receiving from the Septuagint usage the sense of 'consecrate,' 'ratify,' or 'sanction.' Either of these is appropriate here. Chrysostom has well given the sense by the words, *ἦν κατεσκεύασε καὶ ἤσ ἤρξατο.*

*πρόσφατον.* This word (from *προ-* *σφαω*, *σφαζω*)

would mean 'recently killed.' There is therefore a transference of idea from the sacrifice newly slain, to the way of access opened up by that sacrifice. Thus we derive the meaning 'newly opened,' 'fresh,' 'new.'

ζῶσαν. The use of this participle here may be compared with that in 4: 12, ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος. Some render it here, 'a life-giving way;' others, an 'enduring, or perpetual way.' We prefer to explain it as meaning 'a way that leads to life.' Spiritual life is of course intended. While, in other Scriptures, Christ is said to be himself *the way*, such is not the exact figure here; for *He* is said to ratify or consecrate the way. And in this aspect, we cannot say that the way which He thus opens up is life-giving, for it is He himself who is life-giving. This way *leads us to the life* which He gives us through it; and in this sense it is 'a living way,' 'the way of life.'

καταπετάσματος, . . . τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. The author here compares Christ slain upon the cross to the veil in the temple. The veil was the door of entrance into the earthly holy of holies; Christ's body crucified for sin, is the door into the heavenly. Thus in John 10: 7, 9, He says, 'Εγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα. In 14: 6, 'Εγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδός. The author is only carrying out the figure with which he had set out, and the commentators make needless difficulty concerning the seeming irregularity and anomaly of the view. In prosecuting the figure which he had adopted, the author is led to assign to Christ's flesh or body a position or point of view varying from that assigned to it elsewhere, or even in other

parts of the same passage. In this there is nothing which need be represented as unintelligible, or as contrary to usage.

V. 21. *ἱερέα μέγαν*. By these words, most interpreters, among whom are the authors of our English version, seem to understand simply "chief-priest," that is, 'high-priest,' *ἀρχιερέα*. It is indisputable that the Septuagint use *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας* for the Hebrew *קֹהֵן גָּדוֹל*. But *ἱερεύς*, like *קֹהֵן*, is generic, and is used in the Septuagint and elsewhere, without any attributive, for the high-priest. In Acts 5:24 we find it even used in contradistinction to *ἀρχιερεῖς*, so that the simple *ἱερεὺς* signifies the high-priest, and *ἀρχιερεῖς* only the chief-priests or heads of courses. In this Epistle *ἱερεὺς* is frequently used without attributive for Christ and Melchisedek, and Jewish high-priests. Let the reader refer especially to 5:6 above, as compared with 5:1, 5, where, in the words of Ps. 110:4, it is said of Christ, previously called *ἀρχιερεύς*, *σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, κ.τ.λ.*; 7:3, where Melchisedek is called simply *ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διήνεκες*; and 8:4, where Christ is denominated by the same word: while in 6:20, and 8:1, 3, the same persons are called *ἀρχιερεῖς*. In 4:14 we find the phrase *ἀρχιερέα μέγαν* applied to Christ. It seems therefore much more reasonable to understand the adjective *μέγαν* here, as not merely an epithet to distinguish Him as High-Priest, but as more emphatic: He is 'a great High-Priest,' as in 4:14, great in comparison of human high-priests.

V. 22. *ἐθρόαντισμένοι . . . λελουμένοι*. These are



two figurative expressions borrowed from the Levitical dispensation, to represent spiritual truths under the new. The first represents mainly atonement by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. As the sacrificial blood, signifying remission of guilt, was sprinkled on the person of the offerer, so here, the symbol represents the application of the true atonement, relieving the believer's heart of the consciousness of guilt. The second expression, borrowed from the purifications of the priests at the lavers of the temple-court, represents sanctification by the Holy Spirit. Nothing is taught here, as to the mode of Christian baptism, which is remotely, if at all, alluded to.

V. 23. *ὁμολογίαν*. This word has been already sufficiently explained under 3:1, 4:14 above, as meaning 'confession,' 'profession.'

*πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος*. Here we have a reason for our perseverance in a sincere and steady profession of Christianity: 'He who hath made the promises on which we hope, is faithful.' The obvious scope of the context shows that *πιστὸς* here signifies God's fidelity to his engagements. In 1 Thess. 5:24 we read, *Πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει*. In those words the meaning of *πιστὸς* is defined by what follows. It signifies that God is one who *will do* what he engages.

---

24 καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης  
 25 καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες· καὶ τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ βλέπετε

26 ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν. Ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία· φοβερὰ δὲ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.

V. 25. τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν. This word occurs in the New Test. only here, and in 2 Thess. 2 : 1, where it signifies our gathering together unto Christ at his coming. In the apocryphal books of the Old Test. it is employed of the assemblies or congregations of the Israelites. In this place it must be understood not of the 'Christian body,' or Church, as though the Apostle here exhorted his readers not to apostatize from the Church; but of *the act of assembling together*, namely, for social worship. To this sense agree the expressions, which immediately follow, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, and παρακαλοῦντες. For this apostacy from the Church is an act which could not be habitual, as the neglect of meeting the brethren in worship might be. And the exhortation here enjoined obviously implies such meetings.

βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν. This day is, most probably, primarily that of Christ's coming for the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, which, He had himself foretold, should take place in that generation. This is distinctly stated in Matt. 24 : 34 and Luke 21 : 32. All who were overtaken by this destruction would thereby be hurried to the judgment; and this seems to be referred to in the following verses. The apostles knew not when the day of *final* judgment

would come. In Matt. 24 : 36 and Mark 13 : 32, they were told by our Saviour, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." But they nowhere teach that this day of final accounts was just at hand: the apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. 2 : 2 and seqq. expressly repels this assertion, warning his readers not to be "shaken in mind, or troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter as from him, as that the day of Christ was at hand," and assuring them, "that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." The apostles do, however, not unfrequently refer to the coming of our Saviour for the destruction of Jerusalem, or to take us hence to our account by death. And this coming, it should be noted, would in effect be the same, to all concerned, as the hurrying forward of the day of final judgment. Thus we find our Saviour, in Matt. 24 : 36-51 and Mark 13 : 32-37, when foretelling the great catastrophe in language which included both the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, representing them as events in the uncertainty of which his hearers had a personal concern: "Watch, therefore," He says, "for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." "Therefore *be ye also ready*; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." "Take *ye* heed; watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is." None of those hearers were destined to see the end of the world: few of them the overthrow of Jewry which was then nearly forty years

distant. There must have been therefore a "coming of the Son of Man," an end, personal to each of them; and this was their death. In v. 37 below it is said, "For yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." In 1 Thess. 5:2-4 we read that warning, which was so misinterpreted by the Thessalonians into a prediction of the approaching end of the world, as to demand the Apostle's correction in his second Epistle: "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. . . . But ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief." That 'day of the Lord' was therefore, to the Thessalonian Christians, the day of their death. Many other similar passages might be cited, as 1 Pet. 4:7, 2 Pet. 3:10. It has been a favourite assertion with the enemies of inspiration, that the apostles were labouring under a mistake in this thing, and have in these places declared their expectation of an immediate end of the world, which has now been contradicted by nearly eighteen centuries. The comparison of passages which we have made shows that they made no such predictions; but that, while they spoke of the world as having now passed into its last dispensation, and, in that sense, as approaching its end, they profess an entire ignorance of the date of that end, but urge upon every man the nearness and uncertainty of that other event, his own death, which would carry, to his soul, all the results of the final consummation.

V. 26. *Ἐξουσίῳς γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων*, 'If we de-

liberately *err*, or *sin*, in departing from the truth as it pertains to Christ and His sacrifice.' We have presented two senses of *ἁμαρτάνω*, either of which amounts to nearly the same: the last is the stronger and more common. An instance occurs in Josephus, where the verb means to err in word: *οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτοῖμι εἶπων*. Many interpreters understand it as signifying an error in faith, in the following places, 1 Cor. 15:34, and Titus 3:11, *Ἐκνήψατε δικαίως, καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε· ἀγνωσίαν γὰρ θεοῦ τινὲς ἔχουσιν. Ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος (Αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος) καὶ ἁμαρτάνει*. But most commonly in the New Test. it signifies to err in deed, 'to sin,' which is its predominant sense. The context clearly shows that the sin here indicated is that of apostacy from Christianity. It is a sin against that *ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας* which the apostate has received in his understanding and professed to embrace with his heart.

*οὐκέτι . . . θυσία*. The types having been done away, and the true and only availing sacrifice, that of Christ, rejected, there is none left to help the apostate sinner. The warning of 6:4-6 may be compared with this. There, such a deserter of Christianity is said to crucify to himself the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.

V. 27. *πυρὸς ζήλος*. The nominative here depends on *ἀπολείπεται*, which is to be supplied from v. 26. The phrase means literally, "an indignation of fire," i. e. 'a fiery indignation.' The genitive here is qualificative, like an adjective.

28 Ἀθετήσας τὶς νόμον Μωϋσέως, χωρὶς οἰκτιρισμῶν  
 29 ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· πόσῳ,  
 δοκεῖτε, χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν  
 τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης  
 κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθή, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα  
 30 τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας! Οὐδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόν-  
 τα· “Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω [λέλει  
 κύριος]”· καὶ πάλιν· “Κύριος κρινεὶ τὸν λαὸν  
 31 αὐτοῦ.” Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ  
 ζῶντος!

V. 28. Ἀθετήσας. This participle means primarily ‘to put away,’ ‘cast off,’ as in 1 Tim. 5: 12, τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν. Hence the meaning ‘to make void,’ ‘annul,’ which we find in Mark 7: 9, Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. In Luke 10: 16, and John 12: 48, we find a third meaning, to ‘reject,’ or ‘despise,’ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ. Ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ . . . ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν. The second sense is evidently the one to be adopted here: ‘He that made void Moses’ law’ (by neglecting obedience to it).

νόμον Μωϋσέως. Bloomfield understands by this ‘the ceremonial law.’ It seems to us preferable to regard it either as referring to the whole law of Moses, requiring in general the service and fear of the true God as opposed to all false religion and wickedness, the penalty of the contumacious and treasonable violation of which was death. (Thus, in Deut. 13: 6–10, we read that the punishment of apostacy from the Mosaic institutions into idolatry was death; and in Deut. 17: 12, that the presumptuous disobedience of

the priest and judge was punished with the same penalty.) Or else we might, with equal propriety, regard the law of Moses here, as meaning any specific statute whose penalty was death; as that against murder, adultery, or manstealing. He that made void one of these laws *dies* (*ἀποθνήσκει*) by the testimony of two or three witnesses. The author uses the present tense, because his readers were familiar with Mosaic institutions as still existing.

V. 29. *κοινόν*. The *Jewish* understanding of this word will be familiar to every intelligent reader of the Scriptures. We would render it here, 'common,' i. e. as having no efficacy or consecration to the work of atonement more than common blood, or more than the blood of any dying human being; the touch of which by the Levitical law rather suggested guilt and moral contamination, than atonement and sanctification, by rendering him who touched it ceremonially unclean. There is here an implied reference to the views of the apostate returning to Judaism; for he professes himself to prefer the blood of beasts as prescribed by the law, and therefore clean, while he rejects that of Christ as the defiling blood of a dying sinner, unclean and abominable. The phrase *τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης* in this connexion bears an obvious meaning. It is the blood of Christ, sealing the new covenant. The apostate is also represented, figuratively, as trampling on the Son of God (*καταπατήσας*), by which the dishonour, rejection, and contumely, with which the Jewish rulers treated him at his death, are aptly signified. He who

deliberately (*ἐκουσίως*) rejects Christ and Christianity, concurs in that contumelious rejection and condemnation, endorses its justice, and becomes partaker in it; for he thereby professes that Christ was an impostor. The explicitness of His claims to messiahship leaves no middle ground.

*ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθή.* Three explanations of these words have been offered by different interpreters. Some refer the subject of *ἡγιασθή* to *υἶόν τοῦ θεοῦ*, and understand the expression of Him; supposing in it an allusion to the consecration of the Levitical priests by the blood of victims. The words would then imply that the atoning blood which the sinner rejects in his unbelief was also applied to Christ, to consecrate or set Him apart to His priestly office. This is not natural; for not only is there an entire absence of analogous language concerning Christ in the Scriptures, but there is language which bears against it. Of merely human priests, Hebr. 5:2, 3 says that they themselves also “are compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof, they ought, as for the people, so also for themselves, to offer for sins.” But (Hebr. 7:26–28) our High-Priest is “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; *who needeth not daily*, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people’s; for this” (obviously ‘this latter’) “He did once when He offered up himself. For the law maketh men high-priests *which have infirmity*; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh *the Son, who is*



*consecrated forever more.*" To say that Christ, the sinless, perfect, and holy from eternity, was consecrated to the priestly office by sacrificial blood, and that His own, at the same offering when He shed it for the sins of others, is certainly anomalous, if not positively erroneous, according to all the analogy of Scripture truth.

Others refer the subject of the verb to the apostate, the subject of the sentence; and render *ἡγιασθη*, 'was consecrated' or 'set apart to God' by public profession. They thus understand the language as a figurative allusion to the sprinkling of the people referred to in 9:19 above, at the setting up of the first dispensation. That sprinkling is recorded in Exodus 24:8; and the interpretation just given receives some plausibility from the words which Moses there uses, "Behold the blood of the covenant," &c. It may be supposed that the words *τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*, in v. 29, contain an allusion to this. But here again the objection arises, that the Scriptures nowhere represent men as being brought into visible church membership by the sprinkling of Christ's blood in any sense. Baptism is the rite by which, under the new testament, men are brought into this relationship.

The third interpretation, which seems to us clearly the most natural, refers the nominative to the supposed apostate person, and gives to *ἡγιασθη* its regular meaning, 'wherewith he' (the rejecter in question) 'was redeemed.' Such is plainly the signification of the verb in 10:10 and 13:12; and it is always a strong reason for a given rendering, that the word bears that

sense in the same book and in similar contexts. The obvious objection which will present itself to this view is, that it implies that Christ died for, and that his blood was actually applied in its redeeming virtue to, some, who still were finally lost. But popularly understood, this language means no more than 'to despise the blood shed for our redemption,' and by no means teaches that the sins of the person in question were ever actually forgiven in view of the atonement. So, Christ is said to *die for* all; and the most rigid Calvinists continually use parallel language in their writings and speaking. If we adopt the sense we have here recommended, the words under discussion will present no more difficulty than those of Rom. 14: 15, "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." The true key to all the supposed Arminian difficulties of this class of passages is that which has been already given in this Commentary (pp. 215, 216), in the remarks on 6: 4-6.

Among those truths and motives which, applied by the Holy Spirit, are the efficient means of retaining the believer securely in his gracious state, are the dangers and evils of apostacy. And therefore it is consistent that God should address to believers these warnings of the danger and misery of falling away; and in so warning them, He does not imply that He intends to permit them to realize those dangers, and experience that ruin. The warning, the prospect and fear of the danger, are the means He will use to ensure that they shall not fall. It must be borne in mind

that the apostacy of one already justified and sanctified, is not impossible or improbable in the nature of things, so far as the believer's own free-agency is concerned. Adam, when more perfect than any of us, found it not unnatural to fall. The certainty that none of the redeemed will truly and finally perish is in the purpose of God's grace towards them, and the communications of strength certainly resulting from that purpose. Hence, as it was not inconsistent for Paul to warn the Romans against acts which might seduce their weak brethren into destructive sin, as though a true, though weak believer could be destroyed; it is not inconsistent for the author here, speaking generally and popularly, to describe to a believer, what would be the peculiar malignity of the sin of apostatizing from the Saviour who had redeemed him with His blood, as though such a believer could so apostatize.

*ἐνυβρίσας.* This word occurs here only in the New Test.; but there is no uncertainty in assigning it the meaning of 'insult.' There is no good reason for understanding *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος*, with some commentators, as simply *grace*, or *gospel blessings*. This is certainly an unnatural and unwarrantable interpretation. It means 'the Spirit of grace,' or the Holy Spirit who is gracious. He is so called as being, like the Father and the Son, most generously gratuitous in what he does for sinners, and more especially, as being the agent for communicating grace. The sin of deserting the service of Christ insults that Divine Being;

because it contemptuously disregards His teachings prompting us to the contrary.

V. 30. *Οἶδαμεν γάρ.* The writer now introduces, in two quotations, a ground or reason for his assertion that the apostate from Christianity will be adjudged worthy of a far sorer punishment.

*Ἐμοὶ ἐχθίζησας, κ.τ.λ.* This citation is from Deut. 32 : 35, *לִי נִקְּם וְשִׁלְּם*. The passage is thus quoted also in Rom. 12 : 19 ; in neither case in the very words of the Septuagint.

*Κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.* This quotation may be taken either from Deut. 32 : 36, or Ps. 135 : 14. The verb *κρινεῖ* must here bear the sense of the original *דָּן*, which means in general 'to judge,' then 'to maintain one's righteous cause,' and thence 'to avenge.' Thus, in both these passages, God is declared to be the righteous judge, and the avenger of His people, who are injured and dishonoured by wicked deserters and opposers. The appositeness of the quotation is not obscure. If retributive justice is one of God's essential attributes, yea, *His alone*, except where He delegates it, and He is pledged to repay their full deserts to all evil deeds, and to vindicate all the wrongs of his people, there can be no escape for the backsliders above described. If the elements of guilt which the Apostle imputes are in them, the punishment will be upon them, in due time.

V. 31. *Φοβερόν τὸ ἐμπροσθεῖν εἰς χεῖρας, κ.τ.λ.* The meaning of these words may be aptly illustrated by the language of David, when the alternative was

offered to him between war, famine, or pestilence, as his punishment, 2 Sam. 24:14, "Let us fall now into the hand of the LORD,"  $\text{הַיְדָרְדֵּרְנוּ בְּיַד הַיְהוָה}$ . At all times, "our breath is in his hand," Dan. 5:23. But the language here means falling into God's hands for retribution. This is a fearful thing, because He is God, almighty, infinite, &c., and because He is ever living: His wrath never ceases.

- 
- 32 Ἀναμιμνήσκασθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς  
 φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθη-  
 33 μάτων· τοῦτο μὲν, ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι  
 θεατριζόμενοι· τοῦτο δέ, κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως  
 34 ἀναστρεφόμενων γεννηθέντες. Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δε-  
 σμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν  
 ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε,  
 γινώσκοντες ἔχειν [ἐν] ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὑπαρξίν  
 ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσαν.

V. 33. *Τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ*, "Partly while ye were made a gazing stock both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly while ye became companions of them that were so used." This meaning of these phrases is asserted in Matthiæ's Greek Gram. §288, obs. 2.

*θεατριζόμενοι*. The allusion here, as well as in the words *πολλὴν ἄθλησιν* of v. 32, is to the Roman and Grecian theatrical shows: 'Ye were made a spectacle of.' A similar allusion occurs in 1 Cor. 4:9, "For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death; for we are made a spectacle

(*Θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν*) unto the world, and to angels, and to men." It is supposed that the custom is here alluded to, of reserving those gladiators to the end of the show, who were appointed, because they were perhaps condemned malefactors, to fight to mutual extermination without reprieve. Thus, the barbarous pagans gave a piquancy and excitement to the close of entertainments, which might otherwise pall upon the appetite. Such a part of the show did the apostles compose, destined to minister to the pleasure of their persecutors by sufferings more merciless and deadly than private Christians. How the Hebrew Christians were made spectacles, is declared by the words *ὄνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι*. The reproaches and tribulations which they suffered for Christ, had made them conspicuous to a sinful world and to angels.

*κοινωνοί*, 'Partly while ye became sharers of the lot of those who were so exercised.' They became sharers by their sympathies and charitable ministrations to the sufferers. The word *κοινωνίας*, in 13:16 below, has a similar meaning, as will appear from the context. A part of these Hebrew Christians suffered in person for Christianity, and at times. Another part sympathized with and relieved the sufferings of their brethren, and thus, in a sense, partook with them, though at that time personally exempt from persecutions.

V. 34. *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*. This is the reading in the Textus Receptus, and almost all the manuscripts of the Greek Test. *τοῖς δεσμοῖς* (ye sympathized with

the captives) is found in some manuscripts, the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Vulgate versions, and in some Fathers. Some editors of modern date, among whom is Hahn, have therefore inserted it. They have also urged as a reason for preferring this reading, that, according to correct Greek usage, the verb *συμπάσχω* is only used with persons and never with things. But this is certainly incorrect. We have an obvious instance of the contrary in 4:15 above, *συμπαθήσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν*. Br. Jebb has also adduced a similar example from Isocrates. The received reading is clearly to be preferred; and we learn that the persons to whom this Epistle was addressed had sympathized with its author while suffering bondage for Christ. Is it not most probable that this event was the long captivity of Paul at Cæsarea, which is related in Acts 24:27?

---

35 Μὴ ἀποβάλλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, ἣτις ἔχει  
 36 μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην. Ὑπομονὴς γὰρ ἔχετε  
 37 σησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. “Ἐτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον  
 38 ὅσον, ὃ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως, ζήσεται· καὶ εἰς ὑποστείληται,  
 39 οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ.” Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς, εἰς ἀπώλειαν· ἀλλὰ πίστεως, εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

Vv. 35, 36. These words scarcely need any explanation farther than is given them in the Analysis, to which the reader is referred.

V. 37. *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον*. This phrase is intensive, like the Hebrew *מְאֵד מְאֵד*: "For yet a *very* little (time), He that cometh will come," &c. For confirmation of this rendering, see Matthiæ's Gr. Gram. §486. obs. 1, and Viger's Greek Idioms, S. v. c. III. §9. The latter cites Arr. Ind. s. 29, as using the same phrase: *σπεύρουσιν ὅσον ὅσον τῆς χάρας*.

ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει, κ.τ.λ. The quotation is from Hab. 2:3, 4. The Hebrew is כִּי־בֹא רִבְאָא לֹא יִחְתָּר : הַיְהִי עֲפֹלָה לֹא־תִשָּׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בִּי וְצַדִּיק בְּאַמְנֹתָו יִתְהַיָּה; of which the following may be proposed as a correct translation: 'For it (the vision) shall surely come; it shall not tarry: lo; his soul is proud, it is not right within him; but the righteous by his faith shall live.' The Septuagint translate it, *ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἤξει, καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονησῇ· ἐὰν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἢ ψύχη μου ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται*. The English rendering of this would be, 'For he will come and will not tarry. If he (any one) draw back, my soul taketh no pleasure in him; but the just by faith in me shall live.' It would seem that there must have been some variation in the reading which was before the Seventy, from that which we now possess. Their rendering evidently expresses the general sense of the passage. In the last verse our author inverts the order of the clauses, and couples them by *καί*. Otherwise, he follows in the main the translation of the Septuagint, quoting the passage not as a prophecy of the matter in hand (in the view of Habakkuk, the approaching doom of the oppressors of Israel), but as



setting forth principles applicable to the argument of this part of the Epistle. But why the inversion of the clauses in the fourth verse? Bloomfield, and others who desire to give an Arminian sense to the passage, say that the Apostle inverts the clauses in order to manifest the relation which he would have *δίκαιος* bear as the subject of *ὑποστείλῃται*: or at least, that in the sentence of the Apostle as inverted, *ὁ δίκαιος* is the proper subject. Even if this construction were admitted, the remarks which we have offered above on v. 29 would apply and show that the Arminian inference, that any justified person does ever ‘draw back’ finally and totally, does not necessarily follow. But it is a more natural account of the inversion, to suppose that the Apostle viewed the two clauses which he quotes as separated, and as containing two separate principles, both of which he wished to apply to his exhortation, and that thus, the order in which he mentions them is unimportant and accidental. The conjunction *καὶ* is then to be regarded as the mere additive word of transition, by which the second quotation is introduced after the first; and is equivalent to *καὶ πάλιν*, in 2:13 and 10:30 above. In both the places just cited, the clauses of the quotation are thus separated, although they are, in each case, taken from the same passage of the Old Test. In 11:2 below, our author cites the two incidents of Jacob’s blessing each of the sons of Joseph, and leaning upon the head of his staff to worship, but in an inverted order. The latter is first recorded in Gen. 47:31, and the former after-

wards, in Gen. 48:14. Many instances occur, also, which justify us in regarding *καί*, as here used, in the sense of *καὶ πάλιν*, to introduce an additional and separate fact or citation. Thus, in 1 Tim. 5:18, *Βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις· καί·* (an additional quotation from a different place) *ἄξιός ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.* A similar instance occurs in Hebr. 1:10, and it frequently occurs in passing from one argument to another. See Hebr. 1:7, 7:8, 9, 20, 23, &c. Then *ὑποστέλληται* will have the same subject as in the Septuagint and the original. It is in favour of this explanation that upon the other, Bloomfield's supposition, the antithesis between the two clauses would seem to require *ἐὰν δὲ ὑποστέλληται*, instead of *καὶ ἐάν.* But admitting *ὁ δίκαιος* to be the subject of *ὑποστέλληται*, it can only be a general designation of one professedly acknowledged as a righteous man; for the first clause asserts *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, and this distinction is kept up in the following verse. The remarks made on 6:4 above, apply here.

V. 39. *οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς . . . ἀλλὰ πίστεως.* Here the abstract words are used for the concrete, to designate the two classes of backsliders and believers.

*εἰς περιποίησιν.* This word obviously means the opposite of *ἀπώλειαν*, and hence 'salvation.' The kindred verb is used in Acts 20:28, and 1 Tim. 3:13, *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν . . . ἣν περιποιήσατο (ὁ θεὸς) διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου,* "which He purchased with His own blood;" *οἱ καλῶς διακονήσαντες, βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιῶνται,* "purchase to themselves (or

acquire) a good degree." In Xen. Cyropaid. IV. IV. 10, we find τὰς ψυχὰς περιποιήσασθε. In 1 Thess. 5:9, the noun occurs in connexion with σωτηρίας, in 2 Thess. 2:14, in the sense of 'acquisition' (the act of acquiring), and in Eph. 1:14 and 1 Pet. 2:9, in the sense of 'acquisition' or 'possession' (the thing acquired). In 2 Chron. 14:12 (in Sept. 13), the Septuagint use it as the translation for הָקַמְ, ἔπεσον Αἰθίοπες ὥστε μὴ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς περιποιήσιν. Amidst these differing senses there is sufficient usage for the meaning of 'salvation' which the scope and context in this place demand.

## CHAPTER XI. 1—31.

### ANALYSIS.

THE great object of this Epistle is to enforce faith in Jesus Christ as the mediator of the new dispensation, and to guard against apostacy from that faith, especially back to Judaism. Having shown Christ's pre-eminence and excellence, and that in Him was the foundation of all the benefits of redemption, the author has just exhorted his readers to perseverance and patience in their profession, that they may inherit the promises and receive the salvation of their souls. Suitably to the scope of the whole Epistle, and of the immediate context in particular, the Apostle, for the further establishment of his readers (compare 12:1 and seq.), after a general and practical definition of faith, proceeds to show that the fathers had, by perseverance and patience in its exercise, regulated their lives and received their reward. This is proved by the example of Abel, v. 4; of Enoch, vv. 5, 6; of Noah, v. 7; of Abraham, vv. 8-19; of Isaac, v. 20; of Jacob, v. 21; of Joseph, v. 22; of Moses, or his parents, vv. 23-28; of the Israelites in their exodus, vv. 29, 30; and of Rahab, v. 31.

To sum up, Christ and the completeness of His redemption are the main subjects of the Epistle. The

exercise of soul by which we embrace Him, and secure His redemption, is faith. Perseverance in this grace is inculcated on the Hebrew Christians, by showing that it was the principle which governed the admired conduct of the models of Jewish piety.

## COMMENTARY.

XI. 1 Ἔστι δὲ πίστις, ἐπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πρα-  
 2 γμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. Ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ  
 3 ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρῆβύτεροι. Πίστει νοοῦμεν  
 κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ  
 4 ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι. Πίστει  
 πλείονα θυσίαν Ἀβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκε τῷ  
 θεῷ, δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦν-  
 τος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς  
 ἀποθανῶν ἔτι λαλεῖται.

V. 1. ὑπόστασις. Some interpreters, among whom are the authors of our English version, render this word 'substance;' others render it 'firm persuasion.' Both the senses are good, and accord with the uses of the word, as may be ascertained by reference to the common New Test. Lexicons. As was remarked under 1 : 3 above, in that place it must have the sense of 'substance,' while in the other places in which it occurs in the New Test. (2 Cor. 9 : 4, 11 : 17, and Hebr. 3 : 14), it may have the sense of 'confidence.' In the Septuagint it is used as a translation for ἡπίκησις, 'expectation,' or 'hope,' in Ps. 39 : 8, and for ἡπίκη, 'hope,' in Ruth 1 : 12. But yet the sense of 'substance' is to be preferred in the text under remark. It corresponds better, in the strength and fulness of its meaning, with such expressions as the following : 2 Cor. 5 : 7, διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἶδους ; 2 Cor. 4 :

18, *μὴ σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, κ.τ.λ.*; v. 13 below, *πρόρῳθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι*, and v. 27, *τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὄρων*. The representation of faith contained in all these expressions is, that it gives the soul a substantial reality upon which its actings may go forth, and its spiritual senses may fix themselves. Nor is the consideration valid, which is urged by Stuart in favour of rendering the word ‘confidence,’ that if the other meaning were adopted, we would more naturally expect it to be followed by some such word as *ἀσωμάτων*, or *ἀνύλων*, in order to carry out an antithesis more properly. The word *ἐπιζομένων*, as expressing things future and unpossessed, the objects of our anticipations, makes an antithesis entirely natural. It is not only true of faith that it is a ‘firm persuasion’ of the existence of such things, but that it gives them, so to speak, ‘*present subsistence*.’ It gives them the force of present realities. This sense therefore includes the other, and is for this reason preferable, that, while it expresses all that is expressed by the other, it gives more fulness and strength to the Apostle’s words.

*ἔλεγχος*. This word occurs in Homer in the sense of ‘reproach,’ ‘shame,’ and is of the neuter gender. In the later writers it also means ‘proof,’ ‘demonstration,’ ‘refutation.’ It occurs in the Septuagint as a translation for *הַבְּרָיָה*, ‘arguments,’ ‘reasonings,’ in Job 13:6 and 23:4, and for *הַבְּרָיָה*, ‘rebuke,’ in Hosea 5:9. From the meaning ‘demonstration,’ some interpreters have by metonymy derived the sense of ‘conviction.’

Thus Wahl and Kuinoël render it '*persuasio firma*.' But there is no usage to authorize this meaning. A better rendering is 'proof,' 'demonstration,' or that of the English version, 'evidence,' if the latter be taken in the sense of Theophylact, quoted by Bretschneider's *Lex. δείξιν, φανέρωσιν ἀδήλων πραγμάτων*. The sense here maintained for ἔλεγχος confirms that given above to ὑπόστασις. As faith *realizes* things hoped for, so it *brings to view* things unseen. The expressions already quoted from vv. 13, 27 below, confirm the propriety of this meaning. The kindred verb occurs frequently in the New Test. but the noun is only found in this place and in 2 Tim. 3:16, where it is translated 'reproof.' In John 3:20, the verb ἐλέγχω is used as an antithesis for φανερόω, thus defining its sense in that place to be similar: Πᾶς ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων . . . οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, κ.τ.λ. The sense here is evidently that of 'evincing,' 'evidencing the character of,' the respective works.

The faith here defined, and then illustrated throughout the chapter, is *Christian faith in its generic nature*, receiving every word of God, and including justifying faith; which is, so to speak, but one exercise of the general principle of faith, by which Christ is received as the Saviour. It is faith as a perfect Christian grace that is defined, not indeed perfect in the examples given, but strong; not feeble and sickly, as is too common among Christians.



V. 2. Ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, κ.τ.λ., 'For by this were the fathers testified unto' (as being true men of God). Such is the faith which governed the fathers, which we see illustrated in their lives, and which was the means of their winning that approval, divine and human, which makes them undoubted, undisputed examples of the true follower of God. It is an appeal to them to show the practical nature of the faith just defined. The explanation we have given regards the particle γὰρ as introducing illustrative confirmation of the proposition of v. 1, that faith is of such a nature. Winer, in the *Id. New Test.* §7. 2. (f.), p. 55, does indeed give to this place a different connexion of thought, adopted from Griesbach and Knapp: 'There is a faith, a confidence, etc.; for by it the elders obtained a good report.' But this is fanciful and unauthorized; and his assertion that, with our sense, γὰρ would be wholly superfluous, is shown to be untrue by the fact that we have assigned it an intelligible force, strictly accordant with one of its usages: 'The nature of faith is such (as is stated); for by just this principle the elders obtained a good report.'

V. 3. μή. This particle properly qualifies γεγόνέναι, and its effect is to negative the whole phrase ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι. See this well stated in Winer, *Id. of New Test.* §64. 4, p. 418. The doctrine of the verse clearly is, that created things had no previous existence; a doctrine asserted, though less definitely, in Genesis, ch. 1 throughout, John 1:3, and Hebr. 1:2. This was contrary to the received

philosophy of the day, which held that the matter of all created things, as well as the Creator, was from eternity. It is a doctrine against which reason now sometimes rebels. It is by a simple, implicit reception of the inspired statement on this point, that we learn its truth.

V. 4. *πλείονα θυσίαν*. These words are correctly translated by the English version, 'a better sacrifice.' Thus, in Matt. 6 : 25, we have ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστὶ τῆς τροφῆς. 12 : 41, 42, "Ἄνδρες Νινευῖται . . . μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ καὶ ἰδοὺ, πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε. . . . πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. Other examples may be found in the Lexicons. From the idea of superiority in dimension, or quantity in the words 'more,' 'greater,' we easily pass to that of a general superiority. But in what was Abel's sacrifice better than Cain's? Because it was offered by faith on Christ, the seed of the woman, promised in Gen. 3 : 15. Here, then, was a justifying faith; and hence the writer proceeds to add, δι' ἧς (scilicet πίστεως) ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, in allusion to the form of his expression in v. 2. Rom. 1 : 17 and Hebr. 10 : 38 have taught us, in the words of Habakkuk, that faith is the instrument by which man is *placed* in a state of justification. Here the Apostle says that by faith he received the testimony of his being in that state. The latter is a consequence of the former. Since faith always implies a warrant, and the acceptableness of Abel's sacrifice arose in part from its being a bloody offering, we have here a very strong indication that bloody sacrifices had been en-

joined to Adam's family from their expulsion out of Eden.

*μαρτυροῦντος . . . Θεοῦ.* How God signified his acceptance of Abel's offering we are not told; the fact is plainly declared in Gen. 4:4, "And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."

*λαλεῖται.* There is here a doubtful reading. The majority of manuscripts give *λαλεῖται*, but many manuscripts, the Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Slavonic, and Vulgate versions, and many of the Fathers, give the active, *λαλεῖ*. This reading is also adopted by the majority of the critical editors of the New Test. as Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, Scholz, and Hahn. It certainly gives a sense much to be preferred: 'By it (his faith) Abel though dead yet teacheth,' i. e. the example of his faith is still a lesson to us. But if the passive voice is adopted, we must give a sense far less apposite and natural: By means of (or through) his faith Abel is spoken of, though now dead. With the amount of testimony from Mss. and versions in favour of *λαλεῖ*, we would venture to prefer it as the true reading.

---

5 Πίστει Ἐνώχ μετετέθη, τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον· καὶ οὐχ εὗρίσκειτο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός. Πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηται εὐηρε-  
6 στήκεναι τῷ Θεῷ· χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι. Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προερχόμενον τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστί· καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν

7 μισθαποδοτής γίνεται. Πίπτει, χρηματισθεῖς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεῖς κατεσκέυασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ· δι' ἧς κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος.

V. 5. Ἐνὸχ μετετέθη. That this verb is correctly rendered 'was translated,' or removed to heaven without dying, is proved by the words immediately succeeding, τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον. So the Septuagint render the words of Gen. 5:24, ἰὼν ἠῆλ ἐν, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, and so they are understood by Josephus, Philo, Onkelos, Jonathan, and the other Jewish translators. The same verb is employed concerning the translation of Elijah in the Hebrew of 2 Kings 2:9, 10, and is rendered by the Septuagint, ἀναλαμβάνω.

V. 6. χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως . . . πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον, κ.τ.λ. Here are developed two fundamental objects of faith: 1, that God is; 2, that He rewards those who seek after Him, and, by implication, punishes those who reject Him. The connexion of thought is this: Enoch obtained the glorious privilege of translation by his faith. This appears from the fact that the connexion in which his acceptableness to God is mentioned in Gen. 5:24 (And Enoch walked with God), evidently shows that this was the cause of his translation. He was translated because he so walked as to please God. But without faith it is impossible to please God. His faith therefore procured his trans-

lation. And then, to sustain the general assertion that without faith it is impossible to please Him, the author introduces (by γάρ) the considerations drawn from the nature of his service. The very profession of his service implies a profession of a belief in his existence, and in the certainty of his promises and threatenings. If these are not believed, why serve Him at all? But the sincere, practical, and operative belief of these is faith.

ἐκζητοῦσιν. According to a familiar Old Test. usage, to seek after God is to seek after his law in order to obey it, to know, love, and serve Him. Thus, in Ps. 14:2, we have יִמְלִיכֵנוּ שׂוֹרְטֵי, “any that sought God.”

V. 7. *Nōe . . . εὐλαβηθεὶς.* This verb occurs also in Acts 23:10, with the sense of mere natural fear, implying nothing pious: *εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλιάρχος, μὴ διασπασθῆ ὁ Παῦλος, κ.τ.λ.* As was remarked under 5:7 above, to which place the reader is referred, the adjective *εὐλαβῆς* occurs several times in the New Test. and always in the sense of ‘pious fear.’ The noun *εὐλαβεία* has the same sense in a part, at least, of the places where it occurs. We would therefore interpret the word here, ‘moved with fear,’ a reverential, pious fear, arising from his firm belief of the divine declaration. The first word of the sentence, *πίστει*, is to be regarded as dependent on *εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκέυασε*, rather than on *χρηματισθεὶς*. We see here how exactly the principle that moved Noah corresponds to the definition of v. 1. The things he

sought to avoid by his obedience were not seen (*τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων*). Reason and sense gave no indication of them; he had no evidence of their reality but the mere *dictum* of God (*χορηματισθεῖς*); but he acted just as he would have done in view of their immediate and visible presence. *This is faith.*

δι' ἧς. Some refer this pronoun to *πίστει*, some to *κιβωτόν*. The first reference much better suits the scope of the passage. As, in v. 4, Abel though dead yet teaches by his faith, so here, Noah by *his* faith impliedly condemned the unbelief of his hearers. The example of his obedient faith aggravated the inexcusableness of their skepticism.

τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης κληρονόμος. The righteousness here intended is, according to all usage and analogy of faith in the New Test. and especially in the writings of Paul, '*justifying righteousness* (i. e. that of the God-man, Christ) *imputed through faith.*' To be convinced of this, let the reader weigh the force of the inspired language in Rom. 1:17, 9:30, 10:3, 4, 5, 6, Phil. 3:9, compared with 3:6, 1 Cor. 1:30, consulting also Hodge's Com. on Romans, on the passages cited from that epistle. Without turning aside to a discussion of the usage of these words inappropriate to this work, we would only pause to indicate one obvious and overwhelming objection to all other interpretations than the one we have given, and especially to that founded on Rom. 4:5, the believer's "faith is counted to him for righteousness," which asserts that the merits of the act of faith are graciously accepted

by God as the ground of justification. This is indeed the only one of the erroneous interpretations which possesses even any degree of exegetical plausibility. Now it is most distinctly indicated in these passages, that the righteousness which is the ground of justification is God's, and not man's, consisting in what God has done, and not in what man has done in obedience to divine injunction; a truth which is consistent with no other definition of the righteousness of faith than that we have given. "The *righteousness of God* is revealed from faith to faith." "They being ignorant of *God's righteousness*, and going about to establish their own righteousness," &c. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one who believeth." "The righteousness which is of the law is, . . . *the man which* DOETH . . . shall live. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise . . . if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." It is the opposite of 'doing.' "Jesus Christ is made of God unto us righteousness;" not our own faith. "That I may be found in Him" (Christ), "not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through" (only instrumentally) "the faith of Christ, *the righteousness which is of God* by faith."

Because Noah is said in this connexion to have been justified by his faith, some say that the ark must be understood as a type of Christ, and this particular act of Noah's faith, as parallel to that of Abel in v. 4.

But what is here affirmed of his faith is not *necessarily* referred to the particular exercise of it stated in the preceding clause. In the exercise of the same grace he prepared the ark to the condemnation of the world, and trusted in the promised seed to the saving of his soul. It was the same principle, acting with reference to different exigencies, and different truths coming from the same holy God, who cannot lie.

- 
- 8 Πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἤμελλε λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν· καὶ ἐξῆλθε, μὴ ἐπιστάμενος, ποῦ ἔρχεται.
- 9 Πίστει παρώκησεν εἰς [τὴν] γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν, ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας, μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας
- 10 τῆς αὐτῆς· ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός.
- 11 Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρᾶ δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβε, καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας [ἔτεκεν], ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἠγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελιάμενον.
- 12 Διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἐνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἢ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἢ ἀναρίθμητος.

V. 8. ποῦ ἔρχεται. The use of the present tense here instead of the past exhibits an instance of the mingling of the *oratio obliqua* and *recta*, which is common. Another similar instance occurs in v. 13, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοὶ εἰσιν. The usage is explained by Winer, *Id. New Test.* §41. 2. (c), p. 211.



V. 9. *μετὰ Ἰσαάκ*. The preposition here, as usually before the genitive, signifies merely accompaniment, or participation in a common lot.

V. 11. *Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα*. Though incredulous at first, as we learn from Gen. 18:12-15, Sarah afterwards came under the influence of a prevalent faith, as was shown by the event. Abraham himself seems at first (Gen. 17:17) to have yielded to a similar doubt, unless his laughter be referred to joy.

*εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*. This has been well rendered by the English version, "to conceive seed." This is supposed by some to have been a technical expression for conception. Kuinoël and others render it 'strength for founding a family,' comparing with *καταβολὴ τοῦ κόσμου* in so many places. De Wette seems to incline to this sense, and it may perhaps be admitted as preferable.

The Textus Receptus here inserts *ἔτεκεν* after *ἤλικίας*. It is inserted in almost all the manuscripts, but is wanting in the Mss. A.D. 17, and in the Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, and Vulgate versions. On their authority it is expunged by Griesbach, Vater, Scholz, and Hahn. If it be retained, the sense will be as in the English version, "Sarah received strength to conceive seed (or found a family), and was delivered of a child when she was past age." If it be expunged, the sense will be, 'Sarah received strength to conceive seed (or found a family) even after the time of her prime.'

V. 12. *καὶ ταῦτα*. This construction is aptly

imitated in the English, 'and that as good as dead.' We have here, says Winer, *Id. New Test.* §23. 4, pp. 135, 136, an instance of the use of the plural pronoun for the singular, so that it might be correctly substituted by *τοῦτο*. As to its construction, it must be regarded as a kind of accusative absolute, approaching very nearly to a pronominal adverb. Cases of the use of the plural for the singular may also be seen in Luke 12:4, "Be not afraid of them who kill the body, and after that (*μετὰ ταῦτα*) have no more that they can do;" John 15:17, *Ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους*; and 3 John 4, 'I have no greater joy than this (*Μειζοτέραν τούτων χαράν*), to hear that my children walk in truth.' Matthiæ's *Gr. Gram.* II. §470. 6, p. 774, may also be consulted.

*νενεκρωμένον*, 'He was dead for purposes of procreation.' Compare Rom. 4:19, *οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νενεκρωμένον*.

---

13 Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες  
 τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες  
 [καὶ πεισθέντες] καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμολογή-  
 σαντες, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς  
 14 γῆς. Οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἐμφανίζουσιν, ὅτι  
 15 πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσι. Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημό-  
 νευον ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθον· εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνα-  
 16 κάμψαι· νυνὶ δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ'  
 ἔστιν, ἐπουρανίου. Διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς  
 ὁ θεός, θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· ἠτοίμασε γὰρ

- 17 αὐτοῖς πόλιν. Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἰβραὶμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν,  
 18 ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος, πρὸς ὃν ἐλάληθη· “Ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα”·  
 19 λογισάμενος, ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ Θεός· ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο.

V. 13. *μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.* We have here a clear metonymy of ‘promises’ for ‘things promised.’ Literally speaking, they had received the promises, for they were the basis of their faith. What those things promised were, appears from vv. 10, 14–16, ‘a city having foundations,’ scilicet heaven, and a heavenly inheritance.

Between *ιδόντες* and *ἀσπασάμενοι*, the Textus Receptus inserts *καὶ πεισθέντες*. These words are wanting in most of the manuscripts, versions, early editions, and Fathers. They are accordingly usually cancelled by the critical editors.

*ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι.* These words contain an obvious reference to the language of Abraham to the children of Heth, “I am a stranger and a sojourner with you;” of Isaac to Jacob, Gen. 28:4, “that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham;” and of Jacob to Pharaoh, Gen. 47:9, “the days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years.” But in a true and proper sense, all believers are strangers and sojourners in the world.

V. 16. *Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν.* These words are explanatory of *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοῦς*, ‘Where-

fore God is not ashamed of them,' (viz. ashamed) 'to be called *their God*.' To insert οὐδὲ, as does Stuart ('nor to be called their God'), obscures, instead of assisting the sense.

V. 17. καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ. καὶ here may be best translated 'yea,' authority for which may be seen in Winer's Id. New Test. §57. 2, p. 344. The meaning 'and' would not here be inapposite, but the former is preferable.

V. 18. ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα. The verb here does not express a mere *esse*: 'in Isaac shall be thy seed.' The Hebrew, Gen. 21:12, whence these words are extracted, is יִקְרָא. To make it merely equal to the verb of existence most unwarrantably emasculates the meaning. On the contrary, where the verb καλοῦμαι signifies 'is denominated,' it carries a sense even opposed to εἶναι. The meaning here and in Genesis is, 'The descendants through Isaac are those who have been pronounced by me *the seed*, in the covenanted sense.'

V. 19. ἐν παραβολῇ. Some consider this phrase as equivalent to παραβολῶς, 'inopinato,' 'unexpectedly.' This seems to us the least probable view. Many of the commentators, ancient and modern, render the words, 'in a figure,' i. e. typically, of Christ's sacrifice and resurrection. In 9:9 above, παραβολῇ undoubtedly has this sense. The most recent commentators understand the words in the sense of 'in comparison,' i. e. 'simili modo:.' 'He received him, as it were, from the dead.' The sense thus given to παραβολῇ would

correspond well with its composition and primary meaning; but examples of such a usage in the New Test. are wanting.

ὅθεν . . . ἐχομίσατο. ὅθεν may relate to ἐκ νεκρῶν. Some refer this language to Abraham's reception of his son from God at his first conception; and point, in illustration, to the words of v. 12, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου. This sense seems to us preferable. Others understand it as meaning that Abraham received his son back from the altar, Isaac being, as it were, dead in his father's opinion and his own. In support of this view, Bloomfield says, κομίζω never means simply *to obtain*, but *to receive back*, either in the way of *recovering* what is lost, or *in return* for something given. But to confine ourselves to this Epistle, let the reader consult 10:36, 11:39, in both of which that sense is obviously found, and compare them with 11:13, λαβόντες. The Lexicons also assert the same, though they translate by 'to receive back' in this place. We may then render ὅθεν, 'wherefore,' and make it relate to Abraham's faith.

- 
- 20 Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν Ἰσαὰκ τὸν  
 21 Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαῦ. Πίστει Ἰακώβ ἀποθνή-  
 σκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ εὐλόγησε· καὶ  
 προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ.  
 22 Πίστει Ἰωσήφ τελευτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν  
 Ἰσραὴλ ἐμνημόνευσε, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ

23 ἐντείλατο. Πίστει Μωϋσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ἄστεϊον τὸ παιδίον· καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως.

Vv. 20, 21. These words reveal to us the nature of the patriarchal blessings. They were prophetic and inspired. But it may be asked how it was that Isaac blessed his heir 'by faith of things to come,' when he mistook Jacob for Esau? We answer, he pronounced the blessing in the faith that God would bring it to pass on the subject of it; and though he thought the subject was Esau, when he discovered his mistake, he recognised in it the overruling providence of God, and could not and did not reverse it. He assures Esau, in the midst of his grief, 'Yea, and he (Jacob) shall be blessed.'

ἀποθνήσκων. We have here the present participle, which we will not, with some interpreters, regard as used for a future, 'about to die.' The present properly expresses that action which is already commenced, though its completion is still future. Jacob was then dying; not indeed in 'the article of death;' but popularly, the closing scene of his life had begun. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §46. 5, p. 274.

προσεκύνησεν. This is the word used by the Septuagint for *הִשָּׁתַּחוּ*, Gen. 47:31, where the English version renders it "bowed himself." But the word is properly rendered here as there, '*worshipped.*' This act of worship did not take place at the time of the

blessing which is referred to in the first clause of v. 21 ; for that blessing really occurred afterwards. This is evident from Gen. 48 : 1, 15, 16 ; but it is evident from the whole narrative that the events were nearly contiguous. The inversion of the incidents has been already noticed in 10 : 38 above.

τῆς ῥάβδου. The Hebrew word is *מַטֵּה*, which the Masorites point *מַטֵּה*, and so read all the ancient versions except the Septuagint. These translators have evidently read the word as if pointed *מַטֵּה*, ῥάβδος : and they are followed by our author. This is doubtless the true reading ; though Bloomfield, following Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Kuinoël, prefers the former. To say nothing of the form of oriental beds in general, inspiration could not sanction such an error of fact, and one so causeless and inexplicable, as the substitution of Jacob's bed-head for his staff.

V. 23. τῶν πατέρων. This word is here properly translated, 'his parents.' Thus, in Eph. 6 : 1, we have the precept, 'Children, obey your parents, τοῖς γονεῦσι, which is explained in v. 2 by *Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα*, and in v. 4 these parties are addressed concerning their correlative duties to their children as *οἱ πατέρες*. A comparison of Col. 3 : 20, 21, gives a similar instance. A few examples of the same usage are adduced from the classics.

---

24 Πίστει Μωϋσῆς μέγας γενόμενος ἠρνήσατο λέγε-  
 25 σθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, μᾶλλον ἐλόμενος  
 συγκατακεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ πρόσκαιρον

26 ἔχειν ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγη-  
 σάμενος τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδι-  
 σμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθα-  
 27 ποδοσίαν. Πίστει κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβη-  
 θεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως· τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον  
 28 ὡς ὄρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε. Πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα  
 καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος, ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὄλο-  
 29 θρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα, θίγῃ αὐτῶν. Πίστει διέ-  
 βησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς· ἧς  
 30 πείραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν. Πί-  
 στει τὰ τεῖχη Ἱεριχὼ ἔπεσε, κυκλωθέντα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ  
 31 ἡμέρας. Πίστει Ραὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπόλετο  
 τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ'   
 εἰρήνης.

V. 26. ὀνειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Stuart and others regard these words as signifying that Moses bore reproach 'like that of Christ,' or 'after his example.' It is better to interpret them as meaning 'the reproach which falls on His followers for His sake,' or with Bloomfield, Kuinoël, and others, 'the reproach incurred by their professed expectations and hopes of a Messiah.' In 1 Cor. 10:4, a passage which throws much light on the object of the faith of Old Test. saints at this time, it is said, "They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ;" and in 10:9 it is said, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted." Christ was the Angel who led them through the wilderness (see Hengstenberg's Christology, Vol. I.); so that there is a more literal and direct relation between



Him and the faith and obedience of the Hebrews, than at first sight would appear.

V. 27. *κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον.* This does not refer to Moses' flight to Midian, recorded in Ex. 2 : 14, but to the exode of him and the nation forty years afterwards.

V. 28. *πεποιήκε τὸ πάσχα.* This verb, like the Hebrew *פִּיֵּץ* in similar connexions, may either mean, 'he prepared the passover,' 'observed it,' procuring, sacrificing and cooking the lamb, etc.; or it may mean, 'he instituted it.'

*τὸ πάσχα.* This word is an imitation, in Greek letters, of the Hebrew word of later origin, *פֶּסַח*, which was used for *פָּסַח*, from *פָּסַח*, 'to pass over.' The origin of the rite and the name as explained in Exod. 12 : 7, 13, is familiar to all.

*ὁ ὀλοθρεύων.* This is the rendering of the Septuagint for *הַיְהוֹשֵׁעַ*, in Ex. 12 : 23.

V. 30. *κυκλωθέντα.* Some German critics understand this word as describing *circumvallations*, drawn by Joshua around the walls of Jericho. To refute this rendering, it is sufficient to refer to the narrative in Josh. 6 : 1-21. The walls were "encircled" by the sacred and military procession.

V. 31. *ἡ πόρνη.* The Septuagint have rightly used this word for *הַזֵּיָה*, Josh. 2 : 1. James 2 : 25 gives to Rahab the same title. The Hebrew word is the feminine participle of *הָזָה*, 'to commit whoredom;' and should not be derived from *הָזָה*, 'to feed,' or 'nourish.' No such use of *πόρνη* for 'hostess' can be found;

and the apostles would not have endorsed a slanderous translation. Still, Rahab may have also exercised the functions of a hostess.

On all these instances of old believers, it is sufficient to make the one remark, that their conduct all illustrates the same generic principle: an undoubting acceptance of the mere divine word as true, an acting upon it as though the things it revealed or promised were already visible realities, evident to natural reason and sense.

## CHAPTER XI. 32—XII. 11.

### ANALYSIS.

THE author, to save time, *briefly* refers to other examples of the ancient worthies, 11 : 32–38, declaring in conclusion, that, though they all obtained a good testimony through faith, yet in the divine arrangement they enjoyed not the advantages of the Christian dispensation ; God having reserved this glorious privilege for us, who thus receive what they saw by faith, and what alone secures to them and us the perfection which we need, vv. 39, 40.

The Apostle then resumes his exhortation to his readers, to patient and persevering adherence to their profession, notwithstanding all the trials to which it subjected them, 12 : 1–13. First, in view of the bright examples which have been just referred to, v. 1. Second, above all, the efficient help of Christ, to whom they must ever look, and the glorious example which He has set, which they must attentively consider, vv. 2, 3. Third, the comparative lightness of their trials ; they had not yet reached the extreme, v. 4. Fourth, the proofs of God's love in them, declared in a quotation which represents them as chastisements upon His children, vv. 5, 6 ; upon which the Apostle remarks, *a*) that the proof of their sonship depended upon their patient endurance, and *b*) that to be without trials argued desertion by God, as though they were not true

children, vv. 7, 8. Fifth, we revered our earthly parents, who, subject to all the infirmities of humanity, chastened us as appeared good to them: much more should we cheerfully submit to the chastisements of our spiritual Father, who by them seeks to promote our sanctification and salvation, vv. 9, 10. Sixth, this gracious end, though the means were grievous for the present, would certainly follow, v. 11.

## COMMENTARY.

- 32 Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; Ἐπιλείπει γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ  
 χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψών, καὶ  
 Ἰεφθάε, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ, καὶ τῶν προφη-  
 33 τῶν· οἱ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας,  
 εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν,  
 34 ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, ἔσβεσαν δύναιμι πυ-  
 ρός, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, ἐνεδυναμώθησαν  
 ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ,  
 35 παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων· ἔλαβον γυναῖ-  
 κες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ  
 ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προξδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρω-  
 σιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν·

V. 32. τί ἔτι λεγω; The verb here may be either subjunctive, or indicative present. If the former, τί will mean what? giving the sense, 'What can I say more?' In the latter case, we must render τί why? giving the sense, 'Why do I say more?' The latter is to be preferred.

In the following enumeration, the names do not occur in chronological order; nor do the names and deeds correspond each to each, in the order in which they stand. Indeed, several of the acts may be referred to the same person, as, on the other hand, it may be meant that several of the persons have performed the same deed of faith.

V. 33. εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην. There is no suf-

ficient reason for limiting these acts of righteousness to the public administration of justice, as is done by some. The general meaning given to the word in the New Test. Lexicons is sufficient evidence of this. In Acts 10:35, Peter says concerning Cornelius' good deeds, and especially his prayers and alms, "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness (*ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην*) is accepted with him."

V. 34. *ἀσθενείας*. This word has in like manner been unnecessarily limited to bodily *sickness*. It is not only illustrated by the sickness of Hezekiah, Is. 38:9, but by the cases of Joshua, Barak, Samson, David, and others, of whom no bodily infirmity is related.

V. 35. *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*. The preposition *ἐκ* is used of any *source* or cause, as is stated in Winer's Id. New Test. §51. a, p. 297. Its force here is to signify the source from which some believing women, of whom the Shunammite woman in 2 Kings 4:35 is an example, received their dead again.

*ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*. English version, "were tortured." It is usually supposed that the instances before the Apostle's mind were those of 2 Maccabees 6:19. What the exact punishment was, it is not easy to ascertain. Most writers suppose that it consisted in stretching the victim on a rack or drum, and beating him to death. This seems the most probable explanation, upon comparing the terms employed by Josephus and Maccabees. The mode of torment may be illus-

trated by the modern punishments of the bastinado and breaking on the wheel.

*οὐ προσηδέσθαι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν.* They would not receive deliverance on the terms proposed to them, viz. recantation or renunciation of their faith.

*κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως.* There are three interpretations of these words, each giving a different object of comparison. The first is, 'They preferred martyrdom to recantation, in order that they might attain a better resurrection than that of apostates and other sinners, the glorious resurrection of saints instead of the fearful one of the lost.' According to the second, the object of comparison is the resurrection mentioned in the former part of the verse, that which restored the son of the Shunammite, for instance, to a temporary enjoyment of life in this imperfect world. If this interpretation is adopted, and it seems to us the most probable, we are to understand that it is the author and not the martyrs, who makes the comparison between this boon, and the resurrection to undying bliss to which they aspired. They sought a resurrection, in *his* opinion, better; *they* were probably not thinking of any such comparison. The third explanation supposes that the present life was the thing contrasted with the resurrection. On this understanding, the contrast is made in the minds of the martyrs themselves. The two alternatives given them were restoration (*ἀπολύτρωσιν*) to life on condition of apostacy; or death, with the prospect of a glorious resurrection. They preferred the latter as better than life.

36 ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πείραν ἔλα-  
 37 βον, ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς· ἐλιθάσθησαν,  
 ἐπίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν, ἐν φόβῳ μαχαίρας  
 ἀπέθανον· περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις  
 δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχού-  
 38 μνοι, (ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος,) ἐν ἐρημίαις  
 πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσι, καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς  
 39 ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς. Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες  
 διὰ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἔκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν,  
 40 τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρείττον τι προβλεψάμενον,  
 ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι.

V. 37. *ἐπειράσθησαν*. There seems to be a difficulty in the presence of a general word like this, in the midst of specific terms. Various readings have been suggested, but all unsustained. Several manuscripts, the Syriac and Æthiopic versions, and two or three of the Fathers, omit it; but this is not sufficient to authorize its omission from the text. Most probably it refers to the severe trials of the faith of the old saints in the various tortures and sufferings which they underwent.

V. 39. *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*. The clause here is the same as in 10:36 above, and presents an instance of metonymy equally clear. The promise is set for the thing promised. The latter they did not possess, during their mortal life, but only looked for it with a prospective faith.

V. 40. *κρείττον τι*. There is much dispute what this better thing is. That the fathers under the old dispensation did receive the temporal blessings prom-



ised, history and the Apostle himself declare. Besides, the 'better thing' was something which they all alike failed to possess (*οὗτοι πάντες οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο*), and some at least, as Gideon, Samuel, David, enjoyed a full share of these temporal blessings. That the old saints received the eternal rewards of their piety, both history and the Apostle teach. To see this we need only refer to ch. 4, where God's rest is proposed to them as to us. The 'better something' then can only be the promised Messiah (*ἐπαγγελίαν*), the object of their faith and intense desire, and the sole ground of the perfect blessings of redemption to believers of every age. In 9:15 above, we learn that the transgressions under the first testament were redeemed by Him. The privilege of seeing Christ, of knowing that the work of atonement was complete, of having a spiritual instead of a typical dispensation, were provided for us, in preference to Old Testament believers. The passage may be illustrated by Matt. 13:16, 17. By referring to this superior privilege, the author would arouse in his readers a grateful emulation, and thus prepare them for the exhortation which follows in 12:1.

---

XII. 1 *Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν ρέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα, καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα·*

2 ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειω-  
 τὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς,  
 ὑπέμεινε σταυρὸν, αἰσχύνῃς καταφρονήσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ  
 3 τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν. Ἀναλογί-  
 σασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν  
 ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογία, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε  
 4 ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν, ἐκλυόμενοι. Οὐπω μέχρις  
 αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἀντα-  
 γωνιζόμενοι·

V. 1. μαρτύρων. The original sense of this word is, 'witnesses.' Often it means witnesses *forensically*, but oftener it is used *generally* of any one testifying what he has seen, heard, or had revealed. In the last sense, even Christ is called ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, Rev. 1 : 5, 3 : 14. With this may be compared the symbolical witnesses of Rev. 11 : 3. This witnessing, in the common uses of the word, is by mouth. In Acts 22 : 20, Rev. 2 : 13, 17 : 6, Stephen, Antipas, and the martyrs of Jesus, witnessed also by their death; whence the word passed to the ecclesiastical writers in the sense of 'martyrs,' 'confessors,' i. e. those who die or suffer for the truth; a sense not found in the classics. The idea of *testimony* seems therefore in all cases prominent in the word. Hence Wahl says here, it is used 'de personis exemplo suo testantibus aliquid.' Bretschneider renders, 'testis qui suo exemplo testatur, confirmat aliquid.' Both cite Jos. contra Apion. 1. 7. No example has been adduced where the word is used in the sense of 'spectator' simply. We therefore adhere to the sense of 'witnesses,' here, i. e. those who by the

examples of their faith have testified to God and his promises, and his service. The possession of such a cloud of glorious examples is a powerful stimulus to perseverance.

*ὄγκον.* This noun in general means ‘a burden,’ ‘incumbrance.’ The English version has well rendered it ‘weight,’ having in view the idea of a race.

*ἐνπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν.* This adjective occurs nowhere else in the New Test. It is evidently from *περιῖσθημι*, whence we have the noun *περίστασις*, meaning ‘circumstance,’ ‘condition,’ and then ‘peril,’ ‘trouble,’ the adjective *ἀπερίστατος* meaning ‘free from danger or trouble,’ and (according to Liddell & Scott) also, ‘helpless,’ ‘defenceless;’ and therefore *ἐνπερίστατος* would mean ‘full of danger,’ &c. Thus many render it. Others, taking it actively from *περιῖσθημι*, render it ‘besetting on every hand.’ This is the interpretation of Chrysostom, *ἢ ἐνκόλως περιῖσθᾶμιν ἡμᾶς*. These two senses amount to the same, and are the best. Some, deriving from *περίστατος*, ‘surrounded by,’ &c. understand *ἐνπερίστατον* here as ‘well surrounded,’ i. e. ‘popular.’ Others render it ‘well wound around us,’ like a garment; a sense which presents a slight resemblance to *περικείται ἄσθενειαν*, in 5:2 above. So substantially translate Kuinoöl and Bloomfield. Upon any interpretation, *καὶ* must be rendered ‘even’ or ‘especially.’ Compare Winer’s *Id. New Test.* §57. 2. (d), p. 344. The question still remains, whether the Apostle intends by *ἁμαρτίαν* some peculiar besetting sin, or sin in general, as that which

besets us on every hand. On this it may be sufficient to say, that neither of these senses can be shown to be inappropriate.

*ἀγῶνα.* This word denotes generally 'any contest' in the games. Hence those who strove were *ἀγωνίσται*. The contest here is that of a race, a figure used by the Apostle Paul in Acts 20:24, 1 Cor. 9:24-26, Gal. 5:7, 2 Tim. 4:7; a slight argument for his authorship of this Epistle.

V. 2. *ἀφορῶντες.* Christians must run 'looking off' from every thing else to Jesus.

*ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν.* Properly these words signify 'author and finisher.' It is proper to regard them as referring to the *race* in which Christians are engaged. But they convey a deeper meaning than the word *ἀγωνοθέτης*, or *βραβευτής*, by which some have proposed to explain them. The Apostle, in directing us to look to Christ in the race of our faith, proposes him as more than the 'director' and 'umpire' of the games. We prefer to give to *τελειωτής* here, the same meaning which was first indicated in the remarks on 2:10 above. The author teaches us that Christ engages us in this race at first, that it is His help and strength which bring us to the goal, and that it is He who crowns us with glory at the last.

*σταυρὸν . . . αἰσχύνης.* The omission of the article before these words is noticeable. It would be better to suppose that it was intentional, and that the writer intended by it to give a general sense to the phrase,

than to supply them arbitrarily as is done by the English version.

*ἐκάθεισεν.* The best manuscripts and the early critical editions read here the perfect indicative active, *κεκάθεικεν.*

V. 3. *ἀντιλογία.* This noun occurs in the New Test. only here, in 6:16, and 7:7 above, and in Jude 11. In this place it seems to denote, not merely contradiction by words, as in the two places above, but also by deed. Such is its sense in Jude 11, *ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ,* 'the gainsaying of Corah,' in the English version. His opposition to Moses was not limited to verbal contradiction.

*ταῖς ψυχαῖς* may be construed either with *κάμητε* or *ἐκλύόμενοι.* Both the words seem to be borrowed from the *palæstra*, the figure of which is still prevalent in the writer's mind.

V. 4. *ἀμαρτίαν.* Many explain this as an abstract used for a concrete, 'striving against sinners.' Others more properly understand it as a personification, and suppose an allusion to the *παγκράτιον.* Their contest was with sin in all its opposing forms within and without.

---

5 καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῶν ὡς υἱοῖς  
 διαλέγεται· "υἱέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυ-  
 6 ρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· ὃν γὰρ  
 ἀγαπᾷ κύριος, παιδεύει· μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν

7 ὃν παραδέχεται.” Εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς  
 ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός· τίς γὰρ ἐστὶν υἱός, ὃν οὐ  
 8 παιδεύει πατήρ; Εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἐστε παιδείας, ἥς μέ-  
 τοχοὶ γεγονόνασι πάντες· ἄρα νόθοι ἐστέ, καὶ οὐχ  
 υἱοί.

V. 5. παρακλήσεως. Some translate this ‘conso-  
 lation;’ others with more judgment, ‘exhortation.’  
 The quotation is from Prov. 3 : 11, 12, and follows the  
 Septuagint in the main, except that our author writes  
*υἱέ μου* (according to the Hebrew בְּנִי), while the Sept.  
 omit *μου*, and that he employs *παιδεύει* in place of  
*ἐλέγχει*, which the Seventy use.

*παιδείας*. The Hebrew here is מִדְּבָר. Its sense is  
 clearly indicated by its employment in Prov. 22 : 15,  
 where מִדְּבַר מִדְּבָר is ‘the rod of correction,’ and in Prov.  
 23 : 13, ‘Withhold not correction from a child’ (מִדְּבָר).  
 We must therefore give to *παιδείας* here, the transla-  
 tion ‘correction,’ ‘chastisement;’ a sense which it does  
 not bear in classic Greek.

V. 6. *παιδεύει* will of course receive here the  
 same meaning with its kindred noun above.

*μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱόν, κ.τ.λ.* The Hebrew here  
 is, וְכַאֲב אֶת־בֶּן יִרְצֶה, ‘and as a father the son (whom)  
 he loveth.’ It would seem as though the Septuagint,  
 whom the writer here follows, had derived the word  
*μαστιγοῖ* by attributing to it a different pointing, from the  
 verb כָּאָב (in the Hiphil meaning ‘to cause pain’), in-  
 stead of the noun אָב. But they give the sense of the  
 original with substantial accuracy.

V. 7. *Εἰ παιδείαν*. Some respectable manuscripts, and the Syriac, Vulgate, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions read *εἰς* here in place of *εἰ*. The general scope remains the same, whichever of these readings is adopted. If we read *εἰς παιδείαν*, the verb *ὑπομένετε* is imperative and intransitive, and we have the sense, ‘Be patient to the correction; God dealeth with you as children.’ (Of this sense in *ὑπομένω* we have an example, Matt. 10: 22, *ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος*.) But if we read *εἰ*, we obtain the rendering given in the English version: “If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons.” The latter is most probably correct; for the correlative expression at the beginning of v. 8, *Εἰ δὲ χωρὶς, κ.τ.λ.* requires it.

- 
- 9 *Εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας εἶχομεν παιδευτάς, καὶ ἐνετροπέμεθα· οὐ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, καὶ*  
 10 *ζήσομεν; Οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς, ἐπαίδευσαν· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ.*  
 11 *Πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρημικὸν τοῖς δι’ αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσι δικαιοσύνης.*

V. 9. *τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας . . . τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων*. It is very manifest that these expressions indicate our human parents and God. They are evidently antithetic, and the interpretation

of the one must influence that of the other. *ἡμῶν*, however, is not necessarily to be understood in the second. The fact of its omission is an argument against supplying it, if the sense is good and natural without it. If, with many interpreters, we understand the second phrase to designate God as '*the Creator of souls*,' then the first must mean, 'the fathers of our bodies.' This antithesis, besides that it does not so well suit the context, would rather require *σωμάτων* for *σαρκός* in the first member. But if that first member means, as the best commentators agree, 'our natural (earthly) fathers,' flesh and blood, frail and corrupt like ourselves, then the latter, *τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων*, designates God as the exalted 'Father of spirits,' i. e. a spirit (not flesh) above all others, and a father to our parents and us alike. (This view of the sense is illustrated and confirmed by Rom. 9:8, *οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα*.) This makes an easy antithesis; or, we may supply *ἡμῶν*, as many do, and then interpret 'the Father of *our* spirits,' with reference to our regeneration and adoption, whence we are called, in John 1:12, *τέκνα θεοῦ*. But the former view is preferable.

The passage then, rightly interpreted, furnishes no proof against 'the propagation of souls' (ex traduce), none in favour of the creation of them. It only designates the exalted Father of spirits, in contradistinction to our earthly parents as weak and liable to err. The advocates of the theory of the immediate creation of



souls, in opposing their propagation, cite Numb. 16: 22, 27:16, "O God (the Lord) the God of the spirits of all flesh." Zech. 12: 1, "The Lord which stretcheth forth the heavens, &c. and formeth the spirit of man within him." Is. 57:16, "I will not contend, &c. for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Eccl. 12:7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." But let it be remembered that the soul was more honourable in its creation than the body, and is so in its nature, as the sentient, moral, immortal principle in man. It is therefore often taken for the whole man, as in Is. 57:16. So the heart is sometimes taken. Compare Ps. 33:15, "He fashioneth their hearts alike" (Heb. יִהְיֶה. Rosenmüller observes, 'pariter, nullo excepto'). The original creation of the soul is furthermore often included in enumerations of the mighty works of God, designed to heighten our ideas of his majesty, and introductory to some solemn communication. Thus the passage cited from Zech. 12:1 is to be explained. Compare with it Ps. 94:9, "He that planted the ear, shall not he hear? He that formed the eye, shall not he see?" &c. Is. 42:5, "Thus saith God the Lord, He that created the heavens . . . He that spread forth the earth . . . He that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein," &c. And since the same divine power which created, is ever active to preserve being, and keep natural laws in force, we see such passages as those from Numb. 16:22, 27:16. (Zech.

12:1 is more probably a historic present.) In Jer. 32:27 God says, "Behold, I am the Lord, the God of all *flesh*; is any thing too hard for me?" &c. 1:5, "Before I *formed thee in the belly* I knew thee." As to Eccl. 12:7, the terms plainly refer to the original creation; and if the passage teaches that every spirit is directly from God, it equally teaches that every body is taken directly from the ground. Gen. 2:1, 2 hardly proves any thing against the theory of creation. The genus man, like others, was then made, and the law of reproductive succession established: what that law is, is the question. Of more weight is Gen. 5:3, Adam 'begat (a son) in his own likeness after his image.' This image can hardly be confined to the physical man, but must embrace the mental and moral. But moral corruption can be affirmed only of the soul. Those who wish to pursue this subject farther, are referred to Turretin. Instit. Theolog. Elenck Vol. I. Locus Quintus, Quæst. XIII. Virginia Literary and Evang. Magazine, Vol. IV. pp. 285-292.

*καὶ ζήσομεν*; Here *καὶ* connects a consequence: 'Shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits *so as to live?*' See Winer's Id. New Test. §57. 2. (c), p. 343.

V. 10. *κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν*, 'According to their judging.' It is implied that this was with imperfection, sometimes with passion and injustice.

V. 11. *Πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία . . . οὐ δοκεῖ*. This is a Hebraism for *οὐδεμία παιδεία δοκεῖ*. *οὐ πᾶσα, κ.τ.λ.*

would signify a different thing: 'Not every correction seemeth joyful;' implying that some corrections did.

*καρπὸν εἰρημικόν.* We may with equal propriety render this phrase, 'healthful,' 'salutary fruit,' or 'happy,' 'blessed.' The phrase is eminently appropriate, for afflictions are agitating and affect the soul as a storm; while their sanctified results are marked by a calm and sweetness in pleasing contrast with the confusion.

*καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης.* This may be explained as a genitive of apposition, or of explication. In the one case, the peaceable fruit is righteousness; in the other, it is of an upright character. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §48. 2, p. 284.

## CHAPTER XII. 12—29.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle takes occasion, from the considerations just advanced, to encourage his readers in their Christian life, vv. 12, 13, adding several appropriate exhortations and cautions, vv. 14–17. He still has in view the confirmation of his readers, and enforces (*γὰρ*) his exhortations by an animated and sublime contrast of the awful terrors of the old dispensation on the one hand, betokening its own insufficiency to clothe in garments of grace the God of justice, vv. 18–21; and on the other, the glorious and merciful character of the new, uniting in one family believers on earth to the angels and saints in heaven, to a reconciled God and to Jesus, whose mediation and atoning blood secured this wonderful triumph of grace, vv. 22–24. He again exhorts them not to reject Christ, admonishing them of the far greater destruction which awaited those who did so, than overtook those who refused to hear Moses of old; and reminding them that He whose voice caused the earth to tremble at the setting up of the old dispensation, would, according to the prophet, set up another, better and enduring forever, as intimated by the terms and imagery of the prediction, vv. 25–27. He concludes by calling upon

them therefore again, as they lived under such a dispensation, to have grace by which to serve God acceptably; for God was still, to his enemies, a consuming fire, vv. 28, 29.

## COMMENTARY.

- 12 Διὸ τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα  
 13 γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε· καὶ τροχιάς ὀρθὰς ποιή-  
 σατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ χολὸν ἐκτραπῆ,  
 14 ἰαθῆ δὲ μάλλον. Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων,  
 καὶ τὸν ἀγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύ-  
 15 ριον· ἐπισκοποῦντες, μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χά-  
 ριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μὴ τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα  
 16 ἐνοχλῆ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης μιανθῶσι πολλοί· μὴ τις  
 πόρνος, ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἡσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς  
 17 ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ· ἴστε γάρ, ὅτι  
 καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομησαὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν,  
 ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὔρε,  
 καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

V. 12. ἀνορθώσατε. The literal meaning of this verb is ‘straighten up.’ The English version renders it “lift up;” a sense which applies better to its first object, ‘hands,’ than its second, ‘knees.’ The words of the Apostle seem to contain an evident allusion to Is. 35: 3, “Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees,” of which the Hebrew is יָדַי וְרַגְלַי כְּיָדַי וְכַרְגְּלַי וְרַגְלַי וְיָדַי וְכַרְגְּלַי וְרַגְלַי, and the Septuagint version, ἰσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνείμεναι, καὶ γονατὰ παραλελυμένα. The Septuagint also use ἀνορθώω for כִּי and for קָמָה. Its meaning here is, ‘to strengthen,’ ‘confirm.’ The sense of God’s favour sustains us when sinking under discouragements and trials. Διὸ, ‘therefore’ (viz. be-

cause those trials yield afterwards the peaceable fruit of righteousness), 'strengthen the relaxed hands and the paralyzed knees.' The toils of the palæstra are still in view.

V. 13. *τροχιὰς ὀρθάς.* This expressive figure may have been borrowed from Prov. 4 : 26, &c., *ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποιεῖ σοῖς πόσι . . . τὰς ὁδοὺς κατεύθυνε· μὴ ἐκκλινῆς εἰς τὰ δεξιά μηδὲ εἰς τὰ ἀριστετέρα, ἀπόστροφον δὲ σὸν πόδα ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ κακῆς.* Calvin remarks on these words of our Epistle, "Nunc secundum adjungit, nempe ut prudenter ambulemus, ac teneamus rectum cursum." The Apostle's meaning evidently is, 'Pursue the path of duty without swerving through fear, love of ease, worldly gain, or any other cause.'

*χολόν.* The sense of the Apostle is manifestly, from the context, this: 'Lest the maimed member (whether knee or any other) be turned aside from that straight road of duty; and thus, becoming entangled in inextricable difficulties in devious paths, become hopelessly crippled. On the contrary, the effort should be to secure its restoration by diligently following the healthful road of rectitude.' Stripped of the figure, this teaches that the spiritual weakness which yields to trial is increased into a hopeless impotence by so yielding, but is healed by a hearty and manful resistance to temptation. The form of the expression in 1 Kings 18 : 21 may illustrate the Apostle's language here: "How long *halt ye* between two opinions?" This the Septuagint have rendered, *ἕως πότε ὑμεῖς χολανεῖτε ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς ἰγνύαις*: appa-

rently mistaking **אֲרְבַּעַיִם** for 'limbs' instead of 'partes,' 'alternatives.'

*ἐκτραπῆ*. Some translate this 'be strained, dislocated,' but without the authority of usage, and without necessity. The spiritually halting 'turn aside' when others make for them rough and crooked ways; the fearless and faithful course of others confirms and saves them.

V. 14. *καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν*. This word every where in the New Test. signifies 'sanctification,' 'holiness.' In 1 Cor 1:30 it is used by metonymy for the *author* of sanctification.

V. 15. *ὑστερῶν*. To this clause, *τις ὑστερῶν*, as well as the two similar following ones, *μὴ τις ῥίψα* and *μὴ τις πόρνος*, the substantive verb *ἦ* must be supplied. It should be rendered, 'lest any one fail of,' 'come short of;' a sense which was seen in 4:1 above. Some render it to 'fail from,' 'apostatize from.' But this is 'a rare and doubtful sense of the word, of which no instance occurs in the New Test. although one is found in the Septuagint, Ecclus. 7:34, *μὴ ὑστερεῖ ἀπὸ κλαιόντων, καὶ μετὰ πενθοῦντων πένθησον*, "Desert not those that weep," &c.

*ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος, κ.τ.λ.* Some understand by this, 'the Christian religion or dispensation.' If the sense of 'deserting' were given to *ὑστερῶν*, this meaning would be intelligible; but we would scarcely speak of one's coming short of the Christian dispensation, in such a connexion as this. It is better to understand by it 'the grace of God,' sanctifying and saving the



soul. Of attaining unto, or coming short of, that grace, one would naturally speak.

*τις ῥίζα πικρίας.* This phrase seems to be intended to describe generally 'any evil-doer,' and worker of mischief. But there is a manifest allusion to Deut. 29:17, פֶּן יֵשׁ בְּכֶם שֶׁרֶשׁ פְּרָה רָשָׁע וְלִצְנֵה; Septuagint 29:18, *μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χόλῃ καὶ πικρίᾳ.* These words most probably describe the idolaters just spoken of; and therefore the Apostle may here principally mean men who, destitute of the grace of God, apostatize from the faith, and corrupt others.

*ἐνοχλῆ.* Some critics conjecture, against the authority of the manuscripts and versions, that this should be read *ἐν χόλῃ.* The original and the Sept. version just quoted may be compared. But even in this quotation seven manuscripts of the Septuagint, including the Alexandrine, read *ἐνοχλῆ* instead of *ἐν χόλῃ.* But the Apostle does not quote the Septuagint, and therefore its reading does not determine ours here. There need be no reluctance to admit *ἐνοχλῆ* as a verb, signifying 'to involve in tumult,' 'to trouble,' for though it does not occur elsewhere in the New Test. there is both Septuagint and classic usage for it.

V. 16. *πόρνος.* Many understand by this word, the spiritual fornication of idolatry, regarding it as an imitation of the Hebrew usage. While that figurative sense is indisputable in the Hebrew (consult Gesen. Heb. Lex. art. פְּזִי), the words *πόρνος*, *πόρνη*, nowhere have this sense in the New Test. In Revelation, after the manner of the prophets, *πόρνη* and *πορνεία* are so

used. Other interpreters render *πόρνος* here more generally, but still figuratively, ‘profligates,’ ‘wicked sensualists.’ For this sense there seems to be some countenance in the use of *Μοχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες*, in James 4:4, and less in *Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς*, in Matt. 12:39, 16:4, Mark 8:38. But there seems to be no objection to understanding it literally, as it must be undoubtedly understood in 13:4 below. There is every reason to suppose, from Gen. 26:34, 35, and 28:8, 9, that this, as well as profane unbelief, was among the sins of Esau; or else, there is no valid objection to reading the passage, *μὴ τις πόρνος, ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἡσαῦ*, so as to make the words *ὡς Ἡσαῦ* attributive only to the latter.

*βέβηλος* is opposed in the Sept. to *ἅγιος* for the Hebrew *קֹדֶשׁ*. Here, as the context defines, it signifies a profane person who lightly esteems sacred things, and prefers earthly to spiritual blessings. Esau’s sin is detailed in the well-known narrative of Gen. 25:32–34.

*βρώσεως*. This word means literally, the ‘act of eating,’ and thence, ‘a meal.’ Thus, in Gen. 25:34, we read that Esau, for a single meal of bread and pottage, exchanged his birthright. A little delay and patience might have satisfied his hunger innocently at his mother’s tent; so that, however keen it might have been, his impatient act indicated an exceedingly contemptuous estimate of these privileges.

V. 17. *μετανοίας τόπον*. This passage has been supposed to involve peculiar difficulty, because it seems,

at the first glance, to contradict all the precious promises of certain pardon to the true penitent, by presenting one case in which such repentance was rejected. The difficulty is increased, it is supposed, by the employment of *μετανοίας*, the word which uniformly means 'true, saving repentance' in the New Test.; and not *μεταμέλειας*, the common word for 'carnal regret.' Many and the best modern commentators take *μετανοίας* here in the primitive and classic sense of 'a change of mind,' and suppose the words to apply to Isaac. It was Isaac's change of mind (as to the blessing) for which Esau could find no place. This view is strongly favoured by the history of the case. These commentators understand *αὐτήν* as referring to *μετανοίας*: compare Gen. 27: 30–40, and especially vv. 33–38. It is there seen that, in fact, the thing sought by Esau with tears was a change of purpose in Isaac, as to the patriarchal blessing pronounced on Jacob. The Apostle refers to the fact as notorious, *Ἰστέ γάρ*. But there is nowhere any indication that Esau sought to repair the *sin* of his own contemptuous and impious act by evangelical repentance. Other commentators, among whom is Calvin, refer *μετανοίας τόπον* to Esau, and *αὐτήν* to *εὐλογία*; a view which avoids the difficulty stated in the outset; for Esau is not represented as seeking a true repentance and being rejected, but only as seeking a selfish advantage; and it is implied that the reason he found no place for repentance was, that he did not truly seek it. But both these interpretations take *μετανοίας* out of the

sense which, we believe, both it and the verb *μετανοέω* every where sustain in the New Test. even in Luke 17: 3, 4, viz. 'true repentance unto life.' But it does not seem to us impossible to give this sense to *μετανοίας*, whether we adopt the interpretation first mentioned, or that of Calvin. If we refer *μετανοίας* to Isaac, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Apostle used it in its New Test. sense; for Isaac being a true man of God, the only condition on which he would reverse his action in the matter would be such an apprehension of his error, as would be accompanied with some degree of godly sorrow in his pious mind. But that could not be; because Isaac felt that he had done right (Gen. 27: 33), being guided by inspiration. But if we refer *μετανοίας* to Esau, in the sense of true repentance, it would not teach that Esau truly repented of his error. It would only state that he found repentance was too late, and therefore had no place, or was of no avail. So do they, who say too late, "Lord, Lord, open unto us." Compare Hebr. 6: 4-6. The modern interpretation is preferable.

- 
- 18 Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει, καὶ  
 κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ, καὶ γνώφῳ καὶ σκοτίῳ καὶ θυέ-  
 19 λῃ, καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ καὶ φωνῇ ἡμιμάτων, ἧς οἱ  
 ἀκούσαντες παρητήσαντο, μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς  
 20 λόγον· (οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον "κἄν  
 θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους, λιθοβοληθήσεται" [ἢ βο-



V. 20. The words *ἡ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται* are wanting in nearly all the manuscripts, and in all those of best authority, as well as in most of the old versions and early editions. They are consequently expunged by all the critical editors. They seem to have been introduced in imitation of Exod. 19: 13.

V. 21. *Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἔκφοβός εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.* In the history in Exod. ch. 19, it is not explicitly stated that Moses uttered these words, or that he trembled. In 19: 19 it is said, "Moses spake," and his words are not recorded; and as it was just at this juncture that the people were all trembling at the displays of divine majesty, it is every way probable that these were the words he uttered. But be this as it may, 'all the people in the camp trembled;' it is natural that Moses should, and the Apostle asserts, as his readers believed, that he did. There is no ground to suppose the contrary. In Deut. 9: 19 we find him expressing a similar fear of the divine wrath, on the occasion of Israel's sin with the calf.

V. 22. *Σιών ὄρει.* This is the spiritual Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, where God is king of grace. We understand this spiritual Zion, in this place, to signify heaven, the abode of Christ and the redeemed, as well as in the various passages, Hebr. 11: 10, 14—16, 13: 14, Gal. 4: 24 to end, Rev. 3: 12, 21: 2, 10, where 'a city that hath foundations,' 'a continuing city,' 'Jerusalem which is above,' 'new Jerusalem,' 'holy Jerusalem,' is spoken of. But in what sense have we, believers on earth, come to this city of

the living God as yet? The new dispensation, often called a kingdom, either of God, of heaven, or of Christ, is here viewed as extending through time into eternity, and embracing saints on earth and angels and saints in heaven, in one common family, under one common head. (See v. 28 below, and the Lexicons of the New Test. on the word βασιλεία.) Becoming members of Christ's church, we are united to that blessed family whose home and seat are in heaven. The old dispensation is represented throughout the Epistle as having no such efficacy. This is a part of that inferiority asserted of it in 11:40.

V. 23. *πανηγύρει*. Almost all interpreters put this word in apposition with *μυριάσιν*, and in regimen with *ἀγγέλων*. This is strongly favoured by the regular structure of the sentence. This is the word employed in the Septuagint for *מִלְרֵב* and *הַרְבֵּה*. It is supposed to be derived from *παῖς* and *ἀγορά*, Æol. *ἀγυρίς*. *πρωτοτόκων*. This is most probably a figurative designation of ancient and eminent saints, patriarchs, prophets, and possibly apostles. While they seem to be included in *πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων*, they are also distinguished from them as more excellent.

*ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. The meaning of the participle is clear from its use in Luke 2:1, 3, 5, as being of 'those enrolled,' 'written in a list.' The origin of the phrase is perhaps to be sought in Ps. 69:28, "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous," *סִפְרֵי הַיְיִם*. Similar expressions may be found in Luke 10:20, Phil.

4:3, Rev. 3:5, 13:8. They evidently signify those who are recognized by God as among his redeemed ones.

*καὶ κριτῆ θεῶ πάντων.* Some place a comma after *κριτῆ*, construing *πάντων* with *θεῶ*; but the sense is harder, and the structure of the sentence does not require it.

V. 24. *κρείττονα.* Most manuscripts, versions, early editions, and some Fathers, read *κρείττονον*, which is consequently preferred by many critics. The difference in sense is unimportant, merely changing the plural for the singular.

*τὸν Ἄβελ.* A few authorities give *τὸ Ἄβελ*, a reading which would require us to supply *αἷμα*. But the correction is not sufficiently authorized. Literally, the passage means, 'the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things *than Abel*.' It seems somewhat doubtful whether Abel is to be understood as speaking by the blood of the victims which he offered, or by his own. Most commentators understand the latter, and suppose a reference to Gen. 4:10. According to their view, the Apostle contrasts the blood of Christ which procures pardon, with that of Abel which cried from the ground for vengeance. Some degree of support is given to this interpretation by the expression *λαλοῦντι*, which would be very naturally explained as an allusion to the words 'crieth from the ground,' applied to Abel's blood in Gen. 4:10, but would seem more constrained when applied to the truth represented by his bloody sacrifices. But in favour of the former interpretation is the whole scope of the Epistle, which is a



great contrast between the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and mediation, and that of the animal sacrifices of times before Christ. Let the reader recall such passages as 9:13, 14, 10:1-10, and 11:4, above. The scope of the passage in which this sentence occurs argues the same; for it obviously compares the two dispensations, the sacrifice and dispensation of Christ, with the typical ones that preceded it, and not with the guilty bloodshed of a murder. And finally, when the Apostle has so distinctly referred in 11:4 to Abel's *sacrifices*, it is far most natural to understand an allusion here to what was said of him there. There is, indeed, no other plausible way to account for the introduction of his name just here. Abel's bloody offering of animals, the first distinctly stated instance of a typical sacrifice in sacred history, is mentioned in 11:4, and alluded to here, as the general representative of all such sacrifices offered by believers from Abel to Christ. The meaning of the sentence, then, is this: New Test. believers have come to a blood that declares better results than the typical blood of Old Test. sacrifices. Christ's blood declares a complete redemption; the latter only foreshadowed it as future. Christ's takes away all guilt; the latter only made the comers thereunto ceremonially clean.

---

25 Βλέπετε, μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔφυγον, τὸν ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ

26 τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι. Οὗ ἡ φωνὴ  
 τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε· νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται, λέ-  
 γων· “ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ  
 27 καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν.” Τὸ δὲ “ἔτι ἅπαξ” δηλοῖ τῶν  
 σαλευομένων τὴν μετάρθεσιν, ὡς πεπονημένων, ἵνα  
 28 μείνη τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. Διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσά-  
 λευτον παραλαμβάνοντες, ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς  
 λατρεύομεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ  
 29 εὐλαβείας. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ κατανα-  
 λίσκων.

V. 25. τὸν λαλοῦντα. This is Christ, as the im-  
 mediate context both before and after shows, though  
 many interpreters make it God the Father. The con-  
 trast is evidently between Moses and Christ, the two  
*internuntii*, *χορηματίζοντας*, of the two dispensations.  
 Thus in v. 24, ‘we have come to *διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη*,  
 ‘*Ἰησοῦ*,’ whose blood speaks, or rather, who speaks by  
 his blood. It is Moses who is upon and of the earth  
 (τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς *χορηματίζοντα*); Christ is from heaven,  
 and divine, and speaks from heaven (τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν).  
 Our version does not well express the precise antithe-  
 sis of the original. See the contrast between the di-  
 vine prophet and earthly ones stated in John 3:31.

V. 26. Ὁ ἡ φωνή. The interpretation which we  
 have given of the preceding verse requires us to refer  
 ὅς to Christ, τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν.

τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται, κ.τ.λ. There seems to be  
 here a reference to Haggai 2:6. The Sept. well ren-  
 der it, ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὴν γῆν,  
 καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν, κ.τ.λ. By τότε, the

author refers to the setting up of the old dispensation through the ministry of Moses. The shaking of the earth caused by the divine voice was undoubtedly that recorded in Exod. 19:18, "and the whole mount quaked greatly." We learn, thus, that the second person of the Trinity, the Angel of the covenant, was the agent in this awful revelation of the law. The Apostle, by using the perfect tense, *νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται*, applies this prophecy of Haggai to the setting up of the new dispensation; and so the whole context from which it is quoted shows it was meant. Haggai 2:7, "The desire of all nations shall come." V. 9, "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts, and in this place will I give peace." The Apostle quotes the sense, not the terms literally, so arranging words and adding *οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλά*, as to point out distinctly the *greater shaking* predicted.

V. 27. *Τὸ δέ, ἔτι ἅπαξ, κ.τ.λ.* He now proceeds to interpret the prophecy: "The expression, 'yet once again,' &c. (these words standing for the whole sentence of which they are the beginning), signifies the change of the things shaken," &c. The Apostle understands the imagery as borrowed from the circumstances which attended the setting up of the first dispensation. As the Saviour then shook the sacred mountain Sinai literally, so He would figuratively shake or convulse the religious and civil state of the whole world, in setting up the new dispensation. The fact that He would come 'once again' to set up

another, was, from the nature of the case, an indication of the abrogation of the first. The *amplification* in the terms describing his second coming, shows that a greater dispensation was intended. That He comes *but once* more, indicates that this greater dispensation is the last, and will endure (ἵνα μείνη τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα) till the consummation of all earthly things.

τῶν σαλευομένων. These words, on our interpretation, must be restricted to the institutions of the old dispensation, which are opposed to τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα, the permanent institutions of the new.

ὡς πεποιημένων. But were the Mosaic institutions 'made,' 'created,' in any sense in which those of the New Test. were not? There are three interpretations allowable, either one of which explains this phrase consistently with our view. We may take it as synonymous with χειροποίητα, in the sense of 'caduca,' 'evanescent' (because, usually, what man makes perishes like him). And this is confirmed by Hebr. 8:2, 9:11, 23, 24, where the "σκηνὴ ἀληθινή, which the Lord pitched and not man," οὐ χειροποίητος (the οὐ χειροποίητα ἄγια), are contrasted with the earthly one of human construction, and the heavenly antitypes with shadows. Or we may understand our author as saying that the prophecy indicates a change of the Mosaic institutions similar to the passing away of created things; thus not construing πεποιημένων with τῶν σαλευομένων, but comparing with the final catastrophe. Or we may construe μείνη actively, and remove the comma before it, so as to read thus: 'as

made in order to await those (institutions) that are not shaken.' Compare 9:9, 10 above, "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second."

V. 28. βασιλείαν. This 'kingdom' is evidently the dispensation of Christ. This is the sense given by the best New Test. Lexicons, to the phrase βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, οὐρανῶν, and its propriety here is indicated by the adjective ἀσάλευτον, and the whole context. If our interpretation of the two preceding verses was correct, that thing contrasted with the evanescent Mosaic institutions, that thing which 'is not to be moved,' must be the New Test. dispensation. The encouraging exhortation introduced by Διὸ undoubtedly proceeds upon all the facts stated from v. 22 onward. The sum of these is, that the believer now approaches, unites himself to, the Church of the new dispensation, with its divine Mediator, and its universal membership of saints on earth and in heaven. *This* then is the *kingdom*, the reception of which is the ground of the encouragement.

ἔχωμεν χάριν. This phrase, when accompanied with the dative of the person, is often used like the Latin *habere gratias*, in the sense of 'giving thanks to' any one. This is its sense, for instance, in 1 Tim. 1:12, χάριν ἔχω τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με Χριστῷ, and in Luke 17:9, 2 Tim. 1:3. But here the dative is wanting, and the context demands that we shall give it its literal sense, 'Let us have grace.' Examples are not wanting to authorize this. See 2 Cor. 1:15, and especially Acts 2:47, Hebr. 4:16.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### ANALYSIS.

THE Apostle urges various practical exhortations, vv. 1-19, concluding with a prayer for the perfection of his readers, and a doxology, vv. 20, 21. He then entreats a favourable reception for his Epistle, promises conditionally a visit, sends salutations, and closes with the usual benediction, vv. 22-25.

Some of the exhortations have a very intimate connexion with the object of the Epistle. So vv. 7-15. Compare also the prayer and doxology.

## COMMENTARY.

XIII. 1, 2 Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω. Τῆς φιλοξενίας  
 μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες  
 3 ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους. Μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων,  
 ὡς συνδεδεμένοι· τῶν κακουχομένων, ὡς καὶ αὐ-  
 4 τοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. Τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ  
 ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνοις δὲ καὶ μοιχοῦς κρινεῖ ὁ  
 5 θεός. Ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος· ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς  
 παροῦσιν. Αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶρηκεν· “Οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ,  
 6 οὐδ’ οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω”· ὥστε θαυροῦντας  
 ἡμᾶς λέγειν “Κύριος ἐμοὶ βοηθός, καὶ οὐ φοβη-  
 θήσομαι· τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος;”

V. 2. *ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους.* The allusion here is doubtless to Gen 18:2, &c. and 19:1, where Abraham and Lot were rewarded by the presence of heavenly visitors for their pious hospitality, given, as they at first supposed, to wayfarers. Are Christians to expect a similar honour now, for their practice of hospitality? By no means; but we have a true motive for the duty in the fact that God did once honour it in so glorious a way.

V. 3. *ὡς συνδεδεμένοι.* This is a forcible description of sympathy. We are to feel the pains of those who are bound for Christ, as though we shared their bonds. We are to place ourselves, by a lively sympathy, in their condition.

ὥς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. We must remember that, being still mortal, we are liable to every hardship our brethren suffer. It is natural that our sympathy should be made more lively by our sense of exposure to the same ills.

V. 4. *Τίμιος ὁ γάμος.* Some supply here *ἔστι*, as our English version; and some, as the Popish expositors, who wish to evade the evidence against their doctrine of celibacy, understand *ἔστω*. The fact that the previous and subsequent sentences are exhortations, in the imperative mode, favours the latter; but the succeeding clause (*χοινεῖ*) favours the former. Calvin well says, “Ego vero potius sentio, Apostolum hic conjugium scortationi, tanquam remedium morbo, opponere:” ‘Fornicators and adulterers God will judge; but there is no excuse for these crimes, for He hath allowed to all men an honourable, lawful enjoyment of marriage.’ But if the clause be read as a command, ‘let marriage be honourable (chaste) in all,’ it is in truth equally unfavourable to him who asserts the superior sanctity of celibacy. For it is still implied that marriage may be honourable in all; and there is no reason for affixing a limitation to the adjective ‘all,’ contrary to the scope of the passage, and the general strain of the Scriptures. Calvin: “Quum dicit *in omnibus*, intelligo nullum esse ordinem qui a conjugio prohibeatur.” We have no need to depend on this place alone. In 1 Tim. 4:3 it is expressly said that one of the errors of the great apostacy would be ‘forbidding to marry.’



V. 5. *Αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶρηκεν.* He (God) hath said. The same quotation is made by Philo as a *λόγιον τοῦ θεοῦ*. The words do not exactly occur in the Old Test. but seem to be taken from such passages as Deut. 31 : 6, "He will not fail thee nor forsake thee;" Josh. 1 : 5, 1 Chron. 28 : 20, Ps. 37 : 25, 28, Isaiah 41 : 10, &c. Notice the similarity of the Apostle's reasoning here with that of our Saviour, Matt. 6 : 31-33.

V. 6. *τί.* The whole of this verse is an exact quotation of the Sept. rendering for Ps. 118 : 6 (in the Sept. Ps. 117 : 6). It may be read so as to make the pronoun either interrogative or indefinite (either *τί* or *τι*), and the same is true of the original of the Psalm; although the Masorets have pointed it interrogatively: 'I will not fear what man shall do unto me;' or, 'I will not fear; what will man do unto me?' Compare Rom. 8 : 31, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

---

7 *Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ· ὧν ἀναθροῦντες τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν.*  
 8 *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.* *Διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε· καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.*

V. 7. *τῶν ἡγουμένων.* This means 'spiritual leaders,' here 'teachers,' in v. 17 below 'rulers,' and in v.

24, both. Here dead teachers are intended; as appears from the word *Μνημονεύετε*, from the past tense of *ἐλάλησαν*, and especially from the following part of the sentence. Calvin well remarks on the remainder of the chapter, “Quæ sequuntur non tam ad mores quam ad doctrinam pertinent.”

*ἔκβασιν* means literally ‘a going out,’ then ‘exit,’ ‘death.’ Or else, we may understand it as ‘issue,’ ‘result,’ i. e. in glory. It only occurs in the New Test. here and in 1 Cor. 10:13. God “will with the temptation also make *a way to escape*” (*ἔκβασιν*). The meaning first mentioned is best; and the reference seems to be to those holy preachers of the gospel, like Stephen and James, Acts 7:59, 60, 12:1, who died for Christ: ‘Remember them and consider their deaths, in order to imitate their steadfastness in the faith.’ *ἀναστροφῆς* occurs in 1 Pet. 1:15, where it is correctly rendered, as here, ‘conversation,’ ‘course of living.’

V. 8. *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, κ.τ.λ.* Here *ἔστι* is to be supplied. The English version would seem to regard these words as in apposition with *ἔκβασιν*, making Christ “the end of their conversation.” This is not a possible construction, both because the words are in different cases, and because *ἔκβασις* cannot be rendered ‘end,’ in the sense of ‘object or aim.’ The verse is an independent proposition, plainly asserting the eternity and immutability of Christ. Compare Hebr. 1:12, Ps. 102:28, ‘Thou art the same.’ The verse seems to sustain a logical relationship to v. 7 and v. 9; furnish-

ing at once a reason for imitating the faith of those who, in previous generations, trusted in Him, and for future stability in doctrine.

V. 9. *Διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις.* Doctrines ‘many and diverse among themselves, and foreign to the Christian system,’ are here intended.

*περιφέρεσθε*, ‘Be not carried about.’ A better sustained reading is *παραφέρεσθε*, ‘be not carried aside.’ In its favour are manuscripts A, B, C, D, and many others, the Syriac, Coptic, and Vulgate versions, and some Fathers.

*καλὸν γάρ*, ‘It is good.’ So the word is rendered, and properly, in 1 Cor. 7:1, 26, 9:15. It is opposed here to *οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν*. The sentiment is, ‘It is good (profitable) to be confirmed in the grace of the new dispensation, and unprofitable to be entangled again with the meats and drinks of the old.’ *χάριτι* is opposed to *βρώμασιν*, which are among the *διδαχαῖς ξέναῖς*.

- 
- 10 Ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν  
 11 ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκιρῆσει λατρεύοντες. Ὡν γὰρ εἰσφέ-  
 ρεται ζώων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια  
 διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαί-  
 12 ται ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς· διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα  
 ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς  
 13 πύλης ἔπαυε. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν  
 ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέρον-  
 14 τες, (οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὥδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ

15 τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν·) δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν ἀνέσεως διαπαντός τῷ θεῷ, τοῦτ' ἔστι, καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

V. 10. *θυσιαστήριον*. Most commentators call this a metonymy for *θυσίαν*, but incorrectly, as may be proved from the succeeding words ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν. οὗ obviously refers to *θυσιαστήριον*, and if this meant 'victim,' and in conformity with that meaning the following words meant 'to eat of the victim,' the preposition would not be used; because such a verb as *φαγεῖν* would govern the genitive in this sense without a preposition. See Winer's *Id. New Test.* §30. 5, p. 160. The meaning is, 'We have an altar' (as well as the Jews), in a figurative sense, of course; viz. that on which Christ offered up himself a true and efficacious sacrifice. This verse, then, is explicative or confirmatory of the preceding: 'It is better to participate in Christian grace, than meats of Jewish sacrifices. Our exclusion from the latter is no evil in comparison to that exclusion from the former (the results and purchase of the divine sacrifice) which Jews bring upon themselves by their Jewish exclusiveness. For the adherents of the old ritual have no interest in the benefits of the new dispensation. This having been set up, that is abolished and dead.'

V. 11. Ὡν γάρ, κ.τ.λ. This verse and the following give the reason of vv. 9, 10. The former sacrifices were mere types: agreeably to their import (*Διὸ, v.*

12), Christ had made the true expiation for sin by his blood without the gate. The Levitical regulations here indicated, may be read in Levit. 4:12, 21, 6:30, 16:27. The bodies of the animals to which sin was typically imputed were ceremonially polluted, and were therefore destroyed in an unclean place without the camp. Golgotha was a polluted place without the circuit of the city walls, and thither the Jews led Christ for crucifixion as an unclean person.

V. 13. *τοῖνον*. The Apostle designedly gave prominence to this fact set forth in the type, that Christ suffered without the gate, to prepare the way for his exhortation: 'If Christ our Lord was willing to die for us this shameful death, at a polluted place, excluded as an unclean thing from the city; surely we should be willing to follow him in that exclusion (*ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς*), and to bear his reproach.'

*τὸν ὀνειδισμόν αὐτοῦ*. Compare the same words in 11:26 above. The words may mean, 'whatever reproach His service may bring upon us,' or more probably, according to Winer (*Id. New Test.* §30. 2. (b), note, p. 153), 'the reproach which He suffered,' i. e. the same kind of reproach. The practical truth here stated may be well illustrated by Matt. 10:38, 16:24, *Καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος*.

V. 15. *Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν*. The conjunction refers to the scope of the whole passage from v. 9 to 14. The sacrifice of praise and profession of service and fidelity,

the only offering under the New Test. after Christ's perfect sacrifice, is to be offered through His mediation. All that has been said of the value of an interest in His sacrifice, and of His condescension and love in making it, should prompt us to this thank-offering: 'Let us *therefore* offer to God perpetually the sacrifice of praise through Him, that is, the fruit of lips that confess to (make a thankful and honourable avowal of) His name.'

- 
- 16 Τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε·  
 17 τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός. Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑπέκχετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες· ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες· ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο.  
 18 Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν· πεποιθάμεν γάρ, ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες  
 19 ἀναστρέφεσθαι· περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν.

V. 17. *τοῖς ἡγουμένοις.* With the general sense of 'spiritual leaders,' this phrase means here, 'Church rulers.'

*αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν . . . ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσι . . . ἀλυσιτελὲς γάρ.* The logical dependence of these clauses is variously exhibited by different interpreters. It is simplest and best to understand all that follows the injunction as reason for it: 'Obey your spiritual rulers, *for* they watch over your souls, &c.

(Again, obey your spiritual rulers) *in order that they may give their account of you with joy, and not groaning; (and obey your spiritual rulers) for such a sorrowful reckoning for your souls were unprofitable for you.*'

V. 19. ἀποκατασταθῶ. The verb does not determine the cause of the detention, whether imprisonment, sickness, &c.; for its usage would allow of either of them. It is most reasonable to suppose that the cause was the first, and that this Epistle was written by Paul from his captivity in Rome. The words of v. 22 favour this; for they seem to imply that the author was then at the same place with Timothy. And the subsequent words, "They of Italy salute you," show that place was somewhere in Italy, most probably in Rome, where Christianity first and most prevailed in that region. The clear references to Paul's captivity in Rome, made in Phil. 1:13-19, 26, and in Philem. 1, 22, give great plausibility to the statement that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by the same author, about the same time, and from the same captivity, with these. The probability is greatly increased by the fact that when Paul wrote the Epistle to Philemon, Timothy was with him.

---

20 Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν  
ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι δια-  
21 θήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, καταρ-  
τίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ, εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι

τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ· ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων! Ἀμήν.

V. 20. ἐν αἵματι. This preposition signifies here that with which He was provided or attended. It comes therefore very near to the sense of διὰ in 9:12 above (διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος), which we interpreted as signifying with in the sense of 'equipment.' Compare Winer's Id. New Test. §52. (a), p. 309, with §51. (i), p. 306.

V. 21. ᾧ ἡ δόξα. The relative here is most naturally referred to Χριστοῦ, as the immediate antecedent. Others, with a Socinian intent, refer it to θεός as the principal subject. A similar difference of opinion may exist as to the similar clauses in 1 Pet. 4:11, 2 Pet. 3:18.



22 Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου  
 τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα  
 23 ὑμῖν. Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολε-  
 λυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, εἰν τάχιον ἔρχεται, ὄψομαι  
 24 ὑμᾶς. Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν,  
 καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους. Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ  
 25 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.  
 Ἀμήν.

V. 22. διὰ βραχέων. To this most supply λόγων (with brief words). That is, his Epistle is brief, considering the greatness of its topics and occasion. A



similar phrase is used by Peter, 1 Pet. 5:12. It is perhaps still better to supply *χρόνων*, so as to make the author's meaning, 'I have sent it to you with brief time,' i. e. 'hurriedly.' Of this we have two examples in Dio. Cass. Hist. Rom. 36: *διὰ βράχους*, and *ἐν βραχυτάτῳ*.

V. 23. *Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον*. This is commonly interpreted, 'set at liberty;' and so the word often means. But on the whole, it seems most reasonable to render it 'sent away' (a sense which the word has in Acts 13:3, 15:30, 23:22, &c.), and to suppose that Paul wrote the Epistle during his confinement at Rome, whence Timothy had been recently sent on some short journey, which was not expected to occupy much time. The reasons are, that we have no other mention of such imprisonment of Timothy (though of itself this is not decisive); that Timothy *was* with Paul during his first imprisonment at Rome, as we learn from Phil. 1:1, Col. 1:1; that we learn from Phil. 2:19, 23, 24, Paul intended soon to send Timothy over into Greece; and that he certainly expected to be himself set at liberty and visit the churches in the east. (See Phil. 1:25, 26, 2:24, Philem. 22.) The reader is referred to Stuart's Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, §19.

V. 25. *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* may mean either 'persons *from* Italy,' present at the time with the writer wherever he may have been, or it may mean 'persons of Italy,' and at the time in Italy. The latter construction is favoured by the examples of John 11:1,

*Λάξαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας*, and Acts 17:13, *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰουδαῖοι*. The phrase is very common to designate persons of any place, country, party, &c. without reference to their locality at the time. The preposition *ἀπὸ* most certainly (from the examples just given) does not signify in this phrase, that the persons were absent from the place from which they received their denomination, any more than the preposition *of*, in our parallel phrase, ‘men of Italy.’ For the reasons just given, on v. 23, the second of the senses mentioned above is most probably the one to be adopted here. See more fully Stuart’s Introduction, §19, p. 127 seq. Winer’s Id. New Test. §63. (4), p. 397. As to the objection, that scattered Italians out of their own land could hardly send such Christian salutations, we cannot attribute to it any force; as we find such an instance in 1 Cor. 16:19, written from Ephesus. The construction of the sentence is illustrated by Phil. 4:22, *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας*.

THE END.

# CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

## ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS,

285 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Abercrombie's Contest and the Armor, . . . \$ 31	Buchanan on the Holy Spirit, . . . \$ 50
Adam's Three Divine Sisters, . . . 50	Bunbury's Glory, Glory, &c. . . 25
Advice to Young Christians, . . . 30	Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, 12mo., . . 1 00
Alexander's Counsels to the Young, . . . 31	— Do do 12mo., gilt, . . 1 50
Alleine's Gospel Promises, . . . 30	— Do do 18mo., . . 50
— Life and Letters, . . . 60	— Greatness of Soul, . . . 50
Ancient History, 4 vols., . . . 2 00	— Jerusalem Sinner Saved, . . . 50
Anderson's Annals of the English Bible, . . 1 75	Burns' Christian Fragments, . . . 40
— Family Book, . . . 75	— Parables and Miracles, . . . 75
Anley's (Miss C.) Earlswood, a Tale, . . . 75	Butler's Works, . . . 1 50
Australia, Loss of the Brig, . . . 25	— Sermons, . . . 1 00
Bagster's Genuineness and Authen. of Bible, . 60	— Analogy, . . . 75
Baxter's Saint's Rest, . . . 60	— Analogy with Wilson's Criticisms, . 1 25
— Call to Unconverted, . . . 30	Calvin's Life and Times, . . . 3 00
— Choice Works, . . . 50	Cameron's Farmer's Daughter, . . . 30
Bible Companion, with Introd. by Dr. Tyng, . 40	Cecil's Works, . . . 3 00
Bible Expositor, . . . 50	— Original Thoughts, . . . 1 00
Bickersteth on Prayer, . . . 40	— Remains and Miscellanies, . . 1 00
— On Lord's Supper, . . . 30	— Sermons, . . . 1 00
— Waters from Well Spring, . . . 60	— Memoir of Mrs. Hawkes, . . . 1 00
Blossoms of Childhood, . . . 75	Chalmers' Sermons, . . . 3 00
Blunt's Coincidences and Paley's Horæ Paulinae, . . . 2 00	— Romans, . . . 1 50
Bogatsky's Golden Treasury, . . . 50	— Miscellanies, . . . 1 50
Bolton's Call to the Lamb's, . . . 50	— Select Works, containing the above, . 6 00
Bonar on Leviticus, . . . 1 50	— Evidences, . . . 1 25
— Bible Hymn Book, . . . 50	— Natural Theology, . . . 1 25
— Man, his Religion and his World, . . . 40	— Moral Philosophy, . . . 60
— Night of Weeping, . . . 30	— Commercial Discourses, . . . 60
— Morning of Joy, . . . 40	— Astronomical do . . . 60
— Story of Grace, . . . 30	Charnock on the Attributes . . . 3 00
— Truth and Error, . . . 40	— Choice Works . . . 50
Bonnet's Family of Bethany, . . . 40	Cheever's Lectures on Pilgrim's Progress, . 1 00
— Meditations on Lord's Prayer, . . . 40	— Powers of the World to Come, . . 1 00
Booth's Reign of Grace, . . . 75	Child's Own Story Book, . . . 50
Borrow's Bible and Gypsies of Spain, . . . 1 00	Christian Experience, . . . 75
Boston's Four-fold State, . . . 50	— Retirement, . . . 75
— Crook in Lot, . . . 30	Clara Stanley, Illustrated, . . . 50
Brett's Indian Tribes of Georgia, . . . 50	Clark's Walk about Zion, . . . 75
Bridgeman's Daughters of China, . . . 75	— Pastor's Testimony, . . . 75
Bridges on the Christian Ministry, . . . 1 50	— Awake Thou Sleeper, . . . 75
— On the cxix Psalm, . . . 1 00	— Young Disciple, . . . 88
— on Proverbs, . . . 2 00	— Gathered Fragments, . . . 1 00
— Memoir of Mary J. Graham, . . . 1 00	Clarke's Scripture Promises, . . . 30
— Works, 3 vols., . . . 5 00	Claremont Tales, (The) . . . 50
Broken Bud, (The) . . . 75	Collier's Tale, . . . 25
Brown's Concordance, plain, 20; gilt, . . . 30	Colquhoun's World's Religion, . . . 50
— on the Discourses and Sayings of Christ . 6 00	Commandment with Promise, . . . 75
— Sufferings and Glories of Messiah, . . 1 50	Companion for Afflicted, 1st and 2d Part, each, 15
— On Peter, . . . 2 50	Cowper's Poetical Works, 2 vols, . . 1 50
— Galatians, . . . 2 00	Cummings' Christ Receiving Sinners, . . 30
— Explication, . . . 60	— Message from God, . . . 30
— Explication, 18mo., . . . 10	Cunningham's World without Souls, . . 30
— On Second Advent . . . 25	Cuyler's Stray Arrows, . . . 30
Buchanan's Comfort in Affliction, . . . 40	Daily Commentary, 8vo., . . . 3 00
	Dale's Golden Psalm, . . . 60

D'Aubigné's Reformation, 5 vols., cloth . . .	\$2 50	Gray's Poems, illust., 8vo., gilt, \$1 50; plain, \$1 00	
Do do fine edition, . . .	3 50	Griffith's Live while you Live, . . .	30
Do do 8vo., 5 vols. in one, . . .	1 50	Haldane's (Robert and James) Lives of, 8vo., . . .	2 00
Do do vol. 5, separate clo., . . .	60	— Exposition of Romans, . . .	2 50
— Authority of God, . . .	75	Hall's Select Works, . . .	75
— Life of Cromwell, . . .	50	Hamilton's Life in Earnest, . . .	30
— Germany, England, and Scotland, . . .	75	— Mount of Olives, . . .	30
— Luther and Calvin, . . .	25	— Harp on Willows, . . .	30
Davies' Sermons, 3 vols., . . .	2 00	— Thankfulness, . . .	30
Davidson's Connexions, new edition, 12mo. . .	1 00	— Life of Hall, . . .	30
David's Psalms, 12mo., . . .	75	— Happy Home, . . .	50
Do do do gilt edges, . . .	1 00	— Life of Lady Colquhoun, . . .	75
Do do do Turkey morocco, . . .	2 00	— Royal Preacher, . . .	85
Do do 18mo., plain sheep, . . .	38	— Lamp and the Lantern, . . .	40
Do do 48mo., sheep, . . .	20	— Life of Williams, . . .	
Do do do morocco, . . .	25	Hawker's Morning Portion, . . .	60
Do do do gilt edges, . . .	31	— Evening do, . . .	60
Do do do tucks, . . .	50	— Zion's Pilgrim, . . .	30
Do do Brown's Notes, sheep, . . .	50	Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse, . . .	3 50
Do do do do morocco, . . .	1 00	Henry's Commentary, fine edition, half calf, . . .	16 00
Dick's Lectures on Acts, . . .	1 50	— Do, plain do, sheep, . . .	10 00
— Theology, 1 vol., . . .	2 50	— Method for Prayer, . . .	40
Dickinson's Responses, . . .	1 00	— Communicant's Companion, . . .	40
— Scenes from Sacred History, . . .	1 00	— Daily Walk with God, . . .	30
Dill's (Rev. Dr.) Ireland's Miseries, . . .	75	— Pleasantness of a Religious Life, . . .	30
Doddridge's Rise and Progress, . . .	40	— Choice Works, . . .	50
— Life Col. Gardiner, . . .	30	— (Philip) Life and Times, . . .	50
Duncan's (H.) Philos. of the Seasons, 4 vols., . . .	3 00	Hervey's Meditations, . . .	40
— Life, . . .	75	Hetherington's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, . . .	1 50
— Cottage Fireside, . . .	40	— History of the Westminster Divines, . . .	75
— Tales of Scottish Peasantry, . . .	50	Hewitson's Life, . . .	75
— (Mrs.) Memoir of M. L. Duncan, . . .	75	Hill's Divinity, . . .	2 00
— Memoir of G. A. Lundie, . . .	50	— (Rowland) Life, . . .	75
— America, As I Found It, . . .	1 00	Historic Doubts, by Whately, . . .	50
— Children of the Manse, . . .	50	History of Puritans and Pilgrim Fathers, . . .	1 00
— Memoir of George B. Phillips, . . .	25	— of Reformation in Europe, . . .	40
— (M. L.) Rhymes for my Children, . . .	25	Hooker's Uses of Adversity, . . .	30
Edgar's Variations of Popery, . . .	1 00	— Philosophy of Unbelief, . . .	75
Edwards' Charity and its Fruits, 18mo., . . .	50	Horne's Introduction, . . .	3 50
English Pulpit (The), . . .	1 50	— on Psalms, . . .	1 50
Erskine's Gospel Sonnets, . . .	50	Howard and the Prison World of Europe, . . .	1 00
Evidences of Christianity, University of Va., . . .	2 50	Howe's Redeemer's Tears, . . .	50
Family Worship, Prayers for Every Day, . . .	3 00	Howell's Life, . . .	30
Fanny and her Mamma, . . .	50	Howie's Scots Worthies, . . .	1 50
Far Off, illustrated, . . .	50	Huss (John) Life of, . . .	25
First Day of Week, 18mo., . . .	25	Infant's Progress, . . .	75
Fisk's Holy Land, 12mo., . . .	1 00	Jacobus on Matthew, . . .	75
— Orphan Tales, . . .	25	— Questions on Matthew, . . .	15
Fleury's Life of David, . . .	60	— on Mark and Luke, . . .	75
Ford's Decapolis, . . .	25	— on John and Acts, . . .	
Foster's Essays on Decision of Character, . . .	75	James' Anxious Inquirer, . . .	30
— Popular Ignorance, . . .	75	— Christian Progress, . . .	30
Fox's (Rev. Henry Watson) Life of, . . .	1 00	— True Christian, . . .	30
Frank Harrison, . . .	30	— Widow Directed, . . .	30
— Netherton, . . .	40	— Young Man from Home, . . .	30
Fry, The Listener, illustrated, . . .	1 00	— Course of Faith, . . .	75
— Christ our Example, . . .	75	— Young Woman's Friend, . . .	75
— Do, Law, . . .	60	— Christian Professor, . . .	75
— Sabbath Musings, . . .	40	— Christian Duty, . . .	75
— Scripture Reader's Guide, . . .	30	— Christian Father's Present, . . .	75
Gausson's Parables of Spring, . . .	40	Jamie Gordon, 18mo., . . .	50
Geological Cosmogony, . . .	30	Janeway's Heaven upon Earth, . . .	50
Giffillan's Martyrs, Heroes, and Bards, . . .	60	— Token for Children, . . .	30
God in the Storm, . . .	25	Jay's Morning Exercises, . . .	75
Goode's Better Covenant, . . .	60	— Evening do, . . .	75
Graham's Test of Faith . . .	30	— Morning and Evening do., fine edition, . . .	

Jay's Christian Contemplated, . . . . .	\$ 40	Morning and Night Watches, . . . . .	\$ 60
— Jubilee Memorial, . . . . .	30	Murphy's Bible and Geology, . . . . .	1 00
Jerram's Tribute to an only Daughter,	30	My School Boy Days, . . . . .	30
Johnson's (Dr. Samuel) Rasselas, a Tale,	50	My Youthful Companions, . . . . .	30
— (Rev. W. A. B.) Life of, . . . . .	1 00	Near Home, illustrated, . . . . .	50
Kennedy's Profession is not Principle,	30	New Cobwebs to Catch Little Flies,	50
— Jessy Allan, . . . . .	25	Newton's (Rev. John) Works, . . . . .	2 00
— Anna Ross, . . . . .	30	— Memoir of M. M. Jasper, . . . . .	30
— Father Clement, . . . . .	30	Noel's Infant Piety, . . . . .	25
— Decision, . . . . .	25	Old Humphrey's Works, 12 vols. each,	40
Key to (the Assembly's) Catechism, . . . . .	20	Old White Meeting House, . . . . .	40
King's Geology and Religion, . . . . .	75	Olmsted's Counsels for Impenitent, . . . . .	50
— on the Eldership, . . . . .	50	Opie on Lying, . . . . .	40
Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, Morning Ser.	4 00	Osborne's World of Waters, . . . . .	75
— Do. do. Evening do. . . . .	4 00	Owen's Works, 16 vols., . . . . .	20 00
— Lost Senses, . . . . .	1 00	— on Spiritual Mindedness, . . . . .	60
Krummacher's Martyr Lamb, . . . . .	40	Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, . . . . .	75
— Elijah, . . . . .	40	Pascal's Provincial Letters, . . . . .	1 00
— Last Days of Elisha, . . . . .	50	— Memoir of Jaqueline Pascal,	
Last Day of Week, . . . . .	25	Pastor's Daughter, . . . . .	40
Law and the Testimony, . . . . .	3 00	Paterson on Catechism, . . . . .	50
Leyburn's Soldier of Cross, . . . . .	1 00	Pearson on Infidelity, 8vo., . . . . .	
Life in New York, . . . . .	40	Peep of Day, . . . . .	30
Life of Vagrant, . . . . .	30	Phillip's Devotional Guides, . . . . .	1 50
Lighted Valley, Memoir of Miss Bolton,	75	— Marys, Marthas, Lydias, Hannahs, and	
Line upon Line, . . . . .	30	— Love of the Spirit, each, . . . . .	40
Little Annie, 1st and 2d Books, . . . . .	75	— Young Man's Closet Library, . . . . .	75
Little Lessons for Little Learners, . . . . .	50	Pike's True Happiness, . . . . .	30
Living to Christ, . . . . .	60	— Divine Origin, . . . . .	30
Lowrie's Letters, . . . . .	25	Pollok's Course of Time, 16mo., . . . . .	1 00
— India, . . . . .	75	— Do. do. 18mo., . . . . .	40
Luther on Galatians, . . . . .	1 50	— Life, by Scott, . . . . .	1 00
Mackay's Wycklifites, . . . . .	75	— Tales of Covenanters, 16mo., . . . . .	75
Magic's Spring Time of Life, . . . . .	50	— Helen of Glen, . . . . .	25
Mamma's Bible Stories, . . . . .	50	— Persecuted Family, . . . . .	25
Sequel to do. . . . .	50	— Ralph Gemmel, . . . . .	25
Marshall, (Mrs.) My Friend's Family, . . . . .	25	Poole's Annotations, cloth, . . . . .	10 00
— (Rev. Walter) on Sanctification, . . . . .	50	— Do. half calf, . . . . .	12 00
Martin (Sarah) Life of, . . . . .	30	Portens on Matthew, . . . . .	75
Martyn (Henry) Life of, . . . . .	60	Powerscourt's Letters, . . . . .	75
Martyrs and Covenanters of Scotland, . . . . .	40	Precept upon Precept, . . . . .	30
McCheyne's Life, Letters, and Remains, . . . . .	1 50	Psalms in Hebrew, . . . . .	50
— Sermons, separate, . . . . .	2 00	Proudfit's Counsels to Young, . . . . .	
— Familiar Letters, . . . . .	50	Retrospect, The, . . . . .	40
— Complete Works, . . . . .	3 00	Richmond's Annals of Poor, . . . . .	40
McCosh on the Divine Government, . . . . .	2 00	— Domestic Portraiture, . . . . .	75
McCindell's Convent, a Tale, . . . . .		Rogers' Folded Lamb, . . . . .	40
— School Girl in France, . . . . .	50	— Jacob's Well, . . . . .	40
McFarlane's Mountains of the Bible, . . . . .	75	Romaine on Faith, . . . . .	60
McGhee on the Ephesians, . . . . .	25	— Letters, . . . . .	60
McGilvray's Peace in Believing, . . . . .	25	Rowland's Common Maxims, . . . . .	75
McLelland on the Canon and Interpretation, . . . . .	75	Rutherford's Letters, . . . . .	1 50
McLeod's True Godliness, . . . . .	60	Ryle's Living or Dead, . . . . .	75
Meikle's Solitude Sweetened, . . . . .	60	— Startling Questions, . . . . .	75
Menteath's Lays of Kirk and Covenant, . . . . .	75	— Wheat or Chaff, . . . . .	75
Michael Kemp, . . . . .	40	— Young Man's Christian Year, . . . . .	15
Miller's Geology of the Bass Rock, . . . . .	75	Saphir, Philipp, Life of, . . . . .	30
Miller Roger, Life of, . . . . .	30	Schmid's One Hundred Tales, illustrated,	50
Missions, Origin and History of, . . . . .	3 50	Scott's Force of Truth, . . . . .	25
Missionary of Kilmarny, . . . . .	60	Scotia's Bards, 8vo., illustrated,	
Moffat's Southern Africa, . . . . .	75	Scougal's Works, . . . . .	40
Monod's Lucilla, . . . . .	40	Scripture Promises, . . . . .	15
More (H.), Private Devotion, 18mo., . . . . .	50	— Truths, . . . . .	15
— Do. do. 32mo., . . . . .	20	— Facts, 32mo., illustrated, . . . . .	50
Morell's Modern Philosophy, . . . . .	3 00	Select Christian Authors, . . . . .	2 00
Morning of Life, . . . . .	40	— Works of James, Venn, &c., . . . . .	1 50

Serle's Christian Remembrancer, . . . . .	\$ 50	Taylor's (Jane) Hymns for Infant Minds, . . . . .	\$ 40
Sherwood's Clever Stories, . . . . .	50	—— Lined Twigs to Catch Young Birds, . . . . .	50
—— Duty is Safety, . . . . .	25	—— Rhymes for Nursery, . . . . .	50
—— Jack the Sailor Boy, . . . . .	25	Tennent's Life, . . . . .	25
—— Think before you Act, . . . . .	25	Theological Sketch Book, . . . . .	3 00
Short Prayers, . . . . .	15	Tholuck's Circle Human Life, . . . . .	30
Sick Room (The), . . . . .	15	Three Months under the Snow, . . . . .	30
Sigourney's (Mrs. L. M.) Water Drops, . . . . .	75	Tucker's Rainbow in North, . . . . .	75
—— Girls' Book, . . . . .	40	—— Abeokuta, or Sunrise in the Tropics, . . . . .	75
—— Boys' Book, . . . . .	40	Turnbull's Genius of Scotland, . . . . .	1 00
—— Child's Book, . . . . .	35	—— Pulpit Orators of France, &c., . . . . .	1 00
—— Faded Hope, . . . . .	50	Turretine's Works, . . . . .	10 00
—— Letters to Pupils, . . . . .	75	Tyng's Law and Gospel, . . . . .	1 50
—— Olive Leaves, . . . . .	75	—— Christ is All, . . . . .	1 50
—— Memoir of Mrs. Cook, . . . . .	75	—— Israel of God, . . . . .	1 50
Simeon's Life, . . . . .	2 00	—— Recollections of England, . . . . .	1 00
Sinclair's Modern Accomplishments, . . . . .	75	—— Christian Titles, . . . . .	75
—— Modern Society, . . . . .	75	—— Lamb from Flock, . . . . .	25
—— Charlie Seymour, . . . . .	30	Very Little Tales for Very Little Children, . . . . .	75
—— Hill and Valley, . . . . .	75	Wardlaw on Miracles, . . . . .	75
—— Holiday House, illustrated, . . . . .	75	Waterbury's Book for Sabbath, . . . . .	40
Sinner's Friend, . . . . .	25	Wat's Divine Songs, . . . . .	40
Smith's Green Pastures for the Lord's Flock, . . . . .	1 00	Waugh's Life, . . . . .	1 00
Smyth's Bereaved Parents Consoled, . . . . .	75	Week, The, . . . . .	75
Songs in the House of My Pilgrimage, . . . . .	75	Whately's Kingdom of Christ, . . . . .	75
Sorrowing yet Rejoicing, 32mo., . . . . .	30	White's Meditations on Prayer, . . . . .	40
Spring's Memoir of H. L. Murray, . . . . .	1 50	—— Believer, . . . . .	40
Stevenson's Christ on Cross, . . . . .	75	—— Second Advent, . . . . .	40
—— Lord our Shepherd, . . . . .	60	—— (H. K.) Works, . . . . .	1 50
Stories on Lord's Prayer, . . . . .	30	Whitcross' Anecdotes on the Catechism, . . . . .	30
Stuckley's Gospel Glass, . . . . .	75	Wilberforce's Practical View, . . . . .	1 00
Summer on Matthew and Mark, . . . . .	75	Williams' Life, . . . . .	1 00
Symington on the Atonement, . . . . .	75	Willison on Sacrament, . . . . .	50
Taylor's (Isaac) Loyola, . . . . .	1 00	Wilson's Lights and Shadows, . . . . .	75
—— Natural History of Enthusiasm, . . . . .	75	Wine and Milk, . . . . .	25
—— (Jeremy) Sermons, . . . . .	1 50	Winer's Idioms, . . . . .	2 50
—— (Jane) Life and Correspondence, . . . . .	40	Winslow on Declension, . . . . .	60
—— Contributions of Q. Q., . . . . .	1 00	—— Midnight Harmonics, . . . . .	60
—— Display, a Tale, . . . . .	30	Woodruff's Shades of Character, . . . . .	1 50
—— Mother and Daughter, . . . . .	30	Wylie's Journey over Prophecy, . . . . .	30
—— Essays in Rhyme, . . . . .	30	Young's Night Thoughts, 16mo., . . . . .	1 00
—— Original Poems, . . . . .	40	—— Do. 18mo., . . . . .	40

## A D D E N D A .

Africa and America Described. By the author of the "Peep of Day." 16mo . . . . .	\$ 75	Jay (Rev. Wm.) Morning and Evening Exercises. New ed., on large type, 4 vols. 12mo. \$4 00	
Ballantyne (R. H.) Mabel Grant; a Highland story. 18mo. . . . .	50	Kitto. Daily Bible Illustrations. Now completed. 8 vols. 12mo. . . . .	8 00
Bonar (Rev. Horatus) The Eternal Day. 18mo. . . . .	50	Quarles' Emblems, Divine and Moral. 16mo. Illustrated. . . . .	1 00
Brown (Dr. John) Exposition of the Discourses and Sayings of Christ. New edition, 2 vols. 8vo. . . . .	4 00	Scott (Rev. W. A., D.D.) Daniel a Model for Young Men. 8vo. . . . .	
Charles Ronssel; or, Honesty and Industry. By the author of "Three Months Under the Snow." 18mo. . . . .	50	Self Explanatory Bible, with the References printed out at length. Half calf \$4.50, Morocco \$6.00, Morocco gilt \$6.50.	
Cheever (Dr.) The Right of the Bible in the Common Schools. 16mo. . . . .	75	Vara; or the Child of Adoption. An original tale of great beauty and interest. 12mo. . . . .	1 00
Family Prayer. By the author of the "Morning and Night Watches." 16mo. . . . .	75	Woodcuter of Lebanon, and Exiles of Lucerna. By the author of "Morning and Night Watches." 18mo. . . . .	50
Jay (Rev. Wm.) Female Scripture Characters. Royal 12mo. . . . .	1 00	Words of Jesus. By the same author. 16mo. . . . .	40







