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THIS WORK IS DEDICATED,

WITH GRATEFUL RECOLLECTIONS,

BY THE AUTHOR.

Oftentimes, much honoured friend, have you urged upon me to return to my original studies, and to devote my powers to the Criticism and Exposition of the Old Testament; for it was your opinion that I should succeed in connecting human science, in a manner which you consider correct, with Christian and Ecclesiastical interests. Up to the present time I have not been able to look upon this as my vocation. Yet, since my studies have led me to that portion of the New Testament which, in a certain sense, occupies the boundary-territory between the New and Old Covenant, and from the understanding of which the Old Testament interpreter may certainly gain the clearest insight into his own office, I would take the
liberty of presenting you with this Work. There was once a time when the Scriptures found a place in the studies of statesmen. God be thanked, this time has not quite passed away! In the wide circle of your studies, which embraces the classical world and sacred literature, both of ancient and modern times, that Book of Scripture to whose exposition my present work is devoted, will also find a place, and should you meet in this with not a few things which you can from the heart approve, look, I pray you, on the book as only a longer Epistle which may recal to you the time of that delightful mental reciprocation, in which I received as much from you, as I, who occupy a more sacred office, could give in return.

Still stands the Capitol—still Frascati's and Albano's bright heights stand in unchangeable remembrance before my soul. Delightfully streamed the glories of nature, delightfully the glories of art; but how poor would all enjoyment be, had it not in the sanctuary of the family circle found its glorification, which connects earth with heaven.

What the outward and inward man experienced there, has borne manifold fruits, and the greatest share of gratitude I owe to you and to your house. Accept it then, from a distance, and let my name never be forgotten in your heart and in your house.

A. THOLUCK.

Halle, 20th Jan. 1836.
PREFACE

TO THE

SECOND EDITION.

This Second Edition has, here and there, received improvements and several additions. In the sixth chapter of the Introduction, the Section on Inspiration has been recast; as far as Bleek's valuable work has appeared, I have consulted it, and perceive that we have, independently, arrived for the most part at similar conclusions. In the later sections, some parts have been retouched in Chapters VIII. and IX. The Appendices, published under the title of the Old Testament in the New,—or two Essays, 1. On the Citations from the Old Testament contained in the New. 2. On the Ideas of Sacrifice and Priest in the Old and New Testaments, which cannot be dispensed with in the study of the Commentary, were earlier out of print, and appeared last year in a new edition.

As the advertisements of my respected publisher speak of a second and third edition of this Commentary, I must mention, in order to prevent misunderstanding, that, soon after the appearance of the first edition, the printing of an additional number of copies was necessary, but this was not specified in the title.
of the later printed copies, and hence this edition appears as the second.

May this work, the preparation of which has afforded me peculiar delight, meet in this new edition with sympathising friends and readers!

A. THOLUCK.

HALLE, 3d April 1840.
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CHAPTER IX.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE OLD CONSTITUTION CANNOT BE COMPARED WITH THOSE OF THE NEW.

Ver. 1—14.—*The glory of the Ancient Constitution,—

but, at the same time, the indication therein of the New, which lies beyond it.

Ver. 1.—Our author proceeds in the same manner as Paul, who, after having illustrated the infinite superiority of the New Covenant over the Old, in Rom. iii. 2. as well as in ix. 4., discusses that which distinguished the Old Covenant. A great number of Codd. Minusc. read ἡ πρώτη σκηνή, which Beza rejected. Chrysost. and Photius remark, that, from the preceding context, it is requisite to supply διαβήκη. Only in the event of this, and not σκηνή, being supplied, can it, with propriety, be said subsequently: σκηνή γάρ κατεσκευάσθη. Luther translates: *the first, and means Testament, as, after the example of the Vulgate, he had rendered διαβήκη, in ch. viii., by Testament. Διαβήκης is not the accusative, and, therefore, not to be separated, as Cramer and Grotius have separated it, by interpunctuation, from δικαιώματα. It is not so much the Author’s object to compare all the Jewish institutions, as the Temple-worship and the Sacerdotal office, with the sacrifice and office of Christ. The things which he has enumerated, up to ver. 7., are exclusively δικαιώματα λατρείας. Comp. λατρεύονθα, vol. ii.
viii. 6.—The τὸ ἄγιον, as being intimately connected with the notion δικαιώματα λατρείας, may, to a certain degree, be included in it, is connected not by κατ’ but τέ. As this ἄγιον was built according to Divine commandment (ver. 8.), it belongs, in the Author’s idea, to the δικαιώματα, and the particular prominence which he has given to it, and its construction with τέ, is by the figure εξωκή. See Bernhardy, Syntax, s. 48. But we have the pret. εἰσερχεῖν (from a misunderstanding Cod. 45. has εἰσερχεῖν), because here, as well as at viii. 2, 5., the author goes back to the original institution in the time of Moses, nay, has in view the period of the first Divine arrangement. Comp. the Aorist κατέσκυνεσθη, not the Perf.: on which account ἄγιον must be referred more particularly to the tabernacle, and not to the temple. In the exposition of the adj. κοσμικὸς, the ancients were divided into three classes. The writers of the first class, as Chrysost., Theoph., Οἰκεμ., explain: ἐπειδῆ πᾶσιν ἦσετο ἐπιβαίνειν. With only a slight modification, this view has been defended by Kypke, who takes it in the signification: toto terra-rum orbe celebratum: and, along with other passages from Philo and Josephus, in which the temple is called τὸ πανεξίου, τὸ σεριδιβόλου, καθ’ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερόν, he adduces, as the most striking proof of his opinion, that passage from Josephus, De Bello Jud. 1. 4., where the priests are called, οἱ τῆς κοσμικῆς λατρείας κατάζχοντες. Theodoret is at the head of the second class of interpreters: τῇ συνήν οὕτως ἐκάλεσε τούτον ἐπέχογον τοῦ κόσμου παντός;* and so, likewise, Grotius, Este, and Wetstein. These last are joined by Böhme. —The Latin version preceded the third class of interpreters; in the Italic and Vulgate we find saeculare. Now, this word either forms the antithesis to sanctus, as when Tertullian, De praescr. haer. c. 39., opposes the scripturae saeculares to the saeculae; or, it means caducum, as when Augustine, De civ. Dei, 16, 26., says: Saecularia dicuntur multa, quae in hoc saeculo

* He calls the χρόνις thus, as being a type of the whole world.
sic aguntur, ut brevi etiam tempore transeant. According to this it expresses the notion of the σαζξ, under its two heads: 1. The material, outward, and, hence, perishable. 2. The imperfect, morally and religiously considered. So Calvin: Mundanum vocat, quia illis nondum suberat coelestis veritas. Dorsche: Quia oppositum est, τω υπερηχοσωψ, και υπερουανωψ. With some modifications, this view is adopted by the moderns, Cramer, Storr, Schulz, and Kuinöll. There arise still other modifications, according to the preponderance given to the material or to the religiously imperfect, which adheres to the New Testament usage of κόσμος. In the New Testament, Titus ii. 12., it has this signification, as well as in the Patres; for example, in Ep. ad Zen. et Seren. in Opp. Justini M. ed Paris, p. 507.: ὁ την γνώμην κοσμίκην, Theodoret, Opp. t. V. p. 17.: κοσμικὴ σοφία, &c. In like manner among the Latins, in Jerome, Ep. 18. ad Marc.: mundialibus negotiis occupari. The notion of the material is found particularly in the passage from Hermes, quoted in Michaelis, p. 432.: Mundanus homo, for corpus. We shall proceed most correctly by starting from the expression, ver. 11.: οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, parallel with ἄριστοσοφοτων, ver. 24., so that the sense will be: "consisting of the elements of the visible world, of the κόσμος ἀιόθητος;" but with this, at the same time, there is connected, as with σαζξ, the idea of religious imperfection. Against this exposition, supported alike by usage and the parallel passages, it can only be urged, that the apostle would thus degrade the Jewish sanctuary. But, if that sanctuary prefigured, which it does in our author, as κοσμικὸν, the future world in the elements of this, is there not a certain dignity even in this prefiguration? If we translate: "the earthly sanctuary," there does not, properly speaking, appear any thing degrading in the expression. On the other hand, the reasons against the two first expositions appear to me stronger. As to the second, not to mention other grounds, we find ourselves directly ascribing to the author that symbo-
lic view of the temple which is held by Josephus and Philo, and of which we shall speak at ver. 8, 9., while he—at least in this part of the context—gives to the temple a quite different meaning. Kypke's exposition is opposed by the circumstance, that we could apply the predicate in that sense to the Temple only, but not to the Tabernacle, and again, that this usage departs too far from the existing Christian style.—We have still to notice Luther's translation, "outward holiness," and, ver. 8., "the way to holiness." In this conception of the passage he was preceded by Thomas Aquinas and Cajetan.

Ver. 2.—Γάς is here probatory. by particularising the objects. The version of Schulz and de Wette is faulty: "the first tent." Without an article, οκνή is here a tent. Παύη, taken of space, "the fore." There were three articles which attracted attention within the fore-tent, the holy. 1. The large candle-stick of fine gold, for which, including the snuffers, &c., there was used a talent of gold, i.e. about 4477 ducats: 2. The wooden Table covered with gold-plates, upon which stood the Shew-bread, and the Censers: 3. The Altar of incense, covered in like manner with gold. These three articles are mentioned, as the most important parts of the sanctuary, by Josephus, De Bello Jud. V. 5, 5., in these words: εὰν εν αὐτῷ στέκεται τοιαύτα και πεζισότα πάσαν ἀνδρόστοις ἑγανα, λυχνίαν, τράπεζαν, θυμιασθήνου; and Philo, also, Quis rer. div. haeres, p. 512., mentions them as the chief articles. Now the question is, how comes it that our Author entirely passes by the third important article, the Altar of incense? This question we will discuss in our exposition of the next verse. Along with the table the rite which ennobled it is mentioned. The expositors who have just preceded us find in ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἁγίων a hypallage for οἱ ἁγιοι τῆς προθέσεως. Fritzsche, in his chivalrous Excursus to Mark: De hypallage inani grammaticorum commento, lays claim to the merit of having tamed this monster—ut, quam immane mon-
gatur, says he—and yet, in former times, it had got many a buffet, and that too from a Crusian!—from Chr. Schmid, who says in the passage: statuerunt in formula nostra hypallagen, asylum pravī interpretis. We can no more approve, however, of the version of Winer, who translates (Grammar, p. 520.): "the imposition of the bread." There is nothing said here of the act, but, in the Hebrew phrase מִנְעָרָה, we must take מִנְעָרָה as a concrete: strues panum.—The writing of ἄγια here, and ἄγια ἄγιων, ver. 3., introduced by Stephen and Erasmus, was occasioned by the want of the article, which, in the LXX., is not only never omitted with neutr., but is found, also, in the Cod. Vat. Still, as the word is a predicate, the article might certainly be omitted.—Comp. on ἑυμαστήγιον.

As the author, no doubt, attributes a symbolical meaning to these articles, and as he then only can be perfectly understood when we reproduce to ourselves all that he thought and felt in the language he employs, it becomes the duty of an expositor to give an account of the symbolical import of the sacred magnificence which has been placed before him. This we will briefly do at the close of ver. 5.

Ver. 3, 4.—What the author here mentions as the furniture which distinguished the Holy of Holies has given rise to the most grave antiquarian doubts, so that Callinet says: Maxima totius epistolae difficillās in verbis hisce consistit, atque hic locus fortasse prae ter caeteros dubiam apud veteres reddidit hujus epistolae auctoritatem. A similar remark is made by Grotius; and, recently, Bleek has urged, as among the weightiest objections against the composition of the Epistle by a native of Palestine, what he calls the antiquarian errors found in this passage (see above, p. 55. and 66.): 1. That the ἑυμαστήγιον, i. e. the altar of incense, was not in the Holy of Holies, but in the Sanctuary. 2. That the Author, by continuing,
ver. 6., the use of the present, seems to think that all those arrangements of the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies still continued to exist.

Let us first consider the question concerning the Συμιστήριον. It is not requisite to notice the arrangement of the passage in the Cod. Vat. where the words καὶ τὸ (the article is used) χυσοῦν Συμιστήριον are inserted in ver. 2., after the words ἡ πρόσεσις τῶν ἄφων. — The altar of incense, in the LXX., indeed, is called, not Συμιστήριον, but, Συμιστήριον Συμιάματος. On the other hand, Συμιστήριον is found with that meaning in Josephus, Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, so that there can be no doubt as to the propriety of this signification. Still, the very circumstance, that the author should thus have made so remarkable an antiquarian alteration, has given rise in the Vulgate to the translation thuribulum, while the Italic has altare. Luther has followed the Vulgate. The notion that, by Συμιστήριον, we must understand a golden vessel for incense, has been defended with erudition by a great number of learned men, by Villalpandus, De Dieu, Calov, Deyling, Reland, but with most depth by John Ge. Michaelis, in the Museum Bremense, T. 2. P. 1., likewise in the 11th Vol. of Ugolini's Thes., Comp. Deyling, Observ. Sacrae, II. 47.— The result of the investigation is, that, according to the Old Testament and the Talmud, a great number of vessels for incense, chiefly of silver, but also of iron, were in use; on the great day of atonement, however, a golden one only was employed, so that we might suppose the author to have here prefixed the adjective χυσοῦν by way of distinction. The question then comes to be, was this censer also preserved in the Holy of Holies? This being impro-

* In Josephus two kinds of utensils, which in Hebrew have distinct names, are called Συμιστήριον, the coal-pan, πην, and the incense-vessel ἤβ. Here the former, elsewhere called χυσοῦν, is meant.
bale, ἐχοῦσα, when referred to Ἑνιαυτῷ, has not the same sense as when referred to κιβωτός. "Ἐχω signifies: I possess; this may be = I hold, or = it belongs to me,—the last signification, which was found also in ver. 1., occurs here likewise. As the Holy of Holies alone, on the day of atonement, had the use of that censer, it is said, to belong to it. Van Ess translates, "belonged thereto." Others, by various hypotheses, have vindicated ἐχοῦσα.a Among the latest interpreters, too, this exposition has been approved of, Böhme, Kuinöll, Stuart in a particular Excursus, and Klee. It is remarkable, that the defenders of it have omitted one argument which might appear as not altogether without weight, namely, the want of the article before Ἑνιαυτῷ. Of the two hundred and fifty times in which Ἑνιαυτῷ occurs in the LXX. (by this word, as we have mentioned, the LXX. denote the Altar of Incense), it is scarcely found thrice (and then in poetry, which has more freedom, Schäfer, Appar. ad Dem. 1. 329.) without the article. Here, too, the words πράσινα, λυχνία, κιβωτός, πλάκες, ἵλαρτέαν have, all of them, the article; στάμνος, alone, wants it, and this circumstance is easily explained. Now, should we not expect it with Ἑνιαυτῷ, if it denoted that particular Altar of Incense? It may certainly be replied, that, here, the word, like ἄγω and διέκ, ver. 5., is used as a nomen proprium. But it may be said that, if the censer be meant which was exclusively destined to this purpose in the Holy of Holies, we should still have expected the Article.—Of the many doubts which might be started against this supposition, that has been deemed the most important, and undoubtedly with justice (by the reviewers of Hug's Introduction, in the Tübinger kathol. Zeitschrift, 1821. Heft. 3. s. 491.),

---

a The best deserving of consideration is that most recent significance given by Hin. v. Meyer in his "Bibeldeutungen, 1812. S. 8." According to him, the Ἑνιαυτῷ is a vessel for cold incense, emitting an odour of itself, which was kept continually standing before the Ark of the Covenant.
which arises from the circumstance that, if Ἱωμαρχήγιον
denote the censer, the Author has, in a very remark-
able manner, entirely passed by the important Altar of
Incense. We remarked, on verse 2., that its omission
there was incomprehensible. Had the writer, from
inadvertence, attributed it to the Holy of Holies, in-
stead of the Sanctuary, the enigma would have been
at once explained. But, is such an inadvertency to be
expected in the author of this Epistle? Mynster re-
marked, in the paper we have already adduced, p. 67,
that this is not conceivable in a man so thoroughly
acquainted with the Scriptures as our Author, whether
he lived in Alexandria or any where else. In fact,
let us consider what copious stores of Scripture-know-
ledge the writer reveals; and, further, that a know-
ledge of the situation of the two altars in the Temple
must have been as common to every foreign Israelite
as that of the black stone of the Kaaba to a tolerably
educated Mahommedan, and it will appear that such
a mistake is not at all probable. In order to obtain
a more certain notion of the probability or improba-
bility of this matter, it will not be unprofitable to look
around for some corresponding cases. May we not
affirm, for example, of the Fathers of the Church, that
they were not less conversant with the Old Testament
than was, perhaps, our Author? Now, should we ex-
pect to find similar inadvertencies in them? In reality
there are such to be found, and, precisely in respect
of this very subject. It has not, hitherto, been re-
marked, that a number of the most learned Patres ent-
tertain the erroneous notion that the Altar of Incense
stood in the Holy of Holies. Thus OEcumenius says,
he had shewn in his σημειώσεως that there were τρεῖς
σχημάτα. Into the first the people might enter, and in it
was the Altar of Burnt Offerings (he considers the
Fore-Court as a σχημά), in the second were the candle-
stick and the table; and, in the third, was the Ἱωμαρ-
χηγίον. Origens gives the same representation, Hom. VIII
242. In like manner, Augustine, in the Quaestio
CLXXVII. in Exod. c. 20., ed Bened.,* shews he entertained the false notion, that the High Priest could go in daily into the Holy of Holies with a retinue; but, that on the day of atonement he entered alone. In this Sigonius agrees with him, De Rep. Hebr. v. 2. Thus, therefore, the main objection against the possibility of an error in our author is repelled. Still, with this argument few will be able to satisfy their minds. For, it must be observed, that these Fathers were led astray by the authority of this very passage, which they were not otherwise able to explain. In this way, only, could Æcumenius have fallen into the mistake of calling the Fore-Court a σκηνή. In other places we meet also with the correct view. Thus, it is said in Clement, Strom. L. 5., p. 665.: ἀνὰ μέσον δὲ τοῦ καλύμματος καὶ τοῦ παραπτώματος, εἰθὰ τῷ τε ἑρεμίαν ἔχων εἰσείναι, ἡμιευθύγειον τι ἐκεῖνο, σύμβολον τῇ ἐν μέσῳ τῷ κόσμῳ τῷ δε κειμένης γῆς.b And we must add, that, even if the author were an Alexandrian, can we suppose he never travelled to Jerusalem on occasion of the Feast? Can we suppose that he never acquired from others, who had performed the journey, some information touching the arrangements in the Temple? Can we suppose that, as a Christian, he never visited Jerusalem? Philo was an Alexandrian; can any antiquarian oversight of this kind be attributed to him (see, however on x. 11.)? Did he not take this journey to Jerusalem? And, had there not existed, besides, from the year 150 before Christ, the temple of Onias in Leontopolis, formed exactly after the model of that at Jerusalem? In this state of the matter, I conceive, we should be very scrupulous in conjecturing the writer to have been guilty of an error of this kind. At least, it is the duty of the impartial expositor to attempt finding another way of

* What Seb. Schmid, Calov, and others have alleged as the opinion of these Fathers is founded on a mistake.

b Between the covering* and the vail within which it was lawful for the priests alone to enter, was the ἡμιευθύγειον, the symbol of the earth lying in the centre of this world.

* See Vol. I. p. 264 on κάλυμμα, κατακίτασσα. — Tr.
accounting for the fact. I should, therefore, be inclined not to reject the explanation of the censer. The chief difficulty against this is the complete silence of the Author respecting the altar of incense, in the sanctuary. I acknowledge this difficulty. Still, that we cannot argue with much certainty from an Author's silence upon any point, that we must sometimes seek the means of explanation in some incidental circumstance unknown to us, is shewn by many examples of historical Enantiophanies. Nay, upon the very subject under discussion, we have one at hand. In the passage where Josephus relates that Pompey entered into the Sanctuary, he says he saw: “the golden table, the holy candlestick, the censers, and the abundance of incense, (Antiqq. 14, 4, 4.)—therefore, exactly the articles here mentioned,—and, consequently, the same doubts as in the passage before us. Why does the historian mention the censers, even the incense, and yet keep silence regarding the golden altar of incense? Was he, too, ignorant, perhaps, of its situation? This, surely, nobody will affirm. Further, why did Titus carry with him the golden candlestick, the table, the censers,—which are yet to be seen on the triumphal arch in Rome,—but not the golden altar of incense? I know of no answer to this question. It appears to me, that such examples must make the cautious critic pause, and so much the more as our Author adds, that it is not his intention to treat of these things ἀκτὰ μέγος. By these remarks, I am desirous only of enforcing caution, without advancing any opinion as absolutely the right one. Moreover, if the signification, altar of incense, be retained, there are various ways of escape from the difficulty, as, for instance, the following. The author does not say: μετὰ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα ἦν τὸ χευσόν Ἡμιατήριον, but, μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα ἦν

* Josephus, also, enumerating the holy vessels which had been carried off from the Temple, speaks only of the table, and the candlestick, but not of the altar of incense, De Bello Jud. 6, 5, 5.
CH. IX.] COMPARED WITH THE NEW.

σκήνη ἡ λευκόμενη ἄγια ἄγιον, and of this σκήνη he says, it had the Ἑσυμακρήνιον. And what if our Author, as the Altar of Incense stood close by that second veil, directly before the Ark of the Covenant (Exod. xxx. 6.), had described it as belonging to the Holy of Holies? The Altar of Incense is called, 1 Kings vi. 22.,

המְזוּבָתָּן אִשִּׁר-לָהֵבִיר, where ל may be taken in the wider sense, denoting the genitive relation, as well as the direction. It might be said, too, that the Author writes according to his reminiscence of the Scripture, which, in Exod. xxvi., treats of the table and the candlestick, and not till much later of the Altar of Incense, &c. apart, chap. xxx.

The second difficulty arises from the writer having placed the vessel with the manna, and Aaron's rod, in the Ark of the Covenant, while, according to 1 Kings viii. 9., there was nothing in it save the two tables of the law; and, after the captivity, the Holy of Holies was quite empty. See Josephus, De Bell. Jud. v. 5, 5. The Mosaic record speaks, indeed, Exod. xvi. 34. Numbers xvii. 10., of these objects as being in the Holy of Holies: not in the Ark, however, but before it. We think on this point, we can only say with Theophylact, that our author followed a different tradition. How this tradition arose we know not. We see that later Rabbins, by a subtle interpretation of the Old Testament passages, allowed themselves to fall into this opinion: so R. Levi Ben Gerson (died in 1370.), in his commentary on the Pentateuch, which is printed in the Amsterdam Rabbinical Bible, and from which Buxtorf, in the Arca foed., has extracted the passages. In like manner, Abarbanel, in the Comment. on 1 Kings viii. 9.,

who says: בֶּן בַּכֹּל גְּלָתָם זְלַע זָנִיתוּ הַמִּרְכָּבָה חֶמֶר הַמִּשְׂרָה וְלֵבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ "Our forefathers have a tradition that these things, the pot with the manna, and the rod of Aaron for Israel, were preserved in the
Ark of the Covenant." Theophylact: ἵως ὅν ...... ἵν παρὰ δόξεις ἤν ἴχνε τοῦτο ἐπὶ καὶ ἰν ψαλσιαδόντες τῶν Ἐβραίων συνιδένται τοῦτο οὕτως ἐξεῖν.

Ver. 5. Χεζούβιμ appears in the same way as in the LXX., without the Greek flection, and, as in some passages of the LXX. (Gen. iii. 24. Ezek. x. 15, 16, 18, 19; xi. 22.), is employed as a neuter, because, in Winer's opinion, πνεῦματα was supplied, but, more correctly, because they were regarded as ζωά. Comp. Josephus, Antiqu. 3. 6, 5., ζωά πεπεσία; Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5. 241. Griesbach has allowed himself to make, here, an arbitrary change quite unusual with him, namely, the insertion of the article before δόξης. In this he has been followed by Vater and Schott, although they are supported in the change by no authority, with the exception of Cod. 57. and 80.—The Codd. of Matthai and Rink also omit the article. Griesbach considers it as certain, that δόξα signifies the Shekinah, as, for example, Rev. xxi. 11., and, in that case, cannot dispense with the article. Those expositors who do not read it conceive themselves obliged to take δόξης as gen. subst. pro adj., and translate splendidī. This adjectival genitive of the same word, although with the article, τῆς δόξης, is found in Acts vii. 2. James ii. 1., and many times without the article in the LXX.: καθεδρα δόξης, Ecclus. vii. 4., μεγαλεῖον δόξης, Ecclus. xvii. 10. &c. On the other hand, Böhme has here applied the canon, that δόξης has not the article, because (like ἁγία ἁγίων, Ἡττοματησίων ver. 2, 4.) it stands as a nom. prop., and, for this he has appealed to Ecclus. 1. 7, 11. Wisd. ix. 10. In these passages, however, δόξα does not mean the Shekinah. It would have been more proper to have cited 1 Sam. iv. 22. ἀπώθεσ- ται δόξα ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ (more frequently sequ. Gen.), in which passage the Shekinah is really meant. We must, indeed, expect an allusion to the Shekinah when the word occurs with Χεζούβιμ, for, in the Old Testa-

* Perhaps, therefore, he had this from tradition,—for the sect of the Pharisees among the Hebrews agree that it was so.
ment, the cherubim are mentioned expressly as the bearers of the Divine glory, and, in all probability, the name is derived from "כֵּרָב. Comp. the predicate of God יִשְׁבֶּהָ רַבְרְבֹּים. This leads us to the antiquarian question, whether that δόξα or Shekinah, in the temple, is to be considered as a cloud supported by the Cherubim. This was formerly the general opinion. But, since Vitringa, and particularly since Thalemann, this Shekinah has been regarded as a Rabbinical invention, and with this opinion Winer in his Reälwörterbuch (on the word Bundeslade), and Bähr, in a work which we shall immediately quote, coincide. It appears to me, however, that there are various reasons which ought to decide us in favour of the older view, which has been adhered to by Rosenmüller. The discussion of this subject would be too extensive for our limits. And, perhaps, also, that learned Archaeologist will do as Vitringa says he himself did (2d. Ed. of his Observ. 1712.): Si non secundis, saltem tertiius curis pedem retrahere.

We have already remarked, ver. 2., that the author, in all probability, had a symbolical conception of these sacred articles, as, indeed, they were acknowledged to have a symbolical import. In the ancient world, symbol had a much more extensive reign than we are now inclined to suppose. In his Prolegomena to Mythology, p. 258., O. Müller remarks, "An earlier race of men, who lived more under the impressions of sense, must have had a far greater feeling for this (the language of symbol); we may say that all nature shewed a physiognomy to them." Since the appearance of the first edition of this commentary, we have received, in Bähr’s “Symbolik des Mosaischen Kultus,” 2 Thle. 1837. u. 39, a work executed with much talent and extraordinary industry. We embrace this opportunity of urgently inviting the reader to make himself acquainted with that production; for, although seve-
ral of the views it contains cannot be admitted, it will
serve to direct attention to a neglected mine, which
will certainly yield some kind of return. Hengsten-
berg, also, in his work, Die Authentie des Pentateuch,
B. II., has many instructive observations—for the
greater part, indeed, in contradiction with Bähr—con-
ected with this subject, for instance in p. 628. et seq.
In the first place, the principle justly maintained by
both theologians ought to be kept steadily in view, that,
before we inquire what kind of Exemplars, Types, lie
in the Old Testament institutions, we must first deter-
mine what they shadowed out, what was their symbo-
lical signification. As to our Author’s views concerning
the signification of single points we do not venture to
decide, but, we will attempt briefly to display the im-
port of the sacred utensils, in their connection with the
Mosaic arrangement—keeping at the same time more
closely by Hengstenberg than by Bähr (Of the divi-
sions of the tent we will speak at ver. 8.). We agree,
in particular, with Hengstenberg’s opinion, that the
utensils of the Holy of Holies are the expression of the
relation of God to the people, those of the sanctuary
the expression of the relation of the people to God,
they point out how the Israelite may draw near to God.
Notwithstanding all Bähr’s acuteness in his endeavour
to shew, that a meaning must be given to the shew-
bread different from that hitherto adopted, still the
reasons appear to us to preponderate which make it a
presentation of the community to God, of course spiritu-
ally taken, good works. The Oil and the Light de-
note the pure knowledge of God in which the cove-
nant people are to shine, the lights, seven in number, are
the number of the oath, and consequently of the covenant,
the loaves, twelve in number, refer to the twelve tribes,
in which the nation is represented. The Ark of the
Covenant, especially so called from the בֵּרֵך יִהוּדָה
הָרִים, the ten commandments, as the fundamental law
of Israel, denotes the basis of the connection into
which the holy God enters with sinful men. It is
covered with the mercy-seat, in which, on the day of atonement, blood was sprinkled for the collective sin of the people, by which it is expressed, that the divine mercy is stronger than the law; the Cherubim are the personified creation, they look down upon the mercy-seat, thus expressing that the whole creation is based upon God's mercy and law.

Ver. 6, 7.—The Author, by continuing the use of the present, εἰσίασιν, προσφέρειν, after having spoken of the structure of the tabernacle in the time of Moses, marks its continuance throughout all ages. Even of his own time he might so speak, for, that arrangement with which he has chiefly here to do, (see ver. 8, 9.), the relation of the Sanctuary to the Holy of Holies, still existed. Bleek seems very unreasonable in confidently drawing, from this circumstance, the conclusion to the Author's belief, that the Ark of the Covenant and all the other things were extant in his time. Διαπανών, in opposition to ἀπαξιός, ver. 7., relates to such sacerdotal functions as continued to be performed: the daily incense, the lighting of the candles, of which three burned during the day, the others being lighted in the evening, the placing of fresh loaves on the Sabbath, &c. "Ἀπαξιός in ver. 7., like יְנִפְנֵי הַנַרֶּן

Lev. xvi. 34. Exod. xxx. 10., relates only to the one day in the year. There is a difference of opinion respecting the number of times which the High Priest, on this one day, entered the adytum. In Lev. xvi., there is no sure mention made; from ver. 18., we might certainly conclude that he went in once only. But, when we consider the various rites which he had to perform, we shall be inclined to agree with the Rabbins who speak of his having entered it four times. At any rate, he must have gone twice behind the vail. This we learn from Lev. xvi. 15.; and it seems to have been so considered by Philo in the passage, Le- gat. ad Cainum, p. 1035. He says that the High Priest himself, if he went three or four times in a day into the Holy of Holies, was to die the death: indi-
rectly, therefore, we learn that he went in *twice*. Now, we must certainly agree with Philo, excluding, as he does, with so much precision, a *third* entrance. For the Mishna, which is generally brought against him as an Antiquarian authority, does not, in my opinion, speak directly of an entrance four times in a day. The later Rabbins have done this, for instance Maimonides, in the יִהְיָהוּ רְאוֹעָר, and R. Kotzi (in the 13 cent.). But, where these Rabbins, and particularly Maimonides, come into collision with Philo and Josephus, they must, with few exceptions, be ranked below the latter, as authority. Comp. the particular proofs for this opinion in Schöttgen’s Dissertation against Ugolini, *De fide Maimonidis in adstruendis antiquitatibus Hebraicis*, 1750. Comp., however, Winer, Réallex. II. 764., who makes it appear credible, from the Hebrew text, that the priest entered *three* times. On the question in general, comp. Deyling, *Observ. sacrae*, II. 13. The gen. of *time*, τοῦ ἐναυτοῦ, belongs to the “standing formule,” in which it occurs in the New Testament. This passage, as also John viii. 2., remains to be added to Winer, p. 187. Οὗ χρίσει αἰματος, the negative form of the expression to strengthen it, as vii. 20.; the antitype lies in ver. 12. διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἰματος. Without expiation for his own and for others’ sins he dared not even approach God once. On ἀγνομάτων, comp. the exposition of v. 2., where ἀγνοοῦσες is employed as here.

Ver. 8. In this interesting declaration, the author informs us what typical meaning we are to ascribe to the arrangements of the Temple. The Holy of Holies, during the period of the Old Covenant, being shut to the priests and the people, indicated that the Holy of Holies, generally, was not yet opened for mankind. The Old Testament economy is represented by the Sanctuary, the New Testament economy by the Holy of Holies. The lawgiver himself did not comprehend the typical sense of that institution; but the
Holy Spirit of God, who guided him, did at first intend this meaning, Comp. 1 Peter i. 11, 12. "Oده τῶν ἀγίων is the gen. of direction. With this we must not compare ὥδες Σαλάσσης, Matth. iv. 15., which is wrong interpreted by Fritzsche, the sense in that passage being: the way at (by) the sea. But it may be compared with 2 Sam. xviii. 23. ἐδραμεν τὴν ὥδιν τοῦ Κεχάρ, or Matth. x. 5.: ὥδες ἔδωκαν. The gen. is different in εἰσώδες τῶν ἀγίων, x. 19. That ἀγία denotes the Holy of Holies, and what kind of Holy of Holies it is, we find in viii. 1, 2. vi. 19., and in this chap. ver. 12. 24. The idea, that redemption by Christ has opened the Holy of Holies to all mankind, is expressed by the vail rent at the death of the Redeemer. In our Epistle, the Holy of Holies, into which Christ has entered and prepared the way for us, is Heaven, the realised unity with God, absolute bliss. See on viii. 5. This heaven is already open to believers, and they have access to the throne of grace through faith, iv. 16. vii. 19. 25. x. 19. 22. They shall one day have access to it by sight. As it is said of the αἰών μέλλων, on the one hand, that it is yet future, on the other, that, for believers, it is already present; while, on the one side, it is affirmed that they shall hereafter enter into the Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, on the other, that they are already entered in,—so is it with their being in the Holy of Holies. But, at the end cometh the heavenly temple, the tabernacle; the city of God upon earth receives reality in the phenomenon also, Rev. xi. 19. xxi. 2. 3. Comp. on viii. 5. ξέαν ἔχει different from στήναι, = to continue, last, dure. Comp. the passages in Kypke, p. 397., for example, in Polybius, 5, 5, 3. τῶν Ἐρησίων ἡ στῇ στάσεως ἔχοντων, "as the monsoon still continued."

Having thus inquired into the author's views respecting the typical signification of the structure of the Temple, it is interesting to know what the Jewish and Christian expositors have taught concerning it.

There is one ancient view, although certainly not a genuine historical one, which, alas! reigns in many
of our academical lectures on Hebrew Archaeology, and above it, even such books as Winer's Reál-Lexicon, in other respects a valuable work, are very little elevated,—under which the whole Mosaic worship appears in the character of a religious pageant. In our exposition of ver. 5., we drew attention to an opinion of O. Müller's respecting the wide prevalence of symbol in the ancient world. The same philologer comprehends Creuzer's view (Prolegomenon z. Mythol. s. 332.) in these words:—"It was necessary that the pure light of knowledge should break forth in a corporeal object, in order that it might fall upon the eye in the reflex, and in a coloured, although dimmer, shine: therefore that education of the human race was obliged to speak altogether in imagery." De Wette and v. Colln have likewise acknowledged the necessity of symbol in the ancient world (See Hengstenberg's Æchth. d. Pentat. II. s. 614.). Doubtless no symbol is of the highest, but the highest may be in the symbol, as the sun is reflected by the water; and we require the reflection in the water so long as we cannot look upon the sun. It is also admitted by De Wette, that the lawgiver himself, who founded the worship, must have been conscious of its import, and that only the rude mass of the people took the symbol for the thing. Now, since the Old Testament bears so distinctly the symbolic character, and as, moreover, Exod. xxv. 40. alludes to this, although in a more veiled manner, we cannot wonder if the Jews, both of ancient and modern times, explain the arrangements of their worship symbolically. Philo's explanations of the Tabernacle and its component parts are found particularly in the Third Book De vita Mosis. According to his view, the ιανι is in general the image of the νοημα; the αυλη the image of the αίσθημα; the holy candlestick, with its seven branches, the picture of the seven planets; the four colours of the vails of the Temple are the four elements; as the tabernacle in general is the symbol of the universe, &c. Philo, too, proceeds upon the symbolical explanation of Exod. xxv. 40.
The Alexandrine book of Wisdom considers—which Philo also does—the High Priest’s garment as the antetype of the δῶρος ὁ κόσμος, ch. xviii. 24. Josephus philosophizes in a similar manner. He sees in the tabernacle in general an image of the universe, and in the Holy of Holies the image of the οὐρανός, ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀντίκειται, in the Fore-court and the Sanctuary, the image of the earth and sea: καὶ γὰς ταύτα πᾶσιν ἑστὶν ἐπίκειται, Antiqq. 3, 3, 7. According to him, also, the candlestick represents the seven planets, the twelve loaves the twelve signs of the zodiac, &c. The Fathers follow the views of Philo. We find manifold cosmical explanations among the later Rabbins also (See Bähr. I. 105. seq.). There, however, we find the coarse material view, which, taking Exod. xxv. 40. literally, supposes in heaven real outward types of the Jewish sacred things. There it is said, that there is a temple in heaven, nay a priest, Michael (we may here remind the reader of the signification of the name, “Who is like God?”), or Metatron, who presents the souls of the just as an atonement for Israel, &c. The passages are to be found in Schöttgen’s Diss. de Hierosolyma coelesti, c. II. De Templo Hierosol. coel., and in Buxtorf, De arca foederis, c. 6. The following passage forms a remarkable parallel to Heb. viii. 5., yet has been quoted by Schöttgen neither on Heb. viii., nor in that dissertation. It is found in R. Ascher Bechai’s (towards the close of the 13th century, and not to be confounded with the author of the distinguished work Choboth Hallebabot, Ben Joseph Bechai) Comm. in legem, f. 148. col. 3.: חנו נרול המישר את ל défini ל défini בית המקרש של מיתת רומא لماיריאת הණישת בית המקרש של מיעלה: “The High Priest, who performs the service in the lower sanctuary in the presence of God, is a δίψυχοι (thus the Rabbinical notion agrees with ἵπποςμα in our passage) of the sacerdotal functions performed in τ"
upper sanctuary." Now did the Rabbins take what they have said on this subject in its literal sense? Many of them, no doubt, did so, in the same way as Christian Theologians have conceived of the intercession, singing of Psalms, &c. But, unquestionably, others have employed these expressions in a figurative sense. In this respect, the book Sohar is difficult to be unravelled, as it is doubtful whether we are there in a region of coarsely carnal misunderstandings of the Scripture, or in one of profound symbolism. Thus, in a passage relating to the subject before us, and found in the book of Sohar, but omitted by Schützgen in the dissertation we have mentioned, it is said that, "God had intended, when Israel departed from Egypt, to send them down a temple from heaven built by Himself, but that, on account of the sins of the people, He was obliged to retain it, ליסח וימי בפורקך בהרואת "until the end of the days in the last redemption" (Antetype of the redemption from Egypt). In considering the declarations of the book of Sohar, however, the question affecting its authenticity ought not to be forgotten—a question which I have discussed in a dissertation entitled, De ortu Cabulae, 1837.

In all his inquiries respecting the Old Testament arrangements, the Christian Theologian has, above all things, to keep steadily in mind, that his first object must be to determine what meaning the Law-giver himself gave to his institutions (see on ver. 5). When we have defined the symbol, we may proceed to the consideration of the type. For if, according to ver. 8., the Holy Ghost intimated what yet Moses did not perceive, still the object designed for the Christians does not exclude an object for the Israel of that period. The excellent work of Bähr, regarding the import of the ark of the covenant, has, in our opinion, missed that import, in taking—after the example of Philo and Josephus—the Tabernacle of Testimony only as the image of the heavens and the earth (the latter as the fore-court). This view of the subject is
exposed at the very outset to the objection, that, in adopting it, Bähr can assign no special meaning to the Holy of Holies. In essentials we agree with Hengstenberg (passim, p. 628. et seq.), considering the ark of the covenant as "the symbol of God's kingdom in the Old Covenant," as a representation of the dwelling of God among His own. The fore-court receives the whole of the mixed Israel; the sanctuary denotes the position of the genuine, sacerdotal Israelites, and hence, into it, the priests only entered; the Holy of Holies, the absolute communion with God, into which no one, not even the sacerdotal Israelite, could pass. This arrangement must have made upon even the ruder minds among the Israelites the impression, that they were not yet sufficiently pure, that their condition excluded them from God. With this view of the symbolical import, the typical meaning given by our Author agrees. By the prohibition of the priests themselves from entering into the Holy of Holies, it teaches that, in the Old Testament, generally, complete communion with God had not appeared. Among Christian expositors we find a greater agreement on this article of typology than on any other. Induced particularly by x. 20. (comp., below, the Author's exposition, p. 29.), some certainly look upon the tabernacle as an image of the earthly σχήμα of Christ; so, also, Lundius on the Jewish sacred things. But the current opinion of the Christian church is, that the Holy of Holies is a symbol of the ecclesia triumphans, the Sanctuary that of the ecclesia militans. Thus Origen, Hom. IX. in Lev. p. 243. ed. R., and finally, Michaelis, in his Typical Theology. To this many, after the example of Coccejus, added the other meanings: the Holy of Holies is heaven itself, in which indeed is the ecclesia triumphans and the Christian economy in general, which again, stands in the same relation to the Jewish economy as the ecclesia triumphans to the militans. According to Witsius, the Sanctuary unites a threefold type: 1. Coelum visibile, 2.
moniae legis, 3 Caro Christi. Various interpretations are united also by v. Meyer, who particularly refers the three divisions to three degrees of the Christian life; the highest is that where are the offerers, "where the animal nature is slain, and the fire of devotion burns uninterruptedly (Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, Th. 10. s. 39.)." This interpretation, however, I do not understand, as there was no slaying in the Holy of Holies, nor did any light illuminate its sacred gloom. The above mentioned most correct views are, properly speaking, not in opposition with the view taken by our Epistle, inasmuch as these two things are true of the Christian, namely, that he has been redeemed, and is daily being redeemed, that for him the kingdom of God is already present, and that he daily prays, "Thy kingdom come," that already, in faith, he has Heaven upon earth, and—that he still waits for it. Now, in so far as complete communion with God first appears at the end of all things, the Holy of Holies may justly be regarded as the type of the eccl. triumphants; and this reference has also a Biblical basis in Rev. xi. 19; xxi. 2, 3.

Ver. 9. Schulz strenuously insists that παραβολή here, as at xi. 19., should be translated "likeness," and not "type." He is right in so far, as, by type, in the language of dogmatics, we think of something future, although this usage of language is arbitrary.

ץ and מ are used by the Rabbins and in Syriac also of types. If we explain xi. 19. εν παραβολῇ, with Schulz, then, in that passage, the likeness is a type. But, here, the subject is a "representation of a likeness" (Gleichnissdarstellung), as Schulz expresses it, which is not a prototypy, but = συμβασία. Ο̣ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκὼς is, namely, like Gal. i. 4., the time before the Messiah; with relation to this the πρώτη σκηνή, to which also we refer ἤτοι, is a likeness. But the believers, for whom the καιρὸς διορθώσεως is already come (ver. 10. and viii. 8.), are thus far delivered from the καιρὸς ἐνεστηκὼς, as Paul (Gal. i. 4.) says. In
this ante-Messianic period sacrifices were offered, which did not perfect any thing κατὰ συνείδησιν, but κατὰ σάρξα. Comp. δικαιώματα σαρκός, ver. 10., καθα-γόης τῆς σαρκός, ver. 13. As this τελείωσις is not a proper one, so it is said plainly of the time of the νόμος, vii. 19., οὕτως ἦτε τελείωσεν; whereas Believers are sanctified by a real offering, which purifies also the συνείδησις, x. 2—14.—Συνείδησις we cannot translate by conscience (Gewissen), as our language refers the expression commonly in a narrower sense to what is called the dictamen ethicum. In the Greek it has a more comprehensive meaning, and corresponds more nearly with our consciousness (Bewusstseyn). Comp. the derivation συνείδον μοι. Hence, also, the word in Greek, is joined with the genitive of the object, which cannot be done in German, c. x. 2. 1 Peter ii. 19. Herodian, vii. 1. 8. Τελείοις denotes especially, the negative activity of the removal of a consciousness of guilt, but, also, the positive of the sanctification of the inward man through love. In this respect, the translation "Consciousness" (Bewusstseyn) introduced by Schulz, is the preferable one, and ought to have been adopted by De Wette. Theoph.: κατὰ τὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀνθρώπον.

Ver. 10.—We must first consider the reading in this passage. Very weighty authorities read δικαιώματα (some δικαίωμα), namely ABD, the Syriac, Coptic, Italic, &c. These Codd. also, with the exception of B, omit κατ. The external evidence, therefore, predominates in favour of δικαιώματα, which has been adopted by Bengel, Mill, Knapp, and Lachmann. Still, it has found opponents, and that, too, among the more modern critics, Matthäi, Böhme and Kuinöl, who are of opinion that the Nominative was introduced by those who would not suffer the Anacoluthic co-ordination of ἐπικημένα with the fem. μὴ δυνάμεναι. In Cod. c e, of Matthäi, the reading μὴ δυνάμενα, as a neutr., has certainly arisen in this way; and, in Cod. 23. of Griesbach, the fem. ἐπικημέναι. But, I think we must decide in favour of the Nominative, for the fol-
lowing reasons: 1. Δικαιώματι σαρκίς could not well be co-ordinated by the author with βαπτισμοῖς and βρώμασι, as it is a generic idea, not a species; whereas, regarded as the predicament of the preceding nouns, it is here particularly appropriate: 2. The addition μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κτλ. is so negligently adjoined, that we can scarcely expect the author, in the subsequent employment of ἐπικείμενα, to have had in mind the preceding Ἰουδαίοι μη δυνάμεναι. But, if he really had it in view, he would scarcely have co-ordinated the neutr. so completely, as an Anacoluthon, with the μη δυνάμεναι. We explain the proposition thus: At first sight it might be thought that the βρώματα κτλ. were precisely the objects with reference to which sacrifices were to be offered, and that, consequently, impure meats and drinks were meant. And, in fact, Schulz, and especially de Wette, contrary to the opinion of the earlier expositors, have thus explained it: “All of which is imposed only under (forbid of) meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances.” But, how can the words be taken in this sense, seeing that the βαπτισμοῖς themselves belonged rather to the means of expiation and purification? We must of necessity consider the meats, and drinks, and washings, as denoting, along with the institutes of the sacrifices, the remaining part of the ritual worship. ʼΕσι must, therefore, be regarded as pointing out what is contemporaneous, as Wahl, p. 122., explains: the rites of meats go side by side with the sacrifices, &c. Μόνον may not, therefore, be placed in close connection with προσφίγνωσι: it would be more clear if, in this passage, we had, instead of the adverb, the adjective ἐπὶ μόνοις βρώμασι, or ἐπὶ βρώμασι μόνοις, as we find it elsewhere so frequently in the New Testament, Matth. iv. 4. xii. 4., and in other passages. Now, since this proposition with μόνον is but loosely connected with the preceding, the apposition δικαιώματα σαρκίς is less striking; and, indeed, it must not be placed, as an Anacoluthon, in connection with the preceding dative, but—as in
fact the predicate σαφειν is particularly appropriate to sacrifice, ver. 13,—as an apposition to the whole preceding proposition, making it relate also to the προφέρειν δώρα. Compare such appositions, 1 Tim. ii. 6. Rom. xii. 1. 2 Thess. i. 5.—In explanation of σάφειν, under this construction, we refer to that of σαφειν, vii. 16.; here the idea of the external, in contrast to the συνέθησις, as at ver. 13., is made prominent.

Conscious that this severe opinion of ordinances which came from God might give offence, he adds, that Providence had only intended a pedagogical purpose with them. Διός δεσμος has a retrospective allusion to viii. 8, 9.


Ver. 11, 12.—Παραγενθέμενος is employed picturesquely, as if we should say, there Christ appears. Bengel: tum dixit repente cedite Levitae! Μελλοντα αγαθα, like x. 1.; comp. on i. 1., and vi. 5. Το μελλον is used in the Old Testament to denote in general everything belonging to the Messiah; regarded from the Christian point of view, that which the regnum gloriae will give, but which, in its beginnings, is already present in the regnum gratiae. Among these αγαθα μελλονα there is mentioned, in the sequel, what, in this world, is the portion of believers, the αιώνος λύτρωσις, ver. 12., and the καθαρισμός της συνεθήσεως, ver. 14. Contrasted with the Old Testament tabernacle, the New Testament one, through which Christ passed, is called the greater and more perfect. Its perfection consists especially in its being ου χειροποιητος. Το χειροποιητον, even according to Classical usage, denotes what has not φυει arisen, and, hence, αχειροποιητον, everything that God has produced. There is an interesting parallel in Theod., Quaest. in Levit. c. 8., in which he contrasts Υεδυν τυγ, that which God kindled by a ray from heaven, and τυγ χειροποιητον, that which man kindles. A similar contrast is found in Heliodorus. L. 2. p.
111. ed. Comel. The import of the word is, therefore, expressed by a circumlocution, viii. 2: ἂν ἐπεξετάζῃ ὁ κύριος καὶ οὕς ἀνθρωπός. Of course ἄχειροποίητος does not mark the absolute contrast to the material, although an allusion to this was easily added to its meaning, as when in the LXX. ἄχειροποίητος is translated directly τὰ χειροποίητα, or when Paul speaks in a depreciating tone of the περισσότερον χειροποίητος, Eph. ii. 11. Col. ii. 11. On the other hand, the false witnesses, Mark xiv. 58., say that Christ wished to put a ναός ἄχειροποίητος in the place of the χειροποίητος, and think nothing certainly of a pure πνευματικόν, but of an edifice of ethereal matter. In like manner, Paul speaks of a σῶμα πνευματικόν, whose substance, although πνευματικόν, ceases not to be σῶμα. The author here represents the whole heavenly fabric as such an ethereal tabernacle; so that the Holy of Holies, according to this application of the symbol, is not heaven itself; as at ver. 24., but something lying beyond heaven, as we have already remarked, Introd. p. 109., and viii. 1.

Διά, in ver. 12., marks mediation, as afterwards ver. 23., and I John v. 6., in as much as upon the supposition alone of this sacrificial gift was an entrance permitted to the Holy of Holies. The II. Aor. εὐφάνειμος formed according to the termination of the I. Aor. Sturz has collected, De dial. Alex. p. 61., the numerous examples of this termination of the Aorist in the LXX., and in the New Testament; and those in the New Testament have been subjected to a perilous trial by Fritzsche, Comm. in. Marc. p. 638. et seq., who attempts to shew which of them belong to the copyists and which to the writers themselves. It is certain that this form was current in Alexandria, as may be seen by the stone of Rosetta, and other Egyptian inscriptions. It is equally certain that it may be expunged from the manuscripts of the authors prior to the age of Alexander. Fischer has banished it from Hesiod, Dawes and Wolf, &c., from Demosthenes. On the passage in the Orat. Adv. Lept., where Reiske
has read εἰγαμένους, Wolf observes: neque in his (Atticis) ullum certum hujus usus exemplum credo reperiri, Schäfer, Appar. ad Demosth. III. 67. Koch on Möris, p. 361 (Buttmann, indeed, has spoken in favour of retaining ἵστασα in Euripides, but, as a regular I. Aor., Ausführl-Gramm. II. 217.). That this mode of writing, however, was introduced only and solely by the Alexandrian transcribers into the Codd. is an arbitrary assumption on the part of Sturz and Hug. Can the whole of the very numerous Codd. in which that φωνὴ 'Ασιανή i. e. βάρσας is found have been written only in Alexandria? Comp. too a number of examples in Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 139. And, besides, the grammarian in Becker's Anecd. III. p. 1270. expressly ascribes the forms ἱφάγαμεν, ἡλθαμεν to συνήθεια.

* We have already taken occasion, on ch. ii. 1., in speaking of the orthography with a single instead of a double ς, to observe that what Sturz has alleged respecting the orthography of the Alexandrians is in the highest degree uncritical. We there pointed attention to the important conclusions which Hug, in particular, has drawn, with the object of determining the native country of the most important New Testament Codd. from the mode of spelling followed in them. Besides the barbaric α in the terminations of the Aor. II., there is a peculiarity, purely orthographical, from which he determines absolutely the Egyptian origin of the Codd., of the Cod. BAC and even D (Hug's Einleit. I. S. 277. 281. 284. 287.). This is the μ before the labials. The assertion that even the Latino-Grecian Cod. D was written in Alexandria does appear the most surprising. This is felt by that learned critic himself, for he observes: "a Latino-Grecian Cod. written in Alexandria is something exceedingly remarkable, for the proofs of which we should not wish to remain in arrear." Now in what does this proof consist? In the termination of the Aorists in α, and in the μ before the labials—positively nothing more. He has not even adduced the examples (particularly noted by Sextus Empir. as Alexandrian) of the formation of the 3d pers. perf. in α α ντα instead of αυτι, as κατηνά, ἤσσακα, John xvii. 6, 7. Credner has very recently expressed a doubt as to the propriety of regarding the orthography of the Codd. as a sure mark of their descent (Beiträge zur Einleitung ins. N. T. I. 511.); he brings forward nothing, however, that directly refutes Hug's assertion.
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It still remains for us to give a comprehensive survey of the various explanations of this remarkable passage. According to a very widely spread opinion, the σαρκὶ μείζων οὐ χειροποίητος denotes the mortal nature, the body of the Redeemer. If x. 20. was remembered, where the σάρξ of Christ is called the κατάστασις, through which the New Testament High Priest passed, this conception of it was very obvious. The same view is also found in the Grecian interpreters, and in Augustine, Calvin, Beza, James and Ludov. Cappell, and Grotius; and, in like manner, in the greater number of the Lutherans, Hunnius, Gerhard, Bengel; among the Roman Catholics, too,

It must appear very singular that this profoundly learned Divine should have considered the insertion of the μ as purely Egyptian, and have deemed it a sufficient basis for so strong a proof, when we can so clearly shew it to have been an euphonic insertion, which prevailed more and more in the later Greek. In the first place, Comp. Hermann, De emend. rai. græc. gr. p. 16., and the note of Eustathius on the Odyssey, A', p. 1382., where he points out the insertion of the μ in ἐμβέβαιον, εὐφόρον, ἐμπροσθόν, ἐμπεσθόν, &c.;—then the remark of Blomfield, in opposition to Hermann, on Ἀσχιλύς, σεπελέμ. τ. v. 795, with respect to ἐμπέσθε and ἐμβεβηκε;—and again, the examples quoted by d'Urville on Charit. p. 699. 601. 672., ἔμφυτος instead of ἐμπέσθε, ἰέμπηθε in place of ἰατρός, ἐμβεβηκε; and also Lobeck, Ad Phryn. p. 428.; ἐμπεσθόν instead of ἐμπέσθε, κάμβα in lieu of κάβα, ἐμβεβηκε; in place of ἐμπέσθε, ἐμπροσθόν for Τιθών. Compare, too, the mode of writing Latin words in Greek; συμβιβάσεως for subellinium, in Suicer. The tendency of the μ to the labials was so strong that the modern Greeks express σ by μ.σ. Thus, therefore, the arguments which Hug and others, who followed him, have advanced for the Alexandrian origin of the Cod. Cantabr. would be entirely set aside.——Sturz has produced only a single instance of the euphonic μ. Ζωομβασία, p. 127.; why did he not cite along with this at least ΄Αμβασίως, Ζάμψω;? The remark of Hug, also, p. 277. is erroneous: "this peculiarity was found in manuscripts of Herodotus, and conjectured to be an Ionicism." It was not the euphonic insertion of the μ which was regarded as an Ionicism in Herodotus, but, the introduction of the μ belonging to the root, of which Sturz, p. 130., has given examples from the LXX., such as ἀπλέμβατε, ἀπελάμβανον, προσωπηλματία, of which Mattei treats, De Dialectis, p. 155.
as in Este and Calmet. Another reason of this view was this, when the heavenly Holy of Holies is spoken of in other places it is always said: εἰς ἡλιθν εἰς τὰ ἁγία, as here, also, ver. 12., and that, therefore, the σκηνή through which He passed must be something different. The latter circumstance has also been the cause why interpreters, who wished still to understand the σκηνή of the Holy of Holies, have attempted here, as at iv. 14., to prove διὰ = εἰς. See the remarks on that passage. The Syriac translates it thus, while Böhme and Schulz render it "by means of," "by virtue of" (vermittelst, vermöge). Stuart, of America, says, that, to understand this translation, he had sought in vain in the German dictionaries s. v. "vermittelst." And no wonder. Böhme thus explains the expression: "as in heaven there is no sanctuary, and only a Holy of Holies, so Christ has entered the Holy of Holies ("vermittelst") by means of the whole heavenly edifice." Against the supposition that the tabernacle was the body of the Lord, many cogent reasons might be adduced. Firstly, the predicate οὗ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως leads to a notion of the body of Christ which approaches that of the Quakers, and which has been defended by Poiret, Petersen, and others, as if that body in its very nature were not material, and resembling the bodies of other men. To this it has been replied, however, that the expression was intended to exclude only inanimate matter, such as metal and wood. When the opponents of the notion further appealed to ix. 24., where heaven itself is expressly called τὰ ἄληθινα ἁγία, it is answered that this is said only because the Old Testament tabernacle must have an ἱερόν. Finally, it might with reason be required, that these interpreters should explain also, viii. 2., the σκηνή ἄληθινή of the body of Christ. This is done by Beza alone. There is a second class of interpreters who regard σκηνή as denoting the Church, and, indeed, the ecclesia militans which is elsewhere called a spiritual temple, a spiritual house of God—the tabernacle of David, the desig-
nation of the ancient Theocracy, Amos ix. 11., Acts xv. 16. In Rev. xxi. 3., the glorified kingdom of God is called a tabernacle of God among men. This is the view of Cajetan, Cor. a. Lapide, Calv, Wolf, Vriemoet, Cramer, and has been displayed at great length by Blasche in his "Comm. zum Hebrärbriefe. Th. I". Of all these interpreters, however, Corn. a. Lapide is the only one who has been consistent enough to apply this explanation to viii. 2. A third class of expositions contains many various notions, which are, in part, purely arbitrary. According to Justinian, the ὄξνη ὁ is the whole world through which the Redeemer passed into the Holy of Holies. Grotius supposed an allusion to the Universe in viii. 2., but not in ix. 11. Ambrosius Catharinus would have us to understand by ὄξνη ὁ the lap of the virgo deipara, &c. Among the moderns the ὄξνη ὁ has been generally explained of heaven. We find it so early as in the Glossa interlinearis, then in Lyra, Bucer, Zwingli, Schlichting, and others.

Ver. 13, 14.—This sentence is related to the preceding only as a corollary, and draws attention to the circumstance, that, on contemplating the different characters of the Old and of the New Testament sacrifices, an expectation naturally arises of a higher degree of efficacy in the latter. In the one, purification is accomplished by animals, which are only outwardly, and, hence, symbolically stainless, which cannot offer themselves, but must be offered by others, and, according to the legal ordinance itself, purify only from contact with what is physically dead. In the other, a man inwardly, and, of course, essentially stainless, and, at the same-time, not a mere man, but filled with the fulness of God, is not merely offered by others, but, in perfect love, in the power of the Spirit of God, performs an eternally efficacious self-sacrifice. From such a sacrifice may certainly be expected the higher effect of an inward eradication of sin, and the accomplishment of salvation.—The Author's purpose
is to represent the Old Testament sacrifices in their
defectiveness, and he, therefore, mentions first those
animals which were offered on the day of atonement
for the blotting out of the sin of the High-Priest
(ταύρου), and of the people (τεώγος). But, having al-
ready in mind what he afterwards says of the ἐγα
νεκρ., he adds another sacrifice, which served as a
special purification from the touch of what was physi-
cally dead (Numbers xix.), the sacrifice of the red
heifer, the blood of which, mingled with ashes, purified
those who had touched the dead, Ποσ. designates the
object, end; οὐσις the outward and sensuous. See on
ver. 10.

The explanation of the terms διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου
presents peculiar difficulties to the expositor. In re-
cent times, some interpreters, by an optical delusion,
mistaking their own impotency of understanding for
that of their author, have complained of the Apostle
Paul that he did not really understand his own mean-
ing. See Rückert on Rom. vii. 14. A person called
Welcker has fallen into a delusion something similar,
when treating of this expression in our Epistle. In
his philologico-exegetical Clavis on the Epistle to the
Hebrews, he says: "But, how the whole is to be
translated I will not venture to determine, because I
can not satisfy myself by any further explanation of
an expression perhaps not quite understood, and ob-
scurely thrown out by the author himself." It is a grie-
vous evil when the arrogance of an interpreter of Holy
Writ makes him give out his own bankruptcy as that of
his Author. On this phrase we possess a labor-
iously written monography from the pen of the Hol-
lander Boon Mesch, Specimen hermeneticum in locum
ad Hebr. ix. 14. Lugd. Batav. 1819. This produc-
tion is not only wanting in searching criticism, but
also in genuine exegetical tact. In the first place, we
must examine the reading. 'Αγιόπ is found in D.
from the first hand, and is, besides, in several Codd.
Minuscul, in the Coptic and Slavonic versions, in the
Italic and Vulgate, in Chrysostom, and some others
of the Fathers; while αἰώνιον is found in A. B. and D. from the second hand, in the Peshito, Philox., the Arabian and the Armenian versions. in Athanasius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Ecumenius. The external evidence, of course, is in favour of αἰώνιον; and, without doubt, the internal evidence is so likewise. Ἄγιον being originally written beside the word, as an interpretamentum, we can easily account for its passing into the text. Least of all does it stand in need of Reiske's conjecture of ἀγνεύματος. More recent expositors have not only been very arbitrary in their manner of handling the expression, but have shown a great want of precision. According to Nösselt, πνεῦμα means victima, and, even, victima Christi quatenus ea erat omnibus numeris absoluta; according to Döderlein and Storr, it signifies, statum beatissimum, or, as Storr translates: "by virtue of His glorious condition," &c. The older expositors have, upon the whole, taken the right course, by understanding, even when they read αἰώνιον, either the Holy Ghost, as the Grecian expositors, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, or the deitas Christi, as Beza, Aretius, Capell, and Calov. Both conceptions of it pass into one another, as soon as we say, which most interpreters do, that πνεῦμα Ἀγίου stands, per meton. causae pro effectu, for the operations of the Holy Ghost. This conception of the phrase, when we contemplate historically the Jewish and New Testament views of what is divine in the Messiah, is the probable one, and is, likewise, justified dogmatically,—the latter, because the Logos is the Mediator of the Divine communications, but the communication itself is the πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. In the Old Testament, and in the Apocrypha, this πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ is the principle of all cosmical life, and indeed is predominating over the intellectual religious life in the human mind; in the New Testament, there is only the principle of the latter, although some of the Fathers who were much addicted to Platonic views of Scripture, have given a larger extent to the term, and represent the πνεῦμα Ἀγίου either, with Tatian, as the principle of a second
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πνεῦμα, τὸ διὰ τῆς ὕλης ἀνήκον, or, with Origen, περὶ ἀρχῶν, Cyrillus Alex., Aeneas Gazaicus, as the soul of the world. See Mosheim on Cudworth’s Intellectual System, p. 668. The Messiah, as the God-Man, must, accordingly, possess the spirit without measure, John iii. 34. According to the leading passages, Isaiah xi. 2., and ixi. 1., the Messiah is therefore represented by Jewish Theologians, likewise, as “anointed with the Holy Ghost.” And the expression employed by the Authors of a more Cabbalistic turn, that the Shekinah makes its dwelling in Him, amounts to the same thing. Among the Ebionites,—whose language has been subsequently revived by Zinzendorf—the Holy Ghost was said to be the mother of Christ. In the New Testament the πνεῦμα is particularly designated as the principle which filled and animated Christ, Luke i. 35.; on which passage the dogmatists themselves, for instance Baumgarten, remark with justice, that the πνεῦμα ἄγιον is here not merely the principle of physical generation, but of spiritual communication, so that the generator places himself in the generated. If, moreover, the πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, in Baptism, belongs to this subject, then must likewise Matth. iv. 1. Luke iv. 14. Matth. xii. 28. Acts i. 2.; x. 38. Rom. i. 4. 1 Tim. iii. 16, belong to it, and perhaps, also, 1 Peter iii. 18. Now, on comparing Heb. vii. 15. 16. 23. et seq. we cannot be surprised that the πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in this passage, has the predicate αἰωνίον. This πνεῦμα is the δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταληπτοῦ, vii. 16. The expression is purposely selected, as Theophylact has properly expressed it: ὅσοι καὶ τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διαισθῆσθεν. So much for the explanation of the term itself. The question now is, what is the meaning of the expression, “the Messiah offered Himself through this eternal spirit?” At the first view we seem to have found an answer in the remark of Oecumenius, Theophylact, and the Scholiast cited by Matthäi, namely, the πνεῦμα is here the antitype of the fire, which consumed the sacrifice; especially when we consider that ἄνευ and πνεῦμα ἄγιον often correc.
spond in the New Testament, Luke iii. 16. Mark ix. 49. Still, a right point of comparison does not appear from this. We, therefore, prefer considering the spirit as the *causa impellens* of the immolation, so that the sense would be: The being of God in the Redeemer, inasmuch as it included in itself complete love, was the impulse to the self-sacrifice, and, as this being of God is an eternal one, so also is this complete Love, and with it the Redemption—specially understood under the form of the *intercession*—an eternal one, as we see also from c. vii. The explanation of this declaration by de Wette in his dissertation on the symbolical doctrine of the Ep. to the Hebrews, p. 38., is in itself true, but does not follow from the passage according to our view of the context. He says: “Therein (in the expression: “through the eternal spirit”) lies, firstly, that He has done it in a *spiritual manner*, not merely figuratively, for contemplation, but essentially, for the spiritual life of man in general: He has introduced the feeling of guilt, and of the eradication of guilt spiritually into the spiritual life, and brought the moral development of mankind to that point at which they have become conscious at once of their unworthiness and worthiness, of the anger and of the grace of God; and, as He has accomplished this spiritually, He has also, secondly, accomplished it *eternally*, because the Spirit is eternal, in its inward nature, and independent of the mutation of the external phenomenon.” The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us clearly to understand, by this very expression, that the outward shedding of blood, as such, does not constitute, in his mind, the chief thing in the act of Christ, but that inward act of offering which must have preceded the outward, and which is expressed in the discourses of Christ, in the words: ὁ θεός ἀφήγη ἐν ἀγίᾳ ἡμείων John xvii. 19., and, in this Epistle, by the ἰδοὺ ἡκὼ, τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὁ θεὸς, τὸ ἑληματία σου, x. 7.

Here, as everywhere else in our Epistle, we find an essential condition of the efficacy and sufficiency of
the sacrifice of Christ, His sinlessness. The purity of the Old Testament sacrifice was evidently symbolical, but here there is a real stainlessness.

The operation of this New Testament sacrifice is twofold, and of such a kind that the second is a consequence of the first. At vi. 1., we have determined the idea of ἔγνα νεκρά to be those works in which the vital power of the love of God is wanting. Our passage brings this signification still more prominently forward. Contrasted with the touching of the bodily dead is the touching of the spiritually dead, and, in place of the spiritually dead works, there must come the service of the living God. He must be served as a living God, and in a living manner. In the same way, the life under the Old Covenant is characterised by Paul as νεκρῶν, in contrasting, Rom. xii. 1., the living self-sacrifices of the Christians with the dead animal sacrifices. The καθαρίζων marks here the negative act of the eradication of guilt, but is so closely connected in the mind of the writer with the positive one of the new life with the Mediator, that, as the consequens from this, it denotes directly the living service of God. In all probability, the author employs, x. 22., the ἣματα ἔμοι τὰς καθαρὰς ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρὰς with an allusion to ver 13. of this chapter. In the Old Covenant, the body being sprinkled with water was made free from outward stain, in the New Covenant, by a spiritual water, the inward man is freed from inward pollution.

Ver. 15—22.—Christ is the Covenant Sacrifice of the New Testament, for, it is necessary that the New Covenant be sealed with blood as well as the Old.

Ver. 15.—In contrast to the Old Testament sacrifices, the death of the Redeemer had been represented as the New Testament sacrifice. The Author, in passing, points out that the blessings of salvation could only be attained through this sacrifice. He that enters into a covenant relation with God must first be
consecrated, this consecration is accomplished through a bloody sacrifice, for it is an act of expiation. This had been the case under the first covenant, which had been broken by the παρακάσωσις of the people, and thus it was necessary, in concluding the New Covenant, to offer a New Covenant sacrifice.—That this thought is only intercalated is shewn by vers. 24, 25., where there is a return to the act of reconciliation on the feast of atonement.

The elucidation of this parenthetical thought, however, demands an inquiry into the covenant sacrifices. Vers. 19—21., as it appears, treat of covenant sacrifices through which the old covenant was confirmed; and, ver. 15, in like manner, seems to represent the death of the New Testament mediator as a covenant sacrifice. Τὸ ἁμαρτία τὸ γῆς καὶ κυρίας διαθήκης, in Matth. xxvi. 28., seems to point to a sacrifice of the same kind. It has been doubted, indeed, whether that act, on the arrangement of the Old Covenant, can be regarded as a covenant sacrifice, there being no mention of the rite, of passing through (Genesis xv. 10. Jerem. xxxiv. 19.) among the divided parts of the sacrificed animals. Jahn even believed he might venture to suppose that the mention of the custom was omitted by Moses only accidentally, and he appeals, in support of his opinion, to the somewhat peculiar expression, Deut. xxix. 11., וַיְבָאָר בְּנֵי, Archäologie, Th. 3. s. 398. Gesenius, however, in opposition to this opinion, acutely refers to Micah ii. 13. as proving a transition from the signification of "pass over," or "pass through," to that of "pass in." But the act in question may be shewn to be a covenant sacrifice even without that rite. From the very nature of the thing we expect such. Among both Pagans and Jews, consecration to an office, and the swearing of an oath, were accompanied by sacrifice—the pagan Swedes offered sacrifices on contracting marriage. Blood is the medium of binding and uniting. Among many heathen nations the blood of
parties concluding a covenant is mingled (Bähr’s Symbolik, II. s. 421.). Here the sacrificial blood is divided into two portions, of which the one portion is brought to the altar, the other is sprinkled upon Israel, in sign of the reciprocal relation into which both parties enter. The more general kind of sacrifice here made is that of the burnt-offering, which is the general expression of the worship of God, the special kind is the peace-offering, וְָלוֹם, Exod. xxiv. 5.

The burnt-offerings must not be taken here for sin-offerings, precisely as they are connected with peace-offerings, and thus Cramer’s view which is that of Lindner (Die Lehre vom Abendmahl, s. 482.), is shewn to be incorrect. According to that view, these offerings are regarded as expiatory offerings for the blotting out of the sins committed previous to the conclusion of the covenant, and the making sure that covenant. In support of it they certainly have the expression employed in our Epistle respecting the death of Christ, which was: εἰς ἀπολύγωσιν τῶν ἵνα τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παράβασεν. Hence, in the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper we must not, with Olshausen, suppose an expiatory offering intended, but, with Dr. Paulus and Usteri, only a covenant offering. However, the blood which makes sure the covenant relation may be regarded as being, mediately, expiatory blood, if we conceive this act as mediated by the notion of consecration: the former relation of Israel, estranged from God, hence-forward ceased, after the nation entered into this consecrated covenant relation. Our author gives particular prominence to the notion of the ἐγκαταστάς, and in this sense, we think, he has here for once contemplated the death of Christ from that point of vision under which it appears that through it the new covenant had been consecrated and confirmed, and that therewith the sinful state, previous to the conclusion of this new covenant, was made an end of. The two notions are intimately dependent upon one another.

Before we pass to the exposition of the single pas-
sages of this section, we must enter upon another inquiry, namely, whether διαβήξη retain the same signification throughout this section that it bore in the previous, particularly in the eighth chapter; or whether in ver. 15—21., or, as others affirm, at least in ver. 16, 17., it has the meaning of Testament. Many of the older interpreters were interested in maintaining the sense of Testament, wherever the new covenant has the name of διαβήξη. Some Roman Catholic, but, especially Lutheran, expositors, sought their chief support in the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper. There are five requisita testamenti: 1. testator, 2. heredes, 3. bona, 4. testes, 5. sigilla—all these conditions, they said, meet together in this place, shewing us that we have here a testament in the proper sense of the word. Erasmus himself says, on Matth. xxvi. 28., testamentum, quod condunt morituri. To this view, no doubt, the translation of the Vulgate, and, after it, of Luther, who every where rendered it Testament, greatly contributed. The last that retained this translation in its greatest extent, even throughout the whole of c. viii., was Chr. Schmidt. Michaelis gave it the most zealous opposition, and, in his graphic manner, he thus appeals to his adversaries: "Let us imagine that we paid some one a visit, and saw blood in his chamber, and upon our questioning him whence the blood came, he answered, ‘It is Testament blood, my father has just made his last will,’—should we not think that he talked in a wandering manner?"*  

* Like Justinian, some would have even the Hebrew מִרְבָּן, in the Mosaic legislation, exclusively understood in the signification of Testament. The more modern interpreters, on the other hand, have utterly denied the institution of wills among the Hebrews. The most strongly opposed to it, although the proofs adduced are by no means satisfactory, is the dissertation read under the praes. of the learned Raw, entitled, De testamenti factione Hebraeis veteribus ignota, 1760. This treatise, also, has gone too far. With regard to real property, the right of succession was, undoubtedly, so regulated among the Hebrews as to exclude particular, arbitrary dispositions. But the
Several interpreters, on the other hand, limit the signification of Testament, in our Epistle, to ver. 15—20.; but the great majority adopt this signification only in ver. 16, 17. (to the exclusion of all the other passages in the New Testament, in which the word occurs), or—although improperly—in Gal. iii. 17.

If, in ver. 16. and 17., we have the signification Testament, it must be regarded as a play upon words, the author suddenly using the Greek word διαθήκη, in the then current meaning of testamentum. A play upon words, when based upon an inward truth, ought not to offend us in the sacred authors. How full of meaning, for example, is the double sense in which Paul uses νόμος, Rom. iii. 27. viii. 2., or the amphibolony of ημέρα, Rom. xiii. 12. It is the opinion of many, that Christ's proof of the resurrection, Matth. xxii. 32., rests upon the double sense of the genitive relation in the formula ὁ Θεὸς Ἁμαραμός, "He who adopted Abraham," and "He who stands in a living relation to him?" See, however, on xi. 16. Philo has used the word διαθήκη, in one and the same passage, with the amphibolony which appears to exist in our Author, De nom. mutat. p. 1042. The Calembrug, according to which Sulpicius, who was blamed by Gellius, derived testamentum from testatio mentis, returns upon us again in the Rabbins, when they explain, ד' ת' י" by מ' ד' א" "that shall be fast."—The promises of the New Covenant might also be conceived of as a testamentum Christi.—The testator would then be the same person who distributes his Father's goods, according to Luke xxii. 29. καὶ ὁ ἡθικοὶ ἀνήθικα ὁμοι καθός διέδος μοι ὁ πατὴρ. Were it required to apply the image more closely to the thing, repugnance felt by the German tribes to the individual exercising, after his death, a control, in the community, over his property, is unknown among the Orientals. The ancient Arabsians had the institution. The passages quoted by Michaelis, in his "Mos. Recht, Thl. 2. §. 80.," prove it also to have existed among the Hebrews. Grotius, De jure bellii et pacis, l. v. c. 6., appeals to Deut. xxi. 16. Ecclus. xxxiii. 25.
it might be said, according to the ordinance of the twelve tables, that Christ is the \textit{emitor familiae} (Sueton. Néro, c. 4.), and, in so far, the \textit{μεσίτης} of the other heirs. This representation of the matter, certainly, must always have something unsuitable about it, but especially on this ground,—the testament puts the heir in possession, in as much as the testator resigns, and the heres becomes his successor; and this possession is then the most secure, because the testator having once declared his will cannot alter it. But, here, the testator is the \textit{eternally living Being}, who disposes only of \textit{spiritual} goods; the whole property also remains with Him. He is the \textit{χληρονόμος} absolutely (see on i. 2.), they who are His receive but a portion of it, in as much as they live with Him. That, however, which, more than the inconcinnity of the comparison, renders critical the adoption of a change of signification of \textit{διαβήκη} in the two verses, is the striking interruption which it introduces into the context. Not only does ver. 19. continue the thought begun in ver. 15., which would be in this case completely interrupted by a heterogeneous parenthetical thought, but also, in ver. 18., \textit{οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη} connects itself so closely, that we find ourselves almost irresistibly compelled to take \textit{διαβήκη}, ver. 20., as \textit{Testament} also; and, if we do this, we must do so likewise at ver. 15. If now, with Chrysostom, we take absolutely the signification \textit{testamentum}, and say that the sacrificial animals of the Old Covenant were also \textit{μεσίται}, in as much as they were types of Christ, it may be replied, that ver. 19, 20. speak only of the blood of the animals, in as far as it \textit{consecrates}, but not as a bequest is obtained through it. Michaelis asks: "whether the Jews might not have inherited the oxen and goats?" That conception of the passage, therefore, is accompanied by no slight difficulties, in estimating which it will at least be thought justifiable in the expositor to attempt taking \textit{διαβήκη}, ver. 16, 17., in the usual sense. Limborch, and, independently of him, Medhurst have struck into a middle path (the
latter in the *Bibl. Hagana, t. ii. p. 533.*), according to which both significations are retained. Michaelis, especially, is eloquent in the cause of the signification *Covenant,* although, from a secondary consideration, namely, to escape from the play upon words, which would speak in favour of the original composition of the Epistle in Greek. As we have observed above, *Vol. I. p. 76.* note, he was under no necessity, for the sake of this object, of departing from the ancient exposition. And he has been joined in it by no one save Steudel, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift, Jahrg. 1828.* St. I., which is edited by him, and subsequently in his *Glaubenslehre, s. 261. 411.* The small number found, among the countless expositors of our Epistle, who have attempted to vindicate the signification *Covenant,* might almost appear to furnish a strong argument against its correctness. Still, the absence of this view among the older interpreters must certainly be ascribed, in a great degree, to the fact of the opposite one, of *testament,* being considered the more orthodox. Two circumstances appeared completely opposed to the signification *Covenant* in ver. 16. 17., 1. ὁ διαθέμενος must, if that meaning were adopted, denote the *victim.* 2. ἵνα νιχός it would be necessary to render by "over, in the case of slain victims." Both, certainly, present difficulties: still, it appears to me that these are not greater than the difficulty which arises, on the other hand, from the interruption of the context. In so far as a victim ratifies the Covenant, we say in German it (stiftet) *estab-lishes* it, why, then, might not the author say the same thing in Greek? To this conception of the word, indeed, the *masc.* seems to be opposed. But, how would the case stand if the author personified the victim, and regarded it as μυσίτης? Might not this be the more readily done, as in the New Cove- nant, precisely, a *man* took the place of the victim? *O νιχός,* in Greek, like the corresponding term in German, certainly denotes, when used as a substantive, only human dead, corpses of men, see Blomfield,
Ad septem c. Th. v. 1015. But, why should we not take it as a neuter, making it denote *carcases* in general, whether of men or animals? In the later Grecity, τὸ νεκρὸν was used in the sense of τὸ πτώμα (which, in like manner, first occurs in the οἱ θυσίες), e. g. τὸ νεκρὸν τοῦ Φίλίστου, Plutarch, *Vita Dionisii*, c. 35., τὰ νεκρὰ τ. Ἰωνατίσων, Plutarch, *Narr. amat.* 3. 73. See Thomas M. *ed. Bern.* p. 766., Phrynichus, *ed. Lobecck.* p. 376. 'Επὶ passes then, however, as vii. 11., into the conditional signification: "On condition that slain sacrifices be there." So taken, ver. 16. 17. stand in close connection with what precedes as well as what succeeds: "Conclusions of covenants demand sacrifices."

Let us now pass on to particulars in ver. 15. Lößler's opinion that the New Testament knows only of a forgiveness of sins before conversion, an opinion which has lately been defended by Reiche as the only right one, finds its *praesidium* in this passage, and Rom. iii. 25. In Rom. iii. 25., however, it is only declared, that as former sins appeared unregarded before God so now final justice is revealed. But this does not exclude the sacrifice of Christ from having other objects. An appeal might with much more propriety have been made to our passage, a passage of which Reiche, nevertheless, has taken merely a cursory notice. Still, the context shews, that here also the conclusion is arbitrary. What is really the author's intention? To shew that the First Covenant could not truly atone for sins. As the context stands here, then, he had to do only with transgressions under the First Covenant. But when he shews that, through the sacrifice of Christ, believers are cleansed, *once for all*, from the συνείδησις πονηρά (x. 2. 14. 23.), that Christ's redemption is *eternally valid* (ix. 12.), it follows, that its power extends to *all* the sins of Christians. Comp. I John ii. 1. That the declaration before us does not contradict Rom. iii. 26. has been remarked by De Wette in his "Kommentar zu Röm. iii. 26." It is necessary to inquire, whether
the Gen., ῥῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ποιν., is to be joined with ἡκλη-
κώνι, and this Part. to be taken adjectively, as has
been done in the Syriac and Latin versions (iii. 1.),
or, according to Luther, since the edition of 1530 (in
the previous editions he follows the Vulgate). and the
moderns, with the verb λάςωσιν. Our author being
wont, for rhetorical purposes, to place the leading
ideas in pausa (vii. 4. 22), the latter is to be pre-
ferred. Ἐπαγγελία, as at vi. 12. 17. x. 36. xi. 33.,
is to be taken as a concrete, "the promised good."

Ver. 16, 17.—Respecting the signification of φέρεσθαι,
we subscribe to the opinion of Valckenaer: interce-
dendi notio, quam versio latina interprete Beza adop-
tavit, vix poterit affirmari testimoniiis scriptoris antiqui.
Nor have I found in later writers any direct proofs
that φέρεσθαι is used directly as γίγνεσθαι. Φέρεται, in-
deed, occurs in several combinations, where it is
translated: est, extat, versatur. Thus in Dio Cassius:
ἐν τοῖς... εἰς... φέρεται, p. 171, 79. ed. Rein.;
φέρεσθαι εἰς... in Plutarch, Π. 724. ed. Oxon.; τὰ
φέρεται (ἐν τῶν... γεφης) in Theodoret, Ο. Π. 1347.; still, neither these passages nor 1 Peter i. 9.
afford any proof. Abandoning this explanation, which
has, quite recently, been again propagated by Schulz
and Böhme, our choice will be limited to the juridi-
cal signification defended by Hammond and Elsner:
affert coram judicibus, and that adopted by Bret-
schneider: sermone ferri, i. e. constare. We can
by no means approve, however, of the signification in-
sequei, assigned by KuinöI, from Carpzov, as it is de-
rived from a false explanation, or reading, of a passage
of Philo. Μητρος has been incorrectly translated by
Luther, after the Vulgate: "not yet;" and, very
singularly, Böhme has fallen into the same mistake.
This error of Luther's has not been rectified by Von
Meyer.

Ver. 18—20.—Δαλίν as at i. 1. The act of insti-
tution of the Covenant, described in Exod. xxiv., is
brought forward by the author with additional cir-
cumstances, not mentioned in the Old Testament: the
blood of the goats, the water, by which the blood was rendered fluid, the red wool and the sponge, and the sprinkling of the Book of the Law. In all probability these details are supplied either from the subjective conjectures of the scribes, or are founded upon historical tradition. The circumstances are similar in respect of ver. 21., where Josephus agrees with the tradition of our author. The difficulty arising from the silence of the Old Testament respecting the sprinkling of the Book of the Law, in particular, has induced many to connect βιολίον with λακάτων; Erasmus, Bengel, and even Knapp, have placed a comma after βιολίον, and so, also, the Armenian and the Coptic translators. Assuming this to be correct, there will remain scarcely any other course than, with Colomesius, to expunge the ναι before ἐγκάντιος; for the ingenious help of Bengel is inadmissible. But, besides, the sprinkling of the Roll of the Covenant is not only so appropriate in itself, but so suitable to the object of the author, that, on this account alone, we must resign every other view. The Roll of the Covenant represents the Deity as one of the covenating parties. On ἐγκάντιος instead of ἐγκάντιος. See Vol. I. pp. 139, 140.

Ver. 21, 22.—The author wished, in the first place, only to shew, that the covenant act was confirmed by the shedding of blood. But this leads him further to notice, that blood was very much used in consecrations and atonements. In the passage, Exod. xl., where the circumstances attending the consecration of the tabernacle are related there is no mention made of its being sprinkled with blood. Yet we learn from Josephus that this also was handed down by tradition, Antiqg. 3, 8, 6. Carpzov expresses his astonishment that Grotius, Clericus, and Mangey, when the occasion presented itself, did not mention the passage from Philo, De vita Mosis, L. III., p. 676. There, however, we are told not of a sprinkling of the temple and its vessels but a sprinkling of the priests and their clothes, with a mixture of blood and oil. We may, notwithstanding, adduce it here, as we find in Exod.
xl., also, the anointing only, without any mention of the blood. \( \chi\;\varepsilon\delta\omicron; \) belongs to \( \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha; \). At i. 6., we have already had such a transposition of the adverb. Here it does not seem to have been done from negligence, but, \( \sigma\chi\varepsilon\delta\omicron; \) is put before, as if the more to conceal it, and to give greater prominence to \( \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha; \). Thus, d’Orville remarks, Ad Chariton, p. 304., where he treats so profoundly of Synchysis, that, in the passage of Lycurgus, In Leocr. c. 18.: \( \varphi\alpha\;\alpha\nu\;\sigma\vartheta\omicron; \;\varepsilon\tau\iota; \;\tau\omicron;\zeta; \;\mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron; \;\mu\iota\kappa\rho\omicron;\zeta; \;\delta\omicron;\gamma\iota\zeta;\omicron;\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron;\omicron;\omicron;\), there is nothing to be changed in the collocation of the words, orator (enim) cavens aperte Atheniensii populo convicium facere, quasi \( \varepsilon\tau\iota; \;\mu\iota\kappa\rho\omicron;\zeta; \;\delta\omicron;\gamma\iota\zeta;\omicron;\mu\omicron;\nu\omicron;\omicron;\omicron;\), conturbavit verba, illud \( \mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron; \) quasi occultans.—\( \kappa\kappa\iota\beta\omicron;\iota\iota;\omicron;\varepsilon\iota; \) embraces the idea of consecration and of expiation, as, indeed, the former, to a certain degree, comprehends the latter.—It is remarkable that, both by the older and later theologians, this passage has been employed as a dictum probans against those who defend the notion of the possibility of another redemption than that through the blood and death of Christ. Comp. e. g. the Hessian Heave-offerings, Pt. I. p. 1065., against Arndt, who, in his true Christianity, B. II. c. 36. has expressed himself in the same way. The context certainly points to the impossibility of any other redemption; but the passage should not have been appealed to as a dictum probans, as it speaks only of what took place in the Old Covenant. Moreover, we must observe, that the \( \varepsilon\kappa\chi\varepsilon\iota\iota; \) does not refer to the shedding of blood on the slaughter of the animal, but to its pouring out at the Altar \( \varepsilon\kappa\chi\varepsilon\iota\iota; \) is also given for \( \pi\rho\iota; \) by the LXX., 2 Kings xvi. 15.), for this outpouring was “the root, the main part of the sacrifice,” \( \nu\iota\kappa\rho\omicron; \;\pi\omicron;\rho\iota\omicron;\omicron;\omicron; \), See Reland, Antiq. p. 3. §. 22.

Ver. 23—28.—In the place of that earthly expiation, though the death of animals and oft-repeated sacrifices of them, is now come the heavenly expiation, through the One death, once for all effectual, of the real High Priest.
Ver. 23.—The Author glances back upon the whole section, as far as ver. 13., and understands by ταύτα the various mentioned ways of purification. The neuter of the demonstrative denotes the species, the sort; Bernhardy’s Syntax, p. 281.: hence, also, the Greeks attached to it the accessory notion of the contemptible, which many have supposed in ταύτα, 1 Cor. vi. 11., and which, certainly, one might have been tempted to adopt in this place. By reason of this very retrospective reference to the various kinds of purification by blood we are not to think, in considering τὰ ἔνοδιγματα, merely of the σκηνή mentioned ver. 21., and hence, also, at τὰ ἵππονανα not merely of the heavenly temple. The plural τὰ ἔνοδιγματα shows that the Author had in view something heterogeneous; the closing of the Covenant, the Tent, the Vessels of the Tent, perhaps also the Priests; in contrast to which τὰ ἵππονανα must also relate to something of a various character. And, yet, nothing else of this kind can be found, save that very heavenly temple. Now, a consecration of it with blood appears unsuitable. To this it must be added, that, in the following verses, there is an immediate transition to the atoning sacrifice accomplished by Christ, and that, of course, what is to be purified or consecrated in the New Testament is considered by the Author to be only sinners themselves. We must, therefore, take the expression somewhat laxly in this sense: in the heavenly, i.e. the real, province, higher sacrifices come in, and the plural is put ex antithesi.

Ver. 24.—Comp. Vol. II. p. 16., on ver. 8.—on ch. viii., at the beginning, and on vii. 25.

Ver. 25, 26.—Comp. on ver. 11, 12. There is here contrasted in αἵματι ἀλλοτριῶν and διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ (καὶ ἱναντίον), πολλάκις and ἀπαξιζ. ἀπὸ καταξολίθις κόσμου and ἐνεπελείη τῶν αἰώνων. Following the example of the older theologians, but very improperly, Griesbach, and, after him, Knapp and Vater have retained the Parenthesis in the member ἵππονανα τοῦ αἰῶνος: they might, with equal propriety, have placed one at ἵππονανα, chap. x. 2. The antithesis of πολλάκις and ἀπαξιζ,
of συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων and καταβολή κόσμου, as well as ἥν δὲ, indicates that the subject is continued. Ἐπεί, where we translate otherwise (sonst), always retains its usual signification "since," "because," while we must add, "if it were otherwise." Comp. x. 2. "Λύ after ἐδεί is not necessary, notwithstanding that the proposition is hypothetical. The same difference exists as between, "if it had been so, you must have said," and "you ought to have said," the former being the stronger expression. So also in Demosthenes. See Schäfer, Appar. I. p. 549. On ἀπαξ see vii. 27. On συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων see i. 1. On καὶ ἡ Ἑυσίας see ver. 12.

Ver. 27, 28.—To the thought that the Redeemer has once appeared the author adds a memento to his readers, that a second appearance is still to be expected. This truth he expresses in such a way as to make us remark, that the connection of the first and second appearance of Christ is the same as that which exists with respect to all men. Καὶ after οὐρα, which Griesbach, Knapp, and Lachmann have properly adopted, expresses this comparison still more strongly; men, after death, shall not reappear until the day of judgment, and then, also, will the Redeemer be again visible. It follows from this, that the judgment cannot be one commencing immediately after death, but the last judgment. The opponents of the Socinians and Psychopannychites appealed to this μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο, as if it necessarily involved the doctrine of a judgment to be expected immediately after death. Even Bretschneider, "Dogmatik, II. s. 395.," is of opinion that this is clearly contained in μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο. On the other hand, with equal accuracy and impartiality, the learned Gerdes, in his treatise, De judicio particulari, in the Exercit. academ. Amstelod. 1737., although his direct object be the refutation of the Psychopannychites, shews, that the parallel here drawn between the judgment of men and the reappearance of Christ forbids the adding of this passage for the judicium particulare. Hence the want of an article cannot be
brought in proof that κρίσις denotes a *judicium particulare*, one judgment. On vi. 4., we have referred to this passage as proving, that, in our Epistle, the term κρίσις refers to believers and unbelievers; and such appears, in fact, to be the case. Comp. also on xii. 23. We might, perhaps, with Schulz, take it merely *in malam partem*, and translate *punishment*. We should then be obliged to say that the author speaks only of what will happen to men, irrespectively of Christ, in order to bring out more powerfully the *είς σωτηρίαν* as a fruit of the redemption through Christ. We shall give the sense more correctly, however, by rendering *judgment*, and, as it is here plainly spoken of man, by saying, that believers also are included. But as, subsequently, there is no further mention made of the end of unbelievers, it might, on the other hand, be concluded from this passage, that their sentence will be *annihilation*; a view which has lately found many defenders. Still it is easy to conceive that the author might feel occasion to give great prominence in this place to the *one side* of the κρίσις, without exactly intending to exclude the other. The two propositions are brought into parallel by καθ' ὅσον—οὕτω. Instead of καθ' ὅσον, a cod. of Stephen, and in Matthäi, reads καθ' ὅ. It is somewhat strange, therefore, that Griesbach should propose καθ' ως. As the more indefinite comparative ως was also put for the more definitely comparing ὅσον, so ὅσον, which compares the measure more definitely, might easily be employed to denote a comparison in general. Comp. our old “wessmaassen” — sintemal, gleichermaassen—ebenso.” In c. vii. 20, 22., also, the use of καθ' ὅσον approaches that in the passage under consideration, although there the relation of measure may still be retained.—Εἰς τὸ πολλά ὅν ἀνεγερσίαν ἀμαρτίας,—this πολλοὶ, like that in Matth. xx. 28., and Rom. v. 19., has given rise to a dispute, whether, according to the strictly Calvinistic view, the death of Christ is only of avail for the electi? The Lutheran dogmatists have endeavoured to shoot back the bolt upon their assailants in this manner: do not the πολλοὶ
form here an antithesis to ἀπέκδεχόμενοι? is it not, therefore, said, that, while, for a great portion, the redemption is effectual, only a small number expect the Redeemer in faith? We say: that it can scarcely admit of a doubt that not only οἱ πολλοί, which is employed, Rom. v. 19., but πολλοί, Matth. xx. 28., and, therefore, πολλοί in the passage before us, may designate multitude, without, on that account, being exclusive. And in Daniel xii. 2., Isaiah liii. 12., ὁμίλω is conceived to involve no exclusion. Perhaps our author himself, when he wrote this, had the ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήγγεις of the LXX. in view.—Expositors skim too lightly over χωρίς ἀμαρτίας. It cannot have been the author's intention, in these words, to say that the Redeemer, during His life upon earth, was not free from sins of commission, but that He will appear completely without sin, for this would be a direct contradiction of the doctrine of Scripture as contained in other passages, and of the χωρίς ἀμαρτίας in iv. 15. The dogma of an indwelling love of sin in the Redeemer which Dippel, Menken (see also his 10th Homily on the passage, p. 177.), and Irving have founded particularly on this declaration contradicts the analogia fidei. As the expression constitutes an antithesis to ἀνήγγειν ἀμαρτίας, we should most readily expect it to have the meaning assigned to it in Schulz's translation (Ohne Sündengeschäft), "having no more to do with sin." But, has not this expression something in it very striking? In this sense, the words correspond so little with the thought that such men as Jac. Cappell and Michaelis appear excusable in falling into the notion, that ἀμαρτία must be taken here in the same sense as in 2 Cor. v. 21. (Rom. viii. 3.), namely, for τετρα ἀμαρτίας, and signify sin-offering. One Cod. reads ἀμαρτός; another, agreeing with the exposition of Chrysostom and Grotius, has χωρίς ἀμαρτίας οὐσία. We can justify the current exposition only by calling ɔυροε of our aid Rom. vi. 10., and Heb. vii. 26. In the
CHAPTER X.

UNDER THE NEW CONSTITUTION WE FIRST RECEIVED THAT TRUE SACRIFICE WHICH HAS ONCE CLEANSED FOR ALL. WITH CONFIDENCE IN THIS SACRIFICE, CHRISTIANS MUST HOLD FAST FAITH AND TRUTH.

Ver. 1—10.—*The Old Testament sacrifices are shadows, of which Christ has brought the reality.*

Ver. 1.—In the first edition of Luther’s translation we find αὐτήν τὴν εἰκόνα rendered: (das Wesen der Güter selbst) “the essence of the good things themselves,”—a translation greatly blamed by Emser. The Syriac also translates יִצְבָּא דַעַת, “the essence of the things.” This translation arose from the following apparent difficulty: if εἰκόνα be rendered by “image,” it would seem as if the New Testament, also, vouchsafed us only images,—a view, moreover, which might find some support in μέλλοντα ἁγαθά
appearing to denote the good things of the next life. Lessing, on this subject, makes the following observation, which contains a great deal of truth: "As the Church of Christ upon earth is a prediction of the economy of the future life, so the Old Testament economy is a prediction of the Christian Church." In this sense, in fact, the declaration in the text has been explained by OEcumenius: σκιάς μὲν οὖν οἶδα (ὁ ἀπόστολος), says he, τὰ ἐν νόμῳ, εἰκόνα δὲ τὰ ἡμετέρα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, μέλλοντα δὲ καὶ ἄγαθα καὶ πράγματα ἀληθεῖα τὰ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι. In like manner Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. de Pasch., who is cited by Theophylact, Cajetan, Tena, and even Calvin. Against these interpreters, however, a protest was entered by both the Roman Catholic and Lutheran orthodoxy, ergone figurae figuram praedicatis Vetus Testamentum? This view, certainly, is not consistent with a correct conception of αἰῶν μέλλων and ἄγαθα μέλλοντα. See on i. 1. vi. 5. and ix. 11. The regnum gratiae is not the image but the commencement of that brought by the future Kingdom of Christ (see on vii. 18. 19.), and only in so far, perhaps, an image as the commencement may be called an exemplar of the whole. In Col. ii. 17., Paul calls what is given us in Christ, both in this world and in the next, the σῶμα. Luther's translation, which is expressly defended by Raith and Chr. Schmid, cannot be very well maintained; the opinion of Grotius, (who explains it in the same way) that, in 2 Cor. v. 7., εἰκόνα = ἵδος, is arbitrary. If we found αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν εἰκόνα, we might certainly affix that sense to it, for there would in that case be no close reciprocal relation between σκιά and εἰκόνα. But, as the words run at present, εἰκόνα forms the antithesis to σκιά, and must be rendered, as Beza has done, ipsa expressa imago. Σκιά stands opposed to εἰκόνα in the same way as ὑπογραφή, σκιαγράφια to ἀπερ-
γασία and ἡγαρία, See Stallbaum on Plato, De rep. II. p. 60, 179. Synesius, therefore, Hom. in Psalm. ικκ. 9., gives a very appropriate sense: ἐν γὰρ ἐνενευὸν πνεύμα καὶ εἰς σπορήθην καὶ εἰς ἀπόστολον καὶ κατὰ τεῖς ἁγαθῶν ἡγαρίαν πάλαι μὲν ἑστιαγράφησιν, ἐπιτα μέντοι διηφέδως τὰ μὲν τῆς γνώσεως. Chrysostom also has excellently explained it in this sense. Calvin well remarks, therefore, that Col. ii. 17 is different from our passage, but, according to the explanation of τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν, in the representation only, not in the subject-matter. We should say that when the Christian economy is called here an image it is so called as it is a prototype, not as it is again a copy from any thing else.—The καὶ ἐναντίον, τάς αὐτὰς Ἡσίας εἰς τὸ δηνυχίας gives a picturesque description of a painful and objectless cycle of observances, similar to ver. 11.: ἦσυχος καθ ἡμέραν — τὰς αὐτὰς Ἡσίας — πολλάχιας — and also οὐδὲστος, in both instances, contribute to the same object. We must, therefore, not merely translate with Luther, “not,” but “never.” It may be said, that this cycle is here made palpable by the daily sacrificial service of the Priests, as in ver. 11. The Author, however, has made an intentional reference to the sacrifices on the day of Atonement, in so far (see above, Vol. I. p. 289.) as these referred not exactly to single isolated transgressions; but altogether to the expiation of sinfulness. άναστας is in the Present as, at that time, the sacrificial worship still endured. The evi-

a For he breathed one and the same spirit both upon the prophet and the apostle, and, after the fashion of good painters, he first sketched out, and then accurately finished, the things of knowledge.

b Goethe gives a similar impression respecting the returning rounds of priestly ceremonies in a remarkable passage in the "Westöstlichen Divan, p. 263., "The mental prayer which includes and excludes all religions, and only in the case of a few men highly favoured by God pervades the whole course of life, is developed in the greater number merely as an ardent beatific feeling of a moment, after the disappearance of which the man restored to himself, unsatisfied and unemployed, falls back into the extremest ennui. To fill up this blank with ceremonies, with consecrating and expiating, with coming and going, is a duty and privilege of the priesthood."
dence for the plural δυναται is certainly considerable, and
induced Lachmann (and prior to him Mill), in accord-
ance with the external authorities, to receive the reading
into the text. Yet the external evidences for the plural
can by no means be considered as preponderating over
those for the singular, for the Cod. Vat. closes with
chap. ix. 14., and, therefore, cannot here be adduced,
while the other evidences counterbalance each other.
And, even were this not the case, the internal reasons
undoubtedly decide for the singular. The first propo-
sition, σκιών γάρ ἔχων κτλ., were, in case the plural
were adopted, an intolerable solecism, for the removal
of which neither the remark of Theophylact is suffi-
cient: ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῇ γραφῇ τεχνολογιῶν οὐδεὶς λόγος, καὶ
οὕτως αὐτῷ νοῆσωμεν ὡς τὰ ἀντίγραφα ἔχουσιν (he found,
namely, in his Codd. only the plural, and, in a παρα-
γραφή, the statement that the word should be written
without an ν), nor the uncritically applied canon, that
the participle frequently stands pro verb. fin. On
this subject see Fritzsche, Diss in Ep. ad Cor. II. 43.
And we must add, how unconnectedly does the second
proposition there stand, κατ' ἐναυτόν κτλ. ! What is
the subject to δυναται? The priests? But, there
was no mention made of them previously (In ver. 11.
δυναται does not relate to the priests but to the sacri-
fices). Προερχόμενοι, equivalent to λατρεύοντες, ver.
2., comp., in App. II., the explanation of ἔγγίζειν.

Ver. 2.—Οὐχ, both from external and internal evi-
dence, ought to be received into the text. It is found
in ACDE, in the Coptic and Arabic, and in the
Italic, &c., while in the Peshito, and the various
editions of the Vulgate, it is omitted. The Vulgate is
joined by the Complut., Luther, Beza, in the fifth
Ed. (in the second he adopted οὐκ), and Wetstein.
On the other hand, the negation is adopted by Eras-
mus, Rob. Stephen, Bengel, Matthäi, Griesbach, and
Lachmann. Among the reasons for this reading one
of no small importance is the καί, which is found in
few Codd., and has been adopted by H. Stephen the
Son, in the edition of 1576, with the signification of
saltem, a signification which he defends in his Diatr.
de Stylo N. T. c. 13. If ων was not read the origin of this χρν cannot be explained; but, if the two letters ων disappeared in several Codd. it may be imagined that the third would also be omitted. The proposition naturally should be read, in the way the Grecian expositors expressly recommend it to be read, as an interrogation. One of the most singular explanations is that given by Matthäi, who reads the negation, but, who contends against the proposition being taken as a question. According to him, the meaning is: "if the sacrifices could have accomplished perfection they would not have ceased—not that they who hitherto maintained the worship would have continued to do so, for these are already purified—but, their posterity, who for their transgressions need, in like manner, a purification of their conscience, would once (at least) have offered a sacrifice."—A true purification of the conscience is, according to the Author, only such as, once for all, gives the certainty to men, that their sins do not separate them from God. See viii. 17, 18.—Συνιδος; Consciousness, not Conscience, and, hence, construed with the Gen. of the Object. See on ix. 9.—Ἀπαξ, See on vii. 27.

Ver. 3, 4.—The author does not declare the import of the sacrifices according to the Law, but that which springs as the result. "How were"—says Schleiermacher, in his important Sermon on Heb. x. 8—12., the eleventh in the fifth collection—"all the sacrifices of the Old Covenant a remembrance of sin? In such a way that, while, by the sacrifice, satisfaction was made for individual actions which violated the law of the Highest, and the apprehension of reproach and further punishment done away, yet, at the same time, by the offering of the sacrifice, a confession of the punishable action was made, and, therefore, every individual, by the public offering of the sacrifice, established a remembrance of his sins, of that which he himself had offered for the Law." Ἄλλα signifies rather, much more.

Ver. 5—9.—With those inoperative sacrifices the true sacrifice is contrasted. The Redeemer is introdu-
ced as speaking, by the Author putting into his mouth the words from Ps. xl. 7, 8. He has taken that passage to be predictive of Christ. The words are no doubt prophetic. David, it is true, speaks particularly of himself; but, what he here says goes far beyond the Old Testament degree of advancement, and received its proper realization not in him but in his great descendant, See App. I. If this language be put into the mouth of Christ, it will be most appropriately placed in the period before His entrance into the world: and this is done by our Author. He pictures to himself the manner in which the Messiah perceives the inefficiency of the ancient rite of expiation, who, entering into the counsel of the Father, resolves to come into the world Himself, and reconcile it by His death. According to this view we must explain σιγάσχοµενος. Thus Klopstock, in the Messiah,

"Father, I saw their sorrow, Thou my tears. Then spakest Thou: 'Let us anew in man Create Our image.' Therefore We decreed Our myst'ry, the blood of expiation,
The new creation of the sons of men, Formed to Our glorious and eternal image! To perfect, then, for man this act Divine Myself I chose. To Thee, eternal Sire, To all the countless hosts of heav'n 'tis known, Since this resolve, how ardent my desire Man's low estate and nature to assume."

In treating of this passage of the Psalms, we must first notice the striking difference which exists between the Hebrew text and that of the LXX., which is followed by our Author.* The Hebrew text has גַּם קְרִית ל. How did it happen that the

* A difference of a slighter character between the LXX. and our citation is οὐδὲναια instead of ἢνεα or ἢνεας in the LXX. I conjecture that this has arisen from a reminiscence of Ps. li. 18: οὐδὲναια οὐδὲνα, διακαταραματι εἰς οὐδὲναια. Thus, too, may the non-Grecian construction of the verb c. acc. be explained. Alt, in his Grammar, p. 279., is inclined to take οὐδὲναιας. absolutely.
translator rendered \( \text{ἐοίμαι} \) by \( \text{σωμα} \)? In what sense has the Author of our Epistle taken his words? Countless, and, in many instances, highly arbitrary, are the different views upon this subject. The greater part of them is found collected in Pfeiffer, Dubia vexata in Ps. xl., Alting, Opp. v. p. 221., and in Wolf's Curae. The detailed discussion of the passage from the Psalms in Michaelis' Critical Lecture, and in the profound treatise of Frischmuth, in the Thes. philol. Vol. I. are still useful.—We suppose, as in general the modern interpreters do, that the translator of the Psalms had no other reading before him than that which we now have; he therefore had \( \text{ἐοίμαι} \), in the signification ears. We next inquire, wherefore has he \( \text{kαταφρίζων} \), and not \( \text{ἐσκαψας} \), or \( \text{διωγμας} \)? Aquila alone, whose chief object it was to render the literal meaning, has expressed the proper sense of the word; Symmachus has \( \text{ωτία κατασκεύαζας} \); and the fifth and sixth translation, \( \text{ωτία κατηγρίων μοι} \). Now what sense have these translators attached to the version? The more recent exposition of the Psalm, influenced by the reasons assigned by Michaelis, and following in his steps, has taken \( \text{ἐλαφα αυτος} \), \( \text{αυτωμεν} \), \( \text{κρη} \), “to open the inward ear,” and so very recently the passage is rendered by Hengstenberg, Stier, and Hitzig. But, did the Grecian interpreters attach the same sense to the phrase? This is not impossible. As the expression \( \text{ωτία διωροσων} \) would have been almost unintelligible in Greek, they might feel themselves impelled to put, in place of this, the general expression “to prepare.” We have, indeed, some other instances in which the translators have rendered \( \text{κρη} \), “to dig,” less closely, by the word “prepare.” Onkelos has given \( \text{אנה קני ל} \) on Genesis L. 5.; and Numbers xxii. 18. Jerome has rendered: \text{et paraverunt}. We are the more entitled to demand of the Alexandrian translator, although certainly not belonging to the higher order of his pro-
fession, a right understanding of the passage, as the Chaldean has correctly explained the expression, and, what is sufficiently remarkable, given even a Christian turn to his exposition לָאָצְצֵה מַעְרַקְנֶת בַּר יֶהוָה ל֖וֹ: "thou hast digged ears for me, that I might perceive thy ransom, thy redemption." Jarchi, also, Kimchi, and Aben Esra explain the phrase of obedient hearing; the last even appropriately compares the passage with 1 Sam. xv. 22. It must be confessed however, that, if this was intended to be expressed by those Greek translations the language was deficient in perspicuity. The translator of the Psalm in the LXX., as well as the others, could have expressed the sense more clearly if they had resolved the trope in ὀρία. The more adroit translator of Job has rendered בְּרָאָל, Job xxxiii. 16., by ἀναξιλότυπεν νόν. Under these circumstances, I should not be inclined to dispute that the Grecian translators had taken פֶּדֶר, fodere, in the signification exculpere, perficere; or, from the second meaning of the word emere derived the signification parare, and thus had come, by another road, upon the same sense as that given by the Chaldean and the Rabbins, namely, "thou hast given me ears, and, by means of them, I dedicate myself as a sacrifice," i.e. as I perceive Thy commandments. It has been shewn, by the profound Iken, in his Diss. I. p. 221. sq., that the view of the passage which supposes an allusion to the boring of the ears of slaves would lead at last, so far as the sense is concerned, to the same result. But, further, wherefore has the translator of the Psalm put σῶμα instead of ὀρία? If he believed that in the original it was put pars pro toto, the origin of his version is obvious. But, if he took the words in

* The Jewish interpreters expressly assign this as one of the three significations of בְּרָאָל. R. Nathan, in the Concordance, says the word has a three old meaning, to dig, to eat, to prepare, וקינן ורכילים בסינו.
the same way as the Chaldean, the Rabbins, and the moderns have done, he has, in his translation, expressed the *effectus pro causa*. He perceived that, in the passage, another sacrifice must be contrasted with the animal sacrifices; he concluded, that the inward revelation must allude to the self-sacrifice of man. This idea is expressed also in I Sam. xv. 22. Ps. li. 19. Ecclus. xxxv. 1, 2. He therefore put σῶμα κατηργίσω μοι, as Paul, Rom. xii. 1., speaks of the Ἱσόαν τῶν σωμάτων.

A peculiar mode of escape from the difficulty has recently been proposed by Dähne, in his „Jüdisch-alexandrinischer Religionsphil. II. s. 60.” He supposes the Grecian translator to have connected ὀλοκαύτωμα with what precedes: σῶμα δὲ κατηργίσω μοι ὀλοκαύτωμα, and, as a particular proposition, added τὰ καὶ περὶ ἄμαρτίας ὑμᾶς ἑστίησαι. In the first place, we must remark, that this conjecture is at least not necessary, for the proposition σῶμα κατηργίσω μοι, without even the addition of ὀλοκαύτωμα, yields a sense, and because, when contrasted with the other sacrifices, the words, of themselves, refer to the sacrifice of the σῶμα. But there are various other reasons against it. The frequency with which, in the Old Testament, ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ Ἰσαίας occur together, alone renders it improbable that the translator would have broken off τὰ καὶ περὶ ἄμαρτίας ὑμᾶς ἑστίησαι from the preceding ὀλοκαύτωμα, especially as he would have thereby disturbed the parallelism. For, in contrast to the ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ περὶ ἄμαρτίας ὑμᾶς ἑστίησαι, it is said, previously, and in a manner exactly corresponding, Ἰσαία καὶ προσφορὰν ὑμῖν ἡθέλησαι. And, moreover, it may be much questioned whether the reading of the *Cod. Vat.*, which has the sing. ὀλοκαύτωμα, be not the correct one; in case it were genuine, καὶ περὶ ἄμαρτίας would stand quite dismembered from the rest of the words. To this must be added the following consideration: seeing that the term ὀλοκαύτωμα throws the idea of *shedding of blood* into the back ground,
would it really have been employed in speaking of the death of Christ?

We come now to consider the application which our author makes of the passage from the Psalm. In our opinion he has taken σᾶμα κατηργίσω μου in the same way as the translator in the LXX., "Thou hast prepared for me a body, which I must dedicate as an offering to Thee." The sacrifice of the Redeemer, therefore, consists, according to his view, particularly in the ἅπαξον in general. And to this alludes the τοῦ πνεύματος τὸ Ἁλημά σου. How important it appeared to him to bring the obedience prominently forward may be seen from his borrowing the above mentioned words from the Old Testament passage, even with a violation of the context. In the LXX., the Infin. τοῦ πνεύματος is dependent upon an omitted ἐνωλὴν, while our author connects it as a Genit. of Intention with ἡξω. Now the highest expression of this ἅπαξον consists in the taking upon Him of the pains of death, which are pointed out in v. 8., and, with particular distinctness, in Phil. ii. 8., as the pinnacle of the ἅπαξον. In the same way, chap. ix. 14. gave, as the soul of the offering of Christ, the determination made by the Divine Spirit from a feeling of love. It is possible, therefore, that the author, immediately on writing the words σᾶμα κατηργίσω μου, thought of what the Scholiast, quoted by Matthai, supplies: τὸ ἔρχεται Κυρία γενέσθαι σοι, as he says, chap. ii. 14., the incarnation was requisite in order to enable Him to undertake the pains of death. We are induced, however, by ver. 8 and 9., to suppose that he attached no other meaning to these words than what has been expressed by the Alexandrian translator. If he had understood the proposition as the Greek Scholiast has done, and with him the majority of expositors, would he not then, in ver. 8, have repeated these very words, and satisfied himself at ver. 9., as well as at ver. 7., with the ἦξω? Again, in ver. 10., we have the prominent Ἁλημά; the expression προσφορά τοῦ σώματος, directs us back, although not necessarily indeed, yet with the highest
probability (see Rom. vii. 4. Eph. ii. 16. Col. i. 22.). to σώμα κατηγρίω στοι. This, however, might also be imagined, if that proposition contained only the meaning, "Thou hast given me a body, namely, for a self-sacrifice in the general sense." Hence it follows, that the manner in which the passage from the Psalm has been employed; according to the translation of the LXX., agrees, in essentials, with the sense of the Hebrew text, and that Calvin has very justly remarked: neque enim in verbis rectandis adeo religiosi fuerunt (apostoli), modo ne Scriptura in suum commodum falsos abuternur. Semper hoc spectandum est, quorum sitent testimonia: nam in scopo ipso diligenter cavent, ne Scripturam trahant in alienum sensum, sed tam in verbis, quam in aliis, quae praesentis instituti non sunt, sibi liberius indulgent. And with this opinion of the Reformer the suffrages of recent times, although of the most varied character, agree. So De Wette, for instance, in his treatise on the Symbolical doctrinal form of our Epistle. p. 43.: "The erroneous translation of the words: σώμα κατηγρίωστοι is woven, indeed, into the application of it, but the latter does not entirely rest upon it. Had the LXX. translated, ὤντα κατηγρίωστοι, the sense, upon the whole, would have remained the same, there would have always been conveyed in it the idea, that the fulfilment of the Divine will brings true reconciliation, upon which the author had already laid the whole stress at chap. v. 7—9." Another case, in which a quotation in the New Testament, and that without the example of the LXX., departs as much from the Old Testament text, is Eph. iv. 8. In Harless, however, may be seen a simple and satisfactory proof, that this quotation, too, expresses essentially the sense of the Old Testament passage.

The words in κατηγρίω στοι. the author was unwilling to pass over, as they serve to confirm the fact, that God, from the beginning, did not regard the Old Testament sacrifices as a real expiation. In ver. 8. and 9. he draws attention more strongly to the
probative fact of the passage quoted, and, therefore, contrasts more pointedly the circumstances upon which it rests. We find distinctly, thus he reasons by the ἀναγεί κτλ., in the Old Testament declaration, that a higher sacrifice was to take the place of those offerings of animals.

Ver. 10.—The redeeming death is here traced back to the will of the Father, which the Son has made His own. On the notion ἀγιάζειν, see App. II. This consecration is traced back to a twofold cause, to an original and to a mediatory one. The former is expressed by ἐν, the latter by διά. Here, as in other parts of the Sacred Scripture, the whole work of redemption is referred to the Father (John iii. 16. Rom. viii. 32. Eph. i. 4—10.). The Redemption is an everlasting decree, formed before the foundation of the world, 1 Cor. ii. 7. Eph. i. 4. 2 Thess. ii. 13. 2 Tim. i. 9. All the gifts which the redeemed receive as the fruit of the redemption are ordinarily referred by Paul to the Divine will as to their only cause, but especially the plan of redemption itself. Comp. in our Author the κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ Σιλήνου, ch. ii. 4. Paul, too, in particular, ought here to be compared, Eph. i. 5. κατὰ τὴν εὐδοξίαν τοῦ Ἡρῴδατος αὐτοῦ, Eph. i. 11. κατὰ τὴν βολὴν τοῦ Ἡρῴδατος αὐτοῦ. We must hold fast not so much the notion of the gracious will, which is expressed by εὐδοξία, as that of the free will. The diversity of the causal relation denoted by ἐν and διὰ, is expressed by Schulz, and, after him, by De Wette, by (durch) through, and (mittelst) by means of. The same prepositions express the same distinction in 1 Peter i. 5. and i. 22. We do not think, however, that the translation “through” (durch) is the best that may be given for ἐν. Where the cause is immanent, it would be better in our language (Ger.) to retain in (Ang. in). This appears to be the opinion of Winer in his excellent remark, p. 370. The ἐν is to be taken here in the same sense as in Eph. i. 6., according to the reading of the Cod. Vat. ἐν ἐκατεροτάν ἡμᾶς.—On προφορά τοῦ σώματος see above, pp. 59, 60.
Ver. 11—18.—We are, in fact, through a single sacrifice, for ever perfected.

Ver. 11, 12.—καὶ does not add another thought, but serves in propositions, like atque (Hand, De part. I. 497.), to introduce a closer illustration, and may be rendered by namely, which is, in fact, expressed by the Syriac. The object here is to render the ἵππων more evident. The Jewish sacerdotal service is represented as the subordinate, and, at the same time, as a wearisome and yet fruitless service. The following words are placed antithetically, Ἰωσηφιων and ἰκάνων, αἱ αὑταὶ Ἰωσιαὶ and μία Ἰωσία, πολλάκις and εἰς τὸ διηνυσῖς, perhaps, also, αἱ ἑνετές κτλ. and ver. 14. Authorities of considerable weight, as A. C., the Pes- hito and Philox., with other versions, read ἰδεύετο instead of ἰδεύες. Still we must retain ἰδεύες, 1. Because it may be so easily conceived that ἰδεύετο has arisen as a gloss, 2. καὶ Ἰωσηφιων can be less readily taken in the lax sense in which we took it, vii. 27., where it was used of the High Priest, and the passages in which Philo speaks of the daily sacrifice of the High priest are of no value as evidence. See Winer's Reállexikon, 2 A. I. 594. Anm. 2. The High priest being the representative of the whole priesthood, that priesthood, in general, must be here contrasted with the New Testament priesthood. In the temple service the priests stood. Now, in the standing there are two other allusions. Standing, in opposition to sitting, marks subordination, comp. James ii. 3. 1 Kings i. 28. Pliny, Hist. Natur. 35, 2: magnificus est Jupiter, ejus in throno, adstantibus Diis. Stare, in Latin, is used particularly of slaves, Gracchus in Gellius, l. 15. c. 12.: nulla apud me fuit popina, neque pueri eximia facie stabant. But standing denotes, also, what has continuance, Ovid. Fast. 5. v. 383.: saxo stant antra vetusto; and so, also, in German. When, therefore, it is said: "he stands there every day, performing his service," there is, on the one hand, a prominence given to the notion of his being
λειτουργεῖν, while the Son is enthroned, the distinction also made between the angels and the Son (i. 7, 8.), on the other, of his executing some business which is continually doing and undoing, an idea to which the following words give still greater prominence. See also on ver. 1. Περιμεθεῖν is a stronger expression than ἀφαιρεῖν.—The most considerable authorities, ver. 12., read ὁ δὲ which has, like ἀφαιρεῖται, been adopted by Lachmann into the text. Yet, if αὐτὸς originally stood in the text, it is so easy to conceive how ὁ δὲ took its place, that we must prefer the former. Still we do not think that αὐτὸς is here used in that emphatic sense in which the Pythagoreans employed their αὐτὸς, when speaking of their Master. Nor in John (1 John ii. 12. 2 John 6. are quoted) should we be inclined to say this is the case, but believe that it may be better explained from the indefinite manner of expression peculiar to this Epistle. The author employs the αὐτὸς, in speaking of God, so indefinitely, nay God and Christ with him run so much into one subject, that, in such passages as ii. 5, 25, 28, 29; iii. 1, 2., we seek in vain to separate them. Luke might more properly be cited for that use of the Pron., e. g. v. 16, 17. It is here sufficient to point to those passages in which, even in the best writers, the subject referred to by αὐτὸς must be supplied from the context. These passages have been profoundly treated by van Hengel in the Annot. in l. nonnulla N. T. p. 195. sq. Some perhaps may entertain a doubt whether εἰς τὸ δινέκειν should be connected with ἡσύχας, or with ἐνάβιος. We prefer the former construction, placing the comma after δινέκεις, and, for the reason assigned by Beza, that, in ver. 14., εἰς τὸ δινέκεις refers to the validity of the sacrifice, and, also, because it appears to stand in contrast to πολλὰκις.

Ver. 13.—We conceive the thirteenth verse to be intended to meet the difficulty arising from the perfecting having by no means yet taken place. To this our Author answers that, in due time, all things will be accomplished, as announced by that important de-
claration in Psalm cx. 1. "Τὸ λοιπὸν must not be rendered moreover, besides; it is here employed to indicate time, and must, indeed, be strictly distinguished from τῶν λοιπῶν (Gal. vi. 17. Hermann on Viger, p. 706.), not in future, but, for the whole future. If an argument were desired on this point there might, by applying Hermann's doctrine of the position of the particle ἄν (De partic. ἄν, L. 2. c. 8.), be some stress laid upon the circumstance that, while it is employed by the LXX., it is wanting here before ἑβδόμων, and because the author wishes to give prominence to the certainty of this fact. There are cases, however, in the New Testament in which ἄν occurs where it was equally important to give prominence to this certainty, Matth. xvi. 28. Mark ix. 1. Luke ix. 27.—The figure of the enemies being ὑποτάδιον τοδὼν, which has, hitherto, been explained only from the Old Testament and the Arabic, is Grecian: in Sophocles, Electra. ver. 447., Electra prays: παίδ', Ὁσέσης ἵζ \[\text{.} \] The dogmatical conception of the passage must be influenced by that of I Cor. xv. 24–28., where the same thought is more amply developed. This passage, however, has not by any means been explained with the requisite care; and, since the older work of Gerdes, Meletemata sacra in cap. xv. ep. I. ad Cor. Groning. 1759. (which is certainly executed with great exactness, and has, nevertheless, been quite unattended to by our more recent writers on the first Epistle), still waits for a particular monography. Although we have often made it an object of contemplation, we do not take upon us to pronounce a definitive judgment, particularly as a decision respecting it involves several other difficult passages, e. g. Phil. ii. 10. Still, as the author of our Epistle is dependent upon the doctrinal type of Paul, and as, therefore, we shall expound most correctly the declaration before us by following the Pauline notion, we will not refrain from stating briefly what we think at present concerning that Pauline passage. Expositors, even down
to the latest times, have not bestowed sufficient attention on the question, whether the ἱπποτάσσομαι be not a ἱπποτάσσομαι through the πίστις, and, consequently, a leading back of all those that do not yet acknowledge Christ to the acknowledgment of Him? The conclusion, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς ἦ γὰρ πάντα ἐν πάσι, comes very near to this notion. The able defender of the Apocatastasis, Gregory of Nyssa, has some interesting observations on this subject, in his excellent discourse on 1 Cor. xv. 28 (the first in the 2d vol. of the Paris Edition). He draws the following distinction between καταργεῖται and ἱπποτάσσομαι: "There is here a two-fold class of enemies mentioned; the one, to which death belongs, will be thrown down by force, and rendered inoperative—and that is καταργεῖται; the other is overcome by faith, so that God obtains the dominion in it—this is ἱπποτάσσομαι." We will not enter upon the discussion of the argument either for or against this opinion. For our purpose, what follows is sufficient. The fundamental thought of ver. 24—28, is this: One day the βασιλεία of Christ will cease. This, however, can happen only after all ἰχθύς shall have been overcome. Under these Paul comprehends particularly the evil spiritual powers (yet Usteri, in his Paul. Lehrbegr. 4. A. s. 354., inclines to the notion that, after all, perhaps, the "powers" may, here at least, be at the same time earthly kings and princes), and these, too, not merely personalities but impersonal powers, as the Σάκαρος. In other words, he means to say: "Every thing that, until now, obstructs the development of God's kingdom, wickedness and evil must in all its forms be destroyed, before Christ gives up His βασιλεία to the

*a* Neither Heydenreich, nor Billroth, has particularly noticed the circumstance, that the Apostle presses the ἄχρες, and, in this connection, at least, so expounds it as if an end of the βασιλεία of Christ were pointed out by it. Calvin has noticed this, while the older interpreters, as Chrys. and Theod., have merely attended to removing the ἄχρες, as if Christ would at some period lay down His rule.
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Father." If this be Paul's doctrine, we should give
the following as the author's meaning in the passage
before us. "It is not yet evident that the sacerdotal
efficiency of the Redeemer, once for all exerted, has
destroyed sin with all its consequences; but Christ
will not cease to be king of the human race until
all opposing powers are subdued."

Ver. 14.—Here is still another assurance, that, κατὰ
dόναμιν, the ἅγιαζόμενοι are once for all τέλειοι, although
this δόναμις has not yet every where appeared.

Ver. 15—18.—The δὲ is connective. The language
of Scripture expressly testifies in the prophetic pas-
sage, quoted viii. 10—12., that the New Covenant
will transform the outward law into an inward im-
pulse, and that then the sins of men will once for all
be regarded as not existing. This implies, also, that
no further sacrifice will be necessary.

Ver. 19—21.—The contemplation of such a doctrine
is well calculated to excite a firm Faith, Love, and
Hope.

Ver. 19—21.—As, at iv. 14., it is deduced from the
nature of the New Testament doctrine, that faith and
confidence (iv. 16., παρέσκευα) must spring from it, so is
it, in like manner, in the following section. But here
Love, and indirectly, likewise Hope, is added. There is
a similar transition in Rom. v. 1. from the δικαιώμας to the
προσαγωγή. The ὁδὲ refers back to what immediately
precedes, but especially to c. ix., where it was shewn,
that Christ has entered into the true Holy of Holies,
and, as He has done this for our advantage, He is, in
this respect, to be regarded as our πρόδρομος: vi. 19,
20. xii. 1. Παρέσκευα and παρέσκευας, generally
construed with the same Prepositions as τίσις and
πιστέων, with ἐπὶ, ἐν (πρὸς), may also be construed
directly with εἰς. In the description of the nature of
this εἰσοδος there is an opulence of diversified allusions
crowded together into one sentence such as we often
find in Paul. The relative ἦν which might be referred
to ὀδὸς, we should rather refer to ἱερὸς. This way is, first of all, new. In using ἐγχαρίζων, the author indicates the derivation from ξανώς. As being newer, it must first have received a consecration, through which consecration it has now become passable for others, so that even Christ appears on it only as πρόφρομος. The nature of this newness of being is still more distinctly expressed by the adjective predicate πρόφρατος with ὀδὸς. If the writer, however, had wished by πρόφρατος to express only this, he would, most likely, have selected νέος. The more unusual πρόφρατος, especially in connection with ζωος, leads us to suppose still another intimation. According to the etymology, it is also, in Passow’s opinion, recenter mactatus; and it is then particularly used of fresh meats (Phrynicus, Ed.lobeck, p. 375.). Hence he calls it a fresh way, with an allusion to the death through which Christ himself became a way. In reference to this, the way has again the predicate ζωος. It is a living sacrifice through which the way passes. Comp. vii. 16, 25. Rom. xii. 1. 2 Cor. xiii. 4. In the vitality lies also the vital power, Comp. i Peter. i. 3., ἐδίκης ζωος.—In order to become such a way, it was necessary that the carnal covering should fall from the Divine appearance (Erscheinung); it was only by His death that the Vail of the Holy of Holies was rent in twain (Matth. xxi. 51.). According to another allusion, the earthly existence of Jesus appears as the vail which still conceals the Holy of Holies, in the passage John xvi. 7.—In that Holy of Holies, an entrance to which is now opened to us, we find Jesus as High Priest. Our Author, instead of the designation ἄγαζος, which occurs in the LXX. only once, Levit. iv. 3., but more frequently in the Apocryphal books, has made choice of ἰερός μέγας, which is the usual expression in the LXX. It has been inquired whether ὁλός τοῦ Θεοῦ here signify Temple, or, as in iii. 2., Family? The former meaning is certainly here intended; and to it, also, there is a transition in ver. 3. and 4.
Ver. 22, 23.—When we have acquired such a childlike confidence in Christ as to venture to approach God, we must approach Him in faith; and ver. 24. exhorts us muta|ly to encourage one another to love. Faith must be accompanied with the ἀληθινὴ καρδία; ἀληθινὸς forms the antithesis to ὑπόκρισις. In the opinion of the majority of interpreters, the προεξηγόμενοι have a double character. The Author’s thought is, that they dare (dürfen) approach, because they are δικαιοωθῆναι ἰνώτην τοῦ Θεοῦ. This thought, however, he enounces in a form different from that in which Paul expresses it, Rom. v. 1. He denotes the justification with a reference to the rites in the Old Testament by which it was prefigured. He alludes, namely, to the lustration by blood (ix. 21.), and to that by water (vi. 2. ix. 19.). By the sprinkling with blood (1 Peter i. 2.) the heart is purified; by Christian baptism, with a symbolic reference to the whole man, the body is cleansed. It might therefore be inquired, whether in this there be any allusion to the distinction between justification and sanctification? We do not think so. Both the one and the other, in our opinion, denote particularly our objective justification, and our objective purity before God, which springs from that; the context likewise, demands this, as assigning the ground of Christian confidence. The baptismal act is, therefore, to be taken sacramentally as the objective pignus proffered to faith, so that the Author might here spoken of a baptism with the blood of Christ, as in Rev. i. 5. vii. 14. But then the baptismal rite certainly designates indirectly the subjective growing-pure, Rom. vi. 3. et seq.; and, on the other hand, the subject-matter treats also of the παντελῶς ἁμαρτω, 1 Peter i. 2., as of the principle of sanctification. That the expositors of the Reformed Church, after the example of Calvin and Beza, have not been willing to refer the ἀληθινῶν to baptism, but to the spiritual water of healing, mentioned in Ezek. xxxvi. 25., must certainly be ascribed to their dogmatical prepossessions.—There now arises another question:
whether the majority of interpreters, with Kuinöl of
the number, have done rightly in construing both par-
ticipes with the verb, fin. προεσχώμεθα. The Vulgate
has so construed the passage, and so likewise the
Italic and Peshito; the latter of which has, besides,
in an arbitrary manner, inserted an et before κατίχω-
μεν, and been followed in this by Luther. Were
we to adopt this view, we conceive that a καί before
κατίχωμεν must of necessity be supposed; if it stand
before κατανοώμεν, where, however, a new thought is
introduced, we should with still greater reason expect
it before κατίχωμεν; for this proposition expresses the
same thought as the preceding one, which commences
with προεσχώμεθα. The want of this καί appears a
sufficient reason against the adoption of that construc-
tion.—At iii. 1., we have treated of the significance of
όμολογία, and why it is called simply ομολογία τῆς
ἔλεγχος, and not also τῆς πίστεως. On this subject see
vii. 19. Comp. also iii. 6.

Ver. 24, 25.—Here regard is had to the spiritual
state of the brethren, of which the apostle warns
in Gal. vi. 4., namely, when it happens, in order
to procure for themselves, by the comparison, a
κατίχημα. On the other hand, this regard has, as its
object, to excite both one's self and others to good.
Love appears as the principle of action, and the sub-
ject of the passage is the καλὰ ἔργα, in the sense of Paul.

Ver. 25. gives prominence to a manner of expression in
which the παρεξηγοῦμεν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἐργῶν is to be
particularly shewn, in the brotherly παράκλησις; this
lies in the ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες. But, the more exact
conception of it is dependent upon that of the pre-
ceding words. From a remote antiquity, expositors
have been divided respecting ἐπισυναγωγῇ. The Latin
interpreters,Justinian, Calvin, James Cappell, Ger-
hard, Hunnius, and, recently, Seyffarth, have explain-
ed ἐπισυναγωγῇ by coetus Christianorum, so that there

* It might be supposed that the Italic and Vulgate also,
which translate collectio, had thought, not of a conventus, but,
of the societas fidelium. Such a supposition, however, would
be incorrect, for collectio is in them the translation of συλλεγή,
is already mention made here of the apostacy spoken of in ver. 26. et seq. Now, this explanation might be rejected on this single, but sufficient, ground, that the author would never, if he had spoken of apostacy, have added the indulgent καθώς ἔδος τισίν. But, it might still be a very reasonable question whether this exposition, as it appears modified by Böhme, ought not to be approved of. With that modification ἔγκαταλείπεται is understood of the being left in a forlorn state, from the withdrawal of aid and support (x. 33, 34.). A necessitating reason for this view cannot be found. Ἐπισυναγωγή may, no doubt, denote the societas Christianorum; it may, also, just as well stand for the simpl. Ἀναγωγή. If it be inquired, why did the author, in speaking of the conventus, not employ the simpl.? we conceive we ought not, as Seyffarth has done, seek an answer to the inquiry in the Idiosyncrasy of the author. For, the use of composita instead of simpl. has not its origin, in the general, in any idiosyncrasy of a writer. Schweighäuser, on Polybius T. V., p. 332., supposes such to be the case, indeed, in Polybius; and Tzschucke assumes the same with respect to Plutarch. But, as Seyffarth observes, § 40., we must rather attribute to the higher rhetorical culture of an author any tendency which he may have to give a shading to his thoughts by the employment of compound words. The verb. comp. ἐπισυνάγω is found, also, in the New Testament, where συνάγω would have sufficed, Matth. xxiii. 37. Mark i. 33. Luke xii. 1. We prefer the usual conception of the passage to that of Böhme. chiefly for the following reasons. 1. Because, if the subject-matter were the leaving in a forlorn state, εἰσανοῦσ or ἀλλήλωνς would have been employed rather than τῆς ἐπισυναγωγῆς. 2. Because it would be improper to make ἡ

σύναξις, which words denote the conventus sacri. Comp., also, the usage of colligere in Tertullian, De fuga in pers. c. 14. Ireneus, l. 3. c. 3.

* In this respect. no material difference could be pointed out between Paul and our author. In our Epistle are found 534 vocabula composita and decomposita, in that to the Romans 478.
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ἐπισυναγωγικῶς ἀπεκλήσια ὑμῶν, much more τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. Because, in that case, καθὼς ἠδε τοιῶν would be less suitable. Our view of the admonition is this. The παράξενωυσθές ἀγάπης must manifest itself especially in the meetings of the community, which afford such fair opportunities for παράξενως, and, on this very account, no one must absent himself from them. The thought which follows in the context connects itself excellently with this, viz. that from such idleness there might spring apostacy at last. There is a similar admonition, chap. xii. 12. et seq., to establish the sluggish, in order that no instance of apostacy might take place in the community, the consequence of which would be irreparable. It is by no means against the spirit of the first Christian age to ascribe so much importance to the Christian’s presence in the assemblies of the church. Comp. in Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. c. 13.: σπουδάζετε ὑμνοντέροι αὐνέχεοντες εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν. "Ὅταν γὰρ πυρνός ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτὸ γίνεται, καθαυρώνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ λύναι ὁ ὅλοθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὑμνοια ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως," and, in the Epistle to Polycarp, c. 4., he exhorts: τυχόντεροι συναγωγικῶν γνώσωσιν. There is a good treatise on the passage, by Pfizer, in the Thes. novus philol. II. Here, as frequently elsewhere, the solemnity of the admonition is heightened by reminding the reader how near is the approach of the day of judgment. Comp. ver. 37. Rom. xiii. 11.

Ver. 26—31.—From lukewarmness springs apostacy, and apostacy escapes not the Divine vengeance.

Ver. 26—31.—As chap. vi. 1—8. exhorted to a diligent progression, lest a falling off should take place, and from that an apostacy ensue, so here the author makes his readers remark that lukewarmness may pass

* Let it be your care, therefore, to come more fully together, to the praise and glory of God. For when ye meet fully together in the same place, the powers of the devil are destroyed, and his mischief is dissolved by the unity of your faith.

Archbishop of Canterbury’s translation.
into apostacy. Still more accordant with this is what we have remarked, xii. 12., &c., where first slothfulness is reproved, and then the reader is warned against forfeiting the privileges of primogeniture. For, luke-warmness in participating in Christian communion may easily pass into indifference towards the saving truth itself, and this indifference, at last, induce a return to Judaism, and, with that return, a bitter enmity to the truth once acknowledged.

In this section, the state of mind treated of in ch. vi. is still more fully discussed. There the progress which the readers had made in goodness was treated of more in detail, here is shewn more minutely to what extremity their apostacy leads. As respects the nature of the subject, therefore, we must complete the το λαζέων την ἐπιγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας from vi. 4, 5. (Comp. also, below ver. 32. φωτισθείται), and must, accordingly, conceive it to be meant of those who were led into the whole extent of Christian experience, but who did not persevere in holding fast what was offered to them. The apparent contradiction in which it stands to other passages, according to which it would seem as if the Christian once regenerated can never utterly fall away from the faith, is there discussed. But, the minuter description of the nature of this apostacy, and of the manner in which it expresses itself, demands a more particular examination. Respecting ἀμαρτάνειν, as denoting the apostacy, see on iii. 17. xi. 25. xii. 1, 4. This ἀμαρτάνειν takes place ἱκουσίως. The subject-matter, consequently, does not treat of an ἰσπίστευν, as at Rev. ii. 5. et seq., where there is a call to μετάνοια. Comp. the valuable commentary of Episcopius on that passage, where he expounds also the passage before us. The notion, that the employment of this expression betrays a Philonic usage, we have refuted above, Vol. I. p. 69. At the very beginning of the third book of his Ethics, Aristotle has, indeed, a long and profound discussion of the moral conception of ἱκουσίον. In the classical writers, in the Jewish Authors, and in the Fathers, the ἱκουσία ἀμαρτήματα form the opposite of the ἦ ἐγνώμενα ὑπήντειν ου δύσιν γίγνομεν. As syno-
nymous with this, there occurs in these writers τὰ κατὰ γνώμην ποιήσαντα. The strongest expression for this conception is that in the Constit. Apost. 1. 2. c. 23: ἐν παρατήρεσι (veluti acie instructa) ἀμαρτάνειν. However usual the distinction, in our systems of morals, between peccata voluntaria or praecepta and peccata infirmitatis, yet, doubts may still be entertained as to the closer definition of these conceptions. Some of the moderns, treading in the steps of the Pelagians, and of the Catholic dogmatists, regard in general the voluntarium as an essential condition of the conception peccatum. But then, the term peccatum infirmitatis, which is taken as equivalent to involuntarium, must appear to be a contradictio in adjecto; so that Töllner, even from this point of view, in his dissertation: On the division of sins into intentional and unintentional (Theol. Untersuchungen Bd. 1. S. 2.), proceeds consistently in altogether denying a place among sins to what are called unintentional sins. And, on the other hand, it depends upon what we understand by voluntas whether we shall convert all peccata infirmitatis to peccata voluntatis. For, if we understand by voluntas, not the deliberatio, but, the proclivitas, then all sins of infirmity belong to the province of the peccatum voluntarium. In this sense, Augustine, also, Retract. L. 1. c. 13. characterises the peccatum originale as voluntarium: "quia in ipsa hominis voluntate sedem habet, et quia natura depravata illi peccato in adulta aetate consentit." If we set out from the declaration of John: ἡ ἁμαρτία ἴσος ἡ ἁμοία, we must comprehend every thing that opposes the Divine Law, not only the deed but the inclination, under the conception of sin. And, as to the conception of sin there certainly belongs Guilt, and consequently Will, so we must, with Augustine, cha-

racterise the PECC. HABITUALE and ORIGINIS as VOLUN-
tARIUM. By this we join in the censure which Nitzsch
(Protest. Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Möhlers, S.
93) pronounces on Melanchthon: "Melanchthon
ought not to have rejected, as an unnecessary subtlety,
the doctrine of Augustine: peccatum originis volun-
tarium esse, quia non inviti tales simus." But, from the
PECCATUM VOLUNTARIUM we will distinguish the PECC.
DELIBERATUM, as which we regard also the ἐξοντιος in
our passage. The PECCATUM DELIBERATUM is com-
mitt'd where a consciousness of the obligation of the
law and of its holiness was not only, at some time, dis-
inctly present, but is present also at the moment of
commission. However, what we would particularly
observe is, that the subject of our passage does not
concern generally a PECCATUM DELIBERATUM. Such,
according to the dogmatics of the Reformed Church,
can take place in STATU GRATIAE FIDELIUM, according
to those of the Lutheran Church, indeed, only EXTRA
STATUM GRATIAE, yet so, that POENITENTIA ET RESTI-
tUTIO are not excluded. The writer, however, here
speaks rather of that PECC. DELIBERATUM which is
committed against the objective principle of the Re-
demption, the sacrifice of Christ, and against the sub-
jective, the spirit of Grace which liveth in us. It thus
clearly appears, that our passage is a parallel to Matth.
xii. 31. 32. See above, Vol. I. p. 250. The assertion,
that there are sins committed in the face of acknow-
ledged truth is fitted to excite a doubt in many minds,
and we must, therefore, add a few words upon that
topic. It is certainly not conceivable, namely, from the
oneness of the mind, that the bond, which, agreeably
to nature, joins the perception with the will, should
ever be completely severed; from which it follows,
that an evil will may ripen into action only from the
perception being blinded—in other words: every
thing evil, before it can come forth into action, must
veil itself under a false excuse. In advancing this
notion, it may seem as if we retracted the assertion
formerly made; for, where such an excuse hovers be-
fore the mind, the action, it will be said, is not against
a clearly recognised good. Nay, we shall find ourselves, at last, led back to the views of the Stoics, as if all sinning were to be traced merely to a defective insight, to an ἀδυνάτις ὑπόλυτῃς. Here, however, we must accurately distinguish between a false view which may have reached us from without, and been implanted in us, to which the yet unacknowledged religious feeling yields itself captive, and a false view produced by the evil will itself and brought out from the inward man. Such an one we suppose in the case of a peccatum deliberatum. But, we by no means say of it, that it darkens the consciousness of the obligation of the law, or of the truth of the Divine object. We much rather affirm that the very atrocity of it consists in this, that at the bottom of the sinner’s soul there is wanting a thorough faith in his own reasonings and exculpations; and hence the haste with which, in such cases, the particular sin is committed, as if the sinner were afraid that the veil which he has cast over his own eyes might be rent assunder. And, if the pecc. deliberatum display itself not merely as an isolated action, if it be, like the pecc. in Spiritum Sanctum, a firmly maintained state, it may be perceived how miserable must be the continued consciousness of a lie, which is never openly admitted by the mind, and the war with self which we suppose to be allied with such a state. This contemplation leads us back once more to the new view which Gurlitt has given (Stud. u. Kr. 1834. 3. H.) of the nature of the pecc. in Spiritum Sanctum. His supposition, that, with the apostate regenerate, there may, after the period of their hate against what is Divine, follow a still more horrid state, namely, one of indifference towards good, based upon principle, appears to us psychologically inconceivable. In the very fact of the apostate regenerate man having once perceived what is good lies the reason that, to eternity, he can no more be ignorant of it. It cleaves to him as a power superior to himself, which he can never again altogether deny, even to his own mind. And, with that consciousness, if he do not yield himself to this power of goodness, there remains nothing
for him but to struggle against it. To the apostate from the truth, once acknowledged, there is, henceforward, no other course than a war of annihilation against it. In this respect, there takes place what, in the province of human love, Racine makes Phedra say to Hippolytus: *Va, je t'aimois trop, pour ne te point haire.* But, when the author of that acute production, supported by this very circumstance, remarks that this hate still presupposes a lively reference to goodness, and, consequently, that the individual is less bad than when he cherishes an indifference founded upon principle, it may be replied: Certainly, but, the bad man is not a wicked man; although the bad may be more despicable before men, yet the wicked is more reprobate before God. He only who stands high can fall low; and, thus, a lively reference in the soul to what is good is necessary in order to be thoroughly wicked. For the same reason, man can be more reprobate than the beasts, and the apostate angels more reprobate than apostate men.¹

Thus far we have treated of the nature of apostacy: let us now consider the manner in which it expresses itself. The apostate offends against the objective principle of redemption by treading under foot the Son of God,—here, as at ch. vi. 6., the solemn, significant term,—and counts His blood ἐκανά. In classical Greek, also, κατακτήσει is a term expressive of the utmost contempt. Comp. Iliad, IV. v. 157. Kονδέ is translated in the Italic: communis,—in the Peshito: "when he holds his covenant blood as that of a common

¹ The explanation of vi. 4, 5. has shewn us that we cannot, with the Reformed Church, admit that it is only the imperfectly regenerate who are spoken of: the same deduction may be made from the predicates in this chap., ver. 26, 29.² This is the Scriptural proof from these passages, according to which the dogma of the Reformed Church that it is the non perfecte regenitus alone who can commit the pec. in S. S. (See above, Vol. I. p. 221. 252.) ought to be rejected. The deduction here presented to us, that the highest degree of sin presupposes, likewise, the reception of the most exalted gifts of grace leads in a psychological way to the same result.

² See Macknight, &c.—Tr.
man; but, according to the Jewish usage of the word, ἱνώπος designates what is legally unclean, profane, as at ix. 13.; and, that this signification is intended in the passage before us we see from the antithesis in ἤγιασθη. Chrysostom had, therefore, no reason to halt between the two modes of understanding the passage. The Vulgate has rightly given POL-LUTUM: "the blood, through which he himself has been made holy and has entered into a new covenant with God, this very blood he counts unclean." Christ was condemned to the cross, because He made himself equal with God. If He be not what He gave himself out to be, the cross makes Him in truth a σαταναλον. He died justly as a criminal, and His blood is therefore κοιν. To believe this is, in reality, κατα- πατεῖν τον ήιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The apostate offends, moreover, against the subjective principle of the redemption, against the πνεῦμα χάριτος, i.e. against the Spirit which is imparted by grace and seals grace (2 Cor. i. 22.). If Christ be not what this Spirit teaches us that He is, it is a lying Spirit. For the following reason, several theologians have wished to leave it doubtful whether Heb. vi. and x. treat of the PECC. IN SPIRITUM SANCTUM: the subject, namely, is here supposed only to be an apostacy from Christianity, and, consequently, a question may be raised, whether, in that case, a βλασφημία εἰς πνεῦμα ἁγιον take place: for example, Episcopius and Kern, in the treatise published under the direction of Mosheim, 1739., De blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum gravissima. Our passage, however, speaks distinctly enough of βλασφημία. And it may also be employed against that explanation of πνεῦμα ἁγιον, Matth. xii. 31., which has become common, particularly since the time of Mosheim, which makes it imply the power of miracles. We may certainly conceive an apostacy in which such wickedness against Christ and the Spirit does not take place. But such falling away the apostle would not regard as a ἰκνοῦσα ἀμαρτάνειν: it would be merely a weakness, and, considered as a weakness, this apostacy would suppose, also, in accordance with what we
have said above, that there had been no complete bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit. Where, however, this has taken place, a man feels, as we said before, the power of the truth he has abnegated, and can save himself from it only by a war of annihilation, in which he is driven forward to the abyss we have described. Let us add that, when we imagine to ourselves that some of those apostates were Jews who returned to Judaism, their apostacy could not take place then, any more than it could take place now, without a blasphemy against Christ, or in so far as an inward witness testified against the Holy Spirit. The Jews, in speaking of the Redeemer, frequently make use of the calumnious epithets of Moloch, Baal-Peor, נֶאֶר נַעַפְלוֹחַ “the adulterous branch,” רֹעָשׁ נֶאֶר שֵׁם “he who was conceived in shame and iniquity;” during their prayer Olenu, they spit while they mention the worship of false gods, among whom they count Jesus. Of the Jews who became Christians and returned to Judaism, we find, from the history of Uriel Acosta, that they required a blasphemy against Christ.

Having thus obtained some acquaintance with the nature of the Apostacy, and the manner in which it expresses itself, we have now to consider its punishment. As the blasphemer offends against the objective principle of Redemption, i.e. the sacrifice of Christ, and against the subjective, the Holy Ghost, so the sacrifice is objectively withdrawn from him, and subjectively the power of περάνων; and the former, indeed, because of the latter. Our passage, it is true, does not expressly include the latter proposition; and to this circumstance Chrysostom attaches importance in his dispute with the Novatians. But it is, without doubt, to be supposed from c. vi. Even were it not expressly said there, yet, generally speaking, we could only conceive of damnation as the correlative idea of continuance in sin, and parallel with it. Such melancholy and repentant Abbadonases as Klopstock dis-
plays Hell knows not, but only Natures like that of Capaneus, whom Dante (Inferno xvi. 49.) makes exclaim: "Now dead, I am as when formerly alive;" and of whom is true what Virgil there (ver. 61.) calls out to this Capaneus:

"Then thus my guide, in accent higher raised
Than I before had heard him: 'Capaneus!
Thou art more punish'd in that this thy pride
Lives yet unquench'd: no torment, save thy rage,
Were to thy fury pain proportioned full,'

Next turning round to me with milder lip
He spake: 'This of the seven kings was one,
Who girt the Theban walls with siege and held,
As still he seems to hold, God in disdain,
And set his high omnipotence at nought.'"

_Cary's Transl._

The _pain_ of sin may give them suffering, but _sin itself_ they cease not to love.

We have still the following remarks to make on the individual expressions of ver. 26—31. There is no Hypallage in φοεσθα εικονη κρισινς any more than in ὁ λόγος τῆς αρχῆς vi. 1., or ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἀκτών, ix. 2. The thought is even more strikingly expressed when expectation itself is represented as accompanied with fear. Τίς renders a proposition indeterminate, and hence serves, when coupled with adjectives, to strengthen the phrase, as it denotes, at the same time, the unspeakable, like our, "I know not what fear comes over me." See Plato, De Rep. III. p. 432. c.: δοσκαλες τις ὁ τόπος φανεται καὶ κατάσχειος; in Latin: INCREDIBILIS QUAE DAM ANIMI MAGNITUDO, in Cicero, Quae. Acad. ii. 1. Hence, also, the signification of τις as a substantive pronoun, EXIMIUS QUIDAM; as also ALIQUIS, Comp. Matthià Gramm. § 487. 4. In the New Testament, many have taken ἀπαρχή τις, James i. 18., in the same way.—Πυρὸς ζηλος is incorrectly translated by Schulz, "violent zeal" (hef-

* It appears to be a certain place difficult to be passed and shady.
tiger Eifer), the genitive rather denotes the **vox com-**
**posita,** FIREZEAL, See on v. 12. The adjectively
used ἰδεῖν μέλλαντος is rendered still more prominent
by its separation from the substantive.—Ver. 28. con-
tains a conclusion, a _minor ad major_, like ii. 2, and
xii. 25. It is thought by many that there is an allusion
in this place to certain transgressions of the law against
which the punishment of death was declared by Moses.
We shall do better to consider it, with Ja. Cappell,
Storr, and Kuinöl, as referring to a denial of the
Mosaic faith, this forming a more suitable antithesis to
what follows; and Deut. xvii. 6., from which the words
ἰστὶ δεύσει κτλ. appear to have been borrowed, treaties of
the punishment of idolators.—Ver. 29. In this verse,
according to Winer, p. 439., there is a mixture of two
constructions: πόσω δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσατε τιμωρίας
and πόσω χείρονος, δοκεῖτε, ἀξιωθήσαται. It may be ex-
plained, however, from the manner in which, without
any influence upon the construction, δοκεῖτε, ὅρατε, ὁδε,
are elsewhere parenthetically inserted into the dis-
course.—Οἴδαμεν, ver. 30., points to the facts which
had already proved, that God fulfills His declarations
(ii. 2. Gal. vi. 7.), Comp., on the first citation, what
has been said above, Vol. I. p. 49.; the second passage
is borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 36.—On ver. 31., we
quote Bengel’s remark: _bonum est incidere cum fide._
2 Sam. xxiv. 14.—TREMERE, TERRIBLE. v. 27., conf.
Ecclus. viii. 1.

Ver. 32—39. Return to your first love; ye have not
to endure much longer.

Ver. 32, 33.—The author, after his solemn warn-
ing, here takes a retrospective glance (similar to that
at vi. 10.) at the former proofs which the community
had given of the genuiness of their faith, as Paul
does, Gal. iv. 13, et seq., and as the Epistle in Rev ii.
5. exhorts to a return to the πρώτη αὐγάπη. Instead
of the merely copulative δι', we should expect an ἀλλαξ',
or μᾶλλον δε; still, we find, also, at vi. 9., only δε.
which is not to be taken there μετακατικώς, but as
marking the contrast: "on the other hand."—"Διελθας,
like Ἀδηλώς, and other nouns in —ως, belongs more
particularly to a later period; see Lobeck, Ad Phryn.
351. et seq.; the more ancient word was ἄθλος, ἁθλήμα.
The Genit. παθημάτων is gen. object. Τοῦτο μέν—τινὸς
di, classical separative particles, not elsewhere found
Θεατρίζοντα—θεατρον γίνοντα, 1 Cor. iv. 9., and ἔθεα-
τρίζοντα, which occurs in Polybius. The ὀνειδισμοὶ, as
we may readily conceive, struck the converted Jews
heavily, particularly on account of the σκάνδαλον
τοῦ σταυροῦ, comp. xiii. 13. As closely connected,
and, at the same time, as the chief idea, Ἡλίσσος is
added by means of the τῷ καὶ.—Τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφο-
μένων, particularly since Kypke, has been explained:
"of those who have behaved in this steadfast manner."
Böhme and Kuinöl, also, are of opinion that here, as
at xiii. 18., the middle voice can only signify: me gero.
We cannot, indeed, with Beza, force upon ἀναστρεφόντα
the signification, sursum et deorsum verti—agitari;
but, we are unable to perceive why it should not here,
as in other places, signify vitam agere, conversari, and
οὕτως—ἐν Ἡλίσσει, comp. xiii. 7. τὴν ἔκκαιν τῆς ἁνα-
στρεφῆς; nay, the context demands this signification:
"Ye have sustained many conflicts, partly in that ye
were yourselves exposed to and suffering afflictions,
partly in that ye sympathised with others. This sym-
pathy is farther spoken of in ver. 24. On κοινωνία,
comp. 2 Cor. i. 7. and 11.

Ver. 34.—The rec. has δεσμοῖς μου, and the inquiry
into the correctness of this reading excites some in-
terest, as its similarity with 2 Tim. i. 16. might be
adduced in confirmation of the Pauline origin of the
Epistle, although, in his 5th edition, Beza calls this
an argumentum admodum infirmum. In later times,
the rec. has been patronized by Nösselt, Matthiä
and Rinck. If we estimate the external evidences of
the Codd. and versions, not according to their number
but their weight, they preponderate in favour of
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δεσμίοις. Disregarding the untenable arguments brought forward by Wetstein for δεσμοὶς μου, we attach most importance to the question, how could the reading δεσμίοις get into the text, if that were originally δεσμοῖς μου? Nösselt, in his dissertation, De tempore Ep. ad Hebraeos, supposes that the simple τοῖς δεσμοῖς, which Origen has, Exhort. ad martyr. c. 44., may have been the original reading. The Latin version, in the Cod. Clar., has vinculis eorum: from this it were probable that no pronoun was read, and the intermediate noun of the one was supplied by μοῦ, that of the other by αὐτῶν. In fact Philemon, ver. 10., presents an example of μοῦ added in this way to δεσμοῖς. This mode of extricating ourselves, however, is far from satisfactory, for, while, in the passage of the Epistle to Philemon, δεσμοῖς gives a suitable sense without a pronoun, it would, in the context before us, yield none at all. In these circumstances, we prefer δεσμίοις; especially as we find, also, at xiii. 3., the exhortation: μημηξάσετε τῶν δεσμίων. The corruption of δεσμίοις into δεσμοῖς was easy, and that the μοῦ was subsequently added from a reminiscence of Pauline passages we may conclude from the above mentioned reading of Origen.—What is here said of the spoiling of goods appears to be cited as a consequence of that συμπαθείν, although it may be taken otherwise.—'Ἐαυτοῖς is dat. comm. The treasure in heaven is here, as it is in Matth. vi. 19., what we gave upon earth, in faith in an unseen world: this is not lost, it is, as it were, deposited and collected in heaven, Matth. xix. 21. Luke xii. 33. This laying up of treasure in heaven coincides then with the well-pleasing which has been acquired, from which a recompense shall one day flow to us, and, through it, what we formerly gave will be restored with interest, πλούτων εἰς Θεόν, Luke xii. 21. 1 Tim. vi. 18, 19. Μένουσαν, expressing the chief idea, is placed behind; perhaps, also, because it forms, with the preceding καί, an epitréteit sec., which, as well as the ditrochaeus, when employed by the orator, delighted at least the Roman ear, even to rapture. Cic. de orat. c. 63.
Ver. 35—39. The citation in ver. 37, 38. is borrowed from Habak. ii. 3. In the LXX. the translation runs somewhat differently from our own (Ger.), and the first words, ἐπι γὰρ μικρὸν ὄσον ὄσον, belong entirely to our author. There is found μικρὸν ὄσον ὄσον in the LXX., Isaiah xxvi. 20. "Ὦσον is used adverbially = only, II. x. 354. The repetition is one of the very rare examples in Greek of the superlative idea being expressed by a reduplication = tantillum. See Hermann on Viger, p. 726., and Winer in the remark, p. 224. ἑποστῆλλεθαί, originally "to furl the sails," with the acc., which all verbs of turning from have, in so far as they contain the notion of fleeing, "to be afraid of some one, to withdraw from before him." Thus the word forms a strict antithesis to the παραγειοία τῆς πίστεως, from which proceeds the προέχεσθαι, iv. 16. ἐκ. 22.

CHAPTER XI.

THE OLD COVENANT ITSELF HAS ALREADY PLACED BEFORE US A SERIES OF LOFTY EXAMPLES FOR PERSEVERANCE IN FAITH.

Ver. 1. 2.—How faith must shew itself.

Ver. 1.—Our first duty here is to decide the question, whether the context following contains a definition of faith, or, whether the author intends to bear witness to the existence of such a faith as he describes; whether, therefore, the comma is, with Griesbach and Knapp, to be placed after πίστεως, or, as Lachmann has placed it, after ὑπόστασις. Erasmus gave his opinion for the former: encomium potius fidei quam definitio; and, recently, Böhme, and Winer, in his Gram. p. 59., have spoken very decidedly in its favour. Touching the supposition, that this is a definition of faith, we must remark, that the word is not to be taken in its strictest sense, and that there is some truth in the remark of Calvin: longe falluntur, qui justam fidei definitionem hic ponunt ex
The old covenant places before us [CH. XI.

Istimant neque enim hic de tota fidei natura disserit Apostolus, sed paritem elegit suo instituto congruentem, nempe quod cum patientia (perseverantia) semper conjuncta sit. There is nothing compelling us to adopt the view defended by Böhme and Winer. From the ἐστι going before the noun, Böhme should not have so decidedly concluded for the meaning: "to exist." "Esti, certainly, receives this signification by being so placed before (comp., in the New Testament, John v. 2. xviii. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 44.), and so does its corresponding est in Latin (Hand, Lehrbuch des lateinisch. Styls, s. 329.). Still, this position does not exclusively produce this signification, and only serves generally to give emphasis to the word. Now, such an emphasis was required in the passage before us, in which the author, after having spoken of the necessity of faith, passes on to speak of its nature. The same thing occurs by ἔστι δὲ αὕτη ἡ παρακολούθη, Luke viii. 11., where, after ver. 10. had declared the importance of understanding the parable, ver. 11. introduces the nature, the sense of it. Yet the word is found preceding the noun, even where such contrasts do not occur, but where merely the notion of being is emphatically pronounced, as 1 Tim. vi. 6. 2 Cor. xi. 10.; comp. Hermann, De enclitica èστιν, in De emend. rat. gramm. p. 87. Under these circumstances, Winer, with more reason, lays the stress upon γάρ, ver. 2., which, as he thinks, would be, according to the usual view of the passage, quite inadmissible. The contrary, however, has already been rightly shewn by Kuinöl. Let ver. 2., be, therefore, translated: "of this kind was the faith for which the elders were praised." As a positive reason for the usual view, we observe, that a definition of Faith, according to its appearance, is quite appropriate; a circumstance which Calvin, as he keeps acutely by the context in general, has likewise seen here. The preceding section (vers. 23, 35, 36.) had encouraged to ἴλης and ἱππονή; the prophetic passage from Habakkuk had, also, on the one hand, promised the speedy coming of the Deliverer, on the other, had required.
πίστις. How naturally does this thought follow: "the πίστις consists precisely in a firm conviction of what is hoped for," as, in the sequel, those examples of Faith are specially brought forward in which hope appears conspicuous. It has already been observed that our Author closely connects Faith and Hope. The connection of both, on the one hand, and their difference, on the other, can scarcely be shewn more vigorously than has been done by Hugo de St. Victor, in his Quaestiones circa epistolam ad Hebraeos, on this passage: per fidem solam certi sumus de aeternis quod sunt, per spem vero, quod ca nos sumus habituri confidimus. All hope, therefore, presupposes Faith. Calvin compares Rom. viii. 25., where, in like manner, the Apostle derives from a definition of ἰλπις the necessity of ὑπομονή.

The sense in which ὑπόστασις is to be here taken, may appear doubtful, as three meanings present themselves, all equally supported by usage, and by the context. 1. The primary signification, which refers to sensible objects, is a base foundation, and this occurs in the LXX., Ezek. xliii. 11. Ps. xlviii. 3.; the Socinian Felbinger has rendered it quite literally: "Unterständigkeit;" Castellio takes the word in the sense which subjectio has in Latin, Cicero, De oratore. 3. 53., Gellius, L. 10. c. 3.: "a placing before the eyes;" similar to this is the version of Menken: "representation;" Calvin gives: fultura vel possessio, in qua pedem fugimus; so also Clarius, Stolz, and Schulz. 2. In a transferred sense it denotes the substance, the essence, what is designated by the το ὑπο-

The Peshito is by many quoted for the third signification, but improperly. It has, "Faith is a conviction of things which are only in hope even as if they were in reality." It is plain that the translator, in the very same way as Luther,—endeavoured to express, in a popular manner, the metaphysical idea substance. This is, perhaps, the most striking example of free translation in the
Philox., the Italic, the Vulgate, in which the translation substantia gave rise to some profound discussions among the Schoolmen on the nature of Faith. Thus it was rendered also by Beza, Bengel, and Carpzov. 3. The word has the secondary meaning of perseverantia, fiducia, both in Classical writers, and in the LXX. The passages in proof of this are given by Raphel, in the Notae Polyb., on our passage, Wetstein on 2 Cor. ix. 4., Elsner on this passage. The Coptic translates according to this meaning; Luther also who, on iii. 14., wavered between “Essence” (Wesen), and “Faith,” has here, from the very commencement, retained the secondary meaning, “certain confidence.” From his observations on 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. (Walch iii. 2793.), we must, however, conclude that he supposed substantia to be the proper signification. The sense of fiducia is found in Calov, Gerhard, Cameron, Grotius, Michaelis, and Wahl. A decision in favour of any one of these three significations is somewhat difficult, because, as we have remarked, all the three suit the context, although the third perhaps harmonizes with it the most. The sense which arises from the second view is thus given by Chrys.: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα ἐναι δοξεῖ, ἥ πίσις ἡ ἀνυπόστασιν αὐτῶν χαρίζεται, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ χαρίζεται, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ἡ ἐστὶν οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν. ὅσον ἡ ἀνυπόστασις οὐ παραθέγονεν, ὥστε ἡ ἐστὶν ἐν ἡ ἰσόπασι, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπίς ύπόστασιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρῳ ὕπαξή. τοῦτο ἡ ἐστὶν ἰσόπασις πραγμάτων ἰππιζομένων. It is taken in the same way by Theodoret. If the passage were thus to be explained, it would be necessary always to understand an as it were with ἰσόπασις. A more profound result was obtained, by the Thomists, from this declaration, by taking ἰσόπασις without such an as it were. In Thomas himself, in the larger Summa sec. sec., quæst. 4. art. 1., it is said: Substantia solet dici

Peshito, and ought not to have been overlooked by Löhlein in his treatise on the character of that version.

* For, while those things which are in hope appear to be without real existence faith gives them(ὑπόστασις) subsistency, or rather does not give them, for it is in their own nature (οἰωνία); for example, the resurrection is not present, nor is it
prime inchoatio cujuscunque, et maxime quando tota
res sequens continetur virtute in primo principio—per
hunc ergo modum dicitur fides esse substantia rerum sperandarum, quia scilicet prima inchoatio rerum sperandarum in nobis est per assensum fidei, quae virtute continet omnes rer sperandas. In hoc enim speramus beatificari, quod videbimus aperta visi-
one veritatem, cui per fidem adhaeremus. Our author
also, vi. 5., has expressed essentially that, through the
medium of faith, the future object of Christian hope,
in its beginning, is already present. By following
out this thought we shall be led to the important
truth, that, as all true knowledge presupposes Being
(Seyn) in what is known, so also Faith—if there be
no being in God there can be no faith in and no know-
ledge of God. "Ελεγχός is synonymous with the noun
designating the actus. ἔλεγξις, "conviction" (Ueber-
weisung); it is translated by Menken in a passive
sense: Ueberführtsyn, "being convinced," August. Tract. 79. in Joh. : convictio—in the Lutheran trans-
lation now before me it is boldly given by a circum-
locution, "that one doubts not," but, in the editions of
1522—1527. very incorrectly: "and goes by that
which does not appear." Equally strange is the
Italic: accusator non videntium. Ou βλεπόμενα, the
invisible (2 Cor. iv. 18, τα μη βλεπόμενα), is more
comprehensive than ἵπτομενα. What is not per-
ceived by the senses, and yet believed, is either al-
ready present invisibly, or will one day come into
being, so, ver. 7., τα μηδέστω βλεπόμενα. In what fol-
low, the author speaks of a twofold object of faith,
God and the everlasting things of salvation, ver. 10.
14., and, both taken together, ver. 6. The Lutheran
Theologians have improperly asserted, against the Pa-
pists, Socinians, and Arminians, that, under ou βλεπό-
μενα, he designedly included justification by the death
of Christ. See Calov on the passage. The opposite
assertion of Schulz, however, is still farther from the

in (iv βιοντάς) subsistently, but hope gives it subsistently in
our minds. This is the subsistency of things hoped for.
truth, namely, that the author's notion of πίστις has no affinity whatever with that of Paul. He goes even so far as to say, that "this difference would be alone sufficient to prove the Epistle not Pauline." See p. 111. of his Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews. This inconsiderate assertion—we can use no milder term—has been moderated by Bleek (p. 310.), of whose observations upon the subject we approve. He draws particular attention to ver. 6., from which the Pauline τὰν, ὁ ὁμιλέως πίστις, ἡμερία ἑστὶν may be very well deduced. The specific notion of faith in Paul, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is essentially the same. "An improper contrast has certainly been drawn," says Neander (Planting and Guidance of the Christ. Church, II. p. 563.), "between the Pauline idea of faith and that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, by those who assert that the Pauline idea puts the reference to what is Divine as something present, while, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, faith refers only to the future; for, with Paul, faith always includes a reference, at the same time, to the latter; and, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the future becomes as something present through faith." In Paul, faith always appears as contrasted with works, but, in our Epistle, as opposed to faint-heartedness in respect of the fulfilment of the promises, x. 35—39. Still, this does not prevent a like view of its nature from existing in both cases; on the contrary, both references lead us to the same view. He that believes in justification by grace, as well as he that believes that the Lord will fulfil His promises, has an assurance of mind to which the invisible is, as it were, present. What Paul says (2 Cor. v. 7.) of faith is based, as Bleek has remarked, upon the very same thought which lies at the foundation of the declaration in our text. Far as our passage may be from giving a complete definition of faith, it says equally little on the medium through which faith may be awakened, or concerning its seat. That our author does not regard the testimony of Scripture as the only medium follows clearly from the circumstance, that the examples adduced are
taken, for the greater part, from a period when there was yet no written word of God. As to the seat, or organ, of faith, the Roman Catholic polemics have founded particularly on this passage the notion, that it is in the intellectus, especially Bellarmin, when combating the Protestants, and, likewise, Thomas, Scotus, and others, previous to the resuscitation of polemical Theology. Comp. Calov on the passage. and Gerhard's Loci, T. VII. p. 96. et seq. It is much to be lamented that the Roman Church has not adopted into her doctrinal idea the deep perception of the nature of faith developed by Hugo de St. Victor. In our own times, some consideration ought to be bestowed on what that profound thinker has said on the relation of the affectus to the cognitio in faith, in the 10th section of the 1. V. De sacramentis fidei. Bellarmin's conclusion, that an ἔλεγχος must always be a matter of the intellectus, would be correct only in case there were no other manner of being convinced than by the understanding. While the Roman Catholic view, by carrying back the act of faith to the intellectus, would exclude fiducia, it has favoured, along with this, the supposition of the moment of the notitia, and. on the other hand again, it was brought to exclude this from asserting a fides implicita. Had our author had at his command the more modern usage of language he would, assuredly, have traced back faith to feeling; but, at the same time, through the mediation of the witness of God. It may correctly be said that, if the doctrine of feeling was developed from Christianity, and the dominion of a life of feeling be a distinguishing mark of the Christian period, the thing also must have existed in the New Testament, notwithstanding the occurrence of the word αἰσθησις, Phil. i. 9., as an isolated expression. Comp., also, on the faculty of feeling, in the New Testament, and, on the seat of faith, Stirm, pp. 56 and 94.

Ver. 2.—At vi. 12., the writer had exhorted to an imitation of the πίστις and μανθούματα of their fathers, comp. also xiii. 7. On γὰς see Vol. II. p. 84.
Ver. 3.—From this point there commences, in the order of the Old Testament books, from the beginning of Genesis to the Books of the Maccabees, a series of proofs of a faith such as had been described. Every example is prefaced by the word εἰστι, with rhetorical emphasis. A still longer and more eloquent catalogue of the heroes in piety, from Enoch to Simon, the son of Onia, his contemporary, is carried by the Sirachide through seven chapters, ch. xlii.—lii. To this subject belongs the proof given by Eusebius, Hist Eccl. 1, 4., that ὅτι ἡ γένος τῆς τρίος ἡ Χρυσιανών had existed from the time of Abraham. In our author we can distinguish four sections of time, of which each section has its representative: that of the first age is Abel; that of the patriarchal ages, Abraham; that of the time of the giving of the Law, Moses; that of the period of the possession of Canaan, David. The first example is of a different kind from the examples which follow. The writer does not place a particular believer at the head of his series, but a religious fact, in which all Jews and Christians undoubtedly believe. The Dative, εἰστι, is used as an Ablative, in the sense of, in the faith, by means of the faith, 2 Cor. i. 15., with the passive, ver. 5., it must be rendered by: on account of, as in Latin, also, the Ablative is sometimes to be resolved by propter. See Markland on Statius (Dresd. 1827.), p. 253. At ver. 13., in order to avoid all misunderstanding, the more distinct κατὰ πίστιν is employed.—Νοούμεν does not appear altogether suitable, for, elsewhere, the νοείς forms a contrast to the πίστις. That consciousness of perceiving God through the νοείς, which is spoken of, Rom. i. 20., is a lower degree, as Bernhard, Consider. v. 1., remarks on the passage: Scala hac non cives egent, sed exules. But Faith is to be here regarded rather as the soil out of which the νοείς unfolds itself.—On αἰῶν, see at i. 2.—Ῥήμα, according to the Old Testament pas- sages, Ps. xxxiii. 6. Gen. i. 3, 6. Ps. cxlviii. 5., is the "commanding word," the symbol of the Almighty
and self-competent Power, which requires no means exterior to itself. Comp. i. 3., where this word is applied to the Son.—It is doubtful whether μή is to be connected with γεγονότα, as we should expect from the collocation of the words, or whether we are to assume a transposition, and construe it with φανομένων. The latter course has been taken by the Peshito, the Italic, the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, and most others; whereas Beza and Bengel insist upon a strict adherence to the sequence of the words, according to which Schulz, with particular emphasis, translates: “that therefore which can be seen, and yet has not sprung out of what is visible;” and so, also, Böhme and Winer. In favour of this acceptation, perhaps, some weight might be attached to the consideration, that, if μή were not to be joined with the Inf. but with the Part., we should expect not μή, but οὐ, namely, ex vi oppositi (Kühner, griech Gramm. II. 408.). Οὐξ is found, for this reason, 2 Maccab. vii. 28., Xenoph. Mem. 2, 2, 3.: παίδας οὖς οἱ γονεῖς εἰκ μὲν οὖξ δινων εἰποίσαν οὐνα. Chrysostom, on our passage: δὴ λόγῳ ἐστιν, ἢτι δὲ οὖξ δοτῶν τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησαν ὁ Θεὸς, εἰ τῶν μὴ φανομένων τὰ φανούμενα, εἰ τῶν οὐχ ὑφεστῶτων τὰ ὑφεστῶτα. Where he speaks himself, in this passage, he has put οὖξ. Still, in other passages, like Theodoret and Paul, Rom. iv. 27., he has contrasted the τὰ μὴ ὄντα with the τὰ ὄντα. This also may be explained upon very good grounds, without our being obliged to have recourse to the prevalence, in the later Greek, of μή with participles, where οὐ should stand (Schäfer. App. ad Dem. III. 395.). Οὐ, with adjectives and participles, serves to change a notion directly into its opposite, therefore, τὰ οὖξ ὄντα = Nullity. But, what if the Author selected μή, in prefer-

* Children whom the parents have brought into existence from things non-existing.

b It is clear, that God from things not in being, made those which are in being,—from those not visible the things which do appear,—and, from things having no subsistence those things which subsist.
ence to οἷ, in order that τὰ οἷ φανόμενα might not appear as Matter, as a nihil positivum? After all, the difference between the two modes of expression will never amount to more than that of, “the in-visible,” and, “the non-visible”!—On the other hand, the difference between these two constructions, as affecting the sense of the whole, will be essential precisely according to the sense which we attach to τὰ μὴ φανόμενα. There are two acceptations of this expression current, particularly in Theosophical schools, which are connected with the Platonic usage. In the first place, we might take the term in the sense of μὴ ὄν (Mosheim, De creatione ex nihilo. § xix.), in which sense it is employed in the Platonising Book of Wisdom, xi. 18.; οὗ γας ἡτὸς ἡ παντοδύναμος σου χεῖς καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐς ἀμόρφαν ὀλης—the passage to which Hermogenes appealed. The supposition of a creation from (previously created) formless matter (creatio prima et secunda) is found, as is known, very frequently in the older Fathers, from Platonic influence (See Maranus, Praef. ad Just. Mart. P. 2. c. 2.), and, also, in Augustine. This acceptation is insisted on, among others, by Richard Simon, in his history of the translations of the New Testament, II. p. 163., where he bitterly blames the writers of Port-Royal, who, adopting the regular construction of μὴ, translate closely: de sorte que les choses visibles n’ont point été premièremen formées d’autres choses visibles (so also the translation of Sacy, Martin, Osterwald, the English translation, and others). Another conception of the passage, in like manner Platonic, is that according to which τὰ μὴ φανόμενα is rendered in a positive sense, by τὰ νοοῦμενα, so that the meaning would be: “there lies an ideal world at the foundation of the world of sense, a spiritual παράδειγμα, a κόσμος νοητός.” Comp., particularly, the brilliant section in the Soirées de St. Petersb. II. 238., with the superscription: Ce monde est un Système de choses invisibles manifestées visiblement, which is entirely founded upon our passage. And so, also, in the School of Martini. We shall take
a more correct view, however, by regarding the τὰ μὴ φανόμενα as pointing out only the invisible causality of the Divine omnipotence, in contrast to the kingdom of visible causes, comp. τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 20., subsequently more closely defined by ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ. Among those who connect μὴ with φανόμενα is Luther, who appears to have had many a contest with this proposition, after the publication of the edition of 1530, and who renders it, inaccurately: "come into being out of nothing" (aus Nichts geworden ist). Thus the Oxymoron is entirely lost, that the invisible is changed into the visible, which, taken as an object of sense, is incomprehensible. Similar to this is the Oxymoron, Rom. i. 20: τὰ ἀόρατα καθότιται. To this antithesis, at least, great prominence is given by the Ἑθιopic version (according to Bode, for in Walton’s Polyglot it is not closely rendered), which, in other respects, is liable, at this place, to the charge of arbitrariness: cognoscimus per fide, quod creatus fuerit mundus per verbum Domini. et apparuerit id, quod non apparebat, et re vera (certo) factum sit. If we now take τὰ μὴ φανόμενα in the sense last indicated the meaning will amount to the same as that resulting from the construction which connects μὴ with the verb. For my own part, I prefer connecting μὴ with φανομένων. Taking a contrary view, should we not expect another collocation of words—γεγονέναι behind μὴ, or after φανομένων? Proofs of the transposition of μὴ in Classical writers, and, particularly of its coming before prepositions, may be seen in Hartung, II. 179., Winer, p. 510., and, also, in Aristotle, Physic. 5, 1., where it is said: τὴν ἐκ μὴ υποκεισθενον εἰς υποκεισθενον (μεταξολον), and immediately after: ἡ γὰρ μὴ ἐκ ὑποκεισθενον εἰς μὴ ὑποκεισθενον ὥσ περι μεταξολον. Also, in II. Maccab., vii. 28., the Cod. Alex. has: ὅσ εἰς ὅτως.
Ver. 4.—The Divine witness to Abel consisted in the kindling of his sacrifice. The reading λαλεῖ, instead of the rec. λαλεῖται, is favoured by the external, and still more by the internal evidence, and is adopted by Lachmann. It is easy to conceive how the apparently unintelligible active might be transformed into the passive. The most decisive support of the active is chap. xii. 24. The author has the passage, Gen. iv. 10., before his eyes: φωνὴ αἰματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, comp. James v. 4. The question is, whether the author put λαλεῖ because he conceived of the act as one continuing to the present time, or, whether he used it because βοᾷ stands in the text, and whether, therefore, it is employed to give a more lively description of the past. On the former supposition, we must say, that he does not take the declaration according to its first meaning, but according to the fundamental idea which it contains, namely, that believers after death are still present as respects God (Luke xx. 38.). Michaelis, too, in his dissertation: Argumenta immortalitatis animarum ex Mose collecta, employs that passage as an indirect argument. I think, however, that the writer, if he had wished to express this idea, would have written ἐστὶ νῦν, or μέχρι νῦν. Now, if λαλεῖ refer to the past, the sense is: “for his righteousness sake, when dead he still calls upon God for vengeance.” That mystical allusion in the declaration to the immortality of the just is found, moreover, in Philo, who, referring the passage to the mystical Abel, that is, all the pious, in his book Quod deterior etc. p. 164., concludes from it, that they live for ever.—Bengel, who is followed in his opinion by Moldenhauer, improperly places a comma after ἀποθανὼν: “dead in the faith, or, for faith’s sake.”

the sake of an ingenious notion, departs from the prevalent and correct explanation (similar cases are to be found, Heb. xiii. 3. 1 Cor. v. 13. James ii. 1.). He connects is with the verb, which he considers as comp., forces on the τὰ βλαστῖμον the signification of mirror, and translates fide intelligimus aptata esse secula verbo Dei, ut non apparentium specula fierent. He was led astray by the conjectured analogy with Rom. i. 20.
Ver. 5, 6.—Gen. v. 24. Ecclus. xlviii. 16 (14.). The Infinitive with ταῦτα denotes not only intention, but, also, consequence, Acts iii. 12. Luke xxiv. 16. That there was faith in Enoch, also, is proved from the general proposition, that faith in God and His reward is a necessary condition of the Divine good will, and, it is declared of Enoch, that he pleased God.—On προεξίσθημενος, See on iv. 16. vii. 19. For the great practical value of ver. 6., and, also, for the conclusions of the Roman Catholic Theologians from the declaration before us to the righteousness arising from works, see Calvin on the passage, Comp. also vi. 10. In ver. 26., too, mention is made of the allusion to this μισθα-ποδοσία.

Ver. 7.—Here Calvin gives the practical contents excellently: hoc admirabile virtutis exemplum fuit, quod cum totus mundus impunitatem sibi promissens secure et licenter deliciis indulgeret, solus Noē vindictam Dei, quae diu tamen adhuc differenda erat, sibi ante oculos propusuit, quod centum et viginti annos misere se fatigavit in construenda arca, quod inter tot impiorum subsanationes stetit infractus. quod in totius mundi interitu se salvum fore non dubitavit, imo sibi vitam statuit in sepulcro, hoc est in arca ipsa. Comp., on Noah’s example, Wisdom x. 4. Ecclus. xliv. 17—19. 2 Peter ii. 5. Πίστις must not be construed with χειραγώγησις, but with κατεσκευας; δ’ ἦς must not be referred to χειρωτής, but to πίστις. Καταχρίνεται is used to denote the spiritual judicial act, exactly as in Matth. xii. 41, 42. Rom. ii. 27. The idea of a righteousness through Faith was already promulgated in the race of Abel and Enoch, here it is declared more expressly, although it is remarkable, that the author does not rather assert this of Abraham, as the εἰλογίαν αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην in the case of Abraham gave the chief occasion to it, Comp. 1 Maccab. ii. 52. Κατὰ πίστιν, as, also, subsequently, ver. 13., is used, while Paul, elsewhere, employs ἐκ πίστεως, Rom. ix. 30. x. 6. (i. 17.), and διὰ πίστεως, Rom. iii. 22. Phil. iii. 9. or, simply, δικαιοσύνη πίστεως, Rom. iv. 13.
Ver. 8—22.—Examples of Faith from the Patriarchal ages until the time of Moses.

Ver. 8.—The Author having now come to Abraham, we expect that, in proof of his πίστις, immediate mention will be made of that πιστευότας, which is noticed, as its most especial verification, in the Old Testament passages, Wisdom x. 5. Ecclus. xlv. 19—21. 1 Macc. ii. 52. He does indeed enter upon this, but not until ver. 17. As his chief object is to awaken a hope in the future kingdom of Christ, he places those examples in the forefront in which something analogous to this hope is seen in Abraham. Let us endeavour to catch the train of his thoughts up to ver. 16:

Ver. 8.—Abraham being called into a new country follows—he follows, without seeing it, nay without foreseeing; ver. 9 he believes, that it is his country, although he can dwell in it only as a stranger; ver. 10. he directs his looks not merely to this possession, but to that land of which Canaan was only a type; ver. 11, 12. even his wife gave proofs of a Faith hoping in promises; ver. 13—16. in many respects the members of that family prove themselves to be such as are convinced without seeing, particularly with regard to the heavenly country.

Ver. 9.—Abraham firmly believed that Canaan was not his eternal object, ver. 13. Παραχθεῖν, by which the LXX. translate γῆ, “to live in a place as a stranger.” That he had not taken firm possession of the land was proved from the fact, that neither he nor his posterity built cities. The travelling tent, which was pitched in the evening and struck in the morning, is an image of a temporary sojourn, Is. xxxviii. 12. 2 Cor. v. 4. 2 Peter i. 14., hence, in contrast, αἰώνιος σκύπαι, Luke xvi. 9.; with these changeable travelling huts is contrasted the city with foundations, the heavenly Jerusalem, comp. xii. 22.; xiii. 14. Rev. xxi. 2., Introduc-

* It may appear hardly necessary to notice that the Author in thus citing the Apocryphal has no intention of assigning to them equal canonical authority with the Canonical books.—Tv.
tion, p. 105, and, on xii. 22. Πόλις has the article because it refers to the well known heavenly Jerusalem: on the other hand, we do not expect the Article with Συμ&iot;λοι. It is put either because it was customary to speak of the foundations of this city as glorious, Rev. xxi. 14, 19., or it has the sense of the possessive: "which has the foundations," those, namely, which belong to a city. Comp. the article τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, Rom. v. 2. Winer, p. 97.

Ver. 11, 12.—Καὶ αὐτή is climacteric—even his wife, from whom it might have been less expected, especially as she at first doubted, Rom. iv. 19. Also, ver. 31, 35. contain examples of momen.

Ver. 13.—Ἐσπαγγελίας λαμμάτειν, as at ix. 15.—The ἑσπαγγελίαι are represented as coasts, which the sea-faring man descries at a distance. So it is said, Aeneid, III. 524.: Quum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus—Italian laeto socii clamore salutant. Of a kindred character is John viii. 56. The centre of those promises was the Messiah, the future Messianic kingdom, this is the νεστομένη μελανοσα, see on ii. 5. The Author then passes to the thought, that those elders desired a heavenly country (comp. also, ver. 39, 40.), and confirms this thought from Gen. xxiii. 4., where Abraham, and from Gen. xlvii. 9., where Jacob calls his life a pilgrimage. Wetstein says on this subject: "Nullo indicio constat Abrahamum et patriarchas de vita aeternum in coelis agenda cogitasse; ergo sensus mysticus non est ABRAHAMI, sed PAULI; upon which Michaelis, who believed he had proved, that the יִבְנַיִם necessarily includes a reference to a heavenly home, remarks: "I think this unkind sentence on Paul will disappear, if the reader will be pleased to peruse § 15—17. of the Argumenta immort. anim. ex Mose." Schlichting made the following correct remark on ver. 16.: Exprimit divinus auctor ex suo sensu (see on ver. 26.), divini quippe gnarus consili, quae sit ista melior patria, quam illi
expetiverint . . . sufficit, quod hic futurus sit exspectationis illorum et desiderii ex Dei decreto, qui eliam mystico et occulto sensu hanc patriam illis promisit, eventus. Our explanation of this mode of interpretation may be found in App. I.—The last words in ver. 16. are of importance, as they direct us in the exposition of Luke xx. 37, 38. By this direction many expositors have not profited at all, and others not sufficiently. The reason why God honours those patriarchs, by connecting His name with theirs, is, that they are immortal. The God who, according to the Old Testament law, may not come into contact with anything dead, would never place himself in so close a relation to mortals destined to everlasting destruction. This explanation of the Old Testament predicate of God gives the strongest support to that view of Matth. xxii. 32. Luke xx. 37, 38., according to which the sense of Jesus' words in Luke (which is here more detailed) would be this: "God, however, will never call Himself the guardian God of mortals (νυκταρων), but only of such as live for ever (ζωντων)." The most recent philosophy has endeavoured to shew, that God and immortality are correlative notions, and rise in the various religions to a proportionately higher degree. This mode of contemplating the subject may find an initial point in the passage before us.

Ver. 17—19.—The Author now comes to that proof of faith given by the Patriarch, which, as we remarked at ver. 9., the Old Testament writers themselves extol as the highest that could be given. In like manner, in the New Testament, James, ch. ii. 21., represents it as his greatest εγγυς. The και in ver. 17. is explicative (Hartung, I. 145.). The strength of faith which lay in that transaction is excellently brought forward. The point was not, whether his beloved and only Son was to be preserved, but, at the same time, whether all the glorious promises made to his posterity were to be fulfilled, for they were connected with his Son alone.
But, then, as formerly, when this only begotten Son was promised to him, Abraham hoped \( \pi\alpha\rho \iota\lambda\nu\pi\iota\delta\alpha \iota\nu' \iota\lambda\pi\iota\delta \) (Rom. iv. 18.); he knew that, in the extremest case, even an awakening from the dead was possible (Rom. iv. 17. 2 Cor. i. 9.). The exposition of \( \iota\nu \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \) has caused great difficulty to expositors. It is singular that Böhme considers it the most proper way of expounding the phrase, to set out from the inquiry, whether \( \delta\theta\varepsilon\nu \) have a local or a causal signification. The natural inquiry certainly is first (since both significations are equally admissible with \( \delta\theta\varepsilon\nu \)), what, according to the language, does \( \iota\nu \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \) mean? Disregarding some arbitrary explanations of the word, there is a threefold adverbial meaning of which it is susceptible. The greatest authority, as respects its antiquity, and the number of its defenders, is in favour of the supposition, that here, as at ix. 9., it signifies, “likeness” resp. “exemplar” (vorbild). See on that passage. So almost all the translations, the Peshito, the Italic, the Vulgate, the Coptic, the Ethiopic, Luther, the English translation; and, indeed, according to some, the type is intended to refer to the resurrection of Christ,—according to others, of men in general,—and again, according to others, of both. The first view is found in Theophylact, Æcumenius, Erasmus, Wolf, but not in Chrysostom, who has usually been cited with these, and still is by Kuinöl. Chrysostom takes \( \iota\nu \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \) in the sense of \( \delta\iota\alpha \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \), and refers \( \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \) to the ram. The second is found in Cameron, Michaelis, Böhme, and Schulz, the third in Theodoret and v. Meyer. A second class of expositors adopts the signification quodammodo: “he received him back as it were from the grave, from the dead.” So Calvin, Castellio, Scaliger, J. Capell, Grotius (who is improperly reckoned of the first class), Limborch, and Kuinöl. A third class expounds according to the classical use of \( \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\sigma\theta \), “to expose one’s self to danger, to risk something,”—\( \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\sigma \), “fool-hardy, courageous,”—\( \pi\alpha\rho\zeta\omega\lambda\eta \), “hazard, jeopardy;” and according to this,
it is translated by Hombergk and Lösner: *praesentissimo discrimine*, by Raphel and Krebs; *proeter spem*, by Camerarius; *exponens se magno periculo (amittendi filii)*. Of these three explanations the second has the least to recommend it, because it cannot be shewn that *ἐν παράσκευῇ*, or *παράσκευικῶς*, was ever employed in the sense of *ὡς ἔστοι εἰπέν*. The first view is not inadmissible; still there are several points connected with it which appear somewhat strange. There was here no reason for mentioning the typical reference of Isaac to Christ. It would be better, therefore, to refer the difficult expression to the resurrection of the dead in general, and in the following way: "he believed in Him who can raise from the dead, and, as a reward of this, he, as a type of that resurrection, received him also from the dead." In that case, however, should we not expect *εἰς παράσκευήν*, and, perhaps, also, the addition τῆς ἀναστάσεως? Still, perhaps, *ἐν παράσκευῇ* may be explained like *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδηγόμενῷ*, iv. 11. If the sense adopted by the third class can be justified linguistically, I do not hesitate to take this interpretatio, with Krebs, as the unice vera. The objection made by Kuinöl, that *ἐν παράσκευῇ* cannot be rendered *insperato*, strikes only the loose version of Raphel and Krebs, while that of Lösner, and still more that of Camerarius is in a linguistic point of view thoroughly correct. Polybius makes a particularly frequent use of the adv. *παράσκευείς*, and of the adj. *παράσκευος*. Thus, he says of Hannibal, 1, 25, 7, ἀνελπίστως καὶ παράσκευως αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ σκάφῃ διέφυγε, from which passage it is evident, that the idea is related to ἀνελπίστως, and caused the expositors we have quoted to translate insperato. Further, we find in Polybius, 1, 20, 14, παράσκευως διεξόμενοι τοὺς ἄνδρας, b 1, 44, 6, παράσκευως καὶ τεθαξ- ἑξατός εἰσδραμὼν εἰς τὸν λιμήν, c See other passages

* He himself escaped in the small boat contrary to all hope, and with great danger.

* They conveyed the men over at great risk.

* Having boldly and with great risk run into the harbour.
in the *Index* by Schweighäuser. We may, therefore, with good reason translate in our passage: "from among the dead also, in bold hazard, he bore him away." Κομίζοθα (in the New Testament it is commonly in the middle voice, as it is also x. 36. xi. 39.) is used particularly of the bearing away of *booty* or of a *prize of victory*. The expression employed by Josephus, *Antiqu. 1, 3, 4.*, in relating the same event, has a great similarity to this. After mentioning the delivery of Isaac, he says: οἱ δὲ παρ' ἐξείδαις ἰαυτοὺς κεκομιζόμενοι, καὶ τοιοῦτον ἄγαθων ἐπαγγελίας τετυχεῖτες, ἕσπερον ἀλλήλους.*

Ver. 20—22.—In these verses foretelling is represented as a work of faith, in perfect accordance with the definition of faith in ver. 3. The first half of ver. 21. refers to Gen. xlviii. 14. *et seq.*; the second half is borrowed literally from Gen. xlvii. 31. According to the vowels, which we read in the Hebrew text, as well as Onkelos, Jonathan, Symmachus, and Aquila, it runs thus: ἡ ημερήσια ἔναν; for this, the LXX., according to which our Author quotes, has read ἡμερήσια, and, in like manner, the Syriac, which has joined the LXX. In all probability the LXX. took an erroneous view, and their error was still strengthened by the Latin translators, as both the *Versio antiqua* and the Vulgate translate: *et adoravit fastigium virgae ejus,*—not that, as some think, they had overlooked ἐπὶ, and thus translated without a sense; the *ejus* shows that they did not mean the *virga Jacobi*, but *Josephi*, otherwise they must have put suae, and they took ἐπὶ, c. accus., as denoting the direction in which the adoration had gone. But, the explanation of the words of the LXX., according to which τῆς ἐξέδωκαν αὐτοῖ, not αὐτοῖ, was read, must have been generally spread, for, both Chrysos-

* And they having borne themselves away contrary to all hopes, and having obtained solemn promises of such blessings, affectionately greeted each other.
tom and Theodoret explain them in the same way as the Vulgate translates—Jacob had foreseen the future sovereignty in his son, and gave an actual proof of his belief in it by the act of adoration. We may still entertain a doubt, however, whether our Author did not himself so understand the passage of the LXX., for, to what purpose, returning to the xlvii. ch. of Gen., should he have added these words, if he saw nothing of importance in them? It may be said, indeed, that he rightly referred the ἐκπορεύεσθαι to the adoration of God, and quoted the words only to denote the piety of the dying patriarch. Still, they are more significant according to the first mentioned view; and, besides, the acc., construed with ἐπὶ, might more easily lead to the acceptance in which it is taken by the Vulgate. It has, in consequence, been retained by those interpreters who have not slavishly followed their predecessors, as by the Messieurs de Port-Royal, who translate: il s’inclina profondément devant le baston de commandement, que portoit son fils. In this state of the case, the Protestant controversialists at least have very unjustly designated this passage of the Vulgate as one of the most palpable of its errors.—On ver. 22. Comp. Gen. l. 24. et seq.

Ver. 23—32.—Examples of Faith from the time of the departure out of Egypt until the possession of the land of Canaan.

Ver. 23.—Comp. the glorious predicates of Moses, Ecclus. xliv. 1. et seq. (his πιστίς; ver. 4.), Wisdom x. 16. Before the Faith of Moses himself is spoken of, that of his parents is mentioned.

Ver. 24—26.—Had Moses preferred the education of an Egyptian prince, he must have left the Faith of his fathers; hence ἀμαρτία, here, as at x. 26., and iii. 17., must, at least preferably, be referred to apostacy. The phrase ὠνειδισμὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ has been taken in very different ways. The main difference among the various explanations lies in this, that while
the one party makes Χριστός identical with λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, the other understands it of the individual Christ. The former appeals to the immediately preceding mention of the ὅνειδισμός of the λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, and to the retrospective reference to it as being the most natural. Still, irrespective of other reasons, one cannot be induced by anything short of the production of distinct passages to suppose, that, as the community really filled by Christ (Gal. iii. 16. I Cor. xii. 12) is called Χριστός, so that typical, Jewish community might bear the same name. On the other hand, the second supposition, that the subject-matter is the sufferings endured after the example of Christ, presents no difficulty. We need not, on this account, assume, that the Author ascribes to Moses a prophetic eye to the future suffering of Christ, for the whole of the 11th ch., as well as the beginning of the 12th, rests much rather upon the hero of Faith of the Old Covenant having something akin to the Faith and mind of Christ, Comp., also, the parallel of the prophets with the Apostles of Christ, Matth. v. 12. Thus, then, the Author from his point of view can say, that Moses, having, for the sake of God, submitted to the αἰσχύνη (xii. 2.), has borne the reproach of Christ, as he demands that all Christians should do the same, xiii. 13. This simple view is found in Chrysostom and Theodoret.

Ver. 27.—Κατσεβίν is intrans.: "to be steadfast." Here we have the same contrast of ἀδόγματος and ὀξαὶ as in Rom. i. 20. Luther does not keep closely by the language in his translation: "he held by him whom he saw not, as if he saw him," led astray, perhaps, by a false punctuation of the Vulgate: invisibilem evenit (,) tamquam videns (,) sustinuit. The expression, with great propriety and significance, refers us back to ver. 1., and may be thought well calculated to serve, in popular instruction, as the foundation of the development of the notion Faith, especially in the Lutheran translation. Calvin says: apostolus autem intelligit non secus obscuruisse Moisen, quam si in coelum raptus Deum solum haberet ante oculos, negotium
 vero cum hominibus non haberet, non subjiceretur huys vitae periculos, nullum cum Pharaone haberet certamen. Atqui certum est eum tot difficultatibus fuisse obrutum, ut posset animo interdum concipere Deum procul abesse, aut certe superiorem tandem fore regis contumaciam tot praesidiis instructum ad resistendum.

Ver. 28.—According to the supposition of the older expositors, which was lately defended by Deyling: Obs. sacrae, v. p. 18., πίστει refers to the acknowledgment of the typical character of the passover, but, for this supposition there is no foundation. It was a proof of faith, when Moses believed in the efficacy of the Paschal blood for the delivery of the Jewish first-born.

Ver. 29—31. —Ἐπὶ ἔτη ἡμίας, “throughout seven days,” see on ἓτη, e. acc., in defining time, Matthiä II. 1169. On ἀπεθάνου, see iv. 11. and iii. 18.; the ἀπεθάνοντες were the Canaanites, who did not believe the God of the Israelites to be the true God, nor that He had given them the land as their property. Rahab, however, acknowledged the God of the Hebrews, and, subsequently, was completely converted to the belief of the true God, Jos. vi. 25.

Ver. 32—38.—Examples of faith from the time of the possession of Canaan until that of the Maccabees.

Ver. 32.—The multitude of examples which present themselves compels the author to break off, and to speak summarily of those of the succeeding period. Formulae similar to: καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἔδω, καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν τὰ πολλὰ are found in the rhetoricians, Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 448., in like manner: ἐπιλείψει με χρόνος (or ἡμέρα) λέγοντα, see Wetstein on the passage.

Ver. 33, 34.—Bengel who, in general, so willingly takes the language of Scripture according to its weight and measure, wishes to prove a strict reference here to the preceding context; κατηγορούσαντο βασιλείας refers, as he conceives, to David, εἰσγάσαντο
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dikaiosynη to Samuel, ἵστενχος ἐπαγγελίων particularly to the prophets; in like manner, ἐφαρμάν στόματα λεόντων and ἑκεῖνων δύναμιν πυεός, which words distinctly send us back to Daniel vi. 22. iii. 27., perhaps. also, take a glance at Judges xiv. 6. The four following predicates are thought to refer retro-grado ordine to Jephthah, Samson, Barak and Gideon. The artificial, and, in part, unsuitable character of this supposition is evident. Ἐγνάζεσθαι dikaiosynη cannot, certainly, be taken in the general sense of ποιήσαι or ἐγνάζεσθαι dikaiosynη, so as to make it = to walk virtuously, but, it rather signifies in this place to procure justice to the oppressed, which has then an application to the judges,—Ἐφυγον στόματα μ., used, perhaps, with a special reminiscence of 1 Kings xix. 1, 10. If we understand by ἀσθένεια weakness and not sickness, our thoughts may be turned to the history of Samson, Judges xvi. 19, 30., if we understand by it distress, it will remind us of the well known relation of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. Κλίνων παρεμελήν, as in Latin, aciem inclinare, i. e. εἰς φυγήν τρέψεως.

Ver. 35.—The first words relate to 1 Kings xvii. 17. and 2 Kings iv. 32. On τυμπανίζεσθαι, the more recent Lexicons of Bretschneider and Wahl are not satisfactory; they give only the signification of tympano cruciari, and, to that they add this explanation: τύμπανον machina lignea incurva, cui adstringebantur fustibus vel baculis caedendi (Braun gives a drawing, but it is not correct). This is the signification which the Vulgate expresses: distenti sunt, and, likewise, the Coptic version; and Luther’s before the edition of 1530: “they are stretched out.” On the other hand, all the Glossaries, the Etymologicum magnum, Gudianum, Alberti, Photii, and others, give a second meaning: ἐξολοκοσέως, fustibus caedere, according to which Luther has translated since 1530. Have the two modern Lexicographers regarded this meaning as incorrect, and, therefore, not mentioned it? But it is well founded, and has been adopted by Passow. It is especially supported by
Aristoph. *Plutus* v. 476. Interpreters, indeed, waver in their opinions of that passage, but, the best, on account of the addition *νυξανς τυμπανος*, take it in the sense to *stick*. The Scholiast on the passage gives both the significations, Pindar has from him adopted exclusively the last, "to stick." And, keeping out of view that passage of Aristoph., and the evidence of the later writers, it can he proved from the form of the word itself. *Τυμπανος* is derived from *τύσω*; this substantive form, as well as those substantive in *ησον*, denotes an instrument; the *Etymol. Gudianum*, p. 537, has also the form *τυμπανιστρον*, comp. *τύργανον* from *τύργω*, "the crucible, an instrument for melting." Thus, we might as well call the *τυμπανος* the instrument, upon which as with which men beat, as well the *drum* as the *stick*, and, accordingly, the verb, "to stretch upon the drum," or, "to make into a drum," or, also "to strike with the stick." But, *thirdly*, *τυμπανις* and *ἀποτυμπανις* have been used quite generally in the sense of *βασανις*, *δειρωμειν*, *δακρυσαλις*, as here the Peshito has: "they died in torments,"* a the Italic: *necati sunt*. Which of these three significations is to be adopted for our passage? At any rate, the author has had in mind 2 Maccab. vi., in which, at ver. 19. and 28., the *τυμπανος* is expressly mentioned. If this be granted, we might certainly adopt here, as many do, the signification *stick*, but, still, it would be unsuitable. It is much more natural to think of the instrument upon which those to be beaten were stretched. *Κρειττονος* is not to be understood as if it made some reference to

* The Syriac has *ךָּוֹתֵל* For want of a Syriac word, perhaps, for *τυμπανος*, the idea has been expressed by a circumlocution. In 2 Macc. vi. 19. 28., where the instrument itself, *τυμπανος*, is mentioned, the Syriac translator has in both places *ךָּוֹתֵל*, "pain and torment." It is possible, however, that he has taken the word in the general signification.
the ἀνάστασις τῆς ζωῆς (see on vi. 2.)—for the article
is wanting—but, as forming the contrast to that
ἀνάστασις which is previously mentioned. Kuinöl
lays particular stress upon the circumstance, that it
is expressly related of the seven sons of the Jewish
mother, who, after the example of Eleazar, died as
martyrs, 2 Macc. vii., that they expected the ἀνάστασις
as a reward of their martyrdom, 2 Macc. vii.
9. 14., and thinks, therefore, that the author had
these youths particularly in view. He may certainly
have transferred to Eleazar what is related of them,
especially as it is said, that his example was their
model.

Ver. 36—38.—Although ἰμπαγμοὶ is usually re-
ferred to the mockeries of earlier prophets, yet,
there is more in favour of adopting a reminiscence
of the narrative, 2 Macc. vii., respecting the seven
youths, joining it with what immediately precedes,
especially as the examples cited from the olden time
are in this place no longer so appropriate. Immedi-
ately after the relation of Eleazar's history, it is said,
2 Macc. vii. 1.: συνέη δὲ καὶ ἐπτὰ ἄδελφοις μετὰ τῆς
μητρὸς συλληψάντων ἀναγχαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀτὸ
tῶν ἄθεμιτων ὕσιαν ἐρεῖν ἰδαπτεῖσθαι, μάστιξι καὶ νευ-
ραῖς αἰχιζομένους, and, in ver. 7., torment and
death, to which they are subjected, are called ᾧ
ἰμπαγμοῖς. Comp. ver. 10. ἰμπαίζεσθαι.—The most
noted imprisonment suffered by any of the prophets
is that of Jeremiah.— Εὐθανάσθησαν must either be re-
ferred to the tradition of the stoning of Jeremiah
(Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. V. T. I. 1111.) men-
tioned by Tertullian, Synkellos, Elmakin—and, by
the Auct. op. imp. in Matth. hom. 41., or, to the
death of Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada, which is
also mentioned in the Gospels, 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, 22.
Matth. xxiii. 35. Ἐπιτίθησαν is referred to the
widely spread tradition of the death of Isaiah under
the king Manasseh (Gesenius Comm. on Isaiah
i. p. 11.), although this punishment occurs gene-
raliy among the ancients, and the author may there-
fore have had other cases in view. ἔτειράσθησαν occasions some difficulty in this passage, not merely because it notices something too unimportant, but, also, because it expresses a general notion, while, both previously and subsequently, particular kinds of death are mentioned. The external evidence against it, however, is weak; except three Minusc. Codd., the only weighty witness against it is the Syriac: the Arabs. Erp. is of no account, as it translates after the Syriac. Still, suspicion of the genuineness of this word is strengthened when we consider its resemblance to ἕπρισθησαν, from which it might come either as a gloss, or through an error of the transcriber. In favour of this, it may be urged, that Cod. 17. places ἔτειράσθησαν before ἕπρισθησαν, and two authorities omit the former. If ἔτειράσθησαν be not genuine, it may have arisen, as we have said, from some transcribers having written erroneously at ἕπρισθησαν, and others, afterwards, taking up ἔτειράσθησαν along with ἕπρισθησαν: or, it might, as a marginal gloss, be the conjecture of those who did not understand ἕπρισθησαν: or, a third case is possible, that, here, another kind of death was mentioned (the author using an uncommon word), that the transcribers have corrupted this word, and so given rise to every kind of conjecture. Beza conjectured ἔτειρώθησαν Tanaq. Faber, and Gesner ἐπηρήθησαν, Piscator ἐτεράσθησαν. This is undeniably one of those passages where the critica emendatrix appears to be in its place. We must always admit, however, the possibility of a vindication of the rec. There is a similar case, Rom. i. 29., where some Codd. have πορνία and πορνία, some placing the former, some the latter, word first; weighty authorities omit the former, and others, not wanting in claims to attention, omit the latter, and where some hesitation must be felt in declaring πορνία decidedly not genuine. If ἔτειράσθησαν be genuine, we should best conceive it to be that kind of πυρσεμίς which Antiochus, 2 Macc. vii. 24., put before the youth: "an allurement to apostacy
under a threat of still greater torments." In favour of the reading, J. Capell urges the Paronomasia which would result from it. The last words of the 37. verse give still another picture of the self-denying lives of these men. They were clothed in sheep-skins and goat-skins, the dress of those of the lowest class, and especially of the prophets. As a distinctive prophet's dress, this is mentioned in Zech. xiii. 4. Μηλωτή can, as μηλον is, like ζώον, said of all small animals, be employed also for goat-skin; and this has led the great Hemsterhusius, in a remark on the Pollux II. 1366., to the opinion, which he has not farther confirmed, that ἐν αἰγείοις διημανυ is a gloss. Wassenbergh naturally coincides with this opinion, in accordance with his uncritical rule on glosses, that every thing in the New Testament is a gloss: quod abesse posse possit sensu integro. The great critic, however, has nethere displayed that geometrica elegantia, quae vel tenuissima discrimina accurate definit, for which Rhunken extols him; for, why should not μηλωτή be employed in its usual signification of sheep-skins, and the author have completed this idea by adding αἰγεία διημάνα? The Asynodont might rather give rise to a critical suspicion, although Wassenbergh attaches no importance to this, and in passages where χαί stands he assumes glosses equally without hesitation. Still, this Asynodont can be satisfactorily vindicated. By the διημάνα αἰγεία, as the rougher, the notion conveyed by μηλωτὶ is strengthened, and we have the acknowledged rule fulfilled,

* The following circumstances certainly render it probable that the dress of the prophets consisted rather of goat than of sheep-skins, 1. Because they are rougher. 2. Because the expression ἦν ὁ ἄμωσις in the passages cited may thus be better explained, comp. Gen. xxvii. 16. 3. Because the sheep in Palestine are generally white, the goats black, and this colour is more suitable to the prophetic costume. Lamartine recently mentions the black fur of goat-skins as worn by the Bedouins. The poet mistook, at a distance, five eagles, with their black wings, for Arabs clad in black goat-skins.
that the *Asyndeton* occurs not merely with co-ordinated notions, but, also, in climaxes, comp., on this subject, the erudite dissertation in the 14. Excursus on the Remarks on the Iliad by Nägelsbach, Dissen, *Excurs. sec. II. de asyndetis apud Pindarum*, p. 278., and also the three following participles, which are connect-ed ἀναστάτος with one another.—Ver. 38. The world holds them for πιστικάματα, 1 Cor. iv. 13., and so casts out the salt which would have salted it, the light which might have lighted it, and thus the judgment is fulfilled in it, Rev. ii. 5.—Mountains are, Matth. xxiv. 16., waste places, 1 Sam. xxii. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 Kings xvii. and xix. 1 Kings xviii., caves, Judges vi. 2. 1 Sam. xiii. 6. Isaiah ii. 19., spoken of as being, in the East, the usual places of refuge in times of affliction.

Ver. 39, 40.—*In spite of the firm adherence to the Faith manifested by these heros, God has made the τέλειωσις more easy to us.*

Ver. 39, 40.—Ὅμως ἐκκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, like ver. 13., μὴ λαξώντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. Since the Christians are placed in contrast as they who have received the ἐπαγγελία, the ἐπαγγελία must refer to the appearance of the Messiah, and the better lot which God has destined for them is the share which they have in the appearance of the Messiah, Luke x. 23, 24. 1 Peter i. 20. Προέλειψθαί is employed with a reference to the fact of the time of the Redeemer’s appearance having been, from the beginning, determined in the Divine counsel, Gal. iv. 4. The term τελείωσθαί comprehends (Comp. also on v. 9, 10.) the doing away of guilt by the forgiveness of sins, inward perfection and outward appearance as outward glorification: but, in particular passages, sometimes the one side and sometimes the other appears more prominently. Now, does this expression convey the whole of the notion, or does it specify only one side of it? And, again, *does the author consi-
der the τελείωσις of the προηγότερος as having already taken place, and us as already advancing towards them: or, does he mean, that, notwithstanding the truth of their faith, they could not obtain the τελείωσις without us, i.e., without being joined to the kingdom of Christ founded among us, and in us? In the latter case, the passage would yield, distinctly, the dogma, that, so long as Christ was not yet come, there was, for those Old Testament fathers, generally, no bliss, at least no complete bliss, possible. This has in fact, been regarded, under various modifications, by the eastern and western Roman-Catholic Church, by Socinians and Arminians, as the dogmatical scope of the passage. Theodoret gives this solid and clear expression of the sense: a οἱ μὴν τῶν ἄγνωσ τοσοῦτοι καὶ ηλικοῦτοι, ἀλλ' ὡμοις οὐδὲται τῶν στερᾶνοι ἀπῆλασαι. ἀναμένει γὰρ ὃ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς τοὺς τῶν ἀλλῶν ἄγωνας, ἴα τοῦ σταθεὶν λυβέινος κοινῆ πάντας τῶν ἀναχέσουσι, ἀξιώσῃ τοὺς νικήτριας. We see that Theodoret has taken the expression as a term, agonisticus, and this has been done by Peter Faber and Lydias (c. 35.) in their works, De agonistica sacra. Theodoret is followed by Chrysostom, who, towards the close of the XIth Ch., is, generally, very animated, and says, among other things: b καὶ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν χρόνους ἔχουσι τοσοῦτοι νικήσαντες, καὶ οὐδὲται ἁπελαθοί. ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ ἄγων ἔτη ὀνει, ἀσχάλλετε; ἐν νοήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς τί ἐστι, καὶ δοὺν ἐστι τῶν Ἀδελαίμα καθήσασι καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον πεισμένοντας, πότε σὺ τελειωθῆς,

a So many and so great were then the contests of these men, but, nevertheless, they have not yet enjoyed their crowns, for the God of all waits for the struggles of the others, in order that, when the course is terminated, he may pronounce all in common, who have gained the victory, worthy of being proclaimed conquerors.

b So many are the years since they departed victorious, and they have not yet received: and ye, who are still contending, are ye sad? Think, likewise, what and how great a thing it is that Abraham, and the Apostle Paul, himself, are sitting waiting until the time when ye shall be perfected, that then they may receive their reward.
So also Origen, Hom. XVII. in Jos. T. II. ed R. p. 438. The Socinians and Arminians, too, agree with this. The Western Roman-Catholic Church, the dogmatical decisions of which rest sometimes upon operations of the understanding of a very external character, in strong contrast to the speculative depth of so many of her theologians who comment upon them, has here made the following divisions, which are of a very outward character, that the Fathers before Christ were, indeed, beatissimi, but, still, only in limbo patrum degentes, and, that Christ did not then increase their beatitudo, but conducted them into Heaven, where they now wait for gloria at the resurrection. This view, strictly taken, cannot be reconciled with our passage; for, if that change of place were not of essential influence, but, merely, an external event, how could it have been designated as τελείωσις? The interpreters of that Church, therefore, strike into different paths. Calmet joins Chrysostom. Justinian finds the τελείωσις in the resurrection from the dead, through which to the bliss which the patriarchs already enjoy in the spirit will be added that of the body. Thomas Aquinas, in the Summa III. qu. 78. a. 3., explains ἔκαγγελια, in our passage, by plena animae et corporis beatitudo. The reference to the resurrection of the body is rejected by Corn. a Lapide, because, according to Matth. xxvii. 53., many saints are already risen before us. This Jesuit, who, elsewhere, appears very little acquainted with the method of expounding from the context, sees himself here, precisely through the context, placed in opposition to the doctrines of his Church, without, however, confessing the fact. Τελείωσις, he thinks, comprehends the beatitudo in genero; this was first imparted to the elders by the New Testament, for, as ch. ix. shews, the blood of Christ first opened an entrance into heaven. But, the Church rejects the supposition, that the Fathers, licet in ima terrarum
parte versantes, were not already beatissimi. See Calmet.

It was reserved for the Protestant Church—with what justice we will not here inquire—to place itself, as regards this subject, in opposition to the tradition of the whole church, both Eastern and Western, and leave to men, after death, only two roads, Heaven and Hell. Gerhard, in the Loci, after recounting, from the earliest period, the numerous declarations of the Fathers, who, under various modifications, have taught a Middle State, draws only this conclusion from them: verissimam esse regulam istam quod patrum dicta non sint canonicae Scripturarum sacrarum auctoritati exaequanda. In virtue of this dogmatical principle, the Protestant Exegesis found it impossible to accede to the view ascribed to the Greek and Latin Churches. In defining the sense, however, there appear a countless number of modifications. We pass over those views which at once strike us as forced, such as those of Grotius, Hammond, and Morus, and will mention only a few others. According to Cameron, the τελείωσις consisted, particularly, in the better knowledge of which the Fathers participated, only at the same time with us, on the appearance of Christ. The sense, according to J. Cappell, is: "so that they have not seen, earlier than we, the fulfilment, i. e. the reality of Christ upon earth." Gerhard, in his commentary, understands by τελείωσις the generalis consummatio in fine seculi, through means of the resurrection of the body; in the Loci, on the other hand, he explains it, as Piscator and Limborch do: "in order that, if they had already in their time received Christ, the end of the world might not take place, by which, as we should have been excluded from existence in general, so we should also have been from the kingdom of Christ." Beza says: "to us is given the reality of Christ, so that they cannot be blessed without that which takes place in our days." Braun: "as in our times the Messiah first appeared,
they have not been consecrated, i.e. atoned for, without us," &c. According to all the explanations which we have hitherto examined, the intention of the apostle went directly, through the final proposition in ἵνα, to say something of the ancients, and, indeed, something lowering, in order to prove, as by the πρεπεῖν τι πταλ., that God has shewn more grace to us than to them; and, agreeably to this, all these expositors take either expressly, as Cameron and Cappell, or tacitly, the ἵνα in the sense of "so that." If, on the contrary, we take ἵνα in its strict signification, as denoting intention, the conviction will be pressed upon us that the Author's wish was first of all to say something of us, and, indeed, directly something distinguishing as Christians. The sense then assumes this form: "First, in our time, God has caused the Redeemer to appear, in order that we also may attain to the τελείωσις." The proposition may then be conceived as Gerhard, Piscator, and Limborch have taken it, or—which we prefer—it may be supposed, that the Apostle spoke by μετώπως, and that he means to say: "Towards us, who have lived to see the appearance of Christ, God has been more kind, for in Him we have obtained (xii. 2.) the τελειωτῆς πίστεως, so that we have pre-eminently received our share of the τελείωσις of the Fathers." According to our explanation, as according to the most of those already adduced, τελείωσις denotes glorification: a few only, as Braun, Carpzov, and a-Lapide have given particular prominence to the meaning expiare, which, however, is here unsuitable.

The Author's view, then, as we conceive the passage, would be, that those ancients really received the τελείωσίς before the time of Christ; and this is supported by the expression τετελειωμένοι δίκαιοι, xii. 23. But, from the context of the Epistle, there arise difficulties which, as we formerly mentioned, a-Lapide remarked, but did not solve. The preceding part of the Epistle tended every where to shew, that Christ first opened an entrance into the Holy of Holies, that He first
gave a certain hope, that through Him alone the τελειωσις was possible. We certainly do not err when we say, that our Author, to this difficulty, would have answered precisely as the dogmatics of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches answer: “that, namely, the Fathers, through faith in the types and predictions of the Messiah, possessed the essence of faith in redemption, and thereby were entitled to enter, after death, into the same state as the New Testament believers.” From this passage, as well as from xii. 23., in particular from the δίκαιον τετελειωμένοι, we are entitled to conclude, that our Author, in unison with St. Paul, although the key-stone of the τελειωσις of the kingdom of Christ and its individual members can be fixed only at the end of time, supposed that, immediately after death, they who had continued in the faith entered into a state of happiness. If beatitudo and gloria could be outwardly conceived and separated, the distinction might here be made, that the beatitudo commences, for believers, immediately after death, but not the gloria.

CHAPTER XII.

FOLLOW AFTER THE WITNESSES OF THE FAITH WHOM YE HAVE BEFORE YOU, AND CONSIDER, THAT, IN HOW MUCH THE NEW COVENANT IS MORE GLORIOUS AND RICH IN GRACE THAN THE OLD, BY SO MUCH WILL THE PUNISHMENT OF INDIFFERENCE TOWARDS IT BE THE MORE SEVERE.

Ver. 1—3.—Follow after the witnesses of the faith, whom ye have before you.

Ver. 1.—Our Author here employs, in its whole extent, the figure very frequently made use of by Paul, drawn from the gymnastic games. To Palestinian readers, figures drawn from these games were
full of expression, for, in the time of the Herods, they had been naturalized in the capital of the Jewish kingdom itself; Josephus, Antiqu. 15. 8. (2 Macc. iv. 11—19.). The race-course (the στάδιον) is the career of life, the goal (τέλος) is the end of life, the prize (βασίλειον, Phil. iii. 14.) the τελειωσία, the judge of the game (βασιλευόντος) God, the spectators they who formerly ran the same course (vi. 12.), and now, from heaven, turn their eyes upon us (1 Cor. iv. 9.). Ἱερείς τὸ στάδιον, καὶ γίνοντες ἄνδρες ὁλο γνώρισεν, was the phrase which the Eleans called out to those who stood ready for the contest. The writer here employs a similar spiritual acclamation.—The well-constructed sentence is introduced by the emphatic τοργασοῦν. Νίφος and nubes are used by Greek and Latin prose writers of crowds of men. The expression ὤγχος embraces within the image not only the corporeal weight and unwieldiness, which is removed (1 Cor. ix. 25.) by ἐγχάρισα, but also whatever, from without, impedes the career of the runner, as his clothes, which were taken off. It may be further remarked, that the ground on which they ran was not hard, but was covered with deep sand. In the interpretation, too, of the image we must not go beyond the general notion: “every thing that, from within or from without, hinders the Christian from the attainment of his end.” But when we find ἄμαρτία here distinguished from ὦγχος, and connected with it by καὶ, the question occurs, is the ἄμαρτία to be taken as Exegetes, or as something different from the ὦγχος? We cannot look upon the ἄμαρτία as something entirely different, for it belongs to what particularly hinders. We must, therefore, suppose, that the καὶ brings out that wherein especially the ὦγχος consists, and then the conjecture arises, that ἄμαρτία here, as at x. 26., and iii. 17., is synonymous with ἀποστασία. Εὐπεριστάτως belongs to the very conside-

a “Go to the course and be men able to conquer!”
rable number—considerable when we reflect upon the small extent of the New Testament writings—of words which are ἄνατως λεγόμενα in the Grecian literature, as δευτερόπρωτος, ἐπιούσιος, πειθός, ἰμειρισθαί, παρακλείσσομαι; still, it is properly the compound with εὖ, which is not elsewhere found. Philologists and Theologians have not made so many inquiries regarding εὐπερίστατος as they have done respecting ἐπιούσιος, yet, several great philologists have expressed their opinion upon it. The most erudite discussions, partly on the word itself, partly on the simpl. περίστατος, are those by Wetstein, Elsner, Kypke, on the passage, Casauboniana, p. 75. 90., Salmasius, De soenore trapezitico, p. 248—259., Gataker, Advers. posth. c. 3., Suicer, s. h. v., Hemsterhus. on Aristoph. Plut. v. 954., Schneider on Theophrastus' Charact. viii., Lobeck on Phryn. p. 376. Above all, Salmasius, again in conflict with his enemy, the exercitator sacer Dan. Heinsé, shews how he can, ἀνειμίνως καὶ ὠσὶ παῖζων, scatter about learning which others gather together by years of investigation. In various ways, the numerous explanations of the word might be brought under heads. According to the twofold object of the περίστατος, we arrange them in two classes, as veneration, admiration, assistance, may be thought to express it, or the intention to do injury may be its meaning. Let it previously be remarked, that the uncommonness of the word has given birth to two other readings, neither, however, having any foundation. The Ed. Compl., Plant., namely, reads ἄπειριστατος, which occurs in good usage, it is pretended, also, in Stephanus, that a Cod., and some manuscripts of the Gloss. Alberti. read εὐπερίστατος. Περίσταται των, or περὶ της, "to place ourself around any one, to surround him"—usually employed only of several, and also derivatives of the same signification, are found in the best writers, as Isocrates; περίστας, "the crowd of people who surround one;" ἄπειριστατος "one abandoned by such spectators, or, generally, of suppor-
After Salmasius had drawn attention to this classical signification, Küster brought it to bear on our passage, on Suidas I. 902; and, after him, Wetstein and Böhme. Sin, according to this view, would be personified, and considered as a θεοματατοιος, who has crowds of worshippers and admirers around him. This explanation must decidedly be rejected, for, in the first place, it is much more remote from New Testament usage than several which we shall give immediately; and, in the second place, there is nothing in the context which could have caused the writer to give this predicate to sin exactly in this passage. But, from the same use of πειριστατος, there is another signification to be derived, which Theophylact has given to υπεριστατος. He has, namely, after noticing two other views, proposed as a third admissible one: ἡ δι ἡν εὐκλος τις εἰς πειριστασις ἐμαυτινει, οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτω χινδυνώδες ὡς ἡ ἀμαρτία. This explanation rests on a meaning of the word πειριστασις, which had become quite usual in the time of Christ (Comp. Polybius, Plutarch, Epictetus), and belonged to the Stoical school. With the Stoics, namely, πειριστασις denotes that which, in Christian language, we call περασμός, derived from the signification tumulus, turba, in which way, also Jac. Böhme has employed the word turba. Accordingly, in Galen ἄθρως ἀπειριστικος means, "a man who is involved in the affairs of life," ὑπεριστατος "one who is free from the affairs of life," τὰ πειριστικα "the embarrassments of life:" and, therefore, ἡ υπεριστατος ἀμαρτία will signify, "the sin which is thoroughly entangled in the πειριστασις of life." Salmasius, who holds this to be the only correct signification, adroitly refers to 1 Tim. vi. 9. The view of Kypke, too, who translates pecc. impeditissimum et calamitosissimum, gives the same result. I have the following doubts respecting this explanation. This predicate, "involved in the affairs of life," is of such a kind that it can be employed of persons only; and, hence, Salmasius finds

* Of this usage, and of others allied to it, Heinichen has treated on Euseb. III. 142.
himself compelled to adopt a personification. And further, this acceptance of the word, in this construction, does not yield so good a sense as one which we shall afterwards mention. The second class of explanations understands περιστασισ as of the standing around with the purpose of causing injury, and, then, the adjective will be taken either activē or passīvē: “who place themselves around, in order to injure,” or, “who are surrounded, in order that they may be brought to ruin.” Clericus, indeed, considers the active acceptance as quite inadmissible. But see, on the active signification of the adject. verb., Buttmann, Ausführliche Grammat. I. 446. Both the active and passive acceptance were given by Chrysostom, and Oecumenius: ἦτοι τὴν εὐχάλως περιστασισ ἡμᾶς, ἢ τὴν εὐχάλως περιστασισ δυναμένην παθεῖν λάγει, μάλλον δὲ τούτο, ἐὰν διέλθη, ἐὰν Ἰέλωμεν, περιστασισ τῆς ἀμαρτίας. a The passive signification, which is adopted by Chrysostom, lies at the foundation of the Italic, which has fragile. Now, although we cannot exactly say, that the testimony of Christian consciousness rises up against such a predicate of sin, for through Christ, certainly, the victory over all sin is easy (1 John iv. 4.), yet it does so against the foundation of it by Chrysostom, from an overrating of the αὐτικεύσαν in the Greek Fathers. We are free, indeed, to explain the predicate more in accordance with the doctrine of Scripture; still, this whole conception of the passage, the main object being to warn, is not in place. It would be more easy to defend a modification of this view, which proceeds upon the signification of the verb “to change, to transpose.” Comp. the Scholium in Suidas: εὐπεριστασισ, μαρτήν ταχέως περιστρεφόμενον; b in like manner Etymolog. Gud., Photius, Phavorinus; but, why the ἀμαρτία should precisely have this epithet

a “He means that which easily besets us, or that which may easily suffer peril, but rather the latter, for it is easy, if we so will, to conquer sin.”

b “συναφίστατος, quickly subverting a foolish man.”
here is not evident. The context is undoubtedly best responded to by the active signification given by Chrysostom, and which has been adopted, merely with some modifications, by the great majority of expositors. Theodoret himself belongs to this number: ἐν ἐυχαρίστει δὲ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐκάλεσαν, ὡς εὐχόλως συνισταμένη τῷ και γινομένη. Καὶ γὰρ ὀρθαλμὸς δειλάζεται, ἀκραὶ καταβείλεται, ἀφὶ γαρ γαλαξίζεται, καὶ γλώσσα βασιτάν διολθαῖναι, καὶ ὁ λογισμὸς πέρι τὸ χείλος ὀξύροστος. Erasmus and Vatablus have given: "tenaciter inhaerens; Castellio: ambitiosus, mallem: nos ambiens, sicut arbores ambit hedera; Ja. and Lud. Cappell: impediens sicuti laciniosa vestis; Erasm. Schmid: facile noxius; HEINSE: (in lucta) in cursu alterum facile circumveniens. The Gloss also, of Hesychius, who gives εὐχόλον, εὐχρήστον as an explanation, belongs, perhaps, to this class, although, with Le Clerc, we may also refer it to the passive signification. Whatever modification we may adopt from among this great variety, one of the senses of this kind is most suitable for the passage. I should prefer taking the word with Castellio: "which easily cleaves to us, wraps around us;" Luther comes near this view of the word: "always so clings to us." We may then compare, as a parallel in matter, 1 Peter v. 8.; Eph. vi. 12, 13. may also be compared, for the evil spirits are there placed in the aerial space, in order to indicate that their attacks are made from every side. This conception of the passage appears still more suitable the moment we refer ἀμαρτία to the ἀποστασία, for the Author, ch. vi. 3, 4. x. 25, 26., has already pointed out, that the Christian may be gradually seduced to this, and, in the same way, at a subsequent part of our chapter, ver. 15.—'Αγών may be understood with the Vulgate, Erasmus, and Schulz, of the race, or, with Beza, of

a He has called the sin ἐν ἐυχαρίστει as easily being and subsisting. For the eye is allured, the ear is soothed, the touch is tickled, and the tongue most readily slips, and the reason is easily moved to the worse."
the course itself; in both cases προσέπαθαί is the technical expression.

Ver. 2.—What is the vis compositi in ἀφορεῖντες? With πρές and sic, in the same manner as ἀπελέπτειν (xi. 26.), ἀφορεῖν has the signification of: “to look towards something, to fix one’s eyes upon it, to regard it,” Herodian, 5, 6, 17. 6, 5, 1. Josephus, Antiqu. 8, 12, 1. 7, 5, 4., De bello jud. 11, 15. 1.; but, it also means: “to look towards something from afar,” Polybius, 2, 26, 4. Luther regarded this, perhaps, as its signification, for he translates “aufsehen” (look up), probably in the sense “to look towards heaven, where He is now enthroned.”—Many expositors silently pass by the predicate ἁσχημὸς καὶ τελειωθῆς τῆς πίστεως, although it is by no means certain what is the more exact sense. Πίστες is not accompanied by a pronoun—the Syriac only, as it often does, has supplied a ἡμῶν—it may refer both to our faith, and to faith alone. The sense may be: “He who first introduced faith rightly into the world, and, at the same time, has represented it in a complete manner;” but the sense may also be, “He who for us is the auctor (in Latin also having the force of exemplum) of faith, and who, at the appointed term, imparts to us the τελειωσις,” or with reference to an inward efficiency, as Phil. ii. 13.: “who puts the spark of faith into our breast, and fans it into a bright flame.” The last sense is given by Chrysostom, with a reference to John xv. 16. 1 Cor. xiii. 12., the previous one, for example, by Schleusner, Knapp (Scripta 1. 253.), and Kuinöl, who take τελειωτῆς directly in the sense of ἔοικος, the first mentioned sense by Schulz, who translates, “the forerunner and perfected one in believing confidence.” The predicate cannot well be referred merely to the inward efficiency of Christ in the promotion of faith, for this reason, that so applied, it would not have a proper coherence with the figure, and we cannot limit its reference generally to the effects upon us, as otherwise ἡμῶν would not have been wanting. I should, there-
fore, suppose, that the first mentioned sense was the one particularly intended by the author, not, however, to the exclusion of the other two allusions. See on ἀέχνηγός chap. ii. 10. In the explanation of ἀντὶ τῆς προσκυμίνης χορᾶς expositors range themselves in two classes. According to the Grecian interpreters, the Syriac, Calvin, Luther, and Calov, it denotes that which Christ offered up, in giving himself to suffer the death of the Cross; while according to the Italic, the Ethiopic version, Beza, Bengel, Hunsrnius, Grotsius, and the more recent expositors, these words mean the βεγαζών, for whose sake Jesus took the ignominy upon himself. Nothing can be objected to the former exposition either in point of dogmatics or grammar. A strictly dogmatical parallel would be furnished by Phil. ii. 5. et seq., and John xvii. 4., and there would be grounds for the same dispute which has arisen on Phil. ii. 5., between the Greek and Roman-Catholic, the Reformed and Lutheran Church, whether the subject matter be the giving up of the χαρά which the Redeemer had as λόγος ἀσκεῖς (which the greater number here suppose it to be), or, which he might have had as διάδοσις, as some believe, e.g. Erasmus. Ἀντὶ, by the former view, has the usual signification "instead." On the other hand, the meaning of προσκυμίνης, as well as the connection of the passage, speaks decidedly against the view we have mentioned. Had the author wished to express that sense, he would surely have employed παρωνύμης or παρακυμίνης, not προσκυμίνης, which is precisely the terminus technicus for the ἄλα placed before contending parties as the prize of victory. See Kreb's Observ. p. 377. Hebr. vi. 18. And a proper parallel arises between us and the champion only when, for him as for us, the prize of victory lies at the end of the course. With this agrees also, the conclusion of the verse, which gives the χαρῆν ἐν δείγμα τοῦ θεοῦ, similar to i. 3., x. 13. (v. 9. vii. 26.), as the glorious issue of self-denial. This representation of the subject is completely in accordance with the doctrine taught
chap. v. 7. et seq. Thus, the present would be one of the few dogmatical passages of importance in the New Testament, incorrectly translated by Luther. The polemics of the Roman-Catholic and the Reformed Church who are opposed to this translation, Keckerman, Cochläus, and Tanner have not touched upon this passage. Until 1527, before the appearance of Emser's New Testament, he had kept more closely to the text, and, therefore, translated more favourably to our conception of the verse: "who, as joy was placed before him."

The view of Christ which is presented by these passages, as well as by others of this Epistle, e.g. ch. ii. 8—18. iv. 15., is completely opposed to the doctrines of the Apollinarians. And, generally, the Epistle to the Hebrews forms so complete a contrast to the doctrines of the Docetæ and Apollinarians, that, if we did not find such passages as chap. i. 2., its declarations might lead to an Ebionitic or Socinian view of the person of Christ. Comp. the use of παιδεύσα, 1 Cor. xi. 32. In the first Christian Church, while a dogmatical consciousness was yet unfomed, many of those who contended most zealously for the dignity of Christ, mingled Apollinarian notions with their views. Such is the case, also, with ourselves at present, the negative tendency of our (German) opinions during the five past decadaries having spread great obscurity over the opinions of dogmatics. But, we rarely find, as we do in such a writer as Whiston (the strange compiler of the Theological whims of the most different periods and confessions), profound Theological learning combined with this view of the person of Christ. On the other hand, from the ignorance of the doctrine of the Church to be found in its opponents, an objection arises, that, as it is expressed, for an incarnate God virtue had no difficulties, since, without any effort or any peculiar desire on his part, it would fall, as it is conceived, into His lap. Would it might be more and more acknowledg-
ed that, when Göthe says, in praise of the Bible, that it has been and still is of such excellent service, "that we may gather experience in it as in a second world, and go astray in it, and enlighten and cultivate ourselves from it;" and when Lessing says, in praise of the ancient dogmatics, "I would not say with thee, that our old religious system is a patch-work put together by bunglers and sciolists; I know of nothing in the world on which the acuteness of men has been more shewn and exercised than on it, but a patchwork by bunglers and sciolists I count the religious system which it is at present wished to foist into the place of the old, and with a far greater influence on reason and philosophy than the old ever arrogated to itself,"—would I say, that this quality of the Bible and of the doctrine of the Church might be acknowledged to be founded, in a great degree, on the connection of contrasts so unequal as they are found in the Bible (comp. also II. 11), and are, by the doctrine of the Church, partly expounded and partly dogmatically united. With what an admirable and measured step, for instance,—as respects the point before us—have the Lutheran dogmatics proceeded, after the first beginnings by Damascenus, in the doctrine of the communio naturarum and communicatio idiomatum, between the Apollinarian abolition, and the Nestorian insulation of the human nature. As little as a man by giving up his individuality (not his personality) and by God's becoming all things in him thereby ceased to be man—it is said, 1 Cor. xv. 28. not: God will be all, but He will be all in all—but rather then first becomes truly man, even so little does the absolute spirit, who assumes humanity, give up His godhead, but human nature is rather admitted to a participation with the Godhead, just as the Godhead lets itself down to a participation with the manhood. Then, however, the reality of all human affections under the influence of the world is put upon this letting down; on which Melanchthon speaks with a high and antidocetic fervour in the Loci, De filio, p.
36. *De pecc. orig.* p. 35. *ed.* Erlang. *T. I.* Along with this too the struggle is put (see on ii. 18.), and, hereby is also justified the assertion in this place, that the privileges which the Logos eternally possessed were a prize of victory lying afar off for the human nature assumed by the Divine when it had run the contested race. The answer to the question whether His victory were any *difficulty* (Kunst) for Him, springs of itself from what we have said:—it was a difficulty and at the same time no difficulty, in the same way as for what is called a beautiful mind, it is at once a difficulty and no difficulty to do nothing that is not beautiful.

There still remains something to be observed on the second half of the verse. Of the sufferings which the Redeemer had to endure the author immediately mentions that portion which formed the chief, comp. v. 7. Phil. ii. 8. The death of the cross was, according to the notion of the Romans, the greatest ignominy, being only awarded to slaves and rebels; and, according to the notions of the Jews, because the curse rested upon those who were hanged, and they who were crucified were regarded as such. Deut. xxi. 23. Gal. iii. 13. The perfect *καθάρθηκεν* is more accredited by external authorities than *εἰκάθισον*, and, in this place, makes a still stronger impression, as there is connected with it the idea that He who was so despised is *now* enthroned.

**Ver. 3.—**Τὰς is here *explicatiorum.* *Ἀντίλογία* and *ἀντιλέγειν* are employed, according to the usage of the LXX., of actual opposition, revolt, Hos. iv. 4. Is. lxv. 2. Ταῖς ἁμαρταίς ὑμᾶν is, by Beza, Knapp, and Böhme, construed with *κάμητε*, but by Bengel, Matthäi, and Griesbach, with *ικλάμενοι*. An unobjectionable reason of preference cannot be alleged, although *κάμεν* is more frequently employed without any addition. The words *κάμεν* and *ικλάσθαι*, too, lie without the sphere of the image of the race which was formerly employed. Bengel remarks:
qui ixiissent \ DEFICIT actu, \ is xámu DEFATIGATUR habitu.

Ver. 4—11.—*Remain steadfast in suffering, for the goodness of God wills your salvation through suffering.*

Ver. 4.—Having already (see on x. 26.) seen ourselves obliged to take ἀμαργία as denoting ἀποστασία, we shall take it here in the same way, and refer μίχες αἰματος, which occurs in profane writers in the sense of μίχες ἁμάρτων (see Wetstein), to the endurance of martyrdom. Comp. xiii. 7.

Ver. 5, 6.—This sentence will best be taken as a question, for, otherwise, we should expect an ἤδη, as indeed, Luther has inserted a "bereits" (already), and Erasmus: statim. The author's purpose is to prove, taking the θὰ ἐλέης on a favourable side, that they cannot, by any means, be regarded by the Christian as a mark of the Divine δὲ γῆ, Rom. v. 3. viii. 28. et seq. He, therefore, shews, that not only are they not opposed to the condition of the υιοθεσία, but, are even the necessary consequences of it. For this purpose he employs the appellation υίί, and the verb παιδεύει, in the passage quoted from the LXX., Cod. Alex. Prov. iii. 11, 12. Parallel in subject-matter is Job. v. 17.

Ver. 7.—With respect to the reading, very important evidences are in favour of \iota\, instead of \iota\, which has, in consequence, been adopted by Matthäi and Lachmann into the text. The matter seems however, to stand with it as with the \iota\ μὴν vi. 14., and it is to be regarded, like that phrase, as an old error of transcription.—The Author's argument proceeds from the word παιδεύει. If, with Luther, we translate this "züchtigt" (chastens), the proposition: "welchen Sohn giebt es, welchen der Vater nicht züchtigt" (what Son is there whom his Father doth not chasten), does not appear obvious in its full extent. It must, however, be remarked, that παιδεύεω...
is not exactly μαστιγοῖν, κολάζιν. The word signifies, in its primitive sense, to "educate," and in this sense alone occurs in the Attic writers; it first gradually assumed the signification "to chastise,"—precisely as in German from ziehen (to draw, to breed, to educate), arose Zucht and Züchtigung, discipline, correction, chastisement; in Greek the allusion to paternal relation has not disappeared, so much as it has in German; the Author, therefore, may here regard παιδεύσιν and vioł as reciprocal ideas. Schulz well renders it "to keep under discipline"—in Zucht halten. In passing, Thomas M. s. v. πολλάξις, makes this remark: παιδεύσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ κολάζιν παρὰ μόνη τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ τοῦτο εὑρίσκεται.  

Salier adds an example from Lucian, comp. also Planck, in the Commentt. of Rosemüller and Maurer, I. 1. p. 165.

V. 8.—Paul usually contrasts the νιόθεια and the δουλεία, our author here contrasts the νοθεία, for, generally, the illegitimate child is deprived of the blessing of education.

V. 9.—Εἶτα may be considered as belonging to the question, it forms in Greek, like itane in Latin, ironical questions, Valckenaer on the Phoenissae, v. 549. Viger, p. 397. The Spaniards, in conversational language, make very frequent use of their puez, in putting questions: quien lo sabe puez? and the Italians, also, of poi, in German, likewise, "dann soll ich, also, gar nichts bekommen?" in English "shall I then get nothing at all?" If the proposition stood at the commencement of the whole piece of reasoning, it might be so in this place; as an argument, however, has preceded it, we suppose, more agreeably to the context, that there is here a continuation of it.

* Exactly in the same way, disciplina = disciplulina received in the middle ages the signification flagellatio; Suetonius remarks, seuerior institutio gubernatioque, qualis adhiberi solebat primis annis.

b "παιδεύσιν instead of κολάζιν: this is found only in the Divine Scripture."
The first proof was, "every son is kept under discipline," there follows upon this: the effects of God's discipline are particularly salutary. On what rests the opposition of πατέρες τῆς σαφώς ἡμῶν and πατής τῶν πνευμάτων? Remembering Biblical Analogies, our first thought will be of the contrast between bodily and spiritual life; thus Theodoret explains: πατέρα τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν πνευματικῶν πατέρα πέσκηκεν, ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πτηγήν;  

a according to this, the Scholast quoted by Matthäi, and so, also, the Lutheran interpreters, up to Cramer and Storr. This conception of the passage, however, is opposed by the presence of the plural τῶν πνευμάτων; and even the expression πατής τοῦ πνεύματος τινός appears unsuitable, as designating the Authorship of the spiritual life in any one. According to another, and still more widely spread exposition, the contrast is thus defined: "Father of the body, and Father of souls." The expression is not noticed by Chrysostom, but Theodoret has: ἡ τῶν χαρισμάτων ἡ, ὅπερ καὶ οἰκεῖο-τερόν, τῶν ψυχῶν;  

b Oecumenius, also, has the two last views, the Roman Catholic interpreters, as well as those of the Reformed Church, in express opposition to the Lutherans (who defend Traducianism), prove the doctrine of the creation of souls from this passage. Böhme has a peculiar notion:—he thinks, on a comparison of ver. 23., that the departed souls are to be understood by πνεύματα. If we set out with the explanation of πατέρες τῆς σαφής ἡμῶν, this expression is synonymous with the adjective notion σαφεία, and, certainly denotes Fathers as Authors of our bodily existence; yet here, as elsewhere, the notion σαφῆς is more comprehensive than σώμα, and denotes the natural sensuous existence, as at ver. 7. With the word "Father," we must not merely connect the idea of origination, but, likewise, of foresight, care, Job. xxix. 16. Isa. ix. 5.; xxii. 21. The phrase

a "Recalls the spiritual Father, father of spirits, as the source of spiritual gifts."

b Either of gifts, or which is still more proper, of souls."
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is no doubt, a reminiscence of Numbers xvi. 22; xxvii. 16., after which passage the Rabbins make use of the same expression. See Wetstein. The plural here denotes the souls, but it is not immediately evident in what connection this predicate is given to God in these passages. Jarchi says, ירה מִצְוָבָת אֲנָשָׁי יְרוּ שֵׁי מִרְמָא גלעָה יִהוֹ וְעַל הַמִּרְמָא גלעָה יִהוֹ. And Aben Esra, מְדַעְתָּא נִפְגָּם לְלַעְתָּא יִהוֹ וְעַל הַמִּרְמָא. In its true acceptation, it probably designates the omnipotence of God over all life, Job xii. 10., יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֵיזָו נִפְגָּם בְּלַעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֵיזָו נִפְגָּם. In the first passage, Numbers xvi. 22., we have the contrast: "Thou who hast given life, wilt Thou, because of the sin of one Man, take it away from all the congregation?" We thus find ourselves led to a view of the passage according to which it may, doubtless, be employed, in a certain sense, as a dictum probans for Creationism. And, in fact, contemplating this subject either philosophically or psychologically, we cannot remain standing by a lifeless and one-sided Traducianism. We should otherwise regard every procreation merely as a repetition of what is already established, while yet, in the repetition of the general type, we every where find a new being. But the Creationism to which our passage leads, is not of that one-sided kind, according to which body and soul, like two people, utterly strangers to each other, and natives of different regions of the globe, are unexpectedly coupled in wedlock for eternity, but of that kind expressed in the language of the great physician Harvey, "Husband and wife are the organs through which the produce of all things works." In other words: The fathers are called Fathers according to the flesh, because, through the bodily act, they are the mediators of the creative power of God. But, notwithstanding
all human paternity, **He is the real author of every living thing in flesh and spirit, and the true Father.** Along with the creation by God, however, there is the co-operation of man, and the former must be regarded as but **One chief point in the great mystery of generation.** The greatest duallist among our philosophers, indeed, Anthony Günther, has again recently brought forward this one-sided Creationism in its utmost severity (namely, in the 7th Letter, of the 2d Vol. of his Vorschule); still, apart from speculative difficulties, can we explain, according to his view only, the undeniable fact of an original spiritual relation between parents and children? The connection by the body, as well as parental education and intercourse, are, no doubt, powerful points for its explanation, but these surely are not the sole factors.—If we take the expression in the wide sense we have done: “Father of life,” we may then admit, nay we shall be bound so to do, a reference to God as the Author of spiritual life. We are led to this by the καὶ ζήσωμεν, and ver. 10., εἰς τὸ μεταλαμβάνειν τῆς ἁγίότητος αὐτοῦ. It can hardly be believed, that our Author would have here added the αὐτοῦ if he had not intended, at the same time, to point by the πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων, to the origin of the pneumatic life from God.—Instead of καὶ ζήσωμεν we expect a ἡτα: but the καὶ may no doubt be considered a Hebraism, employed, namely, like the so-called relative ἃ, in shorter additional propositions, Ewald, p. 653.; ζῆν is used in the emphatical sense, in which it designates the true, and, consequently, the eternal life, Rom. viii. 13.

**Ver. 10.—**The reason why the chastisement of our heavenly Father is preferable to that of our earthly Fathers. Πρὸς διήγεσθαι ἡμέρας is usually taken (in the way Luther has taken it), as a limitation of time, like πρὸς διήγησιν, James iv. 14., and πρὸς in the formula πρὸς τὸ παρέχει “through a short time,” namely, through the period of childhood. In the second proposition,
the same πρὸς ὅλγας ἡμέρας is conceived as repeated, and referred to the short space of life. The object is here, however, to give prominence to what is defective in human education. This object would have been lessened if the Author had added the alleviating circumstance, that this παράκλησις has but a short duration: πρῶτος, therefore, is better taken as marking the motive, the end, and ὅλγας ἡμέρας referred to the period of life. The antithesis, that the Divine education is directed πρὸς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, is contained in the second proposition, in the εἰς τὸ μεταλαμβάνειν κτλ., for that ἀγίωτα has, as its τέλος, the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, Rom. vi. 22. Si quis objiciat, says Calvin, patrum munus esse filios instituere in timore et cultu Dei, ac propter eorum disciplinam ad tam breve tempus restringendum non videri: respondeo, id quidem esse verum, sed hic de oeconomia apostolus loquitur, quemadmodum de politia solemus vulgo loqui. Nam etsi magistratum est religionem tueri, eorum tamen officium hujus vitae finibus dicemus contineri, quia aliter civilis ac terrena gubernatio a spirituali Christi regno distinguuntur non posset. The first deficiency of human education consists, therefore, in the prevalence in it of the interests of the earthly life, the second deficiency in this, that the unerring wisdom of Divine Providence is wanting in the parents, i.e. πατρὶ τὸ δοξοῦν αὐτοῖς. Bengel remarks: sane ita est: multum indulgentia, multum se veritate in disciplina peccant patres carnis, nec tam castigant, quam castigare se putant. On the other hand, Divine wisdom, which never errs, has especially in view what is salutary for us, and the object of its education is eternity, a participation in the holiness of God, through which participation we become like to the Father, and, in so far, His true children, comp. νεοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, Matth. v. 45., ib. ver. 48. 1 Peter i. 15.

Ver. 11.—With indulgence to the aversion which men have to suffering, it is granted, that, considered in itself, all παράκλησις, human, as well as divine, gives pain, and, hence the allowableness of the prayer μὴ
yet, the fruits of it being kept in view, it is said, on the other hand; χαρὰν ἡγεσεῖ, δι' αὐτοματομένης δικαιοσύνης τυχήν. Parallels in matter on Rom. viii. 28. 2 Cor. iv. 17. 1 Peter iv. 13. Matth. v. 12. Γεγυμαλαμενός, again points to the games. We might consider the use of εἰγνωκός in this place, (which is generally the case), as a Hebrew idiom: "salutary." The LXX., Is. xxxiii. 17., might be compared: καὶ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰρήνη. If it could be shewn, that the expression καρὰς εἰγνωκός is a current Old Testament phrase, we should be obliged to admit this without hesitation. But, since it is not so, we shall find ourselves called upon to inquire after a sense conformable to Greek usage. Bengel says acutely, although something far fetched: castigator demonstrat, se fideliter fecisse, castigatus, agnoscit et gratiam habet, inde Pax. I am inclined to believe that εἰγνωκός is intended to form the Antithesis to γυμνασία, το ἄγων, the fruit of the struggle is enjoyed in peace. On δεσι; likewise, Bengel says excellently: saepe enim sensus dolorosus impedit judicium sincerum. The Author, probably, had not at first the intention of adding anything to καρὰς εἰγνωκός, and, hence the position of δικαιοσύνης at the end.

Ver. 12—17.—In consideration of the glorious issue, let every one take care, both for himself and others, that no inclination to apostacy creep in.

Ver. 12.—There is here an interweaving of various Old Testament dicta into the Author's own text. He had animadverted upon spiritual slothfulness in vi. 11. x. 25.; this declaration is a reminiscence of Isa. xxxv. 3., comp. Deut. xxxii. 36. Ecclus. xxv. 26. If the author had given these words as a regular quotation, they would have formed a remarkable example of departure from the LXX., who have very inappropriately χειρὶς ἀνειμένην καὶ γύνατα παρασιλιμένα in the vocative; but, here, as well as in the following words of ver. 13. and ver. 15., there is only an allu-
sion to the Old Testament passages. By a loosening of the members the Hebrews expressed what we call lamning, when the nerves and muscles lose their activity, and, along with that, motion and feeling. The former words are taken from Prov. iv. 26. On the hexameter, which has involuntarily escaped the Author, see p. 42. note. Our first business here is to make clear the image in the Old Testament passage. It is usually translated "for your feet," and conceived to refer to the clearing the way of stones, or to the making plain of hills, according to Luke iii. 4., but the sense is rather: "make with your feet straight tracks," i.e. "go a straight path." In that passage of the LXX., namely, the words proceed further: καὶ τὰς ὠδοὺς σου κατίθοι. Μὴ ἔκκλησις εἰς τὰ δίκτα, καὶ ἔστησεν τὸν σὸν πόδα ἀπὸ τὸ ὀδούς καθής. See also Symmachus on the passage, and comp. Deut. v. 29, Isa. xxx. 21. Now, in what follows, the expositors either supply, after τὸ χωλόν, the substantive μέλος, and understand ἵπτισθαι in the signification, "to be dislocated," so that the subject is the lame member of those who had been admonished, thus Grotius, Michaelis, Cramer, Schleusner, Bretschneider, or the neuter, τὸ χωλόν, is taken for the plur. masc. οἱ χωλοί, and ἵπτισθαι in the signification: plane a via deflectere, deficere, and, according to this it has been rendered by the Vulgate. The sense would then be, that those who are here addressed should walk in the right way, in order to give others a good example. Against the first mentioned conception of the passage it was objected, that the lame foot presupposes that it is wrenched or dislocated; still, lame may be equivalent to "taking insecure steps from weariness:" on the other hand, it may, with reason, be objected, that the ellipsis assumed is inadmissible. The neuter τὸ χωλόν can only be regarded as denoting a generality: "any thing

"And make thy ways straight. Go not astray to the right hand or to the left, turn away thy foot from the evil way."
lame." At the same time, ἰερεύνεσθαι can still be explained of dislocation, or wrenching, and the contrast of the verb ἱανα makes this view of it probable; although that explanation has something in its favour, according to which ἰερεύνεσθαι denotes "the wandering from the right way," for it would form an apt contrast to the before-mentioned walking or straight tracks. The words, at all events, are not to be taken as if the parties addressed were the sound portion of the community who were to go on as a good example, and τὸ γωνί, the bad portion, for those addressed are precisely they who have grown weary. We should rather say, that the parties addressed are admonished to continue steadfast in the rule prescribed by the Lord, in order that they who are faint among them may not be wrenched, or fall off from the right way.

Ver. 14.—The transition of the thought is, by expositors, given with very great differences. According to Grotius: debetis quidem vobis a Judaismo cavere, attamen non odisse Judaeos etc., Erasmus: neque vero satis vobis, ut quisque sibi certet securus aliorum, imo pax et concordia vos omnes ita jungat et conglutinet, ut communi studio aliis pro aliis solliciti sint. Böhme, "if ye strive after concord with the non-Christians, and after sanctification, ye will be exposed so much the less to assaults. The most correct view is this: πάντες does not refer, as is the case in Rom. xii. 18., to those without the community, but to the members of it; with all these concord must be maintained, in order that thereby brotherly παρέκκλησις may prevail, and so the ἀγίασμος be promoted. Thus ἵσσοσοῦντες, ver. 15., aptly connects itself, and a similar connection may be seen in ver. 24, 25, and 26., in the tenth chapter. ὁ χώρος may be referred, with the Vulgate, to God, or, with the Syriac, to Christ. The position of the article can give us no assistance in this case. See Winer, De sensu vocum χώρος et ὁ χώρος in Actis et Epistolis app. ERL. 1838. In our Epistle itself God
is called, ch. viii. 2., χύριος, on the other hand, Christ is so called, ii. 3. vii. 14. xiii. 20. The reference of the αὐτός, I John iii. 2., is likewise very doubtful. For the case before us, however, the following canon might be maintained, since the expression ὁπεσθαι τὸν χύριον is borrowed from the Old Testament, and was, no doubt, widely spread among the Jews, we may, where nothing speaks particularly in favour of a reference to Christ, with most safety adopt that of a reference to God; so likewise, in this passage, particularly as the connection of the ὁπεσθαι τὸν χύριον with the ἀγναστός, might point to the declaration of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. That the causal relation which is here, and Matth. v. 8., puts between purity of heart and beholding God, leads us to regard this beholding as not a seeing with the outward eyes, I have endeavoured to shew at length in my Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, on Matth. v. 8., Biblical Cabinet, Vol. VI.—A parallel in matter is found also Eph. v. 5.

Ver. 15.—The state of the community gave reason to fear that, even at the time when this Epistle was written, a tendency to apostacy was spreading secretly. That the apprehension here indicated does not merely relate to the future is shown by the conj. praes. after μη: ἵνα γνωρίσῃ and ἵνα φθονοσ. It appears, also, from x. 25., that the corruption had already begun. Τὸσοτερίβα is used with a reference to the figure of slothfulness and faintness previously employed. The verb subst., as a copula, can be omitted in the conj., except in a few cases only, as after ὡς ἄν, ἓς ἄν, in which the omission occurs at least very rarely. The circumlocution by the partic. with the verb subst., which generally serves for the expression of duration or of emphasis, here expresses neither, but stands simply instead of the verb. fin. The construction with ἄνῳ is a constr. praegnans: “so that

* Hermann on Sophocles, Ajax, v. 272., μὴ ἂν ἐρεῖντα εἰσὶ, ne quid nunc sit, simulique nescire so, utrum sit nec ne, significantis.
one will be excluded," the same sense as was expressed, iv. 1., by the perf. of ὄστριψ. The words μὴ τις βίβλος—ἰνοξαλήν are very aptly borrowed from Deut. xxix. 18., where such individuals of God’s people are spoken of as secretly entertain idolatrous sentiments. The LXX. have translated the Hebrew ἰνοξαλήν, "wormwood," by πιξίους: bitter herbs cause vomiting, &c., and, accordingly, bitter herbs, and, especially wormwood, were reckoned by the Hebrews among the number of poisonous plants, Rev. viii. 11. —Ἐνοξαλίων is by Wetstein placed among words of classical usage, but it is also widely spread in the Hellenistical and Ecclesiastical Greek, in Symm., Judges xviii. 7. 1 Sam. xxv. 7. 3 Esr. ii. 22., Test. 12 Patr. p. 508., Theod. Opp. iv. 469. et al., a usage which, of course, cannot appear extraordinary. It is found, too, not only in all the Codd., and all the versions, but in the Old Testament itself, Deut. xxix. 18., in the Cod. Alex. of the LXX., while that of the Vatican reads ἵνα λήν. Proceeding upon the correctness of this latter reading, ἵνα λήν, in that passage, many have conceived that ἵνα λήν was here, also, the original reading. A Roman Catholic interpreter, Este, not upon the whole distinguished for critical ἀγγίνου, first threw out this conjecture, it was followed by Grotius, Mill, Pfaff, Valckenaer, and, finally, Matthäi calls it valde speciosa, which is, in truth, its character. That in the Cod. Alex. ἰνοξαλήν is a correction from the New Testament is the less questionable, as such corrections occur in other passages; the LXX. have translated, Lament. iii. 19., ἰνοξαλήν, as they have done here, by πιξία ἄλλος. Let it be supposed that the Author, quoting Deut. xxix. 18. a little more closely, had written ἵνα λήν, it is easy to conceive that a transcriber, especially as the verb would otherwise be wanting, may have misplaced the letters, which were written scriptura continua, and written ἰνοξαλήν. It is well known that transcribers,
in the same way as the eye does in reading, often transposed letters; and hence, in Greek, the permutation of ἵδαλγε and ἵδαβς,—in Latin, of urina and ruina. The want of the verb, if we should read ἵν χοιλὴ, does not affect this reading, but is rather in its favour; for, in that case, the proposition would be exactly parallel with the preceding one, in which the verb subst. is wanting, and in the succeeding one also, ver. 16., the verb is wanting to μὴ τις κτλ. Perhaps, also, a ὑμας might be expected with ἵνοχαλὴ. Of all conjectures made on the text of the New Testament, amounting to something about three hundred, this is certainly the easiest. Still, where the authorities, versions, and Codd. which we have to guide us in the study of the New Testament, are so numerous, that those of Virgil and Lucan, the authors most frequently transcribed by the ancients, cannot once be compared with them, and where, in the whole of the testimonies, not a single trace of any thing can be found to excite a suspicion against a reading, every εὐστοχία must modestly retire before the historical evidence.—Instead of ταῦτης authorities of no little weight read αὐτῆς; the demonstrative, which in such cases is found also in classical writers, being employed for the sake of emphasis.

Ver. 16.—The warning now comes more distinctly forward, and refers to a low estimate of the Christian state of grace. Πῶς ὅτι is certainly to be understood in the figurative sense, and the spiritual meaning deserves the preference also in James iv. 4. Comp. Ecclus. xlvi. 11. The Old Testament passage, previously cited, had spoken of secret idolatrous sentiments; the Author here applies it with reference to such as had a secret tendency to apostacy from the Gospel. The signification of spiritual licentiousness is therefore quite appropriate.—It is not easy to find a suitable expression in German for βεβηλος; it denotes one who has no feeling or taste for what is holy and consecrated. Luther, in his
translation of 1522, renders it, "ein ungeistlicher" (an unspiritual person). Esau could with propriety be selected as a type of those rude minds which are directed to perishable things, for the exclamation, Gen. xxv. 32., "Behold, I am at the point to die; and what profit shall this birthright do to me?" with which, fatigued in the chace, he yielded up for a single meal his sacred right, and, with it, all the distinctions and blessings which belonged to it, evinces a rude mind, devoted only to the enjoyments of the moment. With him, might the more readily be compared those members of the community who had become indifferent to the inestimable privileges of Christian communion, as the privilege of belonging to the Theocratic line adhered, at the same time, to the right of primogeniture.—Τὰ πρωτότοκια not so much the primogeniture, as Luther translates, but the right of the first born. The later Greek language received a great number of words, unknown in the Attic style, formed in νος, particularly for the designation of notions of right: λειτουργίας, αγάμιον, ἀνθρώπινον, and these neuters were frequently employed in the plural. Comp. Casaubon, and Schweighäuser on τὰ χορήγια in Polybius, 1, 17, 5., and Lobeck on Phrynich. p. 510. For this Josephus uses τὸ πρωτότοκον.

Ver. 17.—Γάρ must be referred back to the warning: "be watchful, as ye know." Καὶ μετέπειτα, not merely at the time of the offence, but, also, afterwards. See Gen. xxvii. 38. Τὸν εὐρίσκειν, διδόναι, λαμβάνειν (comp. Bretschneider, s. h. v.), as, in Latin, locum invenire, habere. As μετάνοια, according to the usage in language of the Christians, is employed in speaking of repentance for a sinful life, so, by the more ancient interpreters, this explanation was adopted here; thus it is in the Latin versions, the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Coptic. The Italic translates: non enim invenit poenitentia locum (viz. apud Deum) et quamquam cum lacrimis inquisisset eam; the Vulgate, expressing the same sense, has poenitentiae
locum.—Luther, following this view, has: "for he found no place for repentance, although he sought it with tears;" and, as we have observed in the note to p. 249. Vol. I., this sense was so offensive to him as to draw forth, on that very ground, an expression of doubt as to the Pauline origin of the Epistle. The passage proves, according to this view of it, that repentance finds no place with God, i.e. is not accepted, even when it is sought with tears; and is thus opposed to the Christian, and, in particular, to the Protestant dogmatics, which assign as the reason why those mentioned in vi. 6. could not be renewed to repentance: "quia medium illud, per quod spiritus sanctus in cordibus hominum poenitentium operatur, pertinacissime repudiatur. Miravisse, however, refers certainly to the change of mind of Isaac the father, so that, in Latin, the translation retractatio is more correct than poenitentia. In favour of this view is Gen. xxvii. 33, 38., which is distinctly had respect to in this passage,* as well as the circumstance, that the tears which flow from a longing after repentance are an undeniable sign of a repentance already existing. However, as this declaration was generally taken in the older Church in the sense previously mentioned, the Novatians found a support in it, as well as in vi. 6.; and, in the time of Franke and subsequently, during which the strict theory of repentance was formed in the school of Halle, the declaration was employed to prove, that even weeping after repentance does not evince a degree of penitence such as is necessary to the right miravisse. The expedients adopted by the Fathers in their con-

* In the passage Gen. xxvii. 38. the Greek translator has inserted κατανεκρίνεις Ἐσαὰρ, which is so far unfavourable to our Author's conception of the passage, as these words intimate the repentance of the aged father. But since the old man did not alter his determination, this addition only shewed more clearly to the reader of the Greek translation the severity of the recompense, for Isaac's want of readiness appeared as a Divine decree.
test with the Novatians were very unsatisfactory, both with respect to this passage and ch. vi. Chrysostom refers to Gen. xxvii. 41. as a proof that the tears which Esau shed in his desire for repentance were not sincere; and Theodoret appears to extricate himself, for how shall we reconcile the following explanation with the text: μετανοίας τόπον οὖν εἶδεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὖν εἶδε τὴν τῆς μετανοίας ὅθεν, οὐδὲ ἐδείκνυεν ἵφ οἷς κα- κῶς ἐβουλεύσατο. ὁδόρατο δὲ οὐ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἱασὼς εὐληγίαν. If by μετανοία we are to understand the change of mind of the Father, the doubt raised by the Novatians, and which gave offence to Luther, falls to the ground; but in its place another arises, and that, too, opposed to the view put forward by us, according to which there is a mutual relation between the Divine condemnation and the hardening of man. We may say, namely, that the author is desirous of shewing, in this example, how God acts towards him who has forfeited his state of grace, the forfeited primogeniture of Esau is the type of the spiritual primogeniture of believers (see ἡμωνο.Serializable, ver. 23.); and, if we now apply the example in this sense it will follow, that our heavenly Father does not alter his sentence of reprobation against those who have been guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost, even when they seek with tears a retractation of the Divine reprobation. To this it may be answered, first, that we are not entitled to draw the parallel farther than the author intended it to be drawn—and, that it was his intention to shew in Esau what heavy punishment awaits levity towards Divine privileges, without pronouncing any decision upon the question, whether in those who have renounced the Divine grace, a longing will ever again be awakened for God to retract his sentence of reprobation against them. The parallel, indeed, does

a "He found no place for repentance, instead of, he found not the way of repentance, nor mourned for the evil resolutions he had come to. He bewailed not his own sin, but the good fortune of Jacob."
not admit of a very close application, as Esau, if he did not receive the blessing of the first born, yet received a blessing of some kind from his Father, and, of course, a forfeiture of that blessing cannot furnish a complete parallel to the *reprobatio finalis*, comp. Gen. xxvii. 39. And also when we apply the example with greater exactness, it appears that we cannot draw the consequence from it. If we understand μετάνοια of the retractatio of the Father, then the Greek interpreters are right in their remark, that those tears of the elder son are no proof whatever of his change of mind; if he had felt a true repentance for his former levity he must have imputed the guilt to himself, and could not have been seized with such fury towards his brother, as we find he was from Gen. xxvii. 41. As, in Dante, the damned weep over the consequences of their sins without lamenting the sins themselves, which is the case even with the tender Francesca of Rimini, so Esau's tears were for the loss of his privilege, not for the sin which he had committed, as the dogmatists say: *fuit poenitentia poene non culpa, a missi, non ad missi*. Calvin observes: *respondeo, poenitentiam his non pro sincera ad Deum conversione accipi, sed tantum pro terrore, quo Dominus impios percellit, postquam diu in sua nequitia delectati sunt.* With that almost feminine tenderness which spreads such a charm over all the learned observations of Bengel, that great and childlike man remarks on μετάνοια: *antea sine lacrimis habuisset, postea, quamlibet flens, repulsam tulit.* *Utamur tempore!* Luke xiii. 28.

Ver. 18—29.—*The more lovely the New Covenant appears in comparison with the Old, the more severely will indifference towards it bring its own punishment, therefore, let us persevere in God's grace in the possession of such blessings.*

Ver. 18—24.—The author, at c. ii. 1—4, and x.
28—31., set before his readers the consideration, that in proportion as the glory of the New Covenant was superior to that of the Old, so also would be the severity of the punishment of indifference towards it, and, in like manner, in a rhetorical, and highly elaborate period (see p. 43.), he so contrasts, in this passage, the Old with the New Covenant, as to represent the former surrounded with the terrors of majesty, the latter crowned with grace and love. The comment of Knapp, in his *Scripta Var. Arg. 2d Ed.* p. 231., is particularly worthy of attention, as it is elaborated with a love of the subject, and displays a micrological industry, such as Bengel would have employed in his commentary, if, instead of a mere index (he says himself that he had originally wished to call his book index instead of gnomon), he had given us a complete exposition of the New Testament. One condiment, indeed, was wanting in the exegetical feasts prepared by the departed Knapp, and in this Bengel abounded more than any other expositor of the New Testament—salt. Bengel has handled this section with particular fondness, and is, as usual (see above, at xi. 33. 34.), especially anxious to point out the symmetry of the sacred edifice. He conceives that, in the first half, which represents the Old Covenant, he has found the sacred Heptas, and, hence endeavours to discover it also in the second half, in the representation of the New Covenant. Even in the first half, however, the number seven can be deduced only by separating καὶ κακαμένη πυγή from ὑστ., which, as will appear, cannot well be permitted. Still less can we approve the course taken by Bengel who, in order to attain his object in the second half also, and uniting καὶ μουράσιν—ἐν οὕτων— in one proposition, thus explains: “to the thousands, namely, to the assembly of the angels and the community of the first born.” If, by ἰκαλησία πρωτοτόκων, we might understand the blessed made perfect, this conception of the passage might be adopted; and, if the Heptas thus gained for the second half of the period
we should be still more entitled to look for it in the first. This ἰεραία προστάξεως, however, can, as we shall see, be properly applied only to the community still upon earth, and, if so, it cannot be counted among the μυριάδες, as, indeed, these προστάξεως are connected with ἄγγελος, not by τε—καί, but merely καί. Along with his exposition, the number seven must also be given up in the second half. And upon a more minute examination of the relation of the two halves it will not appear strange, that the number of the members should not exactly correspond in both. If the members of the second part formed an astrophic parallel in matter to those of the first, the want of an agreement in the number would certainly have been an offence against symmetry. But, as, with the exception of the first member of each half, there is in reality no such contrast, we cannot be surprised at the inequality of the numbers. On the other hand, however, we may reasonably require that, in enumerating the existing members in the second half, there should be an appropriate order. Yet such an order cannot be satisfactorily shewn. It might appear most appropriate, after the mention of the city of God, to have brought forward its inhabitants, and then its head, but, here, the πνεύματα δικαιωμένων τετελειωμένων destroys the regularity of the sequence of thought. If the reader cannot resolve to admit merely some degree of negligence in the order of the thoughts, perhaps the present order of the members of the period may be most readily explained in the following manner: The author first mentions the city of God, then the inhabitants of it, according to the two species of beings, angels and men, after these the head, and, thereafter, he enters more particularly into the form of the heavenly kingdom, as respects the blessings proceeding from Christ.

Ver. 18.—Γὰρ points out the threatening displayed in the preceding example. The term προςεχθείσαι applies more especially to Deut. iv. 11., in the LXX., but with a reference to the solemn signification of
mentioned at iv. 16.; x. 1. The following description of the giving of the law does not, generally speaking, refer so much to the account in Exod. xix. xx., as to that in Deut. iv. v. Agreeably to the object intended in the economy of God, which was founded on the law, namely, to awaken a consciousness of guilt and sin, the giving of the law took place under symbolical manifestations of the severity and majesty of God, as, on the other hand, the expressions of the healing power of Jesus are the emblems of the character of the new covenant of grace. Here, as in Gal. iv. 24., Sinai is the representative of the legal economy, whereas the predictions of the Messiah are connected with Zion, the hill of David, Rom. xi. 26. Rev. xiv. 1. Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. Is. ii. Sinai bears the predicate ἡλαφώμενον. Shall we here retain the participial signification, or adopt that of the adj. verb ἡλαφητος? As the former signification is the most obvious, we must, in the first place, endeavour to discover whether it will furnish an appropriate meaning. Now, we might construe ἡλαφώμενον with τυφλος, and explain "being touched with lightning," but the verb which must have been used in this case would not have been ἡλαφᾶν, palpate, but ἀπτσοθαι, ἐγγάνειν, i. e. tangere (fulmine). Further, we might, with Erasmus and Bengel, refer it to a reminiscence of Ps. civ. 32. cxliv. 5., where the touch of God makes the mountains to smoke. Still, 1. ἀπτσοθαι were there the appropriate word; and, 2. Had this been the sense, it would have been necessary to have made mention of God. If this exposition must be given up, there remains nothing for us but to take, as the ancients have already done, the participle as an adj. verb. for ἡλαφητος. The certainty of this use of the participles has been denied, indeed, by the majority of the modern expositors of Gal. ii. 11.; still, if in that passage the part. perfect κατεγνωσμένος cannot well be explained without supposing this use, so here, it might be affirmed, we are precluded from every
other course. The partic. ἐβδολυγμένοι is found in Rev. xxi. 8., which it will not be found easy to translate, if we do not resort to subtleties, otherwise than as it has been rendered by de Wette: "the abominable, horrible (Greuelhafien,)" moreover, we have the part. praes. καταβολομένος, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 11, 13., nay more, we find, in our Epistle, at ver. 27. τὰ σαλέυματα employed in the same manner, as is shewn by the ἀσάλευτος immediately following it in ver. 28., through which it is again admitted. The examples which Elsner, on Gal. ii. 11., has adduced from the classical writers for this use of the part. pass. certainly, when read in connection, prove themselves untenable; while yet Matthies has produced an apt example from Homer, viz. the formula: εἰ δύναμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἑστι,a II. xviii. 427. and also xiv. 196. The verbal form in τὸς has been originally, however, passive, as it corresponds to the Latin part. in tus. We must not regard the use of the participles in this signification as a Hebraism, although the Hebrew language may, no doubt, have exercised some influence on the idiom of those who were versed in it. But, for what reason does the author here give to Sinai the predicate of the "mount that might be touched;" and how did it occur to him to express the notion of its sensible nature by this predicate in particular? As those circumstances express the fear which accompanied the giving of the law, so this predicate serves to mark the lower character of the old covenant, for, in the new, there is a pneumatical πνεύματατοί πέρας τὸν Θεόν, ver. 22., et seq. But, we should expect, in contrast with πνευματικῶν, according to Alexandrian usage, the predicate αἰσθητῶν, and, according to Pauline usage σαφῆνα. This is one of the cases in which we might be very much inclined to suppose some rabbinical influence, for nothing is more common than the use of the word

a "If at least I can achieve it, and if it be achievable."
from *palpare*, with the signification of *aliquid*, but also: *quod sensibus subjectum est, reale.* Κικαυμινευ has been taken by the Vulgate as a predi-
cate of πῦς, so that the words *καὶ κικαυμινευ πυς* form
an independent proposition, *et accessibilem ignem.*
This connection has been adopted by Michaelis and
Knapp; by the latter, probably, for an accessory
reason, because he attached importance to the cir-
cumstance that, in the paragraph in ver. 22—24,
none of the propositions in apposition have a *καὶ,*
and would, therefore, endure no such incongruity in
the first half. But, many things concur in compell-
ing us to adopt that view of the subject which was
taken by Luther. In the first place, the predicate
*κικαυμινευ*, the primary signification of which is *kind-
led, ignited,* is much more inappropriate when con-
ected with πῦς than with δρός; and, again, we read
expressly, that the Mount of God was set on fire,
and this fact is several times brought prominently
forward, Deut. iv. 11.; v. 23.; ix. 15. Exod. xx.
18., comp. also Rev. viii. 8. The darkness is that
formed by the clouds which hung around the moun-
tain, the tempest that which accompanied the thunder,
the sound of the trumpet the announcement of the
approaching Divinity, the voice, that mysterious voice
which spoke there when no form was seen, Deut. iv.
12. *Ἡ* must be construed with *ἀκούσατε,* the nega-
tion after the verb *negandi* is pleonastic. See
Winer; § 67. 1. Anm. We must not, with Wetstein,
Böhme, and Schulz, explain προστίθεναυ λγον agree-
ably to the passages from Dionysius Halic. Hist. vi.
83.; viii. 9.; x. 30., according to which λγον προστι-
θεναι; πυς would only mean: “to direct a discourse
to some one,” where, however the reading is uncer-
tain, and Reiske prefers προστίθεναι;—but, according
to the Hebrew formula ידבר לאב. These expro-
sitores cite Exod. xx. 18, 19., but a more exact com-
parison is found Deut. v. 25., xviii. 16., where the
people say: "οὐ προσέχομεν ἀκούσας τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου," and in Exod. xx. 19. the prayer strictly taken, goes to entreat, that God may not continue to speak. This verse is referred to in ver. 25.

Ver. 20.—The commandment, Exod. xix, 12, 13., had forbidden the approach of animals as well as of men. The author gives prominence to the fact that this terrible commandment was given even to irrational animals, thus shewing, in the most awful manner, the sternness of the legislator. But, it was not merely the crowd that received the laws who were struck with terror, the lawgiver himself was seized with it. The words ἐκφοβός σιμί (the LXX. have not καὶ ἱργομαῖος at all—it may be remarked with how much freedom the author employs the letter of the Old Testament text) were not spoken, however, by Moses at the giving of the law itself, but, first, according to Deut. ix. 19., with a reference to that fact, when he saw (in the LXX, it is thought we should have ἣμυ) that the Israelites adored the molten calf. Our author probably considered the fear which seized the lawgiver as connected with the deep impression made upon him by the appearance on the mountain, Comp. Deut. ix. 15. With ἡμῶν we should expect an αὐθα. The καὶ cannot be translated by sōgar (even so much) as Schulz renders it, as that would give rise to an Asyndeton.

Ver. 22.—"Ὅσον forms a collateral idea, and is placed, in consequence, as apposition, after Ζωή. Zion, the seat of David, with which the predictions relative to the Messiah were connected (Rom. xi. 26. 1 Peter ii. 6. Is. ii. Rev. xiv. 1.). The idea expressed here by Zion is elsewhere represented by 'Ἰεροσολὴμ ἐσοφάνιος. But our author was desirous of giving the contrast to the ὀσος Ζωή more strikingly than Paul, who, in Gal. iv. 26., opposes to Sinai ἡ ἄνω Ἰεροσολὴμ. In our passage, therefore, 'Ἰεροσολὴμ ἐσοφάνιος serves only for the amplification of the notion contained in

* "We will not hear any more (orig. : we will not add to hear) the voice of the Lord."
The term καὶ Ἰσραήλ is found particularly in Rev. iii. 12.; xxi. 2., to which may be added Gal. iv. 26., and to this may be referred, in our Epistle, xi. 10. 16; xiii. 14.; and Luke xvi. 9., may likewise be compared. As the same expression frequently occurs in Rabbinical writers, and as many of the Rabbis appear to have believed in the existence of a city beyond the sky, of what kind no one can tell, some interpreters have supposed such a belief in the New Testament writers also. We have already seen, p. 105, what a crude superstition, on this point, Böhme has attributed to our author. If, in this passage, he really meant to express a belief in the existence of such a city beyond the sky, he would naturally believe also in that of a Mount Zion, and, if in that, we do not see why he should not, with Rabbi Samuel, have believed in a שְׁמִי יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. a heavenly Sinai, and thus we may at last transport the whole map of the earth into heaven. That Zion, and, of course, Jerusalem also, stand here only as symbols, would appear a necessary conclusion from the contrast to the ἀγία Ἱουλαφώμενον. Paul has, Gal. iv. employed ἡ ἀνω Ἰσραήλ undeniably in the same sense as ὁ Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Gal. vi. 16. Even when, in the Revelations, John calls the city of God the new Jerusalem, his language indicates that this term denotes a civitas, which is to spring from the members of the glorified kingdom of God. But, it is going too far to ascribe such crude representations even to the whole body of the Jewish writers.

*How natural a symbolical phrase of this sort is to every man not wholly destitute of feeling and imagination, may be seen from the history of the Egyptian martyrs (in Euseb. De Martyr. Palæst. chap. 11.), who, being questioned by the judge from whence he came, answered, "from Jerusalem," that is, from the spiritual Jerusalem, interrogated, where this word ἡλιογαμία, In many instances, how much more sagaciously has the plain sense of believers, Scripture than its learned expounders.
we have already remarked, when adducing, at ix. 8.,
their observations respecting the heavenly temple.
The same thing may be said of their declarations in
regard to the heavenly Jerusalem, Synedrium, Sinai,
and schools of doctrine, &c. We find, in these writers
the doctrine of Swedenborg on the "Corresponden-
ces" fully developed; a doctrine, perhaps, first sug-
gested by Exod. xxv. 40. Some have formed upon
it still grosser representations of heavenly things than
those by which the Swedish Theosophist pours-
trays the kingdom of the angels and devils. On the other
hand, some have connected, with that doctrine, the
Platonic idea, that every thing earthly has its πραγμα
with God: in which sense, for instance, in the
book Jalkut Rubeni it is said, that every one of the
earthly schools of instruction has its בַּעַד מְזָרָע,
s strength and its protection in a heavenly one,—a near
approach to the representation of the Persian Fer-
vers! A number of Rabinical passages on רְשָׁעֲלָה
שָׁלְמִים כּוֹלֵהָ may be seen in Wetstein, on Gal. iv. 26.,
and in Schöttgen's Dissertation, De Hierosolyma
cælesti. On ἐνοχάνως, also, comp. the the Introduc-
tion to chap. viii., and the passages there cited. The
City of God having been mentioned, the mention of
its inhabitants follows. These consist of two classes,
of angelic spirits and of men, the former called par-
ticularly by the Rabbis פָּם לָיִשׁ שָׁלִי " the Divine
family," of the others, in their perfected state, it is said
that they are ἱεραγγελοι, Luke xx. 36.; both classes
bear the name of νῖοι Θεοῦ. That mankind, recon-
ciled and sanctified through Christ, are again to be
adopted into the great spiritual union in heaven, is
declared by Paul also, Eph. i. 10. Col. i. 20., and
is the object of the prayer taught by Christ himself,
Matth. vi. 10. Of what follows the punctuation is
disputed. We have had above one view, that of
Bengel, according to which the ἀγγελοι and the προ-
τοξοι are summed up, as two different classes, among
translation of 1522, renders it, "ein ungeistlicher" (an unspiritual person). Esau could with propriety be selected as a type of those rude minds which are directed to perishable things, for the exclamation, Gen. xxv. 32., "Behold, I am at the point to die; and what profit shall this birthright do to me?" with which, fatigued in the chase, he yielded up for a single meal his sacred right, and, with it, all the distinctions and blessings which belonged to it, evinces a rude mind, devoted only to the enjoyments of the moment. With him, might the more readily be compared those members of the community who had become indifferent to the inestimable privileges of Christian communion, as the privilege of belonging to the Theocratic line adhered, at the same time, to the right of primogeniture.—Τὰ πρωτοτοκία not so much the primogeniture, as Luther translates, but the right of the first born. The later Greek language received a great number of words, unknown in the Attic style, formed in ιον, particularly for the designation of notions of right: λειτουργίαν, ἀγάμον, ἀδολήψιον, and these neuters were frequently employed in the plural. Comp. Casaubon, and Schweighäuser on τὰ χωρήγια in Polybius, 1, 17, 5., and Lobeck on Phrynich. p. 510. For this Josephus uses τὰ προεβίδον.

Ver. 17.—Τάγε must be referred back to the warning: "be watchful, as ye know." Καὶ μετέτειλα, not merely at the time of the offence, but, also, afterwards. See Gen. xxvii. 38. Τῶν σὺρίσκειν, διδόναι, λαμβάνειν (comp. Bretschneider, s. h. v.), as, in Latin, locum invenire, habere. As μετάνοια, according to the usage in language of the Christians, is employed in speaking of repentance for a sinful life, so, by the more ancient interpreters, this explanation was adopted here; thus it is in the Latin versions, the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Coptic. The Italic translates: non enim invenit poenitentia locum (viz. apud Deum) et quamquam cum lacrimis inquisisset eam; the Vulgate, expressing the same sense, has poenitentiae
locum.—Luther, following this view, has: “for he found no place for repentance, although he sought it with tears;” and, as we have observed in the note to p. 249. Vol. I., this sense was so offensive to him as to draw forth, on that very ground, an expression of doubt as to the Pauline origin of the Epistle. The passage proves, according to this view of it, that repentance finds no place with God, i. e. is not accepted, even when it is sought with tears; and is thus opposed to the Christian, and, in particular, to the Protestant dogmatics, which assign as the reason why those mentioned in vi. 6. could not be renewed to repentance: “quia medium illud, per quod spiritus sanctus in cordibus hominum poenitentiam operatur, pertinacissime repudiam. Misravon, however, refers certainly to the change of mind of Isaac the father, so that, in Latin, the translation retractatio is more correct than poenitentia. In favour of this view is Gen. xxvii. 33, 38., which is distinctly had respect to in this passage,* as well as the circumstance, that the tears which flow from a longing after repentance are an undeniable sign of a repentance already existing. However, as this declaration was generally taken in the older Church in the sense previously mentioned, the Novatians found a support in it, as well as in vi. 6.; and, in the time of Franke and subsequently, during which the strict theory of repentance was formed in the school of Halle, the declaration was employed to prove, that even weeping after repentance does not evince a degree of penitence such as is necessary to the right misravon. The expedients adopted by the Fathers in their con-

* In the passage Gen. xxvii. 38. the Greek translator has inserted xarauxovres di Isav, which is so far unfavourable to our Author’s conception of the passage, as these words intimate the repentance of the aged father. But since the old man did not alter his determination, this addition only shewed more clearly to the reader of the Greek translation the severity of the recompense, for Isaac’s want of readiness appeared as a Divine decree.
test with the Novatians were very unsatisfactory, both with respect to this passage and ch. vi. Chrysostom refers to Gen. xxvii. 41. as a proof that the tears which Esau shed in his desire for repentance were not sincere; and Theodoret appears to extricate himself, for how shall we reconcile the following explanation with the text: μετανοεῖς τότεν οὕς εὗρεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ όνχες εὗρε τὴν τῆς μετανοεῖς ὅδως, εἰδὲ ἡθήνησεν ἰφ' οἷς κακοῖς ἐβουλεύσατο, ἰδύματ' δὲ οὗ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἄλλα τὴν τοῦ Ἰακώβ εὐκληρίαν. a If by μετανοεῖα we are to understand the change of mind of the Father, the doubt raised by the Novatians, and which gave offence to Luther, falls to the ground; but in its place another arises, and that, too, opposed to the view put forward by us, according to which there is a mutual relation between the Divine condemnation and the hardening of man. We may say, namely, that the author is desirous of shewing, in this example, how God acts towards him who has forfeited his state of grace, the forfeited primogeniture of Esau is the type of the spiritual primogeniture of believers (see πρωτοτόκου, ver. 23.); and, if we now apply the example in this sense it will follow, that our heavenly Father does not alter his sentence of reprobation against those who have been guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost, even when they seek with tears a retraction of the Divine reprobation. To this it may be answered, first, that we are not entitled to draw the parallel farther than the author intended it to be drawn—and, that it was his intention to shew in Esau what heavy punishment awaits levity towards Divine privileges, without pronouncing any decision upon the question, whether in those who have renounced the Divine grace, a longing will ever again be awakened for God to retract his sentence of reprobation against them. The parallel, indeed, does

a "He found no place for repentance, instead of, he found not the way of repentance, nor mourned for the evil resolutions he had come to. He bewailed not his own sin, but the good fortune of Jacob."
not admit of a very close application, as Esau, if he did not receive the blessing of the first born, yet received a blessing of some kind from his Father, and, of course, a forfeiture of that blessing cannot furnish a complete parallel to the reprobatio finalis, comp. Gen. xxvii. 39. And also when we apply the example with greater exactness, it appears that we cannot draw the consequence from it. If we understand μετάνοια of the retractatio of the Father, then the Greek interpreters are right in their remark, that those tears of the elder son are no proof whatever of his change of mind; if he had felt a true repentance for his former levity he must have imputed the guilt to himself, and could not have been seized with such fury towards his brother, as we find he was from Gen. xxvii. 41. As, in Dante, the damned weep over the consequences of their sins without lamenting the sins themselves, which is the case even with the tender Francesca of Rimini, so Esau’s tears were for the loss of his privilege, not for the sin which he had committed, as the dogmatists say: fuit poenitentia poene non culpa, a mi, non ad missi. Calvin observes: respondendo, poenitentiam hic non pro sincera ad Deum conversione accipi, sed tantum pro terrore, quo Dominus impios percellit, postquam diu in sua nequitia delectati sunt. With that almost feminine tenderness which spreads such a charm over all the learned observations of Bengel, that great and childlike man remarks on μετά δεξιων: antea sine lacrimis habuisset, postea, quamlibet flens, repulsam tuliit. Utamur tempore! Luke xiii. 28.

Ver. 18—29.—The more lovely the New Covenant appears in comparison with the Old, the more severely will indifference towards it bring its own punishment, therefore, let us persevere in God’s grace in the possession of such blessings.

Ver. 18—24.—The author, at c. ii. 1—4, and x.
28—31., set before his readers the consideration, that in proportion as the glory of the New Covenant was superior to that of the Old, so also would be the severity of the punishment of indifference towards it, and, in like manner, in a rhetorical, and highly elaborate period (see p. 43.), he so contrasts, in this passage, the Old with the New Covenant, as to represent the former surrounded with the terrors of majesty, the latter crowned with grace and love. The comment of Knapp, in his *Scripta var. arg.* 2d Ed. p. 231., is particularly worthy of attention, as it is elaborated with a love of the subject, and displays a micrological industry, such as Bengel would have employed in his commentary, if, instead of a mere *index* (he says himself that he had originally wished to call his book *index* instead of *gnomon*), he had given us a complete exposition of the New Testament. One *condiment*, indeed, was wanting in the exegetical feasts prepared by the departed Knapp, and in this Bengel abounded more than any other expositor of the New Testament—*salt*. Bengel has handled this section with particular fondness, and is, as usual (see above, at xi. 33. 34.), especially anxious to point out the symmetry of the sacred edifice. He conceives that, in the first half, which represents the Old Covenant, he has found the sacred Heptas, and, hence endeavours to discover it also in the second half, in the representation of the New Covenant. Even in the first half, however, the number seven can be educed only by separating *καὶ εἰκασμένη τυφί* from *διολι*, which, as will appear, cannot well be permitted. Still less can we approve the course taken by Bengel who, in order to attain his object in the second half also, and uniting *καὶ μυψίδιαν*—*ἐν οὐρανοῖς* in one proposition, thus explains: "to the thousands, namely, to the assembly of the angels and the community of the first born." If, by *ἰερά καὶ πρωτοτόκων*, we might understand the blessed made perfect, this conception of the passage might be adopted; and, if the Heptas were thus gained for the second half of the period
we should be still more entitled to look for it in the first. This ἵκλησια πρωτόσχων, however, can, as we shall see, be properly applied only to the community still upon earth, and, if so, it cannot be counted among the μυρίάς, as, indeed, these πρωτόσχων are connected with ἄγγελων, not by τι—καὶ, but merely καὶ. Along with his exposition, the number seven must also be given up in the second half. And upon a more minute examination of the relation of the two halves it will not appear strange, that the number of the members should not exactly correspond in both. If the members of the second part formed an antistrophic parallel in matter to those of the first, the want of an agreement in the number would certainly have been an offence against symmetry. But, as, with the exception of the first member of each half, there is in reality no such contrast, we cannot be surprised at the inequality of the numbers. On the other hand, however, we may reasonably require that, in enumerating the existing members in the second half, there should be an appropriate order. Yet such an order cannot be satisfactorily shewn. It might appear most appropriate, after the mention of the city of God, to have brought forward its inhabitants, and then its head, but, here, the πνεύματι δικαίων τετελειωμένων destroys the regularity of the sequence of thought. If the reader cannot resolve to admit merely some degree of negligence in the order of the thoughts, perhaps the present order of the members of the period may be most readily explained in the following manner: The author first mentions the city of God, then the inhabitants of it, according to the two species of beings, angels and men, after these the head, and, thereafter, he enters more particularly into the form of the heavenly kingdom, as respects the blessings proceeding from Christ.

Ver. 18.—Τὰς points out the threatening displayed in the preceding example. The term προσέγχοντας applies more especially to Deut. iv. 11., in the LXX., but with a reference to the solemn signification of
προεπεθαυμα τετραγωνο, mentioned at iv. 16.; x. 1. The following description of the giving of the law does not, generally speaking, refer so much to the account in Exod. xix. xx., as to that in Deut. iv. v. Agreeably to the object intended in the economy of God, which was founded on the law, namely, to awaken a consciousness of guilt and sin, the giving of the law took place under symbolical manifestations of the severity and majesty of God, as, on the other hand, the expressions of the healing power of Jesus are the emblems of the character of the new covenant of grace. Here, as in Gal. iv. 24., Sinai is the representative of the legal economy, whereas the predictions of the Messiah are connected with Zion, the hill of David, Rom. xi. 26. Rev. xiv. 1. Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. Is. ii. Sinai bears the predicate ἡλαφόμενον. Shall we here retain the participial signification, or adopt that of the adj. verb. ἡλαφης? As the former signification is the most obvious, we must, in the first place, endeavour to discover whether it will furnish an appropriate meaning. Now, we might construe ἡλαφόμενον with συρί, and explain “being touched with lightning;” but the verb which must have been used in this case would not have been ἡλαφᾶν, palpate, but ἄπισταν, ἅγγαις, i. e. tangere (fulmine). Further, we might, with Erasmus and Bengel, refer it to a reminiscence of Ps. civ. 32. cxliv. 5., where the touch of God makes the mountains to smoke. Still, 1. ἄπισταν were there the appropriate word; and, 2. Had this been the sense, it would have been necessary to have made mention of God. If this exposition must be given up, there remains nothing for us but to take, as the ancients have already done, the participle as an adj. verb. for ἡλαφης. The certainty of this use of the participles has been denied, indeed, by the majority of the modern expositors of Gal. ii. 11.; still, if in that passage the part. perfect καταγγελόμενος cannot well be explained without supposing this use, so here, it might be affirmed, we are precluded from every
other course. The partic. ἐβελυγμένοι is found in Rev. xxi. 8., which it will not be found easy to translate, if we do not resort to subtleties, otherwise than as it has been rendered by de Wette: "the abominable, horrible (Greuelhaslen,)" moreover, we have the part. praes. καταφγούμενος, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 11, 13., nay more, we find, in our Epistle, at ver. 27. τὰ σαλευόμενα employed in the same manner, as is shewn by the ἀσάλευτος immediately following it in ver. 28., through which it is again admitted. The examples which Elsner, on Gal. ii. 11., has adduced from the classical writers for this use of the part. pass. certainly, when read in connection, prove themselves untenable; while yet Matthies has produced an apt example from Homer, viz. the formula: εἰ δύναμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἐστι, II. xviii. 427. and also xiv. 196. The verbal form in τές has been originally, however, passive, as it corresponds to the Latin part. in tuus. We must not regard the use of the participles in this signification as a Hebraism, although the Hebrew language may, no doubt, have exercised some influence on the idiom of those who were versed in it. But, for what reason does the author here give to Sinai the predicate of the "mount that might be touched;" and how did it occur to him to express the notion of its sensible nature by this predicate in particular? As those circumstances express the fear which accompanied the giving of the law, so this predicate serves to mark the lower character of the old covenant, for, in the new, there is a pneumatical προερχεσθαι τρές τὸν Θεόν, ver. 22., et seq. But, we should expect, in contrast with πνευματικὸν, according to Alexandrian usage, the predicate αἰσθητὸν, and, according to Pauline usage σαρκικόν. This is one of the cases in which we might be very much inclined to suppose some rabbincical influence, for nothing is more common than the use of the word

* "If at least I can achieve it, and if it be achievable."
from *palpare*, with the signification of *aliquid*, but also: *quod sensibus subjectum est, reale*. *Kxaωμίνω* has been taken by the Vulgate as a predicate of *τύ*, so that the words *καί* *Kxaωμίνω* *τύ* form an independent proposition, *et accessibilem ignem*. This connection has been adopted by Michaelis and Knapp; by the latter, probably, for an accessory reason, because he attached importance to the circumstance that, in the paragraph in ver. 22—24., none of the propositions in apposition have a *καί*, and would, therefore, endure no such incongruity in the first half. But, many things concur in compelling us to adopt that view of the subject which was taken by Luther. In the first place, the predicate *Kxaωμίνων*, the primary signification of which is *kindled, ignited*, is much more inappropriate when connected with *τύ* than with *δύ*. And, again, we read expressly, that the Mount of God was set on fire, and this fact is several times brought prominently forward, Deut. iv. 11.; v. 23.; ix. 15. Exod. xx. 18., comp. also Rev. viii. 8. The darkness is that formed by the clouds which hung around the mountain, the tempest that which accompanied the thunder, the sound of the trumpet the announcement of the approaching Divinity, the voice, that mysterious voice which spoke there when no form was seen, Deut. iv. 12. *'H* must be construed with *ἀκοώσατι*, the negation after the verb. *negandi* is pleonastic. See Winer, § 67. 1. Anm. We must not, with Wetstein, Böhme, and Schulz, explain *προτίθεσαν* λέγουν agreeably to the passages from Dionysius Halic. Hist. vi. 88.; viii. 9.; x. 30., according to which λέγουν *προτίθενα*; *τίνι* would only mean: “to direct a discourse to some one,” where, however the reading is uncertain, and Reiske prefers *προτίθενα*;—but, according to the Hebrew formula יְסִירָה לְרָא. These expositors cite Exod. xx. 18, 19., but a more exact comparison is found Deut. v. 25., xviii. 16., where the
people say: οἱ προσθήκοιν ἀκούσας τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου, and in Exod. xx. 19. the prayer strictly taken, goes to entreat, that God may not continue to speak. This verse is referred to in ver. 25.

Ver. 20.—The commandment, Exod. xix, 12, 13., had forbidden the approach of animals as well as of men. The author gives prominence to the fact that this terrible commandment was given even to irrational animals, thus shewing, in the most awful manner, the sternness of the legislator. But, it was not merely the crowd that received the laws who were struck with terror, the lawgiver himself was seized with it. The words ἵκρισθας εἰμί (the LXX. have not καὶ ἵκρισθας at all—it may be remarked with how much freedom the author employs the letter of the Old Testament text) were not spoken, however, by Moses at the giving of the law itself, but, first, according to Deut. ix. 19., with a reference to that fact, when he saw (in the LXX, it is thought we should have ἡμῖν) that the Israelites adored the molten calf. Our author probably considered the fear which seized the lawgiver as connected with the deep impression made upon him by the appearance on the mountain, Comp. Deut. ix. 15. With ἰδοὺς we should expect an αὐτός. The καὶ cannot be translated by sōgar (even so much) as Schulz renders it, as that would give rise to an Asyndeton.

Ver. 22.—"Oπὶ forms a collateral idea, and is placed, in consequence, as apposition, after Σιὼν. Zion, the seat of David, with which the predictions relative to the Messiah were connected (Rom. xi. 26. 1 Peter ii. 6. Is. ii. Rev. xiv. 1.). The idea expressed here by Zion is elsewhere represented by Ἰερουσαλημ ἵπτομάς. But our author was desirous of giving the contrast to the ὅρος Σινᾶ more strikingly than Paul, who, in Gal. iv. 26., opposes to Sinai ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλημ. In our passage, therefore, Ἰερουσαλημ ἵπτομάς serves only for the amplification of the notion contained in

"We will not hear any more (orig.: we will not add to hear) the voice of the Lord."
The term ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ is found particularly in Rev. iii. 12.; xxiii. 2., to which may be added Gal. iv. 26., and to this may be referred, in our Epistle, xi. 10. 16; xiii. 14., and Luke xvi. 9., may likewise be compared. As the same expression frequently occurs in Rabbinical writers, and as many of the Rabbis appear to have believed in the existence of a city beyond the sky, of what kind no one can tell, some interpreters have supposed such a belief in the New Testament writers also. We have already seen, p. 105, what a crude superstition, on this point, Böhme has attributed to our author. If, in this passage, he really meant to express a belief in the existence of such a city beyond the sky, he would naturally believe also in that of a Mount Zion, and, if in that, we do not see why he should not, with Rabbi Samuel, have believed in a שִׁילֶּׁל הַמֶּרֶת, i.e. a heavenly Sinai, and thus we may at last transport the whole map of the earth into heaven.

That Zion, and, of course, Jerusalem also, stand here only as symbols, would appear a necessary conclusion from the contrast to the ὢς ἡ ἱερά ἱερά ἱερατευμον. Paul has, Gal. iv. employed ἡ ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ undeniably in the same sense as ὢς ἡ ἱερά ἱερά ἱερατευμον, Gal. vi. 16. Even when, in the Revelations, John calls the city of God the νέω Ιερουσαλήμ, his language indicates that this term denotes a θειότατος, which is to spring from the members of the glorified kingdom of God. But, it is going too far to ascribe such crude representations even to the whole body of the Jewish writers. This

* How natural a symbolical phrase of this sort is to every man not wholly destitute of feeling and imagination, may be seen from the history of the Egyptian martyrs (in Euseb. De Martyr. Palæt. chap. 11.), who, being questioned by the judge from whence he came, answered, "from Jerusalem," that is, from the spiritual Jerusalem; and, from political mistrust, being again interrogated, where this Jerusalem lies, replied ἐν Ἰουδαίοις Ἰερουσαλημ. In many instances, how much more sagaciously has the plain sense of believers explained the symbolical language of Scripture than its learned expounders.
we have already remarked, when adducing, at ix. 8.,
their observations respecting the heavenly temple.
The same thing may be said of their declarations in
regard to the heavenly Jerusalem, Synedrium, Sinai,
and schools of doctrine, &c. We find, in these writers
the doctrine of Swedenborg on the "Corresponden-
ces" fully developed; a doctrine, perhaps, first sug-
gested by Exod. xxv. 40. Some have formed upon
it still grosser representations of heavenly things than
those by which the Swedish Theosophist pourtrays
the kingdom of the angels and devils. On the other
hand, some have connected, with that doctrine, the
Platonic idea, that every thing earthly has its παράδει-
γυμα with God· in which sense, for instance, in the
book Jalkut Rubeni it is said, that every one of the
earthly schools of instruction has its לֶךֶזֹלְל, its
strength and its protection in a heavenly one,—a near
approach to the representation of the Persian Fers-
vers! A number of Rabinical passages on
ירושלים ישילול יבשה may be seen in Wetstein, on Gal. iv. 26.,
and in Schöttgen’s Dissertation, De Hierosolyma
cælesti. On ἱστογώνος, also, comp. the the Introduc-
tion to chap. viii., and the passages there cited. The
City of God having been mentioned, the mention of
its inhabitants follows. These consist of two classes,
of angelic spirits and of men, the former called par-
ticularly by the Rabbis מַלְאָךְ עִלָּהוּ " the Divine
family," of the others, in their perfected state, it is said
that they are ἰδῳγγελοι, Luke xx. 36.; both classes
bear the name of υἱοὶ Θεοῦ. That mankind, recon-
ciled and sanctified through Christ, are again to be
adopted into the great spiritual union in heaven, is
declared by Paul also, Eph. i. 10. Col. i. 20., and
is the object of the prayer taught by Christ himself,
Matth. vi. 10. Of what follows the punctuation is
disputed. We have had above one view, that of
Bengel, according to which the ἀγγελοι and the πρω-
thronoι are summed up, as two different classes, among
the μυρίάς. The Latin translators, the Syrian and Arabian, in the Polyglot, connect μυρίας ἀγγέλων μαγγήσει in one proposition, yet in such a way that they translate as if μυρίας stood in the text; the Vulgate: et multorum millium angelorum frequen-
tiam. The Greek interpreters, likewise, connect these words; but they take μυρίας absolutely, and ἀγγέλων μαγγήσει as in apposition with it, and so, in like manner, the Cod. Alex., which, as is well known, marks smaller divisions by points inserted at the side of the letters, above the line; among expositors Seb. Schmid, Griesbach, Knapp, and Kuinöl have taken this view. On the other hand, Beza has connected μαγγήσει with the following καὶ ἐκκλήσια, in this he was followed by Piscator, Er. Schmid, Nosselt (who understands, however, by the τρεῖ τοις the angels themselves, so that this proposition would be in apposition with μυρίας ἀγγέλων), de Wette and others. There is certainly some inducement to adopt this con-
nection of the words, in μυρίας standing apparently too bare in the sentence, especially as it is without the article. Still, it can be shewn that the term μυρίάς was wont to be employed to denote the hosts of more exalted spirits who surround God, see Deut. xxxiii. 2. Ps. lxviii. 18. Dan. vii. 10. Rev. v. 11.; and, particularly, Jude v. 10. The word, therefore, might have received vim nominis proprii, and, accordingly,

* The Italic, which translates, multitudinem angelorum frequen-
tiam, makes us conclude that they did not read μυρίας, but rather considered μαγγήσει as in apposition with μυρίας. This conception of the passage lies also at the foundation of the ver-
sion, according to which Augustine, Quest. 168. in Gen., cites, ad multa angelorum exuliantium. Codex D. has, indeed, at the first hand, μυρίας ἀγγέλων; but, on this passage precisely, it has many copyist’s errors at the first hand. The majority of com-
mentators, also, who allege that Origine, c. Cels. 7, 29., read μυρίας, have done so improperly. Spencer, certainly, has that reading, but Höschel, on the authority of numerous Cod. reads μυρίας,—so does de la Rue, and also De princ. iv. 22. and c. Cels. 8, 5., there is found in the same citation as in this passage μυρίας.
be used without an article. Meanwhile we might here take it indefinitely "to myriads." We are led to conceive of the multitude of the heavenly spirits as superior to that of human spirits from the great number of their various classes and orders. The division which has received currency through Elzevir's edition is moreover opposed, 1. By καὶ always beginning a new member, in the remaining members of this second half; 2. By the connection of both substantives πανηγύρις καὶ ἡκκλησια forming a kind of tautology; 3. By the expression πανηγύρις being much less suitable to the ecclesia militans still upon earth than the angels. Πανηγύρις denotes a festal assembly, especially those assemblies at the Olympic Games which were held with songs and dancing; it contains, therefore, the Predicate of blessedness, comp. the Scholiast on Ἀσχυλος, Septem c. Theb. v. 206. in Blomfield, where Ἀσχυλος mentions the πανηγύρις θεών. Now the angels are conceived as continually lauding and praising God, Ps. ci. 20. cxxviii. 2. Luke ii. 13. Rev. v. 11.

Ver. 23.—By the πρωτότοκος some have understood the patriarchs, others the Apostles, and others, again, the martyrs (Rev. xiv. 4.) or the first Judaeo-Christians. All these views, however, are opposed at the outset, by this, that so small a number would not have been called ἡκκλησια. If we understand by them those already departed, the views of Bengel will appear the most reasonable. He thinks all believing Israelites are comprehended in the number, præsertim patriarchas, and understands, as the distinction, by the πρωτότοκος δικαιος τιτλεισιμαινον, those perfected in Christ: per alteros ducitur agmen beatorum, per alteros claudi tur. Menken has strictly followed Bengel. But, we can never by the δικαιος τιτλεισιμαινον understand exclusively the just men of the New Testament; for, agreeably to xi. 40, and xii. 1., the pious of the Old Testament must be comprehended in the number. Besides, it would be quite improper to apply to those already perfect in heaven, the Predicate, their names
are enrolled in heaven. This Predicate expresses indeed, the very contrast of the destiny bestowed on them by God with the militia in which they combat upon earth, comp. the expositors on Dan. xii. 1. and Luke x. 20. It is precisely on this account that the author adds this Predicate to ἵσαλατος, in order thus to justify that connection with the blessed angels in which he has placed those who are still struggling upon earth: according to their destiny, according to their life in faith, (Phil. iii. 20. Col. iii. 3), they are already in heaven. Augustine says, De civ. Dei 10. 7.: cum angelis sumus una civitas Dei, cui dicitur in Psalmi; gloriosa de te dicta sunt: civitas Dei, cuius pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitulatur. The authorities do not permit us to read in οὐρανός as placed before; but, it is besides not appropriate, for ἀγαγγαμμένων contains the main idea. The predicate of first-born denotes the first rank among the children of God, on which account it belongs, καὶ ἡμῖν, to the Messiah, (i. 6.); and, again in preference to the rest of the faithful, it is applied to those chosen ones mentioned, Rev. xiv. 4.; it is given to all believers in James i. 18. Upon the description of the civitas Dei, there follows the mention of the head of it: cuius voluntas intelligibilis atque incommutabilis lex eorum est, as Augustine observes (James iv. 12.). Is πάνω, in this proposition, dependant upon ρήμα or Θεός? The Vulgate translates: judicem omnium Deum, and so also the majority of translators; the Italic: Deum omnium judicem, and thus Bengel and Knapp, with a comparison of Eph. iv. 6. Wall (in the Biblioth. Hasaei, III. 204.) was the first who pointed out the importance of the circumstance in favour of the construction of πάνω with Θεός, that the author’s intention must have been to represent that spiritual kingdom under a pleasing aspect, and, of course, to conceive God rather as the Father. But, why has he in this passage mentioned God as ἡμῖν; I do not think, indeed, that he has done so in order to enhance the idea of terror, but, as in James iv. 12., to point
out God as the legislative head; in the law lies that which binds the civitas coelestis, and hence the apposition χειρής precedes, for the sake of emphasis, in the same manner as σωτήρ in Titus i. 3. Now follows, as Bengel expresses it, the oeconomia Christi: hoc extremo loco apostolus ea enumerat, quae viatorum oculos oeconomiae Dei splendore percussos ex oeconomia Christi lenius afficiant et reficiant. On a retrospect of xi. 40., we cannot well understand by πνεύμα any thing else than the Old Testament believers also. Still, although we do not, with Bengel, here suppose the perfected Christians to be meant, we can adopt his words; for, as we have seen at xi. 40., the θελισωσις of those Old Testament believers was brought about only through a looking towards Christ, and reaches its accomplishment only in the Messiah-kingdom founded by Christ.

Ver. 24.—There, under the παλαιά διαθήκη, was a μεσίτης, who himself was constrained to tremble, here there is a μεσίτης, who reconciles; on μεσίτης comp. at viii. 22. It is somewhat striking that διαθήκη has, instead of καίνη (viii. 13.; ix. 15.), the predicate via. The distinction between the two was discussed at viii. 13., where it appeared that καινή is the appropriate word. Have we, in this place, merely an exchange of the synonymes? That, even in later times, the difference of meaning was known, may be proved in various ways, for instance, from these passages of Eusebius in which he wishes to shew, that the διδασκαλία of the Christians was, in a certain sense, not νία but was already in the Old Testament, Hist. Eccl. I. 2, 4., and, again, from the heathen being designated νιος λαός, and the proselytes νεόφυτοι, &c. We might here, therefore, as well as at Col. iii. 10. (comp. Eph. ii. 15.; iv. 25.), retain the signification fresh, just founded. Still, in the Fathers of the Church, η via διαθήκη and καινή are used promiscue; see, for instance, Theodore Mops. ed. Wegnern, I. 277.

The means of the New Covenant institution are especially mentioned. The genit. ἐκκυριωμοῦ is em-
ployed to designate the purpose or end, as χαρακτικά ἱερωμένης denotes the laying on of hands in order to confer the priesthood. The similarity of the expression γαττήσιμος αἰματος, 2 Peter i. 2., produced the reading αἰματος γαττήσιμος, comp. x. 22.; ix. 13. The efficacy of this covenant blood is here figuratively represented. Abel's blood cried to God's justice for the avenging of innocence (xi. 4.), this blood cries to the grace of God for the guilty. If we read χρίστον, which is most accredited by external evidence, it will stand adverbially, "more excellently," but, then, from this formal signification, we cannot separate the real reference, that the contents also of what is spoken are more excellent. Some authorities, it appears, read the Neutr. τὸ Ἀβιλ, instead of παρὰ τῷ Ἀβιλ, so that Ἀβιλ would be the Genitive. This results only from a want of acquaintance with that Brachyology, which occurs both in the Greek and Latin Classics. In the New Testament, see (Matth. v. 20). Rev. xiii. 11. 2 Peter i. 1., in Latin, in Justin, 4. 3. 1.: ausi facinus nulli tyranno comparandum, instead of: nullius tyranni facinori. Heinichen gives copious vouchers for this usage, on Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 6. 3., and, for the Hebrew, see Ewald, Gr. Gramm. s. 614. Grotius, in this verse improperly compares παρὰ Καὶν, Heb. xi. 4.

Ver. 25.—The Author, with a retrospective reference to the ταπεινότατον, ver. 19., warns his readers, as at iv. 8.; iii. 11., against following the destructive example of the Jews. However, there can only be an allusion to that ταπεινότατον, for unbelief was not at least the first cause of the refusal of the people there mentioned. Δᾶλῳ appears to refer especially to Christ, as a resumption of the preceding λαλουμε. However, when we find, c. i. 1., ἵνα θητείναι ἦν ἐν νησίω, we perceive that, in the mind of the Author, the reference to God and to Christ must meet together. If we grant this, we shall be disqualified from pressing a separation of the two references in what follows, where the question, whether the ἀντ' ὑποστασις
χρισματιζων, be God or Christ, has given rise to so many inquiries. Before entering on the discussion of those words, on which so much has been said, we observe, that the Author here employs the \textit{praes. λαλουτα}, regarding the preaching of God in Christ, both here and at iii. 15., as one continually addressed to the community. In the following words there is again, as in c. ii. 2. 3., and x. 28, 29., a like relation in degree between the punishment of a contempt of the New and of the Old Covenant, as there is in respect of the dignity of each. As \textit{των ισι γης χρισματιζονα} and \textit{των ἀν' οὐρανων} we conceive, according to c. i. 1., to be \textit{των Θεων λαλησανα} in \textit{Μωυση} και in \textit{υιω}. Instead of the simple \textit{ιφυγη}, the cod. Α. Ό., and some other authorities have \textit{ιδιφυγην}, as at ii. 3. The use of the \textit{simplices pro composito} is found in the older, and hence solemn, and poetical language. For the Greek see Schäfer on \textit{Gregor. Corinth.} p. 589.; for the Latin, Bremi on Cornel. \textit{Nepos Lysand.} 2. 3., Frotsccher on \textit{Quinctil.} 10. p. 90, &c., especially in Tacitus: \textit{asperare, celerare, ciere, &c.} See Bötticher \textit{Lex. Tacit.} p. lix. \textit{'Αποστρησθαι} \textit{τω} is said, also, by Classical writers of the unwilling turning of one's self away, \textit{Oed. Col.} v. 636. Matth. v. 43. To \textit{ἀν' οὐρανων} we supply once more \textit{χρισματιζονα}, comp. John iii. 31. I Cor. xv. 47. 49. \textit{Παλλω μαλλω} is put Brachylogically, on which comp. Matthiæ, § 634. 3. Hermann on \textit{Oed. Rex.} 810. 817. We must here conceive to be added (ii. 2.), the positive notion \textit{ληφθαι ενυπο μισοθανοςιαν}.

Ver. 26, 27.—If ver. 25. has been the source of very detailed inquiries, this is still more the case with these two verses. D’Outrein has devoted to the three verses no less than 58 Quarto pages of exposition. The explanation of the Old Testament passage, Haggai ii. 6—9., to which our passage refers, is full of difficulty, and has given rise to very different views of the passage. Frischmuth, in the \textit{Thes. antiqu.} I., Mieg in the \textit{Thes. novus} I., and Verschuur in his \textit{Dissertationes} have presented us with some profound
investigations; and Hengstenberg has treated the passage with great depth of learning in the Christologie, III. s. 353. I confess that I cannot find so much difficulty as the more ancient interpreters. Without entering, therefore, upon the great mass of heterogeneous views, artificial expositions—the essence of arbitrariness is that of Storr—and even of proposals to alter the reading, I will here state my own view.

At the giving of the Law, the voice of God shook the earth, Exod. xix. 18. Judges v. 4. This shaking was the outward symbol of the movement which then took place in the kingdom of mind. Comp. Acts ii. 3. The Author intends to say, that a far greater movement began at the establishment of the New Covenant. The passage in Haggai ii. 6. presents itself conveniently for connecting this thought, as in it there is mention, with reference to the future, of a shaking of heaven. According to the explanation which Hengstenberg, following Verschuur, has given of that passage of the prophets, the shaking of heaven and earth, is an image of violent agitation among the empires of the world, in consequence of which the kingdom of God is to shine forth in its glory, Comp. Is. xiii. 13. Ps. lx. 4. 1 Macc. i. 21. The correctness of this exposition is evidenced by the 22d ver. of the same chapter of the Prophet. There is no historical exposition of the Old Testament passage, however, in our Author, but merely a linking on of his own thought to the words of Scripture. Hence the freedom with which he has modified the text of the LXX. For while they have: ἵτι ἀπατείνω σιῶ τον οὐρανόν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηραίν, our Author, quoting it freely, has put: οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν, and has laid an emphasis upon ἵτι ἀπατεῖν, notwithstanding these words are an incorrect rendering of the Hebrew. Our Author understands by the prophetical promise, that,

"Yet once I will shake the heaven and the earth, and the sea and the dry land," i. e. "not only the earth but the heaven also."
on the new shaking, heaven and earth shall pass away, and be succeeded by the new heaven and the new earth in the kingdom of the Messiah. This is that great shaking which took place at the establishment of the New Covenant. But, at the same time, he takes advantage of the ἔτι ἀπαξ of the prophetic passage, in order to connect with it another thought descriptive of the glory of the New Covenant, namely, that, in the words of Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 11., it is not παταργοῦμενον but μένον; that is, if we employ the expression "once more," it commonly conveys the meaning, that this once is the last time,—this conclusion is drawn by the Author, who even strengthens the thought by another, that the μεταβαςις of that which formerly existed from the beginning had been kept in view in the establishment of it. Comment. ch. vii. 12., viii. 9, 13.

Two views there are, however, differing from that which we have stated, and these we must not pass by without remark. It is believed by a very great number of interpreters, that we cannot understand by τὰ σαλευμένα, the earth and the atmosphere, the present universe, but that these words rather denoted the Jewish Theocracy; so Justinian, Gerhard, Calov, Coccejus, and especially the moderns, Morus, Rosenmüller, Böhme, Kuinol. Some, like d'Outrein, connect both references. Iken, in an erudite treatise, in the first volume of his Dissert. p. 580., has bestowed great pains in discovering reasons against referring τὰ σαλευμένα to any thing else than to the Jewish

* Hengstenberg (Christologie, p. 351.), in a peremptory way, pronounces a mistake of opinion, that the Epistle to the Hebrews lays a stress upon the ἔτι ἀπαξ, and maintains, on the contrary, that a ἐκλ. should be supplied after the ἀπαξ, so that properly the writer, according to him, wishes again to cite the whole sentence. His observations would be worthy of more attention, if the prophetic declaration had been cited some verses before. But the fact that it so immediately precedes goes quite against that assumption; to which may be added that, as is shewn by our exposition, it is precisely the ἔτι ἀπαξ which is thoroughly serviceable to the writer's purpose.
Theocracy. His reasons, however, are merely presumptuous; for he puts forward as the chief of them, that, according to ver. 28., believers receive the βασιλεία ἀσώλυνος upon earth, that, of course, we cannot by this understand the regnum gloriae, but only the regnum gratiae, and that, therefore, the σαλανύμνα must denote the earthly Jewish economy. The exposition of ver. 28. will shew that this reason is inadmissible.

If τὰ σαλανύμνα be intended to refer to the Jewish Theocracy, our Author must have understood by heaven and earth, in the words of the prophet, the Jewish Theocracy. And, indeed, some Christian interpreters suppose that heaven and earth, in the passage of Haggai, denote the Jews and Heathen, or, as Cocceius has taken great pains to shew, that heaven, with the prophets, frequently denotes the prīncipes politiae Judaicae. But the Author previously took the shaking of the earth in its primitive sense; and when he now adds the heavens, we can imagine this shaking to be taken in no other than its primitive sense also. It is possible, at the same time, that he had some reminiscence in his meaning of the words of Christ: αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται, Matth. xxiv. 29. Perhaps, also, the verb τοιῶν might be considered as less appropriate when made to refer to the Jewish Constitution, than when employed in reference to the machina mundi. Another doubtful circumstance arises from the want of logical exactness in the proposition: "the changeable is made that the unchangeable may remain." Influenced by this circumstance, Lamb. Bos conjectured πέτωνμένων, and Iken, in the treatise we have mentioned, recommended, for μένων, the signification "to expect." We shall see, however, that this doubt is of little consequence when we come to suppose a greater conciseness of expression, and conceive the notion of taking the place of as included in that of remaining. When it is afterwards said, xiii. 1., ἡ ριλαδελφία μετέχω, there is included in the expression the notion that it exists.
The μένει of the renewed machina mundi is spoken of also in Isa. lxvi. 22: ἐν τῷ πάσῳ γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ νῆσος καὶ οἵ γῇ καινῆς, καὶ ἐγὼ τοιὸν μένει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, κτλ. and comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 7. 11., and in our Ep. xiii. 14.

Ver. 28.—The term παραλαμβάνειν τὴν βασιλείαν is borrowed from Dan. vii. 18., where it is said: παραλαμβάνει τὴν βασιλείαν, ἄγιοι οὐσίων, and, according to our Author’s opinion, the expression implies a participation in the royal dignity, the reigning with Christ, 1 Peter ii. 9. Rev. i. 6.; v. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 21. This kingdom is substantially existing now, and will appear openly in the end, Col. iii. 4. The conjunctive ἵκωμεν is the accredited reading. But, if we take χάριν in the sense of grace (Gnade), the indicative will appear to be more suitable. We find it also in a number of Codd minusc., and in the Vulgate, which has been followed by Luther. On the other hand, if we take χάριν, as Chrysostom does, in the signification of thanks, it will justify the use of the conjunctive.

Ver. 29.—The author here shows himself a scribe who rightly divides the word (2 Tim. ii. 15.). and who, as it is said, Jude v. 23., saves some with fear. He has just shewn the greatness of the grace attained in Christ, and, again, he alarms his readers as he takes up the Old Testament declaration, Deut. iv. 24. The expression, “God is a consuming fire,” will be unwelcome at a time when even what Scripture says of the ἥρι τοῦ Θεοῦ is deemed too hard by many. But does John express any thing less when setting light in the place of fire, he says: “God is a light, and in him is no darkness?”

““For as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me,” &c.
CHAPTER XIII.

EXHORTATION TO CONSTANCY, ESPECIALLY IN THE PURE FAITH.—CONCLUSION.

Ver. 1—8.—Single Christian virtues.

Ver. 1, 2.—A sound Christian faith is the foundation of a sound Christian life. Hence, what a Paul writes of Christian faith is, at the same time, a discourse of Christian life; and we have seen, too, in that part of this Epistle which we have gone through, constant references to Christian life unveiling themselves in the doctrines of faith. The roots of Christian life have been planted in what is called the dogmatical part; now a few branches are indicated which ought to be found on every healthy Christian tree. Paul sometimes joins his paraeneses to the dogmatical part by a deductive ὁμόλογος, Rom. xii. 1. In accordance with this, all Christian efforts after virtue must first of all be directed to ascertain that the foundation of the Christian faith and life be rightly laid, and then, in agreement with these, be bent to particular points. There are men who never commit a fault, but their whole life is a fault.

The object of the first exhortation is to render frequent among them that mark of Christian ἀμέμπτοτης, 1 Peter ii. 17., by which the disciples of the Lord were known as his, John xiii. 35. Comp. Rom. xii. 10. 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 Peter ii. 17. 2 Peter i. 7. With the glow of brotherly love which distinguished the first period of Christianity, the 39th chapter of Tertullian's Apolog. discourses of the φιλαδελφία of the Christian church; vide, the heathen have exclaimed, ut invicem se diligant.—In Rom. xii. 13. 2 Pet. iv. 9. 1 Tim. iii. 2., we have exhortations, in like manner, to φιλαδελφία. Sir J. D. Michaelis reasonably leaves for our consideration, whether the agreeable arrangement of our Inns may not have ren-
dered the exercise of this virtue in a great degree superfluous,—the establishments for life assurance, and associations against injury by hail, diminished the necessity of trust in God!—The motive for hospitality is selected with thoughtful simplicity from Gen. xviii. and xix. According to Matth. xxv. 44, 45., they who receive the brethren entertain a still higher guest than the angels.

Ver. 3.—The sympathy of the Christians with their captive brethren gave occasion for the mockery of Lucian. "Ως συνδεσμῶι is explained most simply, "as if you actu shared in their imprisonment,"—by virtue of such a sympathy with all the members of the whole spiritual body, as Paul expresses it, 1 Cor. xii. 26. 2 Cor. xi. 29. This, however, gives rise to a difficulty, for we are obliged to take ὡς in a different acceptance here, and in the subsequent parallel proposition, where it is causal. Hence, ÒEcumenius adopted a causal signification here also: "as ye are intimately connected with them." Others have rendered it: "as ye are fettered in the same σώμα." We are rather inclined, with Böhme, to think that the fellowship in captivity stands metaphorically for all the sufferings by which the church was oppressed, as, on the other side, Paul, 1 Thess. ii. 14., and Peter, 1 Pet. v. 9. comfort the suffering Christians with the consolation that the communities everywhere suffer the same. But, "to be bound," is certainly not a correct tropical expression to denote the καταχρώμενοι. The case must frequently occur of a writer putting in parallel propositions the same word with a difference of signification; so, for instance, Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 31., has not given the ὡς in ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι quite the same force as the ὡς which occurs several times previously; that is, the preceding ὡς denotes merely a likeness in the sentiment, whereas in ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι it denotes a likeness in the outward appearance—what is called the Caph veritatis.—'Εν σώματι οὖν, as at 2 Cor. v. 6., is said of the earthly existence, exposed to every danger; according to Beza it is equi-
valent to *en personne*; according to Calvin, *sua* signifies the *ecclesia*.

**Ver. 4.**—Do the words τίμως ὁ γάμος ἐν πάσι, to which, as in ver. 5., ἵστω must be supplied, contain a warning against lasciviousness, or against the Ascetic rejection of marriage then prevalent among the Jewish and Heathen sects, of which Paul speaks, 1 Tim. iv. 3., and against which also, 1 Cor. vii. 1., the limitation of the recommendation of celibacy is directed? The subsequent words of the verse appear to favour the former conception, which is followed by Beza, while Chrysostom and Theodoret consider the words as a rectification of some heretical views. They were, indeed, employed by the venerable Paphnutius in the Council of Nice, for the justification of the marriage state. According to the marginal remarks on the New Testament by Luther, which were published by D. Paul Luther, and are to be found in the 9th vol. of Walch's edition, Luther refers τίμως only to caution against lasciviousness. The Protestant polemics, on the other hand, have strenuously urged the ἐν πάσι as a proof that marriage is not unsuitable to any state, and therefore not to that of a priest; whereas Roman Catholic interpreters have either, instead of ἵστω, supplied an ἵστι to τίμως, in order to weaken the force of the proposition, or, they have taken ἐν πάσι as neuter: "in all points." Comp. Calov on the passage, and Gerhard's *Loci*, t. xiii. p. 156.—In our opinion, the Author's primary design was undoubtedly to warn against lewdness. The chief reason for this opinion lies in the *ναι ἡ χαστιτί ἀμίαντος*. This predicate ἀμίαντος designates, when applied to matrimonial relations, *chastity*; thus Wisd. iii. 13. iv. 2. Comp. *μολύβδων* and *μολυπειν τὴν χαστίτην* of the doings of incontinence, in the passages quoted in Wetstein. Thus τίμως ὁ γάμος, being placed close by it, cannot well refer to any thing else, although certainly it contains an indirect proof for the Divine institution of marriage. This, indeed, is not by the Roman Catholic Church doubted in the general, but
only as regards the priestly state. Hence, to the Protestant conception of ἵν τὰς, which, moreover, Cajetan has given in all its strictness, Bellarmin replied, that ἵν τὰς could not be taken in an unconditional generality, otherwise it would include a justification of incest. If the passage really contain a warning against lasciviousness, the ἵν τὰς can refer only to persons. In a contrary case, it might be a neuter, as, for example, Col. i. 18., and as many would have it taken also in 1 Cor. xv. 28. Eph. i. 23. Here, however, the contrast to the ἵν μὴν not being distinctly indicated, we must abide by the reference to persons. Besides, in considering the question, whether the declaration be directed against a disregard of marriage, we must inquire if this tendency of the Ascetic spirit may be expected to have prevailed in Palestine. It is true that those against whom Paul contends in his Epistle to Timothy were Judaists; still it is well known that the rejection of marriage never found much favour among the Jewish Ascetics. The Essenes, indeed, regarded celibacy as a higher step, but they permitted marriage among their members; the Sampsœans (according to Credner only a—lower—order of the former) received it, the Clementines do not reject it; the Judaists in Corinth, against whom the Apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 40. (as has lately been supposed by Neander and Billroth) urges his opinion, expressly insisted upon it, and there is no particular mention of the rejection of marriage by the heretical teachers at Colosse.—The exclusion of inordinate sensual lust from the kingdom of God, is declared with equal rigour in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Eph. v. 5.

Ver. 5.—The cause of covetousness lies in an insatiable mind; hence in Paul the exhortation to be contented with little, 1 Tim. vi. 8., and his own assertion, that in the παρθένῳ he had always enough, Phil. iv. 11.; hence, also, the forbidding by our Lord of anxious cares for the morrow, Matth. vi. 34., and in our Lord’s prayer the petition only for the wants of the passing day, Matth. vi. 11. According to 1 Tim.
vi. 10. the ἐλαφρυσία is the root of all evil; a declaration, however, which we must not take in the strictest sense. We are preserved from the μεγερναίν by the remembrance of the divine assurance, that God never forsakes. Notice has been taken of this citation in the note at p. 48. We cannot well refer αὑρίσ, which Böhme, however, holds to be allowable, back to ὁ θεός, it no doubt denotes the subject; God, who is ever present to the mind. Still we may not venture to affirm, what Kuinöl asserts at Luke i. 17, and repeats in his Comm. on our passage, that in Deut. xxxii. 39. and Psalm cii. 28. Νῶν is the name of Jehovah. We say precisely in the same way: "Nun, Er wird wohl machen;" in the Old Testament comp. Job xxiv. 23. Proverbs x. 24.

Ver. 6.—The author's own thought, clothed in the venerable language of Scripture, (Ps. cxviii. 6.) the words of the pious of ancient times become, throughout all ages, true again in the mouths of believers.

Ver. 7.—The reader is here reminded of the former rulers of the community, already departed; and, hence, we have a proof, although not a strong one, that the community had existed for some time. In our Epistle only there occurs, instead of the usual ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι, and that too thrice (namely here, and at ver. 17 and 24.), the name ἰγουμένοι for those who presided over the community. In this Schulz believed he had discovered a proof, that the community of the receivers of the Epistle had a form of church government different from that which generally prevailed in the Christian church. But the expression rather denotes leaders of the community in general, (Acts xv. 22.); as προϊστάμενοι, 1 Thess.

* Carpzov proceeds farthest in the abuse of that view of Νῶν and of αὑρίσ, which was first promulgated by Reuchlin, when he translates it not only here, but also ὁ αὑρίσ in ver. 8. with the article—God. Michaelis thinks that, from the οἱ εἰν αὑρί, Acts xix. 38., Dr. Carpzov might just as well have proved that αὑρί in Greek signifies a goldsm.
v. 12, and τούμων, Eph. iv. 11., are also similar general expressions. We find the same term in Clement of Rome, Ad Corinth. c. 1. and 37., and in the Martyr. S. Ignat. § 4. Chrysostom also explains the expression of the ἰτισξόσω, although so early as his time ἡγούμενοι had become the name of the Abbots. It was the duty generally of the rulers of the community to be exemplars, 1 Peter v. 3. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Titus ii. 7., and Paul represents himself as such to his readers, Phil. iii. 17. More especially it is the termination of the earthly course of those rulers which is intended to stir up the community to remain faithful. μάχι τοῦ τέλους; as ἀναστροφή, however, denotes the course of life, we must conceive life is also to be included in it. "Exβασις, like ἡζοδος elsewhere, is used to denote the end of life." It is not here distinctly said, that this must be regarded as a violent death by martyrdom, yet such a meaning is not improbable; at any rate, no certain proof of the contrary can be drawn from xii. 4. The ἁνιπτ great force to the ἀναθεώρης, in so much that Cicero, in his Epistles, sometimes employs the Greek ἀνα-θεώς, as he was unable to give its full significance in one Latin word. And Stephanus remarks in his Thesaurus, that it means not merely contemplor, but attente contemplor.

Ver. 8.—This declaration, so much discussed in the pulpit, has been considered minutely in its connection only by a very small number of interpreters. Rosenmüller, indeed, has passed over the whole dictum. The majority have contented themselves with point-

* In Eusebius, also, Hist. Eccl. 5. 1., ἡζός occurs, applied to the death of martyrs. Heinichen has taken ἡζός in that difficult passage in the sense of eventus, præmium, and is inclined to assign this signification to ινακείν, also, in the passage before us. In Eusebius, however, there is no necessity whatever for departing from the usual acceptation, and, in the passage under consideration, the signification præmium would even be unsuitable, since the reward of true faith is not visible here below.
ing out the connection in which the words are found with those that succeed them; as Christ himself is unchangeable, so is also his doctrine, from which ye may not depart. In the ancient church, as well as with the older dogmatists of our own church, the declaration was considered a dictum probans for the eternal divinity of the Son. Among others see the evidence which Spener, after the example of Calov's dissertation, De filii praexistentia, c. 37., gives of the eternal Godhead of Christ, p. 200. In opposition to this, Arminians and Socinians, as well as more recent interpreters, have applied the absurd metonymy, that Christus = doctrina Christiana, or, like Crell, because χριστός is used, and not ἀπ' αἰωνός, prove from that circumstance, that Christ and his doctrine together had appeared but a short time before. We imagine we must, of necessity, seek for a connection of the thought with the preceding context. It appears to us improbable, that the author inserted these words merely for the sake of the succeeding exhortation. The transition is,—a circumstance already remarked by Grecian interpreters,—in our opinion this: the Christ, on whom those departed witnesses believed, and for whom they died, is still ours also. On account of this reference, the χριστός may have been placed before. But, as the immutability of the person carries with it the immutability of the doctrine, the declaration naturally leads us to ver. 9. We must, in the mean time, direct our attention to the form of it. "To day" is employed, as in all languages, in the wider sense, to denote the present time, Heb. iii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 15., and the formula μέχρι τῆς οἴκειας = μέχρι τοῦ δεύτερου, Matth. xi. 23.; xxviii. 15., so "yesterday," contrasted with "to-day," may be employed to designate the past, thus Exod. v. 14. Job. viii. 9. But the question is, whether χριστός denotes the far remote and long past of the existence of the Logos in the aeternitas a parte ante, or whether it must be understood of the lately time. The former explanation is far from being ussible; yet, in our opinion, both the context
and the collocation of the words seem to indicate that the author especially connected the other notion with that word. If the verse must be connected with what precedes, then χθίς must refer to the period when these departed teachers lived. We might, indeed, obtain the same connection by assuming that the formula χθίς καὶ σήμερον καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας expresses the same thing as the formula, Rev. i. 8.: ὁ ἄν καὶ ὁ ἡμ καὶ ὁ ἐκκόμισ. This latter formula expresses directly the import of the name of Jehovah, the notion of absolute Being, which lies in the name "meaning being given to the three dimensions of time. But, again, as absolute Being is also unchangeable, the notion of the unchangeable being of God has been linked together with this denomination of Him, as we see from Mal. iii. 6. (Hos. xii. 6.). Following in this track we might arrive at a proof of the predicate of immortality being contained in this formula. In a deduction of this kind, however, there are various portions of it which appear very precarious. What appears most strongly opposed to such is the separation of the καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας from the two first members. It is very clear, that the author's primary intention was to write only χθίς καὶ σήμερον: if this be so, he then referred χθίς only to the time lately past, as we find a recently elapsed past denoted by the word ἐξιδήμη in Exod. v. 14. Job viii. 9.

Finding himself moved, however, to add the καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, he no doubt gave, in a supplementary way, a more extensive reference to the χθίς.

Ver. 9—11.—Remain faithful to the eternally immutable truth, even under ignominy and dishonour!

Ver. 9.—From the immutability of the object of the doctrine results the immutability of the doctrine

* See Macknight, &c., and the writers on the eternity of the Son.—Tr.
itself. The evidences in favour of παρεγερσθε as the correct reading, are so preponderant, that we must regard it as established (Jude ver. 12.). It is possible that περιεχομενος was introduced into this passage from Eph. iv. 14.; still περι and περικεφαλαί are so frequently interchanged in the manuscripts, that in Jude ver. 12., some of them have περιεργασμαι. The leading object in the mind of the author had been to recommend constancy in the faith, which springs from that foundation of all Christian privileges, grace (2 Cor. xii. 9.); and, indeed, as the article is not used with χάριν, we might be induced to consider this not so much the objective grace displayed in redemption (Rom. v. 2.) as the subjective inward operation of God. The Author, when he comes to declare this thought, is led to add a contrast to it: The beggarly means of grace by which individuals in the community endeavoured to silence their conscience (Heb. ix. 10.). Sufficient attention has never yet been bestowed upon the inquiry: Whether this reproach be directed against Ascetics in meats, or against such Jews as still eagerly cling to the ritual law. Had we found ourselves entitled, at ver. 4., to adopt an opposition to false teachers of the former kind, we should here, without hesitation, have to suppose the same opponents. But, even if ver. 4. be not decided against Aseetics, the declaration before us might be so; for, while, as we have seen, the Judaists were not easily brought to reject marriage, yet an ascetic selection of meats was very frequent among various classes of them. The Clementines particularly recommend the αυτάρξων, because through the enjoyments of sense demons enter into men; the eating of flesh appeared to them something παρα φύσιν, and they commanded the strictest fasts. The Essenes limited themselves to bread, vegetables, and fruit, merely seasoned with salt and hyssop, &c. We do not, in truth, hesitate to affirm, that our Author had in view, not the Jews who were anxious respecting the Levitical law, but the ascetic rejection of meats,
and we do so for these three reasons. 1. Because the observance of the Levitical law respecting meats may have gone hand in hand with Christian faith, among a great number of the Jews in Palestine, without any opposition on the part of Judæo-Christian Apostles. 2. Because the observance of the Levitical law of meats was probably in less regard as a means of grace; while it is indubitable that the ascetic abstinence from meats was considered to be such a means. 3. Because the Author, if he had only the usual Judaizers in view, would surely not have employed, in reference to them, such words as, οὐκ ἦν καὶ εἰναι δίδαχαι—a phrase which, on the other hand, appears exactly to characterise the multiplied and strange theoretical and practical prescriptions of the Jewish Ascetics and Theosophers.† We must confess, however, that the weight of these reasons is somewhat diminished by the words ἐν αὐτῶν. The position of the preterite in the verb, ἐν, and in the part., cannot be very appropriately explained unless we suppose a retrospective allusion to the time of the νόμος, of which chap. vii. 18. had said, that it had been ἀνωφελῆς. Moreover, as ὠφεληθήσατο ought to be construed, not with ἐν, but, with ἐν or ἀπό, we ought certainly to connect in ols, not with ὠφεληθήσατο, but with περιπατήσαντες, and suppose that oix ὠφεληθήσατο has been placed before merely for the sake of emphasis. We must there, however, regard the in, in this passage, as denoting the rule just as little as it does in the passages quoted by Wahl (Rom. vi. 4. Eph. ii. 2. Col. iii. 7.), for it rather designates the element in which one leads his life. In order to shew that the use of περιπατεῖν, in this sense, is not a Hebraism, Georgi has adduced examples from the classics in

† The opinion that Theosopho-Ascetic principles were spread among many of the Ebionites is more and more gaining ground in our age, although the proof which Credner has endeavoured to adduce for an amalgamation of these with the Essenes is not tenable, since it must always be remembered that the latter formed not merely a sect, but an order.
which ἁμαρτιαὶ stands for the manner of life. This, however, proves nothing, for the use of τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν, which, in this sense, obviously corresponds to the Hebrew רְוִּיתָה.

Ver. 10.—The Asyndeton here gives a greater emphasis to the thought. The reference to what precedes is thus: if ye would, indeed, hold by βεβαιῶσα, then ye have surely and far more excellent, in Christianity. Setting out from this thought, the Author is led on by a chain of symbolical interpretations to a series of new thoughts as far as ver. 15. He displays a fertile fancy, teeming with the riches of an opulent mind, such as we find in Paul, when, turning the same image, on various sides, like a diamond, to our view, he brings out from it a succession of new and sparkling thoughts. To us the 3d chap. of 2 Cor. has always appeared remarkable in this respect. In our modern and common-sense age, we have lost the taste for richness of symbolical writing, and that capacity for it which we see displayed in the intellectual productions, as well as in the cathedrals of the middle ages. The thought contained in the image, that Christians have a higher altar, leads, first of all, to the idea that Jesus, as the great sacrifice of atonement, is the true βεβαιῶσα of the faithful. Having mentioned the sufferings of Jesus as taking place outside the city, the author is led farther to the idea, that we should be companions of these sufferings; and, having said in the preceding context that our true city is in heaven, this image again brings in the new idea, that we are not, if circumstances should demand such a course of action, to shun the abandonment of the whole earthly city for the sake of Jesus; that is, we should follow him even through martyrdom. And, as the Redeemer is represented at the same time as the true sacrifice, we have, in ver. 15. this additional thought, viz. by virtue of that one sacrifice of Christ all our sacrifices are of a spiritual kind, and, indeed, no longer sin-offerings and expiatory sacrifices,
but simply sacrifices of praise; and, again, that these sacrifices of praise are presented not merely in words but also in good works. Thus this full and brilliant chain of thoughts extend from ver. 10. to ver. 16.

Oi τῆς σκηνῆς λατρεύουσι ἐστί, as at viii. 5., the priests. Ἐν τῷ Σωσίαστήριω denotes the place whence the meat is taken. But, what is the Christian Σωσίαστήριον? There is a view of the passage particularly patronised by the Roman Catholic dogmatists, and lately defended by Böhme, which merits an attentive consideration. The object of the former is to prove from it the propriety of the sacrifice of the mass; and, according to this view, it is the τράπεζα χυρίου, 1 Cor. ix. 21., the table of the Lord's supper. So early as the time of Ignatius, Tertullian, &c., the τράπεζα bore the name of altar, and as, generally, the Christian rites were formed after the model of the arrangements of the temple, so the place occupied by the Christian table, or altar, indicated its Old Testament pattern. In ver. 11. 12. the Redeemer himself is designated as the Christian victim. The first Christians agreed that He and the power of His atonement were dispensed at the Holy Table, although even among them the view as to the how was variously modified. Accordingly, I scarcely know what can be urged against this conception of the Σωσίαστήριον, if it be not, perhaps, the following, that the idea of a particular τράπεζα for partaking of the holy supper was unknown at the time in which this Epistle was written. For τράπεζα χυρίου, in the passage, 1 Cor. ix. 21., does not designate a table especially set apart, and like an altar, but rather in contrast to the ποτήριον, the eating itself, the meal. If this consideration appear of sufficient force to overthrow the notion we have stated, there need be no inquiry respecting the exact counterpart of the Σωσίαστήριον in the Christian Church. The case will stand the same in respect of it as of the καθαρισμὸς τῶν ἐσωτερικῶν, ix. 23.

Ver. 11, 12.—Theodoret, at ver. 11., perceives, in this passage, an allusion to the red heifer, but, impro-
properly, for the blood of the heifer, as may be seen at Numbers xix. 5., was not carried into the sanctuary, but was burned along with the victim. The author has in view rather the general sacrifice of atonement, on the day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 15, 27. The sin-offerings are classed as לשת ארון וزوارן וていきますל, according to the Rabbinical terminology, the outward, i.e. those of which the blood was sprinkled on the outward altar, and the inward, of which latter the priests might not eat, comp. Lev. x. 16.

Ver. 13, 14.—At τοίνυν Casaubon raises his voice: nusquam alibi memini legere hanc particulam ita positam, ut enuntiationem inchoaret, ait hie Beza: egò vero memini—and then cites a number of passages from writers subsequent to the birth of Christ, comp. Lobeck on Phryn. p. 342. The Pres. πήγεσθε is employed, as the beginning is to be made by the carrying. The ἰμεδώρης Χριστοῦ consisting particularly in the σχάναλον τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. i. 23.) comp. x. 33. xi. 26. Although the participation in the reproach of Christ has, to speak more properly, just as little of a wider extent as the ἀκολούθει μοι, John xxi. 19. and Matth. xvi. 24., yet the author requires a readiness to take a full share in the reproach of Christ, in pointing out that our abode in the earthly city is only a transitory one, xi. 13. Ἐπιζητεῖν to seek after (aussuchen).

Ver. 15—19.—Various kinds of admonitions.

Ver. 15, 16.—A new transition to more general admonitions. Christ, after having reconciled us to God, is the mediator of our prayers, for, through Him they become acceptable. So Paul prays διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 8. vii. 25., comp. 1 Peter ii. 5. The same thought is expressed in another form in John xiv. 13, 14. Through that one offering our sacrificial service is henceforward a spiritual service, Rom. xii. 1. 1 Peter ii. 5. Rev. v. 8. This thought re-
cals to the author the Old Testament passage, Hosea xiv. 3., which, in like manner, speaks of spiritual sacrifices. He quotes according to the LXX., who, following another reading of the Hebrew text, read יָּה instead of וְיָּה. The sense, however, remains the same, for the first is to be considered as an offering. But this declaration, making mention only of the sacrifices by speech, does not exhaust the author's thought. Hence the addition of ver. 16. In the τοιαύτας there is a contrast to the ritual sacrifices. Κοινωνία is translated by Schulz according to its classical signification, "to share with others" (Antheil nehmen an Andern). Paul constantly uses the word for ἐλπισθοῦσθαι, as Theophylact has remarked at Rom. xv. 26. As the usage of words in our Epistle coincides in other places with that of Paul, we shall adopt the safest view, by supposing such an argument here. That the two words were then synonymous ought not to surprise us, for we have a similar case in πιθανοθαι and ἐπειθείν, ver. 17. This is found also in the best authors; thus Demosthenes very frequently, when using verba perpendendi, puts two synonymes together; λογίζομαι καὶ θεωρεῖ, θεωρεῖ καὶ σκοπεῖ.

Ver. 17.—Paul demands, 1 Thess. v. 12. 13., reverence towards the teachers of the Church, and that, too, on account of the office with which they are entrusted. Now this office is not only heavy, but heavily responsible, for they are to be examples to the church, and ready to give an account to the Chief Shepherd, as it is expressed in 1 Peter v. 4. "The earnestness of this language made once so deep an impression on Chrysostom, that he was unable to regain his peace of mind, De Sacerd. vi. 1, he says: ὁ φόβος ταύτης τῆς ἀπειλῆς συνέχως καταστείλει μου τὴν ψυχήν. An exalted pattern for a servant of the Church, of earnest self-examination we find in Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4., who, although able to penetrate his own character, in a way of which few others are capable, and unconscious of any thing wrong in him-
vi. 10. the φιλαργυρία is the root of all evil; a declaration, however, which we must not take in the strictest sense. We are preserved from the μεταμφία by the remembrance of the divine assurance, that God never forsakes. Notice has been taken of this citation in the note at p. 48. We cannot well refer αὐτῆς, which Böhme, however, holds to be allowable, back to ὁ Θεός, it no doubt denotes the subject; God, who is ever present to the mind. Still we may not venture to affirm, what Kuinöll asserts at Luke i. 17., and repeats in his Comm. on our passage, that in Deut. xxxii. 39. and Psalm cii. 28. Ἅβα is the name of Jehovah.† We say precisely in the same way: "Nun, Er wirds wohl machen;" in the Old Testament comp. Job xxiv. 23. Proverbs x. 24.

Ver. 6.—The author’s own thought, clothed in the venerable language of Scripture, (Ps. cxviii. 6.) the words of the pious of ancient times become, throughout all ages, true again in the mouths of believers.

Ver. 7.—The reader is here reminded of the former rulers of the community, already departed; and, hence, we have a proof, although not a strong one, that the community had existed for some time. In our Epistle only there occurs, instead of the usual ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι, and that too thrice (namely here, and at ver. 17 and 24.), the name ἤγοΰμενοι for those who presided over the community. In this Schulz believed he had discovered a proof, that the community of the receivers of the Epistle had a form of church government different from that which generally prevailed in the Christian church. But the expression rather denotes leaders of the community in general, (Acts xv. 22.); as προιστάμενοι, 1 Thess.

† Carpzov proceeds farthest in the abuse of that view of Ἅβα and of αὑρίς, which was first promulgated by Reuchlin, when he translates it not only here, but also ἵ αὑρίς in ver. 8. with the article—God. Michaelis thinks that, from the εἰ σὺν αὑρίς, Acts xix. 38., Dr. Carpzov might just as well have proved that αὑρίς in Greek signifies a goldsmith's.
v. 12., and ἐν εἰς, Eph. iv. 11., are also similar general expressions. We find the same term in Clement of Rome, Ad Corinth. c. 1. and 37., and in the Martyr. S. Ignat. § 4. Chrysostom also explains the expression of the ἰνοικάτων, although so early as his time ἡγουμένοι had become the name of the Abbots. It was the duty generally of the rulers of the community to be exemplars, 1 Peter v. 3. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Titus ii. 7., and Paul represents himself as such to his readers, Phil. iii. 17. More especially it is the termination of the earthly course of those rulers which is intended to stir up the community to remain faithful. μετριῷ τοῖς τιλουσ; as ἀγαθοφορή, however, denotes the course of life, we must conceive life is also to be included in it. "Ἐκβασις, like ἡγοῦσα elsewhere, is used to denote the end of life." It is not here distinctly said, that this must be regarded as a violent death by martyrdom, yet such a meaning is not improbable; at any rate, no certain proof of the contrary can be drawn from xii. 4. The ἄνα imparts great force to the ἀναβασις, in so much that Cicero, in his Epistles, sometimes employs the Greek ἀναθέωσις, as he was unable to give its full significance in one Latin word. And Stephanus remarks in his Thesaurus, that it means not merely contemplor, but attente contemplor.

Ver. 8.—This declaration, so much discussed in the pulpit, has been considered minutely in its connection only by a very small number of interpreters. Rosenmüller, indeed, has passed over the whole dictum. The majority have contented themselves with point-

* In Eusebius, also, Hist. Eccl. 5. 1., ἢδος occurs, applied to the death of martyrs. Heinichen has taken ἢδος in that difficult passage in the sense of eventus, præmium, and is inclined to assign this signification to ἢδος, also, in the passage before us. In Eusebius, however, there is no necessity whatever for departing from the usual acceptance, and, in the passage under consideration, the signification præmium would even be unsuitable, since the reward of true faith is not visible here below.
ing out the connection in which the words are found with those that succeed them; as Christ himself is unchangeable, so is also his doctrine, from which ye may not depart. In the ancient church, as well as with the older dogmatists of our own church, the declaration was considered a dictum probans for the eternal divinity of the Son. Among others see the evidence which Spener, after the example of Calov's dissertation, De filii praecistentia, c. 37., gives of the eternal Godhead of Christ, p. 200. In opposition to this, Arminians and Socinians, as well as more recent interpreters, have applied the absurd metonymy, that Christus = doctrina Christiana, or, like Crell, because χριστός is used, and not ἀγαθὸς αἰώνος, prove from that circumstance, that Christ and his doctrine together had appeared but a short time before. We imagine we must, of necessity, seek for a connection of the thought with the preceding context. It appears to us improbable, that the author inserted these words merely for the sake of the succeeding exhortation. The transition is,—a circumstance already remarked by Grecian interpreters,—in our opinion this: the Christ, on whom those departed witnesses believed, and for whom they died, is still ours also. On account of this reference, the χριστός may have been placed before. But, as the immutability of the person carries with it the immutability of the doctrine, the declaration naturally leads us to ver. 9. We must, in the mean time, direct our attention to the form of it. "To day" is employed, as in all languages, in the wider sense, to denote the present time, Heb. iii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 15., and the formula μακρῶν τῆς σήμερον—μακρῶι τοῦ δεῦρο, Matth. xi. 29.; xxviii. 15., so "yesterday," contrasted with "to-day," may be employed to designate the past, thus Exod. v. 14. Job. viii. 9. But the question is, whether χριστός denotes the far remote and long past of the existence of the Logos in the aeternitas a parte ante, or whether it must be understood of the lately past time. The former explanation is far from being inadmissible; yet, in our opinion, both the context
and the collocation of the words seem to indicate that the author especially connected the other notion with that word. If the verse must be connected with what precedes, then χθει must refer to the period when these departed teachers lived. We might, indeed, obtain the same connection by assuming that the formula χθει καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας expresses the same thing as the formula, Rev. i. 8.: ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐκχάριτος. This latter formula expresses directly the import of the name of Jehovah, the notion of absolute Being, which lies in the name Ἡγιασμός, being given to the three dimensions of time.

But, again, as absolute Being is also unchangeable, the notion of the unchangeable being of God has been linked together with this denomination of Him, as we see from Mal. iii. 6. (Hos. xii. 6.). Following in this track we might arrive at a proof of the predicate of immortality being contained in this formula. In a deduction of this kind, however, there are various portions of it which appear very precarious. What appears most strongly opposed to such is the separation of the καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας from the two first members. It is very clear, that the author’s primary intention was to write only χθει καὶ ἡμεῖς: if this be so, he then referred χθι only to the time lately past, as we find a recently elapsed past denoted by the word Ἡγιασμός, in Exod. v. 14. Job viii. 9.

Finding himself moved, however, to add the καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, he no doubt gave, in a supplementary way, a more extensive reference to the χθει.¹

Ver. 9—11.—Remain faithful to the eternally immutable truth, even under ignominy and dishonour!

Ver. 9.—From the immutability of the object of the doctrine results the immutability of the doctrine

¹ See Macknight, &c., and the writers on the eternity of the Son.—Tr.
itself. The evidences in favour of \( \pi\alpha\zeta\alpha\phi\gamma\iota\varepsilon\sigma\delta \) as the correct reading, are so preponderant, that we must regard it as established (Jude ver. 12.). It is possible that \( \pi\phi\gamma\iota\varepsilon\sigma\delta \) was introduced into this passage from Eph. iv. 14.; still \( \pi\phi\gamma \) and \( \pi\phi\gamma\alpha \) are so frequently interchanged in the manuscripts, that in Jude ver. 12., some of them have \( \pi\phi\gamma\phi\rho\epsilon\theta\mu\nu\). The leading object in the mind of the author had been to recommend constancy in the faith, which springs from that foundation of all Christian privileges, grace (2 Cor. xii. 9.); and, indeed, as the article is not used with \( \chi\alpha\omega\iota\nu \), we might be induced to consider this not so much the objective grace displayed in redemption (Rom. v. 2.) as the subjective inward operation of God. The Author, when he comes to declare this thought, is led to add a contrast to it: The beggarly means of grace by which individuals in the community endeavoured to silence their conscience (Heb. ix. 10.). Sufficient attention has never yet been bestowed upon the inquiry: Whether this reproach be directed against Ascetics in meats, or against such Jews as still eagerly cling to the ritual law. Had we found ourselves entitled, at ver. 4., to adopt an opposition to false teachers of the former kind, we should here, without hesitation, have to suppose the same opponents. But, even if ver. 4. be not decided against Ascetics, the declaration before us might be so; for, while, as we have seen, the Judaists were not easily brought to reject marriage, yet an ascetic selection of meats was very frequent among various classes of them. The Clementines particularly recommend the \( \alpha\nu\tau\dot{\alpha}\gamma\xi\omicron\alpha \), because through the enjoyments of sense demons enter into men; the eating of flesh appeared to them something \( \pi\phi\gamma\alpha \phi\omicron\omicron\nu \), and they commanded the strictest fasts. The Essenes limited themselves to bread, vegetables, and fruit, merely seasoned with salt and hyssop, &c. We do not, in truth, hesitate to affirm, that our Author had in view, not the Jews who were anxious respecting the Levitical law, but the ascetic rejection of meats,
and we do so for these three reasons. 1. Because the observance of the Levitical law respecting meats may have gone hand in hand with Christian faith, among a great number of the Jews in Palestine, without any opposition on the part of Judæo-Christian Apostles. 2. Because the observance of the Levitical law of meals was probably in less regard as a means of grace; while it is indubitable that the ascetic abstinence from meats was considered to be such a means. 3. Because the Author, if he had only the usual Judaizers in view, would surely not have employed, in reference to them, such words as, τοιχλαὶ καὶ ξίναι ἰδαψαι—a phrase which, on the other hand, appears exactly to characterise the multiplied and strange theoretical and practical prescriptions of the Jewish Ascetics and Theosophers.\(^a\) We must confess, however, that the weight of these reasons is somewhat diminished by the words ἐν ὅς κτλ. The position of the preterite in the verb. fin., and in the part., cannot be very appropriately explained unless we suppose a retrospective allusion to the time of the ἀμακαίρος, of which chap. vii. 18. had said, that it had been ἀνωφελής. Moreover, as ὑπελείποι ought to be construed, not with ἐν, but, with ἐγ. or ἄνω, we ought certainly to connect ἐν ὅς, not with ὑπελείποι, but with περιπατήσοντες, and suppose that ὁικ. ὑπελείποι has been placed before merely for the sake of emphasis. We must there, however, regard the ἐν, in this passage, as denoting the rule just as little as it does in the passages quoted by Wahl (Rom. vi. 4. Eph. ii. 2. Col. iii. 7.), for it rather designates the element in which one leads his life. In order to show that the use of περιπάτειν, in this sense, is not a Hebraism, Georgi has adduced examples from the classics in

\(^a\) The opinion that Theosopho-Ascetic principles were spread among many of the Ebionites is more and more gaining ground in our age, although the proof which Credner has endeavoured to adduce for an amalgamation of these with the Essenes is not tenable, since it must always be remembered that the latter formed not merely a sect, but an order.
which πορεύομαι stands for the manner of life. This, however, proves nothing, for the use of περπατούν, which, in this sense, obviously corresponds to the Hebrew יָלְדוּת.

Ver. 10.—The Asyndeton here gives a greater emphasis to the thought. The reference to what precedes is thus: if ye would, indeed, hold by βεβαίωσις, then ye have surely and far more excellent, in Christianity. Setting out from this thought, the Author is led on by a chain of symbolical interpretations to a series of new thoughts as far as ver. 15. He displays a fertile fancy, teeming with the riches of an opulent mind, such as we find in Paul, when, turning the same image, on various sides, like a diamond, to our view, he brings out from it a succession of new and sparkling thoughts. To us the 3d chap. of 2 Cor. has always appeared remarkable in this respect. In our modern and common-sense age, we have lost the taste for richness of symbolical writing, and that capacity for it which we see displayed in the intellectual productions, as well as in the cathedrals of the middle ages. The thought contained in the image, that Christians have a higher altar, leads, first of all, to the idea that Jesus, as the great sacrifice of atonement, is the true βεβαίωσις of the faithful. Having mentioned the sufferings of Jesus as taking place outside the city, the author is led farther to the idea, that we should be companions of these sufferings; and, having said in the preceding context that our true city is in heaven, this image again brings in the new idea, that we are not, if circumstances should demand such a course of action, to shun the abandonment of the whole earthly city for the sake of Jesus; that is, we should follow him even through martyrdom. And, as the Redeemer is represented at the same time as the true sacrifice, we have, in ver. 15. this additional thought, viz. by virtue of that one sacrifice of Christ all our sacrifices are of a spiritual kind, and, indeed, no longer sin-offerings and expiatory sacrifices,
but simply sacrifices of praise; and, again, that these sacrifices of praise are presented not merely in words but also in good works. Thus this full and brilliant chain of thoughts extend from ver. 10. to ver. 16.

Oi τὴν σχῆσιν λατρεύσωντες are, as at viii. 5., the priests. Ex τοῦ Σωσίαστήριου denotes the place whence the meat is taken. But, what is the Christian Σωσίαστήριον? There is a view of the passage particularly patronised by the Roman Catholic dogmatists, and lately defended by Böhme, which merits an attentive consideration. The object of the former is to prove from it the propriety of the sacrifice of the mass; and, according to this view, it is the τεσσαρειά xυρίου, 1 Cor. x. 21., the table of the Lord’s supper. So early as the time of Ignatius, Tertullian, &c., the τεσσαρειά bore the name of altar, and as, generally, the Christian rites were formed after the model of the arrangements of the temple, so the place occupied by the Christian table, or altar, indicated its Old Testament pattern. In ver. 11. 12. the Redeemer himself is designated as the Christian victim. The first Christians agreed that He and the power of His atonement were dispensed at the Holy Table, although even among them the view as to the how was variously modified. Accordingly, I scarcely know what can be urged against this conception of the Σωσίαστήριον, if it be not, perhaps, the following, that the idea of a particular τεσσαρειά for partaking of the holy supper was unknown at the time in which this Epistle was written. For τεσσαρειά xυρίου, in the passage, 1 Cor. x. 21., does not designate a table especially set apart, and like an altar, but rather in contrast to the πορνήιον, the eating itself, the meal. If this consideration appear of sufficient force to overthrow the notion we have stated, there need be no inquiry respecting the exact counterpart of the Σωσίαστήριον in the Christian Church. The case will stand the same in respect of it as of the καθαρίμων τῶν εἰσωματialis, ix. 23.

Ver. 11, 12.—Theodoret, at ver. 11., perceives, in this passage, an allusion to the red heifer, but, impro-
properly, for the blood of the heifer, as may be seen at Numbers xix. 5., was not carried into the sanctuary, but was burned along with the victim. The author has in view rather the general sacrifice of atonement, on the day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 15, 27. The sin-offerings are classed as ἄμωμα ἡμείσας and ἀνάλυμα, according to the Rabbinical terminology, the outward, i.e. those of which the blood was sprinkled on the outward altar, and the inward, of which latter the priests might not eat, comp. Lev. x. 16.

Ver. 13, 14.—At τοίνυν Casaubon raises his voice: nusquam alibi memini legere hanc particulam ita positam, ut enuntiationem inchoaret, ait hic Beza: ego vero memini—and then cites a number of passages from writers subsequent to the birth of Christ, comp. Lobeck on Phryn. p. 342. The Pres. φίλος is employed, as the beginning is to be made by the carrying. The ὑποδημάς Χριστοῦ consisting particularly in the σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. i. 23.) comp. x. 33. xi. 26. Although the participation in the reproach of Christ has, to speak more properly, just as little of a wider extent as the ἀξολοθζυμ μου, John xxi. 19. and Matth. xvi. 24., yet the author requires a readiness to take a full share in the reproach of Christ, in pointing out that our abode in the earthly city is only a transitory one, xi. 13. Ἑραξην to seek after (aufsuchen).

Ver. 15—19.—Various kinds of admonitions.

Ver. 15, 16.—A new transition to more general admonitions. Christ, after having reconciled us to God, is the mediator of our prayers, for, through Him they become acceptable. So Paul prays ἄχα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 8. vii. 25., comp. 1 Peter ii. 5. The same thought is expressed in another form in John xiv. 13, 14. Through that one offering our sacrificial service is henceforward a spiritual service, Rom. xii. 1. 1 Peter ii. 5. Rev. v. 8. This thought re-
cals to the author the Old Testament passage, Hosea xiv. 3., which, in like manner, speaks of spiritual sacrifices. He quotes according to the LXX., who, following another reading of the Hebrew text, read יָּד instead of וְיָדוּ. The sense, however, remains the same, for the first is to be considered as an offering. But this declaration, making mention only of the sacrifices by speech, does not exhaust the author’s thought. Hence the addition of ver. 16. In the τοιαύτας there is a contrast to the ritual sacrifices. Κοιναία is translated by Schulz according to its classical signification, “to share with others” (Antheil nehmen an Andern). Paul constantly uses the word for ἱλασμόσων, as Theophylact has remarked at Rom. xv. 26. As the usage of words in our Epistle coincides in other places with that of Paul, we shall adopt the safest view, by supposing such an argument here. That the two words were then synonymous ought not to surprise us, for we have a similar case in πείθομαι and ἐπιτέως, ver. 17. This is found also in the best authors; thus Demosthenes very frequently, when using verba perpendendi, puts two synonyms together; λογίζομαι καὶ ξεφεν, ξεφεν καὶ σχοτεύ.

Ver. 17.—Paul demands, 1 Thess. v. 12. 13., reverence towards the teachers of the Church, and that, too, on account of the office with which they are entrusted. Now this office is not only heavy, but heavily responsible, for they are to be examples to the church, and ready to give an account to the Chief Shepherd, as it is expressed in 1 Peter v. 4. “The earnestness of this language made once so deep an impression on Chrysostom, that he was unable to regain his peace of mind, De Sacerd. vi. 1. he says: ὁ φόβος ταύτης τῆς ἀπειλῆς σωστῶς καταστάθηκεν μου τὴν Ψυχῆν. An exalted pattern for a servant of the Church, of earnest self-examination we find in Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4., who, although able to penetrate his own character, in a way of which few others are capable, and unconscious of any thing wrong in him-
self, yet did not therefore deem himself justified. Ἄγριόνιμος, like the usual ἔγνωρεν, is employed frequently by the LXX. to denote attentive care; construed with ἦς it is found in Eph. vi. 18. In like manner, in the Hebrew יֶלְפָּע, and the prophets are called watchmen of God, Ezek. iii. 17.; xxxiii. 2, 8. Ἠὐξαί is not merely a circumlocution, but is used as at James i. 21. 1 Peter i. 9. There is in ἄλωστελες a Litotes, as in 1 Cor. xi. 17. Ὡς λυστελεῖ is employed in the same way by the Classics as we do our emphatic form of expression, "denn das thut nicht gut," for that does no good, comp. Passow, s. v. λυστελέω, in the New Testament, Luke xvii. 2. λυστελέω "it is good," comp. Tob. iii. 6.

Ver. 18, 19.—As all the Pauline Epistles commence with an assurance that the writer has the Church at heart in his prayers, so they conclude with a request for the intercession of the Church, 1 Thess. v. 35. 2 Thess. iii. 1. Col. iv. 3. Eph. vi. 19. Some, to whom πεπώδησαμεν appeared unsuitable, if the author spoke of his own conscience, would refer συνείδησις to the consciousness of God or of the brethren. They do not consider, that, where self-knowledge is concerned, as may be seen from 1 Cor. iv. 4., the Christian does not trust to his own conscience; and, hence, Paul, Rom. ix. i., speaks of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit which gives rule to his conscience. This appeal, also, to the evidence of conscience is truly Pauline, 2 Cor. i. 12. It is here doubtful whether ἐν πᾶσι (see on v. 4.), should be taken as a Neuter or Masculine; if it be taken as a Masculine, we may compare with it πρὸς τῶν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων, 2 Cor. iv. 2. On ver. 19. comp. the remarks in p. 20. of the Introduction.

Ver. 20, 21.—Conclusion.

Ver. 20, 21.—Comp. the Introduction, c. 1. §. 3. To the full heart it is equally natural, in written and
oral discourse, to conclude with a benediction. In the Ep. to the Romans, the Apostle has done this no less than four times, at a new paragraph. We find such a conclusion, also, in the first and second Epistles of Peter, and in the Epistle of Jude. Nor is it less natural that this benediction should have reference to what has been previously treated of, and thus we find it in the Epistles to the Romans and Philippians, and in the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians. In the conclusion before us, the in αἰματι αἰωνίον διαθήκης contains a retrospective view; but, on the other hand, we are surprised by the allusion to the resurrection of the Redeemer, which, with this exception, is nowhere mentioned in the Epistle, and by the name τοιμὴν given to Christ, Comp. Introd. p. 27. The name τοιμὴν used of Christ may have been derived from Old Testament passages, such as Ezekiel xxxiv. 27., but may also be a reminiscence of the words of Christ himself, John x. It occurs twice in Peter, I Peter iii. 25.; v. 4. The Predicate μίγας, with the Article, is here placed after its subject; a position which is frequently, although not universally, given to it for the sake of emphasis. Μίγας, as at iv. 14. Ἀνάγειν to lead up, namely out of the grave. Εὖν αἰματι κτλ. is, in accordance with the thought, to be joined with τοιμήν, and assigns the reason why Christ has acquired the right of property over His own, as Acts xx. 28. On αἰώνος Comp. ix. 12. Εἰς τὸ σταυρὸν κτλ. is the consequence of the making perfect in every good work. Equally accordant with the Pauline doctrinal type, is the good work, which, on the one side, belongs to man, represented, on the other, as the work of the prime source of all good, Phil. i. 6.; ii. 13. The Doxology can refer only to the immediately preceding subject Christ, and we cannot but be surprised by the remark of Reiche on Rom. ix. 5., that, "in the genuine Apostolical writings, we find doxologies only to God." The contrary is taught in the most indubitable manner in 1 Peter iv. 11. To this must be added 2 Tim. iv. 18.
Rev. i. 6.; v. 13. 2 Peter iii. 18. And, after what was said at the commencement of the first chapter of our Epistle, can this Doxology be at all unexpected?

Ver. 22–25.—Pieces of Intelligence, and Salutations.

Ver. 22–25.—As Paul, in writing to the Church which he had not himself planted, carefully apologises, Rom. xv. 15., when he conceives he may have spoken too boldly, so we might conclude from the words before us, that the Author did not stand in any very close relation with the Churches of Palestine, although the reason of this apology may also have lain in the wavering spiritual condition of these Churches. Δια βοηθησιν the same as δι᾽ ἀληθῶν, 1 Peter v. 12. Comp. Wetstein. It has been considered very singular, that this Epistle—one of the longest of the New Testament collection—should be designated as short. But the notion of the length or shortness of an Epistle is altogether relative and subjective. This is expressed by Peter, when mentioning the shortness of his Epistle, he adds a ὁς λογίζομαι: we should have a counterpart to this if we suppose, in accordance with the views of many expositors, that Paul, Gal. vi. 11., calls the short Epistle to the Galatians long. Admonitory letters are always thought too long, letters of affection are too short, especially since this Epistle, as we saw in the Introduction, possesses more of the character of a treatise than of an Epistle; when considered as a letter treating of matters of doctrine, it may still be denominated short. Ἐπιστέλλω as at Acts xxii. 25.; xv. 20.—On ver. 23. Comp. what is said in the Intro. p. 20.—There remains still one question of importance in a critical point of view, and to the discussion of which, in this place, we have referred in the Introduction, viz. whether οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας mean "they who are fled from Italy," so that this expression would indicate a locality for the composition of the Epistle different from Italy,
or, whether οἱ ἀνδ' Ἰταλίας may denote directly Italians. In p. 23, 24. of the Introd., I shewed that the modern critics press without reason the explanation of fugitive Italians. I observe that Winer, in his Gramm. 4 Ed. p. 484, does not acknowledge the validity of the argument in favour of this explanation. Still I cannot agree to his view of the passage: he supposes the prepositions of locality to be dropped, what is called the attraction of the prepositions, so that οἱ ἀνδ' Ἰταλίας is equivalent to οἱ ἐν Ἰταλίας ἰδ' Ἰταλίας. This attraction is not rare among the Classical writers, οἱ ἐν Ἰταλίας ἰσχύει, ἀπέργων is equal to οἱ ἐν Ἰταλίας ἰσχύει, ἀπέργων. But would a person writing from Italy have expressed himself thus, "the friends from Italy salute you?" To me it appears that we are entitled to take οἱ ἀνδ' Ἰταλίας as directly meaning οἱ Ἰταλίωται. It is known that ἐν is employed in this manner in circumlocutions (Bernhardy Syntax, p. 229); even παγά, with which, originally, the notion of going-out was strictly retained, was used by the later writers in a similar manner. The same remark holds good with respect to the circumlocutions formed by ἀνδ', as we may see from the New Testament, Acts xxiii. 21. ἐν Ἰταλίασ ὑπὸ ἰπογεγελᾶν. The remark of Winer, p. 178, that in all such cases there is no idle circumlocution, is so far correct, that, originally, egression from some place was conceived; but this primitive signification, no doubt, fell as much into the shade as in expressions of a similar kind in our own language; for instance when, in common life, we say, promise: "I have not the letter from you with me," and, "I have not your letter with me," or, "has any one out of my house done this?" and, "has one of my household done it?"* "Ich habe den Brief von dir nicht

* Bernhardy passim remarks, "The numerous circumlocutions with ἐν, which form expressions of the nature of an adjective or independent substantive, not without a contemplation by the senses, have, on this account, been more especially appropriated by the comic writers and orators, and, in a less degree, by the historians.
mit," and "Ich habe deinen Brief nicht mit," oder: "hat jemand aus meinem Hause dies gethan?" und: "hat einer meiner Hausleute es gethan." The Romans employed their ab in circumlocutions, in a manner precisely similar. In Terence, Adelph. 5, 3, 2. quisnam a me pepulit tam graviter fores? a The translator in the Vulgate has given his: salutant vos de Italia fratres certainly in the sense of Italiani fratres. So, in Greek, oi apò γῆς and oi apò Ἐλλάδος are used directly for "travellers by land," and "voyagers by sea," see D’Orville on Chariton, p. 263.; in like manner oi apò χώρας, "the country people." Schweighäuser on Polyb. T. VIII. p. 69.: non modo qui rure veniunt, sed qui rure degunt. Joined with the names of countries, e.g. in Polyb. 5, 86, 10, oi apò τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας βασιλείας. Thus, then, oi apò τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰουδαίων, Acts xviii. 18., stands for Thessalonian Jews; and there is no ground for the supposition that Luke so called them by anticipation, because he subsequently mentions their coming to Berea. Although, according to these remarks, the explanation appears to be justified, yet the other, which makes the phrase = oi παρίνης απὸ Ἰταλίας, ought, perhaps, to be preferred, for, if the Epistle were written, as the former exposition assumes, in Rome, should we not expect the expression to have been oi apò Ῥώμης?

* We may observe on this, that the servant is within the house, for the ancients knocked before they went out, in order that the passers by might beware of the doors, which opened outwards.
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Dissertation I.

On the use of the Old Testament in the New, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The subject which we now propose to discuss, has long demanded a treatise devoted wholly to it, in which it would be carefully surveyed on all sides. To attempt this, is not our design in the present dissertation; but, since the difficulties which would meet us in handling such a theme, unite as in a focus in the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may hope that what we have to say on the application of the Old Testament in that Epistle, will throw some light on the subject in general. We shall first speak of the apparently arbitrary citations from the Old Testament, in the New Testament writers, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews; secondly, of the use of the Septuagint version, instead of the original text; and, thirdly, of the typical interpretation of the history.


Before laying down our own views, we shall present an historical sketch of the methods in which this subject has been hitherto contemplated and treated.

That, in the New Testament, we meet with many citations which do not appear to suit the historical sense of the Old Testament passages, is an observa-
tion to which we are led by two citations at the very beginning of that volume, Mat. ii. 15 and 18; but the citations in the Epistle before us are particularly such as give an impression of being in a high degree arbitrary. Let us enumerate the quotations relating to the Messiah; in chap. i. Ps. ii. 7; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. xcvi. 7; (Dent. xxxii. 43;) Ps. xlv. 7, 8; cii. 26—28; cx. 1; in chap. ii. Ps. viii. 5; xxii. 23; Is. viii. 17, 18; in chap. vii. Ps. cx. 4; in chap. viii. Jer. xxxi. 31; in chap. x. Ps. xl. 7—9; in chap. xii. Haggai ii. 6. Although, in modern times, some theologians have pointed with great éclat to the discrepancy between the historical sense of the Old Testament passages, and that in which they were taken by the Apostles, as if it were a new discovery, yet this difference has confessedly not escaped the most ancient interpreters from the time of Origen; indeed, from the earliest period, expositors have always been divided into two classes; the one has made the New Testament interpretation the rule for the historical explanation of the Old Testament passages; and the other has acknowledged a difference in the Scriptures, which it has attempted in various ways to reconcile.

The first of these two classes has again taken a twofold course. One party of expositors have prevailed on themselves, to disregard the historical references of these portions of the Old Testament, and especially in reference to the Psalms, to view those which are cited in the New Testament, in relation to the Messiah, (whether uttered by the Psalmist in the first or third person), as exclusively compositions which David put in the mouth of the Messiah. Among expositors of the Psalms who have adopted this method, may be mentioned Geier, J. H. Michaelis, Klauss, (Beitr. zur Kritik und Exegese der Psalmen. Berlin 1832;) of expositors of the Epistle to the Hebrews, D'Outrein, Wolf; J. D. Michaelis in his remarks on Pierce, (though differently in many passages of his German commentary which appeared fifteen years later,) Ch. Fr. Schmid and Cra-
mer. On the other hand, many could not help seeing the historic references in many passages of the Psalms, and thus arose that mixed or fragmentary application of them to the Messiah, which had been already combated by Theodorus of Mopsuestia, the canon of which is thus laid down by Chrysostom (on Psalm cxix.) καὶ γαρ τοῦτο προφητικας εἴδος, μεταξὺ διακοπτεῖν καὶ ἱστοιαν τίνα ἐν Βαλλείῳ, καὶ μετὰ το τεύτα διεξελθὲν παλιν ἐπὶ τα προτερα ἐπανειναι. "For this is the form (or structure) of prophecy, to break off and interpolate an historical portion, and after this has been narrated, to return to the former topic." The second class takes its rise with that truly distinguished interpreter Theodorus of Mopsuestia, to whom his adherents, not without reason, gave the honorary title of Ἰσραὴλ the Biblical interpreter," (Assemanni Bibl. Or. iii. 1. 30.) This theologian, whose merits many characterize as one-sided, when they merely bring forward the negative qualification that he has left standing so few Messianic prophecies, recognized, as we see from his remaining works, more than any other interpreter of his times, the necessity of first of all viewing the portions of Scripture which were to be expounded, in all their historical relations. Thus he could not avoid perceiving in the Psalms, that they might for the most part be satisfactorily explained, by considering the historical circumstances of their author, and only four Psalms remained which he believed must be regarded as direct prophecies of Christ. In what light he viewed the others which are cited in the New Testament, may be inferred from a passage in his Preface to Jonah (Wegnerii, p. 277—283,) where he says, that God, as the original author of both the Old and New Testament,

* See Sieffert, De Theodoro Mopsuesteno Veteris Testamenti sobrie interpretandi vindice, Regio 1827. The sincere thanks of the theological public are due to another of the Königsberg Literati, Von Wegner, who has lately rendered accessible the remains of the distinguished Antiochian interpreter, by publishing "Theodori Antiocheni quae supersunt omnia, Vol. I. Berol. 1834. We hope this useful work will soon be completed.
formed the one in relation to the other, so that
the former contains emblems of the latter; as ex-
amples of which he adduces the Exodus, the brazen
serpent, the sacrifices, and Jonah himself. But it is
somewhat doubtful whether he looked upon the agree-
ment of the Old and New Testament as designedly
intended by the Spirit of God, or only as a natural
result of the course of events; the latter is rendered
probable by what a scholar of Theodorus, Kosmas
Indicopleustes, (Moutfanc on collect. nov. Pater. II.
p. 224—227,) says, that David sung these four
Psalms exclusively of the Lord Christ, ὑν γὰς ἐκπο-
ποιεὶς τα ὑπὸ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ μετὰ τῶν δουλῶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα
τού δεσποτοῦ ὡς δεσποτοῦ ἐξειπεῖν, καὶ τα τῶν δουλῶν ὡς
dουλῶν. "For he does not mix together what relates
to the Lord Christ with what relates to servants; but
he has expressed what peculiarly belongs to the Lord
in terms appropriate to his station, and the affairs
of servants as being such." And on such references
to the Psalms as in John xix. 24, and the quotation
from Deut. xxx. 12, in Rom. x. 6, he says, μακαρα-
ξει τῆν χρήσιν, ὡς αριστοδαιμον εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν υποθέσιν, "he
metaphrases the terms used (by Moses) as suit-
able to his own argument." Thus, in this ancient
writer, we already meet with the view that the Old
Testament citations in the writers of the New Testa-
ment, in many cases, only serve as a substratum for
the writer's own ideas,—a view which, (among the
expositors of the Epistle to the Hebrews,) Storr
mentions in i. 10, on which also Stuart indecisively
vacillates: and which Steudel expresses in his Essay
on Inspiration, in the Tubingen Journal, 1832, Part
III. p. 75. A far greater number of those expositors
who acknowledge the difference between the histori-
cal sense and the application of the Old Testament
passages, have, on the contrary, distinguished in these
passages of the Psalms a higher sense intended by the
Divine Spirit from a lower. Among these are to
be classed those Greek expositors who may be con-
sidered more or less as the disciples of Origen, as
Eusebius of Cæsarea, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and
Gregory of Nyssa; the school of Mesopotamian interpreters at Nisibis and Edessa, who claim Ephraem as their leader; the majority of the Latin expositors; and, in the times of the reformation, the heads of the reformed Exegesis, Pellican, Calvin and Bucer; and in later times, Rüdinger, Venema, Muntinghe, and, recently, Stier; the Socinian and Arminian expositors take also the same direction, though we are not certain whether they have fully expressed their peculiar views. Bucer frequently has a conflict with himself, whether he ought to allow an historical sense as the immediate one to *all* the Psalms. At last he does so, and comforts himself with saying, "*veritati enim nihil officit, et facit omnia clariora.*" A peculiar method of modern times, (if we except some single expressions of the Arminians) is the theory of accommodation, by which all citations of this kind, as, for instance, the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is set aside as an *argumentatio e conces sis*; thus Semler, (*Versuch einer freiern theologischen Lehrtart*, attempt at a more liberal method of teaching theology, p. 411, 447,) Ernesti, Teller, Griesbach, and, in a great degree, Stuart also. These were the various expedients adopted before the Apostles were treated as common, narrow-minded Jews, who fell into the mistakes of the Hermeneutics of their times. As a confutation of all previous attempts to adjust the quotations of our Epistle with the text of the Old Testament, stand the *Ex cursus* on this subject which Stuart has appended to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. The learned American tries every possible method of adjustment, with the exception of the double sense, to which he is decided ly opposed, but still leaves every individual passage open to various possibilities of interpretation.

The question has assumed a different shape since the fear has ceased of placing the Apostles on a level with the mass of their countrymen. The industry of the elder critics had collected a great number of examples of arbitrary Hermeneutics in the Rabbini-
Le Clerk and Wetstein had already given hints to deduce consequences from these premises. In our own times, this step has been taken. Supplied with the materials collected by the elder critics, Dopke in his New Testament Hermeneutics, (of which he was only able to publish the first part), attempts to prove that never, in any generation, was a more absurd mode of interpretation adopted than that of the Rabbies, and that the Apostles, in this respect, made no exception to the errors of their nation. Already this view has been brought forward as an indubitable deduction by such interpreters as Böhme, Ruckert, and Meyer.

Only one consequence still remains to be drawn, namely, that the appeals of the Redeemer to passages in the Old Testament, are to be put in the same class with these arbitrary Rabbinical παρεμνησεις. Those interpreters have hitherto been held back from a distinct assertion of this kind, by some remains of traditional veneration, so that they either avoid giving a positive opinion on this point, or do not here admit of that accommodating argumentatio e concessis, which they confine to the Apostles.

While, in the existing state of things, it is not difficult to foresee that many will pass over these last limits, the newly awakened feeling of religious need has impelled others to seek out a different mode of solving the question from that which has hitherto been prevalent in the church. It is granted that even the Apostles might not be exempt from the hermeneutical and exegetical mistakes of the Rabbinical school,—in respect of Christ there is wanting, also, in this quarter, an explicit declaration,—on the other hand, it is acknowledged, that that use of Old Testament expressions is by no means “without a foundation,” but that a true parallelism of the Old Testament and New Testament ideas, a real indication of New Testament facts in the Old, lies at its basis. To this effect has De Wette expressed himself in his valuable treatise on the symbolical and typical method of the Epistle
to the Hebrews, in the third part of the Theological Journal of Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Lucke, and his view is adopted by Bleek in the essay on the use of Old Testament passages in the New, in the 2d part of the "Studien und Kritiken," 1835. Among the interpreters of the Old Testament, Umbreit appears also to take the same view. And to point out the philosophic mode of considering this subject, Bilroth, in his Commentary on 1 Cor. i. 19, makes the following valuable remarks:—"According to his custom, the Apostle supports his assertions by passages from the Old Testament, which, indeed, do not always suit, in a strictly historical sense, as if the writers meant what Paul means in the connection in which he introduces them, but which, according to the words, have a resemblance. In order not to involve Paul (as well as the other writers of the New Testament, and even Christ himself), in a charge of ignorance, or indeed of disingenuousness, we must maintain the view, according to which the Old Testament, taken altogether, is a type of the New; so that, for example, the predictions of the Prophets are not to be applied to the Messiah, as if the writers had consciously referred to the historical Christ, who was born under the reign of the Emperor Augustus, (that this is not the case, any child may see), but so that in the words they utter, the same Spirit of God expresses itself, which penetrates the whole history organically, and which has also appeared in Christianity. This organic conception and exposition of historical phenomena (which, in a historical and philological respect, is entirely free from the fault of attributing a conscious knowledge to times and men which could not take place till a later period), is capable of universal application, even in the scientific representation of mythology. Applied to the relation between the Old and the New Testament, it at once puts an end to all the misunderstandings which have prevailed on this subject, and have given occasion to many complaints, and too often to spiteful witticisms."
Although the view here given presents itself as a new solution, yet we may see that when it is conceived with dogmatic strictness, it soon harmonizes up to a certain point with that long prevalent view of a lower and a higher, a nearer and more remote meaning of Old Testament passages,—as soon, namely, as this mode of considering the subject is not applied mechanically, (as was the case with the school of Cocceius), but proceeds from an organic contemplation of history, as by Olshausen, (especially in his letter to Steudel), but pre-eminently in the truly masterly treatise of Beck on the Messianic Prophecies, and the spiritual Interpretation of Scripture, in the Tubingen Theological Journal for 1831, Part III, and as an appendix to his Exposition of the 9th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. If, indeed, the Apostles knew how to extract from the Old Testament an anticipation of the New so entirely pertinent, and such anticipations, types, and points of connection could be found nowhere but in the Old Testament writings, one and same divine Spirit must have superintended on both sides,—there to ordain the points of connection, and here to impart the capability of perceiving and laying hold of them. What is it that gives to analogies taken from the sphere of nature, to illustrate spiritual relations, that power of conviction over the mind? Is it the simple parallelism? or is it the inseparable conviction of the unity of the Spirit that rules in both departments? Only in one point will a difference remain between the two methods of solution; namely, that the one considers those typical expressions of the prophets as peculiar sudden illuminations, the other, as we have expressed it, in reference to Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as a natural result of preformative Old Testament circumstances. On this point we shall say more in the sequel.

So much in review of the course of inquiry on this subject, down to the present time. As we are now prepared to expound our own views, we consider it necessary to present the citations in three classes.
These citations will either relate to direct prophecies, or to typical prophecies, or belong to the department of supports and adaptations.

That not all the passages quoted in the first and second chapters of our Epistle contain direct prophecies of the Messiah, may be considered as proved for the readers of our times, since no expositor is now to be found who regards Ps. cii. and Isaiah viii. 17, 18. as direct Messianic predictions; as we have already remarked, even Klauss, who, in other respects chiefly belongs to the older schools, does not view in this light Ps. xcvi. and cii. On the other hand, the probability increases, that in other quarters the belief in the existence of direct Messianic Psalms will soon become extinct. The latest expositor of the Psalms, Ewald, has not thought them deserving one word of controversy. Although I now admit, that by a typical construction of such Psalms as the 2d and 110th, as Bleek has taken them, the Christian and religious purpose is answered, yet I cannot, on my part, help recognising Ps. xi. and cii. as Messianic compositions. The positive arguments which are urged against this interpretation of the two Psalms, rest, like those adduced by Gesenius and Hitzig, in reference to Isaiah liii., on a misconception of the character of prophecy. Most of the Messianic prophecies cannot be regarded as literal predictions of history. Prophecy is usually conceived of as an image of history, thrown, by means of a concave mirror, from the future into the past. And, certainly, there are predictions which can only be explained on the supposition, that the God who allows them to become history, really impressed the image of it on the mind of the seer. But there is also another species of prophecy. A Messianic prophecy especially is, the future itself springing out of the past. According to 1 Peter i. 11. the Spirit of Christ was present in the prophets, and thereby they prophesied what hereafter would be realised in Christ. The substance of the Messianic prophecies is the
Psyche of the New Testament, hidden under the chrysalis envelopment of the Old Testament. But as the latter is still a Psyche, even while concealed under its thick covering, so also the prophecies wear an envelope, which they can be divested of only by him who perceives their historical fulfilment. Hence the prophets delineate the blessings of the New Covenant, in colours taken from the Old Testament theocracy; and even the conversion of the heathen to the Messiah is represented only as a supplement to the glorified ancient theocracy, as the flowing together of the Gentiles to Mount Zion (Isaiah ii. 2). To me it appears much more difficult to justify the non-application of the two Psalms to the Messiah. No other motive than an opposition to the Messianic interpretation can be assigned for making David the object, instead of the author of Ps. cx.; and can any historical evidence be produced that David, the restorer of the authority of the priests, could have intended to combine the priestly with the kingly dignity? With respect to the second Psalm, the appeal to 1 Kings ii. 14, in order to shew that the state of the nations spoken of in this Psalm was realized in the time of Solomon, is at least somewhat precarious:—this, however, is not the place for expounding this Psalm in detail. But what prevents me from giving up the Messianic interpretation is principally this—no one who is not under a mental delusion can fail to acknowledge as a great distinguishing characteristic of Israel, that it was a people of earnest desire. What old Amos Comenius says of himself, was true of this people taken in the mass: he was a *vir desideriorum*—*homme de l’avenir*—and such were they. That their ruler also, who had raised the kingdom to the highest state of prosperity,—that he also could not find repose in the present, but looked forward to a beautiful future,—that he distinctly expected a glorious kingdom to be enjoyed by his posterity,—of this we have a memorable historical testimony in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. "David, the son
of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel, said,

The Spirit of the Lord spake by me,
And his word was in my tongue;
The God of Israel said,
The rock of Israel spake to me;
He that ruleth over men must be just,
Ruling in the fear of God;
And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,
Even a morning without clouds,
As the tender grass out of the earth by clear shining after rain.
Although my house be not so with God,
Yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant,
Ordered in all things, and sure, &c.

After such a definite historical testimony to the expectation of the Messiah by this ancient King, it appears to us that the Expositor of the Psalms, guided merely by a regard to historical verity, must proceed on the supposition, that among the many lyrical effusions of the loyal Psalmist, some, at least, will be found in which this great hope is expressed. But, besides this historical reason, there is also a dogmatical one. Can any one deny that Christ (in Matt. xxii. 43,) considered the 110th Psalm as a prophecy. The subterfuge of an argumentatio e concessis, resorted to on other occasions, if at any time admissible, is here completely cut off by the expression in πνευματι. If Christ had intended to dispute with the Scribes ex concessis, he could only have said, "How does David call him a lord?" But by the phrase in πνευματι, it is declared that David could utter this only in a higher state of inspiration. In relation to the 45th Psalm, I speak with less confidence than Rosenmüller, who, in the second edition of his Commentary, says, "in qua quidem allegoria deducenda et exornanda, (namely, the allegory of the union of the theocratic community with the Messianic King its bridegroom, under the image of earth-
ly love, John iii. 29, Ezek. xvi. 23), totum versatur canticum quod dicitur canticorum, cujus idem ac nostri Psalmis esse argumentum, apud sanos interpretes nulla est dubitatio. A close study of the Canticles must precede a decided judgment on this Psalm, and this I have not yet devoted to it. Meanwhile, it forms no valid objection against the allegory, that neither in the Psalm nor in the Canticles can everything admit of a spiritual meaning. In the mystical poems of the Arabians and Persians, which sing of union with God, and in the Hindu Gitagovinda, which celebrates the love of the soul to Rama, the poets delineate, with minuteness, the relations of the soul glowing with love, without intending to give a special meaning to each particular trait. On the other hand, I firmly believe that 2 Sam. vii. 14, is to be understood as a prophecy of the Messiah. The expressions there used are to be explained according to the law of prophetic language, that the family is considered as a whole, and is spoken of as an individual, while the matter of the prophecy either relates principally to one member of the race, or in different parts to different members. An everlasting posterity, and an everlasting dominion is promised to David; a paternal relation of God to their posterity, and that this posterity will found a house to the name of God. In a subordinate sense, this was fulfilled in the inferior offspring of David, in Solomon*—but in a complete sense by his pre-eminent descendant. All that is prophesied of the splendours and everlasting dominion of the house of David also has its peculiar fulfilment in the special individual Christ. The direct Messianic character of the glorious prophecy quoted in the eighth and tenth chapters of our Epistle from Jeremiah xxxi., and from Haggai 2, in chap. xii. require no further justification.

* The remarks of Hengstenberg in his Christologie, I. 91. 93, and of Sack's Apologetik, are most worthy of attention. The latter work deserves to be closely studied by expositors of the Old Testament,
We now proceed to the typical prophecies of the Old Testament. We shall first state in what sense we recognise the existence of such prophecies,—we shall then point out that the holy men of the New Testament cite the Old Testament in a typical manner,—and, lastly, we shall examine in what sense the New Testament writers held these typical prophecies to be inspired.

Types and typical prophecies, in a certain sense, all will acknowledge, who have obtained an organic view of history, as the passage quoted above from Billroth's Commentary expresses. The physiognomical family likeness of all great minds verifies itself here, since the greatest thinkers of the most different times have contemplated history in general in this light. This is what is intended by that well-known aphorism of Bacon, Historia prophetica genus est, &c.; to this also the expression of Novalis refers, "that the highest meaning of all history is when its events become divine allegories to mankind." And the saying of Hamann, "Biblical history is a prophecy which, through all ages, is fulfilled in the soul of every man." The New Testament teaches us to consider the Old Testament as a σκία τῶν μελλοντών ἀγαθῶν, and this constitutes the justification of typical things as well as typical words. Not only in outward appearance is the man preformed in the child, but also the expressions of the child are, in manifold ways, prophecies of what the man will become. If the Psyche of the New Covenant lives in the chrysalis of the Old Testament, it will now and then give signs of its vitality. If Old Testament circumstances and events are outward prefigurations of what must be fulfilled in a spiritual sense, the men placed in those relations would use expressions, which, in a higher sense, would be fulfilled in the representations of the New Covenant. The typical character of the men of the Old Covenant is shewn most clearly by the fact, that the Messiah bears the title of the other David. Jer. xxx. 9. Ezek. xxxiv.
24. xxxvii. 24, 25. Hosea iii. 5. From this point of view, then, no one can hesitate to allow a typical character to many expressions of the Old Testament. But here is the point of divergence which we have already hinted at, namely, whether such typical expressions, and, in short, the direct Messianic prophecies, are merely to be looked upon as the natural result of the preformative nature of the Old Testament institutions and history, or whether they must be considered as special immediate illuminations of prophetic men. We do not hesitate to ascribe such peculiar immediate illuminations to the prophets of the Old Covenant. An indisputable truth is implied in such formulæ as, "The Spirit of the Lord—or the hand of the Lord was upon me." Special moments of elevation were granted to the prophets, in which they were raised above their ordinary consciousness. Hence we believe it must be maintained, that the question, whether the prophecies were the result of the historical circumstances of Israel, or immediate inspirations, admits of no doubtful answer. The poet who, in troubled times, gives utterance to the mental throes of the age, certainly requires the special poetic excitement, yet his lament not the less proceeds from the actual circumstances in which he is placed. And so it is with the prophets. Israel, in all its institutions and its history, was a prophecy of the future; and where individuals prophesied, there the prophesying spirit, which lived in the very substance of the people, concentrated itself; as in a writer of genius, his individual great thoughts appear like lilies on the surface of the water, groundless and rootless, and yet are sustained by one common soil, so also the individual prophets of God's people are not to be regarded as scattered manifestations of the Divine Spirit, but rooted in one common soil, namely, in the prophetic subsistence of the nation itself and its institutions. This we assert of the prophecies in general; and, in saying it, have principally in view the direct prophecies. Even in these
but still more in the typical, we recognize a gradual progress, so that the immediate influence of the spirit is to be conceived as more or less strong, according as the prophecy is more or less founded on Old Testament materials. The expression in the Psalms, cited as typical: "The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up," requires no supposition of a special spiritual elevation of the poet in order to explain it; while such expressions as the bold hopes with which the 22d Psalm closes,—that the glory of the suffering theocratic king would be acknowledged by all the nations of the earth, and be recounted from generation to generation, or the expressions of the Psalmist, Ps. xl. 7, 8, which rise so far above the Old Testament standing point, that a self-sacrifice should be substituted for the sacrifices of beasts:—these can only be referred to a peculiar inspiration. Thus, then, a distinction presents itself to us, though only with fleeting points of contrast between such prophecies, which are the unconscious result of Old Testament circumstances, and such as were the product of a special inspiration.

We have undertaken, in the second place, to show that Christ and his Apostles acknowledged really typical prophecies; and this argument is directed especially against the view, according to which the citations we find in the New Testament, are considered as taken, here and there, from the Old Testament, with absolute arbitrariness and disregard of historical connection. For a person who is acquainted with Rabbinical hermeneutics, it is not necessary to prove that this allowed of a double sense, by means of which one and the same expression is correctly explained in the sense of its historical connection, and yet has another meaning contained under it, a οὔτοιοι. So that even if the Saviour and Apostles were considered as adopting the principles of the Rabbinical school, we should not be at liberty to say, if their application of Old Testament did not suit the connection, that they had falsely interpreted the Old Testament, but only that they had, incorrectly,
sought for a further reference concealed behind the immediate historical sense. Even that writer who has represented the Rabbinical manner of treating the Old Testament more on its dark than on its light side, (Dopke, I mean,) declares, though it would seem with reluctance, (p. 152). "Sometimes it cannot be denied that nothing farther can be said, than that its words are peculiarly suitable to this person or this event." But we have still, in relation to another class of expositors, to justify the opinion of typical quotations from the Old Testament in the New; namely, against those who think that the argumentative force of prophecy would be too much weakened if the references of Christ and his Apostle to the Old Testament are to be considered as only typical. Thus Stuart, as we have already mentioned, is a decided opponent of typical prophecies; Hengstenberg, also, was, at first, less favourable to this method of interpretation than at present appears to be the case. But if we adhere to the Redeemer himself, we believe it can be put out of all doubt that, in declaring that the Old Testament bore witness to him, he referred principally to its typical aspect. When, in Luke xxiv. 27, 44, 45, it is said that the Redeemer proved, to his disciples, the necessity of his sufferings and his glory from Moses and all the prophets, (Compare Acts xiii. 29; xvii. 3. 1 Cor. xv. 4. 1 Peter i. 11,) whence could he take such passages with a typical exposition? Must not John iii. 14, "As Moses lifted up the serpent, &c." be taken as a plain indication of our Lord's method on this occasion? There are two remarkable passages relative to this subject, which have not yet been noticed, Matt. xi. 14, and Mark ix. 13, in the latter it is said, ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ καὶ Ἡλιας ἐληλύθε, καὶ ἔσωθεν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐθέλησαν, καθὼς γεγραπται ἐν τῷ ἀυτῷ. First of all, these passages show that the Redeemer understood that which is said in Malachi iv. 5, of Elias, in a typical sense of him who, under the New Covenant, came in the spirit of Elias, Luke i. 17. Indeed, I know not
whether by that very singular expression in Matt. xi. 14, εἰσελήλθεν δεξαμεναί we are not justified in supposing that the Redeemer intended by this to intimate that that Old Testament prophecy principally had in view not one determinate individual, but only the power of repentance which must precede the preaching of the gospel, so that the sense of the expression, which does not occur elsewhere, is something like this, "if you are seeking the fulfilment of that word in one determinate individual, now behold the Baptist as the person so intended." Still more striking are the last words in the passage of Mark, καὶ γεφυράται ἵν' αὐτῷ. What is there in the Old Testament respecting the sufferings of John the Baptist? Can any one persuade himself that Christ would ever forcibly take a passage out of its connection and refer it directly to the Baptist? These words remain inexplicable as long as it is not admitted that Christ, as far as the idea of Elias was realized in the Baptist, looked upon the sufferings of the Old Testament Elias as a typical prophecy of those of his copy? a In perfect analogy with Christ's conduct on this occasion, is what he says in John xiii. 18, and xv. 25, that the words in Psalm xli. and lxix. were fulfilled in himself; or when, in Luke xxii. 37, he considers the words καὶ μετ' ἀνομίαν ἐλογίσθη as a γεγραμμένον, which was to be fulfilled in him, (see Dissertation II. on Isaiah lii.) Also in that last exclamation on the cross, Ἡλι, Ἡλι, λαμα σαβαχθανι, will such a typical reference be admitted,—not as if a reflection on his

a Von Meyer remarks, on this passage, "typically in the history of the real Elias." Hegesippus presents a very interesting parallel, where he speaks of James the Just, in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii. 23. After saying of him that he was distinguished by the titles, ὁ δικαιος, πρεσβύτερος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἡ ἅγιος, he adds, ἀς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῖ τις αὐτῷ. But where have the prophets prophesied of this James? But Hegesippus afterwards says, that in this James the saying of Isaiah was fulfilled, iii. 10, ἀγομένων τῷ δικαιοί, and therefore must have meant, that what the prophets said, in general, of the righteous, had been eminently realised in James.
own lot compared with David's had led the Redeemer to these words, but that, with the recollection of these words, a consciousness had, at the same time, been present of their typical character. And certainly all typical references of this kind are taken in their full significance only when the Old Testament saints, as well as those of the New, are considered as members of one and the same mystical Christ who is described in history.

Certainly the idea of the prophecies presented by these views, while organic and spiritual, becomes also less fixed than a rigid supranaturalism would desire. Yet it may shew convincingly, that neither the Redeemer himself, nor his Apostles, have proceeded on so rigid an idea of prophecy as has been attributed to them by a far too material supranaturalism. This more spiritual idea of prophecy shews itself also in this, that one and the same word of promise is applied with freedom to manifold and different phenomena, which yet can be ranged under one idea. The aged Simeon finds the prophecy of Isaiah, "A light to lighten the Gentiles," Luke ii. 32. fulfilled in the child Jesus; but Paul, knowing that the Apostles were the conveyers of that light, finds its fulfilment in the Apostles, Acts xiii. 47. When Peter, in Acts ii. 17—21. explains the language of Joel as fulfilled in the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, it certainly was not

* Only a few persons still retain the idea of prophecy in its ancient rigidness. Even in popular works, such as Otto von Gerlach's Commentary, we find on Matt. ii. 16. the following anti-material description of prophecy:—"The word *fulfil*, in there and other passages, is not to be understood as if the words quoted contained a prophecy which merely verified in the instance adduced. Rather, we should say, every divine expression contains a meaning which is *fulfilled* when that takes place which it expresses, either on a smaller or larger scale. Hence all the words of God, which collectively are in a certain sense prophecies, as long as the kingdom of God had not yet appeared, always become gradually, and with increasing brightness, fulfilled as the primary fulfilment, as in the instance of the people of Israel, is typical of a subsequent one."
his meaning that the prophecy he quoted was fulfilled only in that event indeed, what he says in ver. 19, 20. of natural phenomena, were not at that time literally fulfilled. No doubt, Peter employed the words of Joel in the same manner as he quoted the words of Christ, βαπτίζοντας εἰς πνεύματι ἅγιον, at the effusion of the Spirit on Cornelius (Acts xi. 16.): Peter was well aware that this promise of the Redeemer related primarily to the Apostles; but on another occasion, which harmonized in idea with the effusion of the Spirit on the Apostles, this word of the Lord was realized afresh. So also those expressions of Isaiah respecting hardening the hearts of the people. The same passage is four times quoted in the New Testament on different occasions. Matt. xiii. 14. John xii. 40. Acts xxviii. 26. Rom. xi. 8.; and even to the inhabitants of the island of Thule, the Apostle would have had no hesitation in saying, "πληροῦνται ὑμῖν τὸ ἔρθων ἤτοι τοῦ προφητοῦ," in case the state of their dispositions corresponded with that to which Isaiah refers. In this manner we would explain 1 Peter i. 25. where the prophetic expression, το ἐγείρα κυρίου μενει εἰς τὸν διων is boldly explained, as referring to the Gospel, in the words τὸτοὶ δὲ ἵστα ἐν ἐναγγελεῖν εἰς ὑμᾶς. The freedom with which, in these instances, reference is made to the expressions of the Old Testament, is equally applied to the form of the citations, when Christ (John vi. 45.), in order to prove that the Father inwardly teaches men, adduces the prophetic saying, "ἰσόν τι παντες διακτοι Ἡσου," with the general expression, ἵστα γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφηταις. We find a similar instance in John vii. 38. All these examples fall within the limits of typical prophecy, inasmuch as within the original fact to which the Old Testament language relates, those other cases to which it is applied are comprehended (subsumirt) and typified. Exactly in the same manner, John uses the language of the Redeemer himself, when, in chap. xvi. 9., he refers with an να πληγωβῇ to chap. xvii. 12., where
yet the discourse was only of spiritual prediction. But did John intend that the Saviour, in that saying, had in view the fact to which he himself applied it, or did he only mean to say, that the Saviour's words in this respect also might be considered as verified?

This leads us to a consideration of the third question we proposed, namely, What views were entertained by Christ and his Apostles of prophecy generally, and especially of such typical parallels? Immediately after a citation of this kind, Paul says, (Rom. xv. 4.) as if in order to justify it, that all things which are written in the Old Testament are written for the διδασκαλία of Christians, and, in accordance with this sentiment, he declares in 2 Tim. iii. 16, that every divinely inspired writing is profitable for διδασκαλία, for ἐλεγχός, &c. In 1 Cor. x. 11, Paul, after mentioning certain divine judgments recorded in Scripture, adds, that this also was designed for our νους εἰσια. The statements—in which, after all, no special reference is made to prophecy, do not imply that in the Old Testament passages, the cases to which they became applied were specially intended by the Holy Spirit, but only serve for our justification in making use of these portions of Scripture whenever they can be applied for instruction and admonition. Yet there are likewise other expressions which intimate a special intention of God in the Old Testament passages. In this view, 1 Cor. x. 9, 10, is worthy of particular notice. While the Apostle, in 1 Tim. v. 18, quotes the Old Testament precept, βοῦν αὐτῶν τα ἐφιμωσίς, merely as an instructive parallel, and leaves it to the reader by an inference ad minores, to deduce the lesson that the human labourer is still more worthy of his reward,—in the passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, he appears to wish by the question, "Doth God take care of oxen, or saith he it altogether for our sakes?" to intimate that God from the first had the intention that the expression should be applied to human labourers—nay, more, as if the oxen were not peculiarly the
objects of the divine design. This bold argumentation has led such interpreters as Jerome to go such lengths, that they have really believed the poor cattle were excluded by it from God's providence. I think, meanwhile, that the Apostle's language ought not to be interpreted too rigorously. By this form of expression he certainly means no more than what he says in 1 Tim. v. 18. The παντως, expresses no more than that the language may be applied with much greater propriety to men. This also must be allowed, for since the labouring cattle are included in one idea with labouring men, and the labouring man in himself stands in a higher rank, we can certainly say that the expression applies with much greater propriety to men. Accordingly, it would be agreeable to the Apostle's meaning if before the των βοών, we supplied a μονός, which, when a double question is asked, might be dispensed with. Another instance, whereby an apparently accidental expression, a ἐπτομεία intended by God is indicated, we find in John xi. 51. To suppose on this occasion something providential, does not oppose our knowledge of the people. We are wont, when an expression accidentally thrown out acquires, by the course of events, an important meaning, to say, "How remarkable that he should have expressed himself exactly in that manner!" Without doubt the Apostles, as well as Christ himself, considered a λέγειν ἐν πνεύματι, Matthew xxii. 43, as belonging to direct prophecies, 1 Peter i. 11; 2 Peter i. 21. But of all the instances hitherto mentioned which belong to the typical class, the following, I think, might be the correct view. Hamann says,

---

a It is indeed incorrect to take this expression as two separate questions; we have merely to place, as Lachmann does, a comma after ἐπειδή.

b An example of the opposite kind, where the Apostle expressly tells us that his meaning of the Old Testament passage was not intended, as is in Eph. v. 32, if we explain the ἐκ λαγων εις εις Χριστου (the ἐκ designedly prominent), to mean, "I, for my part, use this expression in reference to Christ."
"God has performed so many miracles, that we can acknowledge nothing more as natural." As now to the religious man the divine management appears every where in the kingdom of nature—but more especially where, on the one hand, his limited vision cannot discern the connection between cause and effect, and, on the other, where the teleological importance is particularly prominent, so it happens also in history. Nature and history have their luminous parts, where the Spirit that controls all things behind the curtain comes forth to view. And thus we think the consciousness of a divine intention in the typical parallels would be more or less strongly felt by the Apostles, according as the objects of agreement were more important, the wisdom of the end more visible, but the connection of cause and effect more hidden. As, in reference to the regular course of nature, we say at last, "It is all a marvel," so in reference to the accidental occurrences of history, we exclaim, "It is all design!" The result respecting the views held by the Apostles of the inspiration of typical prophecies, in its essential points, agrees with what we have given above as our own view.

If we now inquire what passages of the New Testament, and especially if our Epistle belong to the class hitherto spoken of, of typical prophecies, after what has been said, it is evident the difference between typical prophecy, and between support and adaptation is only transient. Every support and adaptation presupposes a parallel. The difference between this class and that of typical prophecy consists in this, that in accommodating the passages of Scripture, the notion of a ὑπόνοια intended by God is altogether abandoned, and the parallel is rather taken by the author than given by God. In ecclesiastical phraseology, there is an ambiguity in reference to the expression ἀλληγορία and Ἡσυχία or τροπολογία. Strictly speaking Ἡσυχία or τροπολογία was only a moral interpretation; but since it often
proceeded allegorically, it would be ranked under allegory, as, on the other hand, the \textit{αλληγορία} would be also called \textit{Σεβτία}. Hence, among the ancients, we find the work of Diodorus of Tarsus, with the interrogative title, \textit{τις διαφορὰ Σεβτίας καὶ αλληγορίας}; thus it will be doubtful whether the quotation in John ii. 17. (Acts xi. 16.) is to be considered as a type or mere adaptation. How the Apostle obtained his quotation, the term \textit{iωμέθη} plainly shows; the Old Testament was ever present to the minds of these holy men; they cited it for the most part (or as some think on all occasions), from memory; and in the small extent of the Pauline Epistles, we find no less than seventy-three quotations from the Old Testament. If an event occurred which agreed in idea with an Old Testament fact, in which it was as it were reflected, they had recourse to the scriptural expression, and whether the citation was an adaptation strictly speaking, or a typical prophecy, was determined, as we have before decided, according as the character and importance of the event gave more or less reason for presupposing a divine intention in the Old Testament expressions. In other parts of the New Testament, besides those already mentioned, we venture to consider the following passages as typical quotations: Mat. ii. 15, 18; xxvii. 9, 35. John iii. 14; xix. 24, 36. Acts i. 20; ii. 27—31.\footnote{Very recently \textit{Lengouke} has examined the meaning of the word \textit{Σεβτία} in the book \textit{de Ephraemi Syri actis hermeneutica}, and argued against Ernasti and Müller, who consider it equivalent to \textit{γραφολογία}, of which sense it commonly, though certainly not unusually, occurs.} In our Epistle we may decidedly

\footnote{The manner in which Peter here expounds the 16th Psalm, may in fact serve to prove that even those Psalms in which the Psalmist speaks of himself in the first person, were regarded by the Apostles as direct prophecies. Has not the Apostle, it may be said, here expressly declared that these words could not relate to David? Certainly. But if he wished to say, that the Holy Spirit, inspiring the Psalmist, animated him on this occasion with a hope so pre-eminent that it could not be fulfilled}
recount the quotation from Psalm xxii. in ch. ii. from Psalm xi. in ch. x., and with less confidence the quotation from the Ps. viii. in ch. ii., from Isaiah viii. 17, 18. and from Ps. xcvii. and cii. in ch. i. That the 22nd Psalm is to be reckoned pre-eminently in himself, must he not thus have expressed himself? This cannot be contradicted, and if so, this exposition of Peter cannot be brought as a counter-proof. We must rather assume that David, in a moment of elevation in ἑρωικός, expressed in surpassing terms what God would do for his holy ones, which reached far beyond his own historical standpoint, and was only fulfilled in the "Holy One," ἐξ ἐξωθήκης. In assuming such a peculiar elevation of the Psalmist, in Psalm xvi. we are opposed by the latest interpreters of the Psalms. Already De Wette has found, in the closing words of the 17th Psalm, the Christian doctrine of the resurrection; the latest expositor, Ewald, says, that in our Psalm, the doctrine of the resurrection is deducible from it, in a still more remarkable manner. "The hope, v. 9—11. is so much higher than that with which Psalm xvii. closes, as this whole later Psalm stands higher; the truth which there lies closed up, here unfolds into full bloom, and there is hardly a more beautiful or clearer expression, the whole futurity of individual man than this, (v. Ewald's "Die poetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes erklärte. Zweiter Theil. Die Psalmen, Göttingen," 1835, p. 142.) If this expression of such high expectations stands insulated in this Psalm, this would be a proof that it was composed in ἑρωικός. That Peter grounds his argument only on the LXX. and that ἀνθρώπινος may be an incorrect translation of ἑρωικός is, with respect to the point in question, a matter of indifference. Meanwhile, it may be remarked, that according to the prevailing opinion, the Galilean fisherman first learned Greek on his missionary travels, and, therefore, must have delivered this discourse on the day of Pentecost, not in Greek but in Aramaic. If this were the case, then either must ἑρωικός have been used in Palestine in the sense of "corruption," as the Chaldee translator of the Psalms appears to have understood it, or his argument would have been valid with the meaning "grave." Still the prevalent opinion, that Peter's discourse was delivered in the Chaldee language is not certain, since the greater number of the hearers consisted of Jews from foreign parts. Hence, what I said in the Introduction, on the use of Greek among foreign Jews, must be considered, and the interpretation of the Apostle will require another kind of justification.
among the typical Messianic Psalms, is justified not only by the fulfilment of various details in it, but also by its close, which rises so far above David’s personal position, and as a strictly historical composition is scarcely conceivable. Still more remarkable, if possible, is the fortieth Psalm. The same king who had established the Mosaic sacrificial system in all its extent, declares that he saw into the true meaning of the law, which required not outward sacrifices, but self-sacrifice! Schleiermacher views this Psalm as a typical prophecy, and likewise a support for the peculiar thoughts of the New Testament writer, in his sermon, “the perfecting sacrifice,” on Heb. x. 12. (the fifth sermon of the seventh series; “our author, (he says,) begins with quoting expressions of the Old Testament, as referring to the appearance of the Redeemer in this world, which the Redeemer, as it were, must have uttered on his entrance into this world.” The eighth Psalm also, our author has probably taken typically, induced by the expression παρ’ ἀγγέλους. Especially if we take into account what the latest expositor of the Psalms has been the first to remark, that this Psalm relates to the history of the creation and the original condition of man, the typical application will be more strongly justified, inasmuch as Christ is the second Adam, in whom the original destination of man will be completed. The Author, however, quotes the expression in the form of a proof. As to the three remaining citations, we can indeed put them in the class of typical passages, and must then explain them somewhat as De Wette has done in the treatise already referred to.* But

* On the symbolic and typical method of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 16. “The Theocratic king and the Messiah are related to one another, as the copy and the original (Abbildung und Urbild), and inversely Jehovah and the Messiah, as the original and the copy; and what is true of the one is true of the other. Jehovah was the invisible King of the Theocracy, and his representative the actual reigning king of the Israelites; between both, connecting the invisible and the visible, stands the Messiah, as equally God and Man. He differed from the
though these quotations may in this manner be justi-
fied, they still wear more than any other the appear-
ance of being arbitrary. The citation from the
97th Psalm may still be justified, since this Psalm re-
fers to a time when the kingdom of God will be
spread through the whole earth by the Messiah.
The other quotations can hardly be justified, if we
consider them as more than mere adaptations.
Still the suspicion arises that the Author intended,
as it would seem, to produce proof by those citations,
in the first and second chapters. If we cannot make
up our minds to consider citations collectively as di-
rect prophecies, the adduction of proofs would seem of
a doubtful quality. The supernaturalist Theologians
of the older school, like the Rationalists, would ask
indeed—What can be proved by mere parallels?
Yet let us consider that this objection takes a wide
range. If, indeed, we must not only allow that many
citations of the Apostles, as, for instance, John xix.
36., are yet unquestionably of a merely typical kind,
but that also the Old Testament passages which
were present to the mind of the Redeemer when
(John v. 46.) he referred to Moses, and when (Luke
xxiv. 27. and 44, 46.) he shewed from the contents
of the Old Testament, his sufferings and his resurrec-
tion, might be, at least for the most part, only typical,
we must either charge him with having made use of
insufficient proofs, or give a wider measure to the idea
of proof as well as of prophecy. We must certainly
admit that parallels belong in a wider sense to the de-
partment of proof. Is it not shown how effective for

common kings in perfectly performing the will of God, whom
they served only imperfectly, and deified humanity (die mensch-
vorgöttliche); and differed from Jehovah, by bringing to full
perfection the divine agency on earth, which, in the relation of
Jehovah to his people, was only discernible in imperfect medi-
ations, and humanified the Deity (Die Gottheit vormensch-
lichte). Hence it is clear, that whatever is said in the Old
Testament of the (Jewish) kings as God's representatives, as
well as what is said of Jehovah, as far as he was a revealing
and mediating God, may be affirmed of the Messiah."
conviction they may be, by the analogies from nature, for the phenomena of the spiritual world, of which we have spoken in p. 188? Alone, indeed, they are not sufficient, but rather presuppose acknowledgment of the thing to be verified; hence we must ascribe to them rather a persuasive than a convincing power. As to the instances of which we are here speaking, it should be observed that there was already in the readers an acknowledgment of the higher dignity of Christ; and since they had this, so they certainly would not refuse to allow the reference of such passages to him which he had the authority to apply to himself. In this manner our author (xiii. 6,) puts into the mouth of Christians what they are authorised to say. Thus the Baptist transfers immediately to himself what Isaiah had said, and says "I am the voice of him who cries in the desert," &c. Thus Christ, without hesitation (supposing Is. lixi. to be the language of the Prophet), appropriates the language to himself, and addresses it to the people of his own times, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, &c." Luke iv. 18. Hence it is apparent that the difference between the department of proving by typical passages, and of accommodation, is unfixed.

We pass on to supports and adaptations. As we have already said this department includes such parallels in which the author is conscious of applying at pleasure the Old Testament passages. The quotation from Dopke in p. 195, might suffice to show that this mode of citation is also current among the rabbinical theologians. The expression support, we employ principally where the form of expression plainly shows that the citation is only a substratum for the author's own thoughts, where it is woven into the discourse without any former quotation, or after it has been introduced with a form of quotation, serves as a warp (stamen) for the woof (subtegment) of the author's own thoughts. On the other hand, we call it adaptation in the special sense, the citation of a parallel with a direct form of quotation. These
two classes become mingled with one another. When the Speaker, instead of interweaving the Old Testament *dictum* in his discourse, requires it to be read separately, as Matt. ix. 13; xxi. 16, which is likewise a usual mode of quotation in rabbinical writers; likewise passages where the citation is woven into the writer's own discourse by a parenthetical *kata to γεγραμμένον*, as 1 Cor. i. 31, ii. 9; Rom. xv. 3. Allusive citations of the Old Testament we find in Rom. x. 6—8, 13, 18; xi. 34, 35; xii. 20. Eph. iv. 8—10, 26, v. 14—31; particularly in Peter, 1 Peter ii. 10, 24; iii. 10, 12, 14, 15; iv. 18; v. 7. The same kind of allusion—called by Calvin *ἀναφορά ῥητορικα*, is principally found in Romans x. 6—8. Eph. iv. 8—10. In the class of adaptations, (where nevertheless several instances might in the mind of the author be considered as typical prophecies,) are the following passages, besides some already mentioned, Matt. xiii. 35; xxvi. 31. John ii. 17. Acts (i. 20, 21); xiii. 41. Rom. xi. 8—10. 1 Cor. ix. 9. (xiv. 21.) 2 Cor. vi. 2; viii. 15. A transient use of Scripture in this manner, as has been remarked by Goethe, is founded in the innermost nature of every believer. By every new event, which has a parallel in Scripture, the divine Word is, as it were, always verified afresh. Thus we find this method of employing Scripture with more or less skill from the Apostolic Fathers down to Hamann. We will adduce only a few examples, which are at hand, particularly in reference to the mode of citation, since, from these a person, if he did not decidedly know the opposite, must conclude that the reference was to typical prophecies,—a hint to be kept in view in biblical citations. The examples are from that pompous πανω-

---

*a* To this class belong also the words with which the Redeemer repelled Satan in the Temptation, though they are there introduced with a special form of quotation. As we have there the idea of temptation individualised by three facts, so the idea of the opposing religious principle is individualised by three texts of Scripture.
γυμνος of Ezechiæus on the occasion of building the church at Tyre, Hist. Eccles. x. 4. He there says of those who exposed themselves to all hazards, in order to effect the building of the church; ὡς τὰς παλαις στηλαις ἱερας καταγραφεῖσας προβῆσις, ἵνα πιστας ὁμολογιῶσαι (the divine word is thereby again verified, and therefore so much the more credible,) δι’ ἀναφορας τοις ἁγίους ἐπιλεγμεναι λογος, ἀπαρχαι ταδε περὶ αὐτῶν ἀποφαινομένος: "ὑμὼν ἑστασάντο οἱ ἀμαρτωλοι. ἐνετιναυς τοις οὐτῶν." κτλ. Farther on he says: καὶ τοιχεὶ ἐν τοιοις προαναφοροὶν "κυριε, ἐν τῇ πόλει σου τὴν εἰκὼνα αὐτῶν ἐκουσάνωσες," ἄληθες ὡς ὁ ἅγιος οὕτως πανταῖς ἀναπεφέρατο. And speaking of the spiritual desolation of that Church, he says, it would be so changed, ὡς ἀναφορας αὐτῇ τιν ἀγαθον ἑρεμίαν Ἑσαίου ταῦτα: εὑρεθηκεν ἐρμος διψώσα, κτλ.

Among the instances of support in our Epistle must be reckoned chap. ii. 6—9, where the words from the eighth Psalm form the warp, (Aufzug,) for the development of the author’s train of thought, and to this we may, perhaps add, with Calvin, the citation in chap. xi. 25. That great expositor generally handles passages of this kind with great acuteness. On chap. ii. 6, he makes the following observation; respondeo, non fuisse propositum Apostolo, genuinam verborum expositionem referre. Nihil enim est incommodi, si allusiones in verbis quærat, ad ornamentum praestent causam. Quemadmodum Paulus quum Rom. x. 6, testimonium citat ex Mose: quis ascendat in caelum etc., statim non interpretationem sed exornationem attexit de caelo et infernis etc. Passages from the Old Testament are interwoven with the Apostle’s language without any form of quotation in chap. iii. 2; x. 37, 38; xii. 14, 15: xiii. 6. Parallels with a καθως γεγραμμεναι or ινα πληγωθη, as in other parts of scripture, are not usual in our author, yet we may reckon as such ch. iii. 15, and x. 30.

In connection with the objection that, in our Epistle, citations from the Old Testament are arbitrarily made; another, allied to it, should be noticed,
that the writer takes an unwarrantable liberty with Old Testament words, and this also may be traced back to the influence of the Rabbinical school, in which מְדִינָה, that is to be minutieux, was to the credit of an interpreter. In answering this objection, we must be a little more diffuse. We here meet with a remarkable divergency of opinion in ancient and modern times. While the older, especially the Lutheran interpreters, transferred the same meaning which the Old Testament citations had in the New Testament, in their full extent, to the corresponding passages in the Old Testament, modern interpreters, since Köppen, have animadverted on the want of hermeneutical tact in the Apostles. An unfortunate use has been made of Augustin’s saying; distingue tempora et concordabit scriptura. This saying has, apparently, been proved to be not simply but doubly false: for, while that ancient school have arrived at Augustin’s results, they have neglected his method: non distinguedo tempora concordabit scriptura; the moderns have copied his method, without arriving at his results, probe enim distinguedo tempora, non concordabit scriptura. Where acuteness is wanting, men see only points of similarity; where profundity is wanting, they see only discrepancies. When interpreters are destitute of spiritual freedom, all difference between the Old and New Testament vanishes; where there is freedom without the spirit, a yawning chasm opens between the two, over which no philological or historical erudition can throw a bridge. The pneumatical interpretations here gives the truth, which, indeed, thankfully receives the indications of the difference, but also strives to indicate in the difference of the reference the unity of the idea, (that is, of the spirit,) in the difference of the ἐνυος the unity of the διάνωa. It is certainly true, that a Paul ad- duces many citations where the Old Testament dictum falls short of the New Testament factum, or where the New Testament factum falls short of the Old Testa- ment dictum. When it is said of Abraham’s faith, in
the announcement of the blessing of his seed, "it was counted to him for righteousness," and Paul proves therefrom, that in the Old Testament the righteousness of faith was taught, the New Testament factum goes beyond the Old Testament dictum. And, on the other hand, when he adduces in proof that the preaching of the Gospel sounded far and wide (in Rom. x. 18.), the passage from the Psalms, ἵνα πᾶσα ὁμοιγενής πᾶσα ἐν πάσῃ αὐτῷ, here again the amplitude of the Old Testament dictum exceeds that of the New Testament factum. But whoever, on account of such incongruities, is disposed to pity the Apostle that he could not enjoy the privilege of hearing the late Dr. Keil's Lectures on Hermeneutics at Leipzig, may spare his sympathy, for it is to be feared that, in this instance, such instruction would have been thrown away. In the case of Hamann, at least, who had the advantage of being born in highly-educated Prussia, the instructions of M. Kuntzen, so celebrated in all departments of Philosophy, and also in Hermeneutics, had no visible good effect. On the so called Rabbinical Hermeneutics, which Paul follows, I have already spoken in the Essay in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1835, Part II., and will only quote from it a dictum of Hamann, since it not only makes use of the Old Testament in a manner so remarkably parallel to the Pauline method, but may be placed as a motto over investigations of this kind, comprising, as it does, the substance of what is to be said on the subject; "since Moses places the life in the blood, all the baptized Rabbies shudder at the spirit and life of the prophets, whereby the literal sense, as a darling child, is sacrificed, εν παραβολή (Heb. xi. 19.), and the stream of Eastern wisdom is changed into blood."* If, in any other respect what-
ever, the dependance of the Apostles on the education of their times is discernible, it certainly is most of all in this their method of taxing the letter, and of deducing arguments and important consequences from particular points in the form of the Old Testament expressions, on which, according to our convictions, the original author laid no stress. Meanwhile, let us consider how much depends on the art and method of employing this interpretation. Whether the interpretation err or not, depends entirely on whether it deduces from the γῆμα or γραμμα what is not at all contained in it, κατὰ διανοιαν or κατὰ πνημα; or aims to extract from the γῆμα or γραμμα what it contains only κατὰ διανοιαν or κατὰ πνημα. Only the first merits, in an unfavourable sense, the name of rabbinical interpretation; and to this class belongs the wide extent of those cabalistic interpretations, of which the New Testament contains not a trace,—namely, the deducing of mysteries from the use at blood, but, according to Moses, ‘in the blood is the life.’ Jewish Rabbies, who cannot recognise the life in the blood, shudder at the life in the prophets (confessedly the mass of the Jewish scribes had not much to do with the prophets, but only with the Thorah (law),) and so it is with the baptized Rabbies in reference to the baptized Prophets. Their darling child is the literal meaning; they see only this in the prophets, and in this also only the material blood, without guessing at the life it contains. But whoever wishes to understand the prophets, and to find the life in the offensive blood, he must, like Abraham, offer up his darling child; and that in a double sense, ἑαυτὸς ἐλαυνόμενος; at a ‘bold venture,’ and taking ‘the letter as the parable of the Spirit.’ Thus it is in all books of Eastern wisdom,—but in these, especially, the water of the literal sense must be changed into the blood of the spiritual sense, which indeed is a miracle that it requires the rod of Moses to perform. This spiritual sense is blood, but only such as is identical with the life.’ Truly one cannot read such a sentence of the Northern Magician, without thinking of the cathedrals of ancient times which were scattered over the land, and when every door-post, with its symbolic anagrams, detained the beholder for hours; and how striking that this Christian Rabbi, and the enlightened Moses Mendelsohn, came into the world, not only in the same century, but almost in the same year,—the latter in 1729,—the former in 1730.
and position of single letters, or from their numerical value. (See the Introduction, p. 91.) The argumentation of Paul in Gal. iii. 16. would come nearest to such arbitrariness, where, as modern expositors have maintained, he has, in defiance of grammatical laws, inferred from the singular ὁπιγμα what cannot be inferred from it. See the Appendix to this Dissertation. But the second case of taxing the letter is something quite different. It is indeed, confessedly, the character of what is ingeniously said, when the interpreter, even in the form of the words—which naturally can only be the manifestation of the essence of the thought—detects the thought, only he cannot see as intended what is really not so. Indeed, we are so indulgent, as not to deprive him of the praise of ingenuity, when he—bordering on that cabalistic art—(it being supposed that it is done with ability and a consciousness of what he is about) in spite of the language, forces out of the words what lies only in the thought. Ingeniosi videtur, says Cicero, vim verbi in aliud, atque ceteri accipiant ducere posse. We are reminded of the etymologies of the Stoics and of our modern philosophy, according to which meinen, to mean, intend, signifies what is only mein (mine), and not all-gemeine (common to all); auf-heben, conservando tollere, &c. Such a citation of the Apostle, where he places in the word what lies only in the fact, and where no intelligent person can hesitate to call his conduct in the highest degree ingenious, is his making use of the inscription αὐγῳστῳ Νεφ., Acts xvii. 23. (See the Appendix to this Dissertation.) Of the same kind are also some interpretations in our Epistle, particularly those in chap. ii. 9.; iv. 4—10.; x. 5—10.; xi. 13. What our Author deduces from these passages κατα ἔγιμα, lies certainly not in the words themselves, if taken strictly according to their historical connection,—nevertheless, our exposition will have shewn, that in iv. 4—10. and x. 5—10., the application κατα διανωσα has not missed the sense of
the passages. Hardly so much as this can be affirmed of chap. ii. 9. and xi. 13. As to the passage from the Psalms, the leading thought on which it depends, namely, that the ideal of humanity becomes first realized in Jesus, has in it a real point of connection; but in the application which he makes of the παρ' ἄγγελον and ἐξάρχει φι, his translation has misled him, and so far the passage is again to be brought under consideration.—In order to form a well-grounded opinion of the expression respecting the patriarchs, chap. xi. 13., in which he speaks of their earthly life as being that of pilgrims and strangers, we must go further, and investigate fully what were the expectations of these persons relative to a life on the other side the grave. We can give here only a few hints on this subject. The expression, “gathered to their fathers,” denotes a continuance after death, but does not determine that it would be a happy one. Yet must it not be assumed, that those who stood the highest among the Old Testament saints had an anticipation of future happiness? If we consider the matter psychologically, it will be admitted, that it is not probable that persons of Abraham’s disposition would believe that at death all was over. If we add to this Christ’s declaration, John viii. 56., we cannot hesitate to Abraham some expectation of a Messianic advent. Here it is to be considered whether we may admit that what does not appear as doctrine among the Israelites till the time of the captivity, made its appearance as an anticipation in the minds of individuals,—whether the strength of the divine life in certain minds became predictive of the future. This is in fact the view, which, as we have seen above, Ewald has taken in reference to the author of the 16th Psalm, and with still greater reason, as it appears to us, De Wette in reference to the 17th Psalm. If some traditions were spread among the people like those of Enoch, (whom God, because he walked with God, took to himself) would not they suffice to awaken
anticipations in minds strongly fixed on the invisible, which would go far beyond the general expectations? More than this, the latest critical opinion by Hitzig, has thrown some doubt on what modern critics have expressed, undoubtedly, that the section Isaiah 24—27, belongs to the period of the exile, and has assigned these prophetic expressions to the time of Nahum. Now, if this section does not belong to the period of the exile, we have in ch. xxv. 8, (especially according to Hitzig's Comment.) and xxvi. 19, a striking proof how faith in the resurrection, and the happiness succeeding to it, developed itself without external information in the minds of prophetic men under the influence of God's spirit. Thus then, the supposition of anticipations of a happy futurity, either immediately after death or below the Sheol in individual inspired Israelites, is not made at random, and if so, our author cannot be refused the right to find in the words, which the Patriarch uttered respecting his toilsome earthly pilgrimage, anticipations of a better hope beyond the grave. Meanwhile, those persons who cannot make up their minds to allow the Patriarchs such anticipations, may suppose with Schlichting, (see our Commentary on xi. 13,) that the author interpreted the Old Testament words _ex suo sensu_, as he actually does, when in the same chapter, ver. 10, he explains the living of the Patriarchs in moveable tents, as an indication of their knowledge of a better home. Does not the Redeemer adopt the same method, when he described the anointing by the woman in Matt. xxv. 12, as done for his ἱναφωμος, while the woman herself certainly had not that event in view?

---

* That the lawgiver of Israel, Moses, knew of a happy immortality, is considered as indubitable by those who credit the accounts given by Herodotus respecting the most ancient Egyptian faith; compare especially Kant's Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft, (Religion within the bounds of mere reason,) p. 187. De Wette, Bibl. Dogm. p. 113. Yet that Herodotus, on these points, is to be depended upon, may admit of a doubt.
II. THE USE MADE OF THE SEPTUAINT VERSION

INSTEAD OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT.

Throughout all ages we find two classes of minds, that of the realists and that of the idealists; those belonging to the former believe that they possess only what may be indicated by the letter, the latter what is indicated by the spirit; and this last mental tendency may again be distinguished into the Scholastic-discursive and the Mystic-intuitive. If the literal tendency is pushed to its utmost length, it would no longer be thought sufficient to possess a written revelation, there must be a constant interpreter of it in writing; it would not be enough to have an inspired original text; there must also be an inspired translation; it would not be enough to have inspired words, an inspired punctuation would be requisite. One sees whoever lays a stress upon the letter, must stop somewhere in his demand for tangible evidence: the difficulty is on what point to fix. That realistic tendency is met by difficulties at every step; and if all other points were settled, there remains at last the host of forty thousand New Testament readings, to say nothing of those of the Old, of which 331 are mentioned by De Rossi in Genesis alone, and he professed not to collect all, like Kennicott, but only the most important. On the other hand, it is equally certain that the spirit which has no body, would not be the thing for us, and if in the region of the letter without the spirit, we should be choaked by the thick vapour—in the region of the spirit without the letter, we should die as under an exhausted receiver. Thus then, nothing remains for us but to seek for a golden mean between the preference of the letter and that of the spirit. In what way is it to be attained? It must be the joint result of dogmatic theology and exegesis. If the requirement of the former, that divine truth presupposes a credible witness of it, must direct exegesis on the one hand, so, on the other hand, what is obtained as the unquestion-
able result of exegesis, must exercise an influence on the extent of the idea of inspiration. And we must always bear in mind, that the transition of the degrees of inspiration usually escape our eyes; see the remarks in the Introduction, p. 97.

To the advocates of the letter, it must always appear a most striking phenomenon, which they have tried as long as possible to deny, that the Apostles, instead of citing the original text of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, have cited a translation; and so much the more, when it can be shown, that this translation has come down to us in a critical condition, which, even to the present time, has been regarded as a problem, and that its departure from the original text is greater than any modern version since the Reformation, unless we except the first attempt at a French translation, that of Olivetan. And still more striking must it be, when at last it is found that generally those passages from the Old Testament, whether they are taken from the translation or immediately from the original text, were merely quoted from memory. Yet, however great persons may imagine the influence of this proceeding to be, when they hear these results expressed in abstracto, it is by no means such. Indeed, it is a remarkable circumstance, that although, according to appearance, the body of the New Testament writers make use of the Septuagint Version, nevertheless, when the text of that version, at least as it has come down to us—departs entirely from the meaning of the original text, and is sometimes quite without meaning, (for instance compare Rom. x. 15. with Isaiah lii. 7.) either they make use of another translation, or translate the original independently; compare Mat. ii. 15. John xix. 37. Rom. ix. 17, 33; x. 15; xii. 19. 1 Cor. xiv. 21; xv. 55. Neither in the Gospels, nor in the Pauline Epistles do we remember a passage in which, by adherence to the Septuagint, the Old Testament text is essentially injured. The departure of the Septuagint, from what, according to our exegesis, is
the correct translation, is sometimes also great in those cases in which Paul in a remarkable manner adheres closely to it, as Rom. ix. 27, but the sense which the Greek version gives in the passage there cited, agrees also with that given by our Exegesis. Thus, consequently, only the thought in the passage cited from memory, could be deemed of value. In this respect the writers of the New Testament always allow themselves much greater licence than a Mahommedan, for instance, is wont to do. Their interpretation of the passage they convey in the citation itself, as Matt. ii. 6. xxvii. 9. Rom. x. 7. Elsewhere, only the Old Testament in general is cited, or the Prophets; sometimes so, that no passage in the Old Testament can be pointed out, corresponding verbally, John vii. 38. Luke xi. 49. Matt. ii. 23. (on this text, see Jerome) James iv. 5. Eph. v. 14. (?) In very many, indeed, in most cases, by quoting from memory, the passage is verbally altered, sometimes so, that the variation, as is the case with this in 1 Cor. ii. 9. (Eph. v. 14.) has occasioned the supposition that the citation belongs to some apocryphal book. Also, frequently, several passages are joined in one, Matt. xxi. 5. Romans xi. 26, 27. 2 Cor. vi. 16—18. In some cases both these are united—incorrect quotation and the blending of several passages in one; sometimes a various reading, or a small error of translation in the Septuagint. So in a passage where one least expects it, namely, Luke iv. 18, 19; in the scene here narrated, Christ must necessarily have read the beginning of Isaiah lxi. consecutively; yet in the Greek text of Luke some words from Isa. lviii. 6. are found,—some appear to have fallen out,—and, besides all this, according to our text, an incorrect translation of the LXX. καὶ τυφλοῖς αναθάλασσιν. Yet with regard to the sense of the expression, the freedoms taken by the Evangelist in the quotation have made not the least difference. The free method with which the first publishers of the Gospel use the Old Testament, necessarily leads us
to the admission, that their faith in the inspiration of
the Old Testament passages made a distinction be-
tween the letter and the spirit; or, when they did not
do this intentionally, the spirit that inspired them led
them unconsciously to this distinction. Exactly the
same appearance meets us, when we see with what
freedom the Apostolic Fathers, and those of the first
age, quote passages from the New Testament, not-
withstanding their faith in its inspiration.8 Clement
of Alexandria says expressly, that in his quotation, he
paid more regard to the sense than to the words of
Scripture. Here, then, we must recognise a guide
for our proceedings, especially in deciding such cases
as occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the
Greek translation quoted differs in such a manner
from the text of the Old Testament, as to produce a
modification of the sense.

As we have remarked in the Introduction, our
Epistle differs from the Pauline in this respect, that
its citations are unequally close, and in the longer
passages agree quite verbally with the Septuagint.

8 The investigations lately made by Credner, for critical pur-
poses, first in his treatise, "De Librorum N. T. Inspiratione,
Jena, 1828," have led to some interesting remarks on the views
of the first Christians respecting the inspiration of the Apo-
stles; and in his "Beiträge," he has since brought forward the
question, whether the Apostolic Fathers cited the New Testa-
ment writings as sacred. He decides in the negative, and en-
deavours to shew that the first Christians made no difference
between themselves and the Apostles, in reference to the par-
ticipation of the Spirit. In this last respect he certainly avers
too much; and, on the first point, he expresses several critical
judgments with too great confidence. But, in general, his as-
sertions have truth on their side, and lead to the interesting
remark, that the first Christians, even when they had not a
sacred letter before them, must have been preserved, from insisting
on the form of the expressions of Christ and his Apostles.
For although a number of Christ's expressions were of so in-
flexible a form, that this could not easily be stripped off with-
out doing injury to the contents, and though such expressions
became only a little altered by oral tradition, this was not the
case with all.
The citation in chap. x. 30. is the only one that forms an exception. Our Epistle also, in two important passages, chap. x. 5. and ii. 7. has followed the Greek version closely, although, according to our existing text, it is essentially defective: as similar errors of translation may be also adduced, chap. xi. 21. εἰς τὸ ἀχρόν τῆς ἁςδου, and xiii. 15. καὶ ἔλεος. Much has been said of the difference in chap. x. 5. Yet we venture, agreeably to what we have adduced on the passage, to consider as decided, that the sense of the Psalmist has been as little altered by the Greek translator as when, in Hosea xiv. 3., he translated according to the reading יַעַר, where we have יַעַר. The citation in chap. ii. 7. is not altogether similar, as we have remarked above, in p. 34. In reference to this, it must be acknowledged that our Author has been led, through the translation, to an application not corresponding to the Old Testament text. According to the general principles we have laid down relative to the inspiration of the Apostles, we have no hesitation in acknowledging this. Thus also, in chap. xi. 21., the translation of the Seventy, which the Author follows, must be considered as erroneous. As to importance, this error stands in the same category as when Matthew (chap. xxii. 5.) quotes, according to the Hebrew, εἰς ὑποειράσειν καὶ πῶλον νεον, and refers this to the two animals on the occasion of Christ's entering Jerusalem. Whilst—even according to Hengstenberg, in expounding the passage of the Prophet—the γι only serves here for a climax, and of course the language applies only to one, as John also only mentions the animal on which the Redeemer rode, and hence freely quotes it, εἰς πῶλον νεον. Thus when Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 55., leaves the Alexandrian version, as it is unintelligible, and, according to his own view, translates יַעַר by εἰς νικος, which can scarcely be considered as the correct rendering; and so in other examples.
III. THE TYPICAL EXPOSITION OF HISTORY.

Typical exposition relates either to words or facts. Of the typical interpretation of Old Testament expressions, we have already spoken. As to facts, they are either institutions or historical events. Of the most distinguished class of typical institutions we shall speak in the Second Dissertation, in treating of the Jewish Sacrifices and Priesthood; so that, in this place, we have only to say a few things concerning the typical treatment of history, more particularly the interpretation given in chap. vii. of the history of Melchisedec, and perhaps, also, in reference to Abel, chap. xii. 24. on which passage the older typology lays considerable stress. We shall here be brief, after what we have already said; although, in the prevalence of type in history and mythology, much has been said that is truly profound; and, at the same time, much that is arbitrary and visionary; many proofs of both one and the other may be found in Kanne’s “Christ in the Old Testament,” and Moltitor’s “Philosophy of History.” Beck’s views agree most nearly with our own. As we have said above, of prophecy; it is not the image of the future reflected into the past by a concave mirror, but rather the future which germinates out of the past; so also that view of historical types is to be rejected which will comprehend them only from the future. They are to be comprehended by observing that, in the history of the Patriarchs and of the Jewish people, certain conditions were fixed, by which images of

-- See also Sack’s Apologetik, pp. 180, 215. This learned writer was probably in the right, when he considered a typology to be necessary “to the complete organism of exegetical theology.” His own labours were preceded only by the defective works of Michaells and Hiller. Some interesting hints may be found in Von Meyer, and in the 10th volume of his “Blätter für höhere Wahrheit.” A sketch of typology is given, but we perceive a want of strict criticism and diligence in the execution.
the future must spontaneously arise. This view has been already given in an essay by De Wette, "Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Hebraismus," in the "Studien" of Daub and Kreuzer, iii. 244. "Long before Christ, the world in which he was to appear was prepared: the whole Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and who did come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw, in spirit, long before-hand, the coming of Christ, and had presages of the new doctrine in prophetic anticipations, varying in clearness. The typological comparison of the Old Testament with the New, was no unmeaning amusement. And it is scarcely a mere accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important points, runs parallel with the Mosaic."

Accordingly, typology errs in proportion as it attaches itself only to individual points in the Old Testament, which do not stand in an organic, but only in an outward relation to New Testament facts. The true nature of typology is shown by an expression in the Apocalypse, xi. 8, ἡ τις καλεῖται σπνεύματικως Σοδομα και Αίγυπτος; compare 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, where σπνεύματικως is likewise taken by several critics in the sense of "typically." Historical typology has, indeed, for its object to display the interior, the spirit of the Old Testament historical appearances, and to combine them with those of the New. The same terminus is employed for marking typical interpretation in the

* Lately, Braunschweig in his "history of the world," has allowed too great a predominance to this outward typology. In pointing out parallels between the different periods of history, or between history and nature, we must be very cautious, and oftentimes satisfy ourselves with mere general outlines. It is similar to prognostication of the weather; men may forecast respecting the larger portions of the year, without discredit, but not for only weeks and days. Augustine has given a warning respecting arbitrary historical typology, that it must not be considered as a spiritus propheticus, but only a conjectura mentis humanae quam aliquando ad verum pervenit, aliqua quando fallitur. De Civ. Dei, xviii. 52.
Greek, Latin, and Syrian churches. The example of typical interpretation which our author presents in the 7th chap. certainly is an example of genuine typology. For in fact, in the relation of that Melchizedec to the Levitical priesthood is expressed the relation in which Christ also stands to the priesthood. But this striking comparison is not confined to one occasion by our author, for he also deduces it from a passage in the 110th Psalm, (See Heb. v. 10.) As we have remarked in the commentary, our author has not availed himself of all the points of resemblance; but if it should nevertheless appear to many persons that he has already gone too far in the interpretation, let it be recollected that the type may serve for a parable, and render assistance in the contemplation of abstract truths.

* On the use of Διαφύσις among the Syrians, see Winemann's *Hora Syriaca*, I. 55. This Italian scholar, born in Spain, of English parents of German origin, has enumerated in his works not less than 45 expressions, by which the Syrians designate a type. If these expressions were submitted to closer examination in a fuller treatise on the subject, it would contribute to set in a clear light the views entertained of types by the Syrian school of interpreters. Compare on this subject, Lengerke *de Ephraemi Syri harmen*, p. 169, sq.
APPENDIX TO DISSERTATION I.

ON THE HERMENEUTICS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL, WITH A
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GAL. iii. 16.*

We must begin with entering our protest against the con-
duct of those persons who reject, in the gross, as perversions,
the Rabbinical expositions of the Old Testament. Even
in many of the ancient Rabbinical expositions, which the
otherwise insipid Jarchi has adduced from the writings of
his predecessors, we cannot avoid perceiving what we term
esprit, and we often find genuine theological and religious
tact. Yet, if we concede at once all that is said in deprecia-
tion of the Rabbinical writings, of the Apostle Paul we
maintain that it can be shown how he was guided within
the method of that interpretation, by so fine a tact, that
even a person who comes to his works, without believing
in the higher guidance of the Apostle, in such passages,
cannot help admiring the acuteness and depth of his views,
and acknowledge his mental superiority in this point as in
others. But whoever has a belief in the higher guidance
of the Apostle, in all his religious knowledge will also
recognize, in the masterly expositions of the Apostle, traces
of that Spirit who "led him into all truth."

We shall attempt to show this only in one passage, but
one which is considered the most hopeless (die desperatus).
But we preface this Essay on the hermeneutical skill of the
Apostle in handling Old Testament passages, by consider-
ing a question which ought long ago to have been settled;
—how the Apostle acted as an interpreter, where he could
not appeal to the Codex of the Old Testament, but where he

* This essay is reprinted, with the omission of an introdus-
tory and closing paragraph, from the Litter. Anzeiger, 1834.
No. 31—34.

b This, for example, is De Wette's opinion in reference to
the manner in which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews
has treated the Old Testament. Compare also De Wette's
Essay, containing many beautiful remarks, in the third part
of the Schleiermacher, Lücke and De Wette's Journal, (Zeits-
chrift), also his introduction to the New Testament, p. 291.
came forward as an interpreter of the *anima naturaliter Christiana*, as Tertullian says, or of the *Book of Nature*. In this department, we shall here find exactly the same man as in the first-mentioned, and, if it be so, the reference may be very advantageous in our day, when persons are more disposed to allow anticipations of Christian truth in the breast of a superior heathen, or in the mysteries of nature, than in the books of the Old Testament.

We wish to confine ourselves, here, to three passages, Acts xvii. 23. and 28, and 1 Cor. xi. 15. In the first named passage, the Apostle appeals to an altar of the Athenians, with the inscription "To the unknown God." "Him," said he, "whom ye ignorantly worship. I declare unto you." What? have we here a pious accommodation of the Apostle’s, or an error unconsciously committed? Yet did not the inscription relate to the God whom Paul made known, generally to the unknown God? But ἡγγασθης סיו means only "an unknown God," for whom the appropriate name was wanting. Perhaps, indeed, there was not an altar with the inscription in the singular, but only in the plural, "to the unknown Gods."a Did the Apostle not really know this, or did he not wish to know it? Such are the questions which may be asked here, as well as in reference to the interpretation of many Old Testament passages. But who that has looked more closely into the nature of all religions, and especially of heathenism, will be able to deny that, in this introduction of the Apostle’s discourse, we have the most wonderful union of a knowledge of the world and profound views of religion? Who will deny that the object of all rites and forms of devotion, in every zone of the earth, is no other than that unknown God whom the gospel reveals to us; Though not in the poet’s sense, yet in a certain sense, Pope’s lines are undoubtedly true:—

Father of all! in every age,
In every clime adored,
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

If it were the Apostle’s intention to introduce the truth in a kindly manner, could he have done it more tenderly? But again, how could he give a deeper explanation of that

---
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truth which was still involved in all the untruth of heathenism, than by proceeding from the amazing supposition that he announced nothing else to them than what their souls had long sought and tended towards. But as to the form in which he found this idea, who would call this an accidental artificial connection? Does not rather this idea here connect itself with a fact, in which it had peculiarly realised itself? For certainly the heathen erected his altars to an unknown God, or the unknown Gods, when above all those gods whom he honoured by name, there was another heavenly Being, not included in their class, after whom he had an undefined longing. Thus there was the consciousness of a defective religious knowledge, with an existing necessity,—the consciousness of an inward seeking after an imperfectly defined object, which was expressed in such an inscription. And thus has Paul, by his commentary on this peculiar custom of erecting such altars for the unknown God, disclosed their hidden meaning; and, as it appears to us, not by means of any direct historical information which he had gained respecting the origin of such altars; but, as certainly will be allowed, simply and alone, by what in common life would be called a felicitous aperçu of a man of genius; but which, in his case, we cannot hesitate to ascribe to the Spirit of the Lord with which he was filled.

Let us turn to the second passage, ver. 28. In order to lead the heathen, who had made for themselves sensible images of the Deity, he mentions a sentiment of Aratus, which had come to his knowledge, either by reading or in general intercourse:—τῶν γὰρ καὶ γίνεσθαι μνήμην, in order to lead them to the consciousness that in the human spirit alone there was a worthy image of the Deity, and therefore that the Deity could, as little as the human spirit itself, be represented by the chisel or pencil. Must he not, also, here be subjected to the charge of a good-natured contractedness of mind, or of a πιὰ ναφρίτης? What is the connection in which we read these words of the Greek poet:—"all the ways, all the markets, of men are full of love,—the sea is full, and the harbours every where, we make use of Jove, for we are his offspring." What reader of the poet's words, in this connection, is not struck by the thought that, in a very different range from that of the Apostle, the Deity is here spoken of, and the descent of the human race from him;—namely, as a power of nature, which, as it cherishes and bears all things in its bosom, so also be-
stows existence upon men. But the Apostle, it will be said, draws from the fact, that the human spirit is alone spirit, and therefore alone an image of God, the conclusion that no sensible likeness can be formed of God. And, as was the case with this passage of Aratus, so, in general, no doubt can exist, that the heathens acknowledged, in a peculiar and special sense, the relation of man to God as in a truly antique manner. Pindar says, in the 6th Nemean Ode:—

"There is one race of men, one of Gods; we both are the offspring of one mother, but a power altogether different separates us; one is nought, but the brazen heaven always abides firm; yet we remember the immortals in great force of mind or body."

But if the Greeks generally professed the consciousness of a peculiar relationship of the human race to the Gods, it did not much signify whether the poet, whose words Paul introduces out of their connection, was conscious in their connection of that truth. A known truth met the hearer in those words, though he knew not their connection. But is in fact more than doubtful, whether the poet, in that passage, intended to speak only of an all-pervading power of Nature. His design was to shew that men had cause to begin all things with Zeus:

"ιν Διος ἀγαμεθα, τον οὐδὲν τ' ἄνθρωπος ἴσος ἤμεν 'Αρρήτου—"

and then concludes: μεταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσι μὴ ἄγουσιν.

But after the words, "we are also his offspring," follow farther proofs of the divine προσωπαί: οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἄνθρωποι δέξα σεφιερεφίου ἱερὰς λαοὺς δ' ἐν οἴζον ὕμνοις.

Therefore, if we enter thoroughly into the connection and the poet's design, it will follow that Aratus used these words, not in a pantheistic sense, but rather in a sense similar to Paul's; he adduces many evidences of the divine προσωπαί, and then rises to the greatest, which he places in the close connection of the human race with the Deity. But here it was not reflection on the connection of the passage, and a critical examination on its possible sense in the Author's mind, which enabled the Apostle to compre-
bend it in its depth, but simply and alone a felicitous, intellectual tact.

The third passage which we would attempt to elucidate, is 1 Cor. xi. 15. This whole section appears strange, and even repulsive, to the superficial reader: it treats of the necessity of the veiling of women,—so many words about so inconsiderable a thing,—a subject which to us seems at least one of perfect indifference,—and what strange argumentation from the Old Testament, ver. 7—12. But we cannot avoid the impression, that in the Pauline writings we have to do with a man who, by linking trivial externals with the deepest fundamental truths, manifested a profundity of thought, a mental influence sufficient to assign him a place among those who, in the opinion of the world, are intellectually eminent: such he shews himself in the instance before us. We may be allowed to trace the development of his ideas, which appears to be as follows:—

"The woman must wear a veil, because it is a sign of female quietness, retiredness, and subordination. But it accords with these characteristics of the female sex, that woman generally should not come forward as a teacher in the church; but if she did, she must here, when she appears in the presence of God, maintain before all the character of female modesty, and express it outwardly, by wearing a veil. For the man this is not required; he was first created the original type of humanity (der Urtypus der Menschenidee), pre-eminently the simq and δόξα of God, since he pre-eminently possesses knowledge and power; while the woman, only a weaker repetition of the same humanity, by her whole natural constitution, in which intellect and power are less prominent, is designed for a dependent and passive demeanour, although in Christianity no absolute subjection of one to the other takes place, but, by means of love, man in return subjects himself to woman." After the Apostle had developed these truths, which were entirely new both to the Jewish and Heathen world, and on which, it is to be noticed, even Christ himself had given no decision, which therefore Paul had learned alone by the Spirit of God—he adds, on account of his assertion that it became the woman herself in her outward clothing to have the characteristic

---

a As an instance of the divine ἐποιεῖν from classical authors, this passage of Aratus has been quoted by the early Christian Apologists. See Theophilus ad Autob. II. p. 353. ed Par.
mark of a dependent portion and not of the reverse,—another hint which he borrows from nature,—Is not, he asks, the long hair of the woman already given her by φυσις as a περιβάλλων, a veil? For which reason he concludes, φυσις among hardly any people has led the woman to cut her hair, but everywhere that man should do it; for almost everywhere for a man to allow his hair to grow long would be regarded as the sign of an effeminate, feeble disposition. Here, therefore, we have a specimen of the Pauline Hermeneutics, in reference to the book of nature. But does not this casually adduced hint depend upon a delicate and reflective apprehension of nature? Could it, in fact, be a purely arbitrary and accidental thing, that among no people are women deprived of their ornament of hair, but that in almost all, the male sex re-trench it, and especially from the time that the difference of the sexes begins to be more marked? And does not a thoughtful contemplation of nature lead us to conceive of the long hair, or hanging ringlets of the female, as a natural mark of the more delicate, and, at the same time, subordinate sex? Is it not, although in a less degree, as an ἱγνωμα (that is συμβελον τῆς ἱγνωμας), as well as the veil? In short, has not art, as if to give a comment on this allusion of the Apostle, exhibited the first mother of mankind after the Fall, as veiling, with her dishevelled tresses, her penitential tears and blushes on quitting Paradise?

But if such acute discernment is shown by the Apostle, when he appears as the interpres of heathenism or of nature, shall we not be justified in entering on his interpretations of the Old Testament, with the expectation of finding the same mental superiority?

But the passage in the Galatians, to which we have referred, has been specially adduced, for the purpose of establishing a directly opposite conclusion. Here, it has been said, no doubt can remain that the Apostle has committed a two-fold error. He has not only erroneously considered the collective יִרְאָה in the promise made to Abraham, as referring to an individual Christ, but, in defiance of lexicography, urges the singular form, as if it could only designate an individual; while in Hebrew, as is the case with the corresponding word in Greek, it is used collectively numerous times,—indeed the plural יִרְאֵה occurs only once, and that in the sense of fields
sown with corn.\textsuperscript{a} On this point we refer to Schöttgen, Wetstein, Dopke, for proofs of similar erroneous interpretations by the Rabbis. Similar views are taken by the most modern critics, Winer, Usteri, Ruckert, Matthies.\textsuperscript{b}

Let us examine more closely into the precise nature of the charge against the Apostle. It will afterwards appear whether the Apostle took this view of the Old Testament prophecy, and whether his view was correct. We would ask, as a preliminary, whether he is really chargeable with a textual error? If he be, one of two things must be true; either he himself knew better, and consciously accommodated himself to his readers, whom he supposed that such unsound evidence would satisfy; or he himself did not know better, and considered his argument as satisfactory. The supposition of an accommodation belongs not merely to modern times; Jerome was of opinion that for the "foolish," "dummen," (ἀπαντα Gal. iii. 1.) Galatians the proof was quite good enough. But be it recollected, that the Apostle had not here to do with a mixed multitude of Jews and heathens, but rather with the pharisaically educated adherents of James, who were come from Jerusalem, of whom it cannot be said, that either in the knowledge of Hebrew, or in bitterness and ill-will against the Apostle, they were inferior to the Jewish polemics of the 14th and 15th centuries, who have prided themselves on detecting such a flagrant proof of the Apostle's grammatical ignorance. It would be small commendation of the famed wisdom of the Apostle, who understood so admirably how "to divide" the word, if he really had seized hold of so frail a weapon of defence. Only some theologians might still grant it, who with Reiche in his Commentary on the

\textsuperscript{a} This passage is 1 Sam. viii. 15.; the word is combined with the pronominal suffix. וָהֵלֵךְ, "And your seed."

Eng. Ver. and Lee. Gesenius, like Tholuck, translates it by "Saatfeld." The Septuagint has εἰ οὖσανα — [Tn.]

\textsuperscript{b} The latter is without doubt the most cautious, since he gives the Apostle credit for rightly understanding the prophecy, and considers him only as deficient in the method of establishing the right sense. In p. 69. of his Commentary, he says, "But יְזָכִי can at least be referred to an individual, therefore one individual descendant among posterity may be intended. This the Apostle does, in the conviction that it lay equally in the form of the word."
Epistle to the Romans, p. 328, believe they can show in such passages "on scientific grounds," that the Apostle merely wished to give it as "milk for babes." We then are brought back to the point that Paul himself knew no better; that according to his opinion, the singular יַלְיָד could mean nothing else than "individual descendant," and that when several were intended the plural יַלְיָד would be used. But can any one really persuade himself that Paul, educated from his youth in Jerusalem, under Gamaliel, was less acquainted with the grammar of his own language, than were the Rabbis of the 15th century? As in the 11th and 42nd verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis the word יַלְיָד is used collectively, must he not have known this use? Has he not himself explained the expression τοίς κόλαξιν τοῦ σώματος as applying to the children of God, the τίτιν του θεοῦ? And more than this, has he not explained the term seed in this very promise made to Abraham, Rom. iv. 16, as meaning the collective body of believers among Jews and Gentiles? If, therefore, the supposition of simply knowing no better, (Nicht-besserwissens) on the part of the Apostles is precluded, it seems impossible to find any other resource. Yet Rückert believes that he has found one. In p. 148 of his commentary, he says, "that Paul here commits an error of interpretation, is clear; but neither from a deceitful intention, nor with consciousness, it was the custom among the Jews." Rückert had already in the preface to his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, employed many a notable alternative, but here we fear he has placed himself with his disjunctives between two stools. For if Paul gave a false explanation, and neither knew the right and only concealed it, nor held what was erroneous to be true—we really know not what else remains, all is involved in mist and darkness.

How does the question stand relative to these words in a grammatical and lexical point of view? The term seed applied to a father, may signify either his immediate offspring, consisting perhaps of only one individual, or the descendants of that one which we express by the word posterity (Nachkommenschaft.) The equivalent Hebrew term has both meanings in prose, the Greek, Latin, (proles and semen,) and German properly only in poetry. That on the contrary, the plural should express several
individuals, is logically impossible. We might indeed, with Flatt, appeal to the passage in the book de Maccabees ascribed to Josephus, c. 17, τῶν ἀβεβαιῶν στεγεστάων ἀληθίνῳ τεῖχῳ ἱερόλαταν. Yet we should more correctly take the plural either poetically as aμετα, or in the sense which alone can logically belong to it—posterities, distinct families or tribes. If in Hebrew the plural לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה ל לַעֲנֵי נֵעֶה L Sam. viii. 15, is used of cornfields, the language here employed relates to different portions of seed, and the Chaldee נֵעֶה ל L Dan. i. 12, 16. (pulse) means kinds of seeds. Thus also the Chaldee נֵעֶה ל L in the plural נֵעֶה L appears in the sense of posterity, race, Josh. vii. 14. Jer. xxxiii. 24. Gen. x. 18. Thus in German, the plurals Sämereien, Nachkommenschaften, are used. Before the interpreter accuses the Apostle of palpably violating the most certain grammatical and lexical data, it is his duty to examine, whether the passage will not give a suitable meaning, if we suppose that the Apostle connected with the plural στεγεστάω the perfectly correct meaning, Nachkommenschaften—posterities, descendants. In fact, under various modifications, Beza, Camero, Le Clerc, Bengel, Ernesti, Rössett have adopted this important interpretation, so that we must be surprised that a Usteri and a Rückert have scarcely thought it worthy of being mentioned, to say nothing of refuting it.

Let us attempt, independently of the connection, to prove this view of the passage to be correct.

The argument of the Apostle, in this section, is as follows:—It was already announced to Abraham that his (spiritual) posterity should possess the ἐλλειψεν; the law entered at a subsequent period. If the blessing depended on the fulfilment of the law, then the promise for Abraham’s descendants would lose its power, and be nullified. Paul brings forward this argument in another manner in Romans iv. The promise was given to Abraham on ac-
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*a Camero; cum dicimus semina, notamus rerum specie differentium semina.

b In Ps. xxv. 7, κεκλαυμένος εἶλεν τὰ στεγεστάωσιν; the plural is to be taken distributively.

c Those to whom he applies the σταμεῖν τοῖς ἱερολήπτοις τοῦ Αβεβαιῶν.
count of his faith. If the blessing were made to depend on the law, man might come under the divine wrath, and though a spiritual descendant of Abraham might have no part in the blessing of Abraham, and thus the promise would be disannulled.

In the passage before us, the Apostle remarks incidentally in relation to the argument, that the promises ἑαυτοῖς were not given to the σπῆμα, but to the σπέρμα of Abraham. The next question is, to what ἑαυτοῖς does he refer? The preceding context mentions no other than (v. 8.) the ἑαυτοῖς of the ἔλογον of the ἵνα in Abraham, and of this he also speaks in v. 14. So that, here also the same must be intended. Verse 14. also shows us the mode of its fulfilment, the ἔλογον upon the ἵνα is come ἐν χριστῷ; since by means of believing in him, they received the σωτηρία, and thus became children of God and patriarchs of his kingdom. That simply the participation in the kingdom of Christ is to be understood by this, the use of ἑαυτοῖς in v. 17. 18. 22. shows, and if so, it is evident that this ἑαυτοῖς in its essence is no other than that expressed in Rom. iv. 13. that Abraham’s seed should possess the κληρονομία κοσμοῦ: this, indeed, is to be taken in no other sense than the κληρονομία τῆς γῆς in Matt. v. 5. that the partakers of the kingdom should one day dwell on the glorified earth; therefore, the reception of the ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 14.) includes as consequent the κληρονομία τοῦ κοσμοῦ. And in one chapter v. 18. and v. 29. κληρονομός υἱὸς and λαμβανόντες τὴν εὐαγγελίαν are used as equivalent phrases. That in v. 16. the plural is used, need not surprise us: it is found also in v. 21. and is probably designed to intimate, that though one promise, it was of wide extent, and that it had been often repeated to Abraham. But here the use of the dative is very remarkable to the seed. Never once in the Old Testament was a promise made directly to the seed of the Patriarchs, but only to Abraham in reference to his posterity. This dative then, will in nowise agree with the common interpretation of this passage. What trouble expositors have given themselves in order to find out the dative τοῦ σπῆματος in the Septuagint, and to prove that the Apostle had at least quoted correctly according to that version—may be seen in the beginning of the 2nd Appendix to Flatt’s Commentary, and yet this labour has been all in vain. But the Apostle does not mean to cite here any particular passage: he wishes to express the sense of the citation, v. 8. and the parallel pas
sages in which the word ἁγιάζω is expressly mentioned. When it is promised concerning the posterity, that in it the heathen should be blessed, a promise is also given to the posterity. Thus, also in Rom. iv. 13, there is no verbal citation from the Old Testament, for diserti verbis it is never promised to the seed of Abraham, ἡμεῖς ἐλεονεμοῦσαν ζωήν ζωὴν.

We now come to the question, whom did Paul mean by the singular τὸ στίγμα on which he insists so much? Since it is so obvious, when the prediction promises a blessing to the heathen, in or through Abraham's posterity,—(led by the appearance of the actual fulfilment,)—to understand by it the one great descendant of Christ, it is not to be wondered at, but even to be approved, if the reader's thoughts are turned to the Messiah, especially when we read these as a comment ἐστι νεωθέσεως. But this interpretation presents some important difficulties.

How is the use of the dative to be justified? If the promise consists, as we have seen, in the participation of the kingdom of Christ, in the possession of the στίγμα, by means of this participation, how can such a promise have been made to the Messiah, since it is through him that this promise must derive its fulfilment for the believing posterity of the Patriarch? Our interpreters have, in a remarkable manner, avoided meeting these difficulties. And the difficulty recurs with still greater force in ver. 19, where there is the same dative; ἰδιω τὸ στίγμα, τῷ ἰδιωτῇ. Even a Winer allows himself here,—(quite in the style of the old paraphrasing exegesis)—instead of an interpretation of the dative, to give a circumlocution; in quem facta erat quem spectabat promissio, and thus Usteri. Only Rückert feels the difficulty strongly, and attempts to obviate it; the promise in Romans iv. 13, is understood to mean the possessions of the earth, as Lord of which Paul considers Christ. As this interpreter everywhere so lamentably neglects to interpret Scripture by the Scripture itself, he has also here overlooked, that he might have employed the mention of καθιστομένου in the 18th and 19th verses, to favour his own views. The second difficulty which arises, if we understand the singular τὸ στίγμα to mean the Messiah, is this; how can this passing remark suit the whole of the theme here handled? That the promises might be fulfilled, not through many individuals of the posterity of the patriarchs, but only through one great individual, was a thought which by no means connects itself
with the theme here discussed; it was a position which Paul would have had to defend only against those who, according to the notion of Philo and the modern new Synagogue, expected salvation not from a Messiah, but from a nation filled with a Messianic spirit. But Paul had no occasion to carry on such an argument. The theme he here handles is this: whether those who are partakers of the kingdom only through faith (in Christ) without the law, are genuine partakers? Although ver. 16. may be only a passing remark, it must yet, in some way, be connected with this theme.

In order to find the correct reference of ἐνέργεια we are happily not confined to the 16th verse. Three other places in this chapter, ver. 9, 19, and 29. speak of the ἐνέργεια, besides Romans iv. We think, that if the latest commentators had carefully examined these four places, they must have been forced to admit, not that their interpretation was absolutely false, but incomplete, and therefore one-sided.

Let us first consider the argument of the Apostle in ver. 8—10. Here we have, first of all, to censurate an unscound opinion, from which a misunderstanding of the whole argumentation may arise, when ενυ in ver. 8. is translated through (durch) thee, as is done by De Wette in the new edition of his translations. Winer appears, at least, not to have felt the force which here belongs to the ενυ. Rückert, Usteri, and especially Matthies, have taken it correctly. That ενυ is not here used by the Apostle to denote the medium or instrumentality, is shewn incontrovertibly by the ενυ in ver. 9. Translate it by through, (durch,) and the argumentation will be altogether unintelligible. The explanation of ενυ by εφ (however it may be elsewhere,) is here inadmissible. Matthies says, with correctness and precision; "ενυ τοῖς πνεύσ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, differs in this from ἐνυ τοῖς πνεύσ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, that the former combines the blessing of Abraham and of believers, in complete unity, so that Abraham and believers are blessed in the same act of God."a The Apostle, therefore, means, in this

a Compare 1 Cor. xv. 22. the very important phrase εφ Αδαμ, which has been also much misunderstood by many, and translated, "through Adam," while a far deeper sense lies in the passage. "As forming a unity with the first Adam, all have an equal lot with him, and die; therefore, forming a unity with the second, all will become living. In the Hebrew מ (iv), the
place, to say: inasmuch as God imparted a blessing to believing Abraham; declared him to be justified, and there with constituted him a *πρέσβης*, Rom. iv. 13. the same judgment is also expressed respecting those who walk after the *ιχνόν ἁβρααμ*, and the declaration of scripture, "in thee the heathen receive a blessing," in this sense is fulfilled. a Thus the Apostle has here shown who the *υἱὸν ἁβρααμ*, (ver. 7,) are, according to the deeper sense of scripture, namely, those who, in a spiritual sense, make one person with him, form a posterity from him, who tread in his footsteps. This passage, accordingly, would be in favour of our considering the *σωτήρ*, in ver. 16. as being the spiritual posterity of the patriarch.

The second passage is ver. 19. This, indeed, gives us no positive assistance toward explaining who the *σωτήρ* may be, but it furnishes the negative already mentioned, that the dative here cannot be explained if we understand *σωτήρ* exclusively of the Messiah.

The third passage, ver. 29. furnishes us with complete light. Here the close of an argumentation is given us, which refer back to ver. 16. and the collective body of believers is called *σωτήρ* τοῦ ἀβρααμ; it is expressly said that since they are Abraham's seed, they are also πασί ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποκρινόμενοι, that is, the ἐπαγγελία mentioned in ver. 16. became theirs.

With these passages in our Epistle must be taken Rom. iv. There a two-fold *σωτήρ* is distinguished, one which had the *μνήμη* and the faith (of the gospel) and one which fundamental-being of the effect in the cause is expressed; if this is only outward, as when the arrow is shot through the bow, we translate the Ξ (iv), by *durch* (through); but if the relational of causality be internal, so that the *effectus* has its root in the *causa*, we shall more correctly translate it in, as for example, the Christian rejoices not merely *through* Christ but in Christ; for Christ is not merely the *causa transiens* but *immanens* of his *joy*, *righteousness*, &c. On the passage before us, Beza admirably remarks, "inte, quia in filies tuis reense-buntur omnes credentes, Christo nimirum; illius omnis Abra hamidarum seminis capiti, insiti, et ut fundamento superstructi, ut in eo fiant ejusdem beneficitionis participes.

a As in ver. 8, the reading *ινολέγνυσσω*, instead of the reading adopted by Beza *υλεγνυσσω* is decidedly accredited by external evidence, so also it appears justified by the Apostle's train of reasoning.
only had the faith of Abraham. Both are combined in
ver. 16. as ἔνα το οἴνομα τοῦ Αβραάμ, εἰ ἦν πατὴρ γαντω ὁμήν,
and the Apostle finds, in the fact, that the whole heathen
world, by means of faith in Christ, become a posterity of
Abraham,—a fulfilment of the promise that Abraham was
to be the father of many nations. Romans iv. 17, 18.

It is therefore undeniable, that this idea, that the be-
lieving world are a spiritual posterity of Abraham, is very
familiar to the Apostle; and the question only remains,
whether this idea exactly suits the connection and the
words which we find in verse 16. That οἴνομα in the
plural means descendents, appears to us, on philological
grounds, as the only admissible interpretation. On the
other hand, if we venture to consider as proved, that
οἴνομα τοῦ Αβραάμ, in Paul's writings, means the believing
posterity of Abraham, a meaning offers itself to us which
is quite Pauline, and suits the connection so perfectly,
that, as it seems to us, nothing more is to be desired.
What the Apostle wishes to demonstrate in ver. 16. is
this, that those promises cannot possibly extend to the de-
cendants, in every sense, of Abraham. Had the plural
been used, it might have been inferred that all the poste-rity of Abraham, consequently that those by natural de-
scent were included. But since the singular is used, this
shews that the prophecy had a definite posterity in view,
—namely, believers. The Jew would be more willing to
allow this, because for him it would have proved too much
if the prediction had embraced, unconditionally, all of
Abraham's offspring. He would have wished to find the
lines of descent by Ishmael and Esau excluded. The same
proof that the blessing given to the seed of Abraham did
not apply to every descendant, in whatever sense, is also
adduced by the Apostle in two other places, which may
serve to render us certain that this idea was not strange to
him. Rom. ix. 8. and Gal. iv. 28, 29. In the first pas-
sage, he says expressly, ὅτι οἱ οἴνομα Αβραάμ, πιστεύ-
να; but God acknowledges as the genuine πιστεύονται only
those who are born κατ' ἱστοργίαν, and consequently the
line of Ishmael is excluded. Those who—considered
merely according to the course of nature—had not been
born, are such who must refer all that they are to the Di-
vine grace, and so far are like believing Christians. Of
these we may also say, as Paul expresses it in Gal. iv. 29.,
they are born κατά πιστίαν.

But still the difficulty remains to be considered, that
—apparently in decided contradiction to our interpretation—Paul has expressly explained the το στήμα by το ξενοῖς. In addition to this, we cannot be displeased, if the interpreters previously opposed by us were inclined to presuppose a reference to the one great descendant, in the seed of the patriarchs, by whom all nations would be blessed. If we consider the character of prophecy as it appears in other parts of Scripture, where so frequently may be distinguished a nearer, more general, earthly meaning, and a more remote peculiar one, like concentric circles, of which the larger always encloses the narrower which lies nearer the centre,—this also will probably appear to us as having similar properties. Thus, in Gen. iii. 15. it was prophesied, in the first place, that the seed of the woman, that is, the posterity of woman, mankind should gain the victory over the seed of the serpent; but yet this victory would be accomplished (taking a more remote view of the prophecy) by him who is pre-eminent the Son of Man, by the man μαρία το κηρύ; therefore the seed pre-eminent denotes that one individual. And anticipating this sense, the Jerusalem Targum, on this passage, points out that its perfect fulfilment will take place in the days of the Messiah. Thus it was promised to David, that his posterity should build a temple for God, and while that promise was fulfilled by Solomon in its more limited and primary sense, it was not exhausted in this fulfilment; but David's greater, divine descendant, built that temple, founded that kingdom, over which the seed of David—as so many prophecies expressed it—was to reign for ever. Apart from these two reasons, which favour the common reference of the το στήμα to Christ, we find yet a third, hitherto not noticed, and nevertheless important in the chain of argumentation, ver. 19—29. Let us consider, how does the Apostle arrive at the conclusion, 29th verse, that they are Abraham's seed? The law, Paul says, belonged to the divine plan; it was given partly in order to restrain from transgression, that it might not overstep all bounds, partly in order to make the αμαρτία a παράβασις (ver. 19, also Rom. v. 20. not αμαρτία but παράβασις). To take away sin,—that was not the design of the law, and could not be, by virtue of its nature; it was only a schoolmaster, until the time which God from the beginning had in view when Christ would appear. The schoolmaster withdraws when the pupil is of age. Ye believers are thus mature; for through him who μαρία το κηρύ is the
Son of God, ye are also become sons in the full sense of the word, (ver. 26.) By means of the Gospel ye are become one with Christ, who is a Son, and consequently share in his Sonship. Ye are henceforth regarded as forming a unity with Christ; and so far ye are also Abraham's seed and heirs. a In this reasoning of the Apostle, which some may call subtle, but in which we cannot but acknowledge profound religious views, the participation of believers in the ἀληθεύμα is founded, as is usually represented, on their being the genuine seed of Abraham; but this latter fact is not attributed, as in ver. 8, or in Romans iv, to their treading in his ἱκανόν, but to their forming a unity with Christ. But Christ—for this is the major to this conclusion—is the seed in whom salvation was promised, even he who is the Lord of the kingdom. They are ἀληθεύμονες, inasmuch as Christ is the heir. Compare Romans viii. 17. ἀληθεύμονες μετὰ Σιων εὐγενερευμονες διὰ κρίτων, founded, it is true, on the preceding τινης Σιων. b

We do not, then, hesitate to believe that Paul, under the seed of Abraham, in whom all nations were to be blessed, understood Christ himself—but (and hereina our views differ from the common interpretation, and harmonize with Beza's) not exclusively, but according to that really mystical, though not on that account less true conception, that the collective body of believers (die gemeinde) has its life and its unity in Christ. If this interpretation proves to be the only satisfactory one, we have here an interesting proof how the differing views of interpreters frequently, instead of excluding one another, serve as complements to one another, to supply what is lacking in each. That the combination of the believing members with Christ in one unity is a Pauline sentiment, none will question: it is founded not merely on 1 Cor. xii. 12. (1 Cor. i. 13. ?), but on the whole doctrine of the Christian church as the ἀληθεύμα of Christ; and the chapter we are considering, ver. 28., presents it in the most explicit terms. It means not merely that all who have put on

---

a Sons under age were, according to the Roman law, on a level with slaves (iv. 1.), hence Paul, iii. 26. could use the term νομις emphatically, for sons who were of age.

b The same idea, only in another form, lies in the ἵκατον, ἄνους (namely, 1 νόμος πατρί ἰδίων), ἰδιοκοι τινις Θεοῦ γινείς, John i. 12.
Christ form one whole (is), but that they are only one person (is). Hence, is in ver. 14. is to be taken in the same sensu prægnanti as in ver. 8. When it is said in ver. 14. that the blessing might come in Christ Jesus, the Apostle means to say, since they are in Christ.* Thus, then, we can take no offence at it, if χριστός signifies Christ and the Church. This assertion put nude, may appear indeed as forced and arbitrary; but when elucidated by the Pauline doctrine of the church, as the θρησκεία of Christ, as it is represented in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we shall find it quite natural. Yet some persons may question whether the is χριστός in ver. 17. does not shew that the individual Christ must be intended: we reply,—since the expression denotes the individual equally with the many who form one unity with him, it need not prevent the use of the term immediately after to denote the individual alone, as also in ver. 24. But it will be more correct to say, that the Apostle, in both passages, by no means intended to speak of the individual in his isolated capacity, but rather as he stood in relation to others, or if it be preferred, with a reference also to the church. Thus, when we say, "Since Christ has become an historical personage, the world is quite changed." We think not exclusively on Christ as an individual, but on all the influences that have proceeded from him, and have been embodied in the church.

In order to make still plainer the hermeneutical method of the Apostle in his exposition of the promise made to Abraham, we would imagine how he would give a perfect exposition of it if transported into the scientific cul-

* Among the latest commentators, Usteri could not help being aware that this expression, as used here, certainly gives strong reason for interpreting χριστός, v. 16. of the Church. He says, "it is, strictly speaking, not something promised to Christ, but to believers in Christ, and in v. 29. he says, himself, that Christians are the στηρεω Ἀβρααμ. Hence, Hammond's supposition is not without plausibility, that χριστός is here used as a collective, and to be understood of the body of Christ the Church. (Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 12.) Ver. 29. the idea of the body of Christ is certainly presupposed, or considered as auxiliary; but in our passage this idea is slightly indicated, or rather the individuality of the person is prominent.

ture of our language and times. Then, we think, he would explain himself in the following manner: "To Abraham it was promised that his seed should become as the sand of the sea-shore,—that he should be the father of many nations,—and, more than this, that through his seed the nations should view the divine blessing. Therefore the promise was given to Abraham in reference to his posterity, and, at the same time, to that posterity itself. The promise that the patriarch should be the father of many nations, and that his posterity should be innumerable, in its immediate and superficial sense, to the great Jewish nation—great as contrasted with the one offspring born to him, beyond all expectation, in his old age. But we obtain its full meaning when we view it spiritually, and apply it to the spiritual posterity of the patriarch, who, like himself, are justified by faith in Christ. Principally with this view it stands written, "I have made thee a father of many nations," Romans iv. 17, 18. And when it is further said, that in or through Abraham's posterity all nations shall receive a blessing, this is now in process of fulfilment; for, through Abraham's posterity, faith in the true God has extended over 352 millions of the human race (between 3 and 4 millions of Jews, 220 millions of Christians, 128 millions of Mohammedans), who at present bow their knee before the one living God,—not only Christians, but even the Mahommedans, who call their religion, "Religion of Abraham," — millet Ibrahim,—owe their pure faith in God to the patriarch; and inasmuch as from this posterity the Saviour is born according to the flesh, Rom. ix. 5, as, the source of salvation for all nations. But this Christ, mystically considered, is the unity of believers, who therefore, in a twofold sense, are the descendants of the patriarch,—first, inasmuch as they are his spiritual followers, and then, as far as they form a unity with the great progeny proceeding from his race,—which twofold relation again merges into one, as they form a unity with Christ in faith, and as believers. Thus it is shewn that those persons greatly err, who, because in one sense they can call themselves "the posterity of the patriarch," think that they have also a share in the promise, since the Divine Spirit, by an impartation of the promise from the beginning to a perfectly definite spiritual posterity, had in view, and intended something much higher than they can conceive.

If any one is inclined to say, that the Apostle, when
he thus explained the biblical phraseology, attributed much more to it than it actually contained, we would not controvert this assertion at present, since the object of this essay only is to prove that the Apostle, in handling Old Testament passages, at the utmost remove from rabbinical insipidity, discussed his subject with a profundity which demands our admiration. The object of this Essay is accomplished, if only in future, the opinions on the Apostolic Exegesis are so formed like the above given by Matthies in reference to our passage, namely, that the Apostle, according to the idea, argued quite correctly from the Old Testament expression, Gen. xxii. 18., and erred only in thinking that the reference to the one great descendant lay equally in the form of the sentence. (Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 69.) If the expositor once attains to approach the Old Testament citations, with the belief that a felicitous religious tact so guided the writers of the New Testament, that when they fail in the form of the application, yet they hit upon what is right in essence,—that view will soon be formed by him on the relation of the Old to the New Testament in reference to the citations, which we hold to be the right medium between the ancient one of the Lutheran church in the 17th century and that of modern Rationalists; a view which, as it appears to us, no one has so happily elucidated as Beck in his Essays, "Bemerkung ü ber Messianische Weissagung," &c. "Remarks on Messianic prophecies as an historical Problem, and on Pneumatic Exposition," in the Tubingen Theological Journal. Since then, the Essay by this able writer on the 9th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans has appeared (1833,) in which, by the application of his principles to several Pauline citations, he has fortified his views, which was the more necessary, since his former Essay wore too rhapsodical a character, and was composed in too enigmatical and turgid a style. Many things relating to this subject are contained in the writings and treatises of Steudel, Fr. Von Meyer, Olshausen, and particularly in the first part of Stier's "Hints for a believing understanding of the Scriptures."

The Pauline method of citation is based on what is expressed in that admirable sentence of Bacon quoted by Beck: *Prophetia Historiae genus est, quandoquidem historia divina ea pollet supra humanam prærogativa, ut narratio factum præcedere non minus quam sequi possit.* That
a wonderful parallelism exists in the relation of the Old Testament history to the New, which, in the greater events and institutions, shows itself as the repetition of one great moral law, which presides over both epochs of revelation, but which also enters into the most minute and accidental objects—just as in nature, the measure and number which are elements in the courses of the planets, appear in the relations of the human body, and in far more subordinate spheres—this is not opposed to the observation of such a man as Dr. Paulus, who has expressed himself not unfavourably on typology. Now, if the believing examiner of history must acknowledge herein a divine plan, there are also a great number of Old Testament passages, which, although taken in their immediate connection, cannot be esteemed as entirely Messianic, yet viewed in connection with the history, appear to be such. So, for example, when Paul, Rom. ix. 25—29, quotes passages from Hoses and Isaiah, which incontestibly treat of past events, in order to prove that, according to the divine plan, even now only an ἐλεγή from the seed of Abraham inherited the kingdom, a superficial observation might lead us to conclude that there was only a suitable accommodation of an Old Testament expression. A more careful examination of sacred history would lead us to agree with Beck’s judgment on this citation, which he expresses in p. 105 of the work above referred to.

“At first glance, it might indeed appear sufficient to consider the use which the Apostle makes of prophetical passages as not more than a historical parallel, according to which he transfers expressions which had an unquestionable value, and befitted events of an earlier period of the theocratic standing-point, to analogous events of his own times, taking place on the same national soil. But though this method of citation, as a successful accomodation, will always retain a pragmatical value, yet enough is not thus granted to the higher spirit of the Apostolic writings, and, in our connection, especially, the internal thread is broken in the whole of the Apostle’s argumentation. For if, from the beginning, a merely outward or accomodative parallel between the Jewish and Christian ἐλεγή lies at the base of this, so would not the conflict between the two have arisen, and the earnest heart-gush of the Apostle, ver. 1—5, with all his quotations, would have been a farce,—but rather every thing rests on an organic coherence, by virtue of which the old covenant is related
to the new as the preformant germ to the perfect development. In this connection, we venture to contemplate the citations not merely as historical analogies, to which an internal reference is only given by the meaning attached to them by the reflective Writer, and the force of which lies in the completed parallel,—but, as vital portions of the plan of providential instruction and theocratic history carried on in organic development through the Sacred Writings, so that they bear in themselves the plastic germ of fulfilment which develops itself in regular progression, through various transitionary periods. By this means, the cited passages are not deprived of their historical basis and their primary significancy, but are incorporated in the theocratic character of the whole Scriptures, in the system of the divine economy; and thus their germinant quality is extended to its complete unfolding, which will take place in the maturity of the Messianic dispensation. The prophecies, as they carry on their original form, determined by place and time, genetically, from the past into the historical present, form a link in the chain of development which advances in the succession of historical epochs, through the nearer and more remote sections of the future, from the πρῶτα to the ἔννεα.

If now on the standing-point, where the interpreter comes, without faith, to the citations from the Old Testament found in the New, we have reached so far, that we at least admit an intelligent method of connecting and making use of the ideas,—as soon as the mode of contemplating the subject has developed itself from a believing view of the Biblical history,—no one will be able to hesitate at finding in it more than connections framed by mere human ingenuity.

"Here I may be allowed to refer to my remarks on the Messianic prophecies and the pneumatical interpretation of Scripture, which appeared in the Tubingen Journal, and are here given as an Appendix. If a certain theological tendency will never acknowledge this living connection of sacred history and doctrine, let it not be considered as a mark of superior intelligence. If our contemplation of nature and history, in general, were not frittered down into a polymathy, partly owing to our limited faculties, partly owing to the shallowness of our reflection, which scarcely penetrates below the surface,—science would have educed, in the processes of physical and historical development, the idea of type and prefiguration from the organism of a higher law-giving, and presented it in a sober and connected view."
We shall attain to the result, that the spirit which guides the whole of history, prevades also the prophetic utterances, though so veiled that its intimations can be first understood only with the occurrence of historical facts. We are accustomed, in the department of nature, to behold the lower stages in its most perfect species as preformants of the higher, and so far prophecies of them. To themselves it is unknown whether they point; but is there not a Spirit who comprehends all the stages as he permits them to arise, and leads them forth in succession? This Spirit knew what he designed, while he was still working and arranging in the lower regions. From this standing point, we cannot hesitate to maintain that the Spirit who arranged the whole plan of salvation, when the words sounded in the ears of the father of the faithful; “In thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed;” deposited more in these words than, at that time, the patriarch found in them, or than modern interpreters now find,—that that Spirit stored them with a fulness of meaning which no Christian Interpreter has so admirably comprehended as he who possessed προφητής, the ἀπὸ προφητῆς, the ἀπὸ of him who himself ordained the plan of salvation. 1 Cor. v. 40.
Dissertation II.

On the sacrifices and priesthood of the Old Testament, and on Christ as the sacrifice and priest in the New Testament.

Wherein the redeeming efficiency of Christ consisted, is taught in the New Testament, in a typical form, derived from the institution of priests and sacrifices in the Old Testament. Our Epistle more especially represents the Redeemer as the sacrifice and priest of human kind. In order to understand thoroughly, this doctrine of our Epistle, we must make a three-fold division in this Essay. We have to consider, First, The Old Testament Sacrifices and Priesthood; Secondly, The Nature of the Priestly Efficiency of Christ; and, Thirdly, The Priestly Efficiency of Christ in the Old Testament Form.

The propositions which we here propose to discuss, affect the very heart of Christian faith and Christian theology; hence they are propositions of unceasing interest, which every age and every school must examine for themselves. Thus, every one who enters upon them, may modestly preface his examination with the same words with which the ancient Anselm introduces his treatise, “Cur Deus Homo?” Quosdi aliquatenuis quaestioni tuae satisfacere potero, certum esse debet quia (quod) et sapientior me plenius hoc facere poterit, imo sciem est, quid- quid homo inde dicere vel scire possit, altiores tan- 

tae rei adhuc latere rationes.

Each one of the three parts into which we have
divided our Thesis, belongs to a distinct department of theology; as the first requires deep and extensive researches in the knowledge of antiquity, so does the second in speculative dogmatics, and the third in the New Testament exegesis. The labours of modern writers have hitherto produced no work of decided eminence in either of these three sections. With respect to the important subject of sacrifices, we have, indeed, lately obtained an elaborate discussion by Schott, in the "Studien der Würtemberg Geistl." Vol. I. Part 2; Vol. IV. Part 1; Vol. V. Part 1, of which I would, with gratitude, avail myself. But as this recent labourer says, for 140 years since Outram's work, "De Sacrificiis," Amstel. 1688, the ground has lain almost fallow. In reference to the speculative and dogmatic discussion of the doctrine of redemption, several interesting contributions have been made in later times, among which are to be reckoned investigations by Stier, Marheineke, Schleiermacher, Anton. Günther, Göschel, and yet very briefly, in Vol. VII. Part 2, and Vol. VIII. Part 2, of the "Studien der Würtemberg Geistl." by Klaiber; still a work is wanting, written with the same power as that of Anselm, or even of Grotius, on the doctrinal view of the subject. For the exegetic handling of the subject, several things are to be found in De Wette's treatise on the symbolical language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 273. In the treatises of Winzer, and in Heinr. Günther, De Mortis Christi fine salutari ac vi sacrificiali, Götting. 1831, though this latter is on too contracted a scale. As, in proportion to the importance of the subject, there is still a want of comprehensive prepa-

* By this treatise of Schott, the wish expressed by Baumgarten-Crusius, in his Bibl. Theol. p. 418. is far from receiving perfect satisfaction. "The sacrificial system of antiquity appears still to want complete history,—a history which would allow itself to be detained by the mystical as well as by the too popular, nor find mere meals and royal gifts in the sacrifices of ancient times.
ratory labours, we hope that our work, especially since it is not independent, but is subsidiary to the commentary, may meet with indulgence.

I. THE SACRIFICES AND PRIESTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. The Institution of Sacrifices.

If we had to discuss this subject independently, apart from our definite object, we could not avoid a critical enquiry on the institution of the Mosaic cultus, which, at the present juncture, is more imperatively called for than at any previous period. Much quicker than might be expected is the intimation which we gave in p. 301. passing into fulfilment. Several works, one after another, have appeared, which have made available De Wette’s criticism on patriarchal history in the department of archaeology, and have even proceeded several steps farther. I allude to George’s work on the ancient Jewish feasts, which yet, in opposition to Baur, excludes every influence of the institutions of other nations, and especially Vatke’s Biblical Theology, a work that has besides much scientific merit. It forms a sequel, after an interval of 30 years, to De

* The new wine of critical young Germany, which foamed with more noise than elsewhere, in Von Bohlen’s Genesis, has already acquired a milder temperamentum, by means of Ewald’s treatise, De Feriarum Hebraorum origine et ratione. Ewald’s words in the Gottingen “Anzeigen,” may be considered as the motto of this piece. (No. 204. 1835.) “That most, or almost all the accounts of ancient times are from a later hand, has been acknowledged, in the gross, for the last forty years, as many a thing of the kind has been pointed out. But some persons, as if too overjoyed at the discovery, and blinded by it, only seek what is later, and please themselves with bringing down to as late a period as possible, every thing which was formerly considered ancient; they have got into a new chaos, and lost the threads of all history.”
Wette's "Beitrage," which appeared in 1806, and carries on consequentially the application of the same critical principles to the department of Old Testament dogmatics and antiquities, which the original author had left incomplete. This work, therefore, goes far beyond De Wette's Old Testament dogmatics and archaeology. The Jehovah whom the Israelites worshipped in the time of Moses, according to the results of this work, was the star of Saturn: what hitherto has been considered, if not Mosaic, yet as the Davidean sacrificial and priestly institutes, is the production of the times after Solomon: the feasts, which were first celebrated in that later period, have been fictitiously attributed to the ancient history of the nation: the tabernacle which never existed, is the reflection of Solomon's temple thrown back by a mythical fiction into the dim past, &c. These views will have their stadium, as formerly those of Spencer, which in their day appeared to many so captivating and powerfully supported, and were so little repressed by the efforts of a Witsius, that, strange to say, they find a fundamental refutation, first in this work of Vatke.\(^a\) For our object we do not think it neces-

\(^a\) With invincible learning, as it seemed, Spencer had shown the derivation of so many parts of the Jewish cultus, the sacred ark, the cherubim, &c. from Egypt, and until the time of De Wette, Gesenius, and Winer, modern criticism had obtained no other result. What a deep impression his arguments made, may be gathered from the following words of Le Clerc; they occur in a critique on Saurin's *Discours historiques*, &c. T. I. in which he gives at length his opinion of Spencer in the *Bibl. ancienne et moderne*, T. xii. "Si ces nations (l'Egyptienne et la Juive) etoient si éloignées l'une de l'autre, que Rome l'est d'Ispahan, et n'eussent pas eu plus de commerce ensemble, que ces deux villes, on aurait sujet de demander de fortes raisons pour croire, que l'une étoit sortie des états de l'autre, après y avoir demeuré deux cens ans et plus sujette de l'autre, on ne balanceroit pas beaucoup à croire, que cette dernière auroit pris quelque chose de la précédente, etc." Though deprived of effective grounds of opposition, yet the champions of orthodoxy persisted in their scepticism, and now see the battle fought with their enemies out of their own camp. According to Vatke's view, the greater part of what has been hitherto considered
sary to subject those views to an examination; we have only to do with that form of the Jewish cultus which the Apostles had before their eyes, and in which they found the points of connection for their doctrine. These points of connection remain, yes, they remain as a providential arrangement, even if the views alluded to respecting their origination were correct, and although certainly the connection of the New Testament revelation with the Old, absolutely necessitates to a different conception of the latter, yet perhaps a position may be gained, on the ground of the views stated in p. 90, of the inspiration of the Apostles, by which faith in the revelation made in Christ and the Apostles, would not be so much shaken by such results of Old Testament criticism as it has been apparently. Winer's Realwörterbuch (Vol. I. p. 487—495,) contains under the word Gesetz (Law) an excellent article on the Mosaic law, written with sound judgment and in a spirit of sober criticism.

The institution of sacrifice leads us back into the farthest antiquity. Among all nations, sacrifice makes a part of the most ancient mode of worship. The book of Genesis agrees with this, when it traces sa-

Egyptian, is to be traced back to Phœnician origin. Thus, therefore, the negative position which we maintained above, in reference to the explanation of the tabernacle and the Nubian architectural monuments is quite justified. But the advocate of the orthodox views of the Old Testament will appear not less justified, when he at least previously observes the name נֶאֶשַׁ in reference to the Phœnician origination; Von Hammer sends us to the Persians. The review of the acute Le Clerc gives occasion to another interesting remark. As one of the boldest hypotheses, there appears in the Berlin Critic, a conclusion supported almost entirely on Amos v. 25, 26. that the body of the people who were led out of Egypt, were, through the whole forty years, idolaters; the author of this hypothesis seems himself to have been transported with its boldness. But the learned Genevan has, in his review, founded the same hypothesis on the same expression of the prophet, "le silence des livres de Moïse (he adds) qui ne sont qu'un tres petit abregé d'histoire, ne nous autorise ni a rejeter ni à tordre les paroles d'Amos, qui sont claires."
sacrifice not merely in the Semitic line up to Noah, but to the beginning of the history of man, in the instance of Cain and Abel. However strange this mode of worship may be to the men of our day—at least within the circle of Protestantism—we see that the sacrificial cultus must be connected most intimately with the essence of all religions. Many things have been arbitrarily said on the original meaning of *offering*: the etymology of the word will very simply give us the true point of view. The German word *offern*, in Anglo-Saxon *offrian*, was introduced first by the Romans into the German language, and is the Latin *offerre* (Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 22). An offering is therefore originally a gift to the Deity,—a gift by which man strives to make up the deficiency of the always imperfect surrender of himself to God. This is the view taken of it by philosophy. (Hegel’s *Religion philosophie*, I. 169). “This negation is in devotion, and takes also an outward form, in order to prove that the person is in earnest: it completes this negation, partly in an intensive manner, that something is offered—consumed by fire—even human sacrifices; partly it is the sensual enjoyment, eating and drinking, even the negation of outward things. The negation itself is that man divests himself of his subjectivity, not only in outward things, in

*A a resignation belongs to it, the more respectable kind is to sacrifice whole hecatombs of the most valuable cattle to the Gods. The Catholic has for such resignation still more inclination than the Protestant. “Once absolution cost money—says Harms in one of his Theses—now lords and ladies absolve themselves.” From the times of falling heathenism, Tertullian informs us the least valuable parts were chosen for sacrifice—what benefactions are to be expected from the economists of our day, for so spiritualized an object as the expression of thanks, or of a sense of guilt, before the Deity?

*b Peculiarly arbitrary appears to be the view which *Mone* takes of the original meaning of offering, in the sixth part of Creuzer’s *Symbolik*, p. 210. “It is on the one hand a consecration of the higher life for the offered things, on the other hand, an emblem and admonition to men of these obligations in life and death.”
his property, but that he offers his heart, his innermost (innermost) to God." Highly interesting, and in accordance with this, is the language of the author of a Jewish work יֵדֹר יָדָר, Rabbi Jacob of Metz, Book ix., "Before Adam sinned he was himself an offering, and hence had no need of an offering; but after he had sinned, and felt the deficiency which was the consequence of sin, he then wished to make up this deficiency, and hence brought offerings." The oldest form of offerings, of which the Scriptures inform us, although not the oldest generally, are burnt-offerings ἱλαστήρωμα, since all that could be eaten was burnt. Both objects, that of thanksgiving and that of propitiation, were connected with them: on the one hand, gratitude required man to surrender what was external as well as internal to God; and, on the other hand, the surrender of an outward good was considered as a substitution, a propitiation for that which was still deficient in the internal surrender. Thus, it is said, at the presentation of Noah's offering, "The Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more," &c. Gen. viii, 21. And of Job it is said, "that he offered burnt-offerings for his sons; for he said, it may be that my sons have sinned." The patriarchal sacrificial institute was continued in the Semitic line, and passed into the Mosaic cultus. For understanding the nature of offerings, it will be most convenient to divide the Levitical offerings into three classes:—1. Burnt-offerings. 2. Peace-offerings. 3. Sin-offerings. We shall treat of these three classes separately.

The Burnt-offering, as it is the most ancient, so also it is the most general and important in the Mosaic cultus, ἱλαστήριον ἡ ἱλαστήρια ἡ ἱλαστήρια. Philo de Victimis, p. 838. Only of this all that could be eaten was devoted to God,—it was also to be a male, and that without blemish—(this is intimated in Malachi i, 14.); and when several kinds of offerings are mentioned, the burnt-offering is placed first; and
the whole system of offerings begins in Leviticus, with the directions respecting this class. The daily morning and evening sacrifice, the sacrifice on the Sabbath, the principal sacrifice on the first of every month consisted of burnt-offerings: they were also prescribed in connection with thank-offerings and sin-offerings, and as free-will gifts. Lev. i. 4. Numbers xv. 3. Hence we shall not err if we assume that the burnt-offering in the Mosaic cultus retained its ancient meaning. It expressed, in general, the consciousness that man, in his relation to God, needed something to make up what was deficient on his part (eine ergänzung); that he was bound to surrender himself, and all he had, to God.a

THE PEACE-OFFERING (Das Friedensoffer).—Thus we translate after the Septuagint and the Vulgate the Hebrew יִשָּׁנֶה, which Winer (in his edition of Simonis) and Gesenius translate thank-offering. This class of offerings, it appears to us, is very plainly the opposite of sin-offerings. They were not made for the purpose of rectifying a disordered relation, but

a The view advocated by Sykes, that the burnt-offerings were so related to the sin-offerings, that the former were general expiations, and the latter for particular cases, has lately found many supporters. Rosenmüller, 2d Excursus to Leviticus, p. 201. Sack's Apologetik, p. 253. Winer, Realwörterbuch, I. 227. Yet, in the Mosaic Institute, we cannot consider the burnt-offering directly as a sin-offering. An essential difference lies in this,—that it had other rites, that it did not defile like the sin-offering, that offerings of food were connected with it. To this may be added, that, with the exception of a single passage, Lev. i. 4. (also Lev. xvi. 24. would belong to this, but from ver. 25. one sees that sin-offerings are used also there besides burnt-offerings), only with sin-offerings the formula לֵבֶן occurs; but with burnt-offerings always לְרִינוּן, and this marks the approbation or pleasure of God in general, and is equivalent to the unmetaphorical expression, לְרִינוּן לְפִנֵי יְהוָה.
to complete the surrender to God, to make perfect the imperfect thanks and imperfect prayers of impure man. They comprise, 1. The thank-offering פָּרָן. 2. The petitionary offering as a vow פָּרָן. 3. The petitionary offering as a free-will gift פָּרָן. Corresponding to the character of these classes are the regulations given respecting them. Apart from two peculiar exceptions (Lev. xxiii. 19. Num. vi. 17.) the peace-offerings were voluntary; they were anointed with oil—the symbol of peace and of healing—and sprinkled with incense. For the private peace-offerings, that which was left of the offering, after taking away the portion of the priests, served for a joyful meal. By the Jewish theologians (Maimonides, De Oblationibus, c. i. § 17.), one class of offerings are mentioned under the name of offerings of the second class, which, inasmuch as they were not brought to the altar, wanted the peculiar character of an offering, which yet came under the category of things presented to God; such were the firstlings, the first-born, the tithes, and the paschal lamb.* If these gifts must be ranked under the class of offerings, they may perhaps be most suitably included in the peace-offerings. The firstlings and the tithes expressed the sentiment that all the productions of nature belong to the Giver, whose sanctuary, therefore, ought to receive the first portions of them—the same idea which lies at the basis of the libations or drink-

* Whether the passover is to be reckoned among the offerings or not, is an important point in the controversies with the Romish Church. The Romish Church is urgent in the affirmative, that as it is supposed to be a type of the Supper, the title of the mass to the character of a sacrifice may be vindicated. Stricter Protestants allow only the mediating title of Sacramentum, or Sacramentum Pontificale. See Schmid, De Paschate Tract. 1685. Carpzov. Apparatus ad Antiqu. Sacr. p. 396. Cudworth, De Notione Cæna Domini, c. 23. with Mosheim's remarks.
offerings, and which in Christianity is expressed by the grace, the εὐχαριστία, with which the daily meals are sanctified ἔργα. 1 Tim. iv. 4.—So far they had the character of thank-offerings; but inasmuch as by the devotion of the firstlings, the rest received the blessing of God, Deut. xiv. 29. Mal. iii. 10. Prov. iii. 9, 10., they had also somewhat of the character of petitionary offerings. Also the first-born of man was dedicated to God, not as an offering, but to serve him in the temple; and since the tribe of Levi discharged this service, a redemption price was paid instead for the first-born. On the original meaning of the Passover, opinions have been divided, since De Wette, in his "Beitragen," first awakened doubts on the historical credibility of the institution, and are now only agreed that a reference to its nature must take the place of historical significance. We have only to do with its historical significance, and to propose the question, whether the passover has the nature of a thank-offering or of an atonement? We decide, as Outram has already done, De Sacrificiis, c. 13., that originally the passover was regarded as an atonement. The first passover was the substitution for the Jewish first-born, since the destroying angel passed over the door-posts sprinkled with its blood. This view appears to be at the foundation of the ancient apocryphal dictum from Ezra, to which Justin appeals in Dial. c. Tryph., p. 297., and still more plainly Paul, in 1 Cor. v. 7. (John xix. 36.) In the repetition of the offering, there is only a commemoration of the substitution, and hence it assumes more the character of a thank-offering.

The propitiatory sacrifices were divided into the trespass-offering (schuld-opfer), and the sin-offering.

a Among the most acute writers on this subject is Baur. Weighty counter arguments are presented by Schott, both respecting the passover and the presentation of the first-born, which, according to Baur and Hüllman, originally must have rested on the universal practice of human sacrifices. See also p. 68 of Ewald's treatise before mentioned.
(sünd-opfer) (Lev. vii. 37.), the difference between which must have been formerly quite clear, but cannot now be determined. That the sin-offering had a more serious character may be considered from its ritual; and though it is no longer possible for us to establish the difference in particular cases, yet we must believe it existed in the mind of the lawgiver, as indicated by the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus. Some things will be mentioned hereafter respecting the peculiar rites connected with the propitiatory sacrifices. The most sacred of all the offerings collectively, was the offering on the day of atonement, that propitiatory sacrifice for the universal sinfulness of the people, which was distinguished from all others by its peculiar ritual. It was offered on the only day of fasting and mourning which the law ordained; it was exclusively presented by that priest, in whom the whole idea of the priesthood was concentrated, the high priest, &c. For dogmatic theology, it is now a question of importance in what sense the atoning power was ascribed to the propitiatory offerings, and according to the spirit of the law and resp. of Christ and the Apostles. Inasmuch as the New Testament represents the priestly efficiency of the Redeemer under the form of the propitiatory offering; so far the understanding of this doctrine, is independent on correct conceptions of the Old Testament typical institute. We shall place together, with some fulness, the various views on this subject, partly for the purpose of exciting enquiries respecting it. Such a representation has been industriously drawn up by Schott, who has given these various views in a tabular form, though not with perfect strictness of arrangement.

These views may be divided into two great classes, according as the atonement is considered as effected immediately by the offering, or as the offering is considered as a symbol which atoned mediately by means of intention. Those who adopt the view of an im-
mediate atonement, support it on speculative or juridical or physical grounds.

1. On the principles of Schelling, the propitiatory offering is considered by Zimmer, J. J. Wagner, Marheineke, and others, as atoning, in as far as the sensual is therein given up in order to gain the supersensual. "To offer, (or sacrifice,)") says Marheineke, in his "Grundlegung d. Homiletik," p. 10, is nothing else but to consecrate the transitory apparent-being, (Scheinwesen,) to the eternal Original Being, (Urwesen): in this the Being, (or Essence,) of Religion itself is expressed. The offering is the commencing point from which religion proceeds; through a thousand modifications it makes its way, in this form, through all the stages of human thought, action and life; for man can exercise no true and sincere pious faith in God, excepting solely in this idea of offering a sacrifice, feeling his dependence and distance from God in humility and pain, and giving up all the transitory for the gain of the untransitory, or consecrating the former by his mode of beholding it in a higher light."

2. It is substantially the same idea, only juridically conceived, or as T. T. Wagner expressed himself—the conception (Begriff) is put in place of the idea (Idee) when by Michaelis, Flatt, Süssenkind, and Rosenmüller, the presentation is considered as a cessio bonorum, as a mulcta; a loss of earthly things by which the super-earthly, the remission of guilt, is obtained in exchange.

3. Within the juridical department, also lies the Kantian idea, to which Storr appears to be peculiarly attached; according to which atonement ensues, since the propitiatory offering satisfies the idea of the law, which always requires death or some kind of punishment for sin. Parallel with this view is the acceptation-theory, in the department of the Christian doctrine of redemption.

4. The sentiments of the acute le Maistre have a deep mystical basis. According to the views pre-
valent in theological schools, that evil rests in the sensual principle, the blood, as the sensitive principle, is likewise taken as the principle of sin, and the presentation of it as a physical atonement for sin. In the "Soirées de St. Pétersbourg," I. 390, it is said "l'homme étant donc coupable par son principe sensible, par sa chair, par sa vie, l'anathème tomboit sur le sang."a Stier's Theory of Redemption would lead, as it appears, to a similar view of sacrifices, according to which redemption consisted in a consumption of the flesh and blood affected by weakness. Compare the argument against Stier and Le Maistre in Günther's "Vorschule zur Spekul. Theologie," in the 11th and 12th letters of the second part.

5. The view of the Martinist school is purely physical; according to this, the powerful newly shed blood is absorbed by a polluted atmosphere, and expels the demons who are invisibly present. To the same purport Baader also expresses himself on the meaning of sacrifices in Schelling's "Allgem. Zeitschrift."

The symbolical character of sacrifices has, in later times, been principally advocated by De Wette (De Morte expiat. p. 20,) neque alio nisi sensu symbolico victimarum substitutio in locum offerentis sumi potest, licet postea sicut omnia symbola in superstitionem vererit. Also in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the symbolical view lies at the base, x. 1—4. But what was the idea symbolically represented in the propitiatory sacrifice, and what order of sentiments it was intended to call forth? Here, again, a difference of opinion exists.

1. The propitiating quality consists in this, that the offerer dare not taste of it,—as a sign, that the communion between God and himself was interrupted, a sense of which awakened repentance; while, on the

a The counterpart of this view is found in Klaiber, who considers that the blood, the soul of beasts, is propitiatory, because it is pure, and represents the obligation of the offerer to be pure; see his "Versöhnungslehre," p. 79.
contrary, in the peace-offering the offerer enjoyed his part, as a sign that God and man were in concord. Thus Sykes and Semler.

2. The propitiatory sacrifices effected their design, because their purity, as required by the law, awakened in the offerer a consciousness of his own want of purity. Thus Philo, *de Victim.* p. 336, and Klaiber, in his *Versöhnungslehre.*

3. God, by accepting the gifts, declared that he again entered into a peaceful relation with sinners, and thus silently effected that state in their disposition. Thus Steudel, in his *Weihnachtsprogr.* 1825, and his " *Glaubenslehre,*" p. 259.

4. They represented not the *forgiveness* of sins,—for this can take place only through the *Word* of God, but the *extinction* of sin, since the sin was laid upon the sacrifice, and consumed on the altar by the fire of God; but the blood, in order to represent communion with God, was poured upon the altar: Thus Hasencamp, in the journal " *Wahrheit zur Gottseligkeit,*" in an essay on sacrifices, and a treatise on the sacrifices of the Old Testament. Bremen. 1830.

5. The propitiatory sacrifice represented the punishment which the sinner had merited, and thus awakened in sinners the consciousness of guilt; thus Jahn, Hengstenberg, Sack, (who also (see No. 6,) maintains the consciousness of a typical meaning), and, indeed Schleiermacher " *Glaubenslehre,*" II. § 125, 3, " which expression, *Satisfaction,* ( *Genugthung,* ) marks also his (Christ's high-priestly character; for the completing sacrifice of the high-priest was, indeed, the satisfaction, inasmuch as the faith of the people, agreeably to the divine promise, now felt free from all dread of divine punishment on account of past sins."

6. They seemed to typify the great future propitiatory sacrifice, and to awaken an anticipation of it in believers; thus the dogmatic theology of the

The two last mentioned views are reconciled by what is said in Heb x. 3. not so much of the object as of the result of the sacrifice. As, through the propitiatory sacrifice, the consciousness of guilt is constantly revived, and yet that sacrifice could not exert a renovating power on the disposition, so it exercised an anticipation of a real redemption. That the Apostles had connected the two last named references with the sin-offerings, may be concluded from what they taught in that typical form respecting the redemption by Christ. But, independently of this, it may be demonstrated, from reasons drawn from the Old Testament, that that substitution was connected with the propitiatory sacrifices. Several of the reasons given do not serve, as, for example, the laying on of hands, for this took place in other offerings. Yet the reasons advanced by Scholl are decisive; (1.) The idea of the substitution of a sacrificial animal for the guilty was prevalent through all antiquity. (2.) That the death of man may be substitutionary is confessedly an article of the Jewish faith; with this is connected the admission of a substitution by sacrificial animals. (3.) The ceremonial plainly shows that the animal became unclean only by being a substitutionary sacrifice, *Exod.* xxix. 14. *Lev.* iv. 11, 12, 21; vi. 27, 28; xvi. 28. The remains of it were burnt without the camp, *Lev.* xvi. 27. *Exod.* xxix. 14. *Lev.* iv. 21; and, indeed, as it is expressly declared in *Exod.* xxix. 14, because “it is a sin-offering.” He who performed the burning was to wash himself before he came again into the camp, *Levit.* xvi. 28, &c. (4.) The substitution is to be inferred, *Lev.* xvii. 11, where the blood is called an atonement, because “the life of the flesh is in the blood.” (5.) The idea of substitution is also to be inferred from *Deut.* xxi., for, in the 8th verse, it is said, that the guilt remained on the whole congregation, if the perpetrator of a murder was unknown,
and no sacrifice atoned for it, until, by the washing of hands, the guilt was transferred to the sacrifice.

(6.) Also the substantive רֶפֶן, ransom, (Lösegeld) indicates that רֶפֶן, to atone, propitiate (versöhn), includes the idea of substitution. 

(7.) Likewise the ceremonial on the day of atonement, with the scape-goat, hircus émissarius, from which Süsskind and Steudel have drawn inferences against substitution, is entirely in favour of it; the goat slain was the sin-offering by which sin was atoned; sin was laid on the scape-goat, in order, by this most solemn act, to render so much the more striking the taking away of guilt by the atonement.

a In Persian, to cover, is used instead of to take away, to put away. Thus, in a Persian translation of the Prophets, in the Royal Library at Paris שַמֵּשׁ, the joy (of the harp) ceaseth. Isa. xxiv. 8, is translated he covereth the joy.

b Almost the whole body of modern critics, (with the exception of Ewald,) Rosenmüller, Winer, Hengstenberg, Gesenius, have followed the example of Spencer, and taken Assael for the name of a demon, answering to Satan. The last mentioned of these critics, in his Lexicon, 1833, says, "non dubitans reddo έλλήνως, averruncus, eoque nomine primitus idolum aliquod sacrificiis placandum, cacodememon in deserto habitantem, ex ritu illo vetustissimo (et gentili) hostis miligandum, intelligendum esse statuendo;" and then makes a reference to the Arabic. The Septuagint is adduced as a proof for the literal meaning of the word, in ver. 8, τὸ κτίσμαν = τὸ διάβολον. In this view I cannot concur. The reason expressed by Baumgarten Crusius, is next to be taken into consideration, (Bibl. Theol. p. 294.) In fact, an offering brought to the evil spirit in the Wilderness, is altogether contradictory to the general religious principles of Mosaism, as well as to the meaning of this ceremony. Immediately after the description of the rite of atonement follows (xvii. 7.) the warning not to sacrifice to דָּם ב מ what can these be but cacodemones? Thus, then, the rite cannot have any reference to demons. We must at least, as has been done since the time of Origen, understand Assael to mean the Devil, with Spencer and (in modern times,) Heng-
There is one kind of sacrifices remaining, of which it is doubtful to what class they belong—those of covenants. The investigation on the commentary on Hengstenberg. Against this interpretation, objections were made by early Christian writers; τοιούτος εἰς τῶν ὄντων 

sten says Theodoret, in the xxii. quart. in Levit. and against Julian, who made use of the same interpretation as an objection to the Christians. Cyril says that he borrowed such a representation from Heathenism. The meaning given by Hengstenberg, (Christologie, I. p. 37,) is hardly admissible,—"that the sins were sent back (as it were) to the devil," and yet I do not know one more admissible. As to the reason alleged by Dr. Gesenius, the appeal to the Arabians is plainly inadmissible and erroneous; it is, indeed, allied to the attempt to show that the rite proceeded from ancient heathenism; at all events, the name Assael came, like innumerable others, from the Jews to the Arabians, (see the Commentary, p. 116,) as from them it passed to the Zabians. See נַעַר in Onomast. Libri Ad. p. 31, as the name of the genius גֶּה. Besides, there appears to have been a change of terms among the Arabians. The Jews spoke of two good angels, Asa and Assael, who, at the creation of man, rebelled against God; and, after the fall, had intercourse with the daughters of men, (Gen. vi.) and begat the בֶּן אֵל (In the Targum of Jonathan on Gen. vi. 4. these angels are called יָנָן שֶׁה and יַנָּן יִעְיָה.) In the Mahomedan legends these two angels are called Harut and Marut. Another tradition appears to have interchanged that of Assael with Assael, for in a passage of Abrel Korem, quoted by Reland in his De Relig. Muhamm. p. 189, it is said that the Devil had the name Assael before his fall; and the same things are narrated of him under that name by the Mahomedans which the Rabbinical legends tell of Assael. Mill, in his treatise de Muhammadismo ante Muhammedem, p. 60, has hinted at this interchange of names. Also, in the Greek fragments of the Book of Enoch, (Fabricius, Pseudoepigr. V. T. I. 182,) ἀραμαίος and ἀραμαίος are interchanged. If the Rabbinical interpretation of Assael as the devil be ancient, it cannot, at least, have been universally known, for Jonathan, whom Jarchi also follows, understands by Assael a mountain. But let it be considered that the Rabbies have explained several Biblical names as meaning demon, such as יָרָא יְרַע Gen vi. 5. יָרָא
chap. ix. 15. leads us to conclude that they are a kind of votive offering; yet the character of propitiatory sacrifices seems to predominate.

B. THE INSTITUTION OF PRIESTS.

As the idea of sacrifice is peculiar to all religions, even the most imperfect, so also is that of a priesthood. As from the universality of sacrifice, we must conclude that it is deeply founded in the constitution of man, the same may be affirmed of the institution of priests. The universal idea of the priesthood is that of mediation; accordingly we find in our Epistle, the terms μηταρνς and ισευς used as equivalent to each other.* As the universality of sacrifice,

Ps. xci. 10. (Eisemanger. ii. 424,) וַיַּקְבוּ וַיַּקְבוּ Ps. xci. 6, &c.

And if the LXX. have translated Asasel by υψαντωμανη, ver. 8—yet there is no proof that they thought of a Δεσατωρ αυτωρυκυς, for the second the word occurs ver. 10. they have translated it ως υψαντωμαν. Therefore that explanation of their translation appears to be the just one, which is approved by Theodoret and Cyril: "One lot for the God-devoted animal, the other for the one destined to be turned away." As to the grammatical form of the word, it is the pealpal of יָלוּנ וָלֵנו יָלוּנ, with the exclusion of the final letter of the Penultima and its compensation, by an unchangeable vowel as נוּנ יָלוּנ for נוּנ יָלוּנ (Ewald's Krit. Gramm., p. 243). This form is intensive. I remark that Dr. Steudel has taken the same view, (Glaubensl. p. 258.)

* Since etymology, in solving the problem " vocum cognoscere causas," so frequently, in the ancient languages, solves the other "rerum cognoscere causas," in philosophical and dogmatical inquiries, it is profitable for the subject to take a glance at the etymology. In the word offering (opfer), we have found the earliest idea of sacrifice. The same is the case with the Hebrew יָלוּנ, if we venture to refer to the meaning given by Firuzabadi, from קﬠא to mediate. The Latin sacræ-
so also the universality of the priesthood, is a proof of the depth of that sense of guilt, and consciousness of estrangement from God, which existed in the ancient world. Hence, when predictions, as the prophets expressed them, announced that the time was coming when a priesthood and sacrifices would be no longer necessary, such prophesying spirits went far beyond the religious sentiment of their own times and of all antiquity. When, on the other hand, an age like ours feels the need neither of sacrifices nor of a priesthood, yet, without receiving the only Sacrifice, and the only Priest, of the human race, such an age stands much below the religious sentiment of antiquity. Since the Israelitish nation dare not approach, in their own persons, to the sanctuary of God, but presented their oblations through the medium of another consecrated class, their mediation, in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices, served to keep alive the consciousness of estrangement from God. But this was not enough. The priests could only mediate in the sanctuary, and were excluded from the most Holy place. Only he, in whom again the priestly idea was concentrated, could enter into the Holy of Holies, and thereby became a type of the absolute Mediator, who had introduced humanity into the most Holy place of the kingdom of spirits. Meanwhile, by their office as mediators, all these priests were not altogether from the sinful body of the people, but were both mediators and representatives of their race. Hence, also, the High-priest had access into that most Holy place only once a year, namely, on the day when atonement was made for the collective guilt of the nation. Before he performed that high office, he was obliged to bring an

dos from sacrae, in the sense of "appropriating to the gods," approaches to this idea. Our German Priester is the altered Presbyter, as Pfaffe from Papa. In Sanscrit, Priest is called, among other titles, Puròdhas, Purohità, i. e. overseer. Prae-positus and Yashtì, i. e. adorer. Offering is pùdschà and yadshna, that is, adoring.
atonning sacrifice, with a confession of his own sins, and to lay aside his splendid attire, and exchange it for a lined dress; and when he entered the veiled, narrow apartment of the Holy of Holies, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat, "that he die not," Lev. xvi. 13. Thus this ceremonial awakened in men a consciousness of the immense chasm by which the finite and sinful being was separated from the Infinite and All-holy. Schleiermacher (Glaubenslehre, II. § 125, 2.) observes, "Although every thing outward points at least, in its origin, to something inward that is represented by it, yet to the outward of the Jewish High-priest it also belongs,—First, that while the people remaining at a greater or less distance from the sanctuary approached to it only at befitting times, the High-priest, on the contrary, was always placed in its midst; so that though his functions were few, and confined to certain times, yet his whole existence appeared consecrated;—and, secondly, that though the people presented their offerings to God by the collective priesthood, still the sacrifice of atonement was necessary as an universal completion of the rest, which the High-priest alone could present. The idea, therefore, of his office appears to be, that while, to the Jewish people, their national life appeared as an alternation of drawing nigh to God, and withdrawing from him, which was represented in the alternation of their seasons of worship with the time given to their secular concerns,—the High-priest was the individual whose life, compared with these vacillating movements, was in perpetual equipoise; and as the people were always in a state of impurity, he was the only person who could present himself as pure before God."

What has been said may suffice to give a distinct idea of the priesthood. Now, as we have observed, while sacrifices and priests were among all the nations of antiquity the most essential points of the outward revelation of religion, the Jewish people is the only one which not merely anticipated a stage that rose
above this institution, but with confidence looked forward to the future, and, by that onward gazing on the future, softened all the sorrows of the present. Jewish prophecy foretold with confidence a time when, under a new covenant, the law of God would become an internal one, when, consequently, neither religious error nor sin would exist among the people of God. Compare what is said in Jer. xxxi. 31; (see also Jer. xxiv. 7. Ezek. xi. 19; xxxvi. 26.), in the Commentary on Heb. viii. 8—12. Other passages also speak of the universal holiness and knowledge of God that would prevail in the Messianic age, Isa. iv. 3; xi. 9., which expression is repeated in Hab. ii. 14; compare also the language in Isa. lx. 18—21. Zach. xiv. 9. In these expressions likewise is contained a prophecy, that priests and sacrifices would cease, for as Heb. x. 18 indicates, with the taking away of sin the repetition of the sacrificial ceremonial, and the need of its ministers, is also taken away; according to Isaiah lxi. 6. all the individuals of the people will be priests; yea, even the prophetic office will then be no more, when, according to Isa. liv. 13. all the people shall be Ἱσοῦς υἱοὶ, when, according to Jerem. xxxi. 34. "they shall teach no more every man his neighbour;" and, according to Joel iii. 1. the Spirit of the Lord shall be poured out on both sexes, and on all ages. He must have eyes that see not, who, in such views of the Old covenant, to which the history of no nation offers a parallel, refuses to acknowledge the light and harmony of Revelation. But there are also passages in which their hopes of the future are distinctly connected with the person of the Messiah, in which he is represented as the king, priest, and prophet of the glorified people of God, by whom all this is to be brought to pass. We have here only to do with the priestly office. Since the prophecy of the 110th Psalm calls the Messiah a priest after the order of Melchisedec, it expresses, as our epistle develops vii. 11—13. the cessation of every kind of mediation.
as it existed under the Old covenant. In the same manner the language of Zach. vi. 13. promises the union of the priestly and kingly dignity in the Messiah, and it is even said of the priest that he should build the temple. But the sacrifice which this priest would offer is, according to Isa. liii., the spotless sacrifice of himself. He is there called και τον πληροφόρον, "the righteous one, my servant," that is, who, on account of his righteousness, is my plenipotentiary: and, on account of this righteousness, he is capable of bearing the guilt of his people.

The importance of this prophecy is such, that we may be permitted to descant somewhat more fully upon it, though the Old Testament Exegesis does not exactly come within the limits of this essay. When Tweesten, in his Dogmatik. p. 383. says, "So long as the position, 'there are no prophecies in the sense of the older theology,' is not so much the result as the postulate of Old Testament Exegesis, as appears to me to be the case with modern expositors of Isaiah liii.," this will certainly be regarded by many Old Testament expositors as an unfounded postulate. Meanwhile, let us listen to an honourable confession in Eichhorn's "Bibliothec," Vol. vi. p. 658: "The Messianic explanation of this chapter would doubtless find universal approbation, if in later years doubts had not arisen, respecting the correctness of the elevated meaning which has been attributed to the ancient prophets, and, consequently, the conviction that the prophets published nothing of future things but what they could know without divine inspiration; hence very many have been induced to seek out the ancient Jewish interpretations and to refine them." In our time, men have expressed themselves more distinctly, but, on the whole, the meaning of the long discourse has been the same. We shall occupy ourselves in an examination of the views that are most probably correct in each of them. Let a person, without having heard anything of the different opinions on the subject of Isaiah liii. read
the whole section, chap. xl.—lili. 1—12, in connec-
tion, he will be disposed, in answer to that question
of the eunuch, "I pray thee, of whom doth the pro-
phet speak?" to answer at first, he says such things
of the Jewish people, in the Babylonish captivity,
who, on account of their sufferings, will become so
glorious. To this answer he will be led by the pro-
mises which are made to the people in the 40th
chapter, as to a recompense for their severe suffer-
ings, "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry
unto her, that her warfare is accomplished—that
her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the
Lord's hands double for all her sins." Consola-
tion to this effect abounds through the whole section,
xli. 8—20; xliii. 1; xlv. 1, 21, 22; xlv. 4; (xlix.
7—26.), and several times Israel is expressly called,
"the chosen servant of God." But, more particu-
larly, the prophetic language immediately preceding
li. 9; lili. 12. announces that the Lord had watched
over his captive people, "that he would make bare
his holy arm before the eyes of all nations, and that
all the ends of the earth should see the salvation of
God." But this is only the first impression which
can allow our acceptance of this. On a clearer in-
vestigation insurmountable difficulties present them-
selves. In the first place, the question occurs, how
could the Jewish nation be represented as the serv-
ant of God, the righteous One who only bore the
sins of others, when the constant impression on the
minds of the captive Israelites must have been, that
they were given over to their enemies on account of
their sins? "Neither have we obeyed the voice of
the Lord—therefore the curse is poured upon us, and
the oath that is written in the law of Moses," Dan-
iel ix. 11. "Since the days of our fathers," ex-
claimed Ezra, "have we been in a great trespass
unto this day, and for our iniquities have we, our
kings, and our priests, been delivered into the hand
of the kings of the lands, to the sword, and to cap-
tivity, and to a spoil, and to confusion of face, as it is
this day,” Ezra x. 7. compare Jer. xxxiv. xxxv. 17, &c. Thus it is said, even at the beginning of this section, “Cry unto Jerusalem, that her iniquity is pardoned,” and the same is expressed in the strongest terms in Is. xlii. 22—25; xliii. 25—28. where it is without hesitation said, that Israel had no merit, only sin, and owed its deliverance purely to the grace of God. Glory is predicted of the suffering servant of God, in chap. liii. while yet, according to lvii. 13; lix. 20. it belonged by no means to all, but only to the converted portion of the people. But allowing this objection to be set aside by the reply of a modern critic Hitzig, that the sufferings of Israel in exile, must be supposed to have had an overplus beyond their personal guilt—a reply which seems indeed somewhat scanty, we are then prompted to ask, who uttered the penitent confession in liii. 3—6, and if we are told that it must be the heathen nations, it appears a thing altogether inconceivable that they could be suddenly introduced without any previous intimation. Yet precisely in this section from chapter xl. there is the abrupt introduction of another address, and we might perhaps consent to allow it here, if we could gain the great advantage of venturing to explain the title of servant of God, as everywhere belonging to the same subject. But perfect constancy on this point cannot be attained, for xlv. 26. must be at all events understood of the prophetic class: compare 1. 10. Also the predicates Shepherd and Anointed of God, (xlv. 28. xlv. 1.) which are applied to Cyrus, are so allied to servant of God, that it appears more like a happy accident for interpreters, that Cyrus is not also called כָּרְךָ. As no inconsiderable confirmation of the view we have mentioned, it may seem to serve, that in chap. xlii. 3. Israel is precisely called the servant of God. Here it may be said, what more can be wished for? This circumstance, (if we examine the history of interpretation) has in fact given the first occasion for considering the people of Israel as
the subject in chap. liii. Yet it is exactly here that we meet with inexplicable difficulties. First of all there is this, that the servant of God himself speaks; but then there is the still greater, that even this servant has also the office of bringing back the rebels in Zion to the right path, ver. 5, 6, 8. compare xlii. 2. The newest interpretation of this section, which applies it to the people in general, shows that only an interpretation of so forced a kind remains, that this view, even were there no other reasons against it, must utterly fail in this passage.

Another view may also be taken of chap. xlix. according to which the speaker himself is considered as the יִזַּחֲצֵר. Can any other person be intended than the speaking prophet? Is not the address, "Hearken ye people from afar!" in perfect correspondence with the prophetic language in chap. xxxiv. 1.? This is Stahelin's opinion in his Essay on Is. xl. —lxvi. in the "Studien und Kritiken," iv. But this view can be retained only for an instant, for the substance of what immediately follows, that this servant is to be the Mediator, the light of the heathen and God's salvation to the end of the earth (ver. 6.) opposes such a construction. This interpretation too, is inapplicable to chap. liii. for there the death of God's servant is spoken of, and his glorification after death. Several other individuals have been thought of, Uzziah, Hezekiah, Josiah, as intended in chap. liii. but without success. If then the first as well as the second half of the eunuch's question, ("Does the prophet speak of himself or of some other?") be negatived, nothing remains but to attempt a coalition of the two answers. Such is the supposition, that עֲבֵרַי יָחָר denotes either the collective succession of prophets, or the better part of the Jewish people, though the latter symbolizes with the former, since the prophets were the selectest members of the pious part of the nation. This application of these passages to the prophetic order, has become very
prevalent in recent times. More lately, Hitzig has deserted it; Ewald also is opposed to it, so that not long ago it was noticed by a reviewer, as "a hypothesis near its decease." The funeral certificate (Todtenschein) would not have been issued with such promptitude, had there not been a fear that this was a case of only apparent death (Scheintodten), in which the burial must be speedily performed, before the dormant powers revived. In our opinion, this construction of the passage in question has more to be said in its behalf than any other. It may be combined with Christian views, in the following manner: —"Whether, to the prophetic vision, Christ appeared in the future as an individual, or as the animating Spirit of the church. Each is alike important. The seer who beheld only the first, had the root without the trunk and branches: he who beheld only the second, had the branches without the root. The first part of Isaiah principally announces the Messiah as an individual,—the second, delineates his manifestation in the Church. Compare xlix. 9—23. lx. 61. The Prophet, living at the end of the captivity, was aware that he and his associates in office were principally commissioned to be heralds of that glorious era, to carry to the ends of the earth, and to realize the salvation of the world, that even the kings of distant lands might do homage to the Lord (xlix. 6. lii. 15.). The sufferings endured in this holy cause by him and his associates were for the good of the unrighteous nation; for, by the endurance of these sufferings, the prophets founded the kingdom of God, and beheld a numerous spiritual posterity (l. 4—9. liii. 10—12). These visions of the prophets have always something superabundant—something that reaches beyond the objects immediately before them. But it is the living Spirit of Christ within them which impels them to express so superabundantly, what belongs primarily to the ideal of the prophetic order, but has its fulfilment in the Messiah. We trace here a similarity to the 16th and 22nd Psalms. Is not
the close of the 22nd Psalm so elevated, that it is inconceivable, on any intelligible grounds, that David could connect such hopes with his personal deliverance from trouble. But if we proceed on the idea of the mystical Christ, and contemplate the true prophets as its members, these sufferings will appear so much more as a type of what would be fulfilled in the historical Christ; as Paul also, in this sense, says, that he filled up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ for his body's sake, which is the Church. Colos. i. 24. As, in the beginning of John's Gospel, the words, "He came to his own, and his own received him not," bear a relation to "the light appeared in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not;" so also is the relation of the sufferings of the historical Christ to those of the mystical Christ.

In this manner, by interpreting the sections under consideration of the prophetic order, their Christian application is preserved; and the "must" of Gese-nius, when, at the close of his examination of ch. liii., he says, "The passage can and must be called Messianic," is to be justified in a more comprehensive sense than he there employs it. Yet no inconsiderable difficulties oppose this view of the collective body of the prophets, or of the better part of the Jewish people. From the first, in all these collective explanations, and when the reference is supposed to be to the whole people, a doubt arises, from the fact, that not once is the plural interchanged with the singular. One such instance Ge-senius believes he has found in וְיָם, ver. 8. But, though the mere comparison with other passages would render Gessenius' view doubtful, we have now, after Ewald's examination has terminated in favour of the singular use of וְיָם, (Krit. Gramm. p. 365, Kl. Gramm. 2d edit. § 421), seen, that the majority of critics consider this post as altogether untenable. Especially in reference to the collective explanation
of the prophetic order, it at once awakens suspicion, that the prophets never, like the priests, a peculiar fraternity, and hence, such a fraternal representation would not be in agreement with the character of their order—if they ever constituted a kind of fraternity, it was at the time when their schools or colonies existed (Amos vii. 14.) What, besides, would the priests have said to such arrogance on the part of the prophetical order, they who had suffered more by the exile than the prophets, and truly formed an exclusive fraternity, which acquired greater importance from the time of the captivity? A disproportionately large number of those who returned from captivity, belonged, (as is shown by Ezra ii. and Neh. vii.) to the class of priests and Levites, who naturally must have had the greatest share in building the temple; Ezra is called κατ' εὐξοχν, the priest, and the state gradually passed from a theocracy into a hierarchy. The splendour of the prophetical period, therefore, ceased exactly at that aera, when according to the mode of interpreting of prophecy under review, it ought to have begun. Farther, it cannot be denied, that the ideal description which is given in the latter half of Isaiah, of the members of the glorified kingdom of God—that they should be all priests and possess the spirit of God, (Is. liv. 13; lx. 21; lxi. 6; lxii. 12.) presents a great obstacle to that interpretation, as its chief advocate appears to feel. In so exalted a state of the church, could there be a continual diminution of the burden of sin by the prophets? For so Gesenius explains ver. 11. If we refer to Jerem. xxxi. 34. Joel iii. 1, it is an essential feature of the Messianic age, that no mediators will be needed between God and men. A third objection against admitting a reference to the collective body of prophets, or to the better part of the people, lies in ver. 3—6. Here some persons are introduced as speakers who are distinct from the speaking prophet, for they speak of him and his class. Only it will be very difficult to demonstrate, that the prophet
does not here include himself. Does not the prophet himself stand in ver. 1. as an astonished beholder of what he announces in ver. 2 and 3. Must not especially—and this is our fourth objection—a sense of guilt been felt by the prophets, which would have made it impossible for them to have represented themselves in this manner as the only righteous persons in distinction from the mass of priests and people who were sinners requiring to be atoned for? A prophet who felt his own sinfulness like Isaiah (ch. vi. 5.) could such a one represent himself as righteous compared with the mass of the people? Moreover, we find this great chasm between Christ and pious men like Spener, Paul, and David, that they, the more pious they became, so much the more felt their need of being redeemed, but he from the first presented himself only as a Redeemer. Also in other passages of the second half of Isaiah, the speaker considers himself as included in the sinfulness of the people, chap. xlii. 24. Lastly, in the fifth place, such a mode of interpretation cannot logically and psychologically explain chap. xlix. and liii. Gesenius urges principally against the Messianic interpretation, that in chap. xlix. the servant of God speaks of himself in the first person. But how can this servant of God be the collective body of past and future prophets? "Hearken to me, the Lord hath called me from the womb;" this Gesenius considers as the language of the individual prophet. Where then, does the collective meaning begin? The circumstance that Gesenius has given no decision on this point, Umbreit has taken as an admission, that the reference at first made to the collective prophets, afterward merges in a reference to the Messiah. And how must we settle the question in chap. liii. The historic foundation must be this, that some individual prophet in captivity lost his life, and was ignominiously buried. Must this violent death of some prophet by popular outrage—which moreover is a mere hypothesis—be viewed by another pious man, as so unparal-
led a deed, that the atonement of the guilt of a whole nation rests upon it? Truly, this has little probability. But there is one point more. It is, as the advocates of this interpretation say, not merely descriptive of the suffering and ignominy endured by the prophets in general, but of the real martyrdom of an individual prophet. Now this makes an essential difference. We would not indeed deny, that as according to the view of antiquity, it happened on other occasions with families. So here also a strictly defined class—it being admitted that the pious or the prophets form such a class—might be represented as an individual, and consequently suffering and reward as something common to all. But the passages before us, give in fact the impression, that the glorified and the suffering individual is one and the same person. for here lies the emphasis of the representation that Jehovah's servant after his death should effect such glorious results.

Under these circumstances, surrounded by doubts of various kinds, we must at least attempt to prove the truth of that explanation of the passage, to which, at the present time, may be applied what the prophet says of the contents of the chapter, "Who hath believed our report?"—we mean that explanation which refers the section to the Messiah. So much the more this becomes a duty, since the opinions against the Messianic interpretation are not harmonious, since the interpretation which applies it to the collective body of prophets (held by De Wette and Gesenius), is at variance with that which understands it of the Jewish nation, (held by Hitzig and Ewald); and perhaps here the maxim may hold good,—cui multipliciter respondetur, non semel bene respondetur. The modern opponents of the Messianic interpretation have injured their own views by many weak and untenable objections with such as are really forcible. We wish at once frankly to state what scruples appear to us chiefly to stand in the way of the Messianic interpretation. First, there is the circum-
stance, that in chap. xlix. the servant of God appears speaking in the first person, and also in the passages which critics, though Stahelin is not one of these, are disposed to consider as parallel, L. 4—11. (or—9.), lxi. 1. Secondly, the circumstance that in the sections in question, that must be ascribed to the Messiah, which suits only the Jews in the captivity: in chap. xlix. 7., he is called a servant "who is under tyrants," ("a servant of rulers," Eng. Vers.), and in the same chapter, verse 9. and lxi. 1, 4., deliverance from captivity is announced to the exiles. It cannot be denied that there is weight in these objections. Yet we must, at the same time, take notice, that besides all the difficulties before mentioned, which press on the two prevalent interpretations, new ones here present themselves. Supposing the Jewish people to be intended, we are met by the inconsequence, that the servant of God, in chap. lxix., who speaks in the first person, must be the people, but in chap. L. and lxi., where likewise the first person is used, he must be a prophet. And, indeed, what the speaker in chap. xlix. 9. describes as his employment, the speaker in chap. lxi. 1. also express as his vocation! Since, moreover, it would be incongruous, for the people (xlix. 9.) announced their own deliverance from exile, the captivity is taken by Hitzig as a general image of misery, though Gesenius refers it decidedly to the exile. On the other hand, Gesenius is obliged to refer the expression, "slave of tyrants," xlix. 7. to the prophets; while it must be granted to Hitzig that this language applied to the prophet, or the prophets in specie, cannot be explained so suitably as if referred to the oppressed nation in exile. But as to the difficulty, that it is not credible, that the prophet would introduce, ex abrupto, the person of the Messiah speaking, Gesenius admits against himself, that in cxlix. the prophet as an individual begins to speak and ex abrupto, in the sequel of the discourse, the future prophets are included under the first person; but Hitzig must equally introduce, ex abrupto, chap. xlix. the whole nation speaking, and, in verse 1. con-
sider them as using language which yet can suit only an individual, and, moreover, with much greater harshness, in chap. liii. 4. he must allow the heathen nations to become the speakers.

With respect to the second objection against the Messianic interpretation, it is removed by the following remarks, which assume that Isa. xl.—lx. was composed during the captivity. It is the general opinion that the prophets must have been informed respecting the time of the Messiah's advent. The statements of the New Testament on this point lead to an opposite conclusion, 1 Peter i. 10, 11. But even from the Old Testament it appears, that with the exception of Daniel, the prophets were destitute of any precise views; the Messianic age was the boundary line of their historical circle, an horizon brightened by the dawn of a better hope. Most of the Messianic prophecies rest upon the simple dialectic, which would be confirmed by the history of the world. First a state of mediocrity; then a conflict of opposite principles, until misery and sin rose to a high pitch, then the termination of all strife in the times of the Messiah—and this dialectic will repeat itself so often in prelude, until it shall be absolutely realized, when time is swallowed up in eternity. Thus the prophetic word always announces redemption to the people of the existing times. Already, in the time of Ahaz, Isaiah exclaimed, "To us a son is born, to us a child is given!" and still earlier Micah had said, "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah—out of thee shall come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel—he shall stand and feed (or rule) in the strength of the Lord. And this [man] shall be our peace, when the Assyrian shall come unto our land," &c. ver. 2, 4, 5, and Amos promises to the age of the same deliverer "the victory over Edom and all the heathen," Amos ix. 12. Thus it would not be surprising if in our prophet the historic horizon of the captivity was bounded by the Messiah, and if he was exhibited as the founder of the new kingdom of God, and the herald of deliverance.
to the people. Not long after this point of time had passed, we have Haggai again taking up the ancient theme, and promising to the newly erected temple, the glory of the Lord; and the productions of the last prophet, Malachi, close with the announcement, that "suddenly the messenger of the covenant, the Lord of the temple shall come to it," Mal. iii. 1. And since the expectation of the Lord's advent was intended to be a constant "at hand" in the hearts of believers, there is in the New Testament no definite explanation respecting the final coming of Christ, but a great fundamental law is expressed. "Iniquity shall abound—the love of many shall wax cold, but he that endureth to the end shall be saved," Matth. xxiv. 12, 13, and Paul and John infer from the prevalence of evil, that the final advent was nigh, (2 Thess. ii. 6, 7. 1 Tim. iv. 1. 1 John iv. 3.) and in the twelfth century the nun Hildegard writes, "In the year 1100 the doctrine of the Apostles and the fire of piety began to cool, and in this age am I born," she announces that consequently the end was drawing nigh. According to Luther the whole world stands on two pillars, namely God's arrangement and law," and when these, as in his time, were fluctuating, the world would fall in ruins. According to this we shall have to explain those passages where the Messiah himself—that מְשֵׁאָל spoken of in Is. lix. 20.—is represented as the Instaurator of the new Theocracy. But with respect to the remarkable expression, that in chap. xlix. 7. the servant of God is called in his humiliation "the servant (a slave) of tyrants," it will be best explained by the parallelism, —"abhorred by the people and despised by the great." ("Him whom man despiseth, whom the nation abhorreth."—Eng. vers.) If this view should not be satisfactory, let it be recollected that, as we have said, the expression remains equally striking if it were used of the collective body of the prophets. As to the first objection, that a dramatic introduction of the Messiah—especially when in what preceded he
was not the topic of discourse—would be somewhat too little connected with the subject in hand, \( \text{allzu desultorisches} \) we would acknowledge it in all its strength in every other prophet. But in this latter half of Isaiah, this objection, as any one may perceive, loses its weight, for is not this chapter strikingly pervaded by a peculiarly dramatic character? Through the whole piece there is indeed the same glowing inspiration, but yet the subjects are so distinct that we cannot imagine an unbroken connection. If even it could be affirmed of any prophetic portion of the Scriptures, it must be said of the second half of Isaiah that it bears the impress of a prophetic \( \text{iωσαγας} \). How wonderfully does it begin! xl. 3. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of Jehovah," and v. 6. "The voice said cry, and he said, what shall I say," \&c. How suddenly is God introduced as the speaker, xli. 8. 25., xlii. 1. 14. and generally the addresses begin with "hearken to me!" which might be taken for the words of the prophet himself, as Gesenius, by an oversight, has actually done in reference to chap. li. 1–3. (Commentary, ii. 163.) xliv. 1. xlvi. 3. 12. xlviii. 1. li. 1., compare the mysterious change of persons, if it is one, in xlviii. 16. How picturesque! chap. xlvi. 1. How inspired! chap. li. 17. liii. 1. lx. How unexpected, and yet how dramatic! chap. lxiii. How dramatic, also, is the change of persons in chap. lli. 13. and liii. 1 and 4.

We have now examined the two strongest objections against the Messianic interpretation, of which, strange to say, nothing is found in the latest commentator in that part of his work where he specifies the objections on the subject. If he scorned to learn humility from another book, it is much to be wished that he would have acquired modesty from the work of his learned predecessor, for if this were pleasing in reference to the philological part of his labours, it was an indispensable requisite for the theological part, when Umbreit closes his recension of this Commentary with the following words:—"As to what
concerns the most important point, namely, the theological exposition of the prophet in a higher sense, we find no marks of an advance:—of what avail is all grammatical knowledge if it is not conducive to the Christian faith, and thus lays the foundation for a holy Science of Exegesis.” This mournful apostrophe of the teacher to his former pupil is the gentlest form in which censure can be clothed. The objections stated by Hitzig are as follows:—“To admit that the sufferings and actions of Christ were foretold, is above all things opposed to the character of prophecy, which excludes prediction. It is contradicted, also, by the circumstance, that the humiliation, sufferings and death of the servant (of God) is represented as past, and only his glorification as still future. The present, therefore, of the speaker, and consequently of the author, lies between these two epochs. But if we were disposed to consider what is represented as past to mean something future, yet his “making his grave with the wicked,” (v. 9.) was not fulfilled, and “dividing the spoil with the strong,” spoken of as future, points to a Jewish Messiah, such as has not yet appeared, whose kingdom is to be of this world.”

Let us, then, in the last place, subject these points to examination. If there be no stronger objections than these, the Messianic interpretation may be certain of general acceptance. If by prediction he meant the foretelling of what is purely accidental, and therefore unessential, we agree with that assertion. To foretell what is purely accidental of the Messiah, what kind of garment he wore, or what might be the name of his judge, or in what kind of grave he would be laid would have been matters of curiosity without any religious worth. If the views we have given of prophesy be admitted, we may expect prophecies possessed of ideal worth, in which, if details are introduced, they only serve for individualising the idea.

According to this view, we need not be surprised if, in this connection, (v. 9.) the handsome grave prepared by Joseph of Arimathea were mentioned. When,
on the other hand, the chapter depicts patient suffering under severe oppression, is not that probably a prediction of something purely accidental? But the assertion that v. 12. speaks of actual "spoil," which Gesenius also maintains, men of such intelligence ought to have forborne making. The preceding representation of the servant of God as a meek sufferer, would alone be sufficient for proof that the "spoil" here spoken of is figurative, as we find it elsewhere employed as a transient image, Gen. xlix. 27. Prov. xvi. 19. But if these commentators wish to force the Messianic expositor to adhere strictly to the letter, let him ask them how they can venture (v. 3, 4.) where mention is plainly made of sicknesses, to understand it of sufferings in general, and in ver. 10. where the children of the servant of God are spoken of, to understand it of disciples; thus the Messianic expositor may set Gesenius against Hitzig, because the latter has allowed himself to consider "the prisoners," in xlix. 9. as a figurative expression for the miserable; and Hitzig against Gesenius, because the latter has taken children, and children's children, to mean "disciples." The argument from the strict distinction of the tenses in chap. liii., Dr. Hitzig ought to urge as little as Dr. Gesenius, since both these learned men must confess their embarrassment in attempting to justify their assertion. In his Commentary, Gesenius has referred לָבֹד (ver. 11.) the future time, and contrary to the usus loquendi, has understood and translated it of mere instruction, "and he lightens the burden of their sins;" (present) in the translation (2nd edit.). On the other hand, it is given, "whose sins he bore," therefore in the past. On יִבְּדֵּי in ver. 12. it is said, "After several preceding prete-
rites; this verb may very well take the sense of the preterite; on הַרִּיתֱּשׁ the commentator keeps profound silence. Hitzig confesses to the admission of an anomaly, in the second tense, in verses 11. and 12.; on נִיתִית it is remarked, it may be allowed, "because an act that extends through a long period is mentioned."

—It might be advantageous for allaying the doubts we have mentioned, if that class of interpreters were called in for the exposition of this elevated language, at the head of whom stands him whom Christ called the greatest of all the Prophets of the Old Testament, John the Baptist (John i. 29). But when the latest commentator on Isaiah has dropped the hint, that, "on the one hand, perhaps, the idea of a suffering Messiah first arose after the death of Jesus;" and with still greater acuteness remarks, that, on the other hand, it may not be sufficiently considered, "how far the meaning of our section, as well as others of the Messiah, exercised an influence on the report of the sufferings and actions of Christ, or had acted directly (normativ) on his mode of conduct,"—it were nothing against this monstrous alternative to say, if it had proceeded from two different heads, it would have served to shew to what opposite conclusions men can come; but both these possibilities in one head!—"Yes and No—is no good theology," would Shakspeare have said!

This sacrificial and priestly institute of the Old Testament was the shadow of what the redemption by Christ has accomplished; but the spirit of the New Testament has assumed what once was its shadow as an adequate form for its body, and the work of redemption is represented as a prophetic, priestly, and kingly office of the Divine Mediator. It would be

* This interpreter has lately given up the Gesenian interpretation of "עַלְמָנָה," his contemporaries, and translated the clause, "who thinks of his fate?"
most natural, first to lay down what the New Testament has taught on this subject, in the form in which it is taught, and then to develop the ideal contents deposited under this form; and this we would do, if the understanding of the ideal contents could alone be gained from the circle of the representations under consideration. But it is not so. The doctrine of redemption is an organic whole, in which all the parts of Christian dogmatic are integral parts. Let the integral parts of an organic whole be torn from one another, they are not only unintelligible, but actually at variance with one another; for as every physical, so also every spiritual circle of life, is the result of the friction of antagonist powers and activities. Under these circumstances, it appears preferable to premise a sketch of the ideal contents of the doctrine of Redemption, which must be taken from a general view of the Christian faith; and after that we shall consider the scriptural doctrine of the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ.

II. THE NATURE OF THE PRIESTLY OFFICE OF CHRIST.

The Scripture doctrine of atonement ultimately rests on the relation to man of the two divine attributes, love and holiness. From correct conceptions of these must the Christian doctrine of atonement proceed. We conceive of the holiness of God as the love of himself; and the love of God as the attribute, in virtue of which he communicates himself. Man at his original creation was a work of holiness as well as of love;—of love, for God made a communication to him of holiness, for he communicated himself, so that he loved himself in him. "In his sight nothing is of value, but his own image." What is the relation of these two attributes to fallen man? In proportion as man does not love God, the love of God towards him cannot manifest itself to him, for its manifestation presupposes a susceptibility on
the part of man. But, in the same proportion, man, when he has fallen into sin, becomes an object of penal justice. Penal justice is the manifestation of holiness against the sinner. That God loves himself, he manifests in reference to the sinner, by the punishment which he imposes on sin. Punishment is the revelation of holiness in the kingdom of omnipotence; for, through the evil which holy omnipotence connects with wickedness, it manifests, on the one hand, that the latter is its detestation, and, on the other hand, maintains its sovereignty over it; for wickedness, which will not bear the fetters of obedience, must bear the fetters of punishment. The experience that man can as little withdraw himself from the hand of God as he can run away from under heaven; and that if he withdraw himself from obedience to God, he subjects himself to his punishment, may move the sinner to return, and so far, even in punishment, love may manifest itself; yet punishment is not merely a manifestation of love, but its main purpose rests in the very conception of it, which consists in this, that it is the revelation of holiness towards the sinner; in other words, through it the blow which the sinner gave the law in the face, is returned back again.

From before the foundation of the world, from all eternity, the course of redemption in Christ was ordained. Rom. xvi. 25. Eph. i. 4. 1 Peter i. 20. The fall is only admitted into the history of man on the presumption of a Redeemer. Redemption consists of the following particulars; God himself appeared in humanity, and became a link in that chain, so that the party to be reconciled and the party that establishes the reconciliation is only one. 2 Cor. v. 19. Since the sound member has entered the diseased organization, it is at once affected with sympathy for it; for only on the supposition of that sympathy is a restoration of the diseased members, a communication of sound life possible. That suffering, as well as this life, is substitutionary. The substitutionary power of this life is our redemption, and of the suffering is
our reconciliation; by the latter our guilt is negatively taken away; by the former is righteousness put in its place. The life is substitutionary, for, since the diseased members partake of it, and are restored by it, it is the Redeemer's life which comes in place of their own, by which they can satisfy the law, and which justifies them in its sight. Schleiermacher's "Glaubenslehre," II. § 125. 2; "so that apart from connection with Christ, neither any individual man, in and for himself, nor any portion of the collective life of man in or for itself, is just before God. But, in living communion with Christ, every one gives up to wish to be, or to be considered by God anything in and for himself, but only in communion with him, to be considered as a part of his appearance animated by him, but not yet developed." This redemption by the life of Christ presupposes a fellow-suffering on his part. For how could his life have appeared and become communicable to mankind, if he had not joined himself, as a member, to the diseased organization, and entered into its misery as well as its sin. This he has done in a twofold manner; inwardly, for, with infinite love to his brethren, he has transported himself into the greatness of their fall and misery, and thus suffers with them, (we may refer, for example, to his tears over Jerusalem, to Mark ix. 19, &c.—to his weeping and strong emotion at the grave of Lazarus, which could not be mere grief at the separation of his friend by death, for he was just about to restore him to life); outwardly, for he assumed weak human nature capable of suffering, in that nature he carried on his conflict, and endured, even to the most shameful death, the outbreaks of sin which discharged itself upon him. All this was presupposed, when, in the first place, the Son of God became a link in the chain of humanity; secondly, when he represented in it the original type of true humanity."

"Compare the admirable remarks on the sufferings of Christ"
16. Now in this respect, the communication of the life of Christ to us presupposes his sufferings and the redemption of man rests on the sufferings of the Redeemer, as the condition sine qua non, so it appears, on the part both of God and man, necessary for the forgiveness of sin, for reconciliation; and it is, at the same time, not indeed the only, but the most efficacious channel through which the objective impartation of life from the Redeemer becomes subjective in mankind.

by Schleiermacher, in his discourse on Luke xxiii. 33, 34. "On the mystery of Redemption." "When we speak of the sufferings of his whole life, do we think of the deprivations of earthly enjoyments and of the joys of this world, so that we ascribe to him a longing after these things of which the absence had filled him with anguish? When we speak of the sufferings of his last days, do we think of the sudden change from universal adoration to degradation into the rank of malefactors; and would we ascribe to him an aspiring after the honours of this world, of which the failure had wounded him? Or do we think of the bodily pain that we endure, and would we attribute that to him as bitter suffering which every brave man could set aside? Or do we think of death as death, and would we attribute to him, in so high a degree, the natural love of life, that its sudden interruption, in the vigour of his days, was a peculiar source of suffering? We feel, indeed, that it cannot be all this; but as certainly as Christ must suffer, so certainly all this could not have been suffering to him, excepting only as far as it was brought on by sin. There could be no other source of anguish than the power of sin over the human race, the preponderance which it exercised over those good movements which were awakened in men when the kingdom of God was published to them; he knew no other sorrow than the successful opposition which sin made to his labours to attract men, with divine love to himself, and to bless them. Yes, it might be said, before the period could arrive, when an eternal redemption from sin and its power would be manifested; before he could appear who bore in himself the fullness of the Godhead, sin must become so strong and so powerful, that it was able to bring not only wise men and prophets, but himself, the Holy and Divine, love and wisdom itself, from praise and honour to shame and contempt, and from life to death. And that, from this power of sin, redemption from it would immediately proceed, is the mystery of divine grace which hath concluded all under sin."
The gospel announces to every repenting believer, adoption and acceptance with God. This takes place when repentance negatively, and faith in the Redeemer positively, transfers the life of Christ into man, and thus makes him a fit participator of the Divine kingdom, and a child of God. But the holiness of God, as well as the conscience of the sinner, require at the same time that sin should meet with its deserts. The sense of the divine righteousness innate to man, requires that the sinner should receive his deserts, that the blow which he gives to the law should rebound upon himself. The deeper the feeling of guilt is, the less does mere grace satisfy the sinner, so much the more does he desire punishment, for by punishment he is justified; whence arises this sentiment in man? It cannot come to him from without. Empirically man must look on freedom from suffering as the highest good; it must, therefore, be implanted by God. The holiness of God which reveals itself to the sinner in the connection of suffering with transgression, has deposited a witness for itself in the human breast. Thus, on the one hand, an announcement of the remission of punishment and acceptance with God, cannot satisfy the sinner's sense of guilt, if, at the same time, sin is not atoned for by punishment; on the other hand, Divine love itself can offer its blessings to the sinner only when holiness reveals itself with love. Therefore it was necessary that a suffering corresponding to the fall of man should be endured, which humanity could reckon as its own. Such was the inward and outward suffering of the Redeemer. It follows from this, first, that this suffering corresponds to the greatness of human transgression; secondly, that it can be legitimately imputed to the sinner.

To the first consideration, the objection was long ago made by Socinus, that the sufferings of Christ could not be considered as adequate, because they were limited to a very inconsiderable portion of time, and eternal death was not endured by him. While
the common orthodox doctrine that this objection, by asserting that the presence of the Divinity imparted infinity to human sufferings. Calvin and Βεπιασ endeavoured to solve the difficulty by supposing that the descent into hell involved the endurance of the punishment of hell. But the objection may be more effectually met by observing, 1st, That the greatness of a punishment is not owing to the addition of various kinds of punishment, nor to its prolongation in time, it is susceptibility which gives intensity to suffering. If we attribute to the Redeemer love without measure, love to God and love to the brethren, the pain for the fall of man generally, and for its peculiar manifestations towards himself, (redeeming love incarnate,) appears as infinite. 2d, The other point by which the greatness and significance of suffering are determined, is the dignity of the sufferer. The significance of suffering is very different when one beggar submits to capital punishment for another beggar, and when a king lays down his life for his subjects. It is the Lord of glory, the reflected splendour (Abglanz) of the Father who allows himself to be spit upon, and to be crucified, and thus his dignity imparts an infinite significance to his sufferings. The suffering, therefore, of the God-man was incomparable, and well suited to represent what sin had merited, and it only remains to be considered how guilty man could appropriate to himself the sufferings of that guiltless one. Must he who appropriated it consider himself absolutely as another person than he who suffered, and consequently, that suffering remains a purely outward thing, then such an imputation could not be spoken of; it could not be effected. We must here have recourse to that mystic unity of the Redeemer with the redeemed of which the Scriptures speak. In this organic communion, what belongs to the head belongs also to the members; and as the members consider the life that proceeds from the Head as their own, so, likewise, the sufferings endured by him on their account. This is the substitutionary power of his suf-
sufferings. But, by virtue of this organic communion, the sufferings of the head are as little external to the members as its life. As he occupies our place, so do we occupy his. As the head has suffered with the members, so the members enter again into the sufferings of the head; the sufferings of Christ on account of sin, become to Christians a continual source of repentance and mortification of sin. In his sufferings they first acquire a living sense of the odiousness of sin. This is the deep significance (not generally understood by the modern Exegesis) of not mere parallelism, but causal connection, which Paul represents as existing between Christ’s dying for sin, and the Christian’s dying for sin. Rom. vi. From this spiritual dying with Christ proceeds an outward suffering in the world parallel to his own, by the sins of the world, and for the sins of the world, to which the mysterious expressions of the Apostle relate in Phil. iii. 10. τοῦ γινόμαι την κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ (erroneously explained by Calov and other doctrinal writers) συμμορφωμένος τῷ Χαρίσι αὐτοῦ. 2 Cor. iv. 10. την κοινωνίαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιτομῆς; 1 Pet. iv. 13. κοινωνίας τοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ παθημάτων; 2 Tim. ii. 11. οἱ συναναμοστήσαντες κτλ. and lastly, to the same subject may be referred, Colos. i. 24; the general expression for this idea is, 1 John iv. 17. καὶ ἕκαστός ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

* Schleiermacher in his instructive discourse for Good Friday, observes, “No, thus also (the knowledge of sin) is obtained in its fulness first from the contemplation of the suffering and dying Redeemer; so that it is one and the same glance which shows us in those who were the authors of this death, the whole depth of human corruption, and in him who endured it the whole glory of the only begotten of the Father; and with perfect justice we may say that there is no other veritable memorial of sin than the death of the Lord. Here it has completed its greatest work; here it shows itself in all its strength and perfection. This also the Apostle John well considered when he comprehended all sin under the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life.
In this way, finally, it is shown, that not only the objective communication of the Redeemer's life to us, presupposes his sufferings in the sense before stated, inasmuch as he must enter into the nexus of our sinfulness, when it was needful to introduce a sound member into the diseased organization; but that communication of life objectively is dependent on his sufferings; first the consciousness of the sinner that his sins must be punished, is thus satisfied; and, secondly, the sufferings of the Redeemer on account of sin thus become the true commencing-point for the mortification of sin and the resurrection to a new life.

The sum of what has been said is therefore as follows: To the repenting and believing sinner it is promised that, through the sufferings of Christ, in virtue of their incomparable significance, satisfaction has been rendered for all transgression, so that he can be admitted to all the privileges of a child of God. When he looks with faith in this message on the dying Redeemer, he recognises, first, in its full measure, the odiousness of sin, and longs, after a complete dying to sin, and a resurrection to the new life manifested in Christ, which will be perfected when he shall be transformed into the likeness of the Son of God.

III. THE PRIESTLY OFFICE OF CHRIST UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT FORM.

According to the New Testament, and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ, when he devoted himself to a state of humiliation even unto death, was priest and sacrifice for believers in one person. When, therefore, we speak of his priestly office, we have to contemplate Him, 1. As a sacrifice; 2. As a priest.
A. CHRIST AS A SACRIFICE.

The most general idea of offering a sacrifice was the presentation of something out of ourselves to God, by which the presentation and consecration of the Spirit may be rendered complete. According to what has been said in the preceding section, this idea of sacrifice is realized in Christ; as the completion of the universal relation of man's dependence on God, he is the burnt-offering; as the completion of what is defective in thanksgiving and supplication, he is the peace-offering; as a substitution for penal suffering, he is the sin-offering. But the difference of the sacrifice of Christ from those sacrifices, and with that its essential significance for the spirit, consists principally in this, that they remained something outward to man, but here the offering becomes one with the offerer who enters into such a communion, in a mode by which the suffering, as well as the doing, becomes his own. In explaining our views, we make use of the language of Schleiermacher, who, by his involuntary (as it seems) acknowledgment of the deep import of the priestly and sacrificial institution, has born the most valuable testimony that the Old Testament economy was yet in another sense than he was disposed to grant, a preparation for Christianity. He says (see above, p. 284), in his "Glaubenslehre," II. § 125. "so that apart from his connection with Christ, no individual in and for himself, nor any one period in the collective life of humanity, is just before God. But in living communion with Christ, every one gives up wishing to be any thing in and for himself, as to be so considered before God; but only in communion with him, as a part of his appearance animated by him, but still conceived in development. Hence, as there the High Priest, so here Christ is he who presents men pure before God, by virtue of his own perfect fulfilment of the divine will, which (by virtue
of the life we have in common with him), is also ours, so that we, in connection with him, are also the objects of the divine complacency." It cannot fail that this, certainly very mystical language, must be unintelligible to many; as long as it is incomprehensible so long will the doctrine of redemption be so too. The whole mystery of this language, and, in fine, of redemption itself, is comprehended in the little word ἐν, when it is said that believers are loved, εἰς τὸ γνησίως, and have the ἀπολυτήσεις in him, Eph. i. 6, 7. that they are chosen in him before the foundation of the world, Eph. i. 4.; in short, that they are altogether what they are, εἰς χῶραν. In the chemical retort of the Exegesis of 1790, the ἡμα εἰς Χριστός is skilfully reduced to the caput mortuium, "a professor of the doctrine of Jesus!" That exegetical talent, whose merit consisted in shaving the curly head of Samson to complete baldness, has fortunately been reduced to starvation; first, Winer has restored the εἰς Χριστός, in the Epistle to the Galatians, to its grammatical rights, and Schleiermacher has invested it again with its dogmatical authority.

Although in Christ the idea of sacrifice has been realised in so comprehensive a manner, yet the prevailing type of him in the New Testament is that of the sin-offering; John i. 29. Rev. xii. 11. 1 Peter i. 19; ii. 21, 24. Acts viii. 28—35. Matth. xx. 28.° Rom. iii. 25, 26. 1 Cor. v. 7. 1 John ii. 2. The idea of a covenant-offering, and a sin-offering is combined, (Heb. ix. 16.), Matth. xxvi. 28. Whether the idea of a peace-offering was applied to Christ, and especially to his offering up himself in death, depends on Eph. v. 2; the addition εἰς ὄμην εὐωδίας

° It is indeed assumed that the sin-offering would be regarded as a ἐνὶ. Gunther De Mortis Christi fine salutari

Gotting. 1830, p. 27, calls in question, that at any time among the Greeks the sacrifice was regarded as a λαοὺς. Compare, on the other hand, the passage from Lucian in Wetstein on Matth. xx. 28.
points to a burnt-offering or a peace-offering; on the other hand, the ἔπειτα ἦμαῶν indicates a sin-offering. The orthodox theologians (Harless last of all) have expressly vindicated the latter reference in this passage against the Socinians; when Calov ad- duces Lev. i. 4. in order to shew, that even to the sin-offerings a μητραίως was added, this is not correct, for the passage relates to burnt-offerings. But from what we have before remarked, it is evi- dent that in the burnt-offering, the idea of the peace-offering and the sin-offering was united. Thus, then, the Apostle sometimes represents Christ as a sin-offering, sometimes as an acceptable votive-offer- ing. The idea of votive and thank-offering consists in this, that all prayers and thanks are offered in the name of Christ and through Christ, (John xiv. 13.; xv. 16.; xvi. 24. Rom. i. 8. Heb. xiii. 15. Eph. v. 20.), and all hearing of prayer is through his medi- nation, (2 Cor. i. 20.), since God, with the great gift of his only begotten Son, “hath freely given us all things,” (Rom. viii. 32.)

It still remains to present, in a concise form, what the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches on this subject. First of all, from the standing point of the Spirit, it declares that the offerings, priests, and sanctuary of the Old Testament, were only “shadows of good things to come,” x. 1. ix. 8, 23. viii. 5. What they could do towards reconciliation was ἀδέλθεσις καὶ ἀνωφελεία, vii. 18. The inefficacy of the sacrifices was shewn, first, in their only gaining, access to God in a symbolical manner, ix. 11, 23, 24. viii. 5.; and, secondly, that inasmuch as no living connection ex- isted between the offerer and his offering, the con- science was not thereby made alive, and no living worship could be produced by it, ix. 14. And since sins continually recurred which called for the regular presentation of sacrifices, these sacrifices served for no other purpose than to keep alive the feeling of guilt, x. 2, 3. In contrast to these, the all-efficacions
sacrifice of Christ was presented, which evinced its spirituality, by combining in one person the offering and the priest. In contrast with these dead sacrifices, the Messiah appeared, and said, "Lo, I come, to do thy will," x. 9. The performance of this will implies perfect ἵππαξιν, through all παρχημανα, even unto death, ii. 10. v. 7—9.; compare the μεγίς in Phil. ii. 8. And as this ἵππαξιν was shewn to be complete, the sacrifice of Christ was spoliōς. In virtue of all these qualities, it is an everlasting sacrifice, which has established perfection once for all, ix. 12, 27. x. 12—14. In our Epistle, the reference to the sin-offering predominates, and almost exclusively—only with the exception of the sin-offering of the red heifer, ix. 13. and the reference to the covenant-sacrifice, ix. 16., though that partook of the nature of a sin-offering—to the great sacrifice of atonement on the day of atonement, which stoned for the sinfulness of the people in general, and therefore (as in the High-priest, the idea of the priesthood was concentrated) might be regarded as the concentration of the idea of sacrifice. With a particular reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is asserted in the Racovian Catechism, although in a one-sided manner, Solum anniversarium sacrificium, cujus sanguis in sanctum sanctorum inferebatur, praefigurasse mortem Christi. Compare our Commentary on the eighth chapter. By that sin-offering once made, all sin-offerings on our part are rendered superfluous,—those spiritual offerings which we present to God are only "sacrifices of praise," xiii. 15.

B. CHRIST AS A PRIEST.

As we have already noticed in the Introduction, the representation of Christ as a Priest, and in specie as High-Priest, is peculiar to our Epistle, though, as we have said, only in the designation, and not in the idea it is intended to convey. The terminus μυστῆς,
which belongs as much to the Pauline Epistles as to this, Gal. iii. 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. expresses the same idea, and the synonymous word ἐγγυος; of similar meaning is the Saviour’s declaration, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτον, John xvii. 19. And as the idea of Sacrifice admits of a very general application to Christ, so also does the idea of Priest or Mediator. But before the mediation between God and man through Christ appeared as an active service, it existed as a state. The union of the divine and human natures in Christ is the practical (faktische) mediation and reconciliation of God with man,—that reconciliation is already given in the incarnation was a sentiment deeply rooted in the ancient Church, as it is expressed in the words of Irenæus, Adv. Heres. iii. 18. 19. ἰδεί τον μεσατην Θεοῦ τι καὶ ἀνθρωπον δια ἰδιας σρος ἵκατερος δικαιοσυνος εἰς φίλαι καὶ ὅμοιοιν τοὺς ἀμφότερος συναγαγεῖν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ μεν παραστήσας τον ἀνθρωπον, ἀνθρωπος δὲ γνωρίζεται τον Θεον. “It becomes the Mediator of God and man, by his own intimate acquaintance with each, to bring both parties into friendship and harmony; to present man to God, and to make God known to man.” Perhaps, as Matthies is disposed to think, the term μεσατης is applied, in this sense, to Christ, in Gal. iii. 20. The name μεσατης, in our Epistle, as well as ἐγγυος, is used more in relation to the establishment of a New Covenant, viii. 6. ix. 15. xii. 24. vii. 22. The reference, also, may be taken in a very wide sense; Christ is considered as the organ and originator of the new relation into which mankind enter with God. But the terms Mediator and Priest, in their most restricted and more immediate sense, are used in our Epistle, and are employed to express that the suffering and dying of the Redeemer proceeded from himself—that he was a voluntary agent. At the same time, our Epistle (ix. 14. x. 7.) leads us from the unessential to the essential in the representation of the sacrifice. Not the blood shedding in itself (as if a magical act of atonement) is the essence of redemption—a view
which was expressed most strongly in the disputes between the Franciscans and Dominicans, whether a single drop of blood would be sufficient for atone-
ment. (Cotta Diss. ii. § 33. in Gerhard’s locc. t. iii.) —but love and obedience are the soul of that act.* But, according to Heb. ix. 14. the sacrifice of Christ possesses the power of making satisfaction, on the one hand, through his inward guiltlessness, and, on the other, by the divine dignity of him who devoted himself to death. After this spiritual High-Priest had presented this spiritual sacrifice, as the earthly high-priest entered the earthly holy of holies, so Christ penetrated into the heavenly sanctuary, into the immediate presence of God. (Compare the in-
troduction to chap. viii.) There he presents to God the power of his ever availing sacrifice, and grounds upon it his intercession, (vii. 23—25. p. 268.) Epi-
phanius hær. 55. aut. ἵερεῖον, αὐτὸς Ἐμα, αὐτὸς ἵερες, αὐτὸς Ἠσιαστηριον, αὐτὸς Ὑσος, αὐτὸς Ἀκατοσ, αὐτὸς βα-
sileus, αὐτὸς ἀρχιερευς, αὐτὸς προβατον, αὐτὸς ἁριον, τα
παντα ἐν πᾶσιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γενομενος, ἵνα ἡμῶν ἡμὴ κατα
παντα προσον γενηται.

The priestly office of the Redeemer and its acts are marked in our Epistle with a peculiar terminol-
ogy, the sense of which still remains to be more closely investigated, especially since it is so variously
reated by lexicographers.

1.) Τελειωμ, with its derivatives, is found in ii. 10 ;
v. 9 ; vii. 19, 28; ix. 9; x. 1, 14; xi. 40; xii. 23;
vii. 21; xi. 2. Bretschneider arranges these passages under the following heads: 1.) Talem facio, qualis
esse debet, ii. 10. 2.) Purum facio sive declaro, vii.
19. 3.) Præmio dignum habeo, v. 9; xii. 23. 4.)
Inaugurare, vii. 28. Wahl has the following ar-
rangement. 1.) Immnem reddo a peccatis, vii. 19,

* The noted verse of St. Bernard, redemit unda, cum posset
gutta, instead of being taken as an effusion of devotional feel-
ing, has been dragged into doctrinal controversy. To this ma-
terial view of the efficacy of the blood of Jesus, belongs also the
dispute on the reussuntio sanguinis Christi, on which see
Semler in Baumgarten’s Glaubenslehre, II. 365.
28. 2.) Perfecte tranquillo animum, ix. 9. 3.) Perfecte beo, ii. 10; v. 9; xi. 40; xii. 23: Storr translates v. 9. “to obtain the crown,” vii. 11; x. 1, 14. “to attain its object,” vii. 28, “became translated to glory,” ix. 9, “to be at peace in the conscience.” Most modern interpreters exhibit a similar discordancy; the older critics vacillate between consecrare and consummare. Thus, for example, Wolf in his curæ, ii. 11. Lydious Agonistica Sacra, c. 35. p. 122. More correctly in all the passages, an idea of perfecting should be retained, though presenting various views of it, according to the varied connection. The term is used in reference to the Redeemer and to the redeemed: in reference to the Redeemer, ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 28: (xii. 2.) In these passages, the perfecting can be conceived of either as an inward or an outward act. In the former case, the expression intimates, that the sufferings of the Redeemer are to be viewed as an act, which brought to perfection the unity of the divine and human wills in him; in other words, his suffering and his doing were a process of his own, as must be affirmed of every suffering and doing of every man, in which man is truly present with his will. According to the sense, it might also be translated to consecrate (weißen). The expression ἵψαυν ver. 9. particularly favours this view. According to the other conception τελειοβομαι is referred to the outward acts of glorification, and has the meaning præmio affici.

The former view is found under various doctrinal modifications in Menken, Stier, Nitzsch. Stier in his second Essay on Redemption, in his hints for a believing understanding of the Scriptures, ii. p. 78, says, “Not formally, for the satisfaction of an abstract right, but really to effect and call forth the great good which we wanted, even eternal life, Christ not only assumed our flesh and blood at his birth, but regenerated them for us by a death of anguish and desertion, that we might partake of that new flesh and blood, though still our own.” For the second view, the
older theologians have specified when it means to become glorified; it is believed that a justification of this meaning can be proved from xi. 40; xii. 23. (See Morus, Dis. I. 302) Without a reference to preceding sufferings, the sense of "glorifying" can never be applied; it has been derived from the meaning which τελειωσάι has as terminus agonisticus when it denotes the distribution of prizes to the victors, see Salmasius ad Spart. in Adrian., p. 123. Kuinoel on chap. xii. 2. This meaning is also that which lies at the basis of the use of the word by the Fathers, in the sense of death, and particularly of martyrdom, see Suicer. Compare also the book of Wisdom iv. 13. and Phil. iii. 12. But the glorification that follows the suffering, is not to be considered merely as an arbitrary act from without; it rests on an inward process, and the "perfecting" outwardly is to be regarded only as an expression of the glorification that has taken place inwardly; according to Coloss. iii. 3, 4. Hence we say, that by the τελειώσει of Christ, is signified the "perfecting" which he obtained by the process of suffering, and thus the inward and outward side of the glorification is conceived of together. Only so far as he is himself a τελειώθης, can he bring his people to τελειώσει ii. 10. The law was not capable of effecting a τελειώσει (vii. 19; ix. 9; x. 1.); but what the law could not do, he accomplished; τετελειωσάνεις το δήνεκες τοις ἁγιαζομένους x. 14. (xii. 2.) As elsewhere οἱ τοῦ χριστοῦ are called by an equivalent term ἁγιαζομένοι, so according to this they are called τετελειωμένοι. Consequently the τελειώσει of believers is something accomplished on this side the grave. On the other hand, according to xi. 40. and xii. 23. the τελειοῦσαι appears to be something in the future world. The relation of these two classes of passages is this. The τελειώσει through Christ is in the first place an objective act, since believers in Christ are looked upon by God as just; and so far the terminus may be translated consecrate, as according to the same objective view, baptism in ecclesiæ-
tical language is called τελειωσις. See Suicer. In the same way as we shall show immediately, ἄγιος ἐν and ξαθαιρείν denote the objective sanctification and purifying; i.e. consecration, the same thing is expressed in another form when the χρισμα is attributed to Christians, 2 Cor. i. 21., 1 John ii. 27. compared with 1 Peter. ii. 9. When this objective perfecting, sanctification, consecration, or justification—for all these expressions mean the same thing, are received by faith into the soul, there arises from it the subjective perfecting, purification, sanctification, and righteousness; if we would avoid falling into a false abstraction, we must view the subjective as constantly connected with the objective τελειωσις. But, in the present state, neither the objective τελειωσις, nor the subjective attain their end; for the former is still faith and not beholding; the latter is a thing in progress, (ein werdendes), and not perfected. But if this subjective will be there absolute, so will also the objective, i.e. be there as beholding, and this will issue in δοξασμος. In those who enjoy the privilege of being called "children of God," (1 John iii. 1.) although neither their being, (wesen,) internally, nor their appearance, (erscheiung,) outwardly, wholly corresponds to the idea of the children of God, the being and the appearance will correspond and harmonize with the idea. Thus it may be explained, that in such passages as xi. 40. and xii. 23, τελειοται may be equivalent to δοξαζομαι, so also in ii. 10. the τελειοται of the Redeemer is put parallel with the ἵς δοξα ἄγιος of the Redeemer. In the phraseology of Scripture, all the expressions relating to the redemption, as well as the word redemption itself, refer sometimes to the present still imperfect state, sometimes to the state of perfection; the ἀπολυτρωσις σωτηρία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ζωῆς αἰώνιος is, according to one mode of viewing it, already present by faith; according to the other, it is to be waited for in the future. But that the same thing in progress and in completion should be designated by the same term is perfectly natural, for, through faith, what is not yet seen becomes a reality,
and what is here seen and experienced is distinguished from the future, not genere, but only gradu, and bears the same relation to it as the first fruits to the full harvest, Romans viii. 23.

2.) 'Αγιασμύ occurs in ii. 11; ix. 13; x. 10, 14, 29; xiii. 12. Lexicographers and expositors, also, here place together very different meanings. Bretschneider, in ix. 13, gives it the sense of purgare, in ii. 11, morti se devovere. Wahl distinguishes purum reddo a peccatis and purum reddo a culpa, and in his larger Clavis, has quoted the following passages under the latter meaning; ii. 11; x. 10, 14; xiii. 12. Storr gives to ix. 13. the sense of purifying, in other passages, propitiating, atoning, and thus Stuart. The Old Testament ἁγιάζει has the meaning to make pure or holy; and since declaring is a making to declare pure or holy. So then in this phraseology the subjective and objective sides of the idea are combined. Thus, also, in the New Testament, where ἀγιασμύ sometimes means to declare pure, i.e. to consecrate; sometimes to make pure; in several passages, as in 1 Cor. vii. 14. interpreters differ. Likewise, where ἀγιασμύ denotes the work of Christ, in reference to believers, 1 Cor. i. 2; vi. 11. Acts xx. 32. As in the other books of the New Testament, so also in the last named passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the objective meaning is the primary; this is plainly the case in x. 10, 14, 29; compare, in reference to the Old Testament, ἀγιασμύ, ix. 13. Hence also, ἁγιάζεται, in ecclesiastical diction, for βαπτιζώμαι. Yet that the subjective view is also included in ἁγιασμύ, is clearly shown by x. 19—25. where faith, love and hope are given as the result of reconciliation, i.e. of ἁγιάζεται. In John's writings, where the dialectic distinctions are least visible, ἁγιασμύνω, John xvii. 19. unites both views. Also, when the epithet ἁγιός is applied to Christians, the subjective view is not excluded, but is included as a matter in progression, (Ein werdendes)
3.) Καθαρίζειν, καθαρίσμον τοιούτω, καθαρίζειν, ix. 14, 22, 33; i. 3; x. 2. Also for this terminus, the same distinction is to be made as for the two former. As the Old Testament ἔρνυ equally applies to the inward consecration and the outward purification, the same is the case with the corresponding expression in the New Testament. The outward objective side is most conspicuous in our Epistle, where the discourse relates to the Old Testament, καθαρίσμος; on the other hand, ix. 14, the addition εἰς τὸ λατρευεῖν ὸεῷ ἐννυτι, most plainly expresses that the objective καθαρίζεται comprehends the subjective purification.

4.) Ἑγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ, προσεχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, iv. 16; vii. 19, 25; x. 1, 22; xi. 6. (xii. 18, 22.) In the Old Testament phraseology, בְּרֵם is the terminus solennis, for approach to the outward sanctuary, but it is also applied to drawing nigh to the invisible God. Zeph. ii. 3. Thus also our author uses προσεχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ for drawing nigh to an outward sanctuary, and then transfers it to that drawing nigh to God, which is the effect of redemption; and, as justification, in the present world, is an object of faith, and, in the other world, of intuition; here, subjectively imperfect, there subjectively perfect, so it is with this drawing nigh to God; here the redeemed draw nigh in faith to the invisible throne of grace, iv. 16; vii. 19, 25; x. 22. (xi. 6.) there, since Christ has gone before them, they will be admitted to the vision of the immediate presence of God, vi. 20; x. 19. See the Commentary on iv. 16.

THE END.