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EDITOR'S PREFACE.

The same general plan has been pursued in the preparation of the present volume, as in the "Commentary on the Romans," previously published. The Editor has been careful not to make any alterations in the body of the work that would be at variance with the theological or exegetical views of Professor Stuart. Guarding this point, he has not thought it necessary to indicate the changes made; although in the Introduction it was found necessary to rearrange the matter somewhat, in order to make room, without protracting the work too much, for the addition of the results of the investigations of Forster, Davidson, and others, who have written or published new editions since the previous issue of this work. For the notes, except in a very few instances where they are found in the previous edition, the Editor alone is responsible.

R. D. C. ROBBINS.

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE, MARCH 1, 1860.

(RECAP)
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

A new edition of the present work has for some time been determined upon, in order to meet the calls for it which are often repeated. It may be proper to state in this preface, that since the publication of the first edition, a work of the like kind and of about the same size has made its appearance in Germany; the author of which is Frederic Bleek, Professor Extraordinary of Theology in the University of Berlin, at the time of its publication. Prof. Bleek is distinguished for his attainments in the department of sacred criticism. Of his work, however, only the first volume has come to hand, which (like the first part of the present volume) is wholly occupied with an Introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews. The author believes that Apollos (and not Paul) was the author of this epistle; and a great part of his book is occupied in giving the history of opinions among the ancient churches relative to the authorship of the epistle, or in adducing arguments against the Pauline origin of it.

In addition to this work of Bleek, replete with learning, and exhibiting for the most part a commendable degree of moderation and candor, I have received a review of the first edition of my own work, written by the same author since the publication of his own volume, and published in the Universal Literary Gazette at Halle. When Prof. Bleek published the volume just named, he had not seen my work on the same subject. His Review, therefore, which is a long one, exhibits more definitely his opinions in reference to those points in which I differ from him.

In this second edition of my work I have, throughout the first part, had my eye upon the work and review of Prof. Bleek, and have frequently gone into an examination in extenso of his positions. In consequence of this, there has been a very considerable addition made to the present edition.

I should have much preferred to render the work smaller, instead of enlarging it; for I well know that a majority of readers in our country take less interest in discussions of such a nature as it comprises, than in commentary. But duty to the cause of sacred criticism, and my obligation to endeavor to meet the exigencies of the times in regard to criticisms recently made upon the epistle to the Hebrews, do not render it compatible for me, as I view the subject, to comply with the wishes of this class of readers. I am quite sure, moreover, that if they were fully aware of the force which is already organized against its Pauline origin and its canonical authority, they would feel and judge very differently with respect to the importance of critical efforts to defend the commonly received opinion of the churches in regard to the author of the epistle.
IV

PREFACE.

Persuaded as I am, that no efforts of learning or ingenuity can ever extinguish the light, which the most ancient testimony of the Christian Fathers and the internal structure of the writing itself afford in relation to the origin and author of the epistle to the Hebrews, I feel it to be a duty, while my convictions remain as they are, not to pass in silence any attempt which is worth regarding, to obscure this light. This is my apology for the additional matter of the present edition; which, although it does not amount in itself to a large number of pages, has, from the nature of the discussions, cost much severe labor; such, indeed, as only those can estimate who have been engaged in the like occupation. I do not mention this in order to enhance any claims of mine on the reader, but only to satisfy him that I have not spared any efforts which it has been in my power to make, in order to accommodate my work to the present state of sacred literature.

Prof. Kuinoel, the well-known Commentator on the historical books of the New Testament, has also published, a short time since, a commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, with a somewhat extended and labored introduction. He accords in the main with Bleek; but he has merely given a synopsis of what has been advanced by others, without adding anything that requires notice which is strictly his own. On this account, I have not deemed it expedient to make his introductory essay a subject of special examination in the present edition of my work. His commentary presents some things which are worthy of attention, and by which I shall endeavor to profit in my notes upon the epistle; although, in general, it seems to me far inferior to his other critical works.

The alterations and additions, both great and small, made in the present edition, are too numerous to be specified. It is my sincere wish to render the work more complete, and more worthy of the reader's approbation. All the changes that have been made, have originated in this desire, and in a sense of the obligation to do the best in one's power, which necessarily attaches itself to the publication of a work on subjects so important as those of which the present volume treats.

M. STUART.

Theol. Sem., Andover,
Sept. 3, 1863.
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INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Preliminary Remarks.

The Epistle to the Hebrews does not exhibit, either at the beginning or elsewhere, any express evidence of having been addressed to any particular church, nor any designation of the author's name; and, for this reason, no part of the New Testament, if perhaps we may except the Apocalypse, has occasioned so much difference of opinion, and given rise to so much literary discussion.

At a somewhat early period of the Christian era, the western and some of the eastern churches appear to have been divided in opinion respecting its author and canonical authority. In modern times, and especially of late, every topic which its literary history could suggest has been the subject of animated discussion. It has been disputed whether it is an epistle, an essay, or a homily; whether it was written by Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, or some other person; and whether it was originally written in Hebrew or in Greek. There has also been a difference of opinion as to the place where, and the time when, it was written. The subjects of dispute have, in this case, been more generally, although not always, regarded as topics of literature, rather than of theology or religious sentiment. Men of very different views and feelings, in other respects, have often been found united in the same ranks, when questions respecting the epistle to the Hebrews have been disputed. Such too is the case, even at the present time. All the learning and ability which have hitherto been summoned to the contest, have as yet failed to achieve a victory so complete, as to bring about a general acknowledgment that all ground for further dispute is fairly removed.

The student, who is unacquainted with these facts, and who has merely read the epistle to the Hebrews with the same views and feelings which he has entertained while reading the acknowledged epistles of Paul, finds himself thrown into a situation not a little perplexing, when he begins to make such critical inquiries respecting the epistle in question, as are usually made respecting any ancient writing. He finds philologists and critics of great reputation in the church strangely divided and opposed to each other, in respect to every topic to be examined. What he reads in one author, which perhaps for a time
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satisfies his mind, he finds controverted, shaken, or overthrown by another; who again, in his turn, receives castigation from a third; while a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth, differ each from all his predecessors. The curiosity of the inquirer thus becomes roused, and he begins to pursue some train of thought or investigation, with hope, or perhaps with confidence, that it will lead him to an important and satisfactory result. He presses forward with eagerness, peruses and peruses modern critics, dives into the recesses of the ancient ones, and finds, perhaps, after all his toil, that he has been pursuing a phantom, which recedes as fast as he advances. Perplexed with doubt, and wearied at last with the pursuit, he becomes exposed to the danger of entirely abandoning his object, or of settling down in the cold and comfortless conclusion, that nothing satisfactory can be known in regard to it.

Such, or not much unlike to this, will be the experience, I believe, of nearly every one who sets out with his mind unfettered by any notions of early education, and determined seriously and thoroughly to investigate and weigh for himself all the evidence which can be found, in respect to the topics suggested by the literary history of the epistle to the Hebrews. He who begins such an investigation, with his mind already made up that Paul wrote, or did not write, this epistle; and that it was, or was not, directed to the Hebrews of Palestine; may indeed spare himself most of the perplexity in which an inquirer of the class just named will be involved. But then if his mind is already made up, what need is there of further investigation? And why not spare himself the time and trouble which it must cost?

Minds of a different order, however, will doubtless wish to examine for themselves, to "prove all things" and then "to hold fast that which is good;" if indeed they may be able to distinguish what is of this character. It is for such, that the following investigations are intended; and it is only to persons of this class that they can be particularly useful, even supposing that they are conducted in such a manner as the subject demands. The writer commenced them in the discharge of his duty as a lecturer upon the epistle in question. He found many unforeseen and unexpected obstacles in his path. He had been accustomed, with those around him, to regard Paul as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; and he did not well know, until he came to examine, how long and how extensively this had been doubted. Men of high reputation in the church, and who admitted the canonical authority of the epistle, he found to have been doubtful in regard to the question, Who was the author of it? Neither Luther, nor Calvin admitted it to be from the hand of Paul; and so early, at least, as the latter part of the second century, more or less of the Western churches seem to have doubted or rejected its authority.

With such facts before him, he became deeply interested in the subject, and resolved, if possible, to satisfy his own mind. For this
purpose, he directed his attention principally towards the original sources of evidence, although he has not knowingly neglected any writer of importance among modern critics. The results of his investigation he now gives to the public, in hope that if they do not serve to satisfy the minds of others, they will, at least, excite some to engage in the discussion of the topics presented, until, sooner or later, light enough is poured in to scatter the remaining darkness which rests upon them.

§ 2. Is the Epistle to the Hebrews appropriately called an Epistle, or is it a Homily or Essay?

It has been contended by some writers that this epistle (so called) was originally a homily or address to some assembly of Christians, which was afterwards reduced to writing by some of the preacher's friends or hearers. Others, also, have doubted whether it is properly named an epistle. But none have argued on this topic so much at length, or with so much effort, as Berger. On this account, it may be proper to consider the principal arguments which he has advanced, though but briefly, because the topic seems not to be of sufficient importance to justify the occupying of much time in the discussion. For of what material consequence is it, whether the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews was, in its first conception designed to be an epistle or a homily?

(1) "In the Epistle itself it is called a λόγος παρακλήσεως, a hortatory address, xiii. 22."

But Paul, one may reply, often employs the word παρακαλέω in his acknowledged epistles. May not then an epistle of his in which παρακαλέω is used, be appropriately enough styled a λόγος παρακλήσεως? May not any epistle containing precept and exhortation, be so denominated? An instance exactly in point is the circular letter respecting the question about circumcision, sent by the apostolic council at Jerusalem to the churches in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; which is called a παράκλησις, Acts xv. 31. The words of Luke are; "When they had read [the epistle], they rejoiced ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει."

(2) "The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews uses λαλεῖν instead of γράφειν; which is rather characteristic of a hortatory address than of an epistle."

But an appeal to the Greek Concordance shows, that λαλεῖν is used everywhere in the epistles contained in the New Testament; and a corresponding word of the same import, is in fact used in the epistolary style of all nations and languages. No evidence, therefore, in favor of Berger's opinion, can be deduced from this usage in the epistle to the Hebrews.

(3) The basis of our present epistle to the Hebrews is supposed to
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be the address of Paul to the church at Antioch in Pisidia, as recorded in Acts xiii. 14—41. Some disciple and friend of his, reduced this discourse to writing; commenting or enlarging upon various parts of it, and finally adding of himself to the original discourse the four last verses of our present epistle. To these four verses only the copyist refers as his own, when he says, "I have written to you διὰ βραχέως, briefly."

We reply, first, that the address of Paul exhibits two very important topics, as prominent parts of the discourse, which are not at all commented on (one of them is not even adverted to) in the epistle to the Hebrews; viz.: the subject of John the Baptist's testimony concerning Christ, and the resurrection of Jesus, Acts xiii. 24, 25, 30—37. Would it not be strange, that a commentator should entirely pass by the prominent topics of the very discourse which he designed to explain or to enforce?

Secondly, διὰ βραχέως ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν must be connected with the preceding part of the epistle to the Hebrews, and cannot be attached to the succeeding part without doing violence to the ordinary laws of language.

(4) 'The word ὑμῖν, in Heb. xiii. 21, shows that the original discourse ended there, and that what follows is only an addition made by the transcriber.'

The answer is, that ὑμῖν here stands after a doxology, where Paul always inserts it; and he frequently introduces it in this way in the midst of his letters; e. g. Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 56, xv. 33, xvi. 20, Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 21, etc. It follows, of course, that the insertion of ὑμῖν cannot afford any valid proof that our epistle ended with it; especially if written by Paul.

(5) 'The whole epistle is a regular series of reasoning, a connected chain of discourse; it is like to an essay or a homily, and not written after the manner of a familiar letter.'

But (it may well be asked in reply to this) may not and do not men reason, and regularly discuss subjects, in familiar letters or epistles? Has not Paul discussed and reasoned in the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Ephesians, and in others? Is there any more regularity of structure in the epistle to the Hebrews, than there is in that to the Romans? Surely the regularity and orderly discussion exhibited by any composition, can never prove that this composition was not an epistle. At most, it can only serve to show that it was not an ordinary epistle on topics of little moment. Nor because a great part, or even the whole, of an epistle is of such a tenor, that it might have been spoken as an address or a homily, will this prove that it was not originally, or was not designed to be, an epistle. For every species of composition in use among men, is employed in epistolary writing.

But there is not only no force in these objections, but to the atten-
tive reader the proofs of the epistolary character of the writing are everywhere prominent.

The address is throughout like that of an epistle, viz.: in the second person plural; with the single exception, that the writer occasionally uses a κοινωνείς, that is, he includes himself with those whom he addresses, and so employs the *first person plural*. But this is a practice so common in epistolary correspondence, that it occasions no difficulty in the case under consideration.

It is true, the mode of address would be the same in regard to the particular just noticed, if the epistle had originally been a homily. But other particulars render such a supposition utterly inadmissible. The epistle everywhere supposes the persons addressed to be *absent* from the writer, not present before him, as in the case of a homily. How could he, in a *homily*, ask them to "pray that he might be restored to them?" Heb. xiii. 19. How could he promise to "*make them a visit* in company with Timothy, if he should come speedily?" xiii. 23. The first of these cases, at least, belongs to that part of the epistle, which Berger acknowledges to be the *original discourse* of Paul.

I add, that I am unable to see how any one can well imagine (as Berger does, and as Origen long ago conjectured) that the hand of a *commentator* is discernible in this epistle. The whole tenor of it, from beginning to end, contradicts this. Did ever any writing come more warmly and fully from the heart? Here is no patch-work; no congeries of heterogeneous materials; no designed, exegetical *commentary*; no trace of a copyist or reporter. It is one uniform, unbroken, continuous work; produced by the powerful impulse of one and the same mind, which was fraught with a knowledge of the subject that it discussed, glowed with benevolent feelings towards those who were addressed, and was agitated with alarm at the danger to which they were exposed. Sooner should I think of dividing into parcels the Iliad, the Eneid, or the Paradise Lost, and assigning respective parts to different poets, than of introducing the hand of a copyist or a mere *commentator* into the epistle to the Hebrews. Be it written where, when, or by whom it may have been, one mind performed the great work, and stamped it with characteristics too plain to be obscured, too deep to be erased.

§ 3. *General Considerations respecting the present Inscription to the Epistle.*

In what latitude is the word *Hebrews*, used in the inscription to this epistle, to be understood?

Certainly not as designating all Hebrews of every country. To the *unbelieving* Jews most evidently it was not addressed. From beginning to end, the persons addressed are regarded as having made
a profession of the Christian faith; for the great object of the epistle, as all agree, is to guard them against apostasy from this faith.

To the believing Jews of every country, it could not have been primarily and immediately addressed. It is altogether improbable that all such, in every country, were in special danger of apostasy, when this letter was written. We know from the epistles of Paul, that many churches planted by him, and made up in part of Jews, were, at the period when our epistle must have been written, in a very flourishing condition, and eminent for Christian faith and holiness of life. Other circumstances mentioned in the epistle, and pertaining to those whom he addressed, cannot be applied to all the believing Hebrews of that period. The writer speaks of the great fight of afflictions and the loss of property, to which those whom he addresses had been subjected for the sake of religion, x. 32—34; occurrences which surely had not taken place in every church where Jews were found.

A still more convincing argument in favor of the sentiment just advanced, is drawn from what the writer himself has stated at the close of his letter. He asks the prayers of those whom he addresses, that he may be speedily restored to them, xiii. 19; and promises, if Timothy return in a short time, that he will in his company pay them a visit, xiii. 23. But can he be understood as meaning, that he would, in company with Timothy, visit all the churches where Jews were to be found throughout the world? And could Timothy be known to them all? Or could the circumstances of Timothy, and of the writer himself, be so well known by them all, as the manner of address here necessarily supposes?

These considerations render it quite clear, that whoever the Hebrews were that are named by the present inscription, they must have been those of some particular church and country. And even if we pay no regard to the inscription (but suppose it, after some time had elapsed, to have been fixed to the epistle by another hand), the fact that Jewish converts are addressed, and such, too, as belong to some particular church or region, is, from the internal evidence of the epistle just stated, too plain to admit of any reasonable doubt.

§ 4. To what Church was the Epistle to the Hebrews written?

A question replete with difficulties, and which has been much agitated by late critics. We can easily satisfy ourselves, that this epistle was designed for Jewish converts; and originally adapted to them throughout, in its texture and mode of reasoning. But where did these converts live? We are left to gather from ecclesiastical tradition and from internal evidence, such information as is necessary to answer this question. But the first of these has been regarded by many critics, particularly by recent ones, as too indefinite or too im-
perfect to satisfy the mind of an inquirer; and the second is so indeterminate, as to afford no convincing evidence, but rather to give occasion for constant diversity of opinion. The same passages, for example, have often been quoted to support conclusions directly opposed to each other. And, in other cases, definite conclusions have been drawn in support of particular opinions, from texts which appear to be capable of conveying only a general idea. Thus we meet with critics who have maintained that the epistle was written to the Hebrews of Palestine; to Jewish Christians in Galatia; in Thessalonica; in Corinth; to Hebrews dispersed in Asia Minor; to the church in Alexandria, and in various other places. I proceed to the examination of such of these opinions as seem to demand attention.

(1) Was it written to the Church in Palestine?

In ancient times, so far as I have been able to discover, there was but one opinion on this subject; and this has been adopted and defended by a majority of distinguished critics in modern and recent times. This opinion is, that the epistle was addressed to the Hebrew Church of Palestine. We come now to examine, whether there is satisfactory evidence that this opinion is well founded.

Many arguments have been employed to establish this supposition which appear to be incapable of bearing the test of examination. Lardner and Michaelis, who in many respects were able critics, have brought together a number of such arguments. A proper regard for the opinions of such men, seems to render it necessary to subject these arguments to a brief review.

(a) Lardner adduces Heb. i. 2, God — hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son; which, he thinks, must designate those whom Christ personally addressed, i. e. the Jews.

But although it may have such a meaning, it is equally plain that it may have a different one, viz., spoken unto Christians or to men in general. Thus the word we is in other places employed; e. g. Luke i. 1, The things fully credited by us, i. e. by Christians. Comp. Rom. v. 8; vi. 6; vii. 6; viii. 18, 35; xiii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 8; ix. 10; 2 Cor. i. 5, 8, 10, 21, 22; ii. 14. iv. 14; and a multitude of passages in the Concordance, under ἡμᾶς, ἡμεῖς, etc. See § 27. 17.

(b) 'Heb. iv. 2, Unto us is the gospel preached as well as unto them.'

To this passage the remarks just made will apply, with the same force as to Heb. i. 2.

(c) 'Heb. ii. 1—4, How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness by signs and wonders, etc. Now, Palestine was the place where miracles were performed.
But miracles were also performed out of Palestine, by those who had heard Christ, as well as in it. And how then can it be a proof, that those addressed in the passage under examination, belonged exclusively to Palestine? The meaning is (or at least may be), that Christianity was confirmed to the men of that age, through the miracles which were wrought by the immediate disciples of Christ. This sentiment, of course, has nothing necessarily local attached to it.

(d) 'Those addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews were well acquainted with the sufferings of Christ; and so the Christians of Judea must have been; i. 3; ii. 9, 18; v. 7, 8; ix. 14, 28; x. 12; xii. 2, 3; xiii. 12.'

And so were all to whom the apostles preached. Christ crucified was the grand theme, the prominent subject of apostolic preaching, 1 Cor. ii. 2; Gal. vi. 14.

(e) 'Heb. v. 12, But when for the time ye ought to be teachers of others, ye have need to learn the first principles; which most suitably applies to Christians in Judea, to whom the gospel was first preached.'

But if the epistle to the Hebrews was written after A. D. 60 (as is altogether probable, and as Lardner himself supposes), then the same thing might be said to many other churches out of Palestine, who were among the early converts.

(f) 'What is said of apostates, in ch. vi. 4—6 and x. 26—29, is peculiarly applicable to apostates in Judea.'

But this may be very properly applied, also, to apostates elsewhere, in any other churches where the gospel had been fully preached.

(g) 'Heb. xiii. 13, 14, Let us therefore go forth to him [viz., Jesus], without the camp, bearing his reproach; for here we have no permanent city, but we seek one which is to come. This, Lardner and Michaelis both suppose, was addressed to Christians in Jerusalem, warning them to flee from that city, because the destruction of it would speedily take place.

But it seems quite plain to me, that this passage is merely an exhortation to self-denial, and to patient endurance of suffering on account of Christ, and after his example; couched in figurative language, and applicable to Christians in general of that or any other time or place.

(h) To these arguments Michaelis has added, Heb. x. 25—37; Exhorting one another; and this so much the more, as ye see the day drawing near.—Yet a very little time, and he who is coming will come, and will not delay. This, Michaelis thinks, is a warning to Christians in Jerusalem, that the destruction of the city was near at hand.

The obvious reply is, that the same consideration is addressed by Paul to churches and persons abroad; e. g. to the Philippians, iv. 5; to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. v. 2—6, also v. 23; to Timothy, 1 Tim. vi. 14, 15; and by the apostle James, v. 8, when writing to the twelve tribes dispersed abroad. How can such a warning, then (admitting
that the interpretation of it by Michaelis is correct), be considered as
determining the locality of the epistle? The fall of Jerusalem surely
would not endanger the personal safety of those who lived in Mace-
donia, and other places abroad.

(i) *Heb. xiii. 9, It is good that the heart should be confirmed by
grace, not by meats; for those who are conversant with them are not
profited. This must apply specially to the Jews of Palestine.*

But were there not Christian Jews in other places, superstitiously
attached to doctrines concerning distinctions of meats and drinks?
Were not such to be found at Rome, in Galatia, at Colosse? If so,
how can this text apply exclusively to Jews in Palestine?

On such arguments, then, taken by themselves, dependence cannot
well be placed, in establishing the opinion which Michaelis and Lard-
ner defend. It cannot be denied, indeed, that a peculiar significa-

(1) The inscription to this epistle most naturally leads to the sup-
position, that it was designed for the Hebrews of Palestine.

The point is conceded here, that this inscription is not a manu autco-
ris.* Such is not the manner of the epistles. They contain within them-
selves the direction which the writer gave them. Thus Rom. i. 1—7,
"Paul an apostle ... to the church at Rome; 1 Cor. i. 1, 2, Paul an
apostle ... to the church of God at Corinth; Eph. i. 1, Paul an
apostle ... to the saints at Ephesus; James i. 1, James a servant of
God, to the twelve tribes in dispersion; 1 Pet. i. 1, Peter an
apostle, to the sojourners in dispersion; 2 John v. 1, The elder, to
the elect lady; Jude v. 1, Jude a servant of Jesus Christ ... to those
who are sanctified;" and so of other epistles. Moreover there are
reasons why the titles of the sacred books in general, throughout the
Old and New Testaments, should not be regarded as coming from the
hand of those who originally composed the books. Some of these
inscriptions or titles are incongruous with the contents of the book, or
chapter, to which they are prefixed. But one fact, on which I do
not remember to have seen any comments made, is very striking.
None of the New Testament writers, when they quote the Scriptures,
ever appeal to the names of the Old Testament books. Nothing
could have been more to their purpose, than to employ such names for

* Prof. Bleek, in his recent work on the epistle to the Hebrews (I. p. 34),
supposes that the author of our epistle must of course have given some
address to it; and the present ἐπίσημος Ἑβραῖος, if not an exact copy of the
original address, is for substance a copy of it. The same opinion he has
also expressed, in a review of the first edition of my work, in the Haufe
the sake of guiding their readers, had they been at that time affixed to these books. But they have nowhere employed them. Even when they quote the prophets, it is evidently the name of the person who wrote, and not the name of a book as such, to which they appeal.

Such is the universal practice of the New Testament writers; and such is that of Clemens Romanus, who wrote during the first century. In writing to the Corinthians, he names indeed the epistle of Paul to them; for how could he do otherwise? But in all the numerous quotations which he makes of the other New Testament books, he does not once call any one of them by name.

Such facts show satisfactorily, that the present names of the Scriptural books did not exist in the apostolic age; for had they existed, appeal had been made to them, for the same purpose, and from the same necessity as we now make it every day.

But if the inscription ἡ πρὸς Ἐβραϊοὺς ἐπιστολή, is not from the hand of the original author, it is a very natural and pertinent question, Why was such a title given to the epistle in question? The obvious answer must be: Because the editor or transcriber who affixed this title to the epistle, supposed that it was intended for the Hebrews. And whoever the author of the title or inscription was, it is quite certain that he lived at an early period. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt, that he gave such a title to our epistle as agreed with the general tradition and common opinion of the Christian church at that period. For we find this title, not only in all our present Greek manuscripts (which would not indeed settle the question of its very remote antiquity), but in all the early versions, e.g. the Syriac, and others; and also in the manuscripts of the old Itala, and the Antiochene Latin versions, the Codex Claromontanus and San Germanensis only excepted. There is, indeed, a catalogue of canonical books from the fragments of an anonymous author, who lived near the close of the second century (published by Muratori in his Antiqu. Ital. Tom. III. p. 854), in which the epistle to the Hebrews is supposed to be called [epistola] apud Alexandrinos. But the whole passage of this writer is so obscure, and his ignorance respecting the contents of the epistle to the Hebrews so profound (as will hereafter be shown, § 16), that nothing is to be abated on his account from the statement which has just been exhibited. The Fathers of the second century give the same title to our epistle which it now has: for it is by this name that Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and Origen (with the whole series of fathers after them), make their appeal to it. This shows, beyond reasonable doubt, that from whatever source the title arose, it arose early, and early became general or rather universal in the church, wherever the epistle was received.

* Davidson, Introd. Vol. III. p. 271, says: "It is not improbable, that it was affixed to some copies made from the original autograph."
But although the fact is certain in respect to the early origin and currency of this title, one question remains, about which there has been no small dispute among critics. What is the meaning of the word Hebrews? Does this name apply only to the Jews of Palestine, who spoke the Hebrew language? Or is it equally applicable to all the descendants of the Hebrews, who lived in foreign countries and adhered to the Jewish religion? On this question turns the whole evidence to be derived from the title, in respect to the main subject under consideration. If the first be true, then does it show, that soon after the epistle was written, the church in general believed it to have been directed to the Jews in Palestine; if the second, then it does not at all help to show, whether the early church held it to be written to the Christian community of Hebrews in Palestine or out of it. Viewed in this light, the question as to the meaning of the word Hebrews becomes a matter of no incon siderable importance, and should therefore be radically investigated.

The writers of the New Testament may be fairly presumed to have used the word Hebrew, according to the prevailing usus loquendi of the times when they wrote; and in all probability, too, of the time when the title was given to our epistle, which could not be long afterwards. But they have uniformly employed it to designate the Palestine Jews, or those who had imbibed their opinions and spoke their language. In Acts vi. 1, the Palestine Christians are expressly called Ἑβραῖος, in contradistinction from the foreign Jews, who are called Ἑλληνικοί; there arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily administration. In conformity with this passage (which is fundamental in the question now under consideration), the dialect of Palestine is repeatedly called Ἑβραῖος or Ἑβραῖκος in the New Testament; e. g. Acts xxii. 40; xxiii. 2; Luke xxiii. 38; John v. 2; xix. 18, 17. Agreeably to this, Ἑβραῖος means, to speak or write Hebrew; as Josephus says, τὰ τῶν Ἰσραήλ διηγείται Ἑβραῖος, Bell. Jud. vi. 2, i. e. he narrated Caesar's history in the Hebrew tongue. To have a knowledge of the Hebrew language and to speak it, was deemed among the Jews a matter of great importance or a very valuable acquisition, Acts xxii. 40; xxiii. 2. Hence Paul, when speaking of the ground of precedence which he might claim above the false teachers at Philippi, says that he is a Hebrew of the Hebrews, Phil. iii. 5, i. e. one of full Hebrew descent, and acquainted with the Hebrew language. Although he was born at Tarsus, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, Acts xxii. 3. To this same fact he seems to appeal again in a similar case, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Are they Hebrews? So am I. *

* If, as some maintain, the word in 2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5, is used in a more general sense, the passage in Acts vi. 1, and the Eccl. use of the word are sufficient to give the preference to the more restricted meaning here. See Davidson, Introd III p. 270, sq.
With this usus loquendi of the New Testament agree other facts, which seem to place the question beyond reasonable doubt, as to what the usage of the apostolic age was, in respect to the meaning of the word in question.

The Hebrew Christians of Palestine early possessed a spurious gospel, which long continued to have currency among them. Universal consent gave to this gospel, written in the Syro-Chaldaic or Palestine dialect of the time, the name Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ Ἐφραίων; evidently because it was used or approved by the people of Palestine, who spoke the so-called Hebrew language. The early Fathers, it is well known, drew the conclusion from the title to our epistle, that it was originally written in the Hebrew language. Thus Irenaeus asserts, that "Matthew wrote his gospel ἐν τοῖς Ἐφραίοις τῇ ἱερᾷ αὐτῶν διαλεκτίᾳ," advers. Haer. III. 1; Clemens Alexandrinus asserts that it was written Ἐφραίος Ἐφραϊκὴ φωνῇ, and interpreted by others; in Euseb. H. Ecc. VI. 14. In the same way Eusebius declares that it was addressed Ἐφραῖος διὰ τῆς πατρίων γλώττης, to the Hebrews in their native tongue, Hist. Ecc. III. 28; and again, "Matthew, having first preached Ἐφραῖος . . . delivered to them his gospel πατρίω γλώττῃ," III. 24; and Jerome says that Paul wrote ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraice, i. e. as a Hebrew to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew language; Catal. Script. verb. Paulus.

Now, how could these Fathers reason thus, unless they had understood the word Hebrews as necessarily meaning, according to the usus loquendi of that age, those who spoke the Hebrew language?

Bertholdt declares boldly, that not a single example can be found, in early times, of Jewish Christians out of Palestine being called Hebrews, Einleit. p. 2875. I would express my own conviction in a more guarded manner, and say, I have not been able to find any instance where this is the case.

Yet Eichhorn has ventured to assert, that the name Hebrew never has any reference to language, but always to religion or origin. His proofs from Eusebius's Hist. Ecc. III. 4, Philo, de Abrahamo, p. 388, D. edit. Par., and other passages quoted in Carpzoff, Exercit. in Heb. Prolog. c. 1., fail altogether of affording ground for the conclusion which he adduces from them.

The result of this inquiry is, then, that Ἐφραῖος, in the inscription to our epistle, means, and according to the usus loquendi of the age must mean, the Hebrews of Palestine, i. e. Hebrews in a country where the Hebrew language was vernacular.

Thus much for the external testimony, in regard to the opinion that Palestine was the place to which our epistle was directed; the voice of antiquity, and the title of the letter, constituting strong presumptive evidence that such was the case. But does the internal condition of the epistle itself agree with this? And does this furnish no objections, which will overbalance the weight of tradition? Something
must be said relative to these questions, before we can make our ultimate conclusion. I proceed then,

(2) To examine whether the internal condition of the epistle agrees with and confirms the supposition, which I am now endeavoring to defend.

The most superficial reader cannot help being impressed, on a slight reading of this epistle, with the idea that it is addressed to Jewish converts. In respect to this, indeed, all critics, ancient and modern, are of one opinion. But a close examination discloses a peculiarity of appeal, in this epistle, to the Mosaic ritual, which can be found nowhere else in the New Testament.

In the Acts of the Apostles, and in the acknowledged epistles of Paul, we find, indeed, numerous traces of dispute and difficulty with Jews, who lived in countries remote from Palestine. But the disputed questions turn upon points of circumcision, of meats clean and unclean, points which respected the sabbaths, and the holidays that the Jews had been accustomed to observe. Concerning the priesthood, the temple, and the ritual of sacrifices, we find no questions of difficulty agitated.

The obvious reason of this seems to be, that but very few of the foreign Jews regularly, or even at all, attended the services of the temple. The great body of those who lived in the countries more distant from Palestine, plainly could not attend the feast at Jerusalem three times in each year, according to the prescription of Moses. The time and expenses necessary to do this, could not be spared.

This is not a matter of mere conjecture. We know that the most numerous colony of Jews anywhere to be found at that period, as well as the most learned and rich, was that at Alexandria in Egypt. Hither they had been transplanted, about 284 years A. C. by Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had overrun Palestine with his army. They were allowed great privileges, under the reign of this prince; so that many were allured to Egypt in his time, and the number of Jews in that country became quite large. Under Ptolemy Philometer, not far from 175 A. C., Onias, son of the high priest Onias at Jerusalem, who had fled to Egypt for safety, asked leave of Ptolemy and his queen Cleopatra, to build a temple at Leontopolis in that country, which was a town in the Nome or Prefecture of Heliopolis.* This leave he

* Such was the situation of Leontopolis, if the statement of Josephus (Antiq. XIII. 6) is to be trusted; and he repeats the same in Bell. Jud. VII. 30. edit Colon. But suspicion has arisen of error in his statement, inasmuch as no Latin or Greek writer mentions a Leontopolis in the Nome of Heliopolis, i.e. east of the Delta. The Leontopolis of the Greeks and Romans was within the Delta, between the Mendesian and Phatnesic branches of the Nile, and not far from Busiris. Cellarius (p. 782) places it below, i.e. north of Busiris. But inasmuch as Josephus express'y states the distance from Memphis to be over 180 stadis (22½ Roman miles), which, if Leontopolis
obtained; and there he built a temple, and constituted priests and Levites as ministers for its service. In his petition for obtaining this liberty he states that, while on his military expeditions in the service of the king, he had seen temples used by the Jews for their religious services, in Coelosyria, Phenicia, Leontopolis and other places, Joseph. Antiq. Jud. xiii. 6. edit. Colon. Allowing this statement to be true, it would appear that at least many of these foreign Jews had then already lost their zeal for attendance on the temple worship at Jerusalem. That the Jews in Egypt did not, in general, attend the feasts at Jerusalem, is well known. They only sent an occasional deputy there, by way of testifying their respect and fraternal sympathy.

If the Jews in Egypt did thus, we may well suppose that the Jews at a greater distance from Palestine imitated them in their remissness with respect to attendance on the temple worship at Jerusalem. The nature of the case shows, that as a body they could not have been habitually present at the holy feasts; and that most of them, indeed, never frequented Jerusalem at all. In fact, this city could not have accommodated the one fourth part of the worshippers from abroad, had all the foreign Jews gone up to the feasts held there.

The natural consequence of not being familiar with the temple rites and priesthood, was a diminution of zeal in the foreign Jews with respect to things of this nature; until, in the end, they became to them matters of minor importance, or even of comparative indifference. Hence Paul had no disputes with the foreign Jews about these things. At least, no marks of such disputes appear in the history of this apostle by Luke, nor in the letters of Paul himself.

But here is a point, respecting which the epistle to the Hebrews differs widely from all the other epistles of the New Testament. It is not with the question whether circumcision is to be retained or rejected, not with the dispute about meats offered to idols, not with prescriptions about new moons and sabbaths, that the writer is concerned. The whole epistle turns on different subjects. It is the favorite idea of preeminence, so tenaciously attached by zealous Jews to all parts of the Mosaic ritual, which the writer discusses. The dignity or rank of those, through whose mediation the law was given; the temple apartments, furniture, rites, and sacrifices; the order and honor of the priesthood; in a word, the whole apparatus of the Levitical service, both daily and annual, are the subjects of which he treats; and the things which he compares with the corresponding parts of the

were near Helipolis, would correspond well with fact; and inasmuch as Leontopolis (Onion) was so well known among the Jews in the time of Josephus, because of the temple there, his testimony cannot well be rejected. We must admit, therefore, that there were once two places of this name in Egypt; the one of which, after the building of the temple by Onias, took the name of Onion occasionally, and finally was known altogether by this name.
Christian dispensation, in order to show the superiority of the latter. Were angels employed in order to introduce the law? Christ, who has obtained a name and place far more exalted than they, himself introduced the new dispensation. Was Moses the beloved and honored leader of God's chosen people, placed at the head of the Jewish dispensation? He was placed there as a servant; but Christ, at the head of the new dispensation, as a Son. Was the high priest of the Jews a mediator between God and the people, who offered up their annual propitiatory sacrifice, and went into the holy of holies, into the immediate presence of the Divinity, on their account? The office of this high priest from its very nature and from the brevity of human life, was short and limited; but Christ is high priest forever, he has entered the holy of holies in the highest heavens, and has once for all offered a propitiatory sacrifice of everlasting efficacy. Was the temple a magnificent structure, the sacred character of which inspired awe? Magnificent and sacred as it was, it was merely a copy of the temple in which Jesus officiates, reared by God himself, and eternal in the heavens. Was the blood of goats and bullocks annually presented before the shrine of Jehovah, by the Jewish high priest, on the great day of atonement? Jesus, by his own blood, entered the sanctuary of the eternal temple, and made an atonement which needs not to be repeated. In a word, were all the implements of temple-service, all which pertained to the order and persons of the priesthood, venerable and holy? All these things were merely similitudes of the more perfect temple and priesthood of him, who is the great high-priest of the Christian dispensation.

Who now entertained the particular views in respect to the Mosaic ritual, which the writer thus brings into comparison? To whom could the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews (as he constantly does) appeal, as being familiarly acquainted with everything that pertained even to the minutest parts of the Jewish ritual, and priesthood, and sacred places, and utensils, and the very location of these utensils? To whom I ask, but to the Palestine Jews? It must be to those, who from childhood were familiar with all these objects, and who had been inspired by education with the most profound reverence for them, and with zeal to maintain their importance.

Why are not these subjects brought into view, in Paul's letters to other churches? Disputes he had with the Jews; as the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians and Thessalonians, in a word, as all his epistles testify. But not about the temple ritual, and priesthood, and holy places, and utensils. The disputes concerned other rites of Judaism, which could be generally practised by Hebrews living in foreign countries; and not those in which only a few devotees would feel a particular interest.

I cannot resist the impression, when I read the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the appeal is made to
those who have an intimate knowledge of, and strong jealousy for, the honor of the whole Mosaic ritual there brought to view. I am fully aware that pilgrims (so to speak) annually resorted from all parts of the world where the Jews were settled, to Jerusalem. So they do still. But how few must these have been, from countries more remote. The supposition that the great body of the church, or the whole church, addressed in the epistle to the Hebrews (if these Hebrews belonged to foreign countries), possessed the intimate personal knowledge of the Jewish ritual, holy places, and utensils, which the writer evidently supposes those to possess whom he addresses, does, in itself considered, seem to be very improbable.

It is rendered still more so, by some additional facts which ought to be here stated. In the latter part of Paul's ministry, his disputes abroad about Judaism appear to have generally subsided, and he was everywhere received by the foreign churches with great cordiality and affection. It was only at the first planting of the churches abroad, at the period when the transition was to be made from Judaism to Christianity (which was indeed a great transition in respect to externals), that disputes arose, and passions were awakened, which occasioned much trouble and anxiety to the apostle. More light and a better understanding of the nature of Christianity appeased these disputes, wherever Judaism had not the strong grasp which the constant practice of the ritual gave it.

No: so in Palestine. The very last visit which the apostle made there, before he was sent a prisoner to Rome, occasioned a tumult among the zealots for the law; who even joined in persecuting him. "Thou seest, brother," said the other apostles to him, "how many thousand Jews are become believers, and they are all ζηλωται τού νόμου, zealots for the observance of the law, Acts xxii. 20; the correctness of which sentiment was abundantly confirmed by the sequel. That zealots for the law here means particularly the Jews of Palestine, is evident from v. 21 which follows.

That the Palestine Christians adhered with far greater tenacity to the Jewish ritual than the Jews abroad, is clearly shown moreover by the fact, that while the foreign Jews soon abandoned altogether the rites of Judaism, the zealots for the Mosaic ritual in Palestine even separated, at last, from the community of other Christians, rejected all the epistles of Paul from the canon of the New Testament, and retained, in all their strictness, the ceremonies of the law. I refer to the sect of the Ebionites (I might add, at least in many respects, the Nazarenes), the first party that rent asunder the church of Christ; and which would not bear at all with the catholic spirit of Paul's preaching and epistles.

All these circumstances united have strongly impressed me with the idea, that the whole texture and manner of the epistle to the Hebrews almost of necessity imply, that those to whom it was origi-
nally addressed were in general, habitual attendants on the services of the temple, and intimately and personally acquainted with all its rites and ceremonies. Of course I must regard them as belonging to Palestine, or to its neighborhood.

In addition to these considerations, which apply generally to the epistle in question, there appear to be some particular references made to circumstances, which would seem to presuppose a personal and familiar knowledge, on the part of those addressed, with objects in and about Jerusalem and the temple. E.g. when the writer says, xiii. 12, “Wherefore Jesus, that he might purify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate,” viz., the gate through which criminals were led to execution, this implies, that the readers were supposed to be acquainted with the locality of Jerusalem. And in ix. 5, after recounting the apartments and various sacred utensils of the temple, the writer says : Concerning which things it is not necessary (οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ) to speak particularly; by which an appeal is tacitly made to the knowledge of his readers, that would seem to imply a local and personal acquaintance with the circle of objects to which he alludes; although I acknowledge this interpretation is not a necessary one.

It is a striking fact, also, that Jews only are addressed throughout the epistle. Where were the churches abroad that consisted only of Jews? I am aware that this argument may be met by asking the question: Could not the writer address the Jewish part of a church abroad, and not the Gentile? The possibility of this cannot be denied. The probability that it was so, does not, in this case, seem to be very great. For is it not natural to suppose, that the Gentile part of the church would have been more or less infected with the feelings of the Jewish part; and that some of them, at least, would have also been in danger of apostasy? Could the writer, who shows such deep solicitude to prevent this awful catastrophe, fail to have warned his Gentile brethren against their danger; and to have exhorted and encouraged them to persevere? If this be possible, we must still grant, when we consider the characteristics of the writer, that it is at least highly improbable.

Nor can it be alleged, as an adequate reply to this, that the epistles to the Ephesians and Galatians are exclusively addressed to Gentile converts. For, in regard to the first, no such urgent and fundamental question as that treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, comes under discussion. It is probable, moreover, that by far the greater part of this church were Gentiles. And with respect to the epistle to the Galatians, although Storr has assumed as a point which admits of no question, that it is directed to Gentile converts only, yet Noessel (as we have seen) is of opinion that it is addressed altogether to Jewish converts, and he says that no one except Beausobre denies this, Opusc. Fascic. I. p. 293. Neither he nor Storr can establish their respective opinions, from the contents of the epistle. Most apparent is it, that
in general converts from the heathen are addressed. But when the apostle says, Gal. iv. 9, “Why should ye turn again to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, to which ye desire to be again in bondage,” viz., to the Jewish ritual, can he address only converts from the heathen? And when he says too, v. 1, “Be not again entangled in the yoke of bondage,” can he address only those who were formerly heathen? An appeal, then, to the epistles addressed to the Ephesians and Galatians, as being exclusively addressed to only one part of the churches made up of both Jews and Gentiles, is not satisfactory in the case before us; for the Galatian church is plainly addressed as a mixed body; and the church at Ephesus appears to have been principally made up of Gentiles. It is not comparing par cum pari. The peculiar circumstances of which the epistle to the Hebrews treats, show that a warning to the Gentile part of that church to whom it was sent, if such church were among the Gentiles and consisted in part of them, was a thing to all appearance of indispensable necessity.

Here, then, is another circumstance which contributes to render it probable that some church in Palestine was addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews. It is possible that there may have been some churches abroad wholly made up of Jews; but history has given no account of any such; and not only the possibility but the probability of it must be shown, before the argument now adduced is deprived of its force.

Again; the persons addressed are requested to “call to mind their sufferings in former days, when they were first enlightened, and when they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods,” and suffered other evils from persecution, x. 32, 34. This, indeed, may possibly have been true of other churches abroad; but we have no historical information of persecutions abroad, in the earliest age of Christianity, which were permitted by the civil government to proceed so far as to destroy or confiscate property, and to imprison persons for any length of time. Palestine was the place for such occurrences, from the very first. I am aware that Paul went with a commission to Damascus, that he might cast Christians into prison. But the very terms of that commission directed him to bring those whom he should apprehend, “bound to Jerusalem,” Acts ix. 2. Indeed it is plainly the case, that at this period the Roman magistracy everywhere abroad opposed persecution; for it was contrary to the established maxims of the Roman govern-ment to intermeddle with the religion of their provinces. Often did this magistracy interfere to protect Christians whom the violence of the Jews had assailed; Acts xviii. 12—17. xix. 35—40. Acts xxii. etc. Still I have admitted it to be possible, that such early persecution as the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of, may have taken place abroad; but this has not been rendered probable by the production of any historical records which testify to it. The solitary instance of Antipas at Pergamos, Rev. ii. 13, is the only one I have been able to find. In all probability, he, like Stephen, was destroyed by the rage of a
lawless mob. Of course, until more evidence on this subject can be produced, the argument from the passage in our epistle which has just been cited, adds no inconsiderable weight to the evidence in favor of the supposition that I am endeavoring to defend.

(3) If it can be rendered probable that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, I should think it almost certain that it must have been written to Jews in Palestine; for throughout the whole epistle there is not one word which shows the writer to have been their religious teacher. What church abroad could be thus addressed by Paul? For what one had not been either planted or nurtured by him? I do not deny the possibility of there having been some one; but the evidence that there actually was, at the time when our epistle was written, I have not been able to find.

And besides this, it is peculiar to the epistle to the Hebrews, that not one word is said which implies that their teachers were lacking in anything pertaining either to the knowledge or the duties demanded by their office. All is commendation. How natural is this, and easy to be accounted for, if these teachers were apostles or immediate disciples of Christ himself; and such were the teachers of the churches in Palestine. On the whole, this is a circumstance which increases the probability of the opinion that I am assaying to defend.

Internal evidence, then, is not wanting, which accords with the testimony given by the inscription to the epistle to the Hebrews. Indeed, the concurrence of both kinds of evidence is such, as to afford grounds of probability as strong as could be expected in regard to a question of this nature, which respects a matter so ancient and so difficult. Direct and positive proof, incapable of being in any way questioned or contradicted, can neither be required nor justly expected. But there is evidence enough, as it appears to me, to render the opinion of the ancient church, that the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Christians in Palestine, altogether probable.

Objections against this opinion, however, drawn from the epistle itself, have been often and strongly urged by critics of late; and these cannot, with due respect to the authors of them, be passed over in silence.

Objection 1. ‘Heb. ii. 3, “How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.” From this passage it appears that Christ had not personally taught those to whom this epistle is addressed; they had only been instructed by those who heard him, viz., the apostles and immediate disciples of Christ.’

It is remarkable that this same verse is adduced and relied on by Lardner, to support the opinion that the Hebrews of Palestine only could have been addressed by it; and by Storr, to prove that those could not have been the persons addressed. The argument is equally valid in both cases, i.e. it amounts to nothing in either. For the sim-
ple statement of the text is, ‘How can we escape punishment, if we neglect the gospel first published by the Lord of glory in person, and then abundantly confirmed by miracles which were wrought by the apostles and immediate disciples of Christ.’

Now this might be said to any church of that period, in any country; and to any church on earth, from that period down to the present hour. Of course it determines nothing relative to the question, whether our epistle was directed to a church in or out of Palestine.

OBS. 2. ‘Heb. xii. 4, ‘Ye have not resisted unto blood, striving against sin,’ i.e. against injurious and unjust opposition. How could this be said to the church at Jerusalem, who had been called to witness the martyrdom of Stephen and others, and the bloody death of James; and who had lived in the fire of persecution, ever since its first establishment?’

This argument has appeared so conclusive to many critics, that they have abandoned the idea of supporting the ancient opinion, that our epistle was directed to the church in Palestine. Its first appearance inclined me to the same conclusion. A more particular examination of it, however, has led me to doubt altogether of its validity.

‘Call to mind,’ says the writer, ‘your severe afflictions in former days, when ye were first enlightened,’ x. 32—34. That is, your former persecutions which were severe, ye bore with patience and cheerfulness, although ye suffered imprisonment and los of property. Now indeed ye are tried, continues the writer, but not in the highest degree. ‘Ye have not yet resisted unto blood.’ How then does the history of the church in Palestine comport with these sentiments? A question which must necessarily be investigated here.

The first persecution was that which arose at the time of Stephen’s martyrdom, Acts vi. vii. This happened probably in A. D. 37 or 38. During this persecution many were imprisoned, severely beaten, and subjected to various insults and outrages; but there is no satisfactory evidence that any blood was shed, except that of Stephen. Paul, in giving an account of his former conduct, says that he persecuted Christianity unto death, Acts xxii. 4; which was in fact the case with respect to Stephen, and no doubt he designed to do so with respect to many others. But in telling us what he actually effected, he says that he arrested Christians, beat them in the synagogues, Acts xxii. 4, 19, compelled them to blaspheme, and shut them up in prison, Acts xxvi. 10, 11. But the voice of Jesus arrested him, on his way to Damascus; and in confessing his crime, he avows that he imprisoned believers and beat them in the synagogues. But he does not state that he was guilty of blood, except in the case of Stephen, Acts xxii. 19, 20. As this passage contains, we have reason to believe, a full confession of his guilt, it may serve to explain the doubtful passage in Acts xxvi. 10, where he says *when they were slain* (ἀναπομεῖναι αὐτῶν), *I gave my vote against them*. The plural number here (ἀναπομεῖναι)
has led many to suppose that Paul was concerned in frequent murders. But any one versed in the narrations of the New Testament cannot but know that the plural number is sometimes used to designate the occurrence of facts, in which only one person is concerned as the agent, i.e., where the sense of the passage requires it to be understood in the same way as the singular would be. It is thus that the thieves on the cross are said to have reviled the Saviour, although only one of them did so, Matt. xxvii. 44, Mark xv. 32, comp. Luke xxiii. 39; thus that the demoniacs at Gadara are said to have been exceedingly fierce, when only one of them was so, Matt. viii. 28—34, comp. Mark v. 1—18. Luke viii. 26—38; and thus, in other cases presented by the Scriptures,* and (I may add) by other writings also.

* See Matt. xx. 30—34, and comp. Mark x. 46—52. Luke xviii. 35—43. See also Matt. xxviii. 1. Mark xvi. 1, 2, with which comp. Luke xxiv. 1, 9, 10, and John xx. 11, 18. Prof. Bleek indeed, in his Review (Allg. Lit. Zeit. Erg. B. Jan. 1830), has objected to the analogy of all the instances above produced, with the δειασανος of Acts xxvi. 10. He allows that this latter phrase may well be understood in a general indeterminate sense, without any necessity of an (individually) plural meaning; and he remarks, that the speaker must of course have been conscious still, in his own mind, whether one or more than one was really meant. But in the other cases, in the text and in the instances above cited in this note, of analogous usage as to the mode of expression, he thinks it is clear that the writers differ from each other in expression, because they differed in respect to actual knowledge. E.g. Matthew in xxviii. 44, and Mark in xv. 32, state that the thieves (plural) reviled the Saviour on the cross; and this, because they (the Evangelists) believed that both of them did so; while Luke, in xxiii. 39—43, gives a particular account, which shows that probably only one of these malefactors was concerned in reviling Jesus. Now, not to speak at all of that "guidance by the Spirit" which the Saviour promised to his disciples (John xiv. 16, 17, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 13), or at least to his apostles, of whom Matthew was one, and which I know not whether Prof. Bleek admits or rejects; it would seem to be incredible in itself — yes, utterly incredible — that Matthew did not know the real facts, in respect to the demeanor of the malefactors in question. Were there not disciples present at the crucifixion? John xix. 25—27. And during so extraordinary and deeply interesting a scene, is it possible that the behavior of the thieves should not be noted by the beloved disciple of Jesus, and by his own mother, who remained close by the cross until the very last moments of Jesus' life, John xix. 25—30. Yet this same disciple has not said a word in regard to the behavior of the malefactors; he has merely noted, that two others were crucified with Jesus, xix. 18. Matthew, and Mark after him, on the other hand, have noted that Jesus was reviled by the thieves; and simply noted this, by using the plural number, which is so often used in narration where the writer means to give only a general account without going into particulars. In exact accordance with this, we often speak in common parlance; e.g., "The French do this; the English do that;" when only the individuals concerned in the executive government of France and England have done it.

Why one Evangelist should prefer to narrate in a general way, while another goes into particulars, is another question. In the present case, for example, why have Matthew and Mark related in general terms, while Luke has gone into particulars? Why has John omitted both kinds of narration,
too numerous to be here recounted. Nothing is said, in the history of the first persecution, of any Christians suffering martyrdom be-

i.e. taken no notice at all of the behavior of the malefactors? Why has Luke inserted many important narrations, which the other Evangelists have omitted? And vice versa, why have Matthew and John done the same? The answer to such questions can never be, that the writers were ignorant of all facts which they have not related.

The difference in most cases depends on other causes, and must be sought for in the different views, impressions, and objects of the respective writers in regard to some particulars of their accounts, while they are all perfectly united in the same general object.

In accordance with what is now remarked, we find the account of the demoniacs (in Matt. viii. 28—34 and in the parallel passages) related in the plural by Matthew, and in the singular by Mark and Luke. How happens this? Not for want of knowledge in Matthew, who plainly was present on the occasion referred to, and must have known its true nature. But how could Luke and Mark relate the story of only one demoniac? I answer, that probably it is because one was the principal agent in the whole transaction, and was the special subject of the story. The occurrence is thus related generally (if I may so express myself) by them; while Matthew, who was present, goes into particulars, and tells us of more than one demoniac. That he ascribes fierceness to both, results of course from his mode of narration (just what is every day practised), i.e. from ascribing to those associated the actions of one individual among them.

The same remarks may be made on Matt. xx. 30—34, and the parallel passages; where the diversity is just the same, Matthew using the plural, and Mark and Luke the singular. It is evident that Matthew was himself present, on this occasion; comp. Matt. 20: 17.

As to the other examples, the reader who will take the pains to compare Matt. xxviii. 1, 7, 8 and Mark xvi. 1, 2, 7, with Luke xxiii. 55, 56; xxiv. 1, 9, 10; and then the whole with John xx. 1, 2, will see that where a certain knowledge of the subject, a personal knowledge in regard to Matthew and John existed, yet there is a diversity in the mode of narration; John relating a fact in respect to one only of several concerned in it; while Matthew (as also Mark and Luke) relates the same fact as if several were concerned in it. But does this necessarily imply want of knowledge, or contradiction? I trow not. The passages referred to show thus much, viz. that where the principal thing merely in regard to any event, is the object aimed at by a narrator, he may employ the singular or the plural, just which best suits his mode of narration and conception; while, at the same time, others may narrate in a different manner, having a specific object in view; and all this, without any imputation of the knowledge of the veracity of either narrator.

If the reader has still any doubts on the principal question, whether the plural is employed in a general way of narration when a specific and particular narration would demand the singular, let him compare Mark vii. 17 with Matt. xv. 15; Matt. xiv. 17 and Mark vi. 38, with John vi. 8, 9; Matt. xxvi. 8 and Mark xiv. 4, with John xii. 4, 5; Matt. xxiv. 1, with Mark xiii. 1; Matt. xxvii. 37, with John xix. 19; Matt. xxvii. 48 and Mark iv. 36, with John xix. 29. So in Luke xxii. 67, a question is ascribed to the multitude of the chief priests and scribes, which doubtless was put by one of them. In like manner the plural is used, where the nature of the case shows that the singular is meant, in John xi. 8; Luke xx. 21, 39; xxiv. 5 (et row); Matt. xv. 1, 12. These instances are, indeed, more directly to the point of illustrating the plural form of expression in Acts xxvi 10, than those cited above; and I
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side Stephen; nothing in Paul's confession to the Saviour, which specifies the blood that he had shed. The conclusion seems to be, then, that only the blood of Stephen was shed on this occasion, although doubtless Paul then meant to add to the number of martyrs; he gave his vote for this purpose, Acts xxvi. 10, and abused Christians in various ways, such as the spite and malice of Jews suggested. But they were not destroyed. It must be remembered, in regard to this persecution, that it was limited to Jerusalem; with the exception only, that Paul designed to extend it to Damascus, Acts viii. 12; xxvi. 10.

Saul's conversion, however, appears to have put an end to this persecution; for we read, after his first visit to Jerusalem, that the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, were in a state of peace and prosperity, and were multiplied, Acts ix. 31.

Persecution again broke out under Herod Agrippa (about A. D. 44), who, to gain favor with the Jews, pretended great zeal for the law; and to do them a pleasure, he undertook to harass Christians. How widely he extended his efforts to vex them, the sacred historian has not told us; it is simply said that he undertook κακοφαίρα τῶν τῶν ἄνδρων ἐκκλησίας, and that he put to death James the brother of John, and cast Peter into prison, Acts xii. 1, 3. It is very probable, since Herod lived a part of his time at Cesarea, that he may have extended his vexations to the churches there, in order to increase his popularity in that city, which was the capital of his kingdom. Be this as it may, we read of only one death on this occasion; James he destroyed, ἀνέβλε; but others, ἐκάκωσε.

Herod died a short time after this, at Cesarea, smitten by a divine hand on account of his having impiously received praise as a God. With his death the persecution ceased; for the Roman procurators who followed, allowed of no open persecution. It was not until the departure of Festus, and before the arrival of his successor Albinus (nineteen or twenty years after the persecution of Herod), that the Jews were again engaged in any open or violent outrages against Christians. James the younger, and some others with him, were then destroyed by Ananus the high priest. But this act of violence was disapproved by the considerate and sober part of the Jews; and Ananus himself was thrust out of office, by the interference of the succeeding Roman governor, on account of this act of cruelty. Josephus Antiq. XX. These are all the persecutions unto blood, in Palestine and before the destruction of Jerusalem, of which we have any historical information. The last of these probably occurred after the epistle to the Hebrews was written. Vexation proceeding from per-

am thankful for the remark of Prof. Block, which has occasioned me to seek for and to produce them. I trust the relevancy of these examples to the case in Acts xxvi. 10, will not be called in question.
sonal insult, contumely, excommunications, malice, and blind fiery zeal on the part of the unbelieving Jews, no doubt the Christians in Palestine suffered very frequently, during the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. But restraint of personal liberty and destruction of property or of life, were not permitted by a Roman government, while the civil administration of Judea was actually in their hands.

Compare now these facts (which I have not seen fully developed by any of the critics who have written on our epistle) with the passage which is at present under consideration. Our epistle is directed to Christians as a body, and not to the teachers or officers of the churches; for these are separately spoken of, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, and a salutation is sent to them Heb. xiii. 24, as not being a direct party to the epistle, but a separate class of persons. The investigation which we have instituted shows that only teachers, and not private Christians, had suffered martyrdom in Judea. An epistle to private Christians in Palestine, then, and not addressed to their teachers, might say, and might truly say, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin;" although some of their teachers had suffered martyrdom.

If, however, we should admit all that is contended for, viz., that in the persecution of the time of Stephen, and, under Herod Agrippa, many private Christians were destroyed; even then, the passage of the epistle which we are considering, offers no formidable difficulty. Plainly the principles of interpretation demand no more, than that what is said, in the verse under consideration, should have respect to the generations of Christians then living, and the persecution then pending when the epistle was written. One generation of Christians, who were adults, or in advanced life when they were converted, (which might have been on or near the day of Pentecost) must have necessarily passed off the stage, in a period of about thirty years. But many of the generation now addressed may have been Christians, and probably were so, at the time when Herod persecuted the church; which accords well with what our epistle says, "Remember former days, when, soon after your conversion, ye endured a great fight of afflictions," x. 32—34. But after that, when Herod was dead, there was a remission of severities. Now again, the violence of the Jews had begun to show itself; but the Roman government overawed it, so as to restrain it from shedding blood. Such a state of things agrees well with the language of our epistle. Ye have not, i. e. in your present struggle, resisted unto blood. This expression has not necessarily any respect to preceding times of persecution, but only to that which was then pending. In this way the laws of exegesis are satisfied. But if not, if the expression must be referred to past times, it is, as we have already seen, capable of historical vindication, when
applied to the Hebrews. Private persons had not resisted unto blood.*

Obs. 3. 'Heb. xiii. 24, They of Italy salute you. What did the church in Italy know of the church in Palestine, that they should send salutations to them? Or if, as most critics have averred, they of Italy means Priscilla and Aquila, how should the church of Palestine know anything of these private Jews, who had only travelled from Rome to Corinth, from Corinth to Ephesus, and thence back again to Rome?'

In regard to the first part of this objection, it is sufficient to ask, How could Peter send a salutation to the church at Babylon, 1 Peter v. 13, to the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia? 1 Peter i. 1. How could Paul, writing to the Corinthians from Ephesus, say: The churches of Asia salute you? 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Was then the church at Babylon personally acquainted with all those churches in Asia, to whom their salutation is sent by Peter? Or were the churches of Asia personally acquainted with the Corinthians? Neither the one nor the other. Neither was necessary; for what is more common than salutations, sent by a mutual friend, from some persons to others whom they have never seen?

But farther; had they of Italy never heard of the church in Palestine? And might they not sympathize with them in their trials and dangers, and send them an affectionate expression of their regard in a salutation? Such objections cannot surely help to support the case, in aid of which they are adduced.

As to Aquila and Priscilla (if the of ἀρδ ῆ ῆ ῆ ῆ ῆ τῆς Ἰταλίας means them, which is very improbable), a sympathy in them, as Jews, for their Christian brethren in Palestine, is surely not a matter of wonder. And an expression of this in a salutation, is as little so.

Obs. 4. 'The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has in various places eulogized them for the charity which they had so cheerfully manifested, and continued to manifest, on various occasions, Heb. vi. 10; in particular for their compassion towards those who were in bonds, i. e. imprisoned, x. 32, seq. He exhorts them also to continue their benefactions of this nature, by a liberal hospitality, xiii. 1, 2, 16. How could such things be addressed to the church in Palestine; and how could they be praised for contributions to others, when they were so poor from the first, that they had even been assisted by the contributions of churches from abroad?'

But this argument fails of producing conviction, because it is built on an interpretation of the epistle which is not admissible, and on an assumption of facts altogether improbable and unsupported. The

* It should not be forgotten that the language of the verse in question is figurative, and, as Davidson says, "What the writer states is, that the spiritual contest against temptation which those whom he addresses waged, had not yet proceeded to the extreme." See also Comm. on the verse.
writer tells them that God will not forget their labor of love, in that they have ministered to the saints, and do still minister, vi. 10; that they have had compassion on those who were in bonds, x. 34; that they must not forget to entertain strangers, xiii. 2; and that God is well pleased with their sacrifices of hospitality (κοινωνίας) xiii. 16. Here is nothing said, or even intimated, of making contributions for churches abroad. They are commended for being liberal to the saints, who were in need or in prison; and they are exhorted to continue their hospitality to strangers, i. e. to receive with liberality and kindness brethren that were strangers from abroad (probably preachers), who visited them. Who can doubt that a characteristic so peculiarly exhibited by Christians in general of the primitive age, was manifested by the churches in Palestine,—a country which so many strangers visited?

But when it is said that the church in Palestine was supported by contributions from abroad, why should this be predicted, as it is by many critics, of all the Christian churches in Palestine? There is no support for this opinion to be derived from history. When the famine occurred in the time of Claudius, Acts xi. 27—30, a collection was made at Antioch, and sent to Judea; which appears, however, to have been distributed at Jerusalem, Acts xii. 25. In respect to all the other collections mentioned in Paul's epistle, Jerusalem is evidently the place for which they are destined. See Rom. xv. 25—31; 1 Cor. xvi. 1—3; 2 Cor. viii. ix. εἰς δύναμις; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 1—3; Gal. ii. 1—10. If now we consider the circumstances of the church at Jerusalem, this will not excite any surprise. For first, in this metropolis Jewish zeal was more displayed than elsewhere, and Christians here were, of course, peculiarly exposed to persecution and want. Secondly, the multitude of Christian Jews, who still resorted to the temple in order to pay their services there, and who would naturally consort with the Christians at Jerusalem, rendered necessary the charity of the churches abroad in order that the Christians of the Jewish metropolis might support their hospitality. But as to other churches in Palestine, we know nothing of their poverty. We know that many Christians in that country had possessions, and sold them in order to put the avails into the public treasury of the church, soon after the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 44, 45. Indeed it is beyond all bounds of probability to suppose that, of the many thousand Jews in Palestine who had become Christians, all were poor and in need of foreign charity. Poverty of this nature was not very common among the Jews, who were always an active and industrious nation. Above all, the supposition that the Hebrew Christians were unable to perform the common rites of hospitality, and to aid in any way such as were thrown into prison, or to furnish them with aliment, is destitute of every degree of probability; and therefore it can form no solid objection to the idea, that the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed.
to some church or churches in Palestine. Why is it necessary to suppose that the church at Jerusalem, and that exclusively, was addressed?

Moreover, the very objection itself affords an argument for the position which it is designed to oppose. In what country were the prisoners to whom compassion had been shown? Prisoners they were, evidently, on account of their Christian faith. We have seen that neither liberty nor life was, at this period, in jeopardy abroad on account of religion, because of the restraint over the Jews exercised by the Roman government. We have no history that proves such jeopardy to have been matter of fact. The mere temporary imprisonment of Paul and Silas, on charge of sedition, and as preparatory to trial (Acts xxii), proves nothing to the purpose. Accounts of other imprisonments besides this, out of Palestine, cannot be shown in the history of the primitive church, at least within the Roman provinces abroad. Palestine was the only place where Christians were imprisoned. Even when Paul went to Damascus, he expected to bring his prisoners to Jerusalem, Acts ix. 2. Palestine, then, was the place where compassion to Christian prisoners was needed, and where it was to be shown; and there, as it seems to me, it was exhibited by those whom the epistle to the Hebrews addresses.

Obj. 5. 'Heb. xiii. 23. "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, ἀπολαλυμένον, with whom, if he come soon, I will pay you a visit." How could the church in Palestine know anything of Timothy, who was never there; and what particular concern can they be supposed to have had with a visit of Timothy to them?

But, first, it is altogether probable that Timothy was with Paul at Jerusalem, during his last visit there, before his imprisonment. It is certain from Acts xx. 4, that Timothy set out with him and several others, from Troas, to go to Jerusalem; and equally certain, that although the history of Paul's voyage to Palestine, at that time, is traced with a minuteness that is unusual, not a word is mentioned of Timothy's being left behind, or being separated for any time from him; although it is the custom of Luke to mention such a fact, whenever it occurs; e.g. Acts xix. 22; xvii. 14; xx. 5, 13, 14. Indeed it is altogether against probability, that Timothy would have separated from Paul on this occasion; for it was announced to Paul, on his way, that bonds and imprisonment awaited him at Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 4; xx. 23; not to mention the desire which Timothy, who had been educated as a Jewish proselyte, must have had to see Jerusalem and the interesting objects which it presented.

The sequel of this journey was, that Paul was kept two years as a prisoner at Cesarea; with full liberty of access, however, to all his friends and acquaintance. Is there any probability that Timothy, who was so ardently attached to Paul as to have followed him everywhere, from the very first of his acquaintance with him, would have imme-
diately deserted him; or even if he was then abroad, that he would not have come to aid his necessities? So far then as the objection is built on Timothy's ignorance of the Jews in Palestine, or theirs of him, it appears altogether improbable.

Besides, even supposing Timothy had not been personally there, did not the churches there know that he was a favorite companion and helper of Paul? And was he not commended to the Jews, by the fact that after he became a Christian, he had submitted to the rite of circumcision on their account? If Paul wrote the epistle in question, or any other person immediately connected with Timothy, he might very naturally give the churches in Palestine, and especially the church at Cesarea, information that he was sent away (ἀπολέλυμον) or set at liberty, and that when he should return, he would pay them a visit in his company.

Obj. 6. 'But how could Paul (on the supposition that Paul was the author of the epistle) pray to be restored to the churches in Palestine? Hebrews xiii. 19. 'He had just been sent to Rome as a prisoner, by the persecuting spirit of the Jews of Palestine; how could he expect or wish to return thither again?'

If Paul had been at Rome, and was dismissed there by the emperor himself, on an appeal to him personally as judge in respect to the Jews, might not the apostle well expect that the Jews would in future be overawed, and not venture to attack him again on account of his religion? Besides, it was only at Jerusalem, that he was exposed to dangerous persecution. At Cesarea, he remained a kind of prisoner at large, without any tumult or excitement, for two whole years. Might he not desire to be restored to the brethren there, who had treated him in a friendly manner, and administered to his necessities while he was among them as a prisoner? Besides, Paul was not a man to be deterred from a desire to go, or from actually going, to any place where he thought it his duty to go, by any prospect of persecution or of sufferings, as his history abundantly testifies.

Obj. 7. 'The Ebionites, a sect made up of Palestine Jews, appear to have known nothing of the epistle to the Hebrews. How could this be, if it had been directed to any of the churches in Palestine?'

If Paul was the author of this epistle, then it is very easy to answer this objection; for the Ebionites rejected all the epistles of Paul from their canon (as Eusebius expressly testifies), because Paul everywhere appears in them, wherever occasion demands it, in opposition to a Judaizing spirit. They, on the other hand, separated from other Christians, out of zeal for the rites of the Jewish law. Nay, the manner in which Eusebius mentions this fact, seems to imply that the Ebionites were acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, and rejected it, together with Paul's acknowledged epistles; for Eusebius reckoned this epistle to be certainly one of Paul's; and he mentions the rejection of Paul's epistles by these sectarians, in a manner which
seems to imply, that the whole of these epistles, as reckoned by himself, were rejected by them.*

To the same purpose Irenaeus testifies, Advers. Haeres. I. 26, "Apostolum Paulum [Ebionitae] recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentem."

Moreover, if some other person, and not Paul, had been the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, the sentiments which it contains respecting the Jewish ritual, would have occasioned its rejection from the canon of the Ebionites. That they did not retain it, then, as a part of their New Testament Scriptures, is no argument against its having been directed to the church in Palestine.

OwJ. 8. 'But if the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to the church in Palestine, why was it not written in the dialect of that country instead of the Greek language? Is it not improbable that any writer would address in Greek, Jews who spoke the Hebrew language?'

There are critics, both of ancient and modern times, who maintain that the original epistle was in Hebrew; believing, as Jerome says, that the author ut Hebraeus, Hebraeis Hebraicè scripsit. But as I am not persuaded of the correctness of this opinion, I will not advance it here, as a reply to the objection which we are now considering.

It is well known, and abundantly evident from the writings of the New Testament, that the Greek language was generally understood more or less over all hither Asia. The conquests of Alexander, and the governments established by him, had made Greek the language of courts, of literature, and of all well-informed people. In the larger and more commercial towns, this knowledge extended in some measure to the common people, as well as to those of a more elevated rank.†

The Greek votaries, who went up to Jerusalem every year to perform their religious services there, must have rendered the Greek language somewhat current in the metropolis. It was the language by which all the inhabitants of western Asia, when they met as strangers, held intercourse with one another. If the epistle to the He-

* Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. 111. 27) says, that the Ebionites rejected all Paul's epistles, because they believed him to be an apostate from the law, οὗτος δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἀποστόλου τὰς ἑν κυρίων ἄρχοντας ἡγούμενος εἰς νόμον ἀποτάγων ἄποκαλοῦσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ νόμου. Now as in Lib. 111. 25 of the same author, the epistle to the Hebrews is implicitly reckoned as one of Paul's epistles, and clearly as one of the books of Scripture which are διαλογοβομενοι (comp. Lib. 111. 25 and 111. 3), it appears that Eusebius means to say, that the Ebionites rejected the epistle to the Hebrews; for he undoubtedly held this to be one of Paul's. Of course, he supposes the Ebionites to have been acquainted with it, or to have had opportunity of being acquainted with it.

† See this subject illustrated, in a very able and satisfactory manner by Hug, Einleit. in das N. Test. Theil. II. § 10, a translation of which is given in the Biblical Repository, Vol. I. No. 3.
brews, then, was written in Greek, and directed to the church in Jerusalem, it might have been understood by them.

But if the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Cesarea, there is still more reason to suppose it would have been easily understood there. In that city, there were a great multitude of Greeks, even a majority of its inhabitants, Joseph. Bell. Jud. III. 14. p. 854. edit. Colon., πλέον ὑφ' Ἑλληνικὸν ἐπικοινωνήν. The Jews who lived there were, in general, men devoted to commerce, or to concerns of a public nature, and must have well understood the Greek language. No serious difficulty, then, lies in the way of supposing that this epistle was sent to some part of Palestine, and that it was intelligible there, although written in the Greek language.

On the other hand, is it not apparent that the author of our epistle designed it should be encyclical, so that Jews far and near might ultimately peruse it, in order that they might become weaned from their attachment to the Levitical rites, and substitute Christianity in the place of the Mosaic religion? Such a design would have been in some measure defeated by writing it in Hebrew; for Greek was by far the most general language.

Taking all these facts into view, that it was written in Greek does not appear to constitute any solid objection to its having been directed to some part of Palestine.

Prof. Bleek, in his Review before cited, chooses to account for the epistle being written in Greek, by suggesting the probability, that 'the writer was not acquainted with the Hebrew language as then spoken;' a supposition, he intimates, which is the more probable, inasmuch as the quotations from the Old Testament in the epistle to the Hebrews, show that the writer was not acquainted with the Scriptural Hebrew. The manifestly frequent Hebraisms of the epistle, however (see § 32), are against both of these suppositions. The internal evidence, that the epistle comes from the hand of a Hebrew, seems to be as convincing, on the whole, as it is in regard to the other New Testament books. I am aware how often the contrary has been asserted; but when has it been proved? I have actually produced the Hebraisms of the epistles, and those who do but repeat over the assertion of Origen, that "the epistle is better Greek (Ἑλληνικὸν) than Paul's," are bound either to show that these are not Hebraisms, or to concede that it was possible for Origen to make a mistake in a matter of taste and style; in respect to either of which, I have yet to learn, that he can be accounted a skilful arbiter.

Or. 9. 'How could this epistle have been directed to Palestine, when the ground of argument in it, in several places, is furnished by the Septuagint version, and not by the Hebrew Scriptures? How could Jews in Palestine be convinced, by an appeal of this nature?'

But who does not know that the Palestine Jews of that day regarded the Septuagint version as being of divine authority? Jose-
phus gives full credit to the account of Aristeas, respecting the miraculous manner in which this version was made; as may be seen in his Antiq. XII. 2. edit. Colon. There could be no danger that the Jews of Palestine would object to such an appeal, or to such a mode of argument.

These are all the objections against the opinion that the epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Palestine, which seem to be of sufficient magnitude to deserve attention; and they surely come quite short of being conclusive. On the other hand, the positive proof, I acknowledge, is only of a circumstantial nature, and falls short of the weight which direct and unequivocal testimony in the epistle itself would possess. But uniting the whole of it together; considering the intimate knowledge of Jewish rites, the strong attachment to their ritual, and the special danger of defection from Christianity in consequence of it, which the whole texture of the epistle necessarily supposes; and combining these things with the other circumstances above discussed; I cannot resist the impression, that the universal opinion of the ancient church respecting the persons to whom our epistle was addressed, was well founded, being built upon early tradition and the contents of the epistle; and that the doubts and difficulties thrown in the way, by modern and recent critics, are not of sufficient importance to justify us in relinquishing the belief, that Palestine Christians * were addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews. Thousands of facts, pertaining to criticism and to history, are believed and treated as realities, which have less support than the opinion that has now been examined.

There remains one question more, relative to the original destination of this epistle, concerning which inquiry is now to be made.

Was it directed to all the Churches in Palestine, or only to one?
And if only to one, was this the Church at Jerusalem, or at some other place?

This question cannot be answered, as is sufficiently evident from what has been already said, by adducing any direct testimony concerning it. Probability, made out from circumstantial evidence, is all, at the most, which criticism can achieve. Perhaps it may fail even in respect to this.

While engaged in the investigations necessary to complete the

* Davidson says: "The only tenable opinion is, that it was written for the special benefit of Jewish Christians in Palestine." So "most of the Fathers held as far as we have the means of forming a judgment in respect to their views." . . . . "The same view is adopted by the majority of modern scholars, as Beza, Capellus, Spanheim, Hill, Pearson, Pritius, Harenberg, Hofmann, Lardner, Macknight, Michaelis, Hallet, Hug, Bertholdt, Schott, Bloek, Neudecker."
views above presented, it often occurred to me as possible, that the epistle to the Hebrews might have been originally directed to the church at Caesarea. Perhaps I may venture to say, that there are at least some specious grounds of probability, that this was the case. The reasons of this opinion I will now briefly state.

Caesarea (Καισαρεια παραλιος, Caesarea by the sea) was built by Herod the Great, in a most splendid manner, and named by him in honor of the Roman emperor Augustus. Previously to this, it was an insignificant village called Στράτωνος πύργος, the tower of Strato. Although it lay out of the district of Judea (as anciently defined by the Jews), and within the borders of Phoenicia, yet it was within the Roman Procuratorship of Judea, and was the capital of the Roman prefects or procurators. Josephus calls it "the greatest city of Judea," and says (as has been already mentioned) that the majority of the inhabitants were Greeks, Bell. Jud. III, 14. p. 854. edit. Colon.

Here Cornelius, the first convert to the Christian faith from the Gentiles, was stationed. On the occasion of his conversion a church was gathered here, and the miraculous gifts of the Spirit imparted to it, Acts x. 44—48. This was the earliest church that was gathered out of the ancient limits of Judea.

Paul had repeated opportunities for acquaintance with Christians here. After his first journey to Jerusalem, he returned to Tarsus through Caesarea, Acts ix. 30. After preaching at Corinth, and on going to revisit the churches in Asia, Paul landed here, Acts xviii. 22. On his fourth visit to Palestine, he lodged here at the house of Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven deacons named in Acts vi. Here he abode many days, ἡμέρας πλείως, Acts xxi. 8—10. Here, at the time just mentioned, when Agabus had predicted that in case Paul went to Jerusalem he would be bound as a culprit there and delivered up to the heathen tribunals, the men of the place (ἡ ἑτέρων), as well as his own travelling companions, besought him, with tears and strong entreaties, to refrain from going thither, Acts xxi. 12, 13.

When, after this, he had been up to Jerusalem, and was sent away under a guard of Roman soldiers, he was brought again to Caesarea. There he remained two whole years, a kind of prisoner at large, none of his friends being forbidden to approach or assist him, Acts xxiv. 23, 27.

At Caesarea dwelt a rich and powerful body of Jews. In the time of Felix, these Caesarean Jews, boasting of their riches and of Herod as the founder of the city, treated with contempt the Syrian part of the population. This raised a tumult, and at last occasioned mutual assaults, in which the Syrians were worsted. Felix was obliged to check the overbearing power of the Jewish party, by commissioning the Roman soldiery to kill and plunder them, Antiq. Jud. XX. 5. p. 695, edit. Colon.

It appears, also, that the Jews here were strong zealots for the tem-
ple worship. Herod Agrippa, while king of Judea, very probably in order to ingratiate himself with the rich men of this his capital, as well as with those of Jerusalem, pretended a very strong zeal for Judaism. This he exhibited by causing James the brother of John to be slain with the sword, by imprisoning Peter, and by vexing others of the church, Acts xii. 1 seq. Now, considering that Cesarea was his capital, and that to ingratiate himself with the Jews there, who were rich and powerful, would be a great object for a prince so wholly devoted as he was to the interests of ambition; is it probable that his vexations of the church were limited to Jerusalem?

Let us now put all these facts together, and compare them with the contents of our epistle, on the supposition that Paul wrote it. From the epistle to the Hebrews, it nowhere appears that the writer was the first teacher of the church whom he addresses; but the contrary is plainly implied. Now history tells us, that Peter planted the church at Cesarea, and not Paul, Acts x. The teachers of the church addressed in the epistle to the Hebrews, are applauded without any exception as to their doctrine or behavior; and so this might well be, for the first teachers at Cesarea were apostles and primitive evangelists. Philip the evangelist was stationed there, when Paul made his last visit to Jerusalem, Acts xxii. 8 seq.; and this Philip had four daughters who were prophetesses, i. e. teachers of the Christian religion. Does not this show a flourishing state of the church there? The persons to whom the epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, had often bestowed charity to relieve the necessities of Christians, and particularly of those who were imprisoned, Heb. x. 34. vi. 10. How aptly this fits the circumstances of Paul among the Cesareans, it is easy to perceive. He was a prisoner among them for the space of two years. Well might he say, "Ye had compassion τοῖς δέομεν ἐμοί, on my bonds," as the common text reads; or (which comes after all to the same thing) τοῖς δέομιους, on the imprisoned. It was Paul's gratitude for this, which probably led him to speak of it repeatedly; and so it stands in the epistle to the Hebrews. The eulogy which the writer of that epistle bestows on those whom he addresses, certainly becomes very significant, on supposition that it was written by Paul under such circumstances.

The Hebrews addressed in our epistle had been early made converts to Christianity, v. 12. x. 32. The church at Cesarea was the first gathered out of the ancient limits of Judea. Its first converts, indeed, were Gentile proselytes, Acts x.; but it cannot with any probability be supposed, flourishing as it was when Paul paid his last visit to it before his imprisonment (Acts xxii. 8 seq.), that there were no Jews who belonged to it; for Cesarea contained (as we have seen) a large number of Hebrew residents. Herod Agrippa persecuted the church in A. D. 44, which was some twenty years before the epistle to the Hebrews was written; and Cesarea was Herod's capital.
May not the Christians in it have suffered at that time? The Hebrews mentioned in our epistle, had lost their property in some early persecution, and had been imprisoned, x. 32 seq.; and the persecuting Herod who had the power of life and death, had also the power of confiscation and imprisonment; for he was made a sovereign by the Roman emperor. Under him the church in Cesarea may have experienced, and very probably did experience, such vexations. Certainly the church at Jerusalem experienced them at this time, Acts xii. 1 seq.

The epistle to the Hebrews presents images drawn from the Grecian games and public shows, x. 32 xii. 1 seq. At Cesarea, Herod the Great had instituted all the Grecian games, and built a splendid theatre; so that such allusions would be very forcible and pertinent, if addressed to those who lived there. The writer of our epistle mentions Timothy to the church whom he addresses, as his special friend, and one in whom they would feel a deep interest; and as Timothy, it cannot well be doubted, was at Cesarea with Paul more or less of the time that he was a prisoner there for two years, the church at that place must have been well acquainted with him. Paul requests their prayers, that he himself may be restored to them, xiii. 19; and the frequent visits which he had made the Cesareans, the strong attachment they had manifested to him, and the long residence he had made among them, correspond well with a request so plainly founded in their affectionate regard for him, and in his for them.

Again; Cesarea was only two days' journey from Jerusalem, and the Jews there were zealous for the tradition of their fathers. Resistance to the Roman power, which finally brought on the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, first began here, from the wounded spirit of Jewish pride and national feeling. These facts render it probable, that the Jews there had a full and intimate acquaintance with all the Mosaic ritual; and that the Christian Jews must, from the power, wealth, and overbearing spirit of the others, have been hard pressed (by persecution on the one hand, and the imposing pomp of the temple service on the other) to make defection from the Christian religion. Finally, as the majority of the inhabitants here were Greeks, and of course the current language in this splendid capital was Greek, this may account for it, that our epistle was written in Greek instead of the Palestinian dialect. From this place it could not fail to be circulated abroad; as there must have been comers and goers to and from this place, from all parts of Palestine. For Paul to subscribe his name to the epistle was not necessary, in case he sent it by a friend, as doubtless he must have done; and besides this, the circumstances mentioned in it, of being restored to them, and of coming to them with Timothy, would be sufficient of themselves to disclose the author to the Cesarean Christians. And designed, as the letter in all probability was, to be a circular among the Jews, they who were
abroad, reading it without the name of the author, would not so readily have those prejudices awakened, which had lately shown themselves to be very violent among the Jews who were zealous for the honor of the Mosaic law, whenever Paul had made his appearance among them.

I grant, at once, that all this is supposition. But in the absence of all positive testimony, if a supposition can be presented, which contains nothing improbable in itself, and explains a variety of characteristic passages in our epistle, and accords well with the facts which history has recorded, may it not be regarded, at least, as presenting a probability, until the fallacy of it be exposed, or a more probable one be advanced?

The points of coincidence just recited, forced themselves upon me unsought and unexpected, in the course of my investigation. They are not offered from the love of novelty, nor with any overweening confidence as to the approbation which others may give them.

But while I thus present what may be said in favor of Cesarea, as the place to which our epistle was directed, I must not endeavor to conceal from my readers that there are serious difficulties in the way of the supposition in question. As I have no favorite theory to support, in respect to this matter, I shall suggest them fully, and without hesitation.

One objection to the view here given seems to be, that the church at Cesarea, in the time of Origen and Eusebius (both of whom lived there), do not appear to have retained a tradition that our epistle was directed to them. At least, neither of these fathers, so far as I know, make mention of such a tradition; which they probably might have done, had it existed in their times. Still, if our epistle was designed to be a circular, and for that reason, a direction to any particular church was omitted in it, the Cesarean church, if they were the first who received it, might not have considered it appropriately theirs, in the same manner as the Corinthians, Galatians, and others, did the letters addressed to them.

Another objection to the idea that our epistle was directed to the church at Cesarea, may be drawn from the probability, that the church there must have consisted in part of Gentiles; especially as Greeks constituted a majority of the population of that city. What was really fact, however, in regard to this, at the time when the epistle was written, we have no historical means of ascertaining. It is certainly a very possible case, that, at the time when the epistle to the Hebrews was written, the church at Cesarea might have been principally made up of Jews; or at least have contained a majority of members who were Hebrews. Or there may have been more than one church at Cesarea (a thing not improbable); and the Jews there, who were such uncommon zealots for the law, might have established a religious community of their own, separate from that of the Gentile
Christians, whom the former would regard with an eye of jealousy, if not of distrust. But, independently of all this, one may easily suppose, that if the author of our epistle designed it for the good of the Hebrews in general, he would have written just in the manner which he has adopted, whether the church whom he addressed contained some Gentiles or not.

It is another circumstance, moreover, which seems to make against the supposition in question, that our epistle takes no notice of any relation of the Jews to the Gentiles, in the church of Christ; and does not enter into a discussion of matters usually disputed between Jewish and Gentile Christians. And to this we must add, that the liberal spirit of the Cesarean Christians towards Paul while a prisoner there, and at other times, renders it somewhat difficult to suppose that they had become such zealous Judaizers, as our epistle seems to imply that those were to whom it is addressed.

Upon the whole, it is a plain case, that confident and positive assertions in favor of the point in question, cannot be made with propriety. The most which I would say here is, that some reasons, apparently specious, seem to offer themselves in favor of the supposition, that our epistle was originally sent to the church at Cesarea. At the same time, other considerations seem to make against this view of the subject.

Nothing certain, then, can be determined, as to the particular place. To the churches in general in Palestine, the epistle could not have been first sent, inasmuch as it has so many local and personal implications in it. To Jerusalem it may have been directed. Such was the opinion of the ancients in general, and this is the opinion which Bleek has recently defended. Difficulties may be raised against this; especially if Paul be considered as the author of our epistle.* Yet none of them are invincible. It might well be questioned, also, whether a church at Jerusalem, the metropolis of all proselytes as well as Jews, would be as likely to be purely Jewish, as one in some other part of Palestine; see Acts vii. 1. After all, then, we must perhaps leave the epistle, as the writer has left it, without a particular address; and content ourselves with saying, "We do not know." A salutary lesson for critics to learn, now and then, and one which they would do well to learn oftener than they yet have done.

I might leave the discussion of this particular point here, for not only do the above reasons seem sufficient to show that it was addressed to the Jewish converts in Palestine, so that it is useless to examine other theories, but almost all recent critics, whatever the opinion they

* It seems to me, still, more probable that this epistle was sent originally to the church in Jerusalem, the centre of the influences which it was intended to counteract, and the most natural medium of communication with the Jewish Christians throughout the land. See Davidson, III. p. 276, Bleek, De Wette, and others. — Ed.
entertain of the authorship, do not question as to the persons addressed. So Davidson, after enumerating the various theories, says: "The considerations in favor of these conjectures are such as preclude the idea of all formal examination; for they are not entitled to it. To Jewish Christians living out of Palestine, it is pretty clear that the epistle was not sent in the first instance." But it may not be useless to examine cursorily a few of the more probable theories.

It has been maintained by Storr and a few others that it was addressed to

(2) The Jewish Converts in Galatia.

The basis of this theory is a denial that it could be addressed to the church in Palestine, because it appears from Heb. ii. 3, that the persons to whom it was addressed were not such as heard Christ speak in person; from xii. 4 and xiii. 7, that they had as yet suffered no bloody persecution; and from vi. 10. xiii. 3, 10, and x. 84, that so far from having received charity from other churches, they had themselves contributed to the support of others. But see the examination of these verses under obj. 3, above. Even allowing the interpretation given of them by those who maintain this theory, they only serve to show, at most, that the church in Palestine was not the one to which the epistle was directed; leaving the question still untouched, whether it was sent, as he maintains, to the church in Galatia.

Most, if not all, of the arguments on which Storr relies, are grounded on what he supposes to be probabilities.

(1) 'As the epistle to the Hebrews was not written to the churches in Palestine, and as all the churches abroad consisted of a mixture of Jews and Gentiles, it is a singularity very striking, and at first appearance inexplicable, how it should come to pass that the epistle to the Galatians is written exclusively to Gentile converts, and the epistle to the Hebrews exclusively to Jewish ones. But all appearance of difficulty vanishes, if we suppose that the two epistles were sent at the same time to the church in Galatia; each to the respective party for whom it was intended. A supposition which removes such difficulties must be regarded as a probable one.'

'This supposition is not wanting in ingenuity; and at first view it may be regarded as not being destitute of probability. But even allowing the probability, the critic must ask, How far can we be allowed to draw conclusions, in respect to subjects of this nature, from mere conjectural probabilities? I may conjecture thousands of circumstances, in themselves probable, which would liberate me from difficulties presented by particular passages, or by whole books of the Old Testament and the New; on which conjectures, however, it would be very uncritical and unsafe for me to build conclusions, in respect to any matter of fact.
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But even such a probability, cannot well be allowed. There are circumstances in the epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews, relative to the condition of the persons respectively addressed, which serve to evince that the Galatian church could not, at the same time, have been addressed by both of these letters, for it is far from being certain, as Storr assumes it to be, that the epistle to the Galatians is addressed exclusively to Gentile converts. When the apostle speaks of their being "shut up under the law, before the gospel was preached;" and of "the law having been their instructor to bring them to Christ," Gal. iii. 23, 24; can those whom he thus addresses have been only Gentiles? And when he speaks of their "having been in a state of minority before Christ came;" of their "having been νπτως, and in bondage to the elements of the world," i.e. the ritual ceremonies of the Mosaic law, Gal. iv. 1—3; it is far enough from being obvious that only Gentile converts are addressed. Indeed, so plainly do these passages appear to respect Jews, that a critic of no less note than Noessel considers it as certain, that Jewish converts only are addressed in the epistle to the Galatians; an opinion incapable, no doubt, of being defended, but still serving to show that Storr has, in the case before us, taken much more for granted than can be readily allowed.

Moreover, it is not so singular as Storr represents it to be, that Jewish converts should be exclusively addressed in one case, and Gentile ones in another. The church at Ephesus, for example, consisted, beyond all doubt, of a mixture of Jews and Gentiles. Yet, in the epistle which Paul wrote to them, he seems principally, if not solely, to address the Gentiles (τα ἑβραϊκά—ἀκροβυστία, Eph. ii. 11, also iii. 1). But who ever thought it necessary, in order to account for this, to suppose that Paul wrote another letter at the same time, to the Jewish part of the church at Ephesus?

Besides, what object could be answered by writing two separate letters at the same time? Was it not a matter of course, that the whole church should be made acquainted with an apostolic letter to one part of it? Is there not abundant evidence that the letters of the apostles were regarded and treated by the early churches as encyclical, or (as we call them) circulars? When Peter wrote his second epistle to various churches in Asia Minor, he advert to Paul's epistles as being already known to them, 2 Pet. iii. 16. And when Clement of Rome, within the first century, wrote his epistle to the Corinthians, he made extracts from nearly all the epistles of Paul, without even naming them; which certainly implies, that he regarded the Corinthian church as being already well acquainted with them. Such being the state of knowledge respecting the apostolic epistles in the early churches, it is a very improbable supposition that either the epistle to the Galatians, or that to the Hebrews, was designed to be kept secret from the Jewish or Gentile Christians at Galatia, if
written to them. Indeed, an arrangement of this nature would have worn the appearance of a worldly policy, and of a kind of double dealing; which is far enough from being characteristic of Paul, and which would have served rather to alienate than to reconcile those who were ready to renounce his authority.

(2) 'The epistle to the Hebrews,' says Storr, 'has no salutation (which all the other epistles of Paul have); it wants the usual greeting at the close; and it nowhere exhibits the name of the author. These facts now are easily accounted for, if we suppose that this epistle was sent at the same time with that to the Galatians, which Paul says he wrote with his own hand, Gal. vi. 11. It is probable that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by the aid of an amanuensis; and as it was sent along with an epistle written and subscribed by Paul in his own handwriting, a salutation and subscription were unnecessary and superfluous.'

But why so? Why did not the longer epistle to the Hebrews need as many marks of authenticity as the shorter one to the Galatians? Is the subject less important? Are the persons addressed less regarded by the writer? And why should the fact (if it be one, for this too is mere conjecture) that an amanuensis wrote one letter, supersede all effort to authenticate it, when Paul has been so careful to render the other letter authentic, which was written with his own hand? During such a contest between parties as existed at Galatia, is there any probability that either letter would be left deficient as to the evidence of genuineness, when the whole weight of the apostle's authority was needed to check the growing evil there? Would not the apostle at least intimate plainly in one letter, that he had written another? So far from salutation or subscription being superfluous in such a case, the one or the other, or rather both of them, would seem to be peculiarly needed, in order that neither letter should fail of its proper destination, or have its genuineness disputed.

(3) 'In Gal. vi. 16 it is said, 'As many as walk by this rule, peace be on them, and mercy be upon the Israel of God.' Now, the phrase Israel of God means the Jewish converts at Galatia, in distinction from the Gentile ones; and this conveys an intimation, that the apostle had written to these Jewish converts as well as to the Gentile ones.'

This argument, however, is built upon an exegesis of the passage quoted which is inadmissible. The Israel of God is plainly a figuative name for true Christians. Paul had shown in the previous part of his epistle, that those "who are of the faith," whether Jews or Gentiles, are the children of Abraham, iii. 7, 29. At the close, he pronounces a blessing on such as adopt the principles and obey the injunctions which he had communicated; and he concludes it, very appositely to his purpose, by calling such the Israel of God, kai ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ἴσωι. The kai which stands before this clause seems clearly to be explicative, and not merely conjunctive; amounting in
effect to our English *namely, even, to wit,* or some word of the *same* import, and placing τὸν Ἰσραήλ in apposition to the preceding ἐκ αὐτῶν.

But even supposing the apostle does advert here only to the *Jewish* converts, as such; where is the intimation to be found that he had written to them? Or, if he had, that the letter was the same with our present epistle to the Hebrews?

(4) 'The epistles to the Hebrews and to the Galatians must have been written about the same time; and probably both were written at Corinth, during Paul's first abode there.' Here Paul found Priscilla and Aquila, who had fled from Italy on account of Claudius's decree which banished the Jews from Rome, Acts xviii. 1, 2; and at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, the writer says, *They of Italy* (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) *salute you,* which means, 'Priscilla and Aquila from Italy salute you.' The coincidence of such circumstances renders it probable, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth. And as to the epistle to the Galatians, it was written between the time of Paul's second and third visit to Galatia; and consequently must have been written during some of his journeys recorded in Acts xvi. xvii. and xviii., which are occupied with the history of the apostle in the interval of time between those visits. But if written during this interval, when can it be with so much probability be considered to have been written, as within the eighteen months' abode of Paul at Corinth, during the same time? Consequently, it is probable that both letters were written at the same place, and about the same time; and it may therefore be concluded, that the supposition of their having been sent to Galatia at the same time, is correct.'

Ingenious and specious as this may appear, at first view, it is far from being satisfactory, when we come to examine its parts in detail. In respect to those circumstances which Storr represents as showing that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth, they are far from being decisive. Supposing (with him) that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, in the greeting at the close, means Priscilla and Aquila; is it necessary that the salutation from them should have been sent from Corinth? Did they not afterwards travel with Paul to Ephesus? Acts xviii. 18, 19. And were they not probably at Rome during his captivity there? In Rom. xxvi. 3, a salutation is sent to them as being at Rome; and of course they were there before Paul went thither as a prisoner, because his epistle to the Romans was written before that event, Rom. i. 9—12. How then can we assume that Corinth is the only place from which Paul sent, or could send, the salutation of these Italians to Galatia?

But another consideration must be brought into our account. Storr's exegesis of the expression οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας is altogether improbable. How should two strangers, *lately* (προσφάτως) come from Rome to Corinth, Acts xviii. 2, be so well acquainted with the church at Gala-
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(tia (situated in the interior and very remotest part of Asia Minor, and having but little intercourse with the world), that it was not necessary even to name them to this church, but simply to advert to them by the periphrasis, of ἀρσ Ἰταλίας? How did the Galatians know that Priscilla and Aquila were at Corinth? Or how could they distinguish them from many other Jews that fled from Rome, after the edict of Claudius proscribing the Jews was published? Besides, in all other cases where Paul sends greetings from these Italians, or to them, he calls them by name; e. g., 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 19; Rom. xvi. 3. This view of the subject, therefore, renders highly improbable the very circumstance which Storr has assumed as a fact, in order to make out that the epistle to the Hebrews was written at Corinth.

Furthermore, if we follow the account of Luke in the Acts, it is difficult, nay, impossible, to defend the supposition of Storr, that the epistle to the Galatians was written after the second visit of Paul to Galatia. Acts xvi. 6 gives us the first intimation of a visit to Galatia by Paul; and his second visit is described in Acts xviii. 22, 23, which was after he had left Corinth, and travelled through Palestine and Asia Minor. I know, indeed, some critics have conjectured that Paul made a journey to Galatia, previously to the one first mentioned by Luke in Acts xvi. 6. But of what avail are conjectures in such cases, when they are supported neither by the epistle to the Galatians, nor by the history of Paul?

Nothing then but supposition is offered by Storr, to show that either the epistle to the Hebrews, or that to the Galatians, was written at Corinth, or that both were written about the same time; and of course, these circumstances cannot be assumed as proved, or even as rendered probable, in order to build the conclusion on them, that the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Galatians were written simultaneously to the same church.

(5) 'Timothy originated from the neighborhood of Galatia, and was no doubt in company with Paul during his journey there, as mentioned in Acts xvi. 6. It is a singular circumstance, that although the apostle so often joins his name with his own, in the salutations contained in his other letters, he has not joined him in his epistle to the Galatian church; specially singular, inasmuch as Timothy must have been so well known to the Galatians, and as he was with Paul at Corinth. But this apparent singularity is accounted for, when we suppose that Timothy was sent with both the letters in question to the Galatians; who, of course, would receive his salutation from his own mouth.'

But is it not more singular still, I ask, that Paul should say, at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews: Know ye that our brother Timothy is ἀποστιγμάτων, i. e., either sent away on some errand, or set at liberty? Was it necessary to tell the Galatian church this, when
Timothy was before their eyes in propria persona? I know indeed that Storr, in order to avoid this striking incongruity, has translated γνώσκετε τὸν δὲλφίν Γυμόθεον ἀπολογεμένον thus: Receive honorably our brother Timothy who is sent to you; but it is a violence done to the natural import of the language, which no other respectable critic that I know of has sanctioned, and to do which, I must think, nothing but the eagerness of supporting a favorite theory could have led this excellent writer.

Besides all this, how is it so strange that the name of Timothy is not joined with that of Paul, in the epistle to the Galatians, since neither the epistle to the Romans, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, or to Titus, has this name in the salutation? How easy too the supposition, that Timothy, the habitual διάγγελος of Paul, might have been absent, on business pertaining to the concerns of the churches, when the epistle to the Galatians was written!

(6) 'The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, both in matter and manner, has many striking coincidences with the epistle to the Hebrews. No doubt this is true. But it is equally true also of other epistles of Paul; with the exception, that the subject in the epistle to the Galatians particularly resembles, in some important respects, that of the epistle to the Hebrews, and is prosecuted more extensively in the latter epistle, than in any of the other acknowledged epistles of Paul. Noesselt has used the same argument, in order to prove that the epistle to the Hebrews must have been written to the church in Thessalonica; and Weber, to show that it was written to the Corinthians. Might it not be used, with similar effect, to show also that it was written to the Romans? Such an argument may be of some weight in the question, whether Paul, or some other person, wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; but it cannot be of much avail to show that this epistle was written to the church at Galatia, rather than to some other church.

(7) But the argument in which Storr seems to place most reliance of all, and which, if well founded, is of a historical and not of a conjectural nature, is that deduced from 2 Pet. iii. 14—16. As this passage is not only adduced by Storr, for the purpose of showing that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Galatians; but is also adduced by him, and by many other critics of great reputation, for the purpose of proving that Paul must have been the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; in order to save repetition, I shall here examine it in reference to both of these topics, since I must of necessity institute an examination of it, with respect to the topic now under discussion.

The passage runs thus: "Wherefore, beloved, since ye are in expectation of these things [viz., the changes described in the preceding context], make strenuous efforts that ye may be found of him [Christ] in peace, without spot and blameless; and consider the delay of our
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Lord as to his coming, a matter of favor: even as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, hath written to you; as [he has done] likewise in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood; which the ignorant and unstable pervert, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.”

To understand the nature of the argument drawn from this, we must advert to some circumstances mentioned in the epistles of Peter. His first epistle is directed to the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 1 Pet. i. 1. His second is directed to the same churches; for he says, “This second epistle, beloved, I write to you, in which I aim to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance,” 2 Pet. iii. 1. To the above-named churches in Asia Minor, then, the second epistle of Peter was directed.

The nature of this argument may now be understood. It is this.

In all the epistles of Paul, excepting that to the Hebrews, the churches are designated to which they were sent; but not so in the epistle to the Hebrews. Peter says that Paul had written a letter to the churches in Asia Minor whom he addresses; as our beloved brother Paul hath written to you. Now this cannot advert to any of his letters which have inscriptions, as they are not directed to the afore-named churches in Asia Minor. Consequently, Peter must refer to the epistle to the Hebrews, which is the only one that has no inscription. It follows, therefore, not only that Paul wrote this letter, but that he wrote to some of the churches addressed by Peter. Most probably, then, it was written to Galatia. Especially is this credible, since the epistle to the Hebrews contains those very warnings and sentiments to which Peter adverted, as being comprised in the letter of Paul to the churches in Asia Minor whom he addresses.

One is tempted, at first view, to acquiesce in a statement seemingly so probable, and to conclude that the inference drawn by Storr is substantially supported. A closer examination, however, suggests formidable difficulties, which must not be passed over in silence.

I omit, at present, any consideration respecting the genuineness of the second epistle of Peter so much called in question, and disputed by many churches of ancient times. It is unnecessary here to take other ground in regard to it than that which Storr himself has taken, i.e., to admit its genuineness. What then does the passage of Peter, now in question, teach us?

(1) That Paul had written a letter to the churches whom Peter addressed, ἐγραψεν δικαίον. (2) That he had urged on them the same considerations which Peter himself had urged; even as our beloved brother Paul hath written to you. (3) That in all his epistles (viz., all that had been read by them), he had urged the same or the like considerations; as likewise in all his epistles, speaking in them concerning these things.
The question on which the point under discussion mainly turns, is, What are the things to which Peter refers, as treated of in common by him and by Paul?

To find an answer to this, we may make three suppositions. First, they are all the subjects treated of in the preceding part of Peter's epistle; or secondly, they are those comprised in the preceding part of the third chapter; or thirdly, they are those things suggested by the immediate context, in connection with the passage already cited.

Now the first of these suppositions cannot be admitted; for Paul is so far from treating, in all his epistles, of every subject comprised in the whole of Peter's second epistle, that he has nowhere treated of some of them. If Peter then referred to the epistles of Paul which are now extant, it is clear he did not mean to say that Paul had, in every epistle of his, discussed the same subjects that he himself had discussed throughout his second letter.

But Storr urges in a special manner the second supposition, viz., that the subjects presented to view in the third chapter of Peter's second epistle, are particularly treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews; and consequently that Peter must have referred to these subjects, and to that epistle. The sum of the third chapter of Peter is, 'That the heavens and the earth are perishable; that they will be destroyed by fire; that the delay to destroy the ungodly must not be imputed to slackness on the part of the Lord, who puts off this catastrophe on account of his long-suffering towards men; and that the time when they shall be dissolved by fire, will come speedily and unexpectedly, and then the heavens and the earth will be destroyed, and new heavens and a new earth created.' Such is the context. Then follows the exhortation; "Beloved, keep yourselves unspotted and blameless; and regard the delay of your Lord's coming as a favor; even as our beloved brother Paul has written to you, etc." Now, where has Paul written anything respecting the dissolution of the material elements of the universe by fire, and the creating of new heavens and a new earth instead of them? I do not find this subject treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews; nor is it touched upon in all the epistles of Paul; it is only adverted to in some of them. It is then,

Thirdly, the exhortation in the immediate context, to keep themselves unspotted and blameless, in view of their Lord's coming, which Peter means to say had been urged by Paul on the persons whom he addressed, as well as by himself. This is the plain grammatical construction and it is the only one which will bear examination, by comparing it with the contents of Paul's epistles.

But exhortation of such a nature is far from being contained only in the epistle to the Hebrews. The epistles to the Corinthians, Philippians, the first to the Thessalonians, the first to Timothy, and that to Titus, contain direct exhortations of this sort; and the other epistles of Paul exhibit repeated intimations of the same nature.
positions. First, the preface of Peter's epistle is nowhere treated of in the preceding paragraphs suggested by a passage already cited, and admitted; for Paul is nowhere comprised in the subject comprised in the second supposition, viz., the third chapter of Peter's epistle to the Hebrews, referred to these subjects in the third chapter of Peter is considerable; that they will be destroyed, the ungodly must not be; and, who puts off this case towards men; and that it will cease speedily and be the earth will be destroyed, subdued.' Such is the context, keep yourselves unspotted from the Lord's coming as a favor; to you, etc." Now, above the dissolution of the material, the creating of new heavens and earth, I do not find this subject treated of in any of the passages in the epistles of Paul. It is then, in the immediate context, to keep themselves from their Lord's coming, which Peter tells, Paul on the persons whom he utters. This is the plain grammatical construction, which will bear examination, by comparison with the epistles of Paul. The argument is good, then, to prove that the epistle was written to the Galatians, because it contains such exhortations as those in question, then the same answer that any of the other epistles of Paul were written because they contain the like sentiments.

But there is one of the churches in Asia Minor which wrote, namely that of Galatia, to which a letter of that kind was addressed. May not this be the very epistle to the Galatians, and not the epistle to the Hebrews? In chapter three of the passage of warning and exhortation, grounded on retribution. This possibly may be the very passage which he makes, (as one would naturally be ready for such); then the exhortation may have been in a letter not of Paul's letters are lost is pretty certain, from also, Phil. iii. 1. Evidently one of John's epistles to the church," says he in his second epistle, verse 18, who loves pre-eminence, did not receive us." Why then the epistle to which he here adverts. The letter of Peter mentions, may have shared the same fate. But the epistle has not been found in the Hebrews, even supposing it to be proved that has no special claim to be considered as the letter of the Peter.

If, then, it cannot be shown, (as I am fully prepared that Peter, in the passage under consideration, wrote not to the Hebrews, of course it cannot be shown, from that Paul wrote this epistle. This argument has been and strongly urged by modern and late critics, and this point; but it will not abide the test of examination. In the church, it is well known, never brought it for the opinion that Paul was the author of the epistle. Storr himself, who urges it very strongly, conceals employed by the Christian fathers. It does not then have no validity, because it was not employed by them, at least, that the proof to be derived from it is not so conclusive, as some modern critics have declared.

(8) Storr adduces the special circumstances of the epistles to the Galatians and to the Hebrews for the opinion, that both epistles were directed to the Galatians. The Galatians," says he, 'had for a long time been the Hebrews.'

Now so far from finding evidence of sameness between the two epistles respecting these circumstances of dissimilarity so great as to exclude all hope of
ion of Storr, and to show that the admission of it would do great violence to the laws of probability. To the Galatians Paul says, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him who called you to the grace of Christ, unto another gospel," Gal. i. 6. To the Hebrews he says, "When for the time [i. e. plainly the long time since they professed Christianity] ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again to be taught the first elements of religion," Heb. v. 12. Again, "Call to mind the former days in which, when ye were enlightened, ye endured a great fight of afflictions," x. 32. And again, the writer calls on them to "remember the example of their former teachers, who were deceased," xiii. 7.

Then as to persecution, the Hebrews had suffered the loss of their property by it, x. 34; but there is no intimation of this in respect to the Galatians. Indeed, there is no proof that out of Palestine persecution was such, in the apostolic age, (one or two instances only excepted), as to deprive men of either property or life. The Roman magistracy did not permit this, either out of Palestine or in it, so long as they were in authority. This is evident from several passages of history in the Acts; e. g., Acts xviii. 12, 17; xix. 35—40. Acts xvii. xxvi. Then there is a great difference between the kind of persecution animadverted upon in the epistle to the Galatians, and in that to the Hebrews. In the former, Christians are addressed as in danger, from their pressure, of incorporating Judaism with Christianity, and making the continued profession of it essential to salvation; in the latter, they are everywhere addressed as in danger of a final and total renunciation of the Christian religion. In the one, they are dehorted from superadding the Jewish ceremonies to Christianity; in the other, from utterly abandoning the Christian religion.

But further; Paul says, in Gal. vi. 11, "Ye see how large a letter I have written to you with my own hand." Yet this epistle consists of only six chapters of a moderate length. How then could Paul say to a part of the same church, in a letter accompanying this, "I beseech you, brethren, to bear with a word of exhortation from me, for I have written unto you δια βραχίων, IN A FEW WORDS," or briefly, Heb. xiii. 22. Yet this brief epistle is more than twice as long as the large letter which accompanied it. Could Paul so forget himself, on such an occasion as this?

Again, Paul often adverts, in his epistle to the Galatians, to the fact that he was the first who taught them the doctrines of Christianity. Yet in the epistle to the Hebrews there is not a word of this; but, plainly, the whole manner of the letter, and specially the manner in which he speaks of the teachers of those whom he addresses, implies that he had not himself planted the church to which his letter was directed.

But what determines the question beyond all hope of supporting the views of Storr, is, that in the epistle to the Galatians, their teach-
ers are animadverted upon with great severity, on account of their improper conduct and erroneous doctrines. They are represented as perverting the gospel of Christ; as having an erroneous zeal for selfish purposes, iv. 17; v. 13; and the apostle even proceeds so far as to express a wish, that they might be cut off from the church, v. 12. But how totally different is the character given of teachers, in the epistle to the Hebrews! "Obey your teachers, and be subject to them; for they watch over your souls as they that must give an account;" i.e., they are altogether worthy of your confidence and obedience, xiii. 17. And at the close of the letter, he sends his affectionate salutation to them, xiii. 24.

These considerations seem to remove all probability, and even possibility, that the epistle to the Hebrews was, as Storr maintains, written at the same time and place as the epistle to the Galatians, and that it was also directed to the same church.

I have, throughout this investigation, proceeded on the supposition that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; which Storr fully believed. Whether there is sufficient reason to believe that Paul was the author of the epistle, will be a subject of discussion in a subsequent part of this introduction. In the mean time I shall concede this point (while examining the question relative to its destination), to all the writers who have assumed it in supporting their respective opinions. Such is the case with most of those, whose various opinions relative to the destination of our epistle still remain to be examined, or to which any reference will be made.

(3) **Was the Epistle directed to the Church at Thessalonica?**

It is maintained by Noesselt that 'there are circumstances mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews, in Paul's epistles to the Thessalonian church, and in the life of this apostle, which afford a very striking agreement; so striking as to render it altogether probable, that Paul must have directed to this church the epistle which is now inscribed, *To the Hebrews*; and that he must have written it during his abode of eighteen months at Corinth, as recorded in Acts xviil.' Let us examine these circumstances.

(1) 'When Paul visited Corinth for the first time, he found Priscilla and Aquila there, who had recently fled from Italy on account of the decree of Claudius which banished the Jews from Rome, Acts xviii. 1, 2. At the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, he says, "They of Italy salute you;" meaning Priscilla and Aquila. Here then is a circumstance in the epistle to the Hebrews, which accords with the circumstances of Paul, during his first visit to Corinth.' This is sufficiently answered above, § 4. (2).

(2) 'Paul says, at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, that Timothy was ἀπολαμβάνω, sent away; and Paul had sent Timothy
from Berea to Thessalonica, and Paul himself was at Athens, a little
before he came to Corinth, comp. Acts xvii. 15—16. Here then is a
concurrence of circumstances, which favors the opinion that the epis-
tle to the Hebrews was written by Paul at Corinth, and directed to
the Thessalonians.’

To understand the nature of this argument, and the reply which I
have to make, it is necessary to advert, for a moment, to the history
of Paul’s journeys at the time now under consideration. Paul, in
company with Silas and Timothy, first preached the Gospel at Thes-
salonica, where a church was formed; but being vehemently opposed
by some of the Jews, they went to Berea, a neighboring city, Acts
xvii. 10. Thither the persecuting Jews of Thessalonica followed
them; in consequence of which, Paul, leaving Silas and Timothy
there, withdrew to Athens. Here he resided a short time, and then
went on his first visit to Corinth, Acts xvii. 1—15; xviii. 1. At this
last place he stayed eighteen months, Acts xviii. 11. Now Noesselt
supposes, that before Paul left Athens, he sent Timothy (who was
still at Berea, Acts xvii. 10, 14) back to Thessalonica, in order to
make inquiries respecting the state of the church there; and that this
is the meaning of that passage at the close of the epistle to the
Hebrews, Ye know (as he would translate it), that our brother Timothy is
sent away.

But as there is nothing of all this in the history which Luke has
given of Paul and Timothy, Acts xvii., and as the whole must there-
fore be founded on conjecture; it might be sufficient, on the other
hand, to conjecture that Paul did not send Timothy from Berea to
Thessalonica, as Noesselt supposes.

But I would observe, that in order to render his position probable,
he assumes as a fact, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written be-
fore the epistles to the Thessalonians; a supposition not capable of
being rendered probable, much less of being proved.

It will be admitted, that there is not a word in our present first
epistle to the Thessalonians, respecting any previous letter addressed
to them; a circumstance not to be imagined, provided the apostle had
written such a labored epistle to them as that to the Hebrews is, and
on such an important question. Besides it appears altogether prob-
able from Acts xviii. 1—6, that Silas and Timothy arrived at Corinth
soon after Paul had gone there; so that the absence of Timothy, sup-
posed by Noesselt to have taken place at the time when the epistle
to the Hebrews was written, cannot be rendered at all probable, from
this part of Paul’s history; for it cannot be thought probable, that
such an epistle as that to the Hebrews would be written by Paul im-
mediately after his arrival at Corinth, amidst all the agitation and dis-
pute and hazard occasioned by his first preaching there. But even
conceding that this might have been done; is it probable that Paul,
who (according to Noesselt) had just before, while at Athens, sent
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Timothy to Thessalonica, and who knew that he was now there, should gravely write to the Thessalonians, Ye know that our brother Timothy is sent away; when this same Timothy, in propria persona, was present with the very church to whom this was written?

(3) 'In Heb. x. 34, Paul says, Ye had compassion on my bonds; or, according to another reading of equal authority, Ye had compassion on those who were bound, i.e., the prisoners. This refers to Paul's imprisonment, as related in Acts xvi. 23-40; and to the sympathy which the Thessalonians evinced for him in these circumstances.'

But this imprisonment was at Philippi, before Paul had visited Thessalonica, and before the Thessalonians could know that he was in their region, except by report. This imprisonment lasted but a few hours; it ended in a most triumphant deliverance by the interposition of divine power, and in the shame and mortification of the magistracy who had ordered it. The whole occurrence, instead of demanding compassionate sympathy, was a matter of triumph and congratulation. Or if otherwise, it was not an affliction in respect to which the Thessalonians could compassionate Paul, as they could not know of its having happened, until it was past. And if they had known it, as the Christian religion had never yet been preached to them, what sympathy could they have had with Paul, because he suffered as a Christian?

(4) 'The Hebrews are praised for their liberality; and so are the Thessalonians.'

To which I reply, So are other churches. Does it follow, because they exhibited this trait of character which was common among Christians in the apostolic age, that the Thessalonian church must have been the same which is thus recommended in the epistle to the Hebrews?

(5) 'The persons to whom the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed, had suffered persecution, Heb. x. 32; xii. 4; which was also the case with the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. ii. 14-16; 2 Thess. i. 11.'

So had many other churches; e.g., the church at Philippi, Phil. i. 27-30. But neither at Thessalonica, nor scarcely anywhere else, except in Palestine, do we know of a persecution at this period, which involved the loss of property and the hazard of liberty and life. The epistle to the Hebrews speaks of their being despoiled of their property, x. 34; a circumstance not mentioned in the account of the persecution at Thessalonica, and one which makes directly against the supposition of Noesselt.

(6) 'The Thessalonians were in danger of defection from the faith, so that Paul was obliged to send Timothy to confirm them, 1 Thess. iii. 2, 3; and the same danger is everywhere adverted to, in the epistle to the Hebrews.'

This argument is built on an erroneous exegesis. That Timothy made a visit to confirm the Thessalonians, does not surely imply that
they were in special danger of apostasy. When Paul is said to have
gone through Asia Minor confirming the churches, Acts xv. 36—41;
xvi. 4—6; xviii. 23, are we to draw the inference that all the churches
there were in the same danger of apostasy, as the persons to whom
the epistle to the Hebrews is addressed? If not, this argument of
Noesselt has no force to establish the opinion which he advocates.

(7) 'There is a great similarity between the epistle to the Hebrews,
and the epistle to the Thessalonians.'

So there is, also, between the epistle to the Hebrews and all the
epistles of Paul. This argument, then, proves too much. It may
serve to show that Paul probably wrote the epistle to the Hebrews;
but it can have no important influence on the question, To whom did
he write this epistle?

Most of the similarities, moreover, which are produced by Noesselt,
are similarities of a general nature in respect to sentiments of piety
and morality. Must there not of course be a similarity in these re-
spects in all the epistles of Paul, provided he always taught the same
doctrines of Christianity?

But the dissimilarities between the epistles to the Thessalonians and
the Hebrews, Noesselt has not proceeded to develop. Yet there are
some; and some so striking, as to render the supposition which he
defends altogether improbable. The Hebrews addressed in our epis-
tle had been for a long time Christians; but if Noesselt's supposition
be true, they had been so only a few months, at most, when Paul
wrote his first epistle to them; for Paul had only made a rapid jour-
ney from Thessalonica, to Athens, and thence to Corinth; and soon
after his arrival there, and, (as Noesselt thinks) before Timothy had
come to him, he wrote the epistle in question.

I may add, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews nowhere ad-
verts to his having first planted Christianity among them. But Paul,
in his epistle to the Thessalonians, very frequently adverts to this
circumstance.

Further, the epistle to the Hebrews is directed to a church almost
wholly (if not altogether) Jewish; while it is plain from Acts xvii. 4,
5, that only a few Jews had early joined the Thessalonian church;
and plainer still, that this church was principally made up of Gentiles
from Paul's first epistle to them, i. 9, where he says, 'Ye have turned
from your idols to serve the living God.' Now circumstances so
widely diverse and opposite, cannot be predicated of the same church,
while they have respect only to an interval of time, which, at the most,
cannot exceed the eighteen months that Paul abode at Corinth.

Finally, Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians, throughout, are
filled with commendations of the Thessalonian church, for their firm-
ness and steadfastness in the faith of the gospel. Not a word of their
Jewish prejudices. Not a reference to the imminent danger of apo-
stasy, which is everywhere developed in the epistle to the Hebrews.
Noesselt accounts for this by the supposition that Paul's first epistle to them, (viz., that to the Hebrews, as he supposes), had produced a thorough reformation among them. But when Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians had effected a reformation, in respect to various particulars of far less importance than those treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, how does the apostle fill his second letter with commendations, which have a direct reference to his former admonitions? Could it be otherwise here, if the epistle to the Hebrews had been written before our present epistles to the Thessalonians, and produced such an effect as Noesselt supposes?

On the whole, then, the supposition of Noesselt must be abandoned; not only because it is not well supported, but because it involves difficulties and improbabilities so great as to render it altogether incredible.

(4) Was it directed to Hebrews, who were Sojourners in Asia Minor?

Bolten (who has distinguished himself in a particular manner, by a translation of the New Testament with constant reference to the Syriac or Syro-chaldaic language, in which he supposes many of the original documents must have been composed), has advanced the opinion, that the Hebrews addressed in our epistle, were those who had fled from Palestine about A. D. 60, on account of the persecutions there, and were scattered abroad in Asia Minor. To this he thinks the οἱ καραβαβύωνες in vi. 18 refers; as also the passage in xiii. 14, which speaks of their having no abiding city. He finds parallels of such a meaning in 3 John vs. 5 and 7, where strangers are mentioned, and those who have gone abroad (ἐξελεύθερον) for his [Christ's] name's sake; in 1 Pet. i. 1, where sojourners of the dispersion are mentioned; and in James i. 1, where the οἱ ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ are addressed.

I am unable, however, to find any history of a persecution in Palestine, at the period which he mentions, or any account of a dispersion of Jewish Christians abroad at that period. As to the texts which he cites, in favor of his supposition, they will not bear the construction which he has put upon them. We who have fled, Hebrews vi. 18, is inseparably connected with the clause which follows, viz., to lay hold on the hope set before us, i. e., in the gospel. Besides, the writer does not say you who have fled, but we, i. e., Christians. So also in xiii. 14, it is we (viz., Christians) who have no abiding city, i. e., no permanent place of happiness in the present world. The passage in 3 John vs. 5, 7, probably refers to Gentile Christians, who became exiles, and those in James and Peter, have respect merely to Jews who lived in foreign countries, in distinction from those who lived in Palestine.

Besides, how could the apostle address wandering fugitives, scar
tered over Asia Minor, and destitute of a home, as in a condition to bestow charity? xiii. 1, 2, 16. How could he speak of them as having stated teachers? xiii. 17, 24. How could he expect his letter to reach them; or promise them a visit with Timothy, xiii. 23, in case he should speedily return?

(5) Was the Epistle addressed to the Church at Corinth?

Michael Weber, has especially advanced and endeavored to support the opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the church at Corinth. He labors, in the first place, to show that Paul wrote no less than five letters to the Corinthians. The first was one which has been lost, and which Paul mentions in our present 1 Cor. v. 9—13; the second and third were sent first to the Corinthians, and so much of the second as includes chapters 1—11, with the two last verses of the epistle; the fourth our present epistle to the Hebrews; and the fifth, the remainder of the second epistle to the Corinthians: all which, he thinks, were written in the order now suggested.

His proof that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Corinthians is as follows:

(1) 'The Hebrews became Christians at an early period, and so did the Corinthians; the Hebrews were Judaizing Christians, and so were the Corinthians. An agreement in these respects renders it probable, that the epistle to the Hebrews was sent to the church at Corinth.'

But Paul did not visit Corinth until A. D. 51 or 52, after he had repeatedly traversed the various countries of Asia Minor, and founded several churches in Macedonia. It cannot, therefore, he called an early period, at which the Corinthians were converted. Paul established few, if any, new churches, after the establishment of this at Corinth; at least, history does not give us any account of them.

In respect to the Corinthians being Judaizing Christians, the proof is altogether wanting. The apostle has taken no notice of any contest or question of this nature among them. He has, indeed, in 2 Cor. iii. 6—18, drawn a parallel between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations: but it is of a general nature, and touches none of the points usually contested by Judaizing Christians. In 2 Cor. xii. 13—23, to which Weber appeals for proof of his assertion, it is plain that some false teacher, or teachers, is adverted to by Paul; whose conduct he describes in terms which convey very strong disapprobation. But where is the evidence of a Judaizing spirit here? And then, the manner in which the apostle here speaks, instead of aiding to establish the position of Weber, seems absolutely to overthrow it; for in the epistle to the Hebrews the teachers (as we have already had occasion to remark), are commended as being altogether worthy of confidence and obedience, Heb. xiii. 17, 24. We have already seen,
moreover, that the church at Corinth consisted at first of but few Jews; as is plain from the history of Paul's first labors there, Acts xviii.

(2) 'There is a most striking resemblance between the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle to the Corinthians.'

This, Weber labors to establish, by a comparison of the method in which each quotes the Old Testament; of the ἀπάξ λεγόμενα, and of the similitudes employed.

But resemblance, and even striking resemblance, is not confined merely to the epistles addressed to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews. Storr finds it between the epistles to the Galatians and to the Hebrews; Noesselt, between the epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Hebrews; and it may be easily shown, (as it will be hereafter), that the epistle to the Hebrews has a striking resemblance to all the epistles of Paul, in a variety of respects. Why should we then, or how can we, limit this to the epistles addressed to the Corinthians?

But in various respects, in which Weber has undertaken to make out a likeness between the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistles to the Corinthians, it seems to me that he has entirely failed. In the epistle to the Hebrews, repeated reference is made to the personal sufferings and loss of property through persecution, Heb. x. 33, 34; xii. 4; but in the epistle to the Corinthians, we discover no traces of such persecution; nor does the history of the church at Corinth give us any knowledge that persecution early prevailed there. At all events, when our present first epistle to the Corinthians was written, it is clear that no such event had taken place at Corinth; for Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 13, no trial hath befallen you but such as is common to men. Now, as the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the great fight of afflictions (x. 33, 34), which they endured when they were first enlightened, here is an absolute contradiction of Weber's supposition, instead of a confirmation of it.

(3) 'The warnings, exhortations, and commendations for charity bestowed, are alike in the epistles to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews.'

But the same resemblances, which Weber finds between these epistles, Noesselt finds between the epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Hebrews. Such resemblances may be found, also, in other epistles. They are, however, of a nature too general to afford any evidence which is of weight, in such a question as the one before us. Does not every Christian church need warning, reproof, consolation? And is not every one that is charitable, entitled to commendation? It is not, therefore, from a comparison of general expressions of this nature, that the sameness of churches addressed can be proved. There must be something particular, local, and sui generis, to make such proof valid.

(4) the greeting at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, ἀσπάζωντι ψυμάς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, Weber understands, (like the critics
whom I have already examined), as referring to Priscilla and Aquila; and compares it with the greeting from the same persons, in 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

But in the latter place they are expressly named; so that there is a striking dissimilitude instead of resemblance, in the manner of the salutation.

(3) He further compares several ideas, in the epistle to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Hebrews; such as warnings taken from the example of ancient Israel, 1 Cor. x. 1—12 and Heb. iii. 16—18; the doctrine that God chastises his children for their good, 1 Cor. xi. 82 and Heb. xii. 5—11; and some other things, about which similar views in both epistles are expressed.

The words, however, which are employed in these two cases, are for the most part quite diverse. And even if they were not, could Paul write on such subjects to no more than one church? And must that church be only at Corinth?

(6) 'But the epistle to the Hebrews is called λόγον παρακλήσεως; and also in 2 Cor. xvi. 1, Paul says, παρακλασμένον.'

True; but the same Paul repeatedly uses παρακαλέω in his epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Thessalonians, and elsewhere. Was the epistle to the Hebrews written to each of these churches, because παρακαλέω is a word common to it and to the epistles directed to them?

(7) 'In 1 Cor. iv. 18, 19; xvi. 2—7, the apostle has expressed his desire or determination to pay the Corinthians a visit; and at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, the same determination is expressed, Heb. xiii. 23.'

But were there no other churches which the apostle desired or determined to visit, besides that at Corinth? And could he express the desire or determination to visit no other? Even if all this should be admitted, the determination to pay a visit, as expressed in our first epistle to the Corinthians, was abandoned when he wrote the second, i. 15, seq.; which, according to Weber's own arrangement, was written before our epistle to the Hebrews.

(8) 'From 1 Cor. xvi. 10, it appears that Timothy, when this letter were written, was absent from Paul; and in the epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 23, he is said to be sent away (ἄπελευσάμενος). Here, again, is a similarity of circumstances.'

Granted; but was not Timothy constantly employed in this manner, on errands of Paul to the churches? Was he absent once only? And could Paul tell no other church of his absence, but that of Corinth? Besides, the second epistle to the Corinthians, (written, according to Weber himself, before the epistle to the Hebrews), makes it clear that Timothy had already returned; for he is joined with Paul, in the salutation at the beginning of the epistle, 2 Cor. i. 1.

(9) 'Since the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews says, xiii. 22, I
have written to you διὰ βραχίων, briefly, this refers to our second epistle to the Corinthians, [which, according to Weber, consisted of the first nine chapters]; and the meaning of this phrase is, 'My last epistle to you, (viz., the second epistle to the Corinthians), was short; implying, at the same time, that the present one is longer or more copious.'

But such an explanation the text will not bear. 'I beseech you, brethren,' says the writer, 'bear with my address to you, because (or since) I have written briefly; he evidently means, briefly in comparison with the importance of the subject and the occasion; briefly, in comparison with the copiousness which his interested feelings for them and the cause of truth would have prompted. 'I have written briefly,' is an apology for the letter to the Hebrews which the writer was then concluding; and not for a former one to the church at Corinth. The incongruity of a supposition such as Weber makes, is manifest from the meaning of the very language which he quotes to support it. For how could the apostle say that he had written briefly, in the second epistle to the Corinthians, and imply that he had written copiously in the epistle to the Hebrews; when, even abridged as Weber makes the former, it would be almost as long as the latter?

It may now be observed, in addition, that the subjects treated of in the epistle to the Corinthians, and in that to the Hebrews, are widely different, in general, and quite dissimilar. Not a word in the epistle to the Hebrews of internal disorder, tumult, and parties in the church; no precepts about separation of husband and wife; none concerning meats offered to idols; none about the abuse of spiritual gifts; no discussion about the resurrection of the body; nothing about the denial of Paul's authority; which, with various matters relating to decorum, constitute the principal subjects discussed in our present epistles to the Corinthians. On the other hand, in the epistles to the Corinthians there is nothing about apostasy; nothing relative to persecution; nothing in commendation of their teachers; no apparent apprehension expressed respecting a Judaizing spirit in the church. If the epistles to the Corinthians have resemblances in expression and doctrine to the epistle to the Hebrews, (as all Paul's epistles certainly have a resemblance to it), are they not still so diverse as to the matters treated of, and as to the circumstances of the parties addressed, as to render hopeless all attempts to show that our present epistles to the Hebrews and to the Corinthians were addressed to one and the same church?

(6) Was the Epistle sent to Alexandria, or to Antioch?

In regard to the supposition of J. E. C. Schmidt, (Einleit. ins N. Test. Th. I. pp. 284, 293), that the epistle was directed to the church at Alexandria, much need not be said. This writer alleges,

(1) 'That an Alexandrine spirit pervades the epistle.'
But if this be true, it serves only to render it probable that the writer was of Alexandria, or at least that he possessed the spirit in question. It cannot serve at all to determine who his readers were.

(2) "The church at Alexandria appears early to have been, in a peculiar manner, partial to this epistle."

The answer to this is, that partial as they were, yet none of the distinguished writers at Alexandria, now known to us, have once suggested the idea that the epistle was directed to their church. How could they have all been unanimous in the opinion, that it was directed to the church in Palestine, if it had been originally addressed to their own church?

(3) "The epistle to the Hebrews, (now so named) was anciently called the epistle to the Alexandrians."

This argument depends entirely upon the unreliable testimony of an anonymous writer (adduced by Muratori in his Antiqu. Ital. med. Aevi, Tom. III. p. 854), of whom I shall take more particular notice in § 9.

Boehme, in his recent work on the epistle to the Hebrews, contends (Prolegom. p. XXXII. seq.) for Antioch as the place to which this epistle was directed. But the condition of the church there, which was made up of Gentiles as well as Jews, and was in a state of contention with regard to the ceremonial rites of the Levitical law, renders this altogether improbable; comp. Acts xi. 20 seq.; xv. 1 seq.; Gal. ii. 11 seq. How can it be reasonably supposed, that not a single reference should be made, in all the epistle to the Hebrews, to such a state of things as these passages disclose? The improbability is too great, one would think, to raise any serious doubt in the mind of any considerate and impartial critic. *

§ 5. Antiquity and Canonical Authority of the Epistle.

Its antiquity is abundantly established by evidence internal and external. The allusions made to the temple service in the epistle itself,

* Ebrard maintains that this epistle could not have been addressed to the whole church at Jerusalem, but to certain members of it. He thinks that vi. 10; x. 32; ii. 3, are quite conclusive in this regard. He says "All these circumstances," [alluded to in the verses cited] "taken together with the whole style of representation which characterizes the epistle, must induce us to understand the words, chap. v. 12, ye have need that one teach you, as implying that the readers were in reality again taken under instruction, i.e., that the Epistle was intended for a limited circle of neophytes in Jerusalem, who had become timorous lest they should be excluded from the temple worship, threatened to withdraw themselves from Christianity (chap. x 25), therefore were taken anew under instruction, and for whose instruction the epistle to the Hebrews was to form a sort of guide." Although there does not seem to be any decided proof of this theory, yet it is not improbable; and if true, it furnishes a sufficient explanation of the omission of the usual designation of the author. -- Ep.
necessarily imply that this service was still continued, when it was written; e. g. Heb. ix. 9: "Which [former tabernacle with its services] was a significant emblem in respect to the present time; in which gifts and sacrifices are offered," etc., and viii. 4, 5 . . . "seeing there are priests, who, according to the prescription of the law, perform their service in a tabernacle, which is merely a copy of the heavenly one."

The particular views, too, which the epistle throughout gives of temptation to apostasy, are evidently grounded on the existing rites of the Jewish temple worship. The strong attachment of the Jews to these rites, their jealousy of anything which had a tendency to diminish their importance, and the imposing splendor and magnificence of the sacrificial ceremonies, all concurred to tempt those Hebrews who had embraced Christianity and renounced the common views of their countrymen, to relapse into their former views and habits. The shape in which this whole subject presents itself in the epistle to the Hebrews, manifestly implies that the Levitical institutions were then in full vigor. Now as the whole temple service ceased with the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, it is clear that our epistle must have been written before that period; and consequently it belongs to the apostolic age.

It is equally plain, that our epistle was written in the latter part of the apostolic age. Those whom it addresses are represented as having been Christians long enough to be qualified, had they been properly attentive to their duty in learning the principles of Christianity, to become its teachers, v. 12. The former days, when they were first enlightened, are spoken of by the writer, x. 32, in distinction from the time then current. They are addressed also as having witnessed the death of their first teachers, xiii. 7; and their then present teachers are commended to their affectionate regard, xiii. 17. All these circumstances imply that some time must have passed away since the gospel was first preached among them, and they had been converted to Christianity. In other words, the epistle must have been written in the latter part of the apostolic age. The specific year is not easy to designate.*

With the internal marks of antiquity exhibited by the epistle itself, corresponds the external testimony respecting it. Clement of Rome is the most important witness that can be adduced, in regard to the point before us. His epistle to the Corinthians (commonly named his first epistle), is the most considerable, certainly the most impor-

* Ebrard endeavors to prove that it was written either toward the end of A. D. 62, or late in the summer of A. D. 64. See Comm. on Hebrews App. Chap. ii.

† It is called first, because there is a second which bears his name, and which has usually, though of questionable authenticity, been printed in connection with the first. The first was so greatly esteemed by the churches in
tant and best authenticated, relic of ecclesiastical antiquity which belongs to the first century of the Christian era. According to the general voice of the ancients, the author of this epistle is the Clement whom Paul mentions as one of his fellow laborers, and as having his name written in the book of life, Phil. iv. 3. He was the third bishop of Rome, according to Irenaeus (contra Haeres. III. 3), Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. III. 13. 15. 21. 34. 38), and Jerome (Viri Illust., Clemens). In the name of the church at Rome, and as their bishop, he addressed an epistle to the church at Corinth. This epistle, as all agree, must have been written within the first century; probably about A.D. 96. Several critics of high reputation are disposed to assign it to a much earlier date. For example, Pearson, Pagi, Dodd- well, Wake, and Le Clerc, date it at a period antecedent to the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e., before A.D. 70. If their opinion be correct, the testimony of Clement's epistle will be stronger in proof of the antiquity and authority of the epistle to the Hebrews; for this testimony, in such a case, must have been given within some eight or ten years after our epistle was written, and during the apostolic age. But be this as it may, I am willing to assume the latest date, which can with any show of probability be assigned to Clement's epistle, viz. A.D. 96; for this will be only about thirty years after the epistle to the Hebrews was most probably written.

It will be seen in the sequel, that the testimony of Clement will serve to cast light upon the two points of inquiry which constitute the object of the present section, viz., the antiquity and the canonical authority of our epistle.

I shall first exhibit the evidence that Clement has quoted this epistle, and then subjoin some remarks on his testimony. I enter into the examination of this matter the more formally and fully, because of the important bearing which the testimony of a writer so early and respectable as Clement, must evidently have upon the authority of our epistle, and indirectly upon its origin; and also because the subject has been (at least so it seems to me) imperfectly treated, and passed over with a slight examination, by nearly all the critics whom I have had an opportunity to consult.

It is a singular circumstance, that no book of the New Testament should have been so frequently quoted by Clement as the epistle to the Hebrews. That such is the fact any one may satisfy himself, who will take the pains to examine his quotations as referred to in Wotton's edition of this author, or the detail of them as exhibited by Lardner, Credibil. of Gosp. Hist. I. p. 49 seq.

the early ages, that it was read publicly to Christian assemblies, in like manner as the books of the New Testament, and is very often cited, with great encomiums, by nearly all the Christian Fathers. Vide Clem Rom. edit. Wotton. p. ccvi.
The quotations made by Clement from the epistle to the Hebrews may be arranged under four different classes; viz.:

I.

Passages in which the exact or nearly exact words, of the epistle are quoted.

**HEBREWS.**

No. 1.

1: 8 ὁσ ὅπα ἀπαίγαμα τῆς δόξης . . . . . . . . . . 4. Τοσοῦτω μεγαλοπρόνητος αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτω μελετών αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτω διαφοροποιητικῷ παρ’ αὐτοῦ περιφερείας κεκληρονομηκέν ἀνόμα.

7. Δέγει: ὁ ποιῶν τὸν ἀγγέλαν αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λεπτομέρειες αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλάγια.

5. Τίνι γὰρ εἶπε ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων; Ὅσον μοι ἔστω, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε; 13. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἄγγελων ἔφηκε ποτὲ; Καθὼς εἰ δεδώρων μου, ἀν ἦν ἡ τοὺς ἐξήρεσις σου ὑποτούσιν τῶν πολέως σου.

**CLEMENT.**

No. 1.

Cap. 36. ὁσ ὅπα ἀπαίγαμα τῆς δόξης . . . . . . . . . . 4. Τοσοῦτω μεγαλοπρόνητος αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτω μελετών αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτω διαφοροποιητικῷ παρ’ αὐτοῦ περιφερείας κεκληρονομηκέν ἀνόμα.

7. Δέγει: ὁ ποιῶν τὸν ἀγγέλαν αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λεπτομέρειες αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλάγια.

5. Τίνι γὰρ εἶπε ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων; Ὅσον μοι ἔστω, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε; 13. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἄγγελων ἔφηκε ποτὲ; Καθὼς εἰ δεδώρων μου, ἀν ἦν ἡ τοὺς ἐξήρεσις σου ὑποτούσιν τῶν πολέως σου.

**No. 2.**

Heb. vi. 18 . . . . . . ὁν ὅπα ἀποκαλύφθη Ἵθελον.

Cap. 27. . . . . . . οδέων γὰρ ἄποκαλύφθη Ἐρθεὶ ἔμεθα ἀν ἀληθείαν ὑπερεπάτησαν.

**No. 3.**

Heb. xi. 37. . . . . . . . περεδόθη δείκτος ὑποτελματικός, ἐν αληθείας δήμαρσα.

Cap. 17. οὖστε ἐν δήμαρσαν αἰῶνας καὶ αἰῶνας περεπάτησαν.

**No. 4.**

Heb. x. 87. Ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν διαφόρον ἐν καθαρίᾳ καὶ ὑπερεπάτησαν ὑποτελματικά, ἐν αληθείας δήμαρσα.

Cap. 28. . . . . . . συνεπεμπάρτησαν ὑποτελματικά, διὰ ἐμναὶ καὶ ἐν καθαρίᾳ ὑποτελματικά.
Passages containing the same sentiment, with more or less contraction of the expression, or an exchange of the original for a synonymous word.

**HEBREWS.**

**No. 5.**

Heb. iv. 12. ... καὶ κριτικός ἐνθυμησεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδιάς. Cap. 21. ... οὐδὲν λέγειν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐννοιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν διαλογισμῶν ἐν πνεύματα.

(Again near the end) ... ἔρευνητής γὰρ ἔστω ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμησεων.

**No. 6.**

Heb. xi. 5. Πίστει Ἐννοια μετετέθη, τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν Θάνατον. Cap. 9. ... Ἐννοια, δε ἐν ὑπακοῖ δίκαιος εὑρεθεὶς μετετέθη, καὶ οὕτω εὑρέθη αὐτῷ Θάνατος.

7. Πίστει χρημάτισθείς Νῦ. ... Νῦ πιστός εὑρεθεὶς ...

8. Πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ ὑπῆκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον, κ. τ. λ. Cap. 10. Ἀβραὰμ. ... πιστὸς εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτῶν ὑπῆκον γενέσθαι τοῖς βήμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὕτως δὲ ὑπακοῆς ἔχειλεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, κ. τ. λ.

31. Πίστει Ῥαββ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συνεπώλητο τοὺς ἀπειθησας, δεχαμένη τῶν κατασκόπων μετ’ εἰρήνης. Cap. 12. Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαββ ἡ πόρνη. Ἐκπεμϕάντων γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰερουτοῦ τοῦ Ναυν κατασκόπων εἰς τὴν Ἰεριχὼ ... ἡ οὖν φιλοξένως Ῥαββ εἰς ἰδείς ἀμέν οὕτως ἔκρυψεν εἰς τὸ ὑπεροῦ ὑπὸ τὴν λυκοκαλάμην.

**CLEMENT.**

**No. 5.**

**No. 6.**

**No. 7.**

Passages which are a paraphrastic imitation of the epistle to the Hebrews; or in which the style or phraseology of this epistle is more or less exhibited.

**No. 7.**

Heb. xi. 36—39. Ἐπεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πέιραν Ἰακ. Cap. 45. (Ἐγκύπτετε εἰς τὰς γραφὰς τὰς ἀδηλίθεις ῥήσεις πνεύματος τοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ... οὐ γὰρ εὑρήσεται
AUTHORITY OF THE EPISTLE.

HEBREWS.

"Ελαθάσθεναν, έπρωθεν, έπευ-ράσθεναν, ἑνάφυν μαχαίρας ἁμι-"θανον . . . . καὶ οὐκ οἵτινες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

DUKAIOUN APOBEBELIMÉNOUS APÔ ĐΩ-"VWN ἄνδρῶν). "ΕΩΣ ὡς θανατοῦ ἐνεφυλακίσθη-"σαν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνοσίων ἐλεθάσ-"θεναν ὡς παρανόμων ἀπεκτάν-"θεναν ὡς τῶν μαρτίων καὶ ἄθυ-"νον ἀνειληφότων. Ταῦτα πάσ-"χοντες εὐκλαίως ἤγεγκαν.

No. 8.

Heb. xii. 1, 2. . . τοσούτων ἠχο-"ντες περικείμενον ἥμιν νέοσ μαρτί-"ών . . . δι' ὑπομενῆς τρέξωμεν τῶν προκείμενων ἥμιν ἀγώνα ἄφο-"έντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν, κ. τ. λ.

Cap. 19. Πολλῶν οὖν καὶ μεγα-"λῶν καὶ ἐνδόξων μετειληφότες παραδειγμάτων (Wotton, πράξαι-"ων) ἐπικαθάρισμας ἐπὶ τῶν ἓξ ἀρχών παραδέδομέν ἥμιν τῆς εἰρήνης σκότος καὶ ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα, κ. τ. λ.

No. 8.

Heb. xii. 5—11. (comp. Prov.

iii. 11, 12.) . . . . . . νῦς μου, μη ἀλεγόρει παύεις ἱερεῖς Κύριον μηδὲ ἐκλιπόν ὡς αὐτῷ ἐλεγχόμενον.

"Ον γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παύεις, μαστυγοὶ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν διὰ παρα-"δέχεται . . . . Οἱ μὲν . . . . κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτῶς ἐπαθένων [Τῆμα], δὲ τῇ [Θεός] ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγίτητος αὐ-"τοῦ.

No. 9.

Cap. 56. Ἀναλάβωμεν παύει-"ν εάν ἐρ ό οἶδαις ὠφελεῖ ἀγανακτεῖν . . . . . . . . τὴν αὐτήν Κύριου πα-"υεῖς, μαστυγοὶ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν διὰ παρα-"δέχεται . . . . γὰρ ἀγάθος διὰ παύεις ἰερεῖς, εἰς τὸ νουθετη-"την ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς ὁσίας πα-"υείς αὐτῶς.

No. 9.

Heb. iv. 14 seq. Ἐρχονται οὖν ἀρχιερεῖα μέγαν . . . . Ἰησοῦν . . . . οὗ ἐρχομεν ἀρχιερεῖα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθήσασθαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν . . . . προσερχόμεθα . . . . ίνα . . . . τὸν ἄγαθον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προσε-"ρχόμεν εὑρωμεν εἴς εὐκαιρον βοή-"θεων.

Cap. 36. . . . Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τῶν ἀρχιερεία τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τῶν προφανῶν καὶ βοήθων τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. Cap. 58. . . . . . . τὸν ἀρχιερέως καὶ προσ-"τάτου ἡμῶν I. Χριστοῦ.
Passages similar to texts in the Old Testament, but which Clement probably quoted from the epistle to the Hebrews.

**HEBREWS.**

No. 11.

Heb. iii. 2. Πιστῶν οὖν τῷ τῇ ἁλὼ 

Cap. 17. Μωυσῆς πιστὸς ἐν ἀλλ' 

ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Ἰσραήλ 

κεκλησία ἐν ὁλῷ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. 

5. Καὶ Μωυσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν 

Cap. 43. ὁ μακάριος πιστὸς 

αὐτῷ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ἔστε Ἰσραήλ 

τοῖς Ἰσραήλ 

ἔν ὁλῷ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ.

I shall now subjoin a few remarks on the preceding view.

No. 1. Some parts of this passage from Clement, may be found in the Old Testament as well as in the epistle to the Hebrews; but other parts only in the latter, and there cannot be a reasonable doubt, that Clement had the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews distinctly in his mind, when he wrote this passage.

Here, too, to the quotation made from Ps. ii. 17 by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, Clement adds another verse (v. 8), in order to amplify and confirm the view of the subject which he had introduced. He often, also, intermingles passages taken from different parts of the Bible, without any notice, or any sign of transition from the one to the other. See Epist. c. 50, 53, et al.

No. 2. Clement here, as often, extracts passages from the Bible, without using any formula of quotation, or without any intimation that he is about to quote. The singularity of the expression, and the fact that it is peculiar to the epistle to the Hebrews, plainly indicate that Clement had distinctly in mind the manner of expression in our epistle, when he wrote the sentence presented in the comparison.

No. 3. This is too plain and exact a quotation of an expression sui generis in the epistle to the Hebrews, to require remark.

No. 4 appears to me a case of quotation from Heb. x. 37, which has the formula of appeal to the Scriptures prefixed, συνεπεμφανεύθη τῆς γραφῆς. Another passage from which we might suppose the quotation to be taken, viz., Mal. iii. 1, is quoted at length, in immediate connection with the one exhibited in the table, plainly because Clement deemed it to be a parallel one; so that we cannot choose the passage in Malachi, as the source of his quotation. There remains, then, besides Heb. x. 37, only Hab. ii. 3, which affords any special resemblance to the quotation of Clement. But the passage in Habakkuk relates wholly to a vision or prophesy, and not to a person as in
Heb. x. 37; and to a person Clement evidently applies it. Moreover, the reading χρονισμ, which Clement exhibits (and this without variation, if Walton may be trusted), agrees with the form of the words in Heb. x. 37, but not with the form in Hab. ii. 3, which is χρονισμ. The probability is, then, altogether in favor of the supposition, that the passage is quoted from the epistle to the Hebrews.

No. 5 is so alike in Clement and in our epistle, that it seems highly probable that the expression in the latter was in Clement's mind, when he wrote these passages.

No. 6, although it does not exhibit an exact use of the language in our epistle, contains, in my view, one of the most convincing proofs of quotation. The arrangement of these examples together, as in the epistle to the Hebrews; the manner of characterizing their actions or their rewards, viz., that they flowed from faith; and the almost exact similarity of ideas, in cases where these are peculiar to the writer of our epistle, all combine to prove (I had almost said) the certainty that Clement had Heb. xi. in mind, when he wrote. Imitation thus exact of a passage so peculiar in its style and manner, is better proof that the passage was before the eye of Clement, or at least in his mind, than exact coincidence of language in some such cases would be. Such coincidence might be accidental, arising merely from similarity of views or of idiom. But accidental coincidence as to the mode of reasoning and representation here, seems to be fairly out of the question.

No. 7 seems pretty evidently to be a kind of parody upon, or a paraphrastic imitation of, the corresponding passage in the epistle to the Hebrews. On the manner in which this is introduced, I shall subsequently make further remarks.

No. 8. In Clement's epistle, the passage is in the sequel of the sentence extracted in No. 3. Now as the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has exhibited the same order of thought, Heb. xi. 37 and xii. 1, 2, is it not probable that Clement had the corresponding passages of that epistle in his mind, when he wrote the one presented by the comparison? The similarity of costume in the two passages, can hardly fail to strike the attentive reader.

No. 9 at first might seem quoted from Prov. iii. 11, 12. But on nearer examination, we find in Prov. iii. 12, ἐλέγετο, while in Clement and in Heb. xii. 6, the reading is παρείπε. The strain of reasoning upon the passage shows pretty clearly, that Clement had in mind the corresponding passage in the epistle to the Hebrews; for the close of the quotation from him, is evidently an expression of the sentiment in Heb. xii. 10.

No. 10 exhibits an appellation of the Saviour (ἀρχιερεία), which is peculiar to our epistle. There is, moreover, an evident similarity between Christ as δυνάμενον συμπαθήσας τοὺς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν, Hebrews iv. 15, and Clement's προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν.
No. 11 may have been quoted from Num. xii. 7; but from the tenor of the passage and the context, I am inclined to believe that the quotation was made from Heb. iii. 2 or Heb. iii. 5; but I cannot attach much weight to this opinion.

In order now to make a fair estimate of the comparison which has been made, and the weight of evidence to be adduced from it, it is necessary that we should have correct views of the manner of Clement's quotations in general, and the principles on which they are grounded.

I have examined the whole of this writer's quotations, both from the Old and New Testament, with a view to ascertain whether anything can be determined as to the authority which he attaches to them, from the manner in which they are made; and also to ascertain, by a view of the whole, what his particular manner of quotation is. The result of this examination I will now briefly state.

(1) Clement names no book of either Testament. He appeals, indeed, to the words of the prophets; but their names he evidently uses to indicate their persons, and not (as we do) the titles of their books. The importance of this fact, considered in connection with the same usage by the writers of the New Testament, in respect to a critical examination of the genuineness of the titles prefixed to the books of Scripture, has been already adverted to in a preceding part of this introduction, § 4.

(2) Clement habitually appeals to the books of either Testament, with or without any formula to give notice of a citation. He often prefixes γέγραπται, λέγει, εἶπεν ὁ θεός, φησίν ὁ λόγος ἀγιος, and the like formulas to his quotations. But nearly as often, particularly in the New Testament, he cites without any notice or formula at all; evidently taking it for granted that his readers will at once recognize the quotation, without any pains on his part to designate it.

(3) I find no satisfactory evidence of quotation from the Apocrypha, or any apocryphal writer now known. The instances of quotation from the Wisdom of Solomon (chap. xii. 27), alleged by Wotton, are plainly too far fetched to appear probable; and the reference to the book of Judith (c. 55 of Clement), is only a reference to the story concerning her, which Clement evidently believed. There are, it is true, a few cases of apparent quotation, either from books not found in our present Scriptures, or from traditionary accounts; just as there are some quotations of this nature in the New Testament, which are not found in the Hebrew Scriptures. But there is no satisfactory evidence, that Clement received any of the known apocryphal writings, either of the Old Testament or the New, as canonical.

It seems plain, then, that Clement cites and refers to the epistle to the Hebrews; just as, and quite as often as, he does to the other books of Scripture, and that he distinguishes these from the apocryphal writings. If it were true, then, that he did not formally cite it at
all, it would amount to no proof that he did not recognize it as Scripture.

But has he not *formally* cited the epistle to the Hebrews? Does the phrase \( \gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota \gamma\alpha\rho \omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\omega\varsigma \), in No. 1 above, refer to Ps. ii. 7, or to Heb. i. 7? Bleek and others have contended that it refers to the original Psalm, and assert that 'if Clement had not meant to appeal to the original Psalm (Ps. ii. 7) by \( \gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota \gamma\alpha\rho \omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\omega\varsigma \), he would have inserted this at the beginning of his quotation from Heb. i. ; (for in the context immediately preceding, Heb. 3, 4 is in part cited by Clement).'

But in this remark, the whole structure of the passage in Clement is obviously overlooked. This writer had been recounting the blessings which Christ procures for men; to which he adds, "By him the Lord willed that we should taste of immortal knowledge (\( \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \gamma\nu\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma \omega\varsigma \)); who is the brightness (splendor, radiance, \( \delta\pi\alpha\nu\gamma\alpha\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha \)) of his majesty, being so much superior to the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name [than they], Heb. i. 3, 4." He then adds, "\( \Gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota \gamma\alpha\rho \omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\omega\varsigma \), for it is written, Thou art my Son, this day," etc. Now the phrase *for it is written*, stands here just where the purpose of the writer demands that it should be inserted, viz., just where *appeal to decisive authority* was directly resorted to by Clement. This writer had just affirmed that Christ was superior to the angels, quoting the words of Heb. i. 4, in order to express this sentiment. How, then, is this to be confirmed? would of course be the natural question in the mind of Clement, and of his readers. The answer is, by an appeal to the application of Ps. ii. 7 to the Messiah, which is made by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Now the application in question is made in the very next verse (i. e., in Heb. i. 5) after the one which Clement had just quoted, viz., Heb. i. 4. The very nature of the case shows, that the appeal must be, in Clement's mind, to the *authoritative* application of Ps. ii. 7 to the Messiah, in order to establish the assertion which he had just made, viz., that Christ was superior to the angels. For if Ps. ii. 7 did not apply to Christ, then quoting it would be nothing at all to Clement's purpose. How then does Clement decide for himself, and how does he expect his readers will be satisfied, that it does apply to Christ? Why, plainly from the fact, that Heb. i. 5 applies it to him. What, then, is this but an appeal to *authority*? And how can the force of \( \gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota \gamma\alpha\rho \omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\omega\varsigma \) fall anywhere else, except on Heb. i. 5? It must be very plain, indeed, that the formula of the words is not all which is appealed to here by Clement; most evidently it is the *application* of them, the *authoritative* application of them which was to satisfy the minds of his readers, that is the principal point in question. But surely it will not be contended, that this application is found anywhere else by Clement, in this case, except in Heb. i. 5.

That Clement, after citing the passage in Heb. i. 5, which comes from Ps. ii. 7, should add Ps. ii. 8, is perfectly natural. The words
of Heb. i. 5 he well knew were taken from Ps. ii. 7; of course when he cited these words in Heb. i. 5, the association of ideas would instantly carry back his mind to Ps. ii. 7 and the sequel; which sequel he here very naturally adds, inasmuch as it was to his purpose in proving the superiority of Christ to the angels, which he had before averred. But then, after all, the application of all this to the Messiah, and of course its relevancy to the point in question and its authority, depend entirely on the use made of it by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. To this use Clement appeals, plainly deeming it sufficient in his own mind, and expecting it to satisfy his readers. If Prof. Bleek will review the nature of this whole appeal, and the certainty that the mind of the writer in the whole passage (even as he himself acknowledges), is upon Heb. i., and that the appeal is to this, he may perhaps find little reason to "wonder" at the use which I have made of the passage and the appeal in question. The nature of the appeal is plainly such as to afford an unanswerable proof, that Clement appeals to the authority of our epistle in order to make out his proof.

There is another instance also in Clement (c. 23), where the quotation from Heb. x. 37 is quite probable, and which is prefaced by ἀναλημματικόν τῆς γραφῆς; supra no. 4. In respect to this, Bleek alleges that I have very imperfectly cited the passage from Clement. Accordingly, he has supplied my alleged deficiency; which is καὶ ἐξάφυς ἥξε αὐτῷ Κύριος εἰς τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ ως ἤρθε προσδοκάτς. Now as this last supplement to my quotation is a passage from Mal. iii. 1, and has no parallel in the epistle to the Hebrews; and as the one which I have quoted, is from Heb. x. 37 (see remarks on No. 4 above), or from Hab. ii. 3, and has a parallel in our epistle; and as my only object was to quote passages where parallels are found; I am altogether at a loss, to know how my quotation is very imperfect.

The argument from this passage Bleek meets with the assertion, that it is "a free and contracted citation out of Hab. ii. 3 and Mal. iii. 1." But what has Mal. iii. 1 to do with the citation in question? Surely nothing. Then as to the "freeness and contraction" of the citation, it is verbatim and literatim the same as Heb. x. 37; and the same as in Hab. ii. 3, with the exception, that there we find χρονισθ, but in Clement χρονισ, as it is in Heb. x. 37, so that the external proof, as to the form of words, is clearly in favor of the latter; as all must admit. I have also stated, that an appeal to the authority of Heb. x. 37 is probably made here, by ἀναλημματικόν τῆς γραφῆς; is it shown not to be so?

In regard, moreover, to the instances in No. 6, it will not be questioned, that the writer had in his mind the passages in Heb. xi. which refer to the persons named, inasmuch as there is either a plain quotation from the peculiar diction of these, or a palpable imitation of the
turn of sentiment in them. But who that reads Clement, chap. ix—xii., can refrain from the feeling, that he refers to these examples thus cited, in the same manner that he does to any part of the Old Testament Scriptures, i. e., as binding and authoritative?

If No. 7 be regarded, also, as a paraphrastic imitation by Clement in the corresponding passage to the epistle to the Hebrews, then is this a third direct appeal to the divine authority of our epistle; for he introduces the passage by saying, "Search in the Scriptures the true sayings of the Holy Spirit.

Thus much for the allegation of Eichhorn, that Clement has nowhere cited our epistle formally, as he does the canonical Scriptures. But further; the conclusion which this writer draws from the assumed facts stated by him, is as erroneous as the facts themselves. One might indeed have expected, in a matter so weighty as that of Clement's testimony, and one in which the evidence is so accessible, that so manifest an error in regard to Clement's mode of quotation should not be committed. Nothing can be more evident to a critical reader of Clement, than that no conclusion can be drawn from the mode of his quotation, against the supposition that he believed the book quoted to be canonical. The fact that he appeals to our epistle more frequently than to any other part of the New Testament; that he nowhere appeals (so far as we can discover) to any apocryphal writings of either Testament; above all, that he appeals to our epistle by quoting passages from it in order to confirm and impress the truths which he is inculcating, and appeals to it in the same way and for the same purposes as he appeals to the most acknowledged parts of Scripture; the fact too, that Clement was the companion and fellow-laborer of Paul, and was also bishop of the church at Rome, the metropolis of the world; that he wrote in the name of the church there to the church at Corinth, and that he addressed to them passages from the epistle to the Hebrews, in such a way as necessarily to imply that this epistle was already well known and familiar to them; these facts, taken all together, make on my own mind a strong impression, that the evidence is as clear and convincing, that in the age of Clement our epistle was considered a part of the sacred writings of the Scripture, as it is that any other book of the New Testament was considered as a part of them.

Bleek (Review p. 10) himself acknowledges, that no evidence can be adduced from the manner in which Clement cites our epistle, that he regarded it as of an authority which was inferior to that of other books of the New Testament. But he avers (p. 9) that we are not able to determine, from the manner in which Clement cites the New Testament, what credit it then had in the church. This, he says, can be determined only when citations are made κατ' ἀξοχήν. But are

* c. I. ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Ἰουνῶν ἡ παροικίωσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κ. τ. λ. is the commencement of Clement's epistle:
they not made so? E. g., chap. xiii. of Clement, "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus," etc., then citing Luke vi. 36—38; chap. xxiii. "Far be this Scripture from us, where he saith," etc., quoting James i. 8 and 2 Pet. iii. 4; chap. xxxiv. "For he saith," etc., quoting 1 Cor. ii. 9 (not Is. lxiv. 4, where the order and diction of the passage are both different); chap. xl. "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus," etc., quoting Luke xvii. 1, 2. Is there any room for doubt or dispute here, whether Clement viewed these passages as canonical or authoritative? Certainly none.

If then Clement has, as Bleek allows, given no more reason to call in question the authority which he attached to the epistle to the Hebrews, than that which he attached to any other book of the New Testament; and if he has cited other books καί ἐξ ἡμῶν (which is certain); then how is it so very plain that 'I have erred in my estimate of the credit in which our epistle stood with Clement,' as Bleek supposes? I have examined more than once, every quotation of Clement, from the Old Testament and from the New; and I venture to say, that no sober critic will be able to make out any difference in the modes of quotation, which can go fairly to show that Clement has quoted them in a different way, or entertained different views of their authority. If so, then why should it be called in question, that Clement appealed to the New Testament writings as authoritative, i. e., inspired? In the examples given above, is not this certain? If you say, that in quoting from Luke, Clement has spoken of the words of the Lord Jesus, and not of the authority of Luke; my reply is, that he cites the words of the Lord Jesus from Luke, and by so doing, affords evidence entirely satisfactory, that he believed the narration of Luke to be true and authentic? And is not a book of Scripture canonical, which is true and authentic?

Indeed I do not see how one can read, with an unprejudiced mind, the appeals which Clement makes to the epistle to the Hebrews (more frequent appeals than he makes to any other book of the New Testament), without feeling that he regards the contents of this epistle as of an authoritative nature, in his own mind, and that he expects they will be so regarded by his readers. In fact the tone and manner of Clement's epistle throughout is such, as to afford evidence that the epistle to the Hebrews was a kind of model for him, which he has striven to imitate. It is not without ground, that Walton, the most critical and able editor of Clement, says, "Hanc [epistolam] praecipue prae aliis sibi imitantdam propositum sanctus Pater [Clemens]; quod constat ex plurimis alis locis, magnaque ex parte ex materia ac serie hujus epistolae, sicut prius observatum fuit;" Note on p. 88. Can all this be so, and yet Clement not regard this epistle as canonical? I am unable to perceive any degree of probability in such a supposition. But it is asked if the epistle to the Hebrews was regarded as canonical at Rome in the time of Clement, how could it have lost its credit there so soon after, as it is well known that it did.
AUTHORITY OF THE EPISTLE.

It may be replied that the Apocalypse was in general (I believe one may safely say), in universal credit, among all the oriental churches, until about the middle of the third century; and not long after this, it was pretty generally doubted or rejected by them. If it be said, this was occasioned by the Millenarian dispute; it may be said with the same kind of probability, that the discredit into which the epistle to the Hebrews fell, for a time, at Rome, was occasioned by the dispute with the Montanists. But of this, more hereafter.

Let us see, now, what was the impression which in ancient times Eusebius had, from reading Clement's epistle. Speaking of monuments preserving apostolic doctrines, he says, καὶ [ἐπιστολὴ] τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν τῇ ἁνωμολογουμένῃ παρὰ πάσιν, ἢν ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορυφῆι διετυπώσατο ἐν ηὗ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίων τολλὰ νόημα παραδείγματος, δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξίᾳ ῥητοῖς τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παράστηκαν ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει τὸ σύνεργαμα: ἐν εἰκόνος ἔδωκεν, αὐτό τούτος λοιπὸς ἐγκαταλειμμέναι γραμματικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου: that is, "[We count also the epistle] of Clement acknowledged by all, which he wrote in behalf of the church at Rome to the church at Corinth; in which, exhibiting many of the sentiments of the epistle to the Hebrews, he makes use of some expressions taken from it in the very words of the epistle, by which he most clearly shows that this epistle is no recent composition; whence it seems likely, that it is to be reckoned among the other writings of the apostle [Paul]." Hist. Ecc. III. 38. I am not able to see how one who reads critically the epistle of Clement, can avoid the conviction that he has quoted it as Eusebius avers, and that he has appealed to it as Scripture.

Of other writers, belonging to the first half century after the apostolic age, we have but few remains, and most of these are imperfect. Some near resemblances to passages in our epistle to the Hebrews may be found in them, but after a careful examination of them, I have not thought them sufficiently definite and important to become the subject of discussion here. I shall merely subjoin them, and leave them to the consideration of the reader.*

* Forster, in a work published in 1838, since the previous edition of this Commentary, after repeated, close, and patient perusals of the genuine remains of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Polycarp, comes to the conclusion that they contain apparent references to the epistle to the Hebrews as numerous and strongly marked as those to any other Books of the New Testament. Furthermore, "that various instances occur in which the apostolic Fathers are to be found following each other, in their references to given texts; in which instances the common reference of all parts to the epistle to the Hebrews can be made out, by their general agreement with the text of that epistle; by their agreement between themselves, where
The following are the passages usually compared.

Heb. iii. 5. Μωυσῆς μὲν πστός εν δόλῳ τῷ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ ως Θεράπων
. . . . 6. Χριστὸς δὲ ὦ νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, οὐ οἰκὸς ἄσμεν ἡμεῖς.

Heb. x. 25. Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐβατὼν καθὼς ἦσος τοιῶν.

Heb. xii. 17. . . . . . μετανοιάς γὰρ τόπον οὐκ εὑρε.

Heb. iv. 12. . . . . κρατικὸς ἐν Σωμάτεσιν καὶ ἐννοοῦν καρδίας . . .
οὐκ ἐστὶ κτίσις δαφνῆς ἐννοοῦν αὐτοῦ.


Heb. xiii. 9. Αἰδαχρίδης ποικίλαις καὶ έξαινος μὴ περιφέρεςθε . . . .
εν οἷς οὐκ ὕφελθήσαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.

Heb. x. 28, 29. Ἀθετήσας τις νῦν Μωυσῆς χωρὶς οἰκτυρμῶν ἐπὶ δυούν ἢ τριοῦ μάρτυραν ἀπο-
θάνοικες. Πόσο δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας, ο τὸν νῦν
tοῦ Θεοῦ καταπάτησας, κ. τ. λ.

Barnabas, Epist. c. 14. Μωυ-
σῆς, Θεράπων ἐν, ἠλαβέν [νῦν,
tὸς πλάκας]. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῖν ἐδώκει, εἰς λάον κληρονομιᾶς,
k. τ. λ.

Barnabas, Epist. c. 4. Non se-
paratim debetis seducere vos, tan-
quam justificati.

(Old Latin version; the original Greek here being lost.)

Hermas, Simil. VIII. 8. His
igitur non est locus penitentiae.

Polycarp, Epist. c. 4 . . . λει-
ηθεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν, οὕτω λογοσμῶν οὕτε ἐννοοῦν, οὕτε τι τῶν κρύστων
tῆς καρδίας.

Polycarp, Martyr. . . . διὰ τοῦ
αἰωνίου ἄρχερεως Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν;
133, D.; so, also, in the Latin
version of Polycarp, published by
Usher). Add, from the same ver-
sion, c. xii. . . . et ipsa sempt-
ternus pontifex, Dei filius, Christus
Jesus. Lardner, II. 830.

Ignatius, Epist. ad Magnesios,
c. 8. Μὴ πλάσασθε ταῖς ἐπερ-
doξίαις, μηδὲ μιθεύσασθος τοῖς
tαλαιοῖς ἀνωθενεῖν οὕτων.

Ignatius, Epist. ad Ephes. c. 16.
Εἰ δὲ οἱ τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις οἴκους
dιαφθείροντες, Ἰανάτω καταδικά-
ζονται: πόσῳ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν Χρι-
tοῦ ἐκκλησίαν νοθεύουσι ἐπεχε-
rοῦντες αἰωνίαν τίσουσι δίκην, ὑπὲρ
ὁς σταύρον καὶ Ἰανάτων ὑπὲρείμεν
ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, κ. τ. λ.

The passages may be found in Cotalerius; or in Lardner, Cred. I.

they depart from this text, and by their independent agreements with this
original document, as a common source," "that St. Clement of Rome has
quoted or copied nearly continuously the tenth, eleventh and twelfth chapters
of the controverted epistle, and that St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John,
has in his epistle to the Philippians, formally cited, as a precept of apostol-
ical authority, or rather it would appear, as a precept of the apostolical
evangelist of the church of Philippi, Heb. xii. 28." See Apost. Author,
of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 541—613.
pp. 43. 44. 131. 217. II. 830. I. 177. edit. 1734. See also Eich. Einleit. § 271, note 2. Several of them (specially one from Polycarp naming Christ the eternal high priest), look very much like a quotation. But in a matter so weighty, it is not best to place very much dependence on them, as the similarity may be accidental.

Justin Martyr is the first considerable writer of the second century whose works have come down to us. He was born about A. D. 103, and flourished about A. D. 140. In his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, the following passage occurs: "This is he, who, after the order of Melchizedek, is king of Salem and eternal priest of the Most High," p. 341. He elsewhere calls Christ, αὐτόν τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ Θεοῦ Ιησοῦ καὶ Βασιλείας, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, p. 323. C. In another place he says of Christ; Καὶ ἄγγελος ἐστὶ καὶ λεγόμενος καὶ ἀπόστολος, Apolog. I. p. 95. D.; which name (ἀπόστολος) is given him only in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Bleek admits that these passages "seem like quotations." Truly they do. And are they not made in the same way as Justin quotes other passages of the New Testament, and for the like purposes? In Palestine, then, as well as at Rome, we find evidence of the early credit of our epistle, and indubitable proof of its existence.

In addition to the facts already stated respecting the early existence and credit of the epistle to the Hebrews, it should be noted, that the Peshito or old Syriac version of the New Testament, made (in all probability) during the second century; and the old Latin versions made during the same period, and probably within the first half of it; both contain the epistle to the Hebrews, Berthold, Einleit. p. 637 seq., 717 seq. This is a fact of very great importance; for these versions were in common use and authority, among the churches of the East and West. It is not pretended, so far as I know, that either of these versions, at this period, comprised any book which is now known to be apocryphal. Undoubtedly they did not comprise any, which were then deemed apocryphal.

Augustine speaks of the Latin versions as made primis fidei temporibus, De Doctrina Christ. II. 11. Tertullian speaks of a Latin translation as being in use, (in usum exiti); De Monogam. 11. Advers. Prax. 5. Advers. Marcion. II. 9. v. 4. Sometime, then, before the close of the second century, such a translation must have been made. And can there be any reason to doubt, that it was the earliest of all the translations of the New Testament, when we take into consideration the need there was of such a version in the Roman empire, particularly in Italy and proconsular Africa? How can it be accounted for, too, that neither Augustine nor Jerome, who speak so often and so much of the old Latin versions, should never once mention that the

* More recent scholars doubt whether it was found in the Latin versions.
—Ed.
epistle to the Hebrews was omitted in them? Could Jerome have failed to mention this, on the occasion of his newly translating this epistle?

The silence of these fathers on this subject, where they had so much and so direct occasion to mention it, is good ground, at least, for supposing that they knew nothing of the epistle to the Hebrews being omitted in any of the old Latin versions, of which there were a considerable number, as appears from Jerome (epist. ad Damasum), and by Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. ii. 11); especially when we consider how frequently these fathers have hinted at the division of opinion in the Latin churches about the epistle to the Hebrews, and how decided they were in favor of its Pauline origin and of its authenticity, it is unaccountable that no allusion should be made to it, if the epistle to the Hebrews were omitted in the versions.

Here, then, is strong evidence that the epistle to the Hebrews was widely circulated among Christians, a short time after the apostolic age. In the west, the Itala and old Latin versions in all probability comprised it; in Greece or the middle region, the Church at Corinth are addressed by Clement as being familiar with it; and in the east, the Syrian church, wide spread as it was, comprised it in their canon.

From near the close of the second century onward, the history of the canonical credit of our epistle intermingles itself with the controverted question, whether Paul was the author of it. On this account, I shall not pursue separately the history any farther, at present, as it must necessarily be investigated, in the course of discussing the important question, which still remains for consideration.

The sum of what has been shown under our present head of discussion, is, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, probably but a short time before this event; that in about thirty years, at most, it had acquired such currency and credit, that the church at Rome, the metropolis of the world, in a letter addressed by their bishop to the church at Corinth, made repeated appeals to it as a book of divine authority, and in such a way as to imply a knowledge and acknowledgment of it by the Corinthian church, similar to their own*; that Justin Martyr, about A. D. 140, has evidently appealed to its contents as sacred; that about this time or not long after, it was inserted among the canonical books of the New Testament, by the churches of the East and the West; and that, consequently, it must have had, at a period very little after the apos-

* Davidson, in his Introd. Vol. III. p. 264, says that Stuart "goes too far, and makes an arbitrary assumption," when he infers from this letter of Clement, that the epistle to the Hebrews was received by the churches at Rome and Corinth. Is it, however, probable that Clement, writing in the name of the church of Rome as their bishop, would make a writing not acknowledged as of divine authority, so prominent? Would it be honest in him? And would it be natural or politic for him, thus to use it without comment, if its authority was questioned by the Corinthian church? — E. D.
tolic age, a currency and a credit not at all, or at most very little, inferior to that of other acknowledged books of the New Testament. Better evidence than this of early and general reception by the churches, it would be difficult to find, in respect to a considerable number of books in the New Testament; with less than this we are obliged to content ourselves, respecting several of them.

In later times peculiar views of theology and exegesis and other causes have caused many to reject or undervalue it. The later Arians doubted its canonical authority. In modern times, Cajetan and Erasmus of the Romish Church also doubted its Pauline origin. Among the Protestants, Calvin, Beza, Luther, Carlstadt, Chemnitz, J. Schroeder, Hunnius, L. Hutter, and others, have some of them denied the Pauline origin and canonical authority of the epistle; while others have placed it in the second or third rank of canonical books, regarding it rather in the light of a book profitable for Christian edification, but not of itself decisive in a controverted question as to matters of faith. Among this number Bleek has placed himself, at the close of his section on this subject.

Cajetan, Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, the Remonstrants (e. g., Limborch and his associates), and the Socinians (e. g., Socinus de Auctorit. Sac. Script. I. 2), while they doubt or deny the Pauline origin of the epistle, admit, or at least do not call in question, its canonical authority. Calvin even ascribes it to the artifice of Satan, that some deny its authority; see his Argumentum to his Commentary on the epistle.

Luther finds, or thinks he finds, "wood, hay, and stubble," as well as "gold, silver, and precious stones" in our epistle; Walch's edit of Luther. xiv. p. 146 seq. The cause of his rejection of the epistle of James, is notorious. Then the question between the Lutherans and Roman Catholics assumed such a shape, that everything which the Catholics admitted on the ground of ancient tradition, that could be well denied or rendered doubtful, was in fact denied by the leading disciples of Luther in the first and second generation. Now as there were doubts in some of the ancient churches, and particularly in the Romish, about the Pauline origin of our epistle; and as the modern Romish church fully admitted its Pauline origin; so it was some matter of triumph for Luther and his followers, to set the ancient against the modern church at Rome, and thus to exhibit the want of consistency in a church that claimed to be infallible.

When the heat of this controversy passed away, the Lutheran church in general returned to the common sentiment in regard to the origin of our epistle. It is only of late, that opposition to its Pauline origin and canonical authority has again sprung up, mostly among the theological critics of Germany.

Admitting, however, the early existence and general credit of this epistle which it is now hard to question, there still remains the most difficult of all the questions which have been raised respecting it:
"Who was its author? Was it Paul, or some other person?" This very important question deserves, and must receive, a particular and thorough discussion.

§ 6 Was Paul the Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews?

Every reader of the epistle to the Hebrews must acknowledge that it was written by a man of deep feeling, of a benevolent heart, of extensive knowledge, and of views in respect to the spiritual nature of Christianity, as exalted as can be found anywhere in the New Testament. This epistle, too, is plainly the best key to unlock the treasures contained in the Mosaic law, and affords us a disclosure in respect to the general nature and object of the Jewish dispensation, which Christians much need, and which can nowhere else be found in a manner so full and satisfactory.

This, however correct or important it may be, cannot establish the fact that Paul wrote it. We must not virtually assume this position from reasons a priori, or because we may wish it to be so. It is as uncritical to believe without any evidence as it is to reject evidence when it is offered. It is uncritical also to establish (or rather to attempt establishing), a position that concerns a simple matter of fact, by any reasoning a priori. In the investigation of the present question, we must, therefore, lay aside prejudice either in respect to the affirmative or negative of it; and also our previous opinions, which have been derived merely from education, and have not been established on the basis of proper evidence.

As the epistle to the Hebrews has no subscription, we are left either to conjecture who the author was, or to gather it from evidence external or internal. But since conjecture can give no real satisfaction to the thorough inquirer, circumstantial evidence is necessarily our only resort. This is the only kind of proof that the nature of the case admits or even requires.

In the investigation of the question: 'Who was the author of an anonymous letter that is almost 1800 years old, written in an age and country where literary records (if they at all exist) are accidental and not designed?' it cannot be justly required, that proof of a direct, unequivocal, and positive nature should be produced. Where is the anonymous letter of antiquity that could ever be assigned to any particular author, if demands such as these were made in respect to it?

The question is not, whether the point in dispute can be rendered certain by plain and indubitable testimony, (for then how should it ever have been disputed?) but, all things considered, whether there is not a probability in favor of supposing Paul to be the author of it — a probability deduced from evidence external and internal — which is sufficient to quiet our reasonable doubts, and to command our prevailing belief.
It is not modern critics only, who have been divided on this question. The ancient Christians early differed in opinion about it, for several centuries; the Latin or occidental Christians, after the second century, more generally rejecting it from their canon, as they did not reckon it to be Paul's; while the Greek, or rather the oriental, Christians generally received it as coming from the hand of the apostle Paul.

I shall divide the evidence in respect to this question, into external and internal. By the former, I mean whatever can be gathered from the Christian fathers, or ancient writers, or the tradition of the churches, respecting the epistle; and by the latter, the characteristics of the epistle in respect to sentiment, style, and diction, compared with the acknowledged letters of Paul, and also certain facts which are adverted to in the epistle itself.

The great deficiency of genuine early Christian records, for many years after the completion of the New Testament, is a fact acknowledged, and lamented by all who study either the early history of the church, or that of its sacred books. A few fragments only we have, of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Papias, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and some others; in most instances too short, and too imperfectly preserved, to afford any strong ground of satisfaction to the critical inquirer.*

§ 7. Testimony of the Alexandrine Church.

The evidence that the epistle to the Hebrews was early recognized as one of the sacred books, has been already exhibited. The first testimony that we have respecting Paul's being the author of the epistle, is that of Pantaenus, the head of the celebrated Christian school at Alexandria in Egypt, who flourished about A. D. 180. This testimony was inserted by Clement of Alexandria, the disciple of Pantaenus, and his successor in the famous school just mentioned, in a work of his entitled Υποτύπωσεις, Institutions or Sketches. This work

* Some suppose that we have sufficient evidence of the authorship of our epistle from the reference in the 2 Epistle of Peter, iii. 15, 16: "and account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest," etc.

If Peter intended to intimate here that Paul had previously written to the specific individuals to whom his epistles were addressed, 2 Ep. i. 1; and iii. 1; and 1st Ep. i. 1; and if "in which," in verse 16, refers to the epistles of Paul, it is certainly probable that there is here an allusion to Hebrews v. 11, and the question of the authorship is definitely and certainly settled. But it is a matter of too much doubt to satisfy the careful inquirer. But see above, § 4 (3), and Forster p. 625 sq., who strongly advocates a reference in Peter to the Epistle to the Hebrews.
is now lost; but Eusebius has preserved an extract from it, in his Ecclesiastical History Lib. vi. c. 14. Pantaenus himself was the most learned Christian of the age in which he lived, and one whose weight and authority in the churches was very great.

Clement, in the extract preserved by Eusebius, is endeavoring to assign a reason why Paul had not subscribed his name to the epistle to the Hebrews. After giving his opinion in regard to this point he adds, "As our worthy presbyter [so he here calls Pantaenus] has already said, Since the Lord himself was sent by the Almighty as an apostle to the Hebrews, Paul being an apostle to the Gentiles, on account of modesty does not subscribe himself as the apostle to the Hebrews, both out of reverence for his Lord, and because, being a preacher and an apostle to the Gentiles, by a kind of supererogation he wrote to the Hebrews."

Two points are equally clear from this testimony: First, Pantaenus entertained no doubt of Paul's being the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; second, this had been doubted by himself or others, from the absence of the usual subscription or inscripion of Paul.

It is readily granted that the explanation of the reason for the omission of the subscription of Paul given by Pantaenus is unsatisfactory. For it was not necessary to subscribe himself an apostle to the Hebrews. He might, as on other occasions, have called himself an apostle of Jesus Christ; or he might, as he twice does, have called himself a servant of Jesus Christ, Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; or he might, as he twice does, have simply written his name Paul, 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1. Why should he have been any more diffident with respect to doing this in the present case, than in any other?

And besides, it is plain from the epistle itself that he did not design to wholly conceal his name from those to whom the epistle was addressed. For otherwise he would not so freely have spoken of himself, his condition, circumstances, companions, etc., and asked their prayers that "he might be speedily restored to them."

Still there is very slight ground for the inference of Bertholdt, Einl. p. 2918, that since the declaration of Pantaenus implies the existence of persons, who denied that Paul was the author: it shows that there was not a general tradition in favor of its Pauline origin; for at this time, it was easy to trace a tradition of this nature up to its primary source.

But it may be asked has there ever been a period since the gospels or epistles were written, in which more or less of them were not discarded by some, and doubted by others? Have there not been some

* Ἡδὴ δὲ ὃς ὁ μακρὸς ἐλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐκεῖ ὁ Κύριος ἀπάστολος ἦν, τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετρίπτητα ὁ Παῦλος ὃς ἐν εἰς τὰ θεῖα ἀπεσταλμένοις οὐκ ζηγράφη ἔκειν Ἑβραίους ἀπόστολον διὰ τὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμήν. διὰ τὸ τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῦ Ἐβραίων ἐκατότελοι, ἤδινοι κήρυκα διὰ καὶ ἀπόστολον. Lib. VI. 14.
such men as Ebionites, Alogi, Marcionites, and others of similar character, in every age and almost in every country? And can it be a valid objection to a book, or to testimony respecting it, that such men have rejected it or doubted it? If so, then the whole of the New Testament must be given up at once, and the effort to maintain its genuineness abandoned as a task utterly hopeless; for what part of it has not been discarded by some of these, or such like sectarians?

On the contrary, the weight of his testimony is increased, rather than diminished, by the objections. For whether they had been suggested by members of the catholic church, or by heretics, or he had sometimes entertained them in his own mind; yet, such was the strength of his conviction, arising from the evidence opposed to these doubts, that he now hesitates not in the least to consider it as an established point, that Paul was the author of this epistle. He speaks of it as being his, without intimating that there is any good ground to call it in question.

Now whence did Pantaenius derive such a conviction — Pantaenius, who was at the head of the first Christian school in the world; who resided near Palestine, and where constant communication was all the time kept up with that country; Pantaenius, who lived within a century after the apostolic age? It cannot be shown, nor in any way rendered probable, that he had any favorite or peculiar sentiment to be supported by the epistle to the Hebrews, which was the reason why he defended its apostolic origin. I am aware of the allegation made by some, that the epistle to the Hebrews was already received in the churches as one of the sacred books; and that, as some doubted respecting it because it wanted an apostle’s name to sanction it, Pantaenius, in order to save its credit and defend the custom of the churches in receiving it as canonical, assigned the reasons produced above why Paul did not subscribe his name to it. But is not this, after all, conceding the very point which it is meant to deny? “The epistle to the Hebrews was already received by the churches; therefore Pantaenius defends it!” Indeed? And how came it to be received? Whence this general credit already obtained? A credit so strong, a custom of reception so general, as to inspire Pantaenius with entire confidence in its canonical authority, and raise him above all the objections which had been suggested. And how comes it, that no epistles should have made their way into the canon, amid all the conflicting opinions, and various apocryphal and supposititious writings of the early ages of the church, but those which either bear an apostle’s name, or were by general consent assigned to an apostle? This is a fundamental question, in respect to the great subject of the authority of our New Testament canon. It is an articulus stantis vel cadentis auctoritatis, in respect to it. And the answer to this question plainly is, that the Catholic church in the primitive age, taken as a body, were governed by the maxim, that no look or epistle could be properly re-
garded as canonical, except such as was written by an apostle, or under his direction.

I am far from denying that particular churches, and even particular regions of country, did, near the close of the second century, and afterwards, regard as sacred some of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament and of the New. The quotations from them by the Christian fathers, is conclusive evidence of this. But then such books, for the time being, were, of course, estimated as holding a rank entitled to the credit of inspired books. And in respect to the apocryphal writings of the New Testament, it is clear that they were regarded (where they were admitted as canonical), as either coming from the hands of apostles, or as having been written with their approbation or under their inspection. Nothing can be more evident, than that there was a constant verging of the church as a body, toward the point of limitation in respect to canonical credit, that has just been stated. That some churches and persons should have committed mistakes respecting the extent to which the principle adverted to would carry them, is not at all to be wondered at, considering the state of literary knowledge at that period. But that such mistakes were not committed by the predominant part of the churches, is demonstrated from the state of the New Testament, ever since the earliest period; the received books of which are only those which were regarded as being of apostolic origin or revision, and were generally believed to be so.

Such being the fact we may ask, and we ought to ask. How came the epistle to the Hebrews into the canon; so that Clement of Rome in the very first century, and Pantaenus in the next, refer to it as Scripture? Why plainly, because an apostolic origin was attributed to it. Pantaenus regards this as certainty; and Pantaenus says, that the apostle who wrote it was Paul; ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἑβραίων καὶ ἐφιστολήν [Παῦλον].

I readily concede, that he is not a witness contemporary with Paul. But he is a witness (and one of the very best the age afforded, in which he lived and was so distinguished as a man of knowledge), of what the opinion of the churches then was. Is it not evident, that in the passage under consideration he is defending the usual opinion of the churches in regard to our epistle; and that he is not merely delivering his own private sentiments? The manner in which he speaks, plainly declares this.

Moreover, that he did speak the opinion which was prevalent and general at this period, is rendered still more probable by the fact, that at least as early as the time in which he lived, probably earlier, the Syriac translation in the East, and perhaps the old Latin version in the West, as we have already seen, were completed; both of which went into general use in those countries, and both of which comprise the epistle to the Hebrews. In regard to the Syriac, it may be further noted, that while it was made too early, as it would seem, to coun-
prise the 2d epistle of Peter and the 2d and 3d epistles of John (which for various reasons came later into circulation than the other epistles), it still comprises the epistle to the Hebrews. Are not these facts, then, when taken together, good evidence that the credit of this epistle was early and widely diffused, and that it was regarded at a very early period, by the great body of the churches, as of apostolic origin? To which of the apostles it was assigned by current belief, and of course by current tradition, Pantaenus informs us.

Let it be distinctly noted, that all this took place within about a century after the apostolic age (and probably less); "when tradition," as Bertholdt says, "might be easily traced back to its origin." Does not then the testimony of Pantaenus, whom Photius (Cod. 118) represents to be not only a hearer of those who had seen the apostles, but of some of the apostles themselves, supported as it is by concurrent testimony of the canon of the churches in the East and in the West, amount to satisfactory evidence, in regard to general ecclesiastical tradition, at the time in which this father lived? And if so, does not this plead strongly for the probability that Paul was the author of the epistle?

Even if it be contended as it has been by Bleek and others, that Pantaenus has, in the case before us, only delivered his own private opinion; can there be any doubt on what the opinion was grounded?

I regret to add, that Bleek, in his recent work on the epistle to the Hebrews, after a brief recitation of the testimony of Pantaenus, remarks at the close (p. 98), that this testimony does not declare whether the conviction of Pantaenus originated from historical tradition, or later critical investigation; hereby intimating, that unless this could be known from the testimony, very little weight can be attributed to it. What is this but virtually to destroy not only the great body of evidence, in regard to the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament, but of most classical authors also? Is this critical justice and impartiality? How much of all the testimony that exists in respect to any ancient writing, expressly tells us whether the person who gives it derives his views from the judgment of his own mind, or from historical tradition? And what monument of antiquity can stand, before such an ordeal as Bleek thus virtually proposes?

The importance of this discussion, which treats of testimony so early and respectable in regard to the subject in question, will, I hope, be a sufficient apology for the length to which it has been protracted.

Pantaenus was succeeded in his school, by the celebrated Clement of Alexandria, near the close of the second century. Clement, as he tells us in the first book of his Stromata (p. 274. Lardner, Cred. II. 462), had travelled in Greece, Italy, the East, and Egypt, in quest
of knowledge, and employed masters in all these countries. With Pantaenius he settled down in Egypt; and he represents this teacher, though last in time, as first in merit. He compares him to the Sicilian bee, that had gathered flowers from the prophetic and apostolic meadows; and represents him as filling the minds of his hearers with pure knowledge.

Clement, then, was well qualified to judge what was the general usage and tradition of the churches, in respect to the canon of Scripture; as he had traversed a great part of the regions where churches were planted. His testimony (extracted from a work of his entitled Ὑποταυώσεις), is preserved by Eusebius in his Ecc. Hist. L. VI. c. 14. "In his book," says Eusebius, "Clement affirms that Paul is the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; and that as it was addressed to Hebrews, it was originally written in their language, and afterwards translated by Luke for the use of the Greeks; which is the reason why the coloring of the style is the same in this epistle and in the Acts of the apostles. The reason why Paul did not affix his name at the head of it, probably is, because the Hebrews had conceived a prejudice against him and were suspicious of him. Very prudently, therefore, he did not place his name at the head of the epistle, so as to divert them from the perusal of it."

Eichhorn and Bertholdt have endeavored to show here also, that Clement's testimony is only his own private opinion, or at most, that of his master Pantaenius. Eichhorn attacks the apology which Clement makes for Paul's omitting to prefix his name to the epistle; and seeming to triumph over this, he dismisses the whole of the testimony along with it. Bertholdt has pursued a course somewhat different. Pantaenius he represents as giving one reason why the name of Paul is omitted; Clement another. This contradiction, he avers, proves that neither Pantaenius nor Clement rested on tradition as their support, but only followed their own conjecture.

This conclusion is somewhat singular. What is the point in question? Simply, whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews. Pantaenius says that he did; Clement asserts the same; both, as it appears, without any doubt or hesitation in their own minds. How came they by this confidence? Clement derived it, says Bertholdt, from his master Pantaenius. But from whom did Pantaenius derive it? Whence did he get so much confidence respecting this point, as to overcome all the obstacles thrown in the way of such a belief? He

appears to have been a man of great sobriety, knowledge, diligence, and excellence of character. He was no innovator; nor does it appear that he had any pride of speculative opinions and conceits to foster. But because he answers the doubts that had been suggested against Paul's being the author of the epistle to the Hebrews in one way, and Clement in another, "this," says Bertholdt, "is contradiction, and it shows that neither of these fathers grounded his opinion on tradition, but on his own conjectures." Contradiction in what? Are these two fathers agreed on the great point in question, viz., whether Paul was the author of the epistle? This is conceded. Where then is the contradiction? "They are not agreed how the doubts raised against it should be solved." What follows? "Why," as Bertholdt avers, "that they grounded not their opinions on tradition." That is (if this have any appropriate meaning), that tradition had not brought down to them the nucleus of solving these doubts; since they were not agreed in the mode of solving them. But what if tradition had, as is most probable, handed down to them neither doubts nor solutions; and that the solutions they proposed were of newly raised doubts, which about this time began to appear in some of the occidental churches—solutions drawn, as I would most freely concede, from their own personal views, rather than from tradition; what, I ask, has the manner of solving these doubts to do, with the main point at issue? Nothing at all; and be it that Eichhorn has triumphed over both the good fathers, Pantaenus and Clement, in showing the incompetency of their reasoning to solve the doubts then raised, it leaves their testimony, as to the great point at issue, quite untouched.

I am not disposed, however, to concede so much to Eichhorn's reasoning, in respect to the assertions of Clement. If Paul did write the epistle to the Hebrews, and direct it to a church in Palestine, every one acquainted with his history knows, that the Hebrews in that country, at least very many of them, were affected towards him as Clement has represented them to be; and this might be a proper and adequate reason for not setting his name at the head of his epistle.

But further; Bertholdt says, "Another proof that Clement did not ground his testimony on tradition, is, that he declares the epistle to have been originally written in Hebrew; and that Luke translated it into the Greek language; and thus he merely undertakes, in his own way, to account for the diversity of style between this epistle and those of Paul, and its similarity to that of the Acts of the apostles."

Be it so then, for the sake of argument. But still, what is the amount of this? Nothing more than that Clement undertakes to meet an objection, raised from the style of the epistle; and to show how this style could be somewhat diverse from Paul's, and yet the epistle derive its origin from that apostle. How can this determine that Clement did not ground his belief of Paul's being the author of
the epistle on the tradition of the church, rather than on his own conjecture?

In fact, that Clement should have remained entirely unmoved in his opinion, by all objections made to Paul's being the author of our epistle, proves just the reverse of what Bertholdt has endeavored to establish. It proves, beyond all reasonable controversy, the strength and constancy of his opinion which triumphed over all such obstacles; and which to do this, must, as it seems to me, have been supported, in his own mind, by the general voice of the churches among whom he had travelled.

But further to invalidate the testimony of Pantaenus and Clement, Bertholdt suggests, that "they were inclined to favor the epistle to the Hebrews, on account of the Alexandrine spirit which reigns in it" [he means the spirit of allegorizing and finding secondary senses to language]; and "to establish the credit of a favorite letter, they attributed it to Paul, being supported in this by the apparent similarity which it has to his writings."

Now since this is altogether gratuitous conjecture, it might not improperly be answered by conjecture that such was not the case. I will suggest, however, that it is by no means certain, either that Pantaenus or Clement were natives of Alexandria. The probability is, that they came there partly as learners, but principally as teachers; and that their opinions were not formed, merely by the fashion of interpreting the Scriptures at Alexandria. Besides, what ground is there to suppose that these fathers, conscientious and deeply imbued with reverence for the Scriptures as they were, would have been persuaded by attachment to the Alexandrine spirit of allegory, to lose a book into the canon of the New Testament as Paul's, when they had no evidence on which to ground such an opinion? And how comes it, that at this very period, this same epistle was inserted in the canon if not in the Itala of the western churches, yet at least in the Peshito or old Syriac version of the eastern ones? Did Pantaenus and Clement effect this? What probability can there be, then, that Clement and Pantaenus ascribed this epistle to Paul, merely on the ground of their own private opinion or local prejudices?

In addition to the above principal passage from Clement, others may be cited which serve to show the uniformity and the strength of Clement's conviction, in regard to the Pauline origin of our epistle. E. g. Stromat. ii. p. 362, where in the midst of a literal quotation from Heb. xi. 1, 2, 6, Clement adds, κατὰ τὸν Ἱεῶν ἀπόστολον, according to the divine apostle, i. e., Paul. Again, p. 364, after quoting Heb. xi. 3 he adds, φησίν ὁ ἀπόστολος. In p. 420 he cites Heb. vi. 11, 20 in connection with Gal. v. 6, and both as the declarations of Paul. Ibid. iv. p. 514 seq. he cites Heb. x. 32—39 and xi. 36—39, expressly calling them the declarations of the same apostle who wrote Phil. iv. 11—13, which he had just cited. In p. 525, he attributes Heb. xii. 14
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—16; xiii. 4 to the same apostle who wrote Tit. ii. 3, which he had just cited. In p. 577 he cites Heb. v. 12—vi. 1, expressly as the words of Paul; and again, in p. 645, he cites a part of the same passage in the same manner.

All this testimony Bleek sets aside, by the very same remarks which he makes, as above cited, on the testimony of Pantaenus, where, see remarks.

The sum of testimony for the second century has now been presented. Its importance is greatly magnified, by its proximity to the time when the epistle was written, and when tradition respecting it might be traced back, as Bertholdt avers, without much difficulty, by a sober and interested inquirer. That at the close of the first century, the epistle to the Hebrews was not only extant, but in full credit as a canonical writing at Rome, we have seen in the examination of the testimony of Clement of Rome. That at the close of the second century, it occupied a place in the canon of the eastern, the western, and the intermediate churches, follows from the testimony that has now been examined. That Paul was the author of this epistle, appears to have been the firm belief of the most celebrated theological school then existing; and that this belief harmonized with that of the churches in general, who required evidence of apostolic origin or approbation, in order to entitle an epistle to a place in the canon, seems quite probable, and is contradicted by no circumstances with which we are acquainted.

We may now advance to the former part of the third century, and examine a few of the principal witnesses.

The celebrated Origéne, second to none of the fathers (except Jerome) as a critic, and in general learning superior to them all, the disciple and the successor of Clement at Alexandria, is, in all respects, a most important witness to be examined. He spent his life in the study and explanation of the Scriptures; and his testimony in regard to the canon of Scripture at the time when he flourished (A. D. 220), is of greater weight than that of any other individual of the same period.

The most explicit testimony of Origen preserved by Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. VI. 25, is an extract from one of his homilies on the epistle to the Hebrews. The passage runs thus in Eusebius: "The character of the style of the epistle to the Hebrews has not the unpolished cast of the apostle's language, who professes himself to be a man unlearned in speech, i. e., in phraseology. Besides, this epistle, in the texture of its style, is more conformed to Greek idiom; as every one must confess, who is able to distinguish differences in style. Moreover, the ideas in this epistle are admirable, and not inferior to those which are com-
fessedly apostolic; and that this is true, every one must concede who has attentively read the writings of the apostles. A little further on he adds, If I were to give my opinion I should say, the phraseology and the texture belong to some one relating the apostle's sentiments, and, as it were, commenting on the words of his master. If any church, therefore, hold this to be an epistle of Paul, let it receive commendation on account of this (εἰδοκομίσας καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ), *for it is not without reason (οὐ εἰκῇ) that the ancients have handed it down (παραδεδωκας, have had a tradition) as being of Paul. Who wrote the epistle [γράφων, penned it or committed it to writing], God [only] knows with certainty; but the report which has reached us is, that some affirm it to be written by Clement, bishop of Rome; and some by Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts."† Euseb. Hist Ecc. VI. 25. Lard. IV. p. 235.

This passage has been appealed to for different purposes, by writers of different sentiments; but omitting an account of what others have said, let us endeavor to elicit the sentiments of Origen, by considering this passage in connection with other passages to be found in his writings.

(1) It is plain that Origen felt the force of the objection against the authorship of Paul, drawn from the style and manner of the epistle, in the same way as his preceptor Clement had before done; and to meet this objection, he suggests a reason similar to that which Clement had suggested. Clement says that the epistle was first written in Hebrew, and then translated by Luke into Greek; and thus he endeavors to account for the supposed diversity of style between this epistle and those of Paul. But Origen does not appear to have at all supposed that it was written, at first, in Hebrew. He supposes

* Bleek translates, "so verdiene sie auch deshalb keinen Tadel!" i. c. it deserves no blame on this account: a cold negative enough for εἰδοκομίσας καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Is this being impartial?

† . . . . περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἐπιστολῆς εἰς ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὅμιλαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει τῇ χαρακτῆρῇ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἔπιγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τό ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τῷ ἀπόστολῳ, ὁμολογητῶς λατινὸν ἰδιωτήν εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τούτῳ τῇ φράσει. Ἀλλὰ ἔστω ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνδέει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικῆς, πάσα ἡ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνει φράσεις διαφορὰς ὁμολογητῖς ἐν. Πάλιν τὸ ἀν δι᾽ αὐτὸ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἑαυτής ἐστι, καὶ αὐτὸ διὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογομένων καὶ τούτῳ ἀν μηδενικῇ εἶναι ἀληθὲς τὰς ἐπὶ προσέχων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιστολῆς. Τούτων μὲν ἄτοιο ἑπιφρέω ἕρων ἐν τῇ ἕστω ἐπιστάμενος ἐπικοινωνίαν ἐν, τούτῳ μὴ γνώματα τοῦ ἀπόστολου ἡ ἐπίστολη ἀν, ἐπὶ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀποτελέσας τοῦτο εἰς ἑκατον. Εἰ τις συν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἄν Παύλου, αὐτὴ εὐδοκεῖται καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἄρχαι ἀντίθετα ἄν Παύλου, αὐτὴν παραδεδωκας. Τίς δὲ γράφει τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τὸ μὴ διεξάγεις δέδοις δὲ, διὰ ἐκ τῆς ἑκατον ἑκατον ἡ ἔπος ἐπὶ τῷ ἑκατον, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ἑκατον καὶ τὰς Πράς... s. Ecc. Hist. VI. 25.
it to have been for substance delivered, dictated, or spoken by the
apostle, and penned down by some one who used his own diction,
commenting as it were on the words of his master. In this way, the
sentiments are regarded as apostolic and authoritative; while the dicion
is considered as arising from one not an apostle; and thus the full
credit of the epistle is maintained, while the objection to this credit,
drawn from the diversity of style, is apparently removed.

(2) It should be noted, that Origen does not say, whether the ob-
jections against the epistle to the Hebrews being the production of
Paul, arose from his own mind, or from the allegations of others.
Most probably from both sources. He appears to have had a full
conviction, that there was a diversity of style in it; and to remove
the difficulty about the credit of the epistle, which arose in his mind
from this circumstance, he resorted to the supposition just mentioned.
We can have no reasonable doubt, that at this time there were some,
who alleged that this epistle did not come from the hand of Paul; as
Pantaenus and Clement had, before this, made an effort to remove
objections against it.

(3) The very manner in which Origen attempts to remove ob-
jections, shows that he gave full credit to the apostolic origin of the epis-
tle. ‘The thoughts,’ he avers, ‘are apostolic, and worthy of an apo-
stle; but the diction is derived from another.’ And when he says, It
is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as belonging
to Paul; and then adds, ‘but who wrote it, God knows — some attributing
it to Luke, and some to Clement;’ nothing can be plainer, than
that he means to suggest, that he considered it to be uncertain who
 penned it, i.e., reduced it to writing; for he had just asserted that the
thoughts were suggested by the apostle, while the diction arose from
him who reduced them to writing. To suppose (as has been sup-
posed) that Origen means to assert, that God only knows from whom
the sentiments of the epistle sprung, or who the author in this sense
was, is to suppose that Origen has directly contradicted himself in the
very same paragraph. Therefore,

(4) When Origen says that some attribute it to Luke, and some to

* Origen (in Matt. xxiii. 27. Opp. T. iii.) seems to intimate, that there
were some who doubted the authority of our epistle. ‘Sed pone aliquem
abdicare epistolam ad Hebraeos, quasi non Pauli’ Yet this may be nothing
more than hypothetical. Bleck builds more on this than it is capable of sup-
porting, when he deduces from it (p. 103) the conclusion, that our epistle was
not everywhere received as Paul's. The fact may have been true; and
doubtless it was: but the ground of proof lies not, with certainty, in the
passage of Origen now in question.

But there is another passage of Origen (Epist. ad Africanum), in which
he speaks of the Βούλημαί τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῆς Ἐπιστολῆς ὡς οὐ Παύλου γεγ-
ρωμένην, the inclination of those who reject the epistle as not being Paul's;
and he then adds: "With one who does this, other reasons must be pri-
vately employed, in order to show that Paul was the author of the epistle."
Clement, the probability clearly is (from the connection in which this stands), that he means to say, 'Some attribute the penning or writing of it down, to the one or the other of these persons.' If this be so (and it appears to be very plain that it is), it only serves to show, that Origen did not consider the tradition about Luke and Clement as well established; and especially so, as the traditioinary reports were not agreed respecting the amanuensis or recorder of the epistle. It is possible, I acknowledge, that Origen meant to say, that some attributed the real authorship to Luke or Clement; although I cannot think that this opinion has any probable support in the passage of Origen now under consideration, if it be explained by any just rules of interpretation. Bleek, however, with some other critics, have taken it for granted that Origen did speak here of real authorship. But besides the absolute prohibition to do this, contained in the preceding context, it is clear that in ancient times, Origen's words, or rather the story about Luke and Clement, were not understood in such a way. E. g., Euthalius (f. 460), who knew of doubts about the Pauline origin of our epistle says, when speaking of this epistle, πρὸς γὰρ Ἑβραίους τῆς σφῶν διαλέξει γραφείων, ὑστερον μεδερμηνεύων ηνελεγε ται, ὡς μὲν τινες, ὑπὸ Δουκά, ὡς δὲ οἱ πλλοί, ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος, i. e., for the epistle being written in the Hebrew dialect, it was afterwards interpreted, as some say, by Luke; as many others, by Clement. Euthalius, it is to be noted, was a resident at Alexandria. Here then is evidently the very ἱστορία of Origen; and can we well suppose that this was not the usual and traditionary interpretation of it? See the passage in Zacagni Collect. Monum. Vet. etc., p. 523, and in Bleek I. p. 148. See also the remarks on the testimony of Eusebius, No. 3.

(5) It is clear that Origen ascribes his own belief, and the belief of the churches of his time, that the epistle was Paul's, to ancient tradition. "If any church receive this epistle as Paul's, let it be commended for this; for it is not without reason, that the ancients (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι) have handed it down (παραδεδώκασι) as Paul's." Here two things are asserted; first, that the tradition of its being Paul's is well grounded, in Origen's view, οὐκ εἰκῇ παραδεδώκασι; and secondly, that it is an ancient tradition, for οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες so thought and said.

That Origen was not in doubt about the epistle, as he has been represented to be, may be clearly evinced from other passages in his writings, even if the one already examined were to be regarded as dubious. For example; Comm. on John (II. p. 18. ed. Huet.), "According to this the apostle says,"* and then quotes Heb. v. 12. That by this apostle he meant Paul, other passages in the same commentary clearly show; e. g., "In the epistle to the Hebrews the same Paul

* Κατὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, οὐ, κ. τ. λ. loc. cit.
says,” * p. 56; again, “Paul in the epistle to the Hebrews,”† p. 162. In his book against Celsus, he says: “For it is written by Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians . . . and the same apostle says;” ‡ and then he quotes Heb. v. 12, contra Cels. p. 482. ed. Bened. In his treatise on prayer, he quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, as an epistle of the same apostle who wrote the epistle to the Ephesians, De Oratone I. p. 250. ed. Bened. In a homily preserved in a Latin translation, he says: “Paul himself the greatest of the apostles, writing to the Hebrews says;” § and then he quotes Heb. xii. 18, 22, 23. He also appeals to this epistle as auctoritate in establishing any position; e. g., Comm. in John ii. 57, 58, ed. Huet.

In Princip. III. 1. § 10, Heb. vi. 7, 8, is cited as “an example which the apostle used in the [epistle] to the Hebrews.” Ibid. IV. 18, he twice cites words out of Heb. viii. 4, which are inserted as Paul’s words among other passages taken from his acknowledged epistles. Ibid. IV. 22, he cites Heb. xii. 22, seq. with Gal. iv. 26, ascribing both to the same apostle. The same passage he cites as the words of the apostle, Lib. contra Cels. VII. 29. In Praefat. ad Princip. he cites Heb. xi. 25, 26 as the express testimony of Paul. In his Principia (Vol. I. edit. de la Rue) are other testimonies of the same nature, on pp. 55, 56, 68, 82, 92, 141, 187. In his Exhort. ad Martyr., he quotes Heb. x. 32—36 as Paul’s. In Homil. I. in Jerem., he quotes Heb. i. 4 as the words of the apostle. Ibid. Homil. IX., he cites Heb. vi. 1 as the words of the apostle; also in Homil. XVIII., Heb. viii. 5 is cited. In Praef. in Johan. [ed. Huet. II. p. 2], Heb. iv. 14 is cited in the same way. Ibid. 22, the same passage is again cited, in the same way. Ibid. Tom. III. p. 64, he says, Kai ὁ Παύλος φησίν, quoting Heb. xi. 16. In Tom. IX. p. 140, he ascribes Heb. viii. 5 to the apostle; as also Heb. ix. 23. In Tom. X. p. 162, he ascribes Heb. xii. 22, 23, to Paul. Tom. xxxii. p. 416, he cites Heb. i. 3, as the words of Paul. In Homil. VII. in Jos., he ascribes fourteen epistles to Paul (which of course included our epistle.)

These testimonies can leave no doubt what the opinion of Origen was, as to the real authorship of the epistle, however he might account for what he deemed the peculiar coloring of the style. It is surely quite a subordinate question, Who was the amanuensis or translator of Paul? The important question is, Did the sentiments originate from him? Is he the real author of them? If Origen has not developed his opinion respecting these questions, beyond all doubt, I know not that it is in the power of language to do this. If he has not most ex-
explicitly averred, that the then ancient tradition taught this, and for good reason, I am unable to conceive how he could have averred it.

(6) Let us ask, how far back testimony must have gone, in order to be ancient in Origen's time? Nothing can be weaker than the assertion, that Origen refers, in his ἄρχαὶ τῶν ἀλτεῶν, to Clement and Pantaenus; both of whom were his contemporaries, and lived until he was about thirty years of age. Pantaenus died about 211, as Jerome affirms; Clement, about A. D. 217 or 220; and Origen was born A. D. 184 or 185. Now as Origen lived but little more than a century from the apostolic age, nothing can be plainer, than that the οἱ ἄρχαὶ τῶν ἀλτεῶν must mean, either those who were conversant with the apostles, or at least the generation succeeding them. This not only confirms what I have already endeavored to prove, from Clement of Rome, from the testimony of the Italic and Syriac versions, and from Pantaenus and Clement, viz., that the epistle to the Hebrews was canonical in the primitive age of the church; but it shows, beyond reasonable doubt, that Pantaenus and Clement believed Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, in common with the churches of their times, on the ground of ecclesiastical tradition, and not from their own conceit, or their own prejudices in favor of Alexandrine notions.

(7) It appears that Origen was strongly impressed with the conviction, that the style of the epistle to the Hebrews was different from the usual one of Paul. Yet so firm was his conviction that the epistle for substance did originate from Paul, that he has not only often ascribed it directly to him obiter, but given us at large his views, viz., that he considered Paul as the author of the thoughts or ideas. At the same time he endeavors to account for it, without prejudice to this opinion or to church tradition, that the costume of the epistle is not Pauline, by supposing a disciple of Paul to have recorded the conceptions of his master in his own language. That Origen should have adhered to what he declares to be the tradition of the ancients respecting the author of this epistle, under such circumstances, and beset with such doubts, exhibits in a most striking manner the strength of his convictions, and the weight of tradition in its favor.

(8) The allegation made by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, that Origen conceded the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul's, from forbearance to the prejudices of the church at Alexandria, and out of love to the allegory which is in it, the credit of which he would wish to defend, has no real support. In regard to his prejudices in favor of the church at Alexandria, we cannot suppose them to have been very strong; for he was banished from this place, in the midst of his public labors, when he was about 48 years of age, and he spent the last 22 years of his life principally at Cesarea and in its neighborhood, never returning again to Alexandria. Yet in works published long after he resided at Cesarea, he ascribes to Paul the epistle to the Hebrews. And in regard to the allegory of this epistle, if this were the principal reason...
son for receiving it into the canon, then why did he not also receive the epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas; and many other pieces of a similar nature, in which the ancient church abounded? We may well be permitted to ask, indeed, why should we ascribe any other motive to Origen for receiving this epistle, than what he declares to have been a sufficient and commendable one in the churches, viz., that the ancients, not without reason, had handed it down as Paul's?

The opinion of the church at Alexandria appears to have been uniformly the same, after the age of Origen. I shall very briefly notice it here, as testimony later than his, from this quarter, can amount but to little more than proof, that the opinions of himself and his predecessors continued to be held without variation. Besides, it is a matter of general accord, that no doubts existed in the churches here, after the time of Origen, in regard to the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who flourished about A. D. 247, attributed the epistle to Paul; and he quotes it as his, apud Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 41. So did Hierax, probably a teacher in the celebrated Christian school at Alexandria, about 282. It was received as Paul's by Peter, about 300, who was bishop of Alexandria, and died as a martyr under Diocletian, Roux. Relig. III. p. 333. About the same time, Hierax or Hierakas, at Leontopolis, in Egypt, appeals to the epistle as Paul's, Epiphan. Haeres. LXVII. No. 2.

It was received as Paul's by Alexander, bishop in the same city, about 318, Theod. H. Ecc. I. 3; by Antonius, a contemporary of Alexander, and special patron of the order of monks in Egypt, Galland. Biblioth. Pat. IV. 665; by the celebrated Athanasius, bishop of the same place, about 326, Opp. I. 767, where this father recites the whole catalogue of canonical books, both of the Old and New Testament, and assigns fourteen epistles to Paul, arranging the epistle to the Hebrews before those to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. Bleek acknowledges that this father never once intimates a doubt about the Pauline origin of our epistle, nor that he had ever heard any doubt concerning it suggested by others, either in Egypt, or from any other quarter.

To the distinguished persons in Egypt may be added, of those who fully believed Paul to be the author of our epistle, Orizesis, about 350, Galland. Bib. Pat. V. 40; Marcus Diadochus, probably a bishop in the last half of the fourth century, ibid. V. 242; Didymus, the learned teacher of Jerome and Rufin, and master of the catechetical school at Alexandria, about 370, Galland. Bib. Pat. VI. 313; Macarius, a contemporary of Didymus, and surnamed the elder or the great, Galland. Bib. Pat. VII. 178; Marcus, surnamed Eremita, Galland. VIII. 3 seq.
who contends against certain views of the priesthood of Melchizedek, for the support of which an appeal was made to the epistle to the Hebrews, vii. 1 seq., and yet Marcus does not once call in question the authority of the epistle, or intimate that there were any doubts concerning it; Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, 385—412, Galland. Bibl. VII. 603 seq.; Cyril, the successor of Theophilus, 412—444, a distinguished man, Opp. I. pp. 61, 63, et passim, who, in his controversy with Nestorius respecting the separation of the human and divine natures of Christ, often appealed to the epistle to the Hebrews, and never once intimates that there were any doubts about the genuineness or authenticity of the epistle; Isiodorus Pelusiota, Opp. I. ep. 7. 94. 444, et al. in loc.

I cannot sum up the whole of the Alexandrine testimony better than in the words of Bleek, to whom I acknowledge my indebtedness for several valuable additions, which I have here made, to my original work on the testimony of the Alexandrine or Egyptian church.

"We find it confirmed, then, on all sides, that since the time of Origen, in the Alexandrine and Egyptian churches, the belief that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews was universal, and met with no gainsayers. Constantly do we find this epistle made use of by writers, as being of Pauline origin; and this without the expression of the least doubt on the part of any, or without manifesting any fears that doubts of this nature could be suggested by others," I. p. 142.

One thing more I must say, before I quit the present topic. In the ancient Christian churches, no school of theology flourished so early, none was ever so celebrated as that of Alexandria. None ever had such distinguished and liberal minded and learned teachers. Here criticism first assumed a form, and ventured on claiming its rights. How can Bleek and others account, then, for such views as prevailed here, in respect to the origin of the epistle to the Hebrews? It is a difficult problem indeed; above all it is so, when we consider the proximity of Egypt to Palestine, and the constant intercourse between the two countries. How came Pantaenus and Clement, who had travelled over most of the Christian world, to adopt such views as they did respecting our epistle?

To all these questions, it does seem to me, only one probable answer can be given; and this is, that general tradition among the churches everywhere, at this time, or nearly everywhere, assigned the authorship of the epistle to Paul.

§ 8. Testimony of the Eastern Churches.

From Egypt let us now repair to the eastern region, and see what the tradition of the churches was in that quarter.

We have already seen that Justin Martyr, a native of Samaria,
quotes from our epistle about 140. After Justin, there were no considerable writers in this part of the church, whose works are still extant, until the time of Eusebius. Methodius, however, bishop first of Olympus, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, seems to ascribe this epistle to Paul, about 292, Lard. VII. 261. His words, after quoting Rom. vii. 14, are these: [The apostle] τὰς εἰκόνας ζυμερείχων τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν, with a seemingly evident reference to Heb. x. 1; although Bleek says (p. 144) that they are offendar (evidently) nothing more than the words of Methodius himself. How this is evidently the case, when the resemblance to Heb. x. 1 (σκίαν . . . τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν) is so great, I am not able to perceive. Another passage still more evident, may be seen in Lardner; ubi supra. The epistle was probably received as Paul's by Pamphilus, presbyter at Cesarea, about 294; as it stands in the midst of Paul's epistles, in a manuscript copied from one of Pamphilus, id. VII. 325.

The letter sent out by the Council at Antioch, in respect to Paul, of Samosata (about 264), probably written by Malchion a presbyter of Antioch (Hieron. Catal. 71), contains passages which are cited from our epistle, and one of which is directly ascribed to the same apostle who wrote the epistle to the Corinthians, Euseb. H. Ecc. VII. 30. Bleek acknowledges that this shows the epistle to the Hebrews as standing in good credit at that time at Antioch [and of course with the bishops assembled in the Council there], so that the Pauline origin of it had nothing to fear from any gainsaying of opposers. I. p. 146. See Routh Reliq. Sac. I. 477.

We know from the fact that the epistle to the Hebrews was included in the Peshito, that in Syria it was regarded as a canonical book in the second century.

Jacob, bishop of Nisibis, also (about 325), repeatedly quotes the epistle to the Hebrews as the production of an apostle; Iterum apostolus dicit, quoting Heb. iv. 9, 11; Sicut beatus apostolus, quoting Heb. xi. 15, 16; see Galland. Bib. Pat.-V. I. seq.

Ephrem Syrus, as all confess, abundantly ascribes this epistle to Paul; and this celebrated father was a disciple of Jacob of Nisibis.

After him, there is no doubt on the part of any, so far as I know, that all the different parties in the Syrian churches acknowledged the canonical authority and apostolical origin of the epistle to the Hebrews.

But the most important testimony from the Eastern church (next after that of Origen, who lived at a period so much earlier, and spent in Palestine the most important part of his life, viz., the last twenty years of it), remains to be recited. I refer to the testimony of Eusebius of Cesarea, the well known historian of the church, who has taken so much pains to collect evidence from all quarters respecting the canon of Scripture. I shall produce his testimony in a collected view, in order to facilitate the comparison of it; and then subjoin a few remarks.
Lib. III. ch. 3. "Fourteen epistles are clearly and certainly Paul's; although it is proper to be known, that some have rejected that which is written to the Hebrews, alleging, with the church at Rome, that it is spoken against as not belonging to Paul."* A little after this, in the same book, ch. 25, he reckons among the books of Scripture, which he calls ὑμολογούμενοι (i.e., not contradicted or gainsayed, viz., by such authority as to create any doubts, or to any considerable extent in the church), the epistles of Paul; in which, beyond all question, he includes the epistle to the Hbrews; for he afterwards particularizes the epistle of James, of Jude, 2 Pet., and 2d and 3d John, as those books which are ἀντιλεγόμενοι, i.e., called in question, contradicted.† Yet in VI. 13 he seems to intimate that, in some sense at least, this epistle was among the ἀντιλεγόμενοι, as he mentions it along with Wisdom, Sirach, the epistle of Barnabas, of Clement, and of Jude. In the same book, ch. 38, after saying that Clement of Rome had made many extracts from the epistle to the Hebrews, he adds: "Wherefore, not without reason this epistle is reckoned among the writings of Paul. For when Paul had written to the Hebrews, in their vernacular language, some say that Luke made a translation of it, and some that this Clement did, of whom we have been speaking."‡

In Lib. VI. ch. 20 he mentions, that "Caius in a dispute against Proclus, held at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, blames the temerity and audacity of his opponents in composing new writings, and mentions only thirteen epistles of Paul, not numbering that which is inscribed to the Hebrews. Moreover, even to the present time, this epistle is reckoned by some of the Romans, as not belonging to Paul."§

In Eusebius we meet with the first ecclesiastical writer, who has

‡ Ὄτε ἦν τῆς Ἑβραίως πολλὰ νομίσα παράδειγμα, ἦδε δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεῖμα ρήτορος ταύταν δὲ αὐτὴς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα περίτερον δὲ μὴ νῦν ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμα. "Οδὲν εἰκότως ἢδοιν ἄρτος τοις λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεξέθηναι γραφαὶ τοῦ ἀναστόλου. Ἐβραῖοι γὰρ διὰ τῆς ταυτίσεως γλαύκας ἐγκατελέσθη τοῦ Ἐβραίου, οἱ μὲν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτῷ τοῦ Ὀμφαίῳ, οἱ δὲ τὴν ᾿Εσωτερικὴν ταῦταν αὐτὴν ὑμειναίσθησας λέγουσι τὴν γραφὴν. Lib. III. 38.
§ Ἡδε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαίου λογιστάτου ἀνδρὸς Βιλιάγους, ἐπὶ Ρομαίου κατὰ Ζεφυρίου, πρὸς Προκόλου τῆς κατὰ Φρόνημα αἰρέσεως ὑπομονοῦσα θεομονόμως ἐν τοῖς δὲ ἐννέας τὴν περὶ τὸ συμφόρημα καὶ τὴν γραφήν προτεστεῖν τοῖς καὶ τόλμας ὑπομονώμενοι, τῶν τοῦ οὐκ ἀναστόλου δεκατριήν μόνον ἑντελον μημοναδείκνυτε, τὴν πρὸς Ἐβραίους μὴ συναρμολογοῦσα τοῖς λοιποῖς. Ἐστι καὶ εἰς δέιγμα παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τίς ὡς, οὗ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀναστόλου τυγχάνειν. Lib. VI. 20.
designedly made out a full and regular catalogue of the canon of the New Testament; and who made extensive investigation, in regard to the opinions of the church respecting this subject. From a view of his testimony, collected and compared together, it is clear:

(1) That there were, in the East, some who doubted whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews; and that they appealed, in support of this opinion, to the church at Rome. It is clear too, that in the time of Zephyrinus (about 212), there were persons in the western church, and probably at Rome, who denied that this epistle was written by Paul; for Caius reckons only thirteen epistles of Paul, probably omitting that to the Hebrews. And that this denial continued down to the time of Eusebius, in the church at Rome (his words are, παρ’ Ῥωμαίων τισιν, by some of the Romans), is clearly signified by this historian.

(2) His assertion of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, is as unequivocal and strong as language can well make it. "Fourteen epistles" [of course the epistle to the Hebrews is included, there being but thirteen without it], "are clearly and certainly Paul’s προσηλωκαί καὶ σαφεῖς." And again, he reckons this epistle among the books which are ὁμολογούμενοι, i.e., generally recognized, admitted. These declarations Eusebius makes, with a full view of the objections urged against this epistle by some. It is clear then, that he did not consider those objections as respectable enough, or sufficiently extensive, or well grounded, to raise any serious doubt in his own mind about this matter, or to weigh at all against the current and general opinion of the church on this subject. Consequently, nothing can be more directly to the purpose than this testimony, for demonstrating the strength and generality of the opinion in the church, at the time of Eusebius, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews. For as Eusebius has been careful, even when asserting that the epistle is clearly and certainly Paul’s, to note that there are some who dissent from this opinion, and also to collect in various instances, accounts of disagreement in respect to it, it may be regarded as quite certain, that he viewed opposition to it as neither well founded, nor extensive enough to raise any serious doubts about the correctness of the common opinion of the churches.

(3) It is pretty evident that Eusebius had heard of the objections drawn from the style of the epistle, which Clement of Alexandria and Origen had before endeavored to answer. Eusebius thinks that Paul wrote it in Hebrew, and says that some attributed the translation of it to Luke, and some to Clement; while his own opinion is, that the translation is to be ascribed to the latter.

It will be recollected, now, that Origen, residing at the same place (Cesarea), had, nearly a century before, mentioned the very same report or tradition. The passage in Eusebius shows, therefore, the uniformity of the tradition; it serves also to show, that when Origen ad-
verts to it, he means to say (as I have above supposed him to say),
that God only knows who penned or wrote down the epistle; not who
was the author of the sentiments, for these he directly attributes to
Paul; just as Eusebius attributes the authorship to Paul, and the
diction to Clement.

(4) One thing more is evident from the testimony of Eusebius.
While he records, with fidelity, the fact that there were some in that
quarter of the church who doubted the Pauline origin of this epistle,
he tells us, at the same time, that those who deny it, alleged the ex-
ample of the church at Rome, in order to justify themselves in so doing.
The necessary implication of course is, that they could not support
themselves by any creditable example in the oriental churches.
Would they have made an appeal for support, to a church abroad at
so great a distance, if they could have found it at home and in their
own quarter? Most surely not; for at that period, the church of
Rome was inferior in credit to a number of other churches in the
East. The very nature of this appeal shows, that respectable support
for the denial of the Pauline origin of our epistle, could not be found
in the East.

(5) In regard to the passage quoted above (p. 99) from VI. 13, in
which Eusebius seems to rank the epistle to the Hebrews among the
ἀντίλεγόμενα; it would seem, on the whole, that he must here have
reference merely to the fact, that there were some persons who con-
tradicted the epistle; and the other quotations here exhibited show
that he was fully aware of this. His own opinion is too clearly and
positively given, to render it feasible to call it in question. Nor is it
probable that he has contradicted himself. The testimonies which will
be added in the sequel, will render this sufficiently plain.

Thus much for the direct and special testimony of Eusebius; which,
considering the nature of his researches and his fidelity in communica-
ting the results of them in respect to the Scriptural books, is of
greater weight than that of any other writer, in regard to establishing
the point that respects the canonical credit of the epistle to the He-
brews. We shall now see, that these direct and positive declarations
are indicative of a conviction, which all his works tend to confirm that
exhibit any quotations from the epistle to the Hebrews.

I), on Ps. II. p. 15, he says, περὶ τοῦ φήματος Παύλου, quoting Heb.
xxii. 22, and Gal. iv. 26. In the like manner he refers to these two
passages associated, and as the language of Paul, on pp. 191, 201, 313,
360, 388, 431, 481, 589. In the same way both these passages are
cited by him, in Essiam, xlix. 11; De eccl. Theol. II. 20. De mar-
tyr. Palaest. ch. 11. The passage in Heb. xii. 22 is also cited in pp.
49, 50, 437, 451, 645, and in Ess. xxv. 6; xl. 9. In p. 57, Heb. xi.
1 and 1 Cor. xiii. 13 are cited as words of the same apostle. In p.
101, Heb. iii. 13 are cited as the apostle's words; so p. 175, Heb. viii.
EASTERN CHURCHES.


These are evidence sufficient to show that when Eusebius seems to include our epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι (as has been mentioned above), he could not do this because he was doubtful in his own mind; or because there was any good reason on the part of others to doubt (for then how could he say, "Fourteen epistles are clearly and certainly Paul's?"), but simply because of the fact which he well knew, that there were some who did oppose the canonical credit, or at least the apostolical origin of our epistle.*

I deem it unnecessary to detail the testimony of writers in the oriental churches, subsequent to the time of Eusebius. I shall merely advert to them, because it is not denied by any respectable critics, that, subsequent to this period, the epistle to the Hebrews has ever been regarded in the East as Paul's. Even in the midst of all the Arian controversies which were agitated in Egypt and in the East, neither party, as such, appear to have called in question the authority and apostolical origin of the epistle to the Hebrews. It was only in later times, and after the catholic church began so often to appeal to Heb. I. for proof to establish the divine nature of Christ, that some of the Arian party began to call in question the authority of the epistle.

Archelaus, bishop of Mesopotamia, received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, about A. D. 300; as did the author of the Synopsis of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius, and written about 320; Adamantius, about 330; Cyril, of Jerusalem, about 348; the council of Laodicea, about 363, in their 60th Canon, directly ascribe fourteen epistles to Paul; Epiphanius, about 368; Basil, about 370; Gregory Nazianzen, about 370; Amphilochoi of Iconium, a contemporary of G. Nazianzen; Gregory of Nyssa, about 371; Titus, bishop of Bosstra, about 371; Diadore of Tarsus, about 378; Theodore, bishop of Mopsuesta in Cilicia, about 392; and Chrysostom, about 398. The apostolical canons (Can. 85) ascribe fourteen epistles to Paul; and

* It should be noticed here that Eusebius cites this epistle as "Pauline" in not less than 27 passages. Ebrard App. chap. IV. p. 399, and Biel, p. 149, sq., and Ann. 173.
they were probably reduced to their present shape during the latter half of the fourth century.

In addition to these personal testimonies (if I may thus characterize them), it should be stated, that the arrangement itself of the epistle to the Hebrews, in many ancient Codices and authors, shows that it was regarded as one of Paul’s epistles. In the catalogues of the sacred books by Athanasius, in the Synopsis ascribed to him, in the Canons of the Council of Laodicea, in Theodoret’s Commentary, in Euthalius (Zacagni, p. 548), in MSS. Cod. Alex., Vatican., Ephraemi, Coislin., in Codd. minusc. 16. 17. 22. 46. 47. 57. 71. 73, and some others, the epistle to the Hebrews stands next after 2 Thessalonians, i.e., in the midst of Paul’s epistles. The same arrangement is also found in some of the Coptic (Memphitic) MSS.

The position of the Hebrews in the canon has been made an objection to it; as if its length must necessarily have given it a place after those to the Corinthians. The fact that it was anonymous, was enough to occasion its being arranged after those to which the name of the author was affixed. Besides, matters of this kind in ancient times, were the result of obvious circumstances, or of accident, or even of caprice. E.g., Isaiah is placed by the Talmud after Jeremiah and Ezekiel; but by the Masorites, in the order in which it stands in our present bibles. So the books of the Hagiography are differently arranged, in different MSS., and in different countries. Yet all this determines no critical question of importance. And equally plain is it, that the arrangement of the epistle to the Hebrews can determine neither who the author was or was not, nor even who he was supposed to be. Only so far can we go safely, that those who put it in the midst of Paul’s epistles, did in all probability believe that it belonged to this apostle.*

Other testimonies might be named, which are mentioned in Lardner’s collection of testimonies, but it is superfluous. The object for which these have been adduced, is merely to show the unity and universality of the opinion in the oriental churches, that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, subsequently to the time of Eusebius on whose testimony I have already dwelt.

In fact, not a single writer of any respectability in the catholic church in all the East, has been produced, who rejected this epistle; an extraordinary circumstance, indeed, if the belief of its apostolic origin was not altogether a predominant one in Egypt, and throughout all the eastern world. Individuals in this part of the church there were,

* It should be noticed, too, that, as Ehrard says, “The epistle to the Hebrews, as is still evident from the numbering of the Kephalaia in the Cod. B., originally stood between the epistle to the Galatians and that to the Ephesians, and was not till a later period in the 4th century, placed after the epistle to the Thessalonians (as in Cvd. A. and C.), and still later, after the Pastoral epistles.”
who doubted or denied the authenticity of it. But that there was anything like a respectable or widely diffused party, who denied it, can be supported by no competent evidence whatever.

§ 9. Testimony of the Western Churches.

In the western churches the Pauline authorship of this epistle was not generally acknowledged from soon after the apostolic age until the beginning of the fourth century.

We have already seen, that Clement of Rome, at the close of the apostolic age, has frequently quoted this epistle, and in the same way and for the same purposes that he quotes other parts of the Scripture; and consequently we cannot entertain reasonable doubts, that he regarded it as a part of the sacred records, and according to the belief of Eusebius, as of Pauline origin, see Ecc. Hist. III. 38, and p. 75 above.

The first negative evidence to be found among the western churches respecting the question before us, is that of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, during the latter part of the second century. Neither the country from which he sprung, nor the time of his birth or death, are known with any certainty. He was a disciple of Polycarp, when very young; for he himself states that, when a child, he was a hearer of Polycarp, in hither Asia, V. 20.

Photius (fl. A. D. 858) tells us in his Bibliotheca, that Stephen Gobar, a writer of the sixth century, says that Irenaeus and Hippolytus, declare "the epistle to the Hebrews not to be Paul's," Col. 162. Eich. p. 519. Whence Gobar drew his conclusion, does not appear. In all the writings of Irenaeus now extant, no such assertion is contained; but then several of his writings are lost. That Irenaeus was acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, and that he has cited it in a work now lost, is directly testified by Eusebius; who says, that "he wrote a book of various disputations, in which he mentions the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting some expressions from them,"* but whether as Scripture, does not appear. Some critics have called in question this assertion of Gobar, and have supposed that it is only a conclusion which he drew, from the fact that Irenaeus had not quoted the epistle to the Hebrews in his works. On the whole, however, in the present state of evidence, it would seem that we ought to admit it as probable, that Irenaeus did not include the epistle to the Hebrews in his canon; but on what ground, is uncertain. It may indeed have been the case, that this epistle, originally addressed to Hebrews in Palestine, had not yet ob-

tained circulation and credit among that part of the church in Asia Minor, where Irenaeus lived when he was a youth. It is not improbable, too, that he went in early life, with Polycarp his teacher, to Rome; and that he remained there until he was sent to Lyons in France, where he became the successor of Pothinus in the bishoprick of that city. In this way it may be accounted for, that Irenaeus came to cherish doubts respecting the epistle to the Hebrews; which, we shall see, began to be somewhat extensively cherished in the Roman churches, during the latter half of the second century. *

At the same time one cannot but remark, that it appears quite singular, when Eusebius expressly mentions Irenaeus as having quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, that he should not, on this occasion or some other, have at all adverted to the fact of his having denied the Pauline origin of this epistle, if indeed such were the fact. This is the more singular, because Eusebius has devoted a chapter of considerable length, in his work, entirely to giving an account of the manner in which Irenaeus had mentioned the sacred books; and in this chapter there is not a word of Irenaeus quoted, respecting the epistle to the Hebrews, Ecc. Hist. V. 8.

Moreover Eusebius has evidently been careful and particular, on all occasions where the epistle to the Hebrews was specially treated of, to mention objections to it; or where persons of consideration in the church were named who rejected it, to state this fact. Eusebius also must have had the writings of Irenaeus in a more perfect state and much more complete, than Gobar who lived so long afterwards. And as Irenaeus was a writer for whom Eusebius evidently cherished a high respect, it is really very difficult to account for it, that he should not have once adverted to the opinion which Gobar affirms was held by Irenaeus.

The supposition that Irenaeus did not acknowledge our epistle, is, however, somewhat strengthened by the united asseveration of Gobar and Photius himself (Eichhorn p. 519), that Hippolytus (whom Photius calls a disciple of Irenaeus, and who probably flourished about A. D. 220) asserts of the epistle to the Hebrews, that it is not Paul's, Eichh. p. 520. This Hippolytus is called, by Eusebius, a bishop of some place; but neither he, nor Jerome, knew its name. The probable opinion is, that it was Portus Romanus, Lard. III. 89, seq. The assertion in question was made, as Photius states, in a book of Hippolytus against heresies, which he compiled from a work of Irenaeus. But as the work is lost, all that remains is the statement of Gobar and Photius; which seems, however, to be entitled to some credit.

* It is also possible that Irenaeus, although he knew of the authority in which the epistle was held in the East, refrained from quoting it as authoritative out of regard for the prejudice against it in the West; especially as he would have little occasion to quote a treatise against Judaism, against the gnostics whom he opposed. — Ep.
In accordance with this denial of the Pauline origin of our epistle, is the testimony of Eusebius in respect to Caius, a presbyter at Rome, who flourished probably about A.D. 210. See the passage quoted above, pp. 99, 100. Jerome also states, that Caius denied the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul's; De Vir. illus. voc. Caius.

Other evidence also is adduced, that doubts whether the epistle to the Hebrews was Paul's had already begun at Rome, and in the west, towards the close of the second century. Muratorius (Antiq. Ital. medii Aevi, Tom. III. p. 854), has published a fragment of an anonymous author, who probably lived near the close of the second century, that contains a catalogue of books which he deemed canonical, and which lacks the epistle to the Hebrews, those of James, Peter, and 3d John; while it contains some apocryphal books. Speaking of Paul's epistles, this anonymous writer says, "Fertur [epistola] etiam ad Laodicenses. Alia apud Alexandrinos Pauli nomine ficta ad haereticam Marcionis, et alia plura; quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest, sal enim cum melle misceri non congruit." That is, "An epistle is in circulation addressed to the Laodiceans. Another is current with the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, for the sake of promoting the heresy of Marcion, and many other things; which the catholic church cannot receive, for it is not proper to mingle gall with honey."

Some critics have supposed, that by the alia apud Alexandrinos, this writer means the epistle to the Hebrews, which was received by the Greeks or Alexandrians. But it is very doubtful whether our epistle to the Hebrews is meant, as this anonymous writer admits several books not canonical into his catalogue, and excludes several others which are so. Besides, he mentions another fictitious epistle, viz., that to the Laodiceans. Why may not this epistle among the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, in favor of the Marcion heresy, be wholly different from our epistle to the Hebrews; which has not, and never had, the name of Paul affixed to it? And then how could this writer say, forged in favor of the Marcionite heresy? a heresy which denied the divine origin of the Jewish religion, and rejected the God of the Old Testament; two fundamental articles on which our epistle to the Hebrews is built. Nothing could be more directly opposed to Marcion than this epistle. So that if he did mean to designate it, his consummate ignorance of the nature of its contents forbids us to attach any weight of importance to his testimony.

It may be added, that Zimmermann, Dissert. de Fragmento a Muratorio repertum, etc., 1805, and De Wette, Einleit. ins N. Test. § 21, Anmerk. c, have called in question the antiquity of this Fragment, and have assigned it to the fourth century.

But more definite and satisfactory evidence, that about the close of the second century, there were doubts among the western churches whether our epistle was of apostolic origin, may be adduced from the
works of Tertullian. This father says in his book De Pudicitia (c. 20), “There is an epistle of Barnabas inscribed to the Hebrews; therefore by a man of such authority, that Paul placed him next to himself in respect to abstinence; ‘Am I and Barnabas only without power to do this?’ And certainly this epistle of Barnabas is more received among the churches, than the apocryphal Pastor of adulterers,” [he means the Shepherd of Hermas]. “Warning therefore the disciples, that leaving the first principles,” etc. [quoting Heb. vi. 1, etc.]*

That Tertullian also alludes to the epistle to the Hebrews, in other passages, seems to me quite probable, from the instances of this nature produced by Lardner, II. 608—612. But it now appears, what credit he attached to this epistle. It is plain from the passage quoted, that he ascribed it to Barnabas; and not improbable, that the churches in his neighborhood, and perhaps at Rome, did the same at this period. It is also plain, that he does not ascribe full canonical credit to it, because he does not consider it as the work of an apostle; otherwise he would have vehemently urged its authority upon his opponents, as the passage which he quotes seems extremely apposite to his purpose, which was to prove that lapsed Christians could not again be received into the bosom of the church. That there was a division of opinion among the churches of his day in reference to this epistle, at least in the region where he lived, seems to be plainly indicated, by his saying that this epistle was more correct, and of more authority in the churches, than the Shepherd of Hermas; which latter, however, we know to have been early admitted as part of the sacred records, by a number of churches in the West.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, comes next as a witness for the negative of our question. He flourished about A. D. 248, i. e., the next generation after Tertullian, who died about A. D. 220. From Cyprian, however, no direct testimony can be confidently adduced. There is but one passage hitherto produced from him, which seems to have a bearing on our question. It is as follows: “The apostle Paul who was mindful of this authorized and well-known number [he is speaking of the number seven], writes to seven churches.”† This would of course exclude the epistle to the Hebrews, as there are seven churches addressed beside this. But still, I cannot consider this test-


† Et apostolus Paulus, qui hujus numeri legitimi et certi meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. De Exhort. Mart. cap. XI.
timony so decisive as Lardner, Eichhorn, and Bleek do, in respect to Cyprian’s canon. For as the epistle to the Hebrews has no address, Cyprian, it is easy to suppose, may have had reference only to such of Paul’s epistles as have an address to churches prefixed; which are seven in number.

I am the more confirmed in this opinion, because I find that the epistles of Paul are mentioned in the same way by councils and by fathers, who certainly admitted the epistle to the Hebrews to be his. For example: the council at Hippo, A. D. 393, and the council at Carthage, A. D. 397 (at both of which Augustine was present, and acted a conspicuous part), in the catalogue of canonical books which they set forth in their Canons, make mention of Paul’s epistles in the following manner, viz., Pauli apostoli epistolae tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebraeos, una; Mansi Collect. Concil. III. 924, 821. Yet another council at Carthage, in A. D. 419, who accorded with the two councils already mentioned, reckon fourteen epistles of Paul. In like manner Isidorus Hispalensis (about 500), mentions the epistles of Paul. His words are remarkable, and deserve to be cited here as throwing light on the subject in question. “Paulus apostolus quadruplo epistolos praedicationis sui perstrinxit stylum. Ex quibus aliquas propter typum septiformis ecclesiae septem scripsit ecclesias, conservans potius nec excedens numerum sacramentorum, propter septiformem sancti Spiritus efficaciam. Scripsit autem ad Romanos, Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., Thess., et ad Hebraeos. That is, “The apostle Paul used his pen in fourteen epistles of his preaching. Among these, some he wrote to seven churches by way of similitude to the sevenfold church, preserving, or rather not exceeding, the sacred number, on account of the sevenfold efficacy of the Holy Spirit.” [He probably alludes here to such an efficacy as is described in Is. xi. 2.] Now he wrote to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and to the Hebrews,” Opp. Tom. V. p. 215.

Is it not singular enough, that the number seven should not only be retained here, while eight epistles are expressly recounted, but that the writer should formally give a reason why Paul did not exceed the number seven? What can be plainer, then, than that the mode of reckoning seven might be usual, even where more were ascribed to Paul? The simple reason of this is implied in what Isidore says, viz., that the number seven being the express number where Paul is named, and according with the views in ancient times respecting sacred numbers, it was a usual thing to speak of Paul’s epistles to seven churches; and this would tally, of course, with John’s epistles to the same number of churches, in Apoc. I—III. See also the testimony adduced in connection with that of Augustine below.

The fact, however, that Cyprian has nowhere quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, considering how many writings he has left behind him,
and how many occasions he had to quote the sentiments contained in it, is a circumstance that seems to render it probable, either that he was unacquainted with the epistle, or that he did not admit its canonical authority, or that others doubted it so much that he did not deem it expedient to quote it.

Novatian, a presbyter of Rome (A. D. 251), the founder of the Novatian sect, is supposed by some critics not to have received the epistle to the Hebrews. This inference is drawn from the fact, that he does not appeal to it, in behalf of the sentiments which he maintained respecting the exclusion of lapsed heretics from readmission to the church; nor does he appeal to it in his book De Trinitate, nor in his treatise De cibis Judaicis, where one would naturally suppose that he would have direct and urgent occasion to appeal to it.

There are passages in his writings, however, in which he seems to refer to the epistle to the Hebrews, e. g., "It is asserted of Christ, by prophets and apostles, that he sitteth at the right hand of the Father;"* comp. Heb. i. 3. Again, "Christ is found to be greater and better not than one angel only, but than all the angels."† The last of these passages in particular, looks very much like a quotation from Heb. i. 4.

Be this as it may, the silence of any writer, at the best, can never amount to anything more than a kind of negative argument in respect to any book whatever. Who can with certainty tell, whether doubts about the authenticity of the book, or lapse of memory, or some other cause, occasioned the silence in question?

Be the case as it may respecting Novatian himself, his followers, about thirty years afterwards, admitted the epistle in question; as is clear from the testimony of Philaster (about A. D. 380) on this subject, who states that they received the usual canon of the Old and New Testament, Philast. Haeres. 82.

Victorinus, bishop of Petavio in Pannonia, near the close of the third century, in his book De fabrica Mundi, mentions septem ecclesiae apud Paulum, Routh. Reliq. Sac. III. 233 seq. In another supposed work of his, Comm. in Apocalypsin (Bibl. Max. Pat. I. p. 589 seq.), he expressly states the seven churches to which the apostle wrote, omitting of course that of the Hebrews. But as the genuineness of this work has been strongly suspected, and for pretty cogent reasons, much weight cannot be attached to this testimony. Even if its genuineness be admitted, the mention of seven churches would not seem to prove anything; see above, p. 107 seq.

In addition to this it may be remarked, that Lardner, in his collections from this same Victorinus, has adduced some passages which tend

---

† Qui non uno, sed omnibus angelis et major et melior inventur. Ibid. c. 20.
very much to show, that Victorinus was acquainted with our epistle
and imitated its language.

Phoebedius, bishop of Agen in Gaul, about 385, in his Lib. contra
Arianos, does not appeal to the epistle to the Hebrews. But then, as
he seems principally to rely on the testimony of John relative to the
subject of which he treats, nothing very satisfactory can be deduced
from this. See his works in Galland. Bib. Pat. V.

The like is the case with Zeno, bishop of Verona, about 360, who
in his ninety Sermones does not cite the epistle to the Hebrews, Gall-
land. V. The commentary on the epistles of Paul by an unknown
author (which was once ascribed to Ambrose, but now to Ambrosiaster,
a mere fictitious name for a person unknown), probably written dur-
ing the latter half of the fourth century, does not quote from the epis-
tle to the Hebrews by ascribing it expressly to Paul; but he clearly
quotes from it as Scripture; e. g., in epistola ad Hebraeos scriptum est,
quia Levi, etc., quoting H.eb. vii. 9, etc.

Optatus, bishop of Mileve, about 364—375, in his book De Schis-
mae Donatistarum, does not quote the epistle to the Hebrews.

This is all the negative testimony that I have been able to find, in
the churches of the west, previously to A. D. 400; excepting what is
implied in some of the statements made by a few of the Latin writers,
to whom I shall advert in the sequel.

We have already seen in the passage cited from Tertullian, an in-
timation of a difference of opinion among the western churches in
respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, as if some received and some
rejected it. On the other hand, Lactantius, about 306, who does not
often quote Scripture, at least with any good degree of accuracy,
seems to me to have some indubitable references to the epistle to the
Hebrews, which Lardner has drawn out at length (VII. 185—188);
but as they only seem to recognize the authority of the epistle, but do
not ascribe it to Paul, I shall not adduce them here. I cannot, how-
ever, think it to be candid in Bleek, to aver that these references are
no ground for supposing Lactantius to have thought differently from
others in the Roman church, on the subject of our epistle. If others
refrained from quoting it, where it would have been greatly to their
purpose, and Lactantius did not refrain, does this indicate no differ-
ence in opinion?

The epistle to the Hebrews was clearly received as Paul's by Hilary,
bishop of Poictiers, about A. D. 354; by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari,
about 354; by Victorinus, a famous rhetorician at Rome, about 360;
by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, about 374; by Philaster, bishop of
Breccia, in Italy, about 380; by Gaudentius his successor, about 387;
and by Ruffinus, about 397. Bleek has been careful to note, that
Hilary, Lucifer, and Victorinus, very seldom make use of the epistle
to the Hebrews; yet the instances of quotation from these authors are
of the most unequivocal nature, although few. Such being the case,
why may it not be that others have omitted to quote it at all, in such works of theirs as are still extant, and yet have believed it to be of Pauline origin? and why should so much stress be laid on the mere omitting to quote it?

In regard to others of the authors above mentioned, it is clear that they cite from the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul’s, and argue from it against opponents, just as though they neither knew of, nor expected, any opposition to its apostolical authority. Such is the case with Ambrose. Philaster, although he shows clearly that he knew there were some who admitted but thirteen epistles of Paul, argues in a way which proves that this opinion, in his view, was altogether unfounded; and such is the case with others.

But the testimony of Augustine and Jerome, whose influence appears to have been effectual in re-establishing the credit of the epistle to the Hebrews among the western churches, deserves to be adduced here, as it serves to show that the Latin churches had not been united in respect to the point in question.

Jerome, in his epistle to Dardanus, says: “This is to be maintained, that this epistle which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is not only received by the churches of the East as the apostle Paul’s, but has been, in past times, by all ecclesiastical writers in the Greek language; although most [Latin]s think that Barnabas or Clement was the author. And it matters not whose it is, since it belongs to some ecclesiastical man, and is daily commended by the reading of it in the churches. But if the custom of the Latins does not receive it among the canonical writings, etc.”* Again; “Among the Romans, it is not received down to the present time as an epistle of Paul.”† This general assertion seems to mean only, that such is, or has been, the predominant custom among the Romans; for in his epistle to Evagrius, Jerome says, “which epistle to the Hebrews all the Greeks receive, and some of the Latinas.”‡ In his epistle to Paulinus he says, “Paul the apostle writes to seven churches; for his eighth epistle to the Hebrews is placed by most out of the number of his.”§ And again, in his Comm.

* Ilud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi apostoli Pauli suscipi; licet plerique eam vel Barnabae, vel clementis arbitrentur. Et nihil interesse eujus sit, cum ecclesiasticis viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quodsi autem Latinarum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, etc. Epist. ad Dardanum.
‡ Quam epistolam ad Hebraeos, omnes Graeci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latino- norum. Epist. ad Evagrium.
§ Paulus apostolus ad septem ecclesiis scribit; octava enim ad Hebraeos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur. Epist. ad Paulinum.
on Matt. xxvi. he says, "Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, although many of the Latins doubt concerning it, says, etc."*

As an epistle of Paul, or (which is the same) of an apostle, Jerome cites the epistle to the Hebrews in a multitude of passages; e.g. epist. 26 ad Pammach. Opp. Tom. I. 168 (edit. Paris 1643); adversus Jovin. I. 8, II. p. 323; ibid. II. 1, p. 361; ep. 84 ad Julian. Tom. I. p. 210; Comm. in Essaium, Tom. IV. p. 21; ibid. p. 28; and in a great many other places.

It is true that Jerome says, respecting our epistle, _Si quis vult recipere eam; Siue cujuscunque alterius eam esse putas; Si quis tamen ad Hebraeos epistolam suscipit_, etc.; and from these he draws the conclusion that Jerome, at times, speaks _doubtfully_ of the epistle. But what can be plainer, when all the testimony of Jerome is put together, than that the doubt implied in these clauses has no respect to his own opinion, but to that of others?

On a comparison of all these different passages, the following appears to be the result of Jerome's testimony:

1. That the majority of the Roman churches, in his time, did not receive the epistle as Paul's; "it is placed by most out of the number of Paul's epistles."

2. But some of the Latin churches did receive it still, in accordance with the custom of the Greek, i.e., oriental churches; _omnes Graeci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum._

3. The reception or rejection of this epistle, as described by Jerome, refers (one passage only excepted) to receiving it as Paul's, or refusing to admit Paul as the author. Jerome does not say that the Roman churches condemned it as spurious. Nay, that he does not mean to say this, is very plain from his own express words; for after averring that "most persons [Romans] regard it as written either by Barnabas or by Clement," he goes on to say, _nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur._ That is, it matters not about the person of the author, since he was an ecclesiastical man, and the churches every day read his epistle. But how much this exactly means, it is difficult to say; for the writer adds, _Quod si Latinorum consuetudo non recepit inter canonicas scripturas._

By canonical Jerome seems to understand _apostolical_, or having that authority which the writings of an apostle has. So much is plain, then, viz., that in the day of this writer, the churches made a distinction between writings _apostolic_ and _not apostolic_; and if so, it must have been by giving to the former a rank higher and more authoritative than the latter. On the whole, we must understand Jerome as meaning to aver, that while _some_ of the Latin churches admitted Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, and regarded this epis-

* Paulus, in epistola sua quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, lict de ea _multi Latinorum_ dubitent, etc., loc. cit.
tle as canonical in the highest sense, most of these churches doubted whether Paul was the author, and consequently gave the epistle but a secondary place in their canon; or rather, they read it with the other books of Scripture for edification, but (probably) did not appeal to it as authoritative.

The testimony of Augustine is direct, and sufficiently ample. In his book de Doctrina Christiana, II. 8, he mentions in his catalogue of canonical books, quatuordecem epistolas Pauli apostoli; among which he particularizes the one ad Hebraeos. It is true, that in the context here he speaks of a difference to be made among the canonical Scriptures themselves, the ὄμολογονμενον being preferable in point of weight, to the ἀντιλεγόμενον. Yet this distinction determines nothing respecting what he thought of the authorship of our epistle; certainly nothing against his own express opinion that it is Paul's.

In other places he speaks directly to the same purpose; e.g., Serm. 55. 5, Audiisi apostolum exhortantem etc., quoting Heb. xii. 7 seq. Serm. 82: 8, Audi ergo quid dicit apostolus etc., citing Heb. xiii. 4. Serm. 159. 1, ad Hebraeos dicit apostolus etc., quoting Heb. xii. 4. Serm. 177. c. 11, Heb. xiii. 5 is cited next after 2 Cor. viii. 13, and both as the declarations of the same apostle. Epist. ad. Rom. exposit. inchoat. § 19, de quo tune loquebatur apostolus... ut hoc significatavit apostolus, after quoting Heb. x. 26.

Often he cites the epistle to the Hebrews as a part of Scripture; e.g. Enarv. in Ps. 130. § 12, quos reprehendit Scriptura, dicens, etc., quoting Heb. v. 12. Contra Mamim. Arian. II. 25, apertum Scriptura, ubi legiitur etc., quoting Heb. ii. 9.

He naturally very often cites the epistle in question as "epistola quae scribitur ad Hebraeos; epistola quae est ad Hebraeos; or epistola quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos;" because the epistle is not only anonymous, but Augustine knew that some of the Latin churches doubted its authenticity, or at least, its Pauline origin. This was enough to lead him to references of such a nature as those before us, without his being at all doubtful, in his own mind, with regard to the question, Who was the author of the epistle?

Whilst Augustine implies that some of the Latin churches denied our epistle to be Paul's, he plainly shows that a great majority of these churches made such denial. He says, "Plures apostoli Pauli dicunt; quidam vero negant," De Civit. Dei. XVI. 22. In his book de Pec. cat. mer. et remisa. I. 27, he says of our epistle, "quaquam nonnullis incerta sit;" and in the same passage, he testifies, that "the authority of the oriental churches moves him," viz., to receive the epistle as canonical, because they admit it as such. In his Expos. inchoata Epist. ad Romanos, § 11, he speaks of the usual salutatory address at the beginning of the epistle as being purposely admitted, in order to avoid offence to the Jews; "unde," continued he, "nonnulli eam in canonem Scripturarum recipere timuerunt." From this declaration
it is not only, plain that some (not the majority, plures, as he says in the passage above), feared to receive our epistle as canonical; but that the church at this time insisted on evidence of apostolical origin or sanction, in order to receive any book of the New Testament as truly canonical.

Again, in his book de Fide, Spe, et Caritate, cap. 8, he says, “In epistola quippe ad Hebraeos, qua teste usi sunt illustres catholicæ regulae defensores, fides esse dicta etc.,” quoting Heb. xi. 1; which shows clearly, that in his view the more eminent men in the church admitted the canonical rank of this epistle.

It should be specially noted here also (although I have once before had occasion to advert to the following facts), that the Council of Hippo, A. D. 393; the third Council of Carthage, A. D. 397; and the fifth Council of Carthage, A. D. 419 (at all of which Augustine was present, and acted a conspicuous part); all decided in favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews; the first in Can. 36; the second in Can. 47; and the third in Can. 29. The first two speak of thirteen epistles of Paul, and then add, ejusdem ad Hebraeos una; the third, reckons fourteen.

The Council of Hippo held in A. D. 393; the third Council at Carthage, in A. D. 397; and the fifth Council at the same place, in A. D. 419 (see above), all receiving our epistle as Paul’s, mention that an appeal to the church at Rome is to be made, in confirmation of the canon which they had admitted. What then did they expect from the church at Rome? Denial, or confirmation? If the first, they would surely have proceeded doubtfully or hesitatingly in fixing their canon, so far as it regards our epistle; but this they have not done. Of course, they expected the latter.

That they had reason to expect this, would appear pretty plain from the fact, that Innocent I., bishop of Rome, in an epistle written to Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse (A. D. 405), at his request, and containing a catalogue of the canonical books, mentions among the rest, Pauli apostoli epistolæ quatuordecem, Galland. Bib. Pat. VIII. p. 583. How can it be doubtful, then, what the Latin churches in Italy generally thought, at this period, concerning the epistle to the Hebrews?

Yet this same Innocent (as Bleek concedes), in his other epistles does not quote the epistle to the Hebrews; and this, he candidly allows, must have been accidental. Why not then concede thus much, in regard to many other of the Fathers, whom he represents as rejecting our epistle, because they do not quote it in their works now extant?

As the epistle to the Hebrews appears to have been doubted or disputed, to some extent, in the Latin churches of the third century, and down into the fourth, the question very naturally occurs, What afterwards wrought such a change in the views of the Romish churches?
To this Bleek answers, "The authority and example of the oriental churches." But why did not these operate sooner on the churches of the West? Rome did not become more dependent in process of time upon the eastern churches, but less so. What wrought upon Hilary, and Lucifer, and Victorinus, and Ambrose, and Philaster, and Innocent? not to speak of Rufin, and Jerome, and Augustine. It is difficult to answer this question, except by the suggestion, that the temporary causes, which had occasioned doubt or dispute about our epistle, being removed and forgotten in the lapse of time, the general and prevalent sentiment of the Christian churches at last regained its full influence in the West. At any rate, those who represent the views of the ancient churches in general as doubtful and uncertain with regard to the epistle to the Hebrews, as Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette, Schulz, Bleek, and some others do, must find it a difficult problem indeed to solve, how the western churches could have come, so early and so generally as they did, to the opinion that the epistle to the Hebrews was of apostolical origin and authority.

That the opinion of Innocent, bishop of Rome at the beginning of the fifth century, was extensively cherished at the same place, and generally in the West near the close of this century, is evident from the fact, that in A. D. 494, Pope Galasius, at Rome, and a council of seventy bishops with him, included, in a catalogue of Canonical books which they made, fourteen epistles of Paul, to whom epistola una ad Hebraeos is attributed. Bleek himself admits, that this is "authentic testimony, not only for the opinion of the Romish churches at this period, put also for the other churches of the West," p. 234.

I have now traced the history of this epistle down to the fifth century, in the Egyptian, the Eastern, and the Western churches. Lower down it is altogether unnecessary to trace it; as all admit that it has had a general currency in the Christian churches everywhere, since that period; although a few individuals are not wanting, who have doubted or denied its Pauline origin.

§ 10. Result.

We now come to the Result of this investigation.

Among the Apostolic Fathers there is no direct evidence either for or against the Pauline authorship of the epistle. Clement of Rome, at the end of the first century, often quotes it, as we have seen, but never speaks of the author. So nothing can be found in Barnabas, Ignatius, or Polycarp, directly bearing upon the question of authorship.

The earliest and almost uniform testimony of the Eastern churches, including Greece and Egypt, is in favor of Paul as the author. There are indications that there were doubts in the minds of some few (it
could hardly have been otherwise, considering the anonymous character of the work), but not a single witness of any considerable respectability is named, who has given his voice, in this part of the church, for the negative of the question which we are considering. What Jerome avers, appears to be strictly true, viz., *ab ecclesiis Ori-entis et ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi apostoli Pauli suscipi.*

There seems to be some indirect evidence that it was received as Paul's in the earliest ages, but nothing at all decisive. If it were proved that this was so, the fact that we have no account of the change of belief would produce little difficulty, as we have so scanty records of the time.

In the Western churches, a diversity of opinion prevailed; although the actual quantity of negative testimony that can be adduced is not great. Yet the expressions of Jerome, as cited above, would seem to imply, that the *predominant* opinion of the Western churches, in his times, was in the negative; and, indeed, there cannot be much doubt that it was rejected by most in the West from some time near the second until the fourth century.

During the fourth century it became firmly established in the Western churches, not only as of canonical authority, but as among the authentic writings of Paul. The course of this change, as well as of the one previously alluded to, if such there was, cannot be traced by tangible evidence, though it is highly probable that the intercourse with the East, and the influence of the writings of Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, had much to do with it.

The preponderance of external testimony, when rightly weighed, should seem to be almost overwhelming in favor of the Pauline authorship. For it cannot be denied that the Roman church was far inferior to the Alexandrian, both in learning and critical skill; and those to whom the letter was addressed, and those nearer to and more associated with them, would much more probably have correct information as to its authorship, than those at Rome, where Paul was when he wrote, who in all probability would know little of a letter sent to the believers in Palestine.

The early testimony, too, is, of course, immeasurably the most important. And there seems to me sufficient evidence, that this was as general and as uniform, for the first century after the apostolic age, as in respect to many other books of the New Testament; and more so, than in respect to several. I cannot, therefore, finally, hesitate to believe, that the weight of evidence from tradition is altogether preponderant, in favor of the opinion that Paul was the author of our epistle.
§ 11. Internal Evidence that the Epistle is Paul's.

The evidence drawn from this source may be divided into three classes; first, that which arises from circumstances mentioned or adverted to in the epistle; and secondly, from the doctrines and sentiments contained in it; and thirdly, from the style and manner of composition.

1. Evidence that it was Paul's, from Circumstances mentioned or adverted to in the Epistle.

(1) Verse xiii. 28, "Know ye, that our brother Timothy is ἀπολελυμένον, with whom, if he come speedily, I will pay you a visit," is often referred to. From the first acquaintance of Timothy with Paul, he had been his intimate friend and constant companion. That he was with Paul at Rome, during his imprisonment, we know for certainty; because Paul has united him in the salutation prefixed to the epistles written to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon, during his captivity in that city. Timothy was greatly beloved and confided in by Paul, as the manner of which he speaks of him, in several of his epistles, abundantly shows; and Paul often calls him (as here) his brother. But the meaning of the word ἀπολελυμένον, as applied to Timothy, has been much contested; some rendering it set at liberty, i. e., from prison; others, sent away, i.e., on some errand of Paul's. Giving to ἀπολελυμένον the first meaning assigned to it, viz., liberated, objectors have said, that 'we have no account of Timothy's having been imprisoned during the life of Paul, and therefore, the occurrence of his imprisonment must have taken place after Paul's death; consequently the epistle must have been written by some other friend of Timothy, who calls him brother, in accordance with the usual style of the primitive Christians.' But it cannot be supposed that the Acts of the Apostles, or Paul's epistles, give us a full and complete account of all which happened to the various persons who are named in them. E. g. Aristarchus is called by Paul, in Col. iv. 10, his fellow-prisoner; as is Epaphras, in Philem. v. 23; but where is the history of their imprisonment?

The supposition by Bertholdt, that another Timothy, different from him who is so often mentioned in the sacred records, may be meant here, is doubtless possible, but very improbable; so is it possible that one Virgil wrote the Eneid, and another the Georgics; yet who thinks it to be probable? But if this be insufficient, Bertholdt alleges that a different person from Paul may have been the intimate friend and travelling companion of Timothy, while Paul was imprisoned at Rome; and that the passage we are considering, may have come from him. Eichhorn thinks it must have been written by such a friend of Tim-
othly, after the death of Paul; as during his life Timothy closely ad-
hered to this apostle. All this, no doubt, is possible, but not probable.
Is not the language which we are considering, more appropriate to
the known relation of Paul and Timothy, than to the relation with
Timothy of any other person during that period concerning whom we
have any knowledge? The spontaneous feeling of Christian readers,
in all ages, has fully answered this question.

But what the imprisonment was which is adverted to by the word
ἀπολέλυμένον, it is hard to say. To suppose with Schmidt (Hist.
Antiq. Canon.), and many others, that it was an imprisonment at Rome
with Paul, is evidently preposterous; for how, if Timothy were al-
ready at Rome, could Paul, or any one else there say, if he come or
return speedily? Must not Timothy have been absent, when this was
said? If Timothy had been imprisoned abroad, and was then liber-
ated (ἀπολέλυμένον), would he not have been the immediate bearer of
the news himself to the apostle? I do not allege this as an actual
and certain fact, for possibly there may have been circumstances to
prevent it. But then it is not in itself very probable, that Paul, in
confinement at Rome, would obtain information about Timothy (who,
if absent, was doubtless among some of the churches where Paul had
been) any sooner than those to whom our epistle was written; and
who, as it appears from the manner in which Paul speaks of him to
them, had a special regard for him.

Why, moreover, raise up all these difficulties in order to maintain
an interpretation of ἀπολέλυμένον which accords no better with the
usus loquendi of the sacred or classical writers, than the rendering
dismissed or sent away? a sense so exactly consonantous with the re-
lation between Paul and Timothy.

It has been objected to this interpretation that ἀπολοίω does not
mean to depute, and that if Timothy was sent away by the apostle
then the words ὅτε ἔμοι ὁ ἀπολοίω, or ἧπε ἔμοι ὁ ἀπολοίω, or some equivalent expression
should have been added; and also the place to which, and the err-
and on which he was sent, been indicated by the writer. It might
be well asked, What possible reason there is in this incidental allusion
to the absence of Timothy, to go into all the particulars relating to it?

But an examination of every instance in which ἀπολοίω is employed in
the New Testament, has satisfied me that this allegation is unsup-
ported by the usus loquendi of the sacred writers. Ἀπολοίω is used
69 times; and all of these instances (except the one in Heb. xiii. 23)
are in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles. In 20 cases it is
employed to designate divorce of married parties; in 10, the sending
away or dismissing an assembly or company of men, i. e., sending
them to their homes, or to their proper business; in 5 cases it design-
nates the dismissal of individuals in the same way; in 23 cases, it
denotes liberating from a state of duress or detention by force, on ac-
count of crimes either real or supposed; once it signifies dismissal
from the present life, viz., in Luke ii. 19; once it means simply, to depart, to go away, viz., in Acts xxviii. 25; and twice it seems to mean, to absolve from obligations to debt, or service, or something of the like nature, viz., Luke vi. 37. Yet in all these 62 cases, it is never once followed by a noun denoting either the person by whom the dismissal etc., is made, or the place to which the persons dismissed are sent, or the object on account of which they are dismissed. In three cases only are the persons or things designated, from whom or which one is dismissed or sent away, viz., in Luke xiii. 12, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀποθεωσίας σου; Luke xvi. 18, ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρός κ. τ. ὅ.; and Acts xv. 23, ἀπελύθησαν, ... ἀπὸ τῶν ἄδελφων πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους. Here are a great many kinds of sending away or dismissing, and yet the object for which or on account of which this is done, is not designated at all in hardly any of them. We have only three cases in all, in which the persons or thing from or by whom or which the dismissal is made, are designated; and one (Mark viii. 3) which expresses the place to which they are ἀπολυμένοι. All this serves to render it clear, that ἀπολύω is used as a constructio praegnans, and that the object for which, place to which, etc., may be expressed or omitted, just as the writer pleases; but that it is usually omitted, where it can be gathered from the context.

That ἀπολύω means to depute, to send away on business, etc., it is sufficient to refer to Acts xiii. 3, where the προφήται καὶ ἐκάθεκλων at Antioch, having ordained Saul and Barnabas, ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς, viz. to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; which last, however, is not expressed, but only to be gathered from the context. In Acts xiii. 30, also, ἀπολύθησα is applied to the messengers sent from the church at Jerusalem to that of Antioch; and that it is of the same meaning here with πέμπω, is clear, for those whom it pleased the church at Jerusalem πέμπει εἰς Ἀντίοχου (v. 22,) are here said to be ἀπολύθησαν. So again, the brethren sent back from Antioch to Jerusalem, ἀπελύθησαν ... πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, i. e., to carry back the tidings to them from Antioch.

Let me now add to this investigation a view of the circumstances of Paul, near the close of his captivity at Rome, which may serve to confirm the opinion defended above, that Paul was the writer of our epistle.

In Philip. ii. 19 (this epistle was written while Paul was a prisoner at Rome), the apostle speaks of sending Timothy to them shortly, so soon as he should see how it would go with him in respect to being liberated from prison, ii. 23; at the same time expressing a hope, that he should himself come to them shortly, v. 24. What, then, is more natural than the supposition, that he did send Timothy to them; and that, during his absence, Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in which he tells them that Timothy was sent away, and intimates that he is now assured of being speedily set at liberty, and also that he
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intends to pay them a visit in company with Timothy, if he should shortly return, viz., from Philippi? Many facts are believed by Bertholdt and all other critics, which have less of verisimilitude to support them than this.

I do not feel the weight of the objection made by alleging that Timothy was unknown to the church in Palestine, and that they could have no special interest with respect to the information in question. For, first, Timothy was the well-known and beloved companion of Paul, in all his journeyings during his later years, and must have been known as such, wherever Paul was known. Next, there can be no reasonable question, that he was with Paul during his last visit to Jerusalem, previously to the apostle's captivity for two years at Cesarea. Is there any probability, even if he were not with Paul during his journey to Jerusalem, that he did not frequently visit him in his afflictions? And would not the church at Cesarea, therefore, be well acquainted with him? Specially so, as Timothy would be the more acceptable to the Palestinian Jewish Christians, on account of his having received the rite of circumcision after he became a convert to Christianity.

Now, as all these circumstances do plainly accord with Paul's situation, while a prisoner at Rome; with his relation to Timothy; and with the manner in which he employed him; and as we have not a syllable of testimony that they are applicable to any other person; I do not see how we can be justified in denying that the evidence deducible from them is sufficient to render it quite probable, that Paul was the author of our epistle.

(2) In Heb. xiii. 18, 19, the writer asks the prayers of those whom he addressed, that he might speedily be restored to them; and in Heb. xiii. 23, he expresses a confident expectation of "speedily paying them a visit." From these passages it is clear, that the writer was then in a state of imprisonment; and also, that he was assured of a speedy liberation, which would enable him to pay the visit that he had encouraged them to hope for.

Compare this, now, with the situation of Paul at Rome, during the latter part of his imprisonment there. In his epistle to the Philippians (written during that period), he expresses his entire confidence that his life will be prolonged, so that he shall yet promote their religious profit and joy; τούτω πετομένος οἶδα, ὅτι μενόν καὶ συμπαραμενόν πασῶν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ γοράν τῆς πίστεως, Phil. i. 25. Again, in Phil. ii. 24 he says, πέπεπολα δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἐλεύθερος, I trust in the Lord that I myself shall speedily come [to you]. In the epistle to Philemon (also written during the same imprisonment), he says, ἔλπιζον γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαίρεται ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῶν, for I hope that by your prayers I shall be restored to you, v. 22. So confident was Paul of this, that he bids Philemon prepare lodgings for him, ἐτοιμάζειν μου ἔνταν, v. 22.
It appears very plainly, then, from these passages, that the writer had a satisfactory assurance in his mind of being speedily set at liberty; although it is probable, a formal declaration of his acquittal had not yet been made by the Roman emperor. This last conclusion I gather from Phil. ii. 23, where Paul declares to the church whom he is addressing, "that he shall send Timothy to them immediately, ὅσ τὰν ἀνα cel τὰ πρι τῇ, whenever I shall know how my affairs issue." By this it may be inferred, that he was in daily expectation of receiving official notice of the determination of the emperor in respect to his case, but that he had not yet received it.

Supposing now, as soon as intimation was made by the Roman emperor that Paul would be set at liberty, that intelligence respecting it was immediately communicated to the apostle by those of Caesar's household (Phil. iv. 22) who were his Christian friends; supposing that, agreeably to his promise made to the Philippians (ii. 23), he then immediately sent away Timothy to them; and supposing still further (which surely cannot be regarded as improbable), that there was some little delay in formally making out his sentence of acquittal and carrying it into execution by actually liberating him from prison; then how obviously easy and natural is the expression in Heb. xiii. 23, "Know that our brother Timothy is sent away; with whom, if he speedily return, I shall pay you a visit?" On the supposition that the close of the epistle to the Hebrews was written at this juncture of time, nothing can be more probable, than that the promised mission of Timothy, adverted to in Phil. ii. 23, is referred to in Heb. xiii. 23; and consequently that ἀπολελυμένων here means sent away, dismissed (as all must acknowledge it may mean), and not liberated or set at liberty.

The circumstances adverted to or implied in Heb. xiii. 23, Phil. ii. 23, and Philem. v. 22, have other correspondencies which deserve particular notice. In the two latter passages, it is plain that the writer expects his liberty, and means to send away Timothy to Philippi. In the former, he is assured of his liberty, and only waits for the return of Timothy, in order that he may set out to visit the Hebrews whom he had been addressing. In case Timothy did not return speedily (πρὸς ὁδοί), it is plainly implied in Heb. xiii. 23 that the writer meant to set out on his journey without him. There was then some uncertainty in his mind, respecting the time when Timothy would return. How well all this accords with the journey of Timothy to a place so remote from Rome as Philippi, cannot fail to strike the mind of every considerate reader.

Now, laying aside all favoritism for any previous opinions respecting our epistle, can it be reasonably doubted, that there is a concurrence of circumstances so striking as to render it highly probable that Paul wrote it? More especially so, when we consider that the epistle must have been written about the same period of time when these circum-
stancies happened; for it proffers internal evidence of being written before the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet written so late, that the period when the Hebrews were first converted to Christianity is adverted to as being already a considerable time before, Heb. v. 12, and is called τὰς πρὸ τῶν ἡμέρας, x. 32. Now the imprisonment of Paul at Rome happened probably A. D. 62 or 63, which was some thirty years after the gospel had begun to be preached abroad; and the close of that imprisonment, in case it continued about two years, Acts xxviii. 30, was about five years before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The objections which Bertholdt makes against the arguments just presented, do not seem to be weighty. "Would Paul," he asks, "promise to revisit Palestine, when the people of that country had just sent him into captivity at Rome? A very improbable circumstance indeed!"

But a nearer consideration of the circumstances attending Paul's case, will remove the appearance of any great improbability. For, first, Paul had been kept a prisoner at Cesarea, two years before his removal to Rome, Acts xxiv. 25—27; and at Rome he lived two years more in a similar condition, Acts xxviii. 30. These, with the time occupied by his going to Rome and returning from it, would make nearly a five years' interval between his leaving Palestine and revisiting it. Might not some of his fiercest persecutors have died during this period? Or might they not have laid aside their furious zeal?

But, in the next place, supposing our epistle to have been sent to the church at Cesarea, where Paul had been treated with so much kindness during his imprisonment; could there have been any fear in his mind, with respect to paying them a visit? And even if we suppose that Cesarea was not the place to which the letter was directed, but that it was sent to the Christians at Jerusalem; yet the objection brought forward by Bertholdt will not be of much validity. Paul was not to be deterred from going to Jerusalem, by the prospect of persecution. From the time when he first made his appearance there, after his conversion, the Jews had always showed a bitter enmity against him, and persecuted him. Yet this did not deter him from going, again and again, to that city. And why should it now deter him any more than formerly?

Besides, he was now liberated from the accusations of the Jews, by the sentence of the emperor himself. Would they venture to do again the very thing which the court of Rome had decided to be unlawful? Might not Paul well expect, with the decision of the emperor in his hand, to find his personal liberty for the future respected?

"But," says Bertholdt, "we have no account that Paul paid a visit to Palestine after his liberation."

True. But what argument this can furnish against the probability that he did pay such a visit, I do not perceive. Bertholdt himself, in the very paragraph which contains this objection, says, "who does not know, that the accounts of what befell the apostles and primitive
teachers of Christianity are very incomplete?" Every one knows, that Luke breaks off the history of Paul with the account of his imprisonment at Rome. Has any writer given us a well-authenticated supplement to this? And can the want of any history of Paul, after the period of his imprisonment at Rome, be a proof that he never travelled to any particular place after this, or that he did not live and preach there? Surely this cannot be urged with any show of propriety.

Bleek (p. 283), and others have suggested, that Heb. xiii. 18, 19, contains no certain intimation that the writer was in a state of duress when he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews. But what then can be the probable meaning of ἀποκαταστάσεως? The verb ἀποκατάστασις means to restore a thing to its former state or condition, which has become diseased, injured, or is in a ruinous state. It is applied to designate the restoring of those who labor under diseases, to a state of soundness, e. g., Matt. xii. 18; Mark iii. 5; viii. 25; Luke vi. 10. It also designates the restoration of the lapsed Jewish commonwealth to prosperity and splendor, e. g., Matt. xvii. 11; Mark ix. 12; Acts i. 6. In the passage before us, what can ἀποκαταστάσεως ἵματι mean, unless it be, that the writer should be freed from the state of duress in which he was, and thus be able to pay them a visit? And he expects this τάχιον, the sooner, should they offer up their supplications for him, as he had requested them to do. Ἀποκαταστάσεως alone might signify deliverance from any state whatever of trouble or perplexity; but what τάχιον ἀποκαταστάσεως ἵματι can mean, unless it means what I have above supposed, it would be difficult, I believe, to show. The very use of the word ἀποκαταστάσεως shows the present straitened and distressed condition of the writer; and the use of ἵματι shows, that this condition was of such a nature as then deprived him of the liberty of paying a visit to the Hebrews.

I add only, that analogy would lead us to suppose that Paul, when liberated, would go to Palestine, and then to the other churches in Asia Minor. Such was the general course of his travels; see Acts xviii. 22 seq. It is altogether consonant, then, with the usage of Paul, to suppose that he would visit the church at Palestine, after his imprisonment at Rome; and therefore natural to suppose, that Heb. xiii. 23 refers to such an event.

(3) If the reading in Heb. x. 34, " for ye had compassion on my bonds (τός δεσμοίς μου)," be correct, it is another argument that Paul is the author of our epistle; for his bonds in Palestine, whither the letter was sent, were well known. That he obtained compassion there, particularly during his two years' abode at Cesarea, will not be questioned. But as the reading δεσμοίς μου is controverted, and δεσμοίοις (the prisoners) is preferred by some good critics, I do not think proper to urge this argument; although the evidence is about equally in favor of δεσμοίς μου, δεσμοίς and δεσμοίοις.

(4) The salutation in Heb. xiii. 21, agrees with the supposition
that Paul wrote this epistle; ἀσπαζόμενα ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. Paul writing from Rome, which had communication of course with all parts of Italy, and with the Italian churches, more or less of whose members we may well suppose to have been often at Rome, may very naturally be supposed to have sent such a salutation. Indeed, the circumstances render this quite probable.

The objections made against this, do not strike me as forcible. It is alleged that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας must mean, people who had come from Italy, i. e., who had left Italy, and were locally out of it, when the writer sent a salutation from them, probably those who fled therefrom in the time of Nero’s persecution. Consequently, the writer of the epistle could not have been Paul, during his imprisonment at Rome.

In opposition to this I make the appeal (the only one which can be made) to usage, and ask that the following instances may be duly examined:

(1) οἱ ἀπὸ is manifestly employed, in some cases, as a mere equivalent for οἱ ἰθέ, i. e., as a periphrasis or an expression which in sense is a mere adjective. When the preposition ἀπὸ is followed by a noun, it is often equivalent also to our English words belonging to, pertaining to, etc. As examples of both these usages, we may take Acts xii. 1, Herod vexed some τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, of those who belonged to the church; Acts xv. 5, there arose some τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρήσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων, of those who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees; Luke i. 2, οἱ ἀπὸ ἀρχής αὐτοῦ, original eyewitnesses; Luke xix. 39, and some of the Pharisees ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, belonging to the multitude, which multitude were then present and surrounded Jesus; Acts xxvii. 44, and some by means of those things τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθου, which belonged to the ship; Heb. xii. 25, how much more shall we, if we turn away from τῶν ἀπὸ οὐρανῶν, the heavenly [admonisher].

These may suffice to show the nature of the expression οἱ ἀπὸ ... and to prove beyond all doubt, that it is not unfrequently employed in the same way as οἱ ἰθέ, i. e., in the manner of an adjective; for so οἱ ἰθέ ... is not unfrequently used, e. g., οἱ ἰθέ ἐρευήνας, the contentious; οἱ ἰθέ νόμου, sticklers for the law; τό ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, heavenly; οἱ ἰθέ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, Caesar’s domestics, etc.

We have now to apply the phrase οἱ ἀπὸ ... to place, and to see whether it may here retain the sense of pertaining to, belonging to, and this without any necessary implication that the persons spoken of are out of such place, or without any reference at all to the writer as to what place he is in, whether in the one named, or in some other.

John xi. 1, Now a certain man was sick, Ἀδραπός ἀπὸ τῆς Βηθανίας; and yet we know with certainty from the context, that Lazarus was sick and died at his own home, in this very Bethany; and that the narration has no reference at all to the place of the writer, is equally certain. Acts x. 28, certain brethren τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰούδας συνήλ
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Σον αὐτῷ [τῷ Πέτρῳ], and on the morrow they came to Cesarea. Now here the men τῶν ἀντὶ ἱότητος, set out in company with Peter, and they and Peter both are in Joppa when συνῄσκεω they set out on their journey in company, and it is only on the next day after this, that we find them at another place. Acts xvii. 13, now when of ἀντὶ τῆς Θεοσαλονίκης ἵθιδαίοι knew that in Berea etc . . . . they came thither, stirring up the populace. Bleek has replied to this example (which was produced in the first edition of my work), by alleging that the writer has reference in his own mind, when he says of ἀντὶ Θεοσαλονίκης ἵθιδαίοι, to the subsequent coming of these persons to Berea, and their demeanor there, Review p. 14. But it would be rather a singular reason for calling men of ἀντὶ . . . . because, in the subsequent course of narration, we might have occasion to speak of their being or acting in some other place besides that named in connection with ἀντὶ. Besides, nothing can be plainer than that in the phrase of ἀντὶ τῆς Θεοσαλονίκης ἵθιδαίοι, ἀντὶ τῆς Θεοσαλονίκης is by the laws of grammatical construction a mere adjective in substance. Bleek does not need to be told that circumstances of this nature thrown in between the article and the noun to which it belongs, are adjectives in their very nature, i.e., by the laws and usages of the Greek language; so that here is a case definitely speaking what was claimed for it in the first edition of the present work. If the writer had meant to express the idea for which Bleek contends, he would of course have said, ὡς δὲ ἐγνώσας αὐτὸ ἵθιδαίοι, ἡλέον ἀντὶ τῆς Θεοσαλονίκης κατειςαλεύοντες κ. τ. λ. Acts xxii. 18, συνῄσκεω δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀντὶ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν, κ. τ. λ., i.e., some of the Christian brethren belonging to Cesarea, set out from that place in company with Paul and his friends, or accompanied them; a case of the same nature with that in Acts x. 23 noted above. Here then is surely no reference to the writer as being out of Cesarea, nor to the τῶν μαθητῶν ἀντὶ τῆς Καισαρείας as being out of Cesarea, but to the simple fact, that some of the Cesareans accompanied Paul and his friends on their journey to Jerusalem.

After exhibiting these illustrations of the principle in question concerning the use of of ἀντὶ . . . . it will be sufficient merely to refer to other examples of the like usage. Matt. xxvii. 57, Ἰωσήφ ἀντὶ Ἀριμαθαίων, Joseph the Arimathean, i.e., Joseph belonging by birth or origin to Arimathæa; surely not Joseph who had lately come from that place, for he was ἐνυγχέει αὐλονῦν, one of the honorable Sanhedrīm at Jerusalem; comp. the same expression in Mark xv. 48; Luke xxiii. 51; John xix. 38. So the expression Jesus . . . . ὃ ἀντὶ Ναζαρέτ, is plainly the same as Ἰησοῦς ὃ ἀντὶ Ναζαρέτ, i.e., who belongs there, Jesus the Nazarene; comp. Acts x. 38; John i. 46. So ἀντὶ Καλυκίας, a Cilician, Acts xxiii. 34; τυνῖς δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς Αἰγίας ἵθιδαίοι, certain Asiatic Jews, Acts xxiv. 18; (the position of τυνῖς ἀντὶ κ. τ. λ. makes this meaning certain again). Mark iii. 7, ωδή
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τλήδος ἀπὸ Γαλιλαίας followed him [Jesus]; yet Jesus was now in Galilee, and did not leave here when the multitudes in question followed him. John i. 45, Philip ἀπὸ Βηθσαïδα, i. e., the Bethsaida, a native of Bethsaida; comp. John xii. 21; John xxi. 2, Nathaniel ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ, a native of Cana. Matt. iv. 25, great multitudes ἀπὸ Γαλιλαίας followed Jesus, etc.; yet both he and they were in Galilee during all the time of their following him. Matt. xv. 1, οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ γραμματεῖς, from the position of the words, must mean simply the Jerusalem scribes, i. e., scribes who belonged to Jerusalem.

Other instances might easily be added, but it is plain enough that οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας means neither more nor less than the Italians, i. e., those who belonged to the country of Italy; and this, without at all determining whether the writer, or they, or both, were out of Italy, at the time when he wrote.

Where ἀπὸ is designed to express a local removing or distance, such verbs as ἔρχομαι, διαγέρω, ἀναβαίνω, παρέρχομαι, ἀποχωρέω, καταβαίνω, ἀνέγυς, κ. τ. λ., should seem to be employed before it, or along with it.

I must continue, then, to entertain my former views respecting οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, until I find some better reason to change them than I have yet been able to find. Nay, I may even venture to call in question whether it is agreeable to the usus loquendi of the Greek, to employ οἱ ἀπὸ . . . . in order to designate persons as those who have gone from one place to another, unless some verb is joined with the phrase which expresses the action of going, etc.; compare for example, Acts xvii. 2; Matt. iii. 7; iii. 13, 16; vii. 23; viii. 1, 11, 34; xii. 43; xiii. 1; xiv. 29; xvii. 9, 18; xix. 1; Mark i. 9, 10, 42; iii. 22; v. 35, etc., etc.

But, it is asked, "How came Italians to salute a church in Palestine? If Paul wrote our epistle at Rome, why did he not say, ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης? What acquaintance had the Romans with the church at Palestine? This objection, however, will not bear examination. The Romans surely were Italians; and it is a matter of indifference, whether the writer at Rome said οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, or οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, if he meant to send only the salutation of the Christians who resided at Rome. But is it at all probable that there were not Christians often at Rome from various parts of Italy, who were acquainted with Paul, and who cherished a friendly interest for the church whom he was addressing? If these also, as well as the Romans, wished to send the expression of their friendly regards to the Hebrews, what other phrasology could Paul have adopted, that would be more appropriate than οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, which would embrace Christians in general who lived in the country where the writer was?"

Then why should this be thought so strange, when an example of the very same nature may be produced from the acknowledged writ-
ings of Paul? This apostle, writing from Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 8) to the church at Corinth, says, The churches of Asia salute you, xvi. 19. May not the same questions be urged here, which objectors urge in the case above? May we not ask, How could the Asiatics be personally known to the Corinthians? And why should Paul speak of the churches of Asia, and not of that at Ephesus? Plainly the reason of this was, that Christians from different parts of Asia Minor (which is here meant), were collected together in Ephesus its capital where they had intercourse with Paul, and knew that he was addressing the Corinthians, and desired an expression of their brotherly affection towards them. What is more common, every day, than for single individuals, or societies of men, who had never had any personal intercourse together, to exchange friendly salutations? Could not Paul as well send the salutations of oι ἄντι τῆς Ἰεραλίας, as of the ἐκκλησίαι τῆς 'Ασίας?

Such are the various circumstances adverted to in our epistle, which serve to render it probable that Paul was the author of it. From its nature this evidence is indirect; but evidence of such a kind is, not unfrequently, as convincing as that which appears to be more direct. The prefixing or suffixing a writer's name to an epistle, is a more easy and obvious method of interpolation, than the insertion of minute circumstances which imply a very intimate acquaintance with a writer's condition and circumstances.

Will any one undertake to show, that the circumstances which are brought into view above, may be more probably attached to some other person than to Paul? If not, then the probability from them is in favor of Paul as the author of our epistle.

2. Similarity of DOCTRINES between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledged Epistles of Paul.

Are the sentiments in our epistle such as Paul was wont to teach? Do they accord with his, not only in such a general way as we may easily suppose the sentiments of all Christians in the apostolic age harmonized with each other, but have they the coloring, the proportion, the characteristic features of Paul's sentiments? Are they so stated and insisted on, as Paul is wont to state and insist on his?

Before proceeding in my endeavors to answer these questions, it will be proper to state some general considerations in regard to the nature of the evidence in question.

Those who disbelieve the Pauline origin of our epistle are wont to urge very strenuously all the discrepancies between it and the acknowledged epistles of Paul, as to diction, phraseology, ideas, doctrine, etc., and to claim that these decide the point against the probability that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Schulz and
Seyffarth have made up almost the whole of their arguments against
the Pauline origin of the epistle, from considerations of this nature.
Others before them had done so to a considerable extent; and Bleek
and De Wette have recently adopted much of this nature from the
writers just named.

Now if there be any weight in this argument, it is incumbent on
those who adopt a different opinion, to show that the opposite of this
is true, viz., that there is a resemblance (instead of a great discrep-
ancy), between our epistle and the acknowledged writings of Paul;
and if this resemblance can be shown to extend to all the particulars
above named, to be striking, and to be minute, then of course the
argument in question is deprived of all its importance and shown to
be groundless.

Bleek (Rev. p. 15) expresses his wonder that I should think of
deducing any argument in favor of Paul, from such resemblances. He
says that the resemblance is still more striking between Paul and the
first epistle of Peter; e.g., 1 Pet. i. 3, comp. Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 1,
comp. Eph. v. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 9, comp. Rom. xii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 5,
comp. Eph. v. 21; 1 Pet. v. 14, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 10,
comp. Gal. v. 13 (14?); 1 Pet. ii. 13 seq., comp. Rom. xiii. 1—4; 1

That there are resemblances of expression, in some of these pas-
sages, need not be denied. I have examined them all with attention.
Some of the references are undoubtedly incorrect, and do not express
the meaning of Prof. Bleek; e.g., Gal. v. 13; Phil. ii. 14, or else the
corresponding 1 Pet. ii. 10 and iv. 2 are incorrect. As to the others
collectively we may say, that the respective writers, in inculcating the
same sentiments, have now and then hit upon the same words. This
is all that can be justly said. Why did not Bleek draw out these
parallelisms, and produce them to the view of the reader? The bare
inspection of them would show the very contrary of that for which
they are alleged. Every reader of Greek has the power of making
the comparison for himself; and to every one who does make it, and
is competent to judge of the result, I cheerfully commit the question
at issue.

Then as to arrangement, coloring, diction, course of thought in
general, method of arguing and exhorting,—in a word, the tout ensem-
ble of the first epistle of Peter,—I hazard nothing in repeating it,
that every reader must feel the difference to be wide between this and
the epistle to the Hebrews. But if this is not to be appealed to (and
I am altogether willing that a resort to actual comparison should be
made), then let the resemblance be drawn out for ocular view, be-
tween 1 Pet. and the Ep. to the Hebrews; as I have drawn it out in
the following pages between the latter and Paul's acknowledged epis-
tles. The fairness of this appeal will not be called in question.

If the resemblances that will be pointed out in the sequel, show
nothing more, they show thus much, viz., that there is not in our epistle sufficient diversity, to justify any one for pleading this, in order to prove that Paul did not write it. This done, the principal argument of those who do thus plead, is rendered null. But they are not merely of a negative character. We shall see that they are too near, and too numerous, of too marked and specific a character, not to have some positive weight in rendering it probable that Paul was the author of our epistle.

The resemblance in respect to doctrine may be arranged, for the sake of perspicuity and distinction, under the following heads:

I. General preference of Christianity over Judaism.

There can, indeed, be no reasonable doubt, that all the apostles and primitive teachers of Christianity, who were well instructed in the principles of this religion, must have acknowledged and taught its superiority over the ancient religion of the Jews. The very fact that they were Christians, necessarily implies this. But still, it is quite certain, that the preference of the new over the ancient religion, is taught by Paul in a manner different from that of other writers of the New Testament, and with more emphasis.

The grounds of preferring Christianity to Judaism, may be classed under the following particulars:

(1) The superior degree of light, or religious knowledge, imparted by the gospel.

In his acknowledged epistles, Paul calls Judaism τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3; and again, τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, Gal. iv. 9. He represents it as adapted to children, νήπιοι, Gal. iv. 3, who are in a state of nonage and pupilage, Gal. iv. 2, or in the condition of servants rather than that of heirs, Gal. iv. 1.

On the other hand, Christians attain to a higher knowledge of God, Gal. iv. 9; they are no more as servants, but become sons, and obtain the privilege of adoption, Gal. iv. 5, 6. They are represented as τέλειοι, 1 Cor. xiv. 20; as being furnished with instruction adequate to make them ἀνδρας τελείους, Eph. iv. 11—13. Christianity leads them to see the glorious displays of himself, which God has made with an unveiled face, i. e., clearly, 2 Cor. iii. 18; while Judaism threw a veil over these things, 2 Cor. ii. 13. Christianity is engraven on the hearts of its votaries, ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, 2 Cor. iii. 8; while Judaism was engraven on tablets of stone, ὡς εἰς τοὺς ἐν λίθοις, 2 Cor. iii. 7.

Such is the brief sketch of Paul's views in respect to this point as represented in his acknowledged epistles. Let us now compare these views with those which the epistle to the Hebrews discloses.

This epistle commences with the declaration, that God, who in times past spake to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days
spoken to us by his Son, Heb. i. 1; ii. 1, seq. Judaism was revealed only by the mediation of angels, ii. 2; while Christianity was revealed by the Son of God, and abundantly confirmed by miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, ii. 3, 4. The ancient covenant was imperfect, in respect to the means which it furnished for the diffusion of knowledge; but the new covenant provides that all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, viii. 9—11. The law was only a sketch or imperfect representation of religious blessings; while the gospel proffers the blessings themselves, x. 1. The worthies of ancient times had only imperfect views of spiritual blessings; while Christians enjoy them in full measure, xi. 39, 40.

(2) The gospel holds out superior motives and encouragements to virtue and piety.

Paul represents the condition of the Jews, while under the law, as like to that of children immured and kept under the eye of masters and teachers, Gal. iii. 23; iv. 2; as being in bondage, Gal. iv. 3; as servants, iv. 1; as children, iv. 3; and as having the spirit of bondage, Rom. viii. 15. This servile spirit which inspired them with fear, Rom. viii. 15, gives place, under the Christian religion, to the spirit of adoption, by which they approach God with filial confidence, Rom. viii. 15—17. Christianity has liberated us from pedagogues, and made us partakers of the privileges of sons and heirs, Gal. iii. 25, seq. iv. 4, seq. The liberty of the gospel affords urgent motives for the practice of virtue, Gal. v. 1, seq. v. 13, seq. The spirit imparted under the gospel furnishes aid, and creates special obligation, to mortify our evil passions and affections, Rom. viii. 12—17. Circumcision is now nothing, and uncircumcision nothing; but obedience to the commands of God is the all-important consideration, 1 Cor. vii. 19. Not circumcision or uncircumcision is matter of concern, under the Christian religion, but a new creation, i.e., a spiritual renovation, Gal. vi. 15, and faith which worketh by love, Gal. v. 6.

Turn we now to the epistle to the Hebrews. There we find that the sacrifices prescribed by the Jewish law could not quiet and purify the conscience of the worshipper, ix. 9; nor deliver him from the pollution of sin, in order that he might in a becoming manner worship the living God; which is effected only under the gospel, ix. 14. The law served to inspire its votaries with awe and terror, Heb. xii. 18—21; but the gospel with cheering confidence, xii. 22—24. Now we may obtain grace to serve God in an acceptable manner, xii. 28. We have a covenant established on better promises than the ancient one, viii. 6—13; and are urged by more powerful motives to a holy life under the gospel, xii. 25—29.

It must be admitted, in respect to the particulars of the comparison just drawn, that the diocion of the passages generally, in the epistle to the Hebrews, presents no very striking resemblances to that in Paul's acknowledged epistles. But the difference of the mode of introducing
these topics is naturally different, because it arises from different occasions of introducing them. But the fundamental ideas in both are the same. Other writers also of the New Testament urge the obligations of Christians to peculiar holiness of life; but what other writers, except Paul, urge it from comparative views of the Jewish and Christian dispensations?

(3) The superior efficacy of the gospel in promoting and ensuring the real and permanent happiness of mankind.

Paul represents the law as possessing only a condemning power, and subjecting all men to its curse, in consequence of disobedience, Gal. iii. 10. It is the ministry of death, 2 Cor. iii. 7; the ministry of condemnation, 2 Cor. iii. 9; by it none can obtain justification or pardoning mercy, Gal. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 20.

On the contrary, Christianity is the ministry of pardon, τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. iii. 9; it holds out forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ, gratuitous pardon on account of him, Rom. iv. 24, 25; Eph. i. 7. Through him, we are allowed to cherish the hope of future glory, Rom. v. 1, 2; and this without perfect obedience to the law, Rom. iii. 21; Gal. ii. 16; Acts xiii. 38, 39. And to such blessings under the gospel, a most important circumstance is attached in order to heighten their value, viz., that they are perennial, and not (like the Mosaic institutions) liable to abolition, 2 Cor. iii. 11.

In correspondence with all this, the epistle to the Hebrews represents the Mosaic dispensation as one which was calculated to inspire awe and terror, Heb. xii. 18—21; the offerings and sacrifices which it enjoined, could never tranquilize and purify the conscience of the worshipper, ix. 9; for it was impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin, x. 4, 11. The blood of Christ has made a real expiation, procured forgiveness, and liberated the conscience from an oppressive sense of guilt, ix. 11—14; v. 9; vi. 18—20. Christ by his death has delivered us from the condemning power of sin, and freed us from the oppressive fear which it occasions, ii. 14, 15. He has procured access to God, and is ever ready to aid those who approach him, vii. 25; ix. 24. The offering which he has made for sin has a perennial influence, and without repetition remains forever efficacious, ix. 12, 25—28; x. 12; vii. 23—28.

Other writers also of the New Testament have set before us the blessings of the gospel; and these, as connected with what Christ has done and suffered. But what other writer, except Paul, has charged his picture with such a contrast between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, and thrown so much shade over the one, and light over the other? If the hand of Paul be not in the epistle to the Hebrews, it is the hand of one who had drunk in deeply of his doctrines, and in a high degree participated of his feelings and views.

(4) The Jewish dispensation was only a type and shadow of the Christian.
Thus Paul often represents it. Meats and drinks, feasts and new moons and sabbaths, are σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, but the σκιά is Christ, Col. ii. 16, 17. The passage through the Red Sea was typical of Christian baptism; and the manna, of our spiritual food, 1 Cor. x. 1—6. The occurrences under the ancient dispensation were typical of things under the new, 1 Cor. x. 11. In like manner Paul calls Adam τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, i.e., a type of Christ, Rom. v. 14, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 45—47. The Mosaic institution did but darkly shadow that, which is clearly revealed under the gospel, 2 Cor. iii. 13—18. Hagar and Sarah may be considered as allegorically representing the law and the gospel, or the two covenants, Gal. iv. 22—31. The law was only our pedagogue until the coming of Christ, under whom full privileges are enjoyed, Gal. iii. 23—25; iv. 1—5.

The epistle to the Hebrews, in like manner, represents the Jewish rites and ordinances only as a παραβολή, i.e., a significant emblem of blessings under the gospel; and these rites were imposed only until the time of reformation, ix. 9—14. The law was only σκιά of good things to come; while the gospel proffered the very things themselves, x. 1. All the Levitical ritual, the temple itself and all its appurtenances, were only a υπόδειγμα of the temple in which Christ ministers, and of the functions which he performs, viii. 1—9; ix. 22—24; they were a designed emblem of the objects of the new dispensation, ix. 9.

The question may be emphatically put here, What other parts of the New Testament, the writings of Paul excepted, furnish us with views of such a nature as these exhibit? Manifestly Pauline is both the sentiment, and the custom which the writer has put upon it.

(5) While the Christian dispensation is designed for perpetuity, the Jewish institutes are abolished on account of their imperfection.

Paul represents the Law as having no glory, in comparison with Christianity, 2 Cor. iii. 10; it was designed to be abolished, when the perennial dispensation of Christ should be introduced, 2 Cor. iii. 11, 13. The veil over the ancient dispensation rendered it obscure, and hindered the Jews from fully comprehending it; but the time was come, under the gospel, when that veil was removed, and the glory of God was seen with open face, 2 Cor. iii. 13—18. The law being altogether incapable of justifying sinners, gives place to another and gratuitous method of justification, Rom. iv. 14—16. Christians are dead to the law, and affiliated to another covenant, Rom. vii. 4—6. The law was incompetent to effect the designs of divine benevolence, and therefore gives place to a more perfect dispensation, Gal. iii. 21—25; iv. 1—7; v. 1. It was void of power to justify the sinner, and therefore the interposition of Christ became necessary, Rom. viii. 3, 4; Gal. ii. 16.

On the other hand, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews represents the new covenant as inspiring better hopes than the ancient one did, and the latter as taxable with defects, viii. 6—8. The old covenant is antiquated, and ready to expire, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ viii. 13.
Christ is appointed high priest according to a new order of priesthood, different from the Levitical one; because the dispensation by which the latter received its appointment, was weak, and incompetent to effect the introduction of such hopes as the gospel inspires, vii. 17—19. Burnt-offerings and sacrifices can never take away sin; Christ only can effect this; so that when his offering is made, it needs not to be repeated, but is of sufficient and everlasting efficacy, x. 1—14.

Other writers of the New Testament have also appealed to the efficacy of Jesus' atoning blood; but who, besides Paul, has thrown this whole subject into an attitude of contrast with the inefficiency of the Jewish dispensation?

II. The person and work of the Mediator, Jesus Christ.

Under this head, the following particulars are entitled to our consideration:

1. The person of the Mediator is presented in the same light, by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews and by Paul.

Paul, in various passages, represents Christ as the exact image of God, as the resemblance or likeness of the Father, as in 2 Cor. iv. 4; Coloss. i. 15; as humbling himself, or condescending to assume our nature and suffer death in it; and as being exalted in consequence of this, i.e., as a reward of his benevolence and obedience, to the throne of the universe, and made head over all things. Thus in Phil. ii. 6—11, Christ being τοῦ μορφής Θεοῦ, took on himself our nature, and obeyed, or subjected himself in the same, unto death, even the death of the cross; in consequence of which God hath given him a name above every other, so that all in heaven or on earth must bow the knee to him. In Col. i. 15—20, Christ is represented as the image of the invisible God; as having created all things in heaven and in earth; all things are said to consist by him; over all he has a distinguished preeminence; and by his sufferings and death he has produced a reconciliation among the creatures of God, and made expiation for sin, so that God treats the pardoned sinner as if he were innocent. In 2 Cor. viii. 9 Paul says that the Lord Jesus Christ, who was rich, became poor on our account, that we through his poverty might become rich. In Eph. iii. 9, God is said to have created all things by Jesus Christ; and in 1 Cor. vii. 6, all things are said to be by him. In 1 Cor. xv. 25—27, it is declared that he must reign until all things are put under his feet.

The peculiarity of this Pauline representation consists in presenting Christ as the image of God; in specifying the act of humility by which he became incarnate, he humbled himself (ἐξωθήκη), though rich he became poor; in presenting his obedience and sufferings as the ground of his elevation to the throne of the universe in the mediatorial nature; in representing him as head over all, both friends
and enemies, and as reigning until his enemies be made his footstool; and finally, in representing God as having created all things by him.

If we turn now to the epistle to the Hebrews, we find the same representations there. The Son of God is the radiation or radiance of the Father's glory, he is his exact image or resemblance, χαρακτήρ, i. 3. God made all things by him, i. 2. He directs all things by his powerful word, i. 3. He was in a state of humiliation (ἡλαιώμενον), lower than the angels, ii. 9. He took part in flesh and blood, that he might, by his own death, render null and void the destructive power of the devil, ii. 14. On account of the suffering of death he is exalted to a state of glory and honor, ii. 9. He endured the sufferings of the cross, making no account of its disgrace, but having a regard to the reward set before him, which was a seat at the right hand of God, xii. 2. All things are put under his feet, ii. 8; x. 13; where the very same passage from the Old Testament is quoted which Paul quotes in 1 Cor. xv. 25—28, and applied in the same manner.

Is all this now mere accident? What other writer of the New Testament presents such speciality of views respecting Christ's resemblance to God, his mediatorial character, his obedience, sufferings, and exaltation in our nature to the throne of the universe? No other writer presents them in the same connection; no other employs the same images for comparison, nor brings the topics to view in the same light. There is a peculiarity of representation so distinctly marked here, so exclusively Pauline in its manner, that if Paul himself did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, it must have been some one who had drunk in so deeply of his spirit, as to become the very image of the fountain whence he drew.

(2) The death of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, and the reconciliation of sinners to God by means of this sacrifice.

Other writers of the New Testament, indeed, besides Paul, teach this doctrine. But there is, in his letters, a peculiar and urgent manner of enforcing it. Often he any other writer does he recur to this interesting theme; and in all his representations it stands in high relief.

The general enunciation of it is often repeated. Christ came into the world to save sinners, 1 Tim. i. 15. He died for our sins, 1 Cor. xv. 3. He was given up or devoted to death on our account, Rom. viii. 32. Our redemption was wrought by him, Rom. iii. 24. He was given up, i.e., to death, on account of our offences. Rom. iv. 25. He gave up himself for our sins, Gal. i. 4; ii. 20. He gave up himself an acceptable sacrifice for us, Eph. v. 2. He was our paschal lamb, 1 Cor. v. 7. By his blood we have redemption or forgiveness of sin, Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. He gave himself a ransom for all, 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23. These may serve as specimens of the general statement, which Paul so frequently makes of this subject.

But he also recurs very often to this topic in his reasonings at
length, and insists upon it with particularity. In his epistle to the Romans, he labors at length to prove the universal guilt of men, in order to show that salvation by Christ is necessary for all, Rom. iii. 22—27; v. 12—21. He urges the impossibility of obtaining this salvation by the law, Rom. iii. 20, 23; viii. 3; Gal. ii. 16, 21, averring that Jesus, by his death, has effected what the law could not do. Assuming our nature, he became a sin-offering for us, Rom. viii. 3. He became a propitiatory sacrifice on our account, so that through him we may obtain pardoning mercy, Rom. iii. 24—26. As all men have come into a state of condemnation through Adam, so all men may come into a state of condemnation through Christ, Rom. v. 12—21, comp. 2 Cor. v. 14, 19—21. Now, i. e., since Christ died for us, Christians may regard God as no more inclined to punish them as guilty, for they are in a state of peace and pardon, Rom. v. 1, 8—11; viii. 32. Now we may hope for abounding grace and happiness, Rom. v. 17; vi. 23; viii. 17, 32. Jesus at the right hand of God is ever ready to aid us, Rom. viii. 34. Jesus is the Mediator between God and man, to make reconciliation, 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. It were easy to add many other passages of the same tenor, from the acknowledged writings of Paul; but these are sufficient to exhibit his views, and the mode in which he inculcates them.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, we find the same sentiments urged with the same ardor. Christ, by the sacrifice of himself, made expiation for our sins, i. 3. By the grace of God, assuming our nature, he tasted death for all, ii. 9. He became, through his sufferings, the author of eternal salvation to believers, v. 8, 9. But nowhere is there more speciality of argument to establish this great point, than in Heb. vii. viii. ix. and x.; nearly all of which is occupied with it. The Jewish offerings are altogether insufficient to make expiation, ix. 9—14; vii. 11, 19; x. 1, 11. Those offerings needed constant repetition; and even then, they could never remove sin, v. 1—3; vii. 27, 28; ix. 6, 7, 25; x. 4, 11. Christ by offering up himself has effected this, i. 3; vii. 27; ix. 25, 26. By his own blood, not with that of beasts, he entered into the eternal sanctuary, once for all making expiation for sin, ix. 12—15; x. 10—12, 14, 19. By his death he has delivered us from the oppressive fear of condemnation, ii. 14, 15. He has tranquillized and purified the conscience of penitent sinners, which the law could not do, ix. 9, 14. He is the mediator of a new covenant, ix. 13; xii. 24; which is better than the ancient one, vii. 22; viii. 6. He is exalted to the throne of the universe, ii. 6—10; and he is ever ready and able to assist us, iv. 14—16; vii. 25. He has introduced us to a dispensation, which speaks not terror only, like the law, but offers abounding grace and happiness, xii. 18—29.*

Such are some of the more striking traits of doctrine, and peculiar-

* Davidson adds, among other coincidences between this and other of
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3. Form and Method and Style of the epistle to the Hebrews, compared with those of Paul's acknowledged Epistles.

These topics may be considered, either in a general point of view, as it respects the arrangement of the epistle at large; or specially, as having reference to various particulars which it exhibits.

(1) The general method or arrangement of this epistle is like to that of Paul.

Most of all does it resemble his two epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians; which exhibit first a theoretical or doctrinal, then a practical part. The epistle to the Romans is principally occupied, to the end of the tenth chapter, with the doctrinal part; and the remainder with practical matter and salutations. In like manner the epistle to the Galatians, as far as the end of the fourth chapter, is principally doctrinal discussion; while the remainder is hortatory and practical. In some degree, the same thing may be said of the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Thessalonians. But that to the Romans is most distinctly marked of all.

Turning now to the epistle to the Hebrews, we find that it is composed on a similar plan. As far as chapter x. 19, it is principally doctrinal. It has, however, like Paul's other epistles, occasional exhortation intermixed, which the strength of the writer's feelings plainly appears to have forced from him. Thence to the end, it is hortatory and practical.


"The gifts of the Holy Spirit are variously distributed according to his own will," ii. 4; "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and divers miracles," etc. Comp 1 Cor. xii. 11, and iv. 6. "The importance attached to faith is the same in our epistles as in the acknowledged Pauline ones. . . . . . examples of its power are given from the history of the Jewish worthies: Heb iii. 5; x. 38—xi. 40. Cf. Romans iv 3; Galat. iii 6—14. No other sacred writer illustrates πίστις in the same way, or attaches the importance to it which Paul does," Introd. Vol. III. p. 213, 214. See also Ebrard's Comm. App. chap. 5 (B).
In the epistle to the Romans, just before the salutatory part begins, the writer earnestly asks for a special interest in the prayers of those whom he addressed, in order that he may be delivered from the power of persecution; and he follows this request with a petition, that the God of peace might be with them, and concludes with an Amen, Rom. xv. 30—33. The very same order, petition, style, and conclusion, appear at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 18—21. Cf. also Eph. vi. 18—23; Coloss. iv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 23, 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1, 16. The writer begs an interest in their prayers, that he may be restored to them the sooner; commends them to the God of peace (an expression used nowhere else but in Paul's writings and in the epistle to the Hebrews); and concludes with an Amen before the salutation. Cf. with xiii. 24; Rom. 16: 1 Cor. xvi. 19—21; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Philipp. iv. 21, 22; and also the phrase: Grace be with you all, Amen. Heb. xiii. 25, with 2 Thess. iii. 18; Coloss. iv. 18; Eph. iv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Titus iii. 15.

Is all this arrangement, to which we have now adverted, merely accidental; or does it look as if it must have come from the hand of the same writer? I know, indeed, it has been said, that "the order of nature and propriety would lead every man, writing an epistle which contained doctrinal discussion and practical exhortation, to arrange them in such a manner that the former should precede; and that this arrangement, therefore, cannot with probability be represented as exclusively Pauline. With the views of rhetorical propriety, which are entertained by classical scholars of the present day, I readily acknowledge that such an order is almost spontaneous. But then, another question arises here. Why has not Paul adopted this in all his epistles? And why has neither John, nor James, nor Peter, nor Jude adopted it? All these apostles have commingled doctrine and practice, throughout their epistles. Regularly arranged discussion of doctrine, they do not exhibit. In this respect, the only similarity to the epistle to the Hebrews, are to be found in the epistles of Paul. But if the general arrangement here adverted to, be not considered as of much weight in the matter before us, it must be admitted that there is a striking resemblance between the close of the practical part, just before the salutations or greetings, in the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. Here also we find the exclusively Pauline phrase, the God of peace, employed in the same way in both epistles.

(2) The manner of appealing to and employing the Jewish Scriptures, in Paul's acknowledged epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews, is the same.

The spirit, manner, and the frequency with which the Jewish Scriptures are employed, is similar in the epistle to the Hebrews and in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Paul often quotes passages of Scripture, without any notice of quotations: e.g., Rom. ix. 7, 21; x. 6—8,
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18, 18; xi. 84. 1 Cor. ii. 16; x. 26; xv. 25, 27, 32; 2 Cor. ix. 7; xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 11, 12; Eph. v. 31; 2 Tim. ii. 19; so the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews in iii. 2, 5; vi. 87; xi. 21; xii. 6; xiii. 6, and the historical references in chap. xi. throughout. Paul makes a very frequent and copious use of the Jewish Scriptures, in his epistles which are argumentative; so does the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Paul often appeals to the Jewish Scriptures as prophetically declaring the abrogation of the Mosaic economy, and to Abraham as having received a covenant which the law could not annul; the same does the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Paul employs the Old Testament in every way in which the Jews of that time were usually accustomed to reason from it. Sometimes he appeals to direct and prophetic assurances; sometimes to similarity of sentiment; sometimes he accommodates passages, which in the original have a local or temporary meaning, to designate something then extant or happening at the time in which he wrote; sometimes he appeals to the history of the Old Testament, for analogical cases to confirm or impress the doctrine or truth which he inculcates; and sometimes he uses the Old Testament language as a vehicle of thought, in order to express his own ideas. The very same traits characterize, in a most visible manner, the method in which the Old Testament is employed throughout the epistle to the Hebrews; as every attentive reader must plainly see, without my delaying to specify individual cases.

In a particular manner does Paul employ passages of the Jewish Scripture and Scripture history, κατά Ἰσραήλ ἡμών; in other words, he uses them by way of argumentum ad hominem or argumentum ex concessis. It is thus that he allegorizes on the two sons of Sarah and Hagar, in Gal. iv. 24, seq.; on the command of Moses not to muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn, Deut. xxxv. 4, the spirit of which he applies to the maintenance of religious teachers, in 1 Cor. ix. 9; on the rock from which the Israelites obtained water, Ex. xvii. 6, which he considers as an emblem of Christ, in 1 Cor. x. 2, seq.; on the veil over Moses' face, Ex. xxxiv. 33, which he applies to the comparative obscurity that rested on the Jewish revelation, in 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14; on the declaration that a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and that they twain should become one flesh, Gen. ii. 24, which he applies to the union of Christ and his church in Eph. v. 31, 32.

How conspicuous this method of reasoning is, in the epistle to the Hebrews, need not be insisted on for the sake of any attentive reader. The whole comparison between Christ and Melchisedek (Heb. vii), is of a nature similar to those already mentioned. The temple and all its apparatus, and the holy place which the high priest entered with his expiatory offerings of blood, are types and shadows of the temple, of the offering, and of the great high priest presenting it, in the heavens, Heb. viii. 1—5; ix. 1—9. Indeed, the strain of argu-
mentation, throughout, is often *ad hominem* or *ex concessis*. The argument that Christ is a more exalted personage than the angels, than Moses, than the high priest; that Christ's priesthood, the temple in which he officiates with all its apparatus, the offering of blood which he makes, and his official duties as a priest, are all spiritual, heavenly, elevated above all the corresponding things in the Jewish dispensation to which the Jews adhered with so strong an attachment, and by which he was tempted to make defection from his Christian profession, is peculiarly *ad hominem*. We who are not Jews, and who have never felt the power of their prejudices, need not, in order to produce in us a conviction of the importance of Christianity, to be addressed with comparisons drawn from ritual types and from the analogy of such objects. But these were all familiar to the Jew, and were not only attractive to him, but, in his view, of the highest importance. No one, indeed, can reasonably find fault that the writer addresses the Jews as such; reasons with them as such; and makes use of those arguments, whether *ad hominem* or *ex concessis*, which he knew would produce the most powerful effect in persuading them to hold fast the truths of Christianity. There is nothing in this which is inconsistent with the maxim of that apostle who became "all things to all men;" with the Jews demeaning himself and reasoning as a Jew, and in like manner with the Gentiles, in order that he might win both to Christianity.

But it is not my object here to defend the manner of argumentation employed in Paul's acknowledged epistles, and in the epistle to the Hebrews. I design merely to show (what cannot be denied), that the same method of reasoning from sentiments and objects presented by the Old Testament, is exhibited by both, and in a manner which cannot well escape the attention of the inquisitive reader.

I will only ask now, What other writers of the New Testament have exhibited the traits of composition which I have noted under this head, in the same degree, or with the same frequency? Nay, I venture to affirm that there is scarcely an approximation in any of their writings, to those of Paul, either in regard to the frequency or the latitude of the usage in question. But it may be said: 'This only shows that the other writers just named were not the authors of the epistle to the Hebrews, but not that Paul wrote this epistle.' It seems to me, however, to go somewhat further. It proves that the characteristics peculiar to Paul's epistles and to the epistle to the Hebrews, were not the general characteristics of the sacred writers of that age; and of course that either Paul, or one who had drunk in deeply of his doctrine and manner, must have written the epistle in question.

Furthermore, there are striking resemblances in some *peculiar modus* of quotation, e. g., Rom. xiii. 9 τὸ γὰρ and ἐν τῷ, Gal. v. 14, ἐν τῷ compared with Heb. xii. 27 τὸ δὲ, and iii. 15 ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι.
In Rom. iv. 18, we find the perfect Part. used, καρὰ τὸ εἰρημένον; in Heb. xii. 20, τὸ διαστέλλομενον. In Rom. ix. 25 we have ἐν τῷ Ἡλύῳ λέγει ὁ Θεός, and in xi. 12, ἐν Ἡλύῳ λέγει ἡ γραφή, and in Heb. iv. 7, ἐν Δαβίδ λέγων; a peculiarity of quotation which is very striking and remarkable.

There are also some passages quoted in common in the acknowledged epistles of Paul and the Hebrews, and with special marks of the identity of authorship. Psalms viii. 6 is quoted in Heb. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 27, and Eph. i. 22, and the Pauline peculiarity of digression at a word spoken of above, occurs in each of these passages. Besides, in close connection with these quotations in 1 Corinthians xv. 25, and Ephesians i. 20, there is a quotation from Ps. cx. 1, the first part of the verse in Eph. and the last part in Corinthians, while in Hebrews i. 13 the whole verse is quoted, and in viii. 1 and xii. 2, the part quoted in Ephesians, and again in x. 12 the whole verse, as Forster says, nearly in the words of its disjecta membra, Eph. i. 20 and 1 Cor. xv. 23. There is a possibility, but little probability, that different authors would stumble upon all these peculiarities.

The quotations from Heb. ii. 4, in Heb. x. 38; Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11 only, in all of the New Testament each with a slight variation from the LXX., and in the Romans and Hebrews, in precisely the same words, is not without significance. The change made from the Hebrew, in the LXX. and in quotations, should not escape notice. The Hebrew reads, "The just shall live by his faith;" the LXX., "The just shall live by my faith;" and in all the quotations, the point of difference being omitted, the just shall live by faith. See Forster, p. 398, 399. Compare quotations from Ezek. xxxvii. 26 in the midst of other Old Testament citations in Heb. viii. 10, and 2 Cor. vi. 16; from Deut. xxxii. 33 in Hebrews x. 30 and Rom. xii. 19, in the same words in the two passages, though differing both from the Hebrew and the LXX. Forster, however, acknowledges that there may have been a different reading of the LXX. in the first century, Forster, p. 400. Instances of cumulative quotation from the Old Test. distinguish the acknowledged epistles of Paul and the Hebrews, from other New Testament writings. Cf. Rom. iii. 10-18; ix. 7-33; and chap. xi. with Heb. i. 5-14; chap. iii., and x. 5-17, and also the connecting of these quotations in the same way, by καὶ πάλιν is, according to Forster, nowhere else found in the New Testament. Cf. Rom. xv. 9-12; 1 Cor. iii. 19, 20, with Heb. i. 5; ii. 12, 13; iv. 4. 5; x. 30.

(3) The manner of Paul's writing, in respect to separating premises from conclusion, or protasis from apodosis, bears a striking resemblance to that which is found in the epistle to the Hebrews.

I refer now to the manner of employing suspended sentences, and a species of anacolutha or imperfect sentences; and also his custom of seizing hold of a word or phrase thrown out by the way and commenting on it, and then returning to his subject, and thus making
frequent parentheses. Paul sometimes states the major and minor terms of a syllogism, or the first part of a sentence or comparison; and then, leaving it in this unfinished state, he turns aside to illustrate or confirm some hint which was suggested to his mind by what he had stated; or some train of thought is introduced, to which the natural association of ideas would lead; and after descending on this, he returns, and, with or without repeating his proposition or sentence at first commenced, presents in full the conclusion or apodosis which is required to complete it.

A striking example of this occurs in Rom. v. 12—18. "Wherefore," says he, "as by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned, v. 12." The premises being thus stated, he turns aside to descant on the universality of sin, its pernicious consequences, and the salutary effects of the blessing which is proffered by Christ; and it is not until he reaches the 18th verse of the chapter, that the proposition which he had commenced is repeated and the conclusion fully brought out, where it is thus stated: "Therefore, as by one offence condemnation [came upon] all men, so by the righteousness of one, the blessing of justification unto life [comes upon] all men."

So in Rom. ii. 6, Paul says, "Who [God] will render to every man according to his works;" and after nine verses of explanatory matter, which was suggested by the mention of rendering to every man according to his works, he adds, at last, the remainder of the sentence which he had begun, viz., "in the day when God will judge the secret doings of men by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel which I preach, Rom. ii. 16."*

So in Eph. iii. 1, the apostle says, "For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles;" then leaving the sentence just commenced, he proceeds on 12 verses, with thoughts suggested by the mention of his being a messenger to the Gentiles; and finally, in the 13th verse, he adds the conclusion of the sentence commenced in the first, viz., "I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory."

In the like way has the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews constructed some of his reasonings and sentences. In Heb. iv. 6, he says, "Seeing then it remains that some should enter into [the rest], and they to whom t'ue good tidings were formerly proclaimed, did not enter in through unbelief—;" the sentence is then suspended, until

* Bleek (Rev. p. 19) objects to this instance of suspended sense, that I have not rightly comprehended the connection of the whole passage. But surely v. 16 is not to be connected in sense with v. 15, inasmuch as the testimony there alluded to, in respect to the divine law, is present testimony, i.e., such as the heathen then exhibited; not future testimony at the judgment day. This being evidently the case, to what can v. 16 be attached in sense, except to v. 6? It were easy to appeal to distinguished commentators in support of this exegesis; but it seems to be unnecessary.
the writer introduces another quotation from the Psalms, and reasons upon it in order to prove that the rest in question could not have been such a rest as the land of Canaan proffered. After this, and in the 9th verse, we have the concluding part of the sentence or syllogism, viz., "there remaineth then a rest for the people of God." How entirely this coincides with the Pauline manner above exhibited, must strike the mind of every one who considers it.

In iv. 2, also, καὶ γὰρ εἰσαγελῶμενοι καθ' ἄλλο κρίμαντο introduces a comparison, which, in point of form, is nowhere completed.

So in Heb. v. 6, the writer introduces the divine appointment of Christ as a priest after the order of Melchizedek, with a design to show that this was an appointment of the most solemn nature, and of a higher order than that of the Jewish priests. He then suspends the consideration of this topic, and introduces another, in vs. 7—9; after which he resumes the former topic. But no sooner does he do this, than he turns aside once more, in order to descant upon the difficulties which present themselves in the way of an ample discussion of it. These result from the very imperfect state of religious knowledge among those whom he addresses, v. 11—14; the criminality and danger of which state he dwells upon at large in chap. vi., intermixing threats and encouragements. It is not until we come to chap. vii. 1, that the subject of Melchizedek's priesthood is resumed; where it is treated of at full length.

In Heb. vii. 1, a sentence is begun with "This Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God," which is then suspended through a long paragraph of intervening matter, and finally completed, at the end of v. 3, by μόνα τερείς εἰς τὸ διπνεῖς. And generally from v. 8 to 18, there is a series of propositions, the connection of which it is exceedingly difficult to discover.

In Heb. ix. 7, the writer says, that "the Jewish high-priest entered into the holy place once in each year, with the blood of victims in order to make atonement. This is designed as one member of a comparison; but the other member follows only in ix. 11, 12, after descanting on several matters suggested by what the writer had stated. There the antithesis is stated, viz., "Jesus, the high-priest of future blessings, entered the sanctuary of the temple not made with hands, with his own blood, accomplishing eternal redemption."

Such is the suspended connection here, even if we adopt that method of interpretation which will make it as close as possible. But an attentive consideration of the whole preceding context, will perhaps render it probable to the attentive reader, that Heb. ix. 11, may be the antithesis of the latter part of viii. 4 and the first part of viii. 5; where the ἱπόδειγμα and σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, are in contrast with the μελλόντων ἁγιατόν and the μείζονος, καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνής οὐ χαροποιήνου of ix. 11.

How much such suspensions resemble the manner of Paul, need
not be again insisted on. Instances of this nature might easily be increased; but no attentive critical reader can help observing them, as they abound in the epistle to the Hebrews. See more, connected with this general subject, in the sequel.

The instances above produced may serve to show, that, as to form and method, in regard either to general arrangement, or the deducing of arguments from the Old Testament, or the exhibition of a peculiar manner in the statement of these arguments, or in the method of forming suspended and involved sentences, there is a striking similarity between the acknowledged writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.

Bleek (Vol. I. p. 329 seq. and Rev. p. 18 seq.) has given a brief and very different view of the subject now before us. He states, indeed, the peculiarities of Paul's style in much the same manner that I have done. But in regard to our epistle, he maintains (in his Review), that directly the opposite is true in regard to suspended and unfinished sentences and connections of thought. This he does, however, by simple affirmation here; although in his Introduction (I. p. 327 seq.), he has stated that "a regular finish of periods, an accurate position of words, and a fine rhythmus arising from this, are the characteristics of our epistle." Yet in p. 330 seq. of the same work, he has produced a number of instances in order to show the unskillful use, by the writer of the epistle to the Heb., of ὀν, δὲ, etc., and to illustrate the position, that the writer is inferior to Paul in acuteness, and in definiteness of expression. Among these are ὀν in Heb. iv. 14, which refers back to Heb. ii. 17; and γάρ in viii. 4, where ὀν might be expected, and the same particle in vii. 12, 13, where δὲ would be more accurate; as also in v. 11 [12], 13, etc.

How all this, and more of the like kind which he brings forward, agrees with the φρασεῖς Ἐλληνικοποιεῖσθαι, which he so earnestly contends for, in our epistle, and its fine regular periods and methodical rhythmus, I am unable to see. The truth is, when one point is to be made out by critiques of this nature, then the ancient dictum of Origen in regard to the style of our epistle, is brought forward with confidence; but when this point is out of sight, and the real state of facts in respect to style comes simply before the mind, then difficulties and peculiarities of construction enough may be found, and are actually found. How any man, who has written a commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, can deny that there are suspended and incomplete sentences and sentiments in it, and (to say the least) as much obscurity arising from the constructions, as there is in any of Paul's acknowledged epistle, I am not able to see.*

* Davidson has strongly contested this point in his Introd. III. 252. All that he can make out is, that the irregular constructions are not as striking, at least in his manner of interpreting them, as some in some of the acknowl-
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In respect to the thing itself just stated which Bleek denies, and even ventures to affirm that ' the writer has avoided such constructions with the greatest care; this is a matter of fact, and not of opinion. Examples are not to be set aside by simple denial, and allegation of the contrary. Readers are capable of judging for themselves; and to them Bleek and myself must leave it to decide whether the instances produced correspond with the character which I have given them.

Kindred with this is a species of digression which Paley calls going off at a word, i.e., the introduction of a parenthetical clause or clauses suggested by a particular word, and containing that word as a prominent part, which is common to the epistle to the Hebrews with the acknowledged epistles of Paul. So in 2 Cor. ii. 14, at the word savour; in iii. 1 at the word epistle; iii. 12 at the word vail; in Eph. iv. 8—11 at the word ascended; and v. 12—15, at the word light. Compare in Heb. iii. 2, the use of the word house; in xii. 18—29, the words voice, speaketh, shook; in xii. 8, the word chastening, where the Greek words παìδεω, παìδευται, παìδεωσε are specially Pauline; in ii. 7—9, which is of special significance, as the digression is upon the same Greek word as in 1 Cor. xv. 27. See Forster, 379—389.

The use of the figure of speech called Paronomasia is frequent in Paul's other writings as well as the epistle to the Hebrews, e.g. Rom. xi. 3; v. 16; xiv. 23; v. 19; x. 6, 7. 1 Cor. vi. 14; vii. 31; xi. 31, 32; ix. 21; xii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 13; iii. 2; v. 9; vi. 8—10. x. 12; xii. 15. Eph. iv. 8, 9, 16. Philipp. ii. 17. Coll. i. 11; iii. 9, 10. 1 Tim. vi. 7; 2 Tim. iii. 17. Philem. 11, and in Heb. vii. 12, 13; ix. 16; viii. 13; x. 34; xi. 9.

These several cases where the play is upon the same word in the different epistles, and sometimes where the word is peculiarly Pauline, e.g. Heb. xi. 27 and Rom. i. 20; Coll. i. 15, 16. Heb. vii. 23, 24, and Philipp. i. 25; Heb. viii. 7, 8 and Rom. ix. 19; Heb. ii. 2 and Rom. v. 19 and 14; Heb. i. 1 and 2 Tim. iv. 2; Heb. v. 8 and 2 Tim. iii. 10—14; Heb. vii. 26 and 2 Tim. iii. 2; Heb. viii. 3 and Col. i. 22; Heb. xiii. 1, 2 and Rom. xii. 10—13; 1 Tim. iii. 3; Heb. xii. 12, 13 and 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14. See remarks upon the above, in Forster, pp. 390—395, from whom these references are taken.

To the method of argument which I have thus far employed, in order to show the probability that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, some objections have been, and may be raised.

It may be asked, 'Did not Paul's bearers, disciples, and intimate friends, who travelled with him, daily conversed with him, and for years heard his instructions, cherish the same views of doctrine that he did? And in writing the epistle to the Hebrews, might not an edged epistles of Paul. Allowing this to be so, it is very easily accounted for from the more studied and finished style of the epistle to the Hebrews. Irregularities and obscurities would naturally and necessarily disappear. — Ed.
attentive hearer of Paul, and a reader of his epistles, exhibit the same sentiments? And further, if the same general manner in which the contents of his epistles are arranged, or the contents of some of them, be found in the epistle to the Hebrews; or if the particular manner in which he quotes or employs passages of the Jewish Scriptures, or interprets them; or if even his method of stating arguments, and employing imperfect syllogisms or sentences, be found in this epistle; still, may not some favorite disciple of his, some devoted follower and successful imitator of his manner, be naturally supposed to have derived all this from hearing him and reading his letters? And how then can arguments of this nature prove that Paul wrote the epistle in question?

Prove it, in the way of demonstration, they certainly cannot; nor is this the purpose for which they are adduced. But of this, more hereafter. At present I merely observe, that the force of these objections is very much diminished, if in comparing the epistle to the Hebrews with the writings of Paul, it shall appear that not the strain of sentiment only, not merely the general arrangement of the contents of the epistle or the particular manner of it in respect to various ways of reasoning, or constructing syllogisms and sentences, but even the idiomatical and distinctive style and diction itself of Paul abound in it. These, none but a writer that was a mere copyist or plagiarist could exhibit. But such a writer is one of the last men who can be justly suspected of having composed an epistle like that to the Hebrews.

These suggestions naturally lead us, in the next place, to a comparison in respect to phraseology and words, between the acknowledged writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.

4. Comparison of the Phraseology and Diction of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledged Epistles of Paul.

I. The similarity of phraseology and diction, where the same words, or synonymous ones, are employed; or where the shade of thought or representation is peculiar and homogeneous, although the language may be somewhat diverse.

Heb. i. 2, Δι’ οὗ [Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] καὶ τοὺς αἴωνας [ὁ Θεὸς] ἐποίησεν.
Eph. iii. 9, Τῷ [Ἰησῷ] τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or if the last three words of the latter passage are spurious, Coloss. i. 16, τὰ πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ, or 1 Cor. viii. 6, δὲ οὗ τὰ πάντα.

Heb. i. 3, Ὑς ἐν ἀπαίγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.
Col. i. 15, Ὑς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀδράτου.
Phil. ii. 6, Ὑς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.
2 Cor. iv. 4, Ὑς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
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Heb. i. 3, Φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.  
Col. i. 17, Ῥήμα αὐτοῦ διὰ αὐτοῦ συνεστήκη.

Heb. i. 5, Υἱός μου ἔστιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε.  
Acts xiii. 33, Υἱός μου ἔστιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε; used here  
by Paul, and applied in both passages (but nowhere else in the New  
Testament) to Christ.

Heb. i. 4, Τοσούτω εἰρείτων γενόμενος τῶν ἄγγελων, ὡς διαφορ  
róbερον παρ’ αὐτοῦ κεκληρονομηκέν ὄνομα.

Eph. i. 21, Ῥευμάνω...... παντὸς δυναμικοῦ δυναμικοῦ οὐ μόνον  
ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

Phil. ii. 9, Ὁ Θεὸς...... ἐγκατέστη αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάν ὄν-  
ομα: ὅλα ἐν τῷ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ πάν γονί καμίνῃ ἐποιμανίων κ. τ. λ.

Heb. i. 6, Τῶν πρωτότοκον......  
Rom. viii. 29, Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν τῶν πρωτότοκον.

Col. i. 15, Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. V. 18, Πρωτότοκος. This  
appellation is applied to Christ nowhere else, excepting in Rev. i. 5.

Heb. ii. 2, Ὅ δ’ ἄγγελων λαλήθεις λόγοι.  
Gal. iii. 19, Ὅ νόμοι...... διαταγεὶς δ’ ἄγγελων. Comp. Acts  
vii. 53.

Here is the same sentiment, λόγος and νόμος being in this case  
synonymes; as (for substance) λαλήθεις and διαταγεὶς are. How-  
ever, Stephen once uses a similar expression, Acts vii. 53.

Heb. ii. 4, Σημεῖον τε καὶ τέρας, καὶ ποικίλας δυνάμεως, καὶ πνεύ-  
umatos ὑγίου μεριμνοῖς.

1 Cor. xii. 4, Διαμείνεις δὲ χαράμματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα.

1 Cor. xii. 11, Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνέργει τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα,  
διαρρηκταὶ ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ δυνατὰ διὸν διαφόρα..... all spoken of the miraculous gifts of the Holy  
Spirit, and characterized by the same shade of thought, viz., the  
various or different gifts of this nature distributed by him.

Heb. ii. 8, Πάντα ὑπετάξατο ὑποκάτω τῶν πόδων αὐτοῦ.  
1 Cor. xv. 27, Πάντα γὰρ ὑπετάξατο ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.  
Eph. i. 22, Καὶ πάντα ὑπετάξατο ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

Phil. iii. 21, Ῥημάτων διώκετε τὰ πάντα..... phraseology ap-  
piled to designate the sovereignty conferred upon Christ, and found  
only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. ii. 10, Δι’ δὲ τὰ πάντα, καὶ δὶ σοὶ τὰ πάντα.  
Rom. xi. 36, Ἑκ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν τὰ πάντα.  
Col. i. 16, Τὰ πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν.
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1 Cor. viii. 6, Εἶς Ἰησοῦς ... ἦς ὃς τὰ πάντα καὶ τὸς Κύριος ... δὲ οὖ τὰ πάντα ... a method of expression employed to designate God as the author of all things, and also as the lord and possessor of them, which is appropriate to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. ii. 14, Ἡματικοὶ τοῦ τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ Σάματου, τοῦτ' ἐστι τὸν διαβολον.

2 Tim. i. 10, Καταργήσαντος μᾶν τὸν Σάματον. Καταργέω, employed in the sense of abolishing, rendering null, is exclusively Pauline. No other writer of the New Testament employs it at all, except Luke; and he but once, and then in quite a different sense from that attached to it by Paul, Luke xiii. 7.

Heb. ii. 16, Σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ, to designate Christians.

Gal. iii. 29, Εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἀρα τὸ Ἀβραὰμ στέρμα ἐστε.

Gal. iii. 7, Οἷς πιστεύσας, οὕτω εἰσὶν νῦν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ.

Rom. iv. 16, Ἀβραὰμ, δὲ ἐστι πατὴρ πάνων ἡμῶν.

The appellation seed or sons of Abraham, applied to designate Christians, is found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. iii. 1, Κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου.

Phil. iii. 14, Τῆς ἀνω κλήσεως τοῦ Ἰουνιου.

Rom. xi. 29, Ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Ἰουνιου. The phrase heavenly or divine calling, applied to designate the proffered mercies of the gospel, is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. iv. 12, Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰουνιου ... καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πάνων μάχαιραν διότομον.

Eph. vi. 17, Τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, δὲ ἐστι βῶμα Ἰουοῦ. The comparison of the word of God to a sword, is found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. v. 8, Καὶ ἐπὶ ὑὸς, ἡμᾶς ἐγὼ ἀφί καὶ ἐγὼ τὸν Ἰσακοῦν.

Phil. ii. 8, Ἐγενετό πρὸς ὑμᾶς, γενομένος ὑπήκοος, μέχρι Ἰακόπου. The idea of obedience in the humiliation and sufferings of Christ, constitutes the speciality and the similitude of these two passages.

Heb. v. 13, Νηπίος γὰρ ἐστι, i. e., a child in religion, comparatively ignorant, uninformed.

1 Cor. iii. 1, Ἡ τοῦ νηπίου ἐν Ἰουνιῳ, in the same sense.

Eph. iv. 14, Ἡ ὑποκρίσεις ἐν Ἰουνιῳ, in the same.

Rom. ii. 20, Διδασκαλοὶ νηπίων, in the same.

Gal. iv. 3, ὃς ἠμὲν νῆπιον, in the same. This phraseology is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. v. 14, Τελείων δὲ ἐστιν ἢ στερεὰ τροφὴ.
1 Cor. xiv. 20, Ταῦτα δὲ φρεσκὶ τελειωτὰ γίνεσθαι. The word τελειωτά is here the antithesis of νήπιοι, and means well-instructed, mature. In this sense it is employed only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. vi. 1, Τελειώτγη, an advanced, mature state, i.e., of Christian knowledge.

Col. iii. 14, Σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειώτγης, the bond or cement of a mature Christian state. The word τελειώτγη, in such a sense, is limited to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. vi. 3, Ἐν τῷ ἐπιτρέπῃ δὲ Θεῶς.
1 Cor. xvi. 7, Ἐὰν δὲ Κύριος ἐπιτρέπῃ ... a phrase nowhere else employed.

Heb. vi. 10, Τῆς ἁγίας ἂς ἐνδείξασθα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσασθε τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.

2 Cor. viii. 24, Τὴν οὖν ἐνδείκνυται τῆς ἁγίας ὑμῶν ... eis autou \( \varepsilon \)vndeica\( \varepsilon \) صة. The similarity consists in employing ἐνδείξασθα τὴν ἁγίαν in both cases, constructed with eis before the object that follows.

Heb. viii. 5, Οἶνοι υποδέχματι καὶ σκῦλα λατρεύοντι τῶν ἐπιφανέων.

Heb. x. 1, Σκίαν γὰρ ᾔξων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων.

Col. ii. 17, "Α ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ... language respecting the figurative nature of the Jewish dispensation, which is appropriate to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. viii. 6, Κρείττωνος ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης.

1 Tim. ii. 5, Εἰς μεσίτης ... Χριστὸς Ἰσραήλ.

Gal. iii. 19, 20, Ἐν χείρι μεσίτου. Ὅ δὲ μεσίτης ἄνδρον ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The word mediator, applied to designate Christ, or Moses, is appropriate to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. viii. 10, Καὶ ἵσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεῶν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἵσονται μοι εἰς λαόν.

2 Cor. vi. 16, Καὶ ἵσομαι αὐτῶν θεός, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἵσονται μοι λαός.

Both passages are quoted from the Old Testament. The resemblance consists in the quotation and application of the same passage in the same manner, in both places.

Heb. viii. 10, Καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπηγραφὼν αὐτοῖς.

Rom. ii. 15, Τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.

2 Cor. iii. 18, Ἐγγεγραμμένον ... ἐν πλαζει καρδίαις σαρκίναις.

The passage in Hebrews is a quotation. But the other passages serve to show that such a phraseology was familiar to Paul, and that he probably derived it from the Old Testament passage quoted in Heb. viii. 10.
Heb. ix. 15, Θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεως.

Rom. iii. 24, 25, Διὰ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως ... εἰς ἐνδεικνύεται τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρευσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων.

In these two passages the peculiar idea is expressed, that the efficacy of Christ's atoning blood extends back to past ages; an idea nowhere else brought to view in the same manner.

Heb. x. 19, Ὑπόστησις ... παρθένιοι εἰς τὴν εἰσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ.

Rom. v. 2, Δι' αὐτὸν τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἰδοχόκαμεν τῇ πίστει, εἰς τὴν χάριν ταυτίσεως.

Eph. ii. 18, Δι' αὐτοῦ ἐξομολόγησα τὴν προσαγωγὴν ... πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

Eph. iii. 12, Ἐν ὧν ἡ ἑξάγων τὴν παρθένιον καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποίηται.

The idea of access to God, or παρθένιον, bold, free access, or liberty of address, is designated in this manner only by Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. x. 28, Ἐνι τοιούτῳ τῷ μάρτυρι Αὐγουστηκεν.

2 Cor. xiii. 1, Ἐντούτῳ δὲ τοῦ μάρτυρων καὶ τρώων σταθήσεται πᾶν ρήμα.

1 Tim. v. 19, Ἐνι δὲ τῷ τρώων μαρτύρων. Such an expression is found elsewhere only in the words of Christ, Matt. xviii. 16.

Heb. x. 30, Ἐν τούτῳ ἐκδικήσει, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδωσώ.

Rom. xii. 1, Ἐν τούτῳ ἐκδικήσει, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδωσώ.

The similarity consists in quoting the same passage, in translating it de novo from the Hebrew in the same way, and applying it to show that punishment is the awful prerogative of the Deity, and that he will inflict it.

Heb. x. 32, Ἀγάληθεν ... τῶν παθημάτων.

Phil. i. 30, Τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγώνα ἑχοντες, οἷον εἴδοτε ἐν ἑμοὶ.

Col. ii. 1, Ἡλίκιον ἀγῶνα ἑχον περὶ ὑμῶν.

1 Thess. ii. 1, Διάκονοι ... τῶν εὐαγγελισμῶν ... τῶν πολλῶν ἁγίων.

The phrase context, in respect to afflictions, is peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. x. 33, Ὑπαρξάμοι τῇ καὶ Ῥάβεσθω ἰσαρίζομεν.

1 Cor. iv. 9, Θεατρον ἐγενηθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ, κ. τ. λ., ... language peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

Heb. x. 33, Κομμωνοί τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων γενηθέντες, partaking, i. e., sympathizing with the afflicted.
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Philo. iv. 14, ἄνγκουσε θαυμάζεις μου τῇ Ἕλλη, sympathizing in my affliction. The same figurative expression stands in both passages.

Heb. x. 38, 'Ο δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.
Rom. i. 17, 'Ο δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.
Gal. iii. 11, Ὅτι δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

The passage is a quotation. But the application and use of it appear to be exclusively Pauline. In all the instances it is of the same form, and it differs in some measure both from the Septuagint and the Hebrew.

Heb. xii. 1, Τρέχομεν τόν προκείμενον ἡμῶν ἀγώνα.
1 Cor. ix. 24, Οὕτω τρέγετε ἵνα καταλάβητε.
Phil. iii. 14, Τὰ μὲν ὄπωρ ἐπιλαμβάνομεν, τοὺς δὲ ἐμπροσθεν ἐπεκτείνομεν, κατὰ σκοπὸν διάκοι.

The resemblance here is, that Christian efforts are in each passage compared to a race; a comparison found only in Paul and in our epistle.

Heb. xiii. 18, Ἑποίθαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι καλὴν συνεώρησον ξομον.
Acts xxiii. 1, Παῦλος δὲ διδάσκει τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῖς ἑνεκαθήμενοι πεπολίτευμαι . . . a manner of speaking found nowhere else.

Heb. xiii. 20, 'Ο δὲ πρὸς τῆς εἰρήνης.
Rom. xv. 33, 'Ο δὲ πρὸς τῆς εἰρήνης. Also in Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 33; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; an expression used by no other writer of the New Testament.

Heb. xiii. 18, Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν.
1 Thess. v. 25, Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν.

Natural as this may appear, at the close of a letter, it is peculiar to Paul and to our epistle.

To the instances of phraseology thus collected, may be added the greeting and benediction at the close of the epistle to the Hebrews, which is altogether Pauline.

II. The following words (taken from Forster, pp. 77 to 149), are found in the LXX. and Apoc., and nowhere else in the New Testament except in Paul's acknowledged epistles, and that to the Hebrews.

'Α γὼν, Heb. xii. 1; Philipp. i. 30; Col. ii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; in the LXX., of Isa. vii. 13 twice, and seven times Apocrypha.
'Α δῷ καὶ μος, Heb. vi. 8; Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16, and twice in LXX.
'Α λπέρ μας, Heb. xi. 25; Philipp. i. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 6 times in LXX. and once in Apoc.
"Ακάκος, Heb. vii. 26; Rom. xvi. 18; 11 times in the LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
'Aνωφελής, Heb. vii. 18; Tit. iii. 9; 3 times in LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
Τον Ρατσιός, Heb. xi. 27; Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15, 16; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 in LXX, and once in Apoc.
Βεβαίωθες, Heb. vi. 16; Philip. i. 7; 1 in LXX.
Βεβαίωθες, Heb. xii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 9; iv. 7; vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16; 7 in LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
Δακρυσίς, Heb. v. 14; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 10; 1 in LXX.
Δάφορος, Heb. i. 4; viii. 6; ix. 10; Rom. xii. 6; 3 in LXX, and 5 times in Apoc.
Δολεία, Heb. ii. 15; Rom. viii. 15, 21; Gal. iv. 24; v. 1; 44 times in LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
Εκβασίς, Heb. xiii. 7; 1 Cor. x. 13, and 3 times in Apoc.
Εκτρεπόμαι, Heb. xii. 13; 1 Tim. i. 6; v. 15; vi. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 4; and once in LXX.
Ελευσῖος, Heb. xi. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 22 in LXX and 7 in Apoc.
Ενδείκνυμι, Heb. vi. 10, 11; Rom. ii. 15; ix. 17, 22; 2 Cor. viii. 24; Eph. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 14; Tit. ii. 10; iii. 2; 11 in LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
Ενδυμασώ, Heb. xi. 34; Rom. iv. 20; Eph. vi. 10; Philipp. iv. 13; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 1; iv. 17; and twice in LXX.
Ενστήμω, Heb. ix. 9; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22; vii. 26; Gal. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 1; and 1 in LXX and 6 in Apoc.
Επιστρεφόμαι, Heb. x. 25; 2 Thess. ii. 1; and once in Apoc.
Εὐαρεστος, Heb. xiii. 21, 16; xi. 5, 6; xii. 28; Rom. xi. 1, 2; xiv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 9; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Coloss. iii. 20; Tit. ii. 3; and twice in Apoc.
Θαρσέω, Heb. xiii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 6, 8; vii. 16; x. 1, 2; and 12 in LXX, and 3 in Apoc.
Θεία, Heb. xii. 28; xii. 20; Coloss. ii. 21; and 1 in LXX.
Ταλαιπωρον, Heb. iv. 5; Rom. iii. 25; and 80 in LXX.
Κακίαρεπ, Heb. iv. 2; v. 4; Rom. iv. 6; xii. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 12; 2 Cor. i. 14; iii. 13, 18; viii. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 11; iii. 6; iv. 5; and once in LXX.
Καφειμα, Heb. iii. 6; Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 6; ix. 15, 16; 2 Cor. i. 14; v. 12; ix. 3; Gal. vi. 4; Phil. i. 26; ii. 16; 15 in LXX, and 8 in Apoc.
Δειγματος, Heb. i. 7; viii. 2; Rom. xiii. 6; xv. 16; Philip. ii. 25; 11 in LXX, and 2 in Apoc.
Μετέχας, Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24; Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; and 1 in LXX.
Μετέχω, Heb. ii. 14; v. 13; vii. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 10, 12; x. 17; 1 Cor. x. 21, 30; 1 in LXX, and 8 in Apoc.
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Oλκηρομός, Heb. x. 28; Rom. xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 3; Philipp. ii. 1.
Col. iii. 2; 32 in LXX, and 3 in Apocr.
Ομολογία, Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14; x. 23; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13; 7 in LXX and 1 in Apocr.
Ονεοϊσμός, Heb. x. 33; xi. 26; xiii. 13; Rom. xv. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 7; 53 in LXX, and 2 in Apocr.
Πασελία, Heb. xi. 5, 7, 8, 11; Eph. vi. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 48 in LXX, and 32 in Apocr.
Πασελίστης, Heb. xii. 9; Rom. ii. 20; 1 in LXX, and 1 in Apocr.
Παράβαςσί, Heb. ii. 2; ix. 15; Rom. ii. 23; iv. 15, 16; v. 14; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Tim. ii. 14; 1 in LXX, and 1 in Apoc.
Περιβόλαιον, Heb. i. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 15; and 9 in LXX.
Περάκη, Heb. ix. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 3 twice, and 32 in LXX.
Πόμα, Heb. ix. 10; 1 Cor. x. 4; and once in LXX.
Στεφανώ, Heb. ii. 7, 9; 2 Tim. ii. 5; 4 in LXX, and 1 in Apocr.
Συγκράνυμι, Heb. iv. 2; 1 Cor. xii. 24; and 2 in Apocr.
Σελεύτης, Heb. vi. 1; Col. iii. 14; 2 in LXX, and 2 in Apocr.
Υπεναντίος, Heb. x. 27; Col. ii. 14; 23 in LXX, and 11 in Apocr.
Υπεράνω, Heb. ix. 5; Eph. i. 21; iv. 10; and 9 in LXX.
Υπόστασις, Heb. i. 3; iii. 14; xi. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 4; xi. 17; 17 in LXX, and 1 in Apocr.
Υπάρτω, Heb. xi. 33; Rom. iii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 10; 5 in LXX, and 2 in Apocr.

III. The following words are not found in the LXX, the Apocrypha, or any part of the New Testament, except the epistle to the Hebrews and the undisputed epistles of Paul.

"Α Σ λ η σ ις, Heb. x. 32, and 'Α Σ λ ε, 2 Tim. ii. 5, twice.
Αδώς, Heb. xii. 28, and 1 Tim. ii. 9.
'Αναλογίςμα, Heb. xii. 3, and Αναλογία, Rom. xii. 6.
'Ανυπότακτος, Heb. ii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 6, 10.
'Απείθεια, Heb. iv. 6, 11; Rom. xi. 30, 32; Eph. ii. 2; v. 6; Col. iii. 6.

'Απεκδέχομαι, Heb. ix. 28; Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Philipp. iii. 20.
'Απολαυσίς, Heb. xi. 25; 1 Tim. vi. 17.
'Αφιλάργυρος, Heb. xiii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 5.
'Ανθίκος, Heb. ii. 2; Rom. iii. 8.
'Ενεργής, Heb. iv. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Philem. 6.
'Εφάπαξ, Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12; x. 10; Rom. vi. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 6.
Μηπω, Heb. ix. 8; Rom. ix. 11.
IV. Words which occasionally occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but in manner or frequency pertain to the Hebrews and the undisputed epistles of Paul.

'Αγαμίσμος, άμεμπτος, ἀναμμύησκω, ἀνάμμητος, ἀνταποδώσω, ἀπόκαμα, and προκεμεῖ, ἀπολύτρωσις, ἀφάνεια, βεβαιός, βεβαιώω, γυμνάζω, ψάξω, ἐπορεύομαι, καταργείς, κλίσος, λειτουργέω, λόγον τὸ λοικόν, μέμφομαι, μεταλλαμβάνω, μετατίθημι, μυθήτης, νήπιος, πάθη, παραμένω, περιμεῖναι, περιτοντέρω, πόρως πρέπει, σαρκίζω, σβήνω, σκιά, σκληρώμα, στοιχεῖον, συγκληρονόμος, συνείδησις, Τιμάθεος.†

V. Peculiarity of grammatical construction in regard to the use of the passive verb instead of the active.

Thus in Heb. vii. 11, we find the phrase ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ νεομονήγητο, for the people under it [the Levitical priesthood] received the law, where the Nominative case of the person who is the object (not the subject) in the sentence, is joined with the passive of the verb: and this mode of construction is employed instead of the active voice of the same verb followed by the Dative of the person who is the object; e. g., νεομονήγητο λαῷ.

The like construction is found in Paul's acknowledged writings. E. g., Rom. iii. 2, ὅτι [αὐτοῖ] ἐπιστεύσαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, they were entrusted with the oracles of God, instead of saying the oracles of God were entrusted to them. Rom. vi. 17 — εἰς δὲ παρεδόθη τοῦ διδάχης, into which model of doctrine ye have been delivered, instead of, which form or model of doctrine was delivered to you. 1 Tim. i. 11, ὅ ἐπιστεύσην ἔγω, with which I was entrusted, instead of, which was entrusted to me, ὅ ἐπιστεύση μοι.

But here, while I acknowledge the possibility of such an imitation,

* "Τακόθ, ἡ, obedientia ut παρακοθ est inobediencia. Quae eleganter a Paulo inter se committuntur, Ep. ad Rom. v. 19 — Steph. in verb." Upon which Foster well says: "The use of both words, Heb. ii. 2 and v. 8, derives increased force from this remark of Stevens, as indicative of the same hand," p. 221.

† See other words of similar form and References in Forster, p. 234 sq., from which most of the above are taken.
there is a minuteness of grammatical construction, which a copyist of Paul would not be likely either to notice or to imitate. It affords, therefore, the more striking evidence that all proceeded from the same hand.

Finally, Paul frequently employs an adjective of the neuter gender in order to designate generic quality, instead of using a synonymous noun; e.g., τὸ ἀμετάδεκτον, Heb. vi. 17; τὸ φαντασμένον, Heb. xii. 21; τὸ καλὸν, xii. 18; τὸ γεωργικόν, Rom. i. 19; τὸ χρηστόν, Rom. ii. 4; τὸ περισσόν, Rom. iii. 1; τὸ δικαίον, Rom. ix. 22; τὸ ἀδίκον, Rom. vii. 3; τὸ ἀγαθόν, 1 Cor. i. 25.

§ 12. Remarks on the comparisons made in the preceding sections.

In the first place, without any hesitation, I concede thus much to those critics, who make light of the evidence drawn from such a comparison as has now been made, viz., that no evidence of this nature can ever afford what is equivalent to a demonstration of the fact, for the support of which it is adduced. But then, demonstration is what such a case neither admits nor demands. If the writer's name were affixed to the epistle, it would not amount to proof of this kind; for might it not have been put there by another person, in order to answer some designs of his own? Nay, unless witnesses have given us testimony, who themselves saw Paul write the epistle, the proof is not of the highest kind that is possible; nor even then would their testimony establish the fact, unless we could be well assured of their credibility. By such a criterion, however, the genuineness of no writing, ancient or modern, can be examined. It is generally enough for us, that an author's name is affixed to a writing. Prima facie it is evidence that it belongs to him; and it must be regarded as sufficient evidence, until it is contradicted either expressly, or by implication.

Let us suppose, now, that after an author has published many pieces, and his style and sentiments have become well known, he publishes a composition of any kind without affixing his name to it; can there be no adequate, no satisfactory evidence, that it belongs to him?

This is the very question before us. I grant that similarity or even sameness of sentiment, in different pieces, does not certainly prove identity of authorship; for the friends, or imitators, or disciples of any distinguished man, may imbibe the same sentiments which he inculcates, and exhibit them in similar words and phrases. I grant that the primitive teachers of Christianity were agreed, and must have been agreed (supposing that they were under divine guidance), as to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. But in respect to the mode of representing them; in regard to the style, and diction, and urgency with which particular views of doctrine are insisted on; what can be more various and diverse than the epistles of Paul, and James, and John?
The reply to this, by critics who entertain sentiments different from those which I have espoused, is, that 'the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was an intimate friend, or a studious imitator of Paul; a man of talents, who, with unqualified admiration of the apostle's sentiments, mode of reasoning, and even choice of words, closely imitated him in all these particulars. Hence the similarity between the writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.'

The possibility of this cannot be denied. Designed imitation has, in a few instances, been so successful as to deceive, at least for a while, the most sharp-sighted critics. Witness the imitation of Shakspeare which a few years ago was palmed upon the English public, as the work of that distinguished poet himself. But after all, such attempts have very seldom been successful, even where the most strenuous efforts have been made at close imitation; and these, with all the advantages which a modern education could afford. How few, for example, of the multitudes who have aimed at copying the style of Addison or Johnson with the greatest degree of exactness, have succeeded even in any tolerable measure; and none in such a way, that they are not easily distinguished from the models which they designed to imitate.

Just so it was in the primitive age of the church. The Christian world was filled with gospels and epistles, ascribed to Paul, and Peter, and other apostles and disciples. Yet no one of these succeeded in gaining any considerable credit among the churches; and what little was ever gained by any of them, proved to be temporary and of very small influence. This was not owing to want of exertion; for strenuous efforts were made by writers to imitate the apostolic manner of writing, so as to gain credit for their supposititious pieces. But all of them failed. Indeed, nothing can be more egregious or striking than the failure. A comparison of any of the apocryphal writings of the New Testament, with the genuine writings of the same, shows a difference heaven-wide between them, which the most undistinguishing intellect can hardly fail to discern.

If, then, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was an imitator, a designed and close imitator, of the apostle Paul, he has succeeded in such a way as no other writer of those times, or of any succeeding ones, ever did. He has produced a composition, the sentiments of which in their shade, and coloring, and proportion (so far as his subjects are common with those in the acknowledged epistles of Paul), are altogether Pauline. Nay, he has preserved not only the order of writing which Paul adopts, but his mode of reasoning, his phraseology, and even his choice of peculiar words, or words used in a sense peculiar to the apostle. The imitation goes so far, it extends to so many particulars, important and unimportant, that, if our epistle was not written by Paul, it must have been an imitation of him which was the effect of settled design, and was accomplished only by the most strenuous effort.
I must from thorough conviction say, that the probability of it does seem to be very small. With Origen, I must, after often repeated study of this epistle, say, The sentiments are wonderful, and in no way behind those of the acknowledged writings of the apostles, τὰ νόηματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἰωάννου ἡμῶν, καὶ οἱ δεύτεροι τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογήματος γραμμάτων, Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 25. I cannot elsewhere find any higher intensity of mind; any more exalted conceptions of the true nature of Christianity, as a spiritual religion; any higher views of God and Christ, or of the Christian's privileges and his obligations to believe in, love, and obey the Saviour; any more noble excitements to pursue the Christian course, unmoved by the threats and unallured by the temptations of the world; or any so awful representations of the fearful consequences of unbelief and of defection from Christianity. The man who wrote this epistle, has no marks of a plagiarist or of an imitator about him. Nothing can be more true and original than his thoughts, reasonings, and mode of expressing them. It is most evident, that they flow directly and warm from the heart. They are "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn." Where in all the ancient world did ever a plagiarist or an imitator write in this manner? A man who could form such conceptions in his mind, who could reason and exhort in such an impressive and awful manner, has he any need of imitating — even Paul himself? No; it may be said of him (what Paul on another occasion said of himself in comparison with his brethren), that "he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles."

Then how could such a man be concealed, in the first ages of the church, when the memory of those who were very distinguished has been preserved so distinct, and with so much care and reverence, by ecclesiastical tradition? Men who can write in this manner, cannot remain concealed anywhere. And the writer of such an epistle, it would seem, must have acted a part not less conspicuous than that of the great apostle of the Gentiles himself.

But antiquity, we are told, has attributed this epistle to distinguished men in the early church, to Clement of Rome, to Luke, or to Barnabas, each of whom is known to have been the warm friend and admirer of Paul.

I know this has been often alleged. But fortunately there are extant writings of each of these persons, with which our epistle may be compared; and which serve to show how little foundation there is for such an opinion. But of this more hereafter. I merely say at present, that the great body of critics, for some time past, have agreed in rejecting the opinion which ascribes our epistle to either of the authors just mentioned.

Who, then, did write it, if Paul did not? And what is to be gained by endeavoring to show the possibility that some other person wrote it, when so many circumstances unite in favor of the general voice of
the primitive ages, that this apostle was the author? That the church, during the first century of the apostolic age, ascribed it to some one of the apostles, is clear from the fact that it was inserted among the canonical books of the churches in the East and the West; that it was comprised in the Peshito; and was certainly admitted by the Alexandrine and Palestine churches. Now, what apostle did write it, if Paul did not? Surely neither John, nor Peter, nor James, nor Jude. The difference of style is too striking between their letters and this, to admit of such a supposition. But what other apostle, except Paul, was ever distinguished in the ancient church as a writer? None; and the conclusion therefore seems to be altogether a probable one, that he was the writer. Why should all the circumstances which speak for him, be construed as relating to some unknown writer? Are the sentiments unworthy of him? Are they opposed to what he has inculcated? Do they differ from what he has taught? Neither. Why not, then, admit the probability that he was the author? Nay, why not admit that the probability is as great as the nature of the case (the epistle being anonymous) could be expected to afford? Why should there be any more objection to Paul as the author of this epistle, than to any other man?

My own conviction (if I may be permitted to express it) is as clear in respect to this point, as from its nature I could expect it to be. I began the examination of the subject unbiased, if I was ever unbiased in the examination of any question, and the evidence before me has led me to such a result.


We will now notice the objections to the Pauline authorship of this epistle which have not been sufficiently canvassed in the preceding view, following the same order as in adducing arguments above.

I. Objections from Circumstances mentioned or adverted to in the Epistle.

1. The passage which is much relied upon here, or can be adduced with most plausibility, is Heb. ii. 1, 2, 3, which, according to Schulz, Bleek, and others, proves that Paul could not have been the writer of our epistle; for he did not receive his gospel from others, but was immediately taught it by Christ himself, Gal. i. 11, 12; v. 15—19. See Schulz, p. 125 seq.

I remark, then, in the first place, that if the use of the first person plural by the writer, necessarily makes him one in all respects with those whom he is addressing, then the author of our epistle did himself need the admonitions which he has so powerfully and feelingly addressed to others; see ii. 1, 3; iii. 6; iv. 1, 2, 11, 13, 16; vi. 1—3, 16, 19; x. 22—24, 26, 39; xi. 40; xii. 1, 9, 10, 28; xiii. 10, 13, 15.
OBJECTIONS.

Nay, he must have included himself among those who were shaken in their Christian belief, and who were in imminent hazard of final apostasy.

On the other hand, nothing can be plainer than that he uses *we* or *ye* indifferently, for the persons whom he addresses; e.g., Heb. iv. 1, *let us fear. . . lest any one of you, etc.;* *we, in xii. 1, 2; ye, in xii. 3—8; we, in xii. 9, 10; ye, in xii. 14—25; we, in xiii. 25—28,* and often in the same manner elsewhere, the address being still most manifestly made to the very same persons.* He often employs, also, the first person plural (*συνύσζυ* ) to designate merely himself; e.g., in Heb. ii. 5; vi. 9, 11; xiii. 18. This, in like manner, he interchanges with the first person singular; e.g., xiii. 18, comp. xiii. 19, 22, 23.

The same use of the first person plural runs through all the Pauline epistles; Gal. i. 8, comp. i. 9—24; Gal. ii. 5, comp. ii. 1—4, and ii. 6; 7, and so very often elsewhere. So *συνυζεις and *συνεις for the persons addressed, Gal. iii. 1—12; iii. 13—25; iii. 26—29; iv. 3—5; iv. 6—20; iv. 26—31, et alibi. Cf. also Rom. xiii. 11—13.

The substantial answer to the allegations of Schulz and Bleck, is, that the figurative method of speaking denominated *ἀνακύνοσις* , in which the author includes himself although he does not mean himself, is often employed by all good writers and speakers. Bleck allows (what indeed it is impossible to deny), that in warnings and exhortations such is the case, because the writer means to concede when, he uses the first person plural, that he himself is bound to regard the like warnings, etc. But where the writer should evidently be excepted from the subject of the declaration, he thinks it a plain case that *ἀνακύνοσις* cannot be used, and says that no instance of this nature has yet been produced.

But this method of meeting the argument is not satisfactory. For example; in Heb. vi. 1—3 the writer says, *Let us go on to attain sublimer degrees of Christian knowledge, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, etc., [which surely he did not himself do] . . . and this *we* will do, if God permit, etc.* Now what is it that "*we* will do?" Plainly, "we will go on to higher degrees of Christian knowledge, and not lay again the foundation of repentance from dead works, etc., as we have done." Now if one should reply and say, *The writer may be included among those who are going on to acquire more Christian knowledge;* yet I would ask, is he among those *who are laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, etc.?" Surely not. Nor is *προϊστρόψευς* in v. 3, either *exhortation* or *warning,* but promise. The whole may be summed up in a word; does the writer promise for himself, in the same manner

* Ebrard well remarks: "*συνύσζυ* is said in opposition to the contemporaries of Moses, and only denotes generally the Christians." "How can we escape," etc., is only a milder form of "How can ye escape?"—App. ch. V. (A).
as for his readers, ‘that he will quit building up the old foundations, and advance to the superstructure?’ Truly he does not mean to put himself among such as were building the old foundations.

In Heb. x. 24, 25 does the writer, when he says καταλείπων τὴν ἐπιστυναγωγήν ἐαυτῶν? Most plainly not; and then that the first person plural here means no more than the second, is clear from its being exchanged for the second (Βλέπετε) before the sentence is ended.

But not to dwell on other passages in our epistle, let us see how it is in other epistles of the New Testament. I select only a few. 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32, when the apostle says, παρειδομένη etc., does he not relate a fact, and not a mere general principle, as Bleek suggests, p. 291? And was the apostle himself chastised because he violated the decorum of the sacramental table? And when Paul says, Eph. iv. 14, ἵνα μηκέτι ἐμεν νῦν ἡμείς, does he imply that he was to be included among those who had thus far been νῦντες? In 1 Thess. iv. 15—17, he speaks of ἡμεῖς οἱ ζωντες, etc., being caught up alive to meet the Lord in the air, at the time of the general resurrection; did Paul himself, during his natural life, expect to see that day? Bleek, indeed, answers this question in the affirmative; but it is making the very same mistake that the Thessalonians made, whom Paul so amply corrects in his second epistle, chap. II.

Turn we now to another apostle. James says of the tongue, “Therewith bless we God even the Father; and therewith curse we men, who are made in his image.” That he is not speaking here of a faculty (that of using the tongue), but of a fact, is clear from the context. Does he mean, then, to include himself as cursing ‘the image of God’ with his own tongue? His vehemence reproof may answer this question.

One word more on the passage before us, viz., Heb. ii. 3, 4. The writer begins the paragraph with δι᾽... ἡ μὴ ἄσ προσέχειν... μενοείς... ποτέ... παρ᾽... θυσία... μὲν... i. e., all in the first person plural. He then goes on to say, πῶς ἡ μὴ ἐν ἐξεστώματα κατ᾽... λα.; after which he immediately subjoins, before he finishes this very sentence, the contested ἡμεῖς (συνηρίσθη)... ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουστῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἔβεβαιωθῇ; from which Bleek draws such important conclusions, by comparing this with Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 15 seq. ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xi. 23; Eph. iii. 2. 3. But what room can there be for such conclusions to be fairly made? How could the writer close his sentence in any other manner than that in which he had begun and continued it? This was all in the first person plural. Of course, he could not well say, without infringing upon the grammatical construction and symmetry of his sentence, εἰς ὑμὲις ἔβεβαιωθη, but must write, εἰς ἡμᾶς ἔβεβαιωθη. If now the word ἡμεῖς is to be rigidly pressed into a literal and exact meaning in the last part of the sentence before us, then of course I may reasonably insist on its being so taken in the first part. The
necessary implication would consequently be, that the writer himself of our epistle was neglecting to give heed to the declarations of the gospel, and was in special danger τοῦ παραβόων; that he was neglecting, or in imminent danger of neglecting, the great salvation, and consequently of barring up all the avenues of escape from the aggravated doom of those who slighted the gospel. Will any ingenious reader, who has not a case to make out, venture to say that the writer means to have his readers recognize himself, as being in the same danger and guilt with those whom he was warning?

The true method of interpreting εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβαινώση seems to me, plainly, to be the same as that of construing ἐν ἡμῖν, — παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν, in Luke i. 1, 2; where evidently ἡμῖν is neither more nor less than Christians, followers of Christ, as Kuinoel has rightly interpreted it. Thus understood (and in the like way it is to be understood in a multitude of cases), no argument at all can be derived from it in support of the position which Bleek maintains, and of course none against the Pauline origin of our epistle.

One word more, and I close this topic. If ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκούοντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβαινώση, in chap. ii. 3, proves that the writer of our epistle must necessarily be reckoned among those who received a knowledge of the gospel at second hand, and not from Christ himself; then does ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ in i. 1, of course and necessarily prove that the very same writer had communications made to him by the Son of God himself; in other words, the same expressions prove that the writer has asserted two different and opposite things in the course of 15 verses. It is impossible to escape from this; and this is enough to put an end to this controversy.

(2) Bleek and others allege against the Pauline origin of our epistle, 'the incorrect representation made by the writer of the arrangement of the Jewish Sanctuary, and of the high priest's official duties performed in it, particularly in Heb. IX.' The particulars which go to establish this, are, that the golden altar of incense is placed by him in the inner sanctuary, Heb. ix. 3, 4; and that the golden vial of manna and the rod of Aaron that budded, are said to be there; which is contrary to 1 K. viii. 9; and 2 Chron. v. 10. He alleges also, that in ix. 7 the high priest is said to have gone into the most holy place only once in each year; whereas it appears from Lev. XVI. that he went in several times.

It needs only to be remarked, that the whole strength of his appeal lies in the misconception of the word ἔκβεβλήσης (Heb. ix. 4), which is translated altar of incense. It merely indicates anything on which incense is burned. Of course it may be used to designate the altar of incense, and so it may be to designate a censer or incense-pan that was borne in the hand. Such a one the high priest carried with him into the inner sanctuary on the great day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 12—14. It is usually named ἱππηρ in Hebrew: but sometimes it is
called הָרוּתְוָה, as in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19; Ezek. viii. 11, in both which places the Septuagint render it ἦμωαρίπον.

What is there to show that in Heb. ix. 4 the meaning is not the same?

In regard to the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron, it is sufficient to say, that they were deposited where the writer of our epistle affirms them to have been, as appears from Ex. xvi. 32—34; Num. xvii. 10. (xvii. 25). All the difficulty suggested by Bleek, arises from his having overlooked the fact, that the writer of our epistle is describing the tabernacle as it originally was, not the temple in after ages.

In regard to both these subjects, I refer the reader to Excursus XVI. XVII. at the close of the present work.

In respect to the high priest's entering the sanctuary more than once, comp. Lev. xvi. 2. It would appear by Lev. xvi. 12, 14, 15, that during the day of general atonement, he entered the inner sanctuary several times (see on Heb. ix. 7). But the writer of our epistle plainly speaks here of one day, one time, in distinction from other days and times of the year. Just so does Philo speak of the same subject, "ἀνατρέψεως ὀστήρα οἴκου the high priest entered the inner sanctuary," De Mor. II. p. 821. Legat. ad Caion, p. 1035.

Besides, how is it possible, I would ask, to suppose with any degree of probability, that the writer of our epistle, whoever he might be, was ignorant of so obvious and palpable a fact as the position of the altar of incense? a thing which no one that had ever been at the temple, or heard a description of its services from those who had been there, could possibly be ignorant of. Was the writer of our epistle a novice in the knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures? The frequency with which he has quoted them, the manner in which he employs them and speaks of them, may answer this question. And did he not know, must not every Jew at home and abroad have known, that every morning and every evening, throughout the whole year, incense was burned upon the altar appropriated to this purpose? Ex. xxx. 7, 8; Luke i. 9, 11. — Did he not know, too, that the high priest did not, and could not lawfully, enter the inner sanctuary, except on one day of the year only? This Heb. ix. 7 testifies. How then, since incense, as he well knew, must be burned every day on the altar, could he at the same moment mark the position of the altar as being in the inner sanctuary, which could be approached only once in each year? The thing is plainly too incredible to meet with assent.

Nor does the case appear any better in regard to the sacred pot of manna and the rod of Aaron which budded. Could the writer of our epistle be ignorant of passages, which were so deeply interesting to a Jew as 1 K. i. 9; 2 Chron. v. 10? And even if he had not read them, was it possible that there should not have been a universal knowledge among the Jewish nation, by report, at the period in which he lived, respecting the fact whether any relics of the Mosaic ære were in the ark of the testimony? Truly it would be a great tax on one's credulity, to believe what is in itself so exceedingly improbable.
II. Objections from Sentiments and Doctrines contained in the Epistle.

(1) 'In Heb. x. 25 seq., according to Bertholdt and others, the speedy coming of Christ is mentioned; and so it is often by Paul. But in the epistle to the Hebrews it is evidently a moral change; whereas Paul everywhere speaks of it as an actual, visible coming of Christ.'

This difficulty depends entirely upon the writer's exegesis. Whatever the nature of the coming of Christ may be, I venture to say, it is palpably represented in the same manner in the epistle to the Hebrews and in the epistles of Paul. Indeed, so far has the representation in the epistle to the Hebrews appeared to some from being plainly a moral one, that a portion of the most distinguished commentators have understood it as having respect to the natural changes that are to take place, when Christ shall come at the end of the world. So Storr, and others also, both before and after him. Paul surely says little or nothing, which more certainly designates the actual, visible coming of Christ, than this epistle. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5, 6; Phil. i. 10; iv. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 13; v. 1—6; v. 23; 1 Tim. vi. 13—16; Tit. ii. 11—13. Compare also with these representations, 2 Thess. ii. 1—10, where Paul explains his views in respect to the coming of Christ. Indeed, so much alike is the representation of this subject, in the epistle to the Hebrews and in Paul's epistles, that many critics have used this very circumstance as a proof that the author of both must have been the same person; an argument not valid, however, because the same representation is common to other writers of the New Testament. Still, the mention of this serves to show that the exegesis of Bertholdt, in this case, is not to be relied on with such confidence as he places in it.

(2) 'According to the epistle to the Hebrews, the propitiatory office of Christ continues forever in the heavenly world, vii. 24 seq.; whereas Paul, on the contrary, considers the atonement for men as already completed by the death and resurrection of Jesus, Rom. iv. 25.'

This argument is surely not well chosen. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews says, in so many words, that the high priest of Christianity had no daily necessity, like the Jewish priest, to make offerings first for his own transgressions and then for those of the people; "for this he did once for all, when he made an offering of himself, vii. 27." And again; "Nor had he need often to repeat the sacrifice of himself (as the high priest yearly enters into the holy place with blood not his own); for then he must have suffered often since the foundation of the world; but now in this last age, he has appeared once for all, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." And as all men die, once for all, and then go to the judgment; so Christ was offered up, once for all, to take away the sins of many; and when he shall make
his second appearance, it will not be to atone for sin, but to bestow salvation on those who look for him, ix. 25—28." How can words make it more certain, that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews considered the propitiation or atonement as entirely completed by the death of Christ?

It is true, indeed, that the same author also represents Christ as forever living, and exercising the duties of his office as an intercessor (or helper) for the saints, before God: "He, because he continueth forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood; whence he is able to save to the uttermost those who come unto God through him, since he ever lives to intercede for (ἐντυγχάνειν to help) them, vii. 24, 25." Which agrees another representation, in ix. 24; "Christ has entered into heaven itself, henceforth to appear before God for us." But are these sentiments foreign to Paul, as Bertholdt alleges? "Who shall accuse the elect of God? — God acquits them. Who shall pass sentence of condemnation upon them? It is Christ, who died for them; rather, who is risen again, who is at the right hand of God, and who intercedes for (ἐντυγχάνει) them, Rom. viii. 33." Here is not only the very same idea as in the epistle to the Hebrews, but even the very same term (ἐντυγχάνει) is used in both. Instead, then, of affording any evidence against the opinion that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, the point in question affords evidence in favor of it. Paul, and Paul only, of all the apostolic authors, has presented the idea of the intercession of Christ in the heavenly world. To say the least, the whole mode of representing this subject is Pauline. The only difference between the epistle to the Romans and the epistle to the Hebrews, is, that in the latter case, the nature of the argument which the writer had employed, required him to represent Christ as performing the functions of a priest in the heavenly world. But it is plainly the intercessory function which he is represented as continuing to perform, in the passages which I have cited.

(3) 'The doctrine respecting the Logos, in the epistle to the Hebrews, is of Alexandrine hue, and evidently resembles that of John, and not of Paul. E. g., the divine Logos (λόγος Ἰησοῦ) is quick and powerful, etc., iv. 12, 13; also, Christ is a priest κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλίτου, iii. 16. So too, when Christ is represented as making an offering διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίων ix. 14, this, as well as the other cases coincides with the views and representations of John, and not of Paul.'

If now a critic will do such violence to the laws of exegesis, as to construe these passages so as to make them have respect to the doctrine of the Logos, the best way to answer him would be to show that his principles of interpretation are without any good foundation. I cannot turn aside to do this here, as it more properly belongs to the exegesis of the epistle. I shall content myself with merely observing that one of the last ideas which can well be deduced from the passage respecting the λόγος Ἰησοῦ just referred to, is that which Bertholdt
has deduced from it. His deduction does equal violence to the context, and to the whole strain of reasoning in our epistle. And where does John speak of Christ’s eternal priesthood, or of his offering made in heaven διὰ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ? And what resemblance have his writings to our epistle in this respect?

(4) The author of this epistle was a Judaizing Christian, who grants that Judaism is still to continue, yea to have a perpetual duration. Not a trace of anything is to be found, which intimates an equal participation in the privileges of the gospel by Jews and Gentiles; Schultz, pp. 74, 80.

The first of these allegations is, so far as I know, altogether new. Nothing more need be said in respect to it; than to refer the reader to chapters viii—x., for most ample and satisfactory confutation. I had ever thought, before reading Dr. Schultz, that the writer of our epistle was the last of men who could be justly accused of Judaizing. If his views do not agree with those of Paul, in respect to this matter, I am unable to see how language could express them. See above p. 136.

In regard to the second allegation, it is sufficient to say, that the object of the writer did not lead him to treat of the subject to which it relates. Are there not other epistles of Paul, which do not bring this subject to view? And must a writer always repeat the same topics? In what part of the first epistle to the Corinthians does Paul treat of the equal participation of the Jews and Gentiles in the privileges of the gospel, and maintain the equal right of the latter; as he does in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians? And is it not enough to say, that he did not do this because the occasion did not demand it?

(5) But Christ, in our epistle, appears everywhere as the Son of God, as apostle, and high priest. Where is he so represented by Paul? Schultz, p. 81 seq.

In regard to the appellation Son of God, it is often enough given to Christ by Paul. In respect to ἀπόστολος and ἡγεμόνευς, he is not so called, indeed, by the apostle in his acknowledged epistles. The only reason why the writer of our epistle calls him so, is obviously one drawn from the nature of the comparison instituted between him and Moses, and between him and the Jewish high priest. The nature of the composition and the object of the writer rendered this unavoidable. In the acknowledged epistles of Paul, no such occasion is presented of using the appellations in question.

(6) Our author says nothing of Christ as judge of the world, but uniformly attributes judgment to God. Nor does he say a word of Hades, Gehenna, Satan (excepting in ii. 14, 15), the resurrection of the dead, and generally of the closing scene of all things; of which matters Paul treats so copiously; Schultz, p. 95 seq.

But surely the final close or destruction of all material things, is sufficiently intimated in i. 10 seq.; future punishment in iv. 11 seq.; vi. 4 seq. x. 26 seq. xii. 29. In fact, where is there anything in all
the Bible, on the subject of future punishment, more awful and severe than these passages? That the names Hades and Gehenna do not occur in our epistle, would be a singular argument to prove that Paul did not write it. Where in all the acknowledged epistles of Paul, is either of these words to be found, excepting in one solitary quotation in 1 Cor. xv. 55, which exhibits ἀδήνας? As to Satan, this appellation does not indeed occur; yet its equivalent δάβδος occurs in ii. 14. But the word Satan does not occur in the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon; are these epistles, therefore, spurious?

In regard to the resurrection of the dead, it is sufficient to refer to vi. 2, and to what is implied in xii. 22 seq. The passage in xi. 35 has reference to a resurrection different from the one now in question.

That the writer of our epistle did not make frequent mention of these topics, is easily accounted for on the ground that he was more immediately occupied with other things. Are there not several of Paul's acknowledged epistles, which omit the same topics? But who will undertake to prove, from this, that they are spurious?

(7) 'But not a word of Christ's resurrection, a theme on which Paul everywhere descants, p. 97.' Bleek also avers, in respect to this, that 'Paul seldom mentions the death of Christ, without at the same time mentioning his resurrection, p. 308.' But on the whole, he lays less stress upon the omission of this last topic in our epistle than Schulz does.

In respect to this subject it may be said, in the first place, that the representation of Bleek is an extravagant one, as it regards the topic of the resurrection of Christ. Where, in all his epistles, has Paul given this topic such remarkable prominence, except in 1 Cor. xv.? Often as the apostle mentions the death of Christ in his second epistle to the Corinthians, where has he insisted on his resurrection? Where is it in the epistle to the Galatians? Where is it made prominent in the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, Titus? Assertions at hazard, on such a topic, should not be made; and one must not expect to find credit for them among those who investigate for themselves.

Besides, what does Heb. xiii. 20 mean? And what is implied in viii. 1; i. 3; x. 12; xiii. 2; ii. 9; v. 7—9? Are there not several epistles of Paul, where this subject is less frequently alluded to, or implied, than in our epistle?

(8) 'The grand point of Paul's doctrines is, that Christ is the Saviour of all; that he died or made atonement for all. There is nothing of this in our epistle. Paul everywhere makes belief in Christ essential to salvation, and looks with contempt upon Jewish rites and ceremonies. But our author evidently handles Judaism with a sparing hand, and treats with honor the shell, from which he endeavors to extract the nut.'
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In regard to the first of these allegations, the reader is referred to Heb. ii. 9—11; v. 9; ix. 15, 28; xiii. 10; which afford hints sufficiently plain, that the writer did not regard the Messiah as the Saviour of the Jews only. But to treat, in our epistle, of the extent of his salvation among the Gentiles, plainly was not apposite to the particular design he had in view; and he might abstain from this topic, out of regard to the prejudices which those whom he addressed probably entertained (in common with most Jews) respecting it. Are there none of the acknowledged Pauline epistles which do not treat of this subject? And must Paul always bring it into view, whether to do so would be timely or untimely, apposite or inapposite to the object of his epistle?

In respect to the Judaizing spirit of the writer, I must refer once more to chap. viii—x.; and what has already been said above, on examining the fourth objection. And with regard to belief in Christ as essential to salvation, the great object of all the epistle to the Hebrews was to urge it. Dispute with one who denies this, would surely be in vain.

(9) 'Paul nowhere represents Christ as a priest, nor his intercession as procuring favors for men.'

In respect to this objection, I refer the reader to what has already been said above.

(10) 'Paul has nowhere drawn a parallel between Christ and Moses.'

But he did something very much like it, when he represented Moses and Christ as mediators, Gal. iii. 19 seq. And if he has not formally done it in any of his acknowledged epistles, it is enough to say, it was because the occasion did not call for it.

(11) 'Our author says nothing of the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of Satan, or of the gospel of Jesus Christ — ideas predominant in Paul's epistles.'

But is not a kingdom ascribed to Christ in Heb. i. 8, 9; i. 10 seq. ii. 7 seq. x. 13; xii. 2? And are not Christians represented as belonging to it, in xii. 28? And are the second epistle to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Philippians not genuine, because the first of these phrases is not in them? Is not the power or reign of Satan recognized in Heb. ii. 14, 15? And as to ἐναγγέλων, see iv. 2; iv. 6. Apply, too, the same method of reasoning to Paul's acknowledged epistles. ἐναγγελικός is a favorite word with this apostle; yet Philippians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon do not exhibit it. The word ἐναγγέλων, too, is not found in the epistle to Titus. But is not the thing which it indicates found there? It is; and so it is in Hebrews, as frequently as the nature of the case required; e.g., i. 1; ii. 1, 3; iv. 1, 2; v. 12; vi. 1 seq. x. 25; xiii. 8, 9, 17.

(12) 'How such expressions respecting the resurrection as occur in
1 Cor. xv. 5 seq.; Rom. xvi. 4; xi. 15; Phil. iii. 20 seq.; Col. ii. 13;
1 Thess. iv. 15 seq.; 2 Thess. ix.; 2 Tim. ii. 18, with Acts xxiv. 15;
xxvi. 6 seq., are to be reconciled with the views of the resurrection
presented in our epistle, those who defend the genuineness of the
epistle may be called on to account for.

In some of these citations, I can find no reference at all to the
resurrection. In others (e. g., Col. ii. 13), there is simply a figurative
or moral use of the term. As to the remainder, I can perceive no
discrepancy between them and Heb. vi. 2; xi. 35 and what is implied
in xii. 22 seq. As Schulz has not pointed out in what the discrepancy
consists, I am unable to apprehend it.

(18) 'But 1 Cor. xv. 24 seq., is at variance with Heb. i. 2, 8 seq.
12, 13; vii. 24 seq., comp. v. 16; ix. 14,' p. 116.

Just as much, I answer, as it is with Luke i. 33; Dan. ii. 44; vii.
14; Mic. iv. 7; John. xii. 34; Is. ix. 6; Ps. lxxxix. 36; 2 Sam. vii.
16; and no more. What interpreter, who has carefully studied the
idiom of the Scriptures, does not know that בֵּן-יָם, מָרְאֵך, and εἰς τοὺς
ἀλῶνας τῶν ἀλῶνων, are applied to things, to which a time of continu-
ance is assigned that is not liable to interruption by any adventitious
circumstances, and which are to endure the full period for which they
were designed? So it is with the world, the mountains, the hills;
they are בֵּן-יָם, εἰς τοὺς ἀλῶνας. So also the mediatorial reign is not
to be interrupted, but to continue until all the designs of God in the
redemption of men are completed. Then, of course, it must cease,
as no more mediatorial offices are to be performed.

Under this head may be arranged the objections drawn by Seyf-
farth and others from alleged peculiarities of the matters treated of
in our epistle. Many of these only need to be stated in order to
show their absurdity, as if Paul must always write of the same things,
although addressing persons in different circumstances and needing
different warnings, encouragements, etc.

(a) 'Paul concerns himself only with those churches which he him-
self established, which are none of them purely Hebrew.'

It is not true that Paul did not concern himself with any churches
of which he was not the founder. Did not he write his epistle to the
Romans before he ever saw Rome? See Rom. i. 13; xv. 24. Are
not the expressions in this epistle as affectionate and as authoritative, to
say the least, as in the epistle to the Hebrews? Paul, surely, had a
very deep sympathy and tender concern for his Jewish brethren; see
Rom. ix. 1 seq.; x. 1 seq.; xi. 1 seq. Compare, for expressions of
kindness, Heb. vi. 10 seq.; x. 32 seq., in particular v. 34, if the reading
dition μου be adopted; and Titmann, in his recent edition of
the New Testament, has adopted it.

(b) 'Paul nowhere treats formally of the dignity of Jesus; nor
does he anywhere employ such arguments as our epistle exhibits,
against defection from Christianity,' p. 104.
Paul nowhere else treats of the resurrection in such a manner as the 1 Cor. xv. does; nor of many other subjects, discussed in that epistle; does it follow that Paul did not write the first epistle to the Corinthians because it has these peculiarities? Besides, the fact is not correctly stated by Seyffarth. Surely Rom. ix. 5; Eph. i. 20—23; Phil. ii. 6—11; Col. i. 18—19, contain something about the dignity of Christ; not to mention many other passages. That the apostle has nowhere, except in our epistle, entered into a formal comparison of Christ with others, is true; but it is enough to say, that nowhere else did the occasion demand it.

(c) "Paul everywhere inveighs against Jewish opinions, urges justification χωρίς ξύνευς νόμου, and εκ πίστεως; dwells on the glorious advent of the Messiah; and urges the equal right of the Gentiles to the blessings of the Christian religion. Not a word of all this in the epistle to the Hebrews," p. 105.

And where is there anything of all this, in the first epistle to the Corinthians? Must a writer always speak of the very same subjects, and in the very same way? And if he does not; but speaks pro re satis, is it any just ground of suspicion, that such of his letters as are not exactly like certain other ones, cannot be genuine?

(d) "It is wonderful that our epistle should represent the devil as the cause of death, ii. 14; Paul knows nothing of such a cause, see 2 Tim. i. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 55," p. 106.

This objection is built on an exegesis of Heb. ii. 14 which cannot be supported; see the commentary on this passage. But if the exegesis were correct, it would not follow that the apostle might not, in one passage, express a sentiment which he has nowhere else expressed. See for example, 1 Cor. xv. 22—28. After all, it is not true that Paul does not recognize Satan as the author of the condemning sentence which Adam incurred; see 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14; 2 Cor. xi. 3, comp. with v. 12 seq.

(e) "Paul enters into a particular consideration of the wants, woes, etc., of those to whom he writes."

Does he anywhere show a deeper sympathy for those to whom he writes, than is exhibited in our epistle? Must every epistle which a man writes be de omni scibili, or de omni re possibili? As Paul was not bishop of the church to which he wrote, it is not to be expected that he would use the same degree of freedom, in all respects, which he uses in some others of his epistles. Particularly, we may well suppose that he would be sparing in localities and personalities, if his epistle was designed to be encyclical, as we have good reason to believe it was.

(f) "The manner in which the author of the epistle to the Hebrews employs μετείνα, and the importance which he attaches to faith, and the manner in which he illustrates it by examples, is not like that of Paul in his other epistles." It is true that it is not brought so directly into
contrast with the λαός, νομος, as in Rom. and Gal., where the apostle is addressing those who would place the yoke of ceremonial bondage on the Gentile converts. If it were so, it certainly would indicate a clumsy imitator, rather than the apostle himself. Still the same thing is everywhere implied, and its importance, as contrasted with reliance upon sacrifices and the ministration of priests, everywhere made conspicuous. For what is the object of the whole? Plainly, to prevent apostasy, i.e., renunciation of belief in Christ. But why is such a renunciation criminal and dangerous? Because Christ is of infinite dignity, and because, when belief in the efficacy of his atoning blood is renounced, "there remaineth no further sacrifice for sin." To what purpose is the awful example of the effects of unbelief proposed in chapter III., except to warn the Hebrews against renouncing belief in Christ? To what purpose are the parallels drawn in chapters III.—x., between Christ and Moses, Christ and Melchizedek, between the great high priest of the Christian religion and the Jewish priests, between the sacrifice offered by the former and the sacrifices made by the latter, but for the sake of warning the Hebrews against renouncing their faith in Christ? Plainly for no other purpose. All the warnings, reproofs, and tremendous denunciations of the epistle, converge to the same point: they all have a bearing upon the same specific object.

Faith, in our epistle, is employed to denote belief or confidence in the declarations of God, specially with regard to the objects of a future world. So in Rom. iv. 17—23, Paul represents Abraham, under the most unpromising circumstances, as believing that God would raise up from him, already νεκρωμένον, a numerous progeny. This belief he represents as an act of faith, επιστευεσ—μη δοθησαι τη πιστει—οδ διεκρισθη τη διστασι—πληρωμορητηεις—ελογιοζη τη Αβρααμ [η πιστε] εις δικαιοσυνην. On the other hand, our epistle (xi. 8 seq.) represents Abraham as going out from his country, and sojourning in a strange land, πιστει. By faith also he obtained a son, even when he was νεκρωμενον (xi. 12), from whom a numerous progeny was to spring. Both these accounts characterize this whole transaction in the same way. Both describe the same acts as being faith on the part of Abraham. Both describe his physical state by calling him νεκρωμενον. Both treat the whole transaction as a rare instance of the power of faith, and appeal to it as an example most worthy of imitation. Surely here is something different from discrepancy of views in these writers. Is there not a coincidence which is altogether striking, both in the manner and even diction of the epistles?

But there are other circumstances in the account of Abraham, which deserve distinct notice. Paul, in Rom. iv. 17 seq., represents Abraham as believing the divine assurance that he should become the father of many nations; the assurance of that God, 'who restoreth the dead to life, and calleth things that are not into being.' In this
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expression the apostle evidently refers to the belief which Abraham entertained, that, in case he offered up Isaac as a sacrifice, God could and would raise him from the dead, or call another son into being from whom a numerous progeny should descend. So in Heb. xi. 17 seq., the writer represents Abraham as offering up Isaac, in faith that God would be able to raise him from the dead, from whence, as it were, he did obtain him, i.e., Isaac sprang up from one apparently νεκρωμένος, v. 12. In both cases the writers have characterized the state of Abraham's mind on this occasion, by representing it as faith, εἰς τεντεντε, πίστει. In both they disclose the same specific views of the point on which the faith of Abraham rested, and they characterize it in the same way. Is not here a minute coincidence of thought, expression, and manner of representing faith, which creates strong presumption in favor of the opinion, that the writer in both cases was the same person?

Again, in Heb. xi., Noah is represented as divinely admonished respecting future occurrences, and as preparing an ark for his safety in consequence of his faith in the admonition which he had received. The writer then proceeds to say, that by this act he became an heir τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης, of that justification which is by faith; the very expression and the very idea which Paul so often repeats in his acknowledged epistles, viz., those to the Romans and Galatians. What other writer of the New Testament, except Paul, has employed such an expression?

It is true, indeed, that the author of our epistle does represent faith, in Heb. xi., as confidence in the declarations of God respecting future things. But it is equally true, that this was the view of it which he was naturally led to present, from the circumstances of the case before him. His appeal was to the worthies of former days, as examples of belief. Belief in what? Not in Christianity surely, which had not then been revealed. Could the writer, when characterizing the actual nature of their faith, represent it as a belief in that which was not yet disclosed to them? Surely not; but he must represent it, and does represent it, as a belief in what God had disclosed to them. The nature of the case rendered it impossible, that their faith should be represented in any other light than this.

Just so Paul, in Rom. iv., represents the faith of Abraham as justifying faith, and appeals to it in proof of the fact, that faith is a means of justification. Yet not a word is said there of Abraham's belief in Christ. In what respect does this case differ from that of all the examples cited in Heb. xi.? Rather, is there not a sameness of principle in the two instances of faith? Both respect future things depending on the promise of God; neither have any special reference to Christ.

The truth is, that faith, in its generic nature, is belief or confidence in the promises or revelations of God. Now, whether these respect
things future, things of another world, or things past, or the nature, character, offices, and work of the Messiah, faith receives them all. Faith, therefore, in the ancients, who gave entire credit to what was revealed to them, was the same principle as faith in him who believes in Christ, because Christ is proposed to him. Circumstances only make an apparent difference in the case. The disposition is always the same.

That Paul thought thus of this subject, is clear enough from the example of Abraham, which he cites as a signal instance of justifying faith in Rom. iv. But, besides this, we have other proof that Paul has not always represented faith as having reference only to Christ. He has also represented it as it commonly appears in our epistle. So 2 Cor. v. 7, We walk by faith and not by sight, i. e., we live as those who confide or believe in the realities of a future world, not like those who regard only visible objects. So, too, in 1 Cor. xiii. 13. In 1 Thess. i. 8, we have ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν; 1 Cor. xii. 9, πίστις τὸ αὐτὸ πνεύμα. So in 1 Cor. xiii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Eph. vi. 16; 1 Thess. v. 8, and in many other passages, faith has a variety of meanings, and is not limited to belief in Christ only. I am unable to see, therefore, why this argument should be so strenuously urged as it is by Schulz and others, and relied upon as so decisive. I can see no other difference between the faith of our epistle, and that which the writings of Paul present, than what the nature of the examples to which our author appealed necessarily requires. When Paul makes a like appeal, he treats the subject in the same way; e. g., in Rom. iv. And nothing can be farther from correctness than to aver, that Paul always employs πίστις in the sense of Christianity, or believing on Christ. Merely opening a Greek lexicon or concordance at the word πίστις, is ample refutation of this assertion. Paul employs the word in all the latitude which is elsewhere given it in the New Testament; and that embraces a great variety of specific significations, nearly all of which range themselves under the general idea of confidence in the divine declarations.

That it is the great object of our epistle to inculcate belief in Christ, and to warn the Hebrews against unbelief, I suppose will not be denied. What foundation, then, can Schulz have for saying, that “the Pauline idea of belief is altogether foreign to this writer?” Above all, how could he add, that “a sentence like the Pauline ones, δ ὁ δὲ πίστεως ἀμαρτία ἀπό, would sound strange enough in the epistle to the Hebrews.” Yet strange as it may seem, in Heb. xi. 6 we have χειρὶς δε πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαφεστήσατι [Ἑκ].”

On the whole, the representation of faith in our epistle, as it respects the case of Abraham and Noah, is not only exactly the same as that made by Paul, but in the mode of representation are actually found such strong resemblances, as to afford no considerable ground for supposing that the writer of both must have been the same person.
III. Objections from the Form, Method, and Style of the Epistle.

The objection from the style is a very ancient one. It was felt, as we have seen, by Clement of Alexandria; deeper still, by Origen; and adverted to by Eusebius, and other fathers of the church. It would seem that there must be some real foundation for an objection, so long, so often, and so confidently urged. Late critics have attributed an irresistible power to it. Eichborn and Bertholdt maintain, that it lies so, upon the very face of the whole epistle, that every reader must be impressed with it. So strong indeed are their impressions with respect to it, that they seem to require no other argument, in order to satisfy them that Paul could not have written the epistle to the Hebrews.

That there are cases, where the general character of the style of one piece is so plainly different from that of another, as to leave no doubt on the mind of the discerning reader that both did not, nay, even could not, come from the same pen, certainly cannot be called in question. Who could ever attribute the epistles of John to Paul, or to Peter, or to James? But that there are other cases, where the characteristic marks are not so discernible, and about which there may be a great difference of feeling in respect to the style, is well known. For example; the book of Deuteronomy is ascribed by one set of critics, of high acquisitions and refined taste, of great acuteness and discriminating judgment, to Moses as the author, because it betrays everywhere, as they think, the most indubitable marks of his style and spirit. Another class of critics, equally eminent for literary acquisition and discrimination, confidently draw the conclusion, that Moses could not have been the author, from the feeling which they have, on reading it, that it is composed in a manner totally diverse from the style and spirit of Moses.

Just such is the case in regard to the speech of Elihu in the book of Job. One party reject it as spurious, because their critical taste leads them to do so; and another hold it to be genuine, for the like reason.

Isaiah, too, has met with the same fate. The last 26 chapters are now familiarly called Pseudo-Isaiah, by one party of critics; while another strive to vindicate the whole book as genuine.

Each party, in these cases, is confident and satisfied of the validity of their arguments. But what is the humble inquirer to do, in the midst of all these contests of taste and of opinion? How can he trust his feelings to decide, with confidence, in a case where the most acute and distinguished critics differ, in respect to the judgment that a critical tact should give? He cannot do it with safety. In what way, then, shall one who examines for himself, be able to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion? My answer in all such cases would be, MAKE THE ACTUAL COMPARISON; collate sentiment with sentiment, phrase
with phrase, words with words. This is the kind of proof that is palpable, and is not left to the uncertain tenor of feeling, excited by mere insulated perusal; a feeling which, in cases where the composition read is in a foreign language, must be a very uncertain guide; and which, even in our own vernacular language, not infrequently misleads us.

Origen found the thoughts of Paul in the epistle to the Hebrews; but the words, he thinks, are better Greek (Διδυμοῦτα) than the apostle wrote. He therefore resorts to the supposition, that a translator had given to it its present Greek costume, who had received the sentiments from the mouth of Paul. But Eichhorn does not limit the difference between the style of this epistle and those of Paul to the quality of the Greek. "The manner of it," says he, "is more tranquil and logical than that in which Paul, with his strong feelings, could write. Everything is arranged in the most exact order. The expression is well rounded, choice, and very clear in the representation which it makes. Paul is altogether different; he is unperiodical, involved, obscure, writes poor Greek, is given to rhapsoody and aphorism," Einl. § 260. Bertholdt has repeated the same sentiment, in almost the same words, in his Introduction to this Epistle, § 646. Bleek (p. 324 seq.) has also contended for the same thing, so far as the collocation of words, the rounding off of periods, fine rhythms, oratorical manner, and the avoidance of imperfect or suspended sentences, etc., are concerned; but in regard to perspicuity, connection in the mode of representation, dialectical acuteness, and definiteness of expression, he thinks Paul is superior to the writer of our epistle; a very different representation indeed, in these latter respects, from those of Eichhorn and Bertholdt.

If I may be allowed to express my own feelings, after having for many years annually devoted myself to the explanation of this epistle, translated it with all the care which I could bestow upon it, and minutely weighed every expression and word in it, I should say, that nothing could be more unfortunately chosen than the epithet, "ruhig," equable, tranquil, void of excitement, which two of these distinguished critics have applied to its style. I appeal to every man's feelings who reads it, and ask, Are there in the whole book of God any warnings so awful as those here, and expressed with such mighty energy? Are there any threats of punishment for unbelief so tremendous and impassioned as those in this epistle?

Then, as to 'everything being arranged in such exact order,' as they aver, 'conclusion following conclusion, all in the manner of a good rhetorician,' the instances above produced in § 22, No. 2, and which might easily be increased, of enthymemes, and suspended construction, exactly in the manner of Paul, may help us to judge of this. Moreover, let any one make the attempt to translate this epistle into his own vernacular language, and he will then see whether all is so well-rounded and perspicuous as these critics represent it to be. But even
OBJECTIONS.

if there is more pure and continuous argument in our epistle, than in other epistles of Paul; there is more in the epistle to the Romans than in those to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians; but is this any proof that Paul was not the author of those epistles? I find ellipsis as frequent here, as in Paul's acknowledged writings. Any good translation that exhibits the supply of these ellipses, and marks them by the common mode in which they are printed, demonstrates this to the eye. Hebraism I find here, as well and as often as in Paul; see § 15.

On the whole, however, I cannot but feel, in reading the epistle to the Hebrews, that the writer has reached the very summit of eloquence, and energy, and vivid representation, in many passages of his composition; but I am constrained to make a similar acknowledgment, in respect to many passages of the known epistles of Paul. I cannot perceive any striking diversity in regard to these characteristics.

To what cause now can it be attributed, that feelings so very different in respect to the character of the style, should arise in the minds of men when they read the epistle in question? Two reasons for this, I apprehend, may be given. The first and principal one is, that the main topics of this epistle are so diverse from those generally treated of in the acknowledged epistles of Paul, that they required, of course and from necessity, a variety of words, phrases, and ideas, that either are not common, or are not at all to be found, in his other epistles. This I regard as chiefly the ground of the judgment, which has so often been passed in respect to dissimilarity of style. The other is, that one comes to the reading of this epistle, with his feelings impressed by the circumstance, that there is a want of direct evidence about the author; and consequently so tuned, as to be strongly agitated by anything, which may seem to increase or diminish the probability that Paul was the author of it. That the doctrinal views contained in this epistle, have made many willing to get rid of its canonical authority, if it could be done, is not by any means improbable. After all, however, in a question where there is such a difference of sentiment in regard to style, among those who are capable of judging, the appeal must be made, and can be made, only to actual comparison. Such an appeal I have endeavored to make above. To a mere feeling or apprehension arising from the perusal of the epistle, against actual comparison, can never be to judge by making use of the best means of judging. Origen's authority, in this case, cannot go far with any one who chooses to examine and decide for himself. Origen, with all his talents and learning, was far enough from being a Ciceron or a Quintiliian, in respect to taste and nice discernment of difference of style. He makes assertions equally confident, in other cases, that will not bear the test of examination; and assertions too, that have respect to the Greek language, his mother tongue. For example, he says that the want of the article before ἔρις,
in John i. 1, proves that the writer cannot have meant to designate the supreme God by this word; thus intimating that the presence of the article is necessary whenever a writer means to designate the supreme God. But whether the supreme God be meant or not, can never be determined by such a rule; for it is usual, in the Greek language, that the predicate of a proposition should be without the article, while the subject commonly has it. Moreover, in the very same chapter, Ἰερός stands without the article, in more than one instance, incontrovertibly for the supreme God; e.g., in vs. 5, 12, 13, 18. Whether Origen’s opinion, then, about the style of the epistle to the Hebrews, is well founded or not, is a proper subject of examination. The result of comparison has shown, that in respect to sentiment, phraseology, and diction, our epistle is filled with the peculiarities of Paul. I doubt whether any one of Paul’s acknowledged epistles, compared with the others, will supply more, or more exact resemblances. It remains for those who follow the opinion of Origen, as to the style of our epistle, to point them out if they exist.

I know, indeed, that no critic can be argued out of feelings of this sort in respect to style. But he may reasonably be called upon to state the ground of those feelings; specially so, when he asserts, with a confidence which is intended to influence others, that the style of the epistle to the Hebrews cannot be Paul’s.

(1) ‘It is a suspicious circumstance,’ says Bertoldt and others, ‘and against the opinion that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, that he has not subscribed his name; since he says in 2 Thes. iii. 17, that it was his practice to do this, in order to show that letters purporting to be his, might thus be certainly known to be genuine.’

The reply to this is obvious. After Paul had written his first epistle to the Thessalonian church, in which he had mentioned the second coming of Christ, it appears that some one had written another letter, counterfeiting his name, in which the day of the Lord had been represented as very near. On this account Paul says, in his second letter to the same church, “Be not agitated by any message, or by any epistle as from me, in respect to the day of the Lord as being already at hand, ii. 2.” And then, to avoid the effects in future of any misrepresentation of this nature, he says at the close of the letter, iii. 17, “This salutation from me, Paul, by my own hand. This is the proof [viz., of the genuineness of my letter] in every epistle [i.e., to your church]; so I write.” Let it now be noted, that the epistles to the Thessalonians were the first, in regard to time, which Paul wrote to any church; at least, the first that are now extant. Under circumstances like these, when letters to the Thessalonians had been forged in his name, can the assurance that he subscribes all his letters to them with his own hand, be taken as a satisfactory proof, that in all his future life he should never address an anonymous letter to any church in any circumstances? Nay, can it in itself be any proof at all, that
Paul would adopt the same custom in respect to all the letters which he might afterwards address to other churches? As this was only the second of his letters now extant, can any conclusion at all be drawn from it as to the rest in general, such as Bertholdt draws? It would be extraordinary, if in writing to a church where forged letters of his had been in circulation, the assuring them that he should put his name with his own hand to all his own letters addressed to them in future, should be appealed to as a proof that he must always do the same in all circumstances, and that he never should, on any occasion, write an anonymous epistle.

(2) It is objected by Bertholdt, Bleek, and others, that no good reason can be given why Paul should not give his name, as in his other epistles. Does he not intimate at the close of the letter, that he is yet in prison, but expects soon to be set at liberty? Does he not ask their prayers that he may be speedily restored? And does he not promise them a visit in company with Timothy, if his return be speedy? Why should Paul attempt to conceal himself, when he has developed circumstances (see xiii. 18—23) which evidently imply that he was not concealed, and that he did not desire to be so?

But if this objection be of any validity, it is just as valid in respect to any other person, as to the writer of this letter. Why should any other writer attempt to conceal himself, when most clearly the tenor of the letter implies, that he must be known to those whom he immediately addresses? If there be any incongruity here, it applies just as much to any other writer as to Paul.

Besides, how many adequate reasons may have existed at the time when the epistle was written, for such a method of address, which we now know nothing of.

If he designed the epistle to be a circular among the Jews generally (which from the nature of the discussion, comprising topics so interesting to them all, I am altogether inclined to believe was the case), then might he not, as a measure of prudence, omit prefixing or subscribing his name directly, lest the prejudices of those Christians who were zealous for the law might be excited, on the first inspection of his epistle? Ultimately he might be and must be known, if the letter was traced back to the church to whom it was first sent, and the inquiries made respecting it, which the circumstances mentioned at the close of it would naturally suggest. To this the writer would probably feel no objection; trusting that the arguments suggested in it might disarm prejudiced readers, before they came to the certain knowledge of the author. Is it an unknown, unheard-of case, that men should write letters anonymously at first, but afterwards avow them? Or that they should write letters anonymous, but so circumstanced, and designedly so circumstanced, that inquiry might ultimately lead to a knowledge of the author?

The case in hand, too, is not one without parallel. The first epistle
of John is destitute of the author’s name, and has no inscription whatever to any church or churches. Yet tradition and the internal state of the epistle, satisfy us that John was the author; for, although this has been denied by some, it has been generally admitted. The fact that our epistle is anonymous, is not then a singular thing. Why should it be more wonderful that Paul should write an anonymous letter than that John should do it.

Occurrences of a similar nature happen, too, at all times, in all countries, wherever circumstances of an arduous, difficult, dangerous nature occur, where feeling is deeply concerned, and where prejudice is to be regarded and avoided. And such were the times of Paul; and such his relation to the Jews, and theirs to him.

I dismiss this topic, then, with the full persuasion that arguments to prove that Paul could not, and did not write an anonymous letter, and that he had not an occasion to do this, in order to act prudently and wisely, most manifestly can never be adduced. The utmost which can be said is, We are not able to see any good reasons for such a course. This we may if we please fully concede; but then this is quite a different thing from the affirmation that such reasons never could have existed. The latter can never be proved, nor ever rendered in any good degree probable.

(3) According to Schulz, Seyfarth, and others, the manner of citing or appealing to the Old Testament by Paul and by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is different. Paul appeals to it as a written record; but the writer of our epistle everywhere cites it as the immediate word of God or of the Holy Ghost. Paul's formulas of citation are γέγραπται, καὶ γέγραπται, ἦ γραφὴ λέγει, ἦ γραφη, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὁ λόγος γεγραμμένος, Μωϋσῆς γράφει — λέγει, ὁ νόμος λέγει, ἐν Μωϋσεως νόμῳ γέγραπται, Δαβίδ λέγει, Ἡσαίας λέγει — κράζει, ἐν τῷ ᾽Ωσίῆ λέγει, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον; which are not used in a single instance in the epistle to the Hebrews. Instead of these formulas the author uses λέγει — μαρτύρει τῷ πνεύμα τὸ ἀγιον, λέγει ὁ Ἰσραήλ, μαρτύρει, φησι. Does not such a diversity of style necessarily imply diversity of authorship?

It is moreover maintained by Bleek, following Schulz and others, 'that Paul plainly makes less frequent use, in general, of the Old Testament Scriptures, than is made of them in the epistle to the Hebrews.'

The result of an attentive and frequently repeated examination of our epistle, and of all the acknowledged Pauline epistles, in respect to the mode and frequency of quotation, has led me to conclusions somewhat different from those which Schulz and others have adopted. I shall present them, with my reasons for adopting them, as summarily as the nature of the case now admits.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is by no means uniform,
in his mode of appeal to the Jewish Scriptures. In eighteen cases, viz. i. 5; i. 6; l. 7; ii. 12; iv. 3; v. 5; v. 6; vii. 17; vii. 21; viii. 5; viii. 8; ix. 20; x. 5; x. 8; x. 9; x. 30; xii. 26; xiii. 5, he has used ἐπερ, ἐπηκ, λέγει, λέγων, μαρτύρει, φησί, with a Nominative never expressed. In fourteen of these cases, we may gather from the context that Ἁeos; or κύριος is the Nominative probably implied, i. e., the one which the writer meant his readers should supply. Four of them have Χριστός or Ἰησοῦς for an implied Nominative, viz., ii. 12; x. 5; x. 8; x. 9. The expressed Nominatives are three, viz., τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, iii. 7; x. 15, and Ἁeos, vi. 14, expressed, however, in only an indirect manner.

In five cases more, which are introduced merely with πάλιν, καί, or δὲ, viz., i. 5; i. 8; i. 10; ii. 13; x. 30, but stand connected with a preceding quotation, the grammatical connection requires us to supply ἐπερ, λέγων, λέγει, etc., i. e., κύριος or Ἁeos λέγει, ἐπερ, etc. In two cases of the like nature, viz., ii. 13; ii. 14, Ἰησοῦς or Χριστός is the implied Nominative.

In the whole twenty eight instances of quotation, there are twenty five, then, in which the Nominative is not expressed; in nineteen of which it probably is Ἁeos, and Χριστός in the other six. There are two cases only, in which the Nominative τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is expressed; and one only where Ἁeos is actually inserted, and this in a way indirect.

If one should trust to the representations of Schulz and Seyffarth, he would of course be led to believe, that these now mentioned are all. These, however, are not the only kinds of quotation which our epistle presents. In ii. 6, we have δειμαρτύρατο δέ πνεσ τις, viz., Δαβίδ; in iii. 15, ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, when it is said (like ἃ ὠν in the Mishna); in iv. 4, εἰπή γὰρ πνεσ, sc. ἡ γραφὴ plainly, which formula is virtually repeated by πάλιν in iv. 5; in iv. 7, we find ἐν Δαβίδ λέγων, saying by David, where ἡ γραφή may be in the Nominative, comp. Rom. xi. 2; in ix. 20, Μωυσῆς — λέγων; in xi. 18, δαλαπθή (like ἃ ὠν); in xii. 5, παρακαλήσεως; in xii. 20, τὸ διαστελλόμενον; in xiii. 21, Μωυσῆς ἐπερ; in xii. 27, τὸ δέ; in xiii. 6, ως τε ἡμᾶς λέγων, so that we may say. Besides this, we have in iii. 2, 5; x. 37; xi. 21, and xiii. 6, quotations without any direct sign or notice of appeal; not to mention several references or partial quotations which might easily be subjoined. In the whole there are fifteen instances of quotation (i. e., about three eighths of all the quotations), where the appeal is different from that which S hulz and Seyffarth attribute to our author, and on which they have built their argument against the Pauline origin of our epistle. Let us now compare the method of Paul.

There is a similar variety of appeal in the acknowledged Pauline epistles. Nearly all of this variety, however, is made by the use of γράφω, or λέγω, and its synonyms εἰπω and μεν, just as in our epistle.
(a) ΤΡΑΦΩ. (1) Καθώς γέγραπται, Rom. i. 17; ii. 24; iii. 4, 10; iv. 17; vii. 36; ix. 13, 33; x. 15; xi. 8, 26; xv. 8, 9, 21; 1 Cor. i. 31; ii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 15; ix. 9; in all eighteen. (2) Ὑμεῖς γέγραπται, 1 Cor. xi. 7. (3) Οὕτω καὶ γέγραπται, 1 Cor. xv. 45. (4) Κατά τὸ γεγραμμένον, 2 Cor. iv. 13. (5) ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, 1 Cor. xv. 54. (6) ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται, 1 Cor. xiv. 21. (7) ἐν τῷ Μωυςέως νόμῳ γέγραπται, 1 Cor. ix. 9. (8) Μωυσῆς γράφει, Rom. x. 5 (the only example of the use of active voice of this verb, when employed in the manner under consideration). (9) Γέγραπται γὰρ, Rom. xiii. 19; xiv. 11; 1 Cor. i. 19; iii. 19; Gal. iii. 10, 13; iv. 22, 27; in all eight.

(b) ΛΕΓΩ and its synonyms. * (10) ἢ ἐβρήσῃ αὐτῷ, Rom. ix. 12. (11) Καθώς προείρηκεν Ἑσαίας, Rom. ix. 29. (12) Ἑσαίας κράξει, Rom. ix. 27. (13) Κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Rom. iv. 18. (14) Λέγει Δαβίς, Rom. iv. 6; xi. 19. Ἑσαίας λέγει, Rom. x. 16, 20, 21; xv. 12. Μωυσῆς λέγει, Rom. x. 19. (15) Λέγει ὁ χρηστασμός, Rom. x. 4. (16) Ἡ δὲ ἐκ τίτους δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει, Rom. x. 6. (17) ὁ νόμος λέγει, Rom. vii. 7. (18) Ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, Rom. iv. 3; ix. 17; x. 11; xi. 2; xv. 10, 11 (where ἡ γραφὴ is the probable Nominative); Gal. iv. 30; 1 Tim. v. 18. There are other instances of the like nature, in which λέ γω and εἴπω are employed, and where κύριος or Ἰησοῦς is the Nominative. For a special reason, I reserve these to be exhibited under another head.

(c) There are a few formulas which are peculiar, and which I shall group together under No. (19,) viz., ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, Rom. ix. 9. — Ἀλλὰ, 1 Cor. x. 20. — Τὸ γάρ καὶ ἐν τῷ, Rom. xiii. 9. — Ἐν τῷ, Gal. v. 14. — Καὶ πάλιν [i.e., λέγει or γέγραπται], Rom. xv. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 20.

(d) There is a considerable number of citations without any formula of notice; viz., (20) Rom. ix. 7; x. 13, 18; 1 Cor. ii. 16; x. 26; xv. 25, 27, 32; 2 Cor. ix. 7; xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 11, 12; Eph. v. 31; 2 Tim. ii. 19 bis; in all fifteen.

It is possible that there may be some one or more instances, which have escaped my notice; but I believe that the above view of the formulas of Paul's quotations (including those that are to be inserted under the next head), will be found, to say the least, as complete as any that has hitherto been exhibited. At all events, not a single instance is purposely omitted.

The reader has now the whole of Paul's formulas, in his acknowledged epistles, placed before him; and he can decide for himself, whether there is not a variety of manner in the method of making quotations. We shall have occasion to recur to the facts contained in the above representation, more than once in the sequel.

That Paul does sometimes, contrary to the declaration of Schulz and others, appeal, like the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, to the direct words of God himself, and not merely to the Scripture,
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(which is the more usual method of the apostle), is clear from the following examples; viz. (21) ἄγει κύρως, 2 Cor. vii. 17. ἄγει κυρός παντοκράτωρ, 2 Cor. vi. 18. Καθὼς ἢπειρ ὁ θεός, 2 Cor. vi. 16. So in Rom. ix. 15, λέγει, sc. ἡ θεός, which is implied, as will be seen by inspecting the preceding verse; Rom. ix. 25, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί λέγει, sc. θεός, as appears by vs. 22—24; 2 Cor. vi. 2, λέγει, sc. θεός, as v. 1 shows; Gal. iii. 16, οὗ λέγει, sc. θεός, as the nature of the case, and the context in Genesis shows; Eph. iv. 8, διὸ λέγει, sc. θεός probably, comp. vs. 6, 7; Eph. v. 14, λέγει, sc. θεός probably. If it be objected to this instance, that the passage quoted is not in the Hebrew Scriptures, this will not alter the nature of the appeal. Wherever it is, or was, the writer appeals to it as Scripture. Whether he quoted some part of the Old Testament ad sensum, or whether he referred to some other book, may be very difficult now to decide; but that his quotation was viewed by him to be of such a nature as a scriptural one must be conceded; and that θεός is the most probable Nominative, I cannot help thinking will also be conceded. In Rom. ix. 12, ἰφήγη αὐτῷ plainly refers to Jehovah as the speaker; comp. Gen. xxv. 23. In substance, λέγει ὁ χρησμώσας, Rom. xi. 4, belongs to this same class of texts, inasmuch as the words of God to Elijah are directly cited.

The allegation, then, that Paul in quoting from the Scriptures, "always cites them simply as Scripture, and not as the words of God;" and that "the writer of our epistle is entirely opposite to him in this respect," is plainly contradicted by the above examples. Paul, in common with our epistle, appeals to the words of God as such. Nor can it be objected here, that in Paul the noun θεός (as Nominative to λέγει) is not expressed, since this is never expressed, except once indirectly, in the epistle to the Hebrews.

I concede to Bleek, that Rom. xv. 10 (to which he should have added Rom. xv. 11, καὶ πάλιν sc. λέγει), and 1 Cor. vi. 16, where λέγει is used without a Nominative, most probably have ἦ γραφή as their implied Nominative.

But in order to diminish the force of the above appeal to facts, Bleek remarks (p. 379), that 'Paul never introduces God as speaking, except when the words are properly his own, i. e., uttered in the first person; whereas the writer of our epistle cites the words of Scripture as the words of God, even when the third person is used, and God cannot properly be considered as the speaker.' As instances of this latter fact, he appeals to Heb. i. 6, 7, 8; iv. 4, 7; vii. 21; x. 30.

I cannot feel, however, that much stress is to be laid upon this. Surely the reader of the New Testament Scriptures needs not be told, that the writers of them considered the Old Testament as ἔσω τας, as the word of God; and that they habitually appealed to them as such, as well as called them by this name. Nor need he be told, that God, in the Old Testament, often speaks in the third person.
as well as the first, or speaks of himself as a third person, in the same manner that another would speak of him; e. g., Is. i. 20, 28; iii. 17, 18; vi. 12; vii. 11; viii. 5—7, 13, 19; x. 26, etc., in places without number. Besides, the examples of Bleek are not all certain. In Heb. i. 6, 7, 8, the quotation after all, is not directly made by λέγει, i. e., the force of λέγει does not fall on the quotation as such. The writer affirms, that God speaks concerning his Son, what is meant by the words which follow; comp. v. 5. As to the examples in Heb. iv. 4, 7, the first evidently has ἡ γραφή for the Nominative to εἰρηκε, as the word ποῦ plainly shows. In Heb. vii. 21, the quotation is from Ps. cx. 4, and is wholly inapposite to the object of Bleek, since God is simply introduced by it (and so in the Psalm) as addressing the Messiah, and is directly affirmed to be the speaker, and is appropriately so. In Heb. x. 30, καὶ πάλιν refers indeed to God; but then the words which follow are in the third person, just as they are in innumerable cases in the Old Testament. What argument can be built, now, on facts of such a nature? I think we may reasonably answer, None.

Bleek further states, that 'the writer of our epistle appeals to Scripture by the use of λέγει—μαρτυρεῖ το πνεύμα το ἄγιον, Heb. iii. 7; x. 15; and that Christ is represented as appropriating the words of the Old Testament to himself, Heb. ii. 11, 13; x. 5, 8; all of which is foreign to the method of Paul.'

But what does this prove? Merely that the writer had occasion to make an appeal to Scripture here, in a manner different from that in Paul's acknowledged epistles, and accordingly has done so. Nothing more than this, surely, can be urged from these facts, unless we can prove from the quotations in one part of Paul's acknowledged epistles that he did not write the other in which there is a marked difference of quotation, or no quotation at all. But the illustration of this, I reserve for the next head.

In regard to the assertion of Schulz and Seyffarth, that Ἰσώτις, Χριστός, or πνεύμα ἅγιον, is always the Nominative to λέγει, εἴπε, etc., in the epistle to the Hebrews, the following formulas may be consulted: viz., Heb. ii. 6, διεμαρτυρατο δὲ ποιο τῷ, [sc. Δαβίδ]; iv. 4, εἴπητε γάρ [sc. ἡ γραφή]; which is repeated by necessary implication. in iv. 5; Μωυσῆς . . . λέγον ix. 20; Μωυσῆς εἶπε (either a quotation of a sacred traditional saying, or a reference to the Scriptures ad sensum), xii. 21; all cases of the same nature as those which occur in Paul's acknowledged epistles. Besides these we have, as has been noted before, a quotation referred to by calling it παράκλησις, xii. 5 (comp. Rom. xi. 4 χρηστοσύμμοι λέγει); and in xiii. 6, we are pointed to a text of Scripture by the expression, ἦσεν ἡμᾶς λέγειν. There are several instances, also, of quotation without any formula of appeal, e. g., iii. 2, 5; x. 37; xi. 21; xii. 6: just as in Paul's acknowledged epistles.
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There is as great a difference between Paul's acknowledged epistles themselves, in regard to the formulas and the frequency of quotation from the Old Testament, as there is between the epistle to the Hebrews and some of Paul's acknowledged epistles; nay even a greater difference. E. g., in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the only formula of quotation is the verb γέραπται, viz., 1 Cor. i. 19; i. 31; ii. 9; iii. 19; iii. 20; ix. 9; x. 7; xiv. 21; xv. 24, 54; one case only being excepted, vi. 16. Five times quotation is made without any formula, viz., 1 Cor. ii. 16; x. 26; xv. 25, 27; xv. 32. Now in the epistle to the Romans, out of forty eight quotations, only sixteen are introduced with the formula γέραπται; the others exhibiting all the variety above described.

On the other hand, the second epistle to the Corinthians is divided between the formulas with γράφω, and λέγω or εἰπω; e. g., καθὼς γέραπται, viii. 15; ix. 9; κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, iv. 13; λέγει or ἔλθει, vi. 2, 16, 17, 18. Two quotations are without a formula, viz., ix. 7 and xiii. 1.

The epistle to the Galatians has four instances of γράφω, viz. iii. 10, 13; iv. 22, 27; two with λέγει, iii. 16 where Χριστός is implied, and iv. 30, where ἡ γραφή is expressed. Besides these, it has two without any formula, viz., iii. 11, 12; and one with ἐν τοῖς.

The epistle to the Ephesians has one quotation with λέγει, iv. 8; one with ἦτοι ἐστίν ἐντολὴ πρώτη, vi. 2; and one without any formula, v. 31. The reference in v. 14, also exhibits λέγει.

The first epistle to Timothy has one quotation only, which is introduced with λέγει ἡ γραφή, v. 18; and the second to Timothy has a quotation without any formula, ii. 19.

In all the other epistles of Paul, viz., those to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and to Titus and Philemon, there are no certain and direct quotations at all.

Suppose now that we take the epistle to the Romans (one of the most undoubted of all Paul's epistles), as the model of this writer's quotations. Then the argument is conclusive (on the ground which Schulz and Seyffarth have taken), against the genuineness of all his other acknowledged epistles, unless it be the second to the Corinthians, and that to the Galatians. Above all, what shall we say of all those epistles which never quote the Old Testament at all? Can it be that the same man wrote these, who has directly appealed no less than forty eight times to the Old Testament, in the epistle to the Romans; not to mention many other implicit references? And can it be, that when his formulas of reference are so diverse, as they are between this epistle and the first to the Corinthians, that the same person was the author of both? It is easy now to perceive, that if arguments can be built on such circumstances as these, then the genuineness of the greater portion of the Pauline epistles must of course be denied. Is Dr. Schulz or Prof. Bleck prepared for such a conclusion?
When Bleek asserts, that Paul often cites the words of a sacred writer as being such, but that the author of our epistle never does this (p. 377), could he have maturely weighed the nature of the quotations in Heb. ii. 6; ix. 20, and xii. 21, where the first is plainly ascribed to David, who is understood by τίς, and the other two directly name Moses? I am aware of his assertion, that 'these two last cases merely refer to what Moses said as a person, and not as an author.' But are not the words cited, exhibited as matter of record in the books of Moses, being there found either verbatim or ad sensum? And if so, how does the nature of these quotations differ from those in the epistle to the Romans, where the words of authors as such are introduced? But granting that it does differ, even then our epistle will not differ more from Paul, than Paul does from himself; for in the epistle to the Romans only has Paul quoted the words of authors as such; e.g., Rom. iv. 6; xi. 9; x. 5, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20; ix. 29, 27. Are the epistles to the Corinthians spurious, because they exhibit no such mode of quotation?

A word as to the greater frequency of quotations, in the epistle to the Hebrews. Let us compare it with that to the Romans, which it most of all resembles in respect to discussion and method of argument. In the epistle to the Romans, there are at least forty-eight quotations; in that to the Hebrews, thirty-four. More may be made in each, if we reckon all the cases of phraseology or resemblances to the Old Testament in the turn of thought, which may be found in both. Now the proportion of the epistle to the Romans to that of the Hebrews, in regard to length, is as fourteen to ten; the number of quotations as forty-eight to thirty-four; which would average nearly three and a half to a page, in each epistle; the proportion being nearly the same in both, but the excess, on the side of the epistle to the Romans. So much for the assertion, that the frequency of quotation in our epistle proves that Paul was not the author of it. If there be any weight in such an argument, it lies equally against the genuineness of the epistle to the Romans, compared with Paul's other epistles which have no quotations at all.

While I am discussing the subject under consideration, I must also notice some of the views and positions of Bleek. He endeavors to show (pp. 388—381), that 'Paul in his epistles, although he usually follows the Septuagint in his citations, yet sometimes translates de novo, and at other times corrects the version by the use of the Hebrew; on the contrary, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews follows the Septuagint throughout, even where it gives a sense wholly diverse from that of the Hebrew; and consequently, this author had no acquaintance with the Hebrew, which cannot be affirmed of Paul. In no instance, does Paul employ the Septuagint, where the sense is diverse in any considerable respect from that of the Hebrew.'

To the subject of quotations, Bleek, as will appear by the refer-
ence above, has devoted more than forty pages of his work. After examining the whole with great care, I can express the result in the words of Schulz; who, in his Review of Bleek's work (Allgem. Lit. Zeitung, June 1829), says respecting the essay in question of Bleek, "We have not been able, indeed, to convince ourselves of the correctness of the author's argumentation. It appears to go too far; and, like every demonstration that proves too much, proves nothing."

The substantial part of Bleek's allegations, however, must be put to the test of fact.

Is it true then, that Paul nowhere follows the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew? Or that he corrects this translation, when he cites it, in case it does differ from the Hebrew? Bleek, p. 351.

I shall content myself, for the sake of brevity, with referring the reader to such passages as will enable him fully to make up his mind, as to the answer which one should give to these questions. Let him compare, then, Rom. ii. 24 with Is. lxi. 5, Sept. and Hebrew, where the apostle holds with the Sept. in respect to the addition of δι' υμᾶς and ἐν τοῖς ἑβραῖοι. Rom. iii. 4, comp. Sept. Ps. l. 4, Heb. Ps. li. 6; where the Heb. μὴ ἔχει καί ἄνθρωπον, thou shalt be pure, upright, in verity; in Paul and the Septuagint. Rom. iii. 10, comp. Sept. Ps. xiii. 1; Heb. Ps. xiv. 1. The latter has nothing that corresponds to the οὐδὲ εἶ of Paul, which comes plainly from the Sept. οὐκ ἔστω ἐστὶν ἐνός. Rom. iv. 3, comp. Gen. xv. 6 Sept and Heb.; where the apostle uses ἡλεώνημα (passive voice) taken from the Sept., while the Heb. has the active verb ἡλε𝛿εψαν, and the [Jehovah] imputed it. Rom. ix. 27, 28, comp. Is. x. 22, 23, Sept. and Heb.; where (in v. 28) the Heb. runs thus, "For destruction and that which is decreed, i. e., decreed destruction, the Lord Jehovah of hosts will execute, in the midst of the whole land; Sept. and Paul, λόγον κ. τ. λ., with only a very slight and entirely unimportant variation in Paul at the close, viz., εἰπεν τὸς γῆς instead of the Sept. ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ἔλη. Rom. x. 16, comp. Is. liii. 1, Sept. and Heb., where the Heb. has no word corresponding to κῦρος. Rom. x. 20, 21, comp. Is. lxv. 1, 2, Sept. and Heb.; where αὐτὴ ἔγγεντα is added to the text, the Heb. having no corresponding word. Rom. xi. 9, 10, comp. Sept. Ps. lxviii. 22, 23, Heb. Ps. lxviii. 23, 24; where the Heb. in v. 24 runs thus, make their loins continually to shake, instead of καὶ τῶν ἑρων κ. τ. λ. Rom. xii. 20, comp. Prov. xxv. 22 Heb. and Sept.; where the Heb. ῥῆμα, to take, capere, imponere, is rendered σωματικώς, to heap up, in the Sept. and by Paul. Rom. xv. 12, comp. Is. xi. 10 Sept. and Heb. where, for the Heb. ἀνδρόν for a banner, the Sept. and Paul have ἐρωτήσεως; and where also for the Heb. ἐρωτήσει they shall seek, the others have ἐλπιστῇ. 1 Cor. i. 19, comp. Is. xxxix. 14 Sept. and Heb.; where, for the Heb. γένεται shall be hidden, Paul has δισταῖιον, equivalent to the Sept. κρατήσας. 1 Cor. vi. 16, comp. Gen. ii. 24 Sept. and Heb.; where the Heb. has no word corresponding to the ωὶ διὸ of Paul and the Septuagint. 1 Cor. xv. 56, comp. Hos. xiii 14 Sept. and Heb.;
where the Heb., I will be thy plague, O death! I will be thy destruc-
tion, O Hades! Paul with some verbal differences from the Sept.,
follows the spirit of that vision throughout, and most evidently had it
in his mind, or before his eyes. Gal. iii. 13, comp. Deut. xxi. 23
Sept. and Heb.; where ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ has no corresponding word in He-
brew. Eph. v. 31, comp. Gen. ii. 24 Sept. and Heb.; where of δῶρο
has no corresponding word in Hebrew.*

It will be difficult, I believe, for an impartial reader who is con-
veniant with criticism, to go through with these comparisons, without
being persuaded that the apostle has departed (with the Septuagint)
from the text of the Hebrew. Bleek alleges, indeed, that none of
these departures are material. In one sense this is true, viz., that the
general sentiment will accord, in one way or another, with what the
apostle has cited them to establish. But is not this true of all the ci-
tations in the epistle to the Hebrews; as true as it is of the examples
above adduced? Let the reader compare again Rom. ix. 28 in Paul
and the Sept., with the original Hebrew in Is. x. 28; and in like man-
nner, Rom. xi. 9, 10 with Ps. lixix. 23, 24, and 1 Cor. xv. 55 with Hos.
xi. 14; and then he can answer for himself.

Bleek himself concedes (p. 338), that 'Paul usually (in der Regel)
cites the Old Testament according to the Seventy; as was natural for
him to do whenever it was present to his memory, because the church-
es and persons whom he addressed, were more familiar with this ver-
tion than with the original.' But the citations of the apostle, he further
avers, 'are all from memory, whether he cites from the Septuagint, or
from the original Hebrew,' p. 343.

How this last point can be made out, it is difficult for me to con-
ceive. It is true, there are a considerable number of quotations, in
which the discrepancies with the Hebrew are of so circumstantial and
unimportant a nature, and the order of the words sometimes such, as
would very naturally proceed from memoriter quotations. But then,
who can show us that the apostle, in case he had the original before
his eyes, would have held himself bound to copy it verbatim et litera-
tim? A slavish copying of this nature, I take to be indicative of the
superstitions of later ages, and not of the wisdom and knowledge of
the primitive teachers of our religion, who knew that Scripture was
the sense, and not the form merely, of any passage.

I cannot resist the impression, that a sober and intelligent critic,
who has no cause to make out, must from the thorough study of the
quotations in the epistles of the New Testament, come to a deep con-

* Even if we grant, as Davidson says, that only three of the instances
above are in point, Rom. iii. 10; xv. 12; 1 Cor. i. 14, because only in these
cases is there a material difference between the Hebrew and Greek, yet those
are sufficient to invalidate Bleek's position. For if a peculiarity of this kind
appears at all in the other epistles, it is nothing at all strange that more in-
stances of it are found in the Hebrews. — Ed.
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tiction, that there was among the sacred writers almost an unlimited freedom in respect to the manner of quotation.

(1) Paul, in his acknowledged epistles, very often quotes verbatim from the Septuagint, where this agrees as exactly with the Hebrew as any translation can be made to do.*

(2) In other cases, the apostle cites passages with a merely minute and altogether unimportant variation both from the Septuagint and the Hebrew, where these two (in all parts of any consequence as to the sense) are exactly, or almost exactly agreed.†

(3) In some other cases there are slight differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint, and the citation of the apostle agrees exactly with neither, in regard to words, but the difference in respect to sense is altogether unimportant.‡

(4) There are other cases, where there is more or less freedom of departure from the original, some of which would seem almost like a new version, and others a mere paraphrastic imitation of the Hebrew; while some of the cases might be ranged, without any serious difficulty, under some one of the preceding classes.§

* E. g. Rom. iii. 13 quoted from Ps. v. 9 (10); iii. 13 from Ps. cxxxix. 3 (cxl. 4); iv. 7, 8 from Ps. xxxii. 1, 2; iv. 17 from Gen. xvii. 5; iv. 18 from Gen. xv. 5; vii. 7 from Ex. xx. 17; viii. 36 from Ps. xliii. 22 (xlv. 22); ix. 7 from Gen. xxi. 12; ix. 12 from Gen. xxv. 23; ix. 13 from Mal. i. 2, 3; ix. 15 from Ex. xxxii. 19; x. 5 from Lev. xviii. 5, where the δ of the Septuagint is a manifest error of the scribes for δ; x. 13 from Joel ii. xxxii. (iii. 5); x. 18 from Ps. xviii. 4 (xix. 5); xv. 3 from Ps. lxviii. 9 (lxix. 10); xv. 10 from Deut. xxxii. 43; xv. 11 from Ps. cxvi. 1 (cxvii. 1); xv. 21 from Is. li. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 9 from Deut. xxv. 4; x. 7 from Ex. xxxii. 6; x. 26 from Ps. xxxii. 1 (xxiv. 1); xv. 32 from Is. xxxii. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 13 from Ps. cxv. 10 (cxvi. 10); vi. 2 from Is. xl. 8; ix. 9 from Ps. cxii. 9 (cxii. 9); Gal. iv. 27 from Is. liv. 1; v. 14 from Lev. xix. 18; 1 Tim. v. 18 from Deut. xxv. 4.

† E. g. Rom. iii. 14 from Ps. x. 7; iii. 15 from Is. lix. 7, 8; iii. 18 from Ps. xxxv. 1 (xxxvi. 2). Latter part of Rom. x. 11 from Is. xxviii. 16; x. 19 from Deut. xxxii. 21; xv. 9 from Ps. xvi. 49 (xvii. 50). 1 Cor. x. 20 from Deut. xxxii. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 15 from Ex. xvi. 18; xiii. 1 from Deut. xix. 1; Gal. iii. 8 from Gen. xlii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 19 from Num. xvi. 5.

‡ E. g. Rom. i. 17 from Hab. ii. 4; xi. 34 from Is. xl. 13; xiii. 9 from Ex. xx. 13—17 (13, 14). Lev. xix. 18 (differing only in the order of some words). Eph. vi. 2, 3 from Ex. xx. 12.

§ E. g. Rom. ix. 9, from Gen. xviii. 10; ix. 17 from Ex. xvi. 16; ix. 25 from Hos. ii. 23; ix. 29 from Is. i. 9; ix. 33 (first part) from Is. viii. 14; x. 6 seq. from Deut. xxx. 12 seq.; x. 15 from Is. iii. 7; xi. 3 from 3 (1) Kings xix. 14; xi. 4 (1) Kings xix. 18; xi. 8 from Is. xxix. 10 and Deut. xxix. 4; xi. 26, 27 from Is. lix. 20, 21; xiv. 11 from Is. xlv. 23; 1 Cor. i. 31, from Jer. ix. 24 (23); ii. 9 from Is. lxiv. 4 (3); ii. 16 from Is. xl. 13; iii. 20 from Ps. xcviii. 11 (cxv. 11); xiv. 21 from Is. xcviii. 11, 12; xv. 23 from Ps. cix. 1 (cx. 1); xv. 27 from Ps. viii. 6 (7); xv. 45 from Gen. ii. 7; xv. 54 from Is. xxv. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 16 from Lev. xxv. 11, 12; vi. 17, 18 from Is. lii. 11, 12 and perhaps an imitation of 2 Kings (2 Sam.) vii. 14; Gal. iii. 10 from Deut. xxvii. 26; iii. 11 from Hab. ii. 4; iv. 30 from Gen. xxii. 10; Eph. iv. 8 from Ps. lxvii. 18; (lxviii. 19).
Rom. xii. 19 and 1 Cor. iii. 19, look much like a new translation from the Hebrew, differing entirely from the Septuagint.

Now who can attempt to decide in so many cases of variations from the original Hebrew, or from the Septuagint, of all gradations — from the most minute verbal agreement up to a mere paraphrastic imitation — who can possibly decide which of them Paul took directly from the Septuagint, without reference to the Hebrew; which from the Hebrew, without reference to the Septuagint; which he made out from a comparison with both; which he translated anew; which he copied merely as to sense, without intending to copy the diction; which he wrote down from mere memory, and which from consulting the original? The thing is plainly impossible; and the assumption of Bleek, that the apostle now copied in this way, and then in that; that he now made out his citation from a predominant recollection of the Hebrew, and then of the Septuagint; is, and must be, destitute of any certainty at all. I agree altogether with Schulz (Review of Bleek, June 1829), that "in the very examples produced by him, who ever will make the comparison, in a manner unprejudiced and without partiality, cannot but concede that the object is rather sought after by art and acuteness in the display of evidence, than found or accomplished."

One question still remains. Are the citations in the epistle to the Hebrews, like to those in Paul's epistles, with respect to the characteristics that have now been exhibited?

In the main they are; although on the whole the coincidence with the Septuagint is more exact, than in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. But this I must regard as accidental, not as designed. In the greater part of the quotations, as Bleek himself acknowledges, the Septuagint is so near to the Hebrew original, that there was no occasion to depart from it.

(1) There are many exact coincidences between the Septuagint and Hebrew and the quotations in our epistle, in almost every minute word.*

(2) In a considerable number of cases, there is nearly an exact coincidence with the Sept. and Hebrew, yet with some slight verbal differences.†

* Heb. i. 5 from Ps. ii. 7 and 2 Sam. vii. 14; i. 10 seq. from Ps. ci. 25 seq. (cii. 26 seq.) i. 12 from Ps. cix. 1 (ex. 1); ii. 6 seq. from Ps. viii. 4 seq. (viii. 5 seq.); ii. 12 from Ps. xxi. 22 (xxii. 23); ii. 13 from Is. viii. 17, 18; iii. 7 seq. from Ps. xciv. 7 seq. (xcv. 7 seq.) ii. 15 from Is. xciv. 7, 8 (xcv. 7, 8); iv. 3 from Ps. xciv. 11 (xcv. 11), iv. 7 from Ps. xciv. 7, 8 (xcv. 7, 8); v. 5 from Ps. ii. 7; v. 6 from Ps. cix. 4 (ex. 4); vii. 17, 21 from Ps. cix. 4 (ex. 4) xiii. 6 from Ps. cxvii. 6 (cxviii. 6).

† E. g. Heb. i. 6 from Ps. xcvi. 7; iv. 4 from Gen. ii. 3; vii. 5 from Ex. xxxv. 40; viii. 8 seq. from Jer. xxxviii. 31 seq., ix. 20 from Ex. xxiv. 8; x. 16, 17 from Jer. xxxviii. 33, 34 (xxxii. 33, 34); x. 37, 38 from Hab. ii. 3, 4.
(3) There are a number of cases, in which there is a little discrepancy in diction from the Sept., where it agrees with the Hebrew.

(4) There is an accordance in several cases with the Sept., where it differs from the Hebrew.

(5) There is an accordance with the Hebrew, and entire discrepancy from the Sept., in Hebrew x. 30 from Deut. xxxii. 35.

How can any just inference, now, be drawn from such a state of facts as this, against the Pauline origin of our epistle? Bleek himself seems to concede (p. 385), that the author of our epistle might retain the Sept. in all the cases in which he has quoted the Old Testament, with the exception of two, which will be noticed more particularly in the sequel. Indeed, I can see nothing more in the state of the quotations in our epistle, than that it so happened, that the citations in general accorded well in the Hebrew and the Sept.; a thing which might happen, or might not, in respect to any other epistle, and one which actually happens, for example, in regard to the second epistle to the Corinthians. Such accordance actually existing, there was no occasion (so far as we can see), to make any change, in general, from the Sept. version. Yet after all, as the facts above show, actual changes here are little if any less frequent, than in the other epistles of Paul. They are certainly more frequent in proportion, than in the second epistle to the Corinthians. See Nos. 2, 3, 5, above.

But Bleek, in order to show that the author of our epistle implicitly follows the Sept. throughout, even where it differs in sense from the Hebrew, appeals to Heb. i. 7, where, he says, the writer has followed the Sept. contrary to the sense of the Hebrew, which is, “who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his servants.” But the sense which he thus gives to the Hebrew, is against the laws of Hebrew grammar, and against the design of the writer. In support of this, I must refer the reader to the commentary on the passage.

He further adduces Heb. ii. 6—8 (quoted from Ps. viii. 3—7), as an instance in which there is a departure from the Hebrew, and an agreement with the Septuagint in respect to the words ἡλατθωρας αὐτον βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους. The Hebrew, he alleges, runs thus, “Thou hast made him but little inferior to the angels;” which, he thinks, is counter to the sense of the Greek. But in this last suppo—

* E. g. Heb. i. 7 from Ps. ciii. 4 (civ 4); i. 8, 9 from Ps. xliv. 6, 7 (xliv. 7, 8); xii. 26 from Hag. ii. 7 (6); vi. 14 from Gen. xxii. 16, 17; xiii. 20 from Ex. xix. 12, 13; xii. 21 from Deut. ix. 19.

† E. g. x 5 seq. from Ps. xxxix. 6 seq (xl. 7 seq.) xi. 21 from Gen. xlviii. 31 (where, however, the discrepancy is occasioned merely by the vowel points under παρέκλητος, which the author of our epistle no doubt read with the Seventy, παρεκλήτος, as it should be read; so that this case does not properly belong here). xii. 6 from Prov. iii. 12 (where, however, our epistle has παρεκλήτος instead of the Sept. παρέκλητος) xiii. 5 from Deut. xxxi. 8 Sept., and from Deut. xxxi. 8 and Josh. i. 5 of the Hebrew (where the form of the Sept. is altered from the third person of the verbs to the first).
sition he is as much mistaken, as in regard to the sense of the passage in Heb. i. 7. For proof of this, I refer to the commentary in the sequel.

Heb. i. 6 is also adduced; but here the writer confesses that it is dubious whether the author of our epistle cited Ps. xcvi. 7, or Deut. xxxii. 42. The former, he concedes, might be understood so as to accord with the citation.

Heb. xii. 5, 6 (Prov. iii. 11, 12) is also cited, to show a departure from the Hebrew, and an agreement with the Seventy. "This," says he, "is exactly after the Septuagint." But he has overlooked the fact, that the Septuagint in Prov. iii. 12 has ἐλέγχετε, for which in Heb. xii. 6 the writer employs παθέτες; a circumstance indeed that is immaterial, but one quite as important as Bleek has not unfrequently employed, in his essay on the quotations in our epistle, as the basis of some important conclusions. All the departure from the Hebrew in the above passage, consists in reading ἄγοντι, scourgeth, afflicting, instead of our present Hebrew punctuation ἄγοντι, as a father. But surely this writer, who alleges such a discrepancy as this, does not need to be told that the present Masoretic punctuation is the offspring of the fifth or sixth century of the Christian era; and that the author of our epistle, who read Hebrew without vowel points, read it as the Seventy did, and (as Bleek himself acknowledges) "perhaps in a way preferable to the Masoretic punctuation."

There remains, then, after all the allegations respecting close adherence to the Septuagint at the expense of the Hebrew, only one solitary passage, where the departure is in any measure of consequence. This is Heb. x. 5, 7, quoted from Ps. xxxix. 6 seq. (xi. 7 seq.). Here Bleek alleges, that the passage is not quoted from memory; that the departure from the Hebrew is entire; and that this offers full evidence, that the author of our epistle could not have understood the original Hebrew, so as to be able to compare it, p. 366 seq. But,

(1) The passage is not exactly quoted from the Septuagint; for ἔχεις (Cod. Alex. ἔχεταις) is here εἰδόκεσαι. (2) Τοῦ ποιήσας, ὁ Θεός, τὸ Ἑλληνιστικὸν is, in the Septuagint, τοῦ ποιήσας τὸ Ἑλληνιστικὸν, ὁ Θεός μοῦ, ἡβηβαλλεῖσθαι, κ. τ. λ.; so that the order and the connection both, of this last clause, are changed by the author of our epistle. Bleek, who makes so much of such minulae, surely will not object to my making mention of them.

But the main point is the citing of σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι from the Septuagint, instead of using the Hebrew "εἴ πρός σε ἐκοινωνήσω, ears hast thou opened for me;" which Bleek avers, cannot possibly mean what the Septuagint, and after them the author of our epistle, have translated it as meaning.

Literally and exactly as to diction, the Hebrew certainly does not mean σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. But ad sensum, will not both pa-
sages come to the same amount, in the argument of the apostle? *Mine ears hast thou opened* means, 'Thou hast made me obedient, listening.' In what respect? The preceding context intimates, 'Sacrifice and offering thou hast not desired.' What then is to come in place of these? "Mine ears hast thou opened," namely, thou hast made me "obedient," i.e., "unto death" (Phil. ii. 8), instead of requiring these. The sequel confirms this. "Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou hast not required. Then I said, Lo! I come... to do thy will, my God." What is this will? That the body of Christ should be made an offering; see Heb. x. 10. What important difference, then, is there as to *sēme*, between saying in this case, "Thou hast made me obedient," viz., unto death, and "Thou hast provided me with a body," viz. for sacrifice?

Bleek may call in question the commentary of the writer of our epistle on the whole passage extracted, and probably would do so; but then it would be a question between him and the writer of our epistle; and he will not take it amiss, in a matter of this kind, if some should prefer the writer's authority.

It seems not to be correct, then, that the whole stress of the passage in Heb. x. 5 seq., lies on the σῶμα ἐκ κατηρίσω μοι. Heb. x. 10 shows this not to be the case. It is "doing the will of God," viz., being obedient unto death, which affords the substitute for the offerings of the Levitical law; and this is the very gist of the question that is agitated in this passage. See Comm. and Excursus on Heb. x. 5.

Thus much for the solitary instance of departure from the Hebrew, on which so great stress is laid. Let us now reverse the matter, and see how the account stands on the other side.

*Heb. x. 30, ἐμοὶ ἐκδικήσεις ἐγὼ ἀνταποδόσως, Hebrew יָוָא יָפָה יָב. Deut. xxxii. 35. But here the Septuagint renders, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεσις ἀνταποδόσως. Bleek himself (p. 355), in commenting on this very passage (as exhibited in Rom. xii. 19), avers that here 'Paul plainly had the Hebrew before his eyes.' This I should admit; but then, what had the author of our epistle before his eyes? Bleek answers (p. 367), 'here, without any doubt, the author of our epistle transferred this from Rom. xii. 19, where the same words are employed.' But on this solution Schulz has remarked (Review of Bleek p. 194), that 'the author escapes with the unsatisfactory assertion, that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has literally copied Paul; an assertion which it would of course be impossible to substantiate, if Paul himself be not the author of our epistle.'

We have, then, *one* case in which the writer of our epistle has followed the Seventy, where the discrepancy from the Hebrew, as to diction, seems to be striking; and one where he has followed the Hebrew, with a discrepancy from the Septuagint that is striking. Can any conclusions for the opinion of Bleek, be drawn from such facts as these?
But Schulz, although he differs so much from Bleek in his estimation of the evidence to be drawn from quotations, still holds, with him, that it is altogether probable the writer of our epistle had no knowledge of the Hebrew language. How such a position can be rendered probable, I do not see. Bleek holds Apollos to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Was this disciple, then, who was mighty in the Scriptures, and in all probability a Jew, ignorant of Hebrew? Did not all well educated Jews of his time understand" Hebrew? Above all; did not the author of our epistle, so profoundly and intimately versed in everything Jewish, understand Hebrew? If the thing is possible, it is utterly improbable. At all events, it can no more be proved from the quotations in our epistle, that the author did not understand Hebrew, than it can by the quotation in Matthew's gospel which accord so well with the Sept., that he did not understand the original language of the Jewish Scriptures.

But Bleek has advanced another position peculiar to himself, and one, I apprehend, not very likely to satisfy his critical readers. This is, that 'the writer of our epistle follows the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint, while Paul follows that of the Vatican manuscript.'

Schulz has replied to this, in his Review; and I employ his words, in part, as a sufficient answer. "The differences in the readings, for the most part, have respect to mere minutiae. The number of passages, where the readings in Paul differ from the Vatican Codex, and agree more with the Alexandrine; and on the other hand, in the epistle to the Hebrews, where they agree more with the Vatican than the Alexandrine; is not much smaller than where the reverse of this is the case. A few exceptions, moreover, prove in this case as much as many, and suffice to destroy the credit of the writer's [Bleek's] views. In some citations, the apostle agrees neither with the Vatican nor with the Alexandrine."

Schulz then proceeds to observe, that the probability that the text of the Septuagint, at the time when our epistle was written, was in the different states now represented by the Vatican and Alexandrine manuscripts, cannot be made out; and that minute changes, of the nature here in question, are everywhere found in the New Testament. He then produces a number of cases, in which he shows that Bleek has given an imperfect view of the state of the discrepancies in question; and he goes on to ask, "Where are the passages, in which Paul and the writer of our epistle cite the same texts, in which the first follows the Vatican Codex, and the second, the Alexandrine? Not one has. Bleek been able to produce;" and then concludes by saying, 'Among the readings in which Paul differs from the Vatican text, are some which are far more decisive than those which Bleek has brought, in order to prove his agreement with his text; e.g., Rom. ix. 25, where ἵκει is omitted; ix. 27, where αἰτῶν and γὰρ are omitted; and Rom. xiv. 11, where the Vatican has ὀματικὰ . . . τῶν Ἰσρα.
but Paul ἔξωμολογήσεται ... τῷ Ἰσω, as has also the Alexandrine Codex."

On the whole, then, the objection, drawn either from the method or the frequency of quotation (singularis ratio prae ceteris omnibus of our epistle, as Seyffarth calls it), vanishes away upon a close examination; or if adhered to, must disprove the genuineness of a major part of the acknowledged epistles of Paul. That Paul, in our epistle, should have more frequently than elsewhere used λέγει, εἶπεν, εἶπε, is altogether consonant with what we may suppose him to have done, when addressing the Hebrews. The usual and almost the only mode of quoting, prevalent among the Jews, in ancient times, appears to have been such; at least if we may judge of it as it appears in the Mishna, where יַעֲרֵנָה, יַעֲרֵנָה, it is said, as it is said, which is said, is almost the only formula in use. There is an obvious reason for this. Every Jew, being conversant with the Old Testament Scriptures, would of course know what was the kind and weight of the appeal, made by λέγει, εἶπεν (יִשָּׂא); i. e., he would at once refer it to divine testimony. Hence this abridged and natural mode of quotation prevails, in our epistle. But in writing to churches made up of both Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom were of course less familiar with the Old Testament, and knew less where to look for passages quoted, it was more natural for the apostle (as he has done in the epistle to the Romans), to say Μωσῆς λέγει, Ἡσαῖας λέγει, etc., so that the reference might be more definite. This is a sufficient reason to account for any differences in the formula of quotation, between our epistle and the other epistles of Paul. The difference itself has, however, as we have seen, been greatly overrated. Nothing important, most plainly, can be made of it by higher criticism, in performing its office upon our epistle. What can be more improbable, too, than that such a master-spirit as Paul should cast all his letters in the same mould; always use the same round of expression; mechanically apply the same formulas of quotation; and forever repeat the same sentiments in the same language? And because he has not done so in the epistle to the Hebrews, must it be wrested from him by criticism which exacts such uniformity in a writer? Whence is the writer of epistles ancient or modern, who possessed any talents and free command of language, whose letters can be judged of by such a critical test as this?

(4) According to Schulz, De Wette, and others 'The appellations given to the Saviour, in Paul's acknowledged epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews are so diverse, as to afford strong evidence that both did not originate from the same person. E. g., in the Pauline epistles, these apppellations are either, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. X. Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, or ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. In innumerable passages is Christ referred to by these appellations; which are so characteristic of Paul's writings, that they are to be regarded as nearly the constant established formulas, by
which he adverts to the Saviour. On the contrary, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the writer uses most commonly νῶς τοῦ θεοῦ or οὗ νῶς; he also employs at times, ὁ κύριος or ὁ Ἰησοῦς simply. Twice only has he connected Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς. This must appear striking to every unprejudiced person, and of importance.

Striking, indeed, the argument may appear, in the form stated by Schulz; but an investigation, through the medium of a Concordance, will present a very different result from that which he has presented.

(a) In regard to νῶς τοῦ θεοῦ or οὗ νῶς being the most frequent appellation given to Christ by the writer of our epistle, the facts stand thus. Omitting dubious references, and all the names of Christ that are appellatives suggested merely by the occasion (such as ἀπόστολος, ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, καιρός, πιστεύω, μακάρις, σωτήρ, and καλονόμος), the writer refers to the Messiah, by some one of his usual titles, in 32 places; in four only of which he calls him νῶς τοῦ θεοῦ, viz., Heb. iv. 14; vi. 6; vii. 3; x. 29. In 8 other places he calls him νῦς, viz., i. 2, 5 bis, 8; iii. 6; v. 5, 8; vii. 28. In the Pauline epistles, these designations are used 17 times, viz., Rom. i. 3, 4, 9; v. 15; viii. 3, 29, 32; 1 Cor. i. 9; xv. 28; 2 Cor. i. 19; Gal. i. 16; ii. 20; iv. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 15; 1 Thess. i. 10.

(b) Κύριος is so far from being limited to the epistle to the Hebrews, in its application to Christ, that, if I have counted rightly, it is found in the acknowledged Pauline epistles, applied in the same way, 117 times, and is the most frequent appellation of any except Χριστός. The cases where κύριος stands united with Ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, etc., are exempted from this enumeration. On the other hand, the writer of our epistle is so far from making a frequent use of this designation, that he has employed it singly in two places only, or at most three, viz., ii. 3; vii. 14, probably xii. 14.

But further; in the epistle to the Romans, κύριος is applied to Christ not more than 17 times; some may think, still less, in as much as the exegesis, in a few of the cases, may be doubtful. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, however (which is about the same length), the same appellation is given to Christ 45 times; while, in the epistle to Titus it does not occur at all. Further, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, is used in the epistle to the Romans, as connected with κύριος only 14 times; in 1 Corinthians, only 11. Ἰησοῦς κύριος is used in Romans twice; in 1 Corinthians, only thrice. Κύριος Χριστός only in Rom. xvi. 18. Such a variety of usage in these different epistles, must, if Schulz’s method of arguing is correct, prove that Paul could not have written them all.

(c) Ἰησοῦς, without being connected with the other usual appellations of Christ, is employed in our epistle 7 times; viz., ii. 9; vi. 20; vii. 22; x. 19; xii. 2. 24; xiii. 12. In the Pauline epistles, 16 times, viz., Rom. iii. 28; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 5; iv. 10 bis; iv. 11 bis; iv. 14; xi. 4; Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; 1 Thess. i. 10; ii.
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13; iv. 14 bis. In the epistles to the Gal., Col., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit., and Philemon it is not found at all.

(d) Χριστός is used in like manner by our author 6 times; viz. ii. 6, 14; v. 5; vi. 1; ix. 11, 14, 24, 28; xi. 26; in the Pauline epistles, 198 if I have rightly counted.

(e) Ἰησοῦς Χριστός instead of being used only twice, as Schulz avers, is used three times; Heb. x. 10; 8, 21, omitting iii. 1, where it stands also in the textus receptus.

(f) In xiii. 20, Κύριον I. Χριστόν is used by the writer just as Paul employs it.

(g) Those designations of Christ in the Pauline epistles, which Schulz has mentioned as the usual and only appellations of him by Paul, do not collectively amount to more than 68, if we take the number as stated by himself (who, however, as is usual with him, has in haste overlooked some instances); while in the same epistles, other appellations which he does not acknowledge, are used with far greater frequency; e. g. κύριος is used 147 times, and Χριστός, 198; the former being an appellation which this writer holds out as characteristic of our epistle to the Hebrews, and neglected by Paul. Truly this matter is striking (if I may use Dr. Schulz's own language); and if the epistle to the Hebrews can be wrested from Paul, only by arguments such as this, those who ascribe it to this apostle have not much reason for apprehension in regard to the safety of their cause.

Even if the facts stated by Schulz were correct, it would not follow that Paul could not be the author of our epistle. The predominant appellation of the Saviour in the Pauline epistles is simply Χριστός; as we have just seen. Yet in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, this appellation, simply used, occurs but once (iii. 5); and in both the epistles to Timothy, and in that to Titus, it does not once occur. Does it follow from this, then, that Paul did not write these epistles? If not, then, supposing the facts alleged by Schulz to be correct, no critical argument could be safely built upon them. But they are so far from being correct, that one finds it difficult to account for it, how any man, who expected others to examine for themselves and not to receive what he says as authoritative, should have thrown out before the public such affirmations as every tyro, with a Greek Concordance in his hand, would be able to disprove. Truly Prof. Schulz must not blame his readers, if they are slow and cautious about admitting his allegations, on subjects where accuracy and diligence and patience are necessary, in order to produce correct results.

* In respect to the appellation High Priest, ἄρχιερος, and apostle, ἀπόστολος, not a word need be said to the critical reader. For the comparison of Christ with the Jewish High Priest and with Moses naturally suggests these designations; and if they had been avoided, we might justly take it as an indication of an imitator who avoids all words not used by the apostle. See Com. on iii 1, for further remarks upon the use of these words. We
On the whole, nothing can be plainer, than that the usage in our epistle, with respect to the appellations in question, differs no more from the common Pauline one, than the usage of several of his acknowledged epistles differs from that of others belonging to him. Consequently no weight can be attached to this objection.

(5) 'The writer of our epistle has made use of a great many words and phrases, in order to express ideas which Paul expresses (either always or usually) by different words or phrases,' Schulz, p. 138, seq.

This objection is drawn out at great length, and requires a minuteness of consideration and philological exhibition which is truly appalling. But having commenced the work, it must not be left unfinished. The importance of the subject under discussion, is the apology on which I must rely for justification, as to the length and minuteness of the examination. General assertions may satisfy those who think in generals and reason in generals; but the true critic demands facts, and of course detail, in an investigation dependent on facts.

It will shorten our work, however, and be of no small importance with respect to the satisfaction which the reader's mind should experience, if some acknowledged, or at least just, principles of reasoning in regard to such a topic, can be premised before we enter upon particulars.

might at least with as much propriety derive an argument against the Pauline authorship of the Rom. from the use of ἐκμορος in v. 8, as against the Hebrews, from the use of these appellations.

* Davidson, in his Introduction, in accordance with the opinion of those who oppose the Pauline authorship asserts: 'When we compare the phraseology of our epistle with that of Paul, we should certainly expect a more frequent use of the compound appellation.' So most others who even, on the whole, acknowledge Paul as author. But is it so? Is it not, on the other hand, most natural that the more simple designation should be predominant in the epistle to the Hebrews? Christ is compared with the angels, with the High Priest, with Moses, etc. Would a skilful writer in such comparisons, where the object is mainly designation, introduce generally compound appellations? Besides, would it have been natural or politic in writing to the Jews in order to show them the superiority of the Christian dispensation from the superior dignity of its founder, to introduce frequently such appellations as δόκιμος ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, etc? An inferior writer might have done so, but not Paul. Furthermore, I might point out the particular significance of the designations used. The Son of God, ὅς τοῖς Ἰσδω, in the four places in which it is found, Heb. iv. 6; vii. 3; xx. 29, specially designates the divinity of Christ, and in the eight places where ὅς μοι, etc. are used three (1. 5, twice v. 5) are direct quotations from the Old Testament; and in the other five places, the connection naturally, if not necessarily suggests the appellation in i. 8; iii. 6; v. 8; vii. 28; and the same might be said of i. 2, when taken with the subsequent part of the chapter. I might go on to speak of other appellations, the appropriateness of which and the similarity of use to the other epistles of Paul, when the connection and circumstances are considered, are far from furnishing any objection to Paul as author; on the other hand, to my own mind, are indicative of the hand of the great apostle.
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The following principles seem to be such as will be assented to, by all sober and judicious critics; at least we may hope this will be the case. In particular, all who have not a special end to accomplish by the denial of them, we may presume will assent to them.

(a) The same writer, if a man of knowledge and talents (both of which will be conceded to Paul), does not, in an extensive correspondence either on matters of business or sentiment, always express the same ideas by the same words or phrases; much less, always repeat the same ideas, whatever may be the nature of the subject which the occasion demands. I appeal to all the volumes of letters extant, in proof of this.

(b) The same writer, at different periods of life, in different circumstances and states of mind and feeling, exhibits a variety of style in his epistles; especially where the subjects themselves are very diverse. The appeal in proof of this, I make to well-known facts, and to every one's own experience, who has been long accustomed to write letters on a variety of grave and important topics. In particular will the case be as now represented, if a writer's lot, at one period of his life, be cast among men and authors, who differ in style and modes of thinking and expression, from those with whom he has at another time been associated.

(c) It follows, then, that differences in the choice of expression, in two epistles, in order to convey the same idea (above all when this stands in connection with diverse subjects), is no good proof that the same person did not, or could not, write both. Indeed, no man who is not a writer of the most sterile genius, and of a mind the most mechanical, nay, absolutely insusceptible of excitement or of improvement, will always limit himself to the same round of expression. While there will be occasional words and expressions, which will mark some characteristics appropriate to a writer of knowledge and talents, yet in the great body of them, there will not be a mechanical sameness either of thought or of expression; but every letter will take its coloring, more or less, from the occasion and the state of mind which prompted it.

(d) If any person refuses to accede to principles so plain and reasonable as these, it would be easy to show him (as will be seen hereafter), that any one of Paul's acknowledged epistles may be proved to be spurious, on a different ground, just as easily as the epistle to the Hebrews. Schulz and Seyffarth have undertaken to prove that Paul did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, because it contains many words either not employed by Paul, or not employed by him in the same sense; and also some favorite expressions, not found in his acknowledged epistles. At first view, the number of such words or expressions, as exhibited by them, seems very great; nay, quite appalling, before examination. Most critics of the present day seem to have been influenced principally by this consideration, in giving up the
Pauline origin of our epistle. But a widely extended examination of this subject, has ended in producing different impressions in my own mind. I am fully persuaded, now, that there is scarcely any one of Paul's acknowledged epistles, which cannot be proved to be spurious, if the grounds of argument assumed by the above-named writers is tenable. I will pledge myself (I do not say it at a venture), to produce as many peculiarities, as many ἀπαξ λεγόμενα or ἀπαξ λογιζόμενα, for example, in the epistle to the Romans, in the first to the Corinthians, or in the second to the Corinthians (in proportion to the length of these epistles, and compared with the other acknowledged epistles of Paul), as there are in the epistle to the Hebrews. If this can be done, then is the argument equally good against either of these epistles, which are among the most undoubted of all the writings of Paul. The proof of this I shall by-and-by produce, in laying before the reader the result of the principles which I have ventured to call in question, by applying them to the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.

(e) Schulz himself, who has labored with so much zeal and confidence to fix upon our epistle the charge of peculiarities in style, expression, and favorite phrases, has, in another part of his work, and before his mind became heated with this subject, made the following remarks, which are well worthy of attention.

"We give up words, and phrases, and thoughts [in the epistle to the Hebrews], which occur but seldom in the books of the New Testament or in Paul's epistles. We shall not insist upon the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα or the ἀπαξ λογιζόμενα; for why must a writer of numerous works necessarily repeat oftentimes his ideas in general, or his favorite phrases? Why must he often do this in all his works, and not use some of them merely in particular passages? Every writer will do the latter, and must do it, when, either by accident or by design, he falls only once upon some particular idea. But in regard to a writer whose whole works we do not possess (perhaps only a small part of them), how can we pronounce sentence upon many phrases and thoughts, or deduce any argument at all from them? And such is the case before us. What now appears in the letters of Paul still extant to be ἀπαξ ἐρμηνεύω, he may have said and written numberless times in works now lost, p. 52."

He then proceeds very justly to ask, 'whether it is the design of any New Testament writer, in any one particular book, to represent the whole scheme of Christian doctrine, complete in all its parts? And if not, whether that which in one book differs from the contents of another, is to be considered as departure or contradiction in respect to that other?' And then he adds, "It is quite surprising, and deserving of reprobation, that any one should call in question expressions against which no objections can be made, when they are consonant with the usus loquendi, and are genuine Greek; and also, that any
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one should produce them as grounds of suspicion against a book, because they do not occur in other compositions of a similar nature. In the epistle to the Hebrews, there are many of this kind," p. 53.

These remarks are no less just than striking. I freely give to them my entire and hearty approbation; and I am willing, with such principles in view, to join issue with the author, as to his list of words and phrases which he brings forward, in his attack upon our epistle. Nine parts in ten of all that he, as well as others, have advanced of this nature, would be excluded from the argument by his own sentence. But I proceed to the examination of particular words and phrases.

I. Words and phrases, instead of which Paul employs other and different ones.

The phrase ὀλυμπένη μαλλονσα, for the Christian dispensation is nowhere else found in Paul’s epistles, but everywhere αἰὼν μαλλον.

This latter phrase is also used in our Ep. vi. 5; and only once in the same signification in the other epistles of Paul, Eph. i. 21. Is it to be made an objection to our epistle that exactly the same phraseology is not always used, especially where the Christian is necessarily so often referred to as contrasted with the Mosaic dispensation?

In Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 24 the word ἡγούμενον is used for teachers, whilst Paul everywhere uses διδάσκαλοι. So Bertholdt.

It may be said in reply that Paul uses besides διδάσκαλοι to designate teachers, the words προεδρεύει, 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5; ἐπίσκοπος, Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; ποιμήν, Eph. iv. 11. Very natural for Paul it must have been, to apply a variety of appellations to Christian ministers, which would correspond with those applied to religious teachers in the Jewish synagogues. These were ἀρχιπρεσbyterus, pastor, leader, guide, prefect; ἐρωτόσκοπος, leader, guide; ἐπίσκοπος, ruler, prefect; and ἄρχων, guide, director. What could be more natural, then, than for Paul, when writing to Hebrews, to call the teachers in their churches ἡγούμενον, which corresponds quite well with all the above appellations that they had been accustomed to give to their religious teachers? Besides, the argument of Bertholdt, if admitted, would prove too much. The same mode of reasoning must lead us to conclude, that those epistles, in which Christian teachers are called ἐπίσκοποι, cannot be reckoned as Paul’s, because διδάσκαλοι is not used instead of ἐπίσκοποι. The same may be said, in respect to the use of the words ποιμήν and προεδρεύειν. The consequence would be, that several of Paul’s now acknowledged epistles could not be ascribed to him. But who that knows the variety of appellations which were employed to designate teachers in the Jewish synagogues, can attribute any critical weight to the fact, that such a variety of Greek terms is used, corresponding with the Hebrew appellations that were familiar to those whom our author addressed? And of all these
But Schulz, although he differs so much from Bleek in his estimation of the evidence to be drawn from quotations, still holds, with him, that it is altogether probable the writer of our epistle had no knowledge of the Hebrew language. How such a position can be rendered probable, I do not see. Bleek holds Apollonius to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Was this disciple, then, who was mighty in the Scriptures, and in all probability a Jew, ignorant of Hebrew? Did not all well educated Jews of his time understand Hebrew? Above all; did not the author of our epistle, so profoundly and intimately versed in everything Jewish, understand Hebrew? If the thing is possible, it is utterly improbable. At all events, it can no more be proved from the quotations in our epistle, that the author did not understand Hebrew, than it can by the quotation in Matthew’s gospel which accord so well with the Sept., that he did not understand the original language of the Jewish Scriptures.

But Bleek has advanced another position peculiar to himself, and one, I apprehend, not very likely to satisfy his critical readers. This is, that ‘the writer of our epistle follows the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint, while Paul follows that of the Vatican manuscript.’

Schulz has replied to this, in his Review; and I employ his words, in part, as a sufficient answer. “The differences in the readings, for the most part, have respect to mere minuiae. The number of passages, where the readings in Paul differ from the Vatican Codex, and agree more with the Alexandrine; and on the other hand, in the epistle to the Hebrews, where they agree more with the Vatican than the Alexandrine; is not much smaller than where the reverse of this is the case. A few exceptions, moreover, prove in this case as much as many, and suffice to destroy the credit of the writer’s [Bleek’s] views. In some citations, the apostle agrees neither with the Vatican nor with the Alexandrine.”

Schulz then proceeds to observe, that the probability that the text of the Septuagint, at the time when our epistle was written, was in the different states now represented by the Vatican and Alexandrine manuscripts, cannot be made out; and that minute changes, of the nature here in question, are everywhere found in the New Testament. He then produces a number of cases, in which he shows that Bleek has given an imperfect view of the state of the discrepancies in question; and he goes on to ask, “Where are the passages, in which Paul and the writer of our epistle cite the same texts, in which the first follows the Vatican Codex, and the second, the Alexandrine? Not one has. Bleek been able to produce;” and then concludes by saying, ‘Among the readings in which Paul differs from the Vatican text, are some which are far more decisive than those which Bleek has brought, in order to prove his agreement with his text; e.g., Rom. ix. 25, where ἥκει is omitted; ix. 27, where αἱτών and γάρ are omitted; and Rom. xiv. 11, where the Vatican has ὅμωσα... τον Ἰεων,
but Paul ἔμυθος ἂνετα... τὸ Ἡερ, as has also the Alexandrine Codex."

On the whole, then, the objection, drawn either from the method or the frequency of quotation (singularis ratio prae ceteris omnibus of our epistle, as Seyfahrth calls it), vanishes away upon a close examination; or if adhered to, must disprove the genuineness of a major part of the acknowledged epistles of Paul. That Paul, in our epistle, should have more frequently than elsewhere used λέγει, εἶπεν, εἴρηκε, is altogether consonant with what we may suppose him to have done, when addressing the Hebrews. The usual and almost the only mode of quoting, prevalent among the Jews, in ancient times, appears to have been such; at least if we may judge of it as it appears in the Mishna, where ידעלב, י-mêmeל, it is said, as it is said, which is said, is almost the only formula in use. There is an obvious reason for this. Every Jew, being conversant with the Old Testament Scriptures, would of course know what was the kind and weight of the appeal, made by λέγει, εἶπε (י_probs); i.e., he would at once refer it to divine testimony. Hence this abridged and natural mode of quotation prevails, in our epistle.

But in writing to churches made up of both Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom were of course less familiar with the Old Testament, and knew less where to look for passages quoted, it was more natural for the apostle (as he has done in the epistle to the Romans), to say Μοίῳ λέγω, Ἡσαρᾶς λέγει, etc., so that the reference might be more definite. This is a sufficient reason to account for any differences in the formula of quotation, between our epistle and the other epistles of Paul. The difference itself has, however, as we have seen, been greatly overrated. Nothing important, most plainly, can be made of it by higher criticism, in performing its office upon our epistle. What can be more improbable, too, than that such a master-spirit as Paul should cast all his letters in the same mould; always use the same round of expression; mechanically apply the same formulas of quotation; and forever repeat the same sentiments in the same language? And because he has not done so in the epistle to the Hebrews, must it be wrested from him by criticism which exacts such uniformity in a writer? Where is the writer of epistles ancient or modern, who possessed any talents and free command of language, whose letters can be judged of by such a critical test as this?

(4) According to Schulz, De Wette, and others, the appellations given to the Saviour, in Paul's acknowledged epistles and in the epistle to the Hebrews are so diverse, as to afford strong evidence that both did not originate from the same person. E.g., in the Pauline epistles, these appellations are either ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, or ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. In innumerable passages is Christ referred to by these appellations; which are so characteristic of Paul's writings, that they are to be regarded as nearly the constant established formulas, by
which he adverts to the Saviour. On the contrary, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the writer uses most commonly νίος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ or δ' νίος; he also employs at times, δ' κύριος or, ὅ τις κύριος simply. Twice only has he connected Ἰσραὴλ Χριστοῦ. This must appear striking to every unprejudiced person, and of importance.'

Striking, indeed, the argument may appear, in the form stated by Schulz; but an investigation, through the medium of a Concordance, will present a very different result from that which he has presented.

(a) In regard to νίος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ or δ' νίος being the most frequent appellation given to Christ by the writer of our epistle, the facts stand thus. Omitting dubious references, and all the names of Christ that are appellatives suggested merely by the occasion (such as ἀπόστολος, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιπρέσβης σωτήρια — τῆς πάντως, μεσίτης, σωτήρ, and καλονομος), the writer refers to the Messiah, by some one of his usual titles, in 32 places; in four only of which he calls him νίος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, viz., Heb. iv. 14; vi. 6; vii. 3; x. 29. In 8 other places he calls him νίος, viz., i. 2, 5 bis, 8; iii. 6; v. 5, 8; vii. 28. In the Pauline epistles, these designations are used 17 times, viz., Rom. i. 3, 4, 9; v. 10; viii. 3, 29, 32; 1 Cor. i. 9; xv. 28; 2 Cor. i. 19; Gal. i. 16; ii. 20; iv. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10.

(b) Κύριος is so far from being limited to the epistle to the Hebrews, in its application to Christ, that, if I have counted rightly, it is found in the acknowledged Pauline epistles, applied in the same way, 147 times, and is the most frequent appellation of any except Χριστός. The cases where κύριος stands united with Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραὴλ Χριστοῦ, etc., are exempted from this enumeration. On the other hand, the writer of our epistle is so far from making a frequent use of this designation, that he has employed it singly in two places only, or at most three, viz. ii. 3; vii. 14, probably xii. 14.

But further; in the epistle to the Romans, κύριος is applied to Christ not more than 17 times; some may think, still less, in as much as the exegesis, in a few of the cases, may be doubtful. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, however (which is about the same length), the same appellation is given to Christ 45 times; while, in the epistle to Titus it does not occur at all. Further, Ἰσραὴλ Χριστοῦ, or Χριστός Ἰσραήλ, is used in the epistle to the Romans, as connected with κύριος only 14 times; in 1 Corinthians, only 11. Ἰσραὴλ κύριος is used in Romans twice; in 1 Corinthians, only thrice. Κύριος Χριστός only in Rom. xvi. 18. Such a variety of usage in these different epistles, must, if Schulz's method of arguing is correct, prove that Paul could not have written them all.

(c) Ἰσραὴλ, without being connected with the other usual appellations of Christ, is employed in our epistle 7 times; viz., ii. 9; vi. 20; vii. 22; x. 19; xii. 24; xiii. 12. In the Pauline epistles, 16 times, viz., Rom. iii. 26; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 5; iv. 10 bis; iv. 11 bis; iv. 14; xi. 4; Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; 1 Thess. i. 10; vii.
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15; iv. 14 bis. In the epistles to the Gal., Col., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit., and Philemon it is not found at all.

(d) Χριστός is used in like manner by our author 6 times; viz. ii. 6, 14; v. 5; vi. 1; ix. 11, 14, 24, 28; xi. 26; in the Pauline epistles, 198 if I have rightly counted.

(e) Ἰησοῦς Χριστός instead of being used only twice, as Schulz avers, is used three times; Heb. x. 10; 8, 21, omitting iii. 1, where it stands also in the textus receptus.

(f) In xiii. 20, Κύριον Ἰ. Χριστόν is used by the writer just as Paul employs it.

(g) Those designations of Christ in the Pauline epistles, which Schulz has mentioned as the usual and only appellations of him by Paul, do not collectively amount to more than 68, if we take the number as stated by himself (who, however, as is usual with him, has in haste overlooked some instances); while in the same epistles, other appellations which he does not acknowledge, are used with far greater frequency; e.g. κύριος is used 147 times, and Χριστός, 198; the former being an appellation which this writer holds out as characteristic of our epistle to the Hebrews, and neglected by Paul. Truly this matter is striking (if I may use Dr. Schulz's own language); and if the epistle to the Hebrews can be wrested from Paul, only by arguments such as this, those who ascribe it to this apostle have not much reason for apprehension in regard to the safety of their cause.

Even if the facts stated by Schulz were correct, it would not follow that Paul could not be the author of our epistle. The predominant appellation of the Saviour in the Pauline epistles is simply Χριστός; as we have just seen. Yet in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, this appellation, simply used, occurs but once (iii. 5); and in both the epistles to Timothy, and in that to Titus, it does not once occur. Does it follow from this, then, that Paul did not write these epistles? If not, then, supposing the facts alleged by Schulz to be correct, no critical argument could be safely built upon them. But they are so far from being correct, that one finds it difficult to account for it, how any man, who expected others to examine for themselves and not to receive what he says as authoritative, should have thrown out before the public such affirmations as every tyro, with a Greek Concordance in his hand, would be able to disprove. Truly Prof. Schulz must not blame his readers, if they are slow and cautious about admitting his allegations, on subjects where accuracy and diligence and patience are necessary, in order to produce correct results.*

* In respect to the appellation High Priest, ἅρπιερεύς, and apostle, ἀπόστολος, not a word need be said to the critical reader. For the comparison of Christ with the Jewish High Priest and with Moses naturally suggests these designations; and if they had been avoided, we might justly take it as an indication of an imitator who avoids all words not used by the apostle. See Com. on iii 1, for further remarks upon the use of these words. We
On the whole, nothing can be plainer, than that the usage in our epistle, with respect to the appellations in question, differs no more from the common Pauline one, than the usage of several of his acknowledged epistles differs from that of others belonging to him. Consequently no weight can be attached to this objection.

(5) The writer of our epistle has made use of a great many words and phrases, in order to express ideas which Paul expresses (either always or usually) by different words or phrases. Schulz, p. 138, seq.

This objection is drawn out at great length, and requires a minuteness of consideration and philological exhibition which is truly appalling. But having commenced the work, it must not be left unfinished.

The importance of the subject under discussion, is the apology on which I must rely for justification, as to the length and minuteness of the examination. General assertions may satisfy those who think in generals and reason in generals; but the true critic demands facts, and of course detail, in an investigation dependent on facts.

It will shorten our work, however, and be of no small importance with respect to the satisfaction which the reader's mind should experience, if some acknowledged, or at least just, principles of reasoning in regard to such a topic, can be premised before we enter upon particulars.

might at least with as much propriety derive an argument against the Pauline authorship of the Rom. from the use of ἢδιμωνος in xv. 8, as against the Hebrews, from the use of these appellations.

* Davidson, in his Introduction, in accordance with the opinion of those who oppose the Pauline authorship asserts: “When we compare the phraseology of our epistle with that of Paul, we should certainly expect a more frequent use of the compound appellation.” So most others who even, on the whole, acknowledge Paul as author. But is it so? Is it not, on the other hand, most natural that the more simple designation should be predominant in the epistle to the Hebrews? Christ is compared with the angels, with the High Priest, with Moses, etc. Would a skilful writer in such comparisons, where the object is mainly designation, introduce generally compound appellations? Besides, would it have been natural or politic in writing to the Jews in order to show them the superiority of the Christian dispensation from the superior dignity of its founder, to introduce frequently such appellations as δεῖ θυσίας ἡμῶν Θεοῦς Χριστός, etc? An inferior writer might have done so, but not Paul. Furthermore, I might point out the particular significance of the designations used. The Son of God, ὦς τῶν Ἰσραήλ, in the four places in which it is found, Heb. iv. 14; vi. 6; vii. 3; x. 29, specially designates the divinity of Christ, and in the eight places where ἔστι πατρός, etc. are used three (i. 5, twice v. 5) are direct quotations from the Old Testament; and in the other five places, the connection naturally, if not necessarily suggests the appellation in i. 8; iii. 6; v. 8; vii. 28; and the same might be said of i. 2, when taken with the subsequent part of the chapter. I might go on to speak of other appellations, the appropriateness of which and the similarity of use to the other epistles of Paul, when the connection and circumstances are considered, are far from furnishing any objection to Paul as author; on the other hand, to my own mind, are indicative of the hand of the great apostle.
The following principles seem to be such as will be assented to, by all sober and judicious critics; at least we may hope this will be the case. In particular, all who have not a special end to accomplish by the denial of them, we may presume will assent to them.

(a) The same writer, if a man of knowledge and talents (both of which will be conceded to Paul), does not, in an extensive correspondence either on matters of business or sentiment, always express the same ideas by the same words or phrases; much less, always repeat the same ideas, whatever may be the nature of the subject which the occasion demands. I appeal to all the volumes of letters extant, in proof of this.

(b) The same writer, at different periods of life, in different circumstances and states of mind and feeling, exhibits a variety of style in his epistles; especially where the subjects themselves are very diverse. The appeal in proof of this, I make to well-known facts, and to every one's own experience, who has been long accustomed to write letters on a variety of grave and important topics. In particular will the case be as now represented, if a writer's lot, at one period of his life, be cast among men and authors, who differ in style and modes of thinking and expression, from those with whom he has at another time been associated.

(c) It follows, then, that differences in the choice of expression, in two epistles, in order to convey the same idea (above all when this stands in connection with diverse subjects), is no good proof that the same person did not, or could not, write both. Indeed, no man who is not a writer of the most sterile genius, and of a mind the most mechanical, nay, absolutely insusceptible of excitement or of improvement, will always limit himself to the same round of expression. While there will be occasional words and expressions, which will mark some characteristics appropriate to a writer of knowledge and talents, yet in the great body of them, there will not be a mechanical sameness either of thought or of expression; but every letter will take its coloring, more or less, from the occasion and the state of mind which prompted it.

(d) If any person refuses to accede to principles so plain and reasonable as these, it would be easy to show him (as will be seen hereafter), that any one of Paul's acknowledged epistles may be proved to be spurious, on a different ground, just as easily as the epistle to the Hebrews. Schulz and Seyffarth have undertaken to prove that Paul did not write the epistle to the Hebrews, because it contains many words either not employed by Paul, or not employed by him in the same sense; and also some favorite expressions, not found in his acknowledged epistles. At first view, the number of such words or expressions, as exhibited by them, seems very great; nay, quite appalling, before examination. Most critics of the present day seem to have been influenced principally by this consideration, in giving up the
Pauline origin of our epistle. But a widely extended examination of
this subject, has ended in producing different impressions in my own
mind. I am fully persuaded, now, that there is scarcely any one of
Paul's acknowledged epistles, which cannot be proved to be spurious,
if the grounds of argument assumed by the above-named writers is
tenable. I will pledge myself (I do not say it at a venture), to pro-
duce as many peculiarities, as many ἀπαξ λεγόμενα or ἀπαξ λογιζό-
μένα, for example, in the epistle to the Romans, in the first to the
Corinthians, or in the second to the Corinthians (in proportion to the
length of these epistles, and compared with the other acknowledged
epistles of Paul), as there are in the epistle to the Hebrews. If this
can be done, then is the argument equally good against either of these
epistles, which are among the most undoubted of all the writings of
Paul. The proof of this I shall by-and-by produce, in laying before
the reader the result of the principles which I have ventured to call
in question, by applying them to the first epistle of Paul to the Co-
rinthians.

(e) Schulz himself, who has labored with so much zeal and confi-
dence to fix upon our epistle the charge of peculiarities in style,
expression, and favorite phrases, has, in another part of his work, and
before his mind became heated with this subject, made the following
remarks, which are well worthy of attention.

"We give up words, and phrases, and thoughts [in the epistle to the
Hebrews], which occur but seldom in the books of the New Testa-
ment or in Paul's epistles. We shall not insist upon the ἀπαξ λεγό-
μένα or the ἀπαξ λογιζόμενα; for why must a writer of numerous
works necessarily repeat oftentimes his ideas in general, or his favor-
itive phrases? Why must he often do this in all his works, and not
use some of them merely in particular passages? Every writer will
do the latter, and must do it, when, either by accident or by design,
his falls only once upon some particular idea. But in regard to a
writer whose whole works we do not possess (perhaps only a small
part of them), how can we pronounce sentence upon many phrases
and thoughts, or deduce any argument at all from them? And such
is the case before us. What now appears in the letters of Paul still
extant to be ἀπαξ εἰρημένον, he may have said and written number-
less times in works now lost, p. 52."

He then proceeds very justly to ask, ʻwhether it is the design of
any New Testament writer, in any one particular book, to represent
the whole scheme of Christian doctrine, complete in all its parts?
And if not, whether that which in one book differs from the contents
of another, is to be considered as departure or contradiction in respect
to that other?ʼ And then he adds, "It is quite surprising, and de-
serving of reprobation, that any one should call in question expressions
against which no objections can be made, when they are consonant
with the usus loquendi, and are genuine Greek; and also, that any
one should produce them as grounds of suspicion against a book, because they do not occur in other compositions of a similar nature. In the epistle to the Hebrews, there are many of this kind,” p. 53.

These remarks are no less just than striking. I freely give to them my entire and hearty approbation; and I am willing, with such principles in view, to join issue with the author, as to his list of words and phrases which he brings forward, in his attack upon our epistle. Nine parts in ten of all that he, as well as others, have advanced of this nature, would be excluded from the argument by his own sentence. But I proceed to the examination of particular words and phrases.

I. Words and phrases, instead of which Paul employs other and different ones.

The phrase ὀλκομάνῃ μέλανος, for the Christian dispensation is nowhere else found in Paul’s epistles, but everywhere αἰῶν μέλανος.

This latter phrase is also used in our Ep. vi. 5; and only once in the same significion in the other epistles of Paul, Eph. i. 21. Is it to be made an objection to our epistle that exactly the same phraseology is not always used, especially where the Christian is necessarily so often referred to as contrasted with the Mosaic dispensation?

In Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 24 the word ἱγούμενος is used for teachers, whilst Paul everywhere uses διδάσκαλος. So Bertholdt.

It may be said in reply that Paul uses besides διδάσκαλος to designate teachers, the words πρεσβύτερος, 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5; ἐπίσκοπος, Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; ποιμήν, Eph. iv. 11. Very natural for Paul it must have been, to apply a variety of appellations to Christian ministers, which would correspond with those applied to religious teachers in the Jewish synagogues.

These were διδάσκαλος, pastor, leader, guide, prefect; ἱγούμενος, leader, guide; ηγετής, ruler, prefect; and διδάσκαλος, guide, director. What could be more natural, then, than for Paul, when writing to Hebrews, to call the teachers in their churches ἱγούμενος, which corresponds quite well with all the above appellations that they had been accustomed to give to their religious teachers? Besides, the argument of Bertholdt, if admitted, would prove too much. The same mode of reasoning must lead us to conclude, that those epistles, in which Christian teachers are called ἐπίσκοποι, cannot be reckoned as Paul’s, because διδάσκαλος is not used instead of ἐπίσκοπος. The same may be said, in respect to the use of the words ποιμήν and πρεσβύτερος. The consequence would be, that several of Paul’s now acknowledged epistles could not be ascribed to him. But who that knows the variety of appellations which were employed to designate teachers in the Jewish synagogues, can attribute any critical weight to the fact, that such a variety of Greek terms is used, corresponding with the Hebrew appellations that were familiar to those whom our author addressed? And of all these
Greek names of pastors, certainly none better corresponds with the Hebrew ones, than the word ἵγινενοι employed in our epistle.

It may be added, too, that Paul employed a term here which was not at all unique; for the same appellation is given to teachers in Luke xxi. 26; Acts xiv. 12; xv. 22. And besides all this, ἵγινενοι is used for teachers only three times, in the whole epistle to the Hebrews, viz., xiii. 7, 17, 24, all in the concluding part of the epistle, and all standing so connected together, that the name once employed, would almost of course be repeated in the other instances.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, κατέχειν βεβαιαν is used for holding fast, Heb. iii. 6, 14; and κατέχειν ἀκλητή, in Heb. x. 23; while Paul uses only κατέχειν simply; 1 Cor. xi. 2; xiv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21.

On examination, I find the verb κατέχω, in the sense of holding fast, carefully retaining, to be exclusively Pauline. This word, then, affords an argument to establish a conclusion, which is the very reverse of that for which it is adduced by Bertholdt. The addition of βεβαιαν or ἀκλητή is evidently for the purpose merely of intensity: just as we may join an adverb to a verb for this purpose, or we may refrain from the use of it, and still employ the same verb simply in the same sense. What could be more natural, now, than for the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews to employ words of intensity, while in the state of strongly excited feeling in which he wrote?

In the epistle to the Hebrews, we find εἰς τὸ διπρεκές, vii. 3, and εἰς τὸ παντελές, vii. 25, used to designate the idea of forever; while Paul always uses εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Our author also employs αἰῶν, in the epistle to the Hebrews, no less than nine times in the like way; viz., i. 8; v. 6; vi. 20; vii. 17, 21, 24, 28; xiii. 8, 21; while διπρεκές is employed only four times, viz., vii. 3; x. 1, 12, 14. Is it a matter of wonder, that he should sometimes employ other words than αἰῶν, which were synonymous; specially, if those words belonged both to common and to Hebrew Greek? Such is the fact, in respect to both the words in question. Διπρεκές is used by Aelian, Var. Hist. i. 19; by Appian, Bell. Civ. I. p. 682; Heliod. Ethiop. I. p. 25. Lucian, V. H. I. 19; by Symmachus, translator of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, Ps. xlviii. 15. Παντελές is used by Aelian, VII. 2. XII. 20; by Josephus, Antiq. VI. 2, 3; and by Luke, xiii. 11; and in our epistle, once only, viz., in vii. 25. But whether the sense of the word παντελές in Heb. vii. 25 is forever, may be doubted. Its etymology would lead to the sense of prorsus, omnino, i.e., entirely, altogether, thoroughly; and so many critics have construed it. Such is clearly the meaning of παντελές; o. g. Jos. Antiq. IV. 6. 5. 2 Macc. iii. 12, 31; vii. 40; and so Bretschneider construes εἰς τὸ παντελές in Heb. vii. 25, in his recent lexicon. But supposing it does mean forever, in the case before us, can the argument, derived from the employment of such synonymes, i.e. belong to
common and to Hebrew Greek together with εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, be of any validity to show that Paul could not have written our epistle?

'Αἰῶνας, in the sense of universæ, is used only in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 2; xi. 3. Paul employs other terms to designate the same idea, such as τὰ πάντα, etc.

Paul, in the phrase τοῦ βασιλεία τῶν αἰωνῶν, 1 Tim. i. 17, has employed the word in the same sense as that in which it is used in the epistle to the Hebrews; and as the use of the word αἰῶν, in such a sense, is limited to Paul and to our epistle (so far as the New Testament is concerned), if it proves anything, it would seem to prove the very reverse of what Bertholdt has adduced it to establish.

'Εὐλάβεια Heb. v. 7; xii. 28, is used in the sense of piety, devotedness to God; it is equivalent to εὐσέβεια as employed by Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 2; iii. 16, etc. Neither of the writers employs the word used by the other.

The sense of εὐλάβεια, in Heb. v. 7, it is altogether probable, is fear, which is the classical sense of the word; and this is probably the sense, too, in Heb. xii. 28, as its adjunct αἰῶνας seems to indicate. Schulz's objection is founded on an exegesis far from being certain, and indeed quite improbable. But if we allow his interpretation to be true, the objection amounts only to this, that Paul, at one time, has employed εὐσέβεια (the proper Greek word) in order to express the idea of piety; and at another time, in writing to the Hebrews, he has used εὐλάβεια (corresponding to the Heb. וַעֲשָׂר reverence, piety), to express the same idea. What could be more natural for a Hebrew, than to do this?

'Our author uses διαπαντός; Paul, πάντοτε, and he very frequently repeats it.'

Διαπαντός is common among the Evangelists, and in the Septuagint. Paul uses it in the citation from the Old Testament, in Rom. xi. 10. Paul, then, was familiar with the word. In our epistle, it is found only twice, viz., ix. 6; xiii. 15. In this same epistle we find the Pauline πάντοτε also, viz., in vii. 25. Now as to the epistle to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and 2 Timothy, each has the word πάντοτε but once; the first epistle to Timothy and that to Titus, not at all. If the fact that πάντοτε is used no more than once, is proof that our epistle is not Pauline, then surely these other epistles must be ranked in the same class. The same fact must surely afford the same argument, in both cases. But as this proves more than Schulz is willing to allow, we may suppose he will not insist on such an argument.

'Our epistle uses ἀνακαυνίζεων and ἐγκαυνίζεων; for which Paul employs ἀνακαυνοῦν and ἀνανεῶν-θαι.'

Ἀνακαυνίζεων occurs only once, Heb. vi. 6; ἐγκαυνίζεων but twice, Heb. ix. 18; x 20. On the other hand, ἀνακαυνοῦν is found in Paul only twice, 2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10; and ἀνανεῶν-θαι but once, Eph. iv. 23. Now as ἀνακαυνίζω, ἀνακαυνῶ, and ἀνανεῶ are all
either of classic or Septuagint usage, and are of the same signification, the use of one or the other, so few times as they are employed in the Pauline epistles and in ours, can afford no argument in favor of a different writer. As to ἐνακαινίζεων to consecrate, to initiate, it is a verb of a different meaning from the others, and is not used in the sense in which Paul employs either ἀνακαινίζεων or ἀνανεῶν.

There is in our epistle, an abundance of verbs ending in ἤς, such as can be nowhere else found in the New Testament, above all, in Paul’s epistles.


Other verbs of this class, adduced by Schulz, are used in our epistle only once; viz., ἀναλογίζεος Ἡσ, xii. 3; ἀναγωνίζεος Ἡσ, xii. 4; καταγωνίζεος Ἡσ, xi. 33; ἀναγωνίζεος, x. 33; προδέος, x. 37; and τριτατικίζεος Ἡσ, xi. 85. The three last are denominatives, for which the Greek language offered no other forms; so that no choice, in this case, was left to the writer. All of them are of classic or Septuagint usage.

Προσοχίζεων, Heb. iii. 10, is a quotation from the Septuagint; of which the use of the same word, in iii. 17, is a simple repetition.

It turns out, then, that of the great multitude of words in ἤς, peculiar to our epistle, only six are employed, exclusively by it; and of these six, three are denominatives, and necessarily employed, as there was no choice of other forms; while the other three occur but once each, and are all compound verbs, common to the Septuagint and to the classics. But Schulz has not ventured to present us with a view of the numerous verbs in ἤς, employed by the New Testament writers and by Paul, which are not used at all in our epistle. Selecting only a single letter (as a specimen of what might be gathered from the whole), we find the following, among others, καθωμίζοις, κατακρήμνίζοις, καταντιματιζοῖς, καταπολεμόμενοις, καταπολεμήμενοις, καταμοτίζοις, καθαρίζοις, κλεισιμίζοις, κοιλάφιζοις, κοινούλιζοις, κοινοπαλάζοις, κτίζοις; 12 under only one letter; which our author, with all his al-
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Leged partialities for -unless, never uses. Surely this is an argument unfortunately chosen, and very incorrectly stated.

"'Εντέλλεσθαι is used in our epistle; Paul uses παραγγέλλω, διατάσσω, or επιτάσσω."

'Εντέλλεσθαι is employed only twice, ix. 20, xi. 22. In the New Testament it is used 15 times, although not employed by Paul. Paul employs παραγγέλλω only in 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy; διατάσσω only in 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and Titus; επιτάσσω only once in Philemon. Do not these words differ as much from each other, as each of them does from εντέλλεσθαι; and will not the reasoning be the same, to prove that Galatians and Titus or Philemon are spurious, as that our epistle is? And what shall be said of all those epistles, where none of these words are at all employed?

"Our author employs καθέσθαι in a neuter sense, i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2; Paul employs this verb in a transitive sense."

In the quotation by Paul in 1 Cor. x. 7, it is used in a neuter sense; as it is in 2 Thess. ii. 4. It has a transitive sense only in 1 Cor. vi. 4; Eph. i. 20. It occurs in no other case, in Paul, so that his usage is equally divided. In our epistle, it occurs in the same formula, in all the four instances where it is employed; and all of these instances refer to Ps. cx. 1 (Sept. cix. 1), where is the like usage of καθέσθαι.

"Abstract appellations of God, such as θεός τῆς χαράς, πνεῦμα τῆς χαράς, θεός τῆς μεγαλοπρέπειας, are unheard of in Paul's writings."

What then is πνεῦμα ἁγιωτάτης, Rom. i. 4; θεότης, i. 20; ἀληθεύων τοῦ Θεοῦ, true God, i. 25; also ψεύδος, false God, ibid.; and πνεῦμα ζωῆς, viii. 2? Is the usage of employing abstract words for concrete ones, foreign to the style of Paul? Every one who reads this apostle with attention, will be able to answer this question.

"Our epistle calls Christ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, i. 3; Paul says εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀντίτυπον, 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, and μορφή Θεοῦ in Phil. ii. 6."

Is not μορφή Θεοῦ as different from εἰκὼν Θεοῦ ἀντίτυπον, as ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης is from the same? And if this argument prove anything, does it not prove that the epistle to the Philippians, which employs μορφή Θεοῦ (and not εἰκὼν Θεοῦ), must also be spurious?

"In our epistle κακουχίω is used, xi. 37; xiii. 3; Paul uses θλίβω instead of this."

Paul uses στρογγυλομάτων three times in his second epistle to the Corinthians (and not once anywhere else), to express the same idea that he elsewhere expresses by θλίβω. Is this epistle therefore spurious?

"Our epistle employs ἀνίψυχος and ἀνων for which Paul uses διάλογουμος and λογοσφυρόμος."

Διάλογος is found 2 Cor. x. 4; but διαλογισμός in Romans, first
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Corinthians, Philippians and first Timothy. Is the second Corinthians spurious because it does not use διαλογισμός?

"Our epistle uses ἀκλίνης; for which Paul employs ἑδραῖος ἀμετακίνητος, or μὴ μετακινοῦμενος."

Ἀκλίνης is used once only, Heb. x. 23. So ἀμετακίνητος is used only in 1 Cor. xv. 58, and μὴ μετακυνοῦμενος only in Col. i. 23. Now as in first Corinthians and in Colossians both, Paul uses ἑδραῖος as well as these words, in order to express the same idea, shall the like choice of a synonyme, in another letter, be denied him? And is it reasonable that it should expose his letter to the charge of spuriousness, because that, out of various synonymes, he has sometimes taken one and sometimes another?

"Συμπαθεῖν, μετριο παθεῖν, and παθεῖν are current in our epistle; Paul uses συμπάθεχεν and πάσχειν."

Paul uses πάσχειν five times only, in four of which the present tense is required, and of course this form must be used, as there is no present πάθεω. He also employs ἔπαιζε twice, viz., in Gal. iii. 4, and 1 Thess. ii. 14. Our epistle has this same form, but only three times, v. 8; ix. 26; xiii. 12. Here then are the same forms, in both Paul and our epistle. Besides, are not πάσχω, συμπάσχω, and συμπαθεῖν commingled forms, and everywhere exchanged for each other? As to μετριοπαθεῖν, it is used but once (Heb. v. 5), and is there employed in its classical sense.

"In our epistle, we find μετάσχε, κατάσχομεν; but in Paul, μετέχειν, κατέχειν."

Once only is μετάσχε used, Heb. ii. 14. On the other hand, the Pauline μεταχεῖν is also employed once, in II. Cor. v. 13. Besides, in all Paul’s acknowledged epistles, μετάχω occurs only five times, and all of these are in the first epistle to the Corinthians. Is this the only epistle which is genuine?

As to κατάσχομεν, it is found in our epistle only twice, iii. 6; iii. 14; while the alleged Pauline κατέχειν is also used in x. 43. Besides, are not both of these one and the same verb, in different tenses? And may not the writer of different epistles employ even a different tense of the same verb, when the case demands it, without hazarding the reputation of his letters in respect to genuineness?

"Verbal nouns feminine, particularly such as end in —τικ, are unusually frequent in our epistle; and, when put in the Accusative by εἰ, they are employed instead of the Inf. mode with εἰς τό before it; which latter is the construction that Paul employs, even to excess, and in a manner not consentaneous with Greek idiom."

Paul is no stranger to the employment of nouns in —τις with εἰς before them in the Acc. in the sense of the Inf. mode with εἰς τό; e. g. Rom. i. 17; iii. 25; v. 18; xiv. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. In regard to other fem. nouns, put in the acc. with εἰ, and used as the Inf. with εἰς τό, see Rom. i. 5, 16; iii. 7; v. 16; vi. 19, 22, ix. 21 bis. 22,
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23; x. 1, 10; xi. 9; xv. 18; xvi. 26; 1 Cor. i. 9; ii. 7; v. 5; x. 31; xvi. 13. All these cases have respect to nouns fem. only; very many cases might be added of nouns of the masculine form, employed in the same way. The above instances of the feminine forms are selected from only two epistles of Paul. I have found more than forty cases, of the same kind, in his remaining acknowledged epistles.

On the other hand, as the excessive and uncritical use of the Inf. with ἐλατό by Paul, I do not find it to be as Schulz has stated it. In Romans, I find 15 cases of Infinitives with ἐλατό; in 1 Cor. there are 5 cases; in 2 Cor. there are 4; in Gal. 1; in Eph. 3; in Phil 4; in Col. not one; in 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Titus and Philemon, not one. But in our epistle, we have the Inf. with ἐλατό, in ii. 17: vii. 25; viii. 3; ix. 14, 28; x. 2 (διὰ τοῦ); x. 15 (μετὰ τοῦ); xii. 10: xiii. 21; i. v. 7 cases, just the same as the Pauline ones, and two more (x. 2, 15) of the same nature. If the want of frequency, with respect this construction, proves the spuriousness of our epistle, what does the same thing prove, in respect to the longer epistle, called the first to the Corinthians, which exhibits it only five times? And what is to be said of the five epistles named above, which do not at all exhibit this favorite construction of Paul?

In regard to the frequency of nouns ending in -τες, the proportion is not greater than in several of the Pauline epistles; as any one may determine by consulting a Greek Concordance.

"Our epistle uses παροξυσμός; Paul ζηλος."

Παροξυσμός is used only once, Heb. x. 24, and there not in the sense of ἐλατό.

"Our epistle uses προσβέβετροι for ancients; Paul uses πατέρες."

Paul uses πατέρες in this way, only in Rom. ix. 5; xi. 28; xv. 8. As to προσβέβετροι, it is a common word for πατέρα, ancients, Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3, 5, also Sept. What should hinder Paul from electing either of these synonyms at his pleasure?

"Our author uses προβλήτωμαι; Paul προστομάζω, προορίζω, προτίθημι. Our author uses ἀντικαθίστημι; Paul ἀνάθητημι."

Προβλήτωμαι occurs only in xi. 40, and is synonymous in some of its meanings, with the other verbs named. Besides, is there not as much departure from uniformity, in employing the several words, προστομάζω, προορίζω, προτίθημι, as there is in using προβλήτωμαι? And is not ἀντικαθίστημι a classic and Sept. word, and synonymous with ἀνάθητημι? Must a writer never employ but one and the same word?

II. Words employed in the epistle to the Hebrews in a sense different from that in which Paul uses them.

Some of the objections drawn from words of this class, have already been noticed above.
"Makroδυμía or makroδυμεῖν means patient waiting or expectation, in our epistle; in Paul, it means lenity towards others."

Paul employs it in other senses than that of lenity; e.g. Col. i. 11, patient endurance of evil; so 2 Tim. iii. 10, prob. iv. 2, see Wahl's Lex. In the same sense probably it is used in Heb. vi. 12, 15. But if this be not allowed, it is enough to say, that makroδυμía in the sense of patient expectation, is agreeable to Hellenistic usage. See Job vii. 16, Sept., and James v. 7, 8.

"Kataleiptoθαι and apoleiptoθai are used by our author in the sense of restore, reliquum esse: they are not so used by Paul."

Kataleiptoθai is used actively in the like sense, in Rom. xi. 4, and this sense is classic and Hellenistic. Apoleiptoθai is used in the active voice by Paul, in 2 Tim. iv. 18, 20, in a sense as kindred to the use of it in our epistle (where it is passive), as one of these voices can be to the other, in regard to a verb of this nature.

"Υπόστασις, in our epistle, has a different sense from that in Paul's epistles."

I am not able to perceive the difference between ὑπόστασις in 2 Cor. ix. 4; xi. 17, and in Heb. iii. 11; xi. 1. These are all the instances in which this word is employed by Paul or in our epistle, excepting Heb. i. 3, where the word is used in the classical sense of the later Greek writers. See Wahl's Lex. on ὑπόστασις.

"In Hebrews, λόγος means word given, assurance, declaration; in Paul, doctrine, command, word in opposition to deed."

So also in Heb. xiii. 7. λόγος means doctrine, as also in v. 13; vi. 1. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. xv. 54 it means assurance or declaration; as also in Rom. ix. 6, 9; 1 Cor. iv. 19; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9. Surely there is no ground for distinction here. In the sense of account, too, Paul and our epistle agree; e.g. Rom. xiv. 12; H. b. iv. 13; xiii. 17.

"Táξις, in Hebrews, means series, succession; Paul uses it for good order, arrangement."

Táξις in the Septuagint answers to ἡ ἀρχή, prescribed order or arrangement, Prov. xxix. 24 [xxx. 26]; to ὁ ἀρχή, Job. xxviii. 13, Aquila's translation. In the Sept. Job. xxiv. 5; xxxvi. 28, it has the sense of prescribed arrangement. This sense fits equally well 1 Cor. xiv. 40; Col. ii. 5, and all the cases where it is used in our epistle, viz., v. 6, 10; vi. 20; vii. 11, 17, 21, all of which are merely the same instance of táξις repeated. Even if this exegesis be not admitted, still it is enough to say, that táξις is employed in both the senses named by Schulz, in the Septuagint Greek and also in classic authors. May not Paul, like any other writer, employ the word in different parts of his writings (as he does a multitude of other words), with different shades of meaning?

"Πληθών is used by our author in the sense of praestantior; by Paul, only for more."
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In Heb. iii. 3; vii. 23, ἁλεών is used in the sense of more; certainly in the last instance. On the other hand, it occurs only once in the sense of praestantior, xi. 4. And this sense is supported both by classic and Septuagint usage.

III. Favorite expressions and peculiar phraseology.

Of these Schulz, Seiffarth, De Wette, and others, have collected together a great number; so great, that if they are truly what they name them, they must render the genuineness of our epistle suspected by every critical reader. But whether they have rightly attributed to these words and expressions the characteristics which they give them, remains to be examined.

"The use of γάπ in our epistle, is excessive; so much so, that a translator, if he means to avoid misleading his readers, must often pass it over unnoticed. Paul is less frequent in the use of this particle; and employs it only in cases where it has a meaning."

In the New Testament before me, the epistle of Paul to the Romans occupies fourteen pages; that to the Hebrews, ten. In Romans I find γάπ 145 times, i.e., on an average, more than 10 to a page; in our epistle I find it 91 times, i.e., on an average a little more than 9 to a page. So much for this favorite particle of the author of our epistle.

Bleek (Review p. 25) has noticed the answer to Schulz contained in the above paragraph; but he remarks that the question is not how often γάπ is used, but whether it is employed correctly and in its proper place; which he thinks is overlooked by me.

But is not the essence of Schulz's objection drawn from the frequency of its use? And in replying to this, is not the frequency, of course, the main question with me? The question whether γάπ is classically used, in all cases in the New Testament, even by any of its writers, I had supposed was no more a question. Even Schulz acknowledges that Luke (the almost classical writer), employs γάπ very much as it is employed in the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 162. And when Bleek challenges me to find it as much out of place, in the epistle to the Romans, as it is in Heb. viii. 4; vii. 12, 13 and v. 11, 18, I reply by inviting his attention to Rom. i. 18; v. 7; viii. 6; viii. 7 ἀδε γάπ. viii. 15, 18, 24 γάπ. ix. 28, where it is superadded to the Septuagint. It were easy to double this list from this single epistle. If Bleek should endeavor to show, that the usage in these cases may, in some tolerable measure be justified by classic, and specially by Hellenistic usage, then I will pledge myself to show that the instances which he has specified, or may be able to specify, from our epistle are equally conformed to these usages. Nay, I venture to affirm, that any and all of them may be justified by principles laid down in Passow's admirable Lexicon, under the word γάπ. The development which
this writer has made, shows that γάρ, in many of the classics, is used with very little if any more precision than in the New Testament.

"Our author is partial to the use of participles, and of the Gen. absolute. He employs 84 active participles, and 107 passive and middle ones, and seven cases of the Gen. absolute; while in the epistle to the Romans, there are only 90 active participles, and 42 passive, and no cases of the Gen. absolute, Seyffarth," p. 81.

Allowing the enumeration of Seyffarth to be correct, the average number of participles on each page will be for Hebrews, nineteen; for Romans, ten. Put now this principle to the test, in some other epistles. If I have rightly counted, the epistle to the Colossians has active participles 34, passive 40, pages three; average number of participles to a page, 24. Ephesians has active participles 60, passive 24, pages four and a half; average to a page, 23. Of course, if our epistle is spurious because it employs so many as 19 participles to each page, then these epistles must be spurious which employ 23 or 24 to a page.

And as to the Gen. absolute, the 2 Cor. (which has active participles 97, passive 77, pages nine, average to a page 19, the same as in our epistle), has the Gen. absolute three times. Can anything be more inconclusive, now, than such a species of reasoning?

"The words προσφέρεων and προσφέρω are used, times almost without number in our epistle, in respect to Christ's offering up himself before God by means of his death; Paul does not use the verb at all, nor the noun but once (Eph. v. 2) in this sense," p. 158.

These words are employed in respect to the offering by Christ, in Heb. ix. 14, 25, 28; x. 12, 14, six instances; which, considering the nature of the comparison between Christ's death and the Jewish offerings, is rather to be wondered at on account of unfrequent, than frequent occurrence. But is it not truly surprising that Schulz should produce, as examples which have respect to the offering made by the death of Christ, προσφέρεων and προσφέρω in Heb. v. 1, 3, 7; viii. 3, 4; ix. 9, 9; x. 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 18; xi. 4, 17; xii. 7? All of these refer to Jewish offerings, excepting xii. 7, which has wholly another sense. Nor is the language of our epistle limited to προσφέρεων, and προσφέρω. The writer uses ἀνασφαλέω, in vii. 27 bis, ix. 28; xiii. 15; which is also used by other New Testament writers, e. g. James ii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 24. As to the frequency with which προσφέρω is used, it is found only in five instances; two of these (x. 5, 8) are quotations from the Old Testament; and the other three (x. 10, 14, 18), are all plainly occasioned by the quotations just named, as they are employed in reasoning upon it. Nowhere else, in our epistle, does the writer use this word; but he employs ἰσοδία no less than fifteen times, which word Paul has employed five times. Considering the nature of the discussion in our epistle, is there any ground for the objection made by Schulz?
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"Εγγίζειν τῷ Ἰερῷ, and προσέρχεσθαι τῷ Ἰερῷ are frequent forms in our epistle; but not so in Paul."

The first of these phrases occurs only once, vii. 19. The frequency of it, therefore, should not have been alleged. But the same verb, as applied to time, is used in Heb. x. 25, and in Rom. xiii. 12. That Εγγίζειν τῷ Ιερῷ was a usual form of Hebrew Greek, is evident from James iv. 8. In respect to προσέρχεσθαι, it is nearly a synonyme with Εγγίζειν, and is used a great number of times in the New Testament, and by Paul in 1 Tim. vi. 3, but in the figurative sense of attending to, giving heed to. The use of it in our epistle (it is employed seven times), is occasioned by its correspondence with the Hebrew בֵּרוּם, which describes the action of approaching God with an offering; an idea which, from the nature of the comparisons instituted, must of necessity frequently occur.

"Such forms as λαμβάνειν—μορφοδοσίαν—ἀρχήν—τιμήν—νεκροῦς—ἐπαγγελίαν—ἐπαγγελίας, are frequent and peculiar to our epistle."

In Paul too we have λαμβάνειν—ἀποστολὴν—σημεῖον—καταλλαγὴν—περιποιεῖται—ἀφορμήν—πνεῦμα δουλείας—πνεῦμα νικηφόρον—κρίμα—πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου—μορφὴν—βραβεύον—στέφανον—ἀρτον—οἰκοδομήν—οἰλίῳν—οὖς—πρόσωπον—ἐπαγγελίαν—μορφὴν—ἐντολήν—ὑπόμνησιν. Is not this equally peculiar?

"Διαθήκη, and the compounds and derivates of τιθῆναι, are unusually frequent in our epistle."

Διαθήκη is employed by Paul nine times; but in our epistle, where the nature of the comparison lies between the old covenant and the new, the more frequent use of this word was altogether to be expected. Out of the 17 instances, however, in which our author uses it, six are quoted from the Old Testament, viz., viii. 8, 9 bis, 10; ix. 20; x. 16; and three more are in phrases transferred from the Old Testament, viz., ix. 4 bis, x. 29; so that eight instances only belong properly to our author's style. Could a less number than this be rationally expected, considering the nature of the discussion?

As to the uncommonly frequent use of the compounds and derivates of τίθημι in our epistle, the following is the result of comparison. Πολλὴς, four times in Hebrews, two of which are in quotations, viz., viii. 10; x. 16. In the other two cases, the word is employed in a sense different from the one usual in the New Testament, viz., ix. 16, 17. Πολλὴς is one of the διὰ ἄρκειαν of our epistle (see on these, iv. below). Πολλὴς is used three times; also in Gal. i. 6; ἄρκειν, Hebrews once, Paul six times, ἄρκεσθι, Hebrews twice; νομοῦσθειν, Hebrews twice (νομοθεσία in Romans ix. 4); εἰσίς, Hebrews once, Paul twice; ἐπικόλαξις, Hebrews once, Paul six times; ἄρκεσθι, Hebrews once, Paul four times. Can the position of Schulz be supported, when the result of investigation turns out thus?
"Τέλειον, to bring to perfection, to advance to the highest place, is a favorite expression of our epistle."

It is so employed in ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 28; xii. 23; but in a different acceptation in vii. 19; ix. 9; x. 1, 14; xi. 40 (perhaps the last instance belongs to the other category). To the former peculiar sense of τελειόω (as alleged), Paul is no stranger, Phil. iii. 12, comp. 2 Cor. xii. 9. Other Hellenists also employ it in the same manner; Luke xiii. 32. The derivate forms τελείωσις and τελειότης, vii. 11; xii. 2, occur once only in this epistle. Τελείωσις also in Luke i. 45. Besides, the word is naturally more frequently used in this epistle, in which the fulfilment of the types of the Old Testament is so often brought to view.

"Κράτος is employed frequently, by our author, in a sense altogether peculiar, viz., in the sense of more excellent."

In the same sense Paul uses it in 1 Cor. xii. 31; a sense, moreover, which is common to classic and Hellenistic usage.

"Αἰώνιος is unusually frequent; e.g. αἰώνιος joined with σωτηρία — κρίμα — πνεῦμα — λαύρωσις — κληρονομία — διαθήκη, etc."

But Paul uses αἰώνιος ζωή — χρόνος — θεός — βάρος — αἰώνια βλεπόμενα — αἰώνιος διάθεσις — παράκλησις — κράτος — δοξή. Paul uses the word 24 times; our epistle only six.

"Κληρονομός, lord, possessor, is peculiar to our epistle," Seyffarth, p. 63.

Not so. In Rom. iv. 13; viii. 17; Gal. iii. 29; iv. 7; Tit. iii. 7 it is used in the same way. Indeed it is strictly Pauline in this sense.

"Ζωή and ζήν are used very frequently by our author, to denote perpetuity, lasting, continuance."

So they are by Paul; e.g. Rom. ix. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 8; vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15; iv. 10; and this sense is frequent in the New Testament.

"The frequent use of πᾶς in the singular is striking."

Our epistle makes ten pages in the edition of the New Testament lying before me; and I find πᾶς in the singular, 16 times in it, i.e. on an average about once and a half to each page. The epistle to the Ephesians makes four and a half pages, and I find the same πᾶς in it 23 times, i.e., on an average more than five times to each page. So much for the strikingly frequent use of πᾶς in our epistle!

"The words δεῖγων χωρίς, ἔντερπ, and ἀδύνατον are unusually frequent in our epistle."

"Οὐκ is not used in the acknowledged epistles of Paul (see in respect to ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, iv. below); but in the New Testament it is common. χωρίς, Paul uses 15 times. ἔντερπ, is peculiar to Hebrews, and occurs thrice. ἀδύνατον is employed four times in our epistle; twice by Paul, and four times by the other writers of the New Testament.

"Compound words are specially frequent in our author" according
to Seyffarth and others. "It contains 534, whilst in Romans there are only 478."

In Colossians there are 178, which would average 59 to a page; whilst Hebrews, on a page of equal size, would average about 53 to a page. Hence by the same reasoning the epistle to the Colossians is a fortiori spurious; but particularly according to Schulz and others.

"Compounds with επ, are favorite forms with our author."

The following results will show how far this is well founded. ἐφέτος occurs in Heb. once; εὐθύτης, once; εὐφάρστων, Heb. 1, Paul 8; εὐφαρστεῖον, Heb. 8; εὐφάρστω, Heb. 1; εὐλαβεῖα, Heb. 2; εὐλαβείαν, Heb. 1; εὐφοδα, Heb. 1; εὐπεριτάτως, Heb. 1; εὐλογία, Heb. 2, Paul 9; εὐλογεῖν, Heb. 6, Paul 8; εὐκαιρος, Heb. 1; εὐδοκεῖν, Heb. 3, Paul 11. On the other hand compare the compounds of this sort in Paul, which do not occur in our epistle; viz., εὐγενής, εὐάγγελον, εὐαγγελισμός, εὐδόκια, εὐεργεσία, εὐδός, εὐκαρία, εὐκαιρία. εὐλογητός, εὐνοια, εὐευτάκτος, εὐδοκομία, εὐπρόσδεκτος, εὐπρόσφερος, εὐπροσώπως, εὐσίτεια, εὐσεβεία, εὐσεβεῖα, εὐσήμως, εὐσήμως, εὐσχημονία, εὐσχημὸν, εὐσχημονία, εὐστατεία, εὐφημία, εὐφήμος, εὐφάραια, εὐχαριστεῖον, εὐχαριστοσ, εὐχάριστος, εὐψυχία, εὐψωσία. Is there any foundation for the assertion of Schulz?

"Compounds with ἀνά also are unusually frequent, in our author."

The fact stands thus. Once only are ἀναδύχου, ἀναθεωρεῖ, ἀνακαυνίζω, ἀνάγω, ἀνακάμπτω, ἀναλογίζομαι, ἀνασταυρόν, ἀνάστηλλα, used in our epistle. 'Ἀναφέρω is employed four times. In Paul, on the other hand, we find, ἀναβαίνω 7, ἀναγέλλω 2, ἀναγνώσκω 8, ἀνάγνωσις 2, ἀνάγω 1, ἀναζω 2, ἀναζωτυρεῖ 1, ἀναζάλλω 1, ἀνατέμια 5, ἀνακαίνωσις 2, ἀνακαυνίζω 1, ἀνακαλύπτω 2, ἀνακεφαλαίομαι 2, ἀνακόπτω 2, ἀνακρίνω 10, ἀναλαμβάνω 4, ἀνάλυσις 1, ἀναλύω 1, ἀναλύω 2, ἀναλογία 1, ἀναμένω 1, ἀνανέω 1, ἀνανήψω 1, ἀνανεώσω 1, ἀναπαύει 4, ἀναπάτωμος 2, ἀναπληρώσω 5, ἀναστασίων 1, ἀνατίθημι 1, ἀναρπήτω 2, ἀναψύχω 1; all of which are wanting in the epistle to the Hebrews. Is there any want of frequency in compounds of this sort, in the writings of Paul? Rather is there not even a want of frequency, with respect to words of this class, in our epistle?

"Good periods, with comparisons by ὅσον — τοσοῦτο, with εἰ γὰρ — πῶς, δὲ, with καὶ ὅτι, etc., are not so frequent in Paul’s writings as here."

In what other epistle has Paul had so frequent occasion for comparisions?

"Σωτηρία, in the sense of Christian happiness, is peculiar to our epistle. "Ἀντιλογία is also peculiar."

Our epistle does not limit the word σωτηρία to such a sense. It is employed in its usual acceptation, in ii. 10; xi. 7, and probably in v. 9; vi. 9; ix. 28. On the other hand, Paul uses σωτηρία for Christian happiness, Rom. x. 1, 10; xi. 11; Eph. i. 13; 1 Thess. v. 8, 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15. (b) As to ἀντιλογία, it is not found,
it is true, in Paul's acknowledged epistles; but it is in Jude v. 11; and the verb *antileγον* is in Rom. x. 21; Tit. i. 9; ii. 9.

The following phrases, according to Seyffarth, are *sui generis et maxime peculiare* in our epistle, viz.:

'Diaforóteron ὄνομα κληρονομεῖν, εἶναι εἰς πατέρα, δόξῃ στεφανοῦν, πεποιθότα εἶναι, ἀρχήν λαμβάνειν λαλῆσαι, ἀρχεῖν τῆς ὁμολογίας, μαρτυρον τῶν λελαλημένων, παράρτημα τῆς ἐλπίδος, στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν ἁγιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαίωσαι ἂν καὶ μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, προσέρχεσθαι Ἰρώνω γάρτος, ἢ ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνειν, περικείσθαι ἀμαρτίαν, αἵματι τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγου, καὶ εἰπεῖ τὴν τελείωτην φέρεσθαι, γεννᾶσθαι διωκόμενον, μιμητὰ τῶν διὰ πίστεως κληρονομοῦντων, ἄγυρα ἐλπίδος, προκειμένη ἐλπίς, ἵνα εἴη τὸ διηνεκές, ἐντολή ἁποδεκατοῦν, μετατιθεμένη ἕρωτιν, καὶ ἀκατάλυτος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, δικαίωμα λατρείας, περικεκλημένος χρυσίμων, στάσιν ἤχου, παινοῦσαι προσφέρωμαν, διδαχαί εἶναι, καὶ ἱεροὶ αἰνέσων.'

Admitting now that the same phraseology cannot be found in Paul's epistles, is not the Greek of these phrases classic or Hellenistic? Is it not such as a writer might choose, without any uncommon peculiarities? But without insisting on this, I have only to remark, at present, that the same kind of argument, if it be valid, will prove any one of Paul's epistles to be spurious, with equal force. I must refer the reader, for the illustration and proof of this, to § 14 in the sequel.

'Our author has peculiar junctures of words; e. g. ἀγαίνων, τὸ ἀμετάχτενον τῆς δικαιοσύνης, κοινωνεῖν with the Gen., διαφοράς παρά, ῥησία πρὸς τινα, ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, παράρτημα Ἰαννίτου, ἀγαίνων εἰς δόξαν, κρατῆσαι with the Acc., εὐαγγελίζω with the Acc., ἀνίατον with the Inf. after it, αἱ πρότερον ἡμέρας, καταβάλλειν Θεόμενον.'

Some of these phrases are Pauline, e. g. ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, Rom. i. 4; xv. 12, 21, 24; Phil. iii. 11. So εὐαγγελίζω with the Acc. Rom. x. 5 bis, 2 Cor. xi. 7; Gal. i. 9. In regard to the others, if they prove anything, they will prove too much; for they will prove, as in the last case, that some of the acknowledged epistles are spurious, e. g. 1 Corinthians, as we shall hereafter see.

'Mαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρεῖσθαι, in the sense of bearing honorary testimony, are peculiar to our epistle.'

They are not. See Rom. x. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; and often in the gospels, as may be seen in any of the New Testament lexicons.

'The following habitual expressions, so often employed by Paul, are wanting in our epistle; viz., ὤν Ἰελώ ὑμᾶς ἄγνοια — Ἰελώ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι — τοῦτο δὲ φημὶ — γνωρίζω (γνωρίζομεν) δὲ ὑμῖν — οἶδα γὰρ — οἴδαμεν δὲ, etc. γνωσκέω δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι — τί οὖν ἐρωτοῦμαι — ἀλλ' ἐραί τις — ἐραίς οὖν μοι — ἢ ἄγκοιτε — μὴ γένοιτο — τί οὖν — τί γάρ — ἄρα οὖν — μενοῦνε.'
If the want of these forms of expression in our epistle proves it to be spurious, then the same argument must prove a great part of Paul's epistles to be so. E. g. öu ἦλθον ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν is not in Gal., Phil., Col., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit., Philemon. Favorite as Schulz represents this phrase to be, it is found only in Romans twice, 1 Corinthians twice; and in 2 Cor., öu γὰρ ἦλθομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν once. Ἑλθὼ δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδεναι is once in 1 Cor. xii. 3, and wanting in all the other Pauline epistles; an expression, therefore, singularly favorite. Τούτο δὲ φημι is in 1 Cor. twice, and wanting in all the rest of Paul's works, Γνωρίζω (γνωρίζομεν) δὲ ὑμῖν, Paul uses four times. The verb is employed some twenty times, in all his epistles, but not in the formula mentioned by Schulz. Οἶδα, οἶδαμεν, etc., are used very often by Paul; in our epistle, less frequently. In x. 30 we have οἶδαμεν, and five other cases of derivatives from εἶδω or εἶδον occur. Τυπώσεως δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι occurs only in Phil. i. 12. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, in Rom. six times, and nowhere else. Which then is spurious, the epistle to the Romans, or all the others? 'Ερείς οὖν μοι, only twice, Rom. ix. 19; xii. 19. 'Ερεί τις, 1 Cor. xv. 37. 'H ἄγνοετε, only twice, Rom. vi. 3; vii. 1. Μὴ γένοιτο, only in Gal. and Romans. Τί γὰρ, not in Gal., Eph., Col., 1 Thess., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Titus. Τί οὖν, not in any of Paul's epistles except Rom., 1 Cor., and Galatians. "Ἀρα οὖν only in the epistle to the Romans, Gal. once, Eph. once, 1 Thess. once, 2 Thess. once. "Ἀρα is used by our author too, iv. 9; xii. 8. Μνοῦνγε, in Rom. and Phil.; but nowhere else in Paul's epistles.

Certain is it, then, that the same argument which would prove the spuriousness of our epistle, would also prove the spuriousness of more or less of Paul's acknowledged epistles; for there is not a single phrase mentioned by Schulz, in all his list of "favorite expressions often repeated by Paul," which is not wanting in more or less of his acknowledged epistles. Only the words οἶδα, οἶδαμεν, etc., are to be excepted. Many of these favoritisms, we see too, upon examination, turn out to belong only to some single epistle; e. g. ἦλθον δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδεναι, τούτῳ δὲ φημι, γνωσκεῖ τι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, ἐρείς οὖν μοι, ἐρεῖ τις, and ἕν ἄγνοετε. It is difficult to conceive how a man of Schulz's intelligence could willingly risk the hazard of such arguments as these.

IV. Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα of our epistle.

Nearly one half of Seyfarth's Essay is occupied with reckoning up words of this class, §§ 16—28. It is singular that he should bring into this computation words that occur in the quotations made from the Septuagint; e. g. οὐσεῖς, παραπτυχασίοις, προσόχθεις, τροχα, ὀρόοι, etc.; as if these were chargeable, as peculiarities, upon the idiom of our epistle. Yet such is the ardor with which arguments of
this nature have been urged by him, Schulz and others, that the
bounds of sober reflection are not unfrequently overlapped, and ob-
jections undistinguishingly pressed into service by these writers.

I subjoin a catalogue of these ἄταξ λεγόμενα, because I wish to
put the reader in possession of all that is adduced to overthrow the
Pauline origin of our epistle. The force of the argument I shall ex-
amine in a subsequent section.

I remark here only, that by actual examination, I find this whole
class of so called ἄταξ λεγόμενα (almost without exception), are words
both of classical and of Septuagint or Alexandrine usage. Now the
employment of words belonging to both these kinds of Greek, can
mark nothing very peculiar in the style or choice of words adopted
by our author. The instances alleged by Seyffarth are the follow-
ing, viz.:

Chap. I. Πολυμερός καὶ πολυτρόπως, ἀπαίγασμα, χαρακτήρ, μεγα-
λωτότης, θλίσσειν.* II. Παραρθύνειν, μοναδικότης, συνεκμαρτυρεῖν,
βραχύ, παραπληκτώς, ἱλάσκεσθαι. III. Μέτοχος, θράπτως, παρα-
πυκνασμός,* προσοχής. IV. οὕτωςεσθαι, ἀφανής, πραγμάτως,
βοήθεια, εὐκαρπ." V. Μετροπαθεῖν, ἰερεύναι, αἴτιος, προσαγωγε-
θεῖν, νοῦρος, αἰσθητήρια, ἔξεις. VI. Παραδειγματιζόμεθα, βοτάνη, ἑπιγο-
νάω governing the genitive, ἄντλογία, ἀμετάδετος. VII. Κοπή,
ἀπάτωρ, ἄμήπωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, ἀφωμοιομένος, διπηρεῖς, ἀκροθίνω,
pαραμάχης, ἰερατεία, συναντάω, ἀθέτησις, ἀπαράβασις, παντελές,
ἀμαντός. VIII. Ἑπτή, δῶρα, ἀναφέρω, χρηματιζόμεθα; νομοθετεῖ,
διατιθάναι, θεος εἰναι,* παλαιοί, ἀφανισμός. IX. Ἑγκαίνιομαι,
βαντίζω, αἰματεκκύσθη, ἀντίτυπος, συντέλεια, τῶν ἁλών. X. Ἀνά-
tερον, πρόσφατος, ἀκλίνης, παροξύνμος, ἐκουσίως, φόβερος, ἐνυβρίζω,
ἀθλητής, ἑπταβίζω, ἀνεκδοσίμος, χρονίζω. XI. Εὐαρεστεῖται, ἀστρα,
ἀνάρρηματος, παραπληκτός, τρίμηνον, ἀστεῖος διάγαμμα, συγκακουγεῖ,
kατάσκοπος, παρεμβολή, τυπανίζω, καταγωνίζομαι, μελωτία, δέρμα,
προβλέπωμα. XII. Τοιχαρχεῖν, νέφος, ἄφρονες, ἀμαλγάζωμαι,
κάμνεω, ἀντικαθιστάω, ἐκλάπαω, ἐλγυρεῖ, νόθος, παράξων,
τροχαί.,* ὁρός,· ἔνοχεῖν, πρωτοτοκία, μετέπειτα, ψυχαφάν, γυνός,
δαιστέλλωμαι, φαινατία, ἑτρομος, ἰκεφός, πανέγυρις, σείω, ἀσά-
λευτος, καταναλόω. XIII. βορζός, ἢγουμένος, ἀνάκλειστος, εὐφωνία,
ἀλυσιτης.

The whole number is 118; from which are to be subtracted those
six marked with an asterisk, as they are quoted from the Septuagint,
and belong not to our author. The amount then of ἄταξ λεγόμενα
is 112. And they are collected, too, with an unsparking hand; e. g.
ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήπωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, τρίμηνον, ἑτρομος, ἰκεφός, and
many other words like these, where it is difficult to see how the au-
thor of our epistle could avoid choosing the very terms which he has
employed, if we consult the connection in which they stand.

This list appears, indeed, quite large and formidable to any one
who has not put to the test the principle of reasoning to which it
must appeal, if any weight be allowed it in the scale of evidence against our epistle. That principle I shall bring to the test, by subjecting one of Paul's acknowledged epistles to an examination in the same way, and on the same grounds which Seyfarth, Schulz, and others, have thought proper to adopt in the examination of our epistle.

§ 14. Objections made against the Genuineness of our Epistle, compared with those which may be made against the first Epistle to the Corinthians.

It often struck me, while engaged in the toilsome and protracted labor of examining the preceding objections made against the Pauline origin of our epistle, that the only just method of weighing the whole force of the arguments deduced from peculiarities of phraseology and the choice of words by our author, and judging of the alleged singularities of our epistle, would be to carry the same principles of reasoning along with us to the examination of one of Paul's acknowledged epistles, and see whether as great a list of expressions and words foreign to the other acknowledged epistles of Paul might not be found, as in the epistle to the Hebrews. I have chosen the first epistle to the Corinthians, because, like that to the Hebrews, it presents several topics that are peculiar to itself. In this respect it has more resemblance to our epistle than any other of Paul's acknowledged letters, and consequently the most apposite for a comparison in respect to peculiarities of phrase and diction.

I divide the peculiarities of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, into two great classes.

I. Phraseology peculiar to this Epistle and found no where in the other acknowledged Writings of Paul.

1 Cor. I. 1 Ἡγιασμένος, as a title of Christians, used no where else by Paul. 2 Ἐκκαλοῦμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. as a periphrasis for the idea of Christians. 5 Ἐν παντὶ ἐπιλογίᾳ ἐν αὐτῷ. 9 Εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ νόημ. 10 Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ ὄνομας τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. . . . . . . Paul says διὰ Ι. Χριστοῦ, Rom. xv. 30. τὸ αὐτὸ λάγητε, διὰ ἑν ὑμῶν — κατηγοροῦμεν εἶν τὸν αὐτὸν νομ. 13. Μεμάρωσται ὁ Χριστός; is Christ divided? . . . . . . Paul uses μερίς, in the sense of impart, e. g. Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 18. 16 Λοιπὸν εἰκόνισα, Paul commonly uses τὸ λοιπὸν, Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1; iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1. 17 Σοφία λόγου, . . . . . . Paul uses λόγον σοφίας, Col. ii. 23 — κανωνὶ δ ἁπαρακτ. 18 Ο λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 21 Μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος, 25 Μωρίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 27 Μωρίας τοῦ κόσμου. 25 Ἀναθέτω τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 27 Ἀναθέτω τοῦ κόσμου. 26 Βλέπετε τὴν κλήσιν — σοφία κατὰ σέρκα — δυνατόν, for those in
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an elevated station. 30 *Os ἐγενόθη ἡ ἡμῶν σοφία ...... δικαιοσύνη
tε καὶ ἀγάμος καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις.

ΠΙ. 1 Ἰτεροχιλ λόγον.—τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2 Οὐ γὰρ ἐκεῖνα
tι εἰδέναι, I determined not to make known. 4 Πειθοὶ σοφίας λόγος
—ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως. 5 Σοφία ἀνθρώπων, human
sublety. 6 Σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον, ...... in 1 Cor. σοφία is used
seventeen times, in the epistle to the Romans only once, and that in a
quotation, Rom. xi. 33. 7 Προώρισαν ...... πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων. 8
Ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον——κύριος τῆς δόξης. 10 Ἀποκάλυπτεν
dιὰ τοῦ πνεύματος——πνεῦμα ἔρευνα——τὰ βαθύ στὸ αἰῶν. 13 Διδακ-
toïς ἀνθρώπινης σοφίας λόγους——διδακτοῖς πνεύματος——πνευματι-
kōs πνευματικά συγκρίνοντες. 14 Ψυκκός ἀνθρώπου——πνευματικός
ἀνακρίνεται.

ΠΙΙ. 1 Σαρκικοὺς, as applied to persons. 3 Κατὰ ἀνθρώπου περι-
πατεῖν. 6 Ἐγὼ ἐφήτευσα, applied to the labor of a religious
teacher——Ἀπολλωνίου ἐπότισε, Apollos supplied with water, applied to
the same——Ἰὸς ἐξανέμηκε, made to increase (Hiphil of the Hebrews),
no where employed in this sense by Paul in his other epistles, nor
appropriated to designate such a shade of thought. 8 Λύβηναι κατὰ
tὸν ἱδίον κόστος ...... Παῦλος ἐγείρα, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, e. g. Rom. ii. 6; 2
Cor. xi. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 14. 9 Συνεχείαν Ἰηθοῦ——Ἰηθοῦ γεγορῶν——Ἰηθοῦ
οἰκοδομή. 10 Σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων. 11 Θεομάλιον τῆς κακίας. 12 Ἐσπε-
κοδομεῖν χρυσόν, ἀργυρόν, κ. τ. λ. 13 Ἡ ἡμέρα δηλώσεως——ἐν πυρὶ
ἀποκαλύπτεται——τὸ πῦρ δοκιμάσεως. 14 Μιστὸν λαμβάνειν. 15
Ἐργον κατακαίεται——σωτηρία ὅσ διὰ πυρὸς. 18 Μιστὸν γίνεται. 21 Ἐν
ἀνθρώπων καυχάσθαι. 22 Ἰηθοῦς Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς Ιηθοῦ, ὦ
ἄνεμος Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς Ιηθοῦ, ye are Christ's, Christ is God's.

IV. 1 Υπηρέτης Χριστοῦ——οἰκονόμος μυνηρίων. 3 Εἰς ἱλαστή-
tὸν εἰναι——ἡμέρα, day of trial, trial. 4 Ἐπαμνητῇ συνείδει. 5 Πρὸ
καίρου κρίνει——βουλαὶ τῶν καρδιῶν——ἐπανός γίνεται τῷ.
6 Μετα-
σχηματίζει εἰς, to transfer figuratively——τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὥς γεγραπται
φρονεῖν, not to think of one's self more highly than the Scriptures allow;
Paul uses ὑπὲρ ὥς φρονεῖν in such a case, Rom. xii. 3, and
employs φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ in the sense of having a regard for, Phil. i. 7;
iv. 10. 9 Ὕσιν ὑπὲρ ...... κατὰ. 7 Διακρίνειν τῷ, to make one
to differ. 8 Κοκκορειμάνοι εἰναι——βασιλεύειν, to be in a happy st
prosperous state. 9 Ἑσυχάτους ἀποδείκται——Σδαρων γένεσθαι. 10
Μιστῷ ἥδι Χριστοῦ——φρονεῖν εὐχριστῶν εὐχριστῶν applied to per-
sons——ἐνδοξοῖς in the same manner. 13 Περικαθάρματα τῶν κόσμων
——πάνων περίψημα——ἐν ἀρτὶ. 14 Ἐντρέπων, act. voice, putting
to shame; no where else, except with a passive meaning. 15 Παπο-
γαγοί εὐ χριστῷ——πατέρες [εὐ χριστῷ]——εὐ χριστῷ ...... γεν-
νάν. 17 Ὑσοίν .... τοὺς εὐ χριστῶν Christian doctrines. 19 Εἰδο-
ῦ κύριος ἡ λατρεία. 20 Βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰηθοῦ ...... οὐ εὐ λόγῳ ......
eὐ δυνάμει. 21 Ἐν ῥάμβῳ ἔλθεν.

V. 1 Ὠλος ἀκούεται——γυναῖκα ...... ἤχει, to cohabit with a
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woman. 2 Πενθεῖν, to be sorrowful; Paul, to make sorrowful, 2 Cor. xii. 21. 3 Ἀπὸν ἐν σῶματι (Paul, ἀπείναυ ἐν σαρκί, Col. ii. 5.) — παρῶν τῷ πνεύματι. 4 Συναχόθητοι ὤμων, καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος, is altogether unique, in the shade of idea. 5 Ἑις δὲ ἔλθον τῆς σαρκὸς, ένα τῷ πνεύμα σωφρ. is altogether peculiar. 7 Ἐκκαθαίρω ... ... ζύμην — τὸ πάχα, ὀμοῖο (Χριστὸς) ἐστιν. 8 Εστάλεξεν ἐν ζύμῃ ταλαιρ — ζύμη κακίας καὶ πονηρίας — ἀξίους εἰλικρινείαι καὶ ἀληθείας. 10 Πόροι τοῦ κόσμου τούτου — ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν, to withdraw entirely from converse with men. 12 Τοὺς ἔσω, those within the church.

VI. 1 Πράγμα ἦγεω, to have ground for a suit at law. 2 Οἱ ἄγοι τοῦ κόσμου κρυφοῦν — ἀνάξιοι κριτηρίων. 3 Ἀγγέλους κρυφοῦμεν, altogether sui generis. 4 Καθίζω, to make to sit as judges. 5 Πρὸς ἐντροπὴν λέγω, also in xv. 34; — διακρίνων ἀνὰ μέσον. 6 Κρίνεται μετά, goes to law with — ἀπιστῶς, used eleven times in this epistle, and not once in Romans, Colossians, Galatians, Ephesians, Thessalonians, Philippians, 2 Timothy. 7 Κρίσιμα, law-suits — ἀποστρέφωμαι, to suffer one’s self to be defrauded — ἀποστρέφω, to defraud. 9 Ἀδικοῦ, for Heb. ἀτιμώ. Paul uses the word but once, and then in the singular number, Rom. iii. 5, and in quite a different way. 11 Δικαιοδοθῆναι ἐν ὀνόματι Ιησοῦ. 12 Πάντα μοι ἔσεσι — συμφέρει, five times in this epistle, and no where else in all of Paul’s acknowledged epistles, except twice in 2 Cor.—τευνομαξίος ἔσθε ὑπὸ τῶν. 15 Ἐνεκε Χριστοῦ — πόρρης μελῆ. 16 Κολλώμενος Κυρίω — κολλώμενος τῇ πόρρῃ. 20 Ἀπορᾶκεος ἤμερ — δοξάζεω ἐν τῷ σώματι.

VII. 1 Γυναικὸς ἀντεσθαί, to cohabit with. 2 Ἐχεῖν γυναῖκα, to marry or possess a wife. 5 ἄντι τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτα, ye may come together. 14 Ἀγαλίῳ, in a sense sui generis — ἀκαθαρτός, in a sense peculiar; so also ἄγοι, which follows. 19 Ἕρες ἐπερμήνευς ὁ θεός. Paul says, ὅτι ἐπερμήνευς τι Ιησοῦ, Gal. v. 6; vi. 15; — ἡ ἀκροβυσσιά οὐδὲν ἔστι — τρόφις ἐκταλοῦ ... ... Paul says, ὡστε τίποτος, Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26; or ὡστε συμφέρει, Rom. v. 19; vi. 18; xv. 18; xvi. 19; or ὡστε εὑρεθείη, Rom. vi. 12; vi. 17; x. 16, et sanep. 20 Κλήσεως, condition in life, rank; no where so employed by Paul. 21 Μὴ σοι μελέτω; be not solicitous — μίλλον χρῆσαι, prefer. 25 Ἐπιτεληθοῦσα ἦγεω — ἠλεημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου ... ... Paul uses ἠλεητήριου simply, Rom. xi. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Tim. i. 18, 16. 26 Καλὸν ἀθρόων ... ... Paul uses καλὸν simply in the same sense, e. g. Rom. xiv. 21; Gal. iv. 18. 29 Τὸ λοιπόν, hereafter, for the future. 31 Χράζατο τῷ κόσμῳ — τῷ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου. 32 Μεριμνᾷ τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. 33 Μεριμνᾷ τοῦ τοῦ κόσμου ... ... Paul uses μεριμνᾷ τὰ περί. 34 Ἀγία εἶναι σωματικά καὶ πνευματικά. 35 Πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, for the profit. 37 Ἀναγιγνά ἦγεω. 40 Δοκεῖν πνεύμα Θεοῦ ἦγεω, truly unique, in the epistles.

VIII. 1 Γυνῶν ἦγεω. 4 Οὐδεὶς εἶναι ἐν κόσμῳ — οὐδεὶς ἐτέρος. 6 Ἔμιν εἰς Θεος, τὸ πατήρ, κ. τ. λ. The whole verse is unique. 7
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Συνείδησις, conscientious scruples. 12 ирующαν εκ, to sin against — τύπτειν συνείδησιν. 13 Βρώμα σκανδαλίζει ... . Paul, διὰ βρώμα λυπεῖται, Rom. xiv. 15.

IX. 1 Τὸ ἄργον μον ... ἐν Κυρίῳ. 2 Ἀλλος ... ὑμῶν ἰδίων ἀπόστολος ... . Paul uses the gen., ἰδίων ἀπόστολος, Rom. xi. 13; ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίας, 2 Cor. viii. 23; ὑμῶν ἀπόστολος. Phil. ii. 25 — σφαγίς τῆς ἀποστολῆς. 5 Γυγαίκα περάγην — 7, 13 Εσθένει ἐκ, to eat of. ... Paul uses simply the accusative, e. g. Rom. xiv. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 12. 11 Στείρων πνευμάτων — ἑρικές σαρκικά, to have one's temporal wants supplied. 12 Ἐξοντία, property. 16 Ἁνάγκη ... ἐπικείμενος, Phil. v. 14. 17 Οἰκονομίαν πιστεύειν. 19 Ἑλέος Ἑρος ἐκ ... Paul uses ἔλεος Ἑρος ἀπό, Rom. vii. 3. 20 Κεραυνεὺς, to win over ... in a different sense, Phil. iii. 8. 22 Γνώσις τοῦ παστὸ τὰ πάντα. 24 Βραβεῖον λαμβάνειν. 25 Φθοράς ... ἀφαίρετος στέφανος. 26 Αἶδα δέσμως.

X. 1, 2. The whole of the description presented in these two verses is sui generis, and found nowhere in Paul. 3 Βρώμα πνευματικὸν — τὸ μα σαρκικὸν. 4 Πνευματικὰς τέτρας — and specially the idea of the whole phrase, πνευματικὰς ἀκολουθήσῃς τέτρας. So also ἐπινοον ἐκ ... Paul uses πινω (2 aor.) with the accusative, Rom. xiv. 21. 11 Τύπου συμβαίνειν ... . Paul, τύπος simply, Rom. v. 14; or γνώσις τῶν πόνων, 1 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 12 — τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων ... Paul, ἔχειται ἡμέρα, 2 Tim. iii. 1. 13 Πειρασμὸς ἀγάπην ἐλήφη, singular both as to the verb and adjective, joined with peirasmos. 15 ὑμεῖς φωνούμενοι λέγω. 16 ποτηρίων τῆς εὐλογίας — κοιμονὶ αἴματος — κοιμονὶ σώματος. 17 Εἰς ἁρτον ... ἐναι, said of Christians comming at the Lord's table. 18 Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα — κοιμονὶ θυσίας τουριών. 19 Τι οὖν φημί; 20 Δαιμονίων Ἰουν — κοιμονὶ δαιμονίων γίγαντες. 21 Ποτηρίων δαιμονίων — τράπεζα δαιμονίων. 27 Καλέω, in the sense of inviting to a meal. 32 Ἀπρόσκοπον, with the dative after it — πάντα πάνω δρᾶσειν.

XI. 2 Ἀπαράδεισας κατέχειν. 3 Θελω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι — παντὸς ἀνδρὸς κεφαλὴν Ἑρστοῦ, κεφαλὴν Ἑρστοῦ Ἡσ. 4 Κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἢκειν, to cover the head. 5 Κατασχινοῦσαι, to disdain, Paul, to disappoint, Rom. v 6; ix. 33; x. 11; — τὸ αὐτῷ τῇ, the same thing as, i. e. αὐτῷ with the dative after it. 7 Ἀνῆρ ... εἰκῶν καὶ δόξα Ἰην — γυνὴ δόξα ἄνδρος. 9 Οὗ ἀνήρ ἐκ γυναικὸς κ. τ. λ. 10 Ἐξοντία, see, or token of power — ἄγγελος, σπέρμα. 12 ὁ ἀνήρ διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς. 14 Θυάτης διδάσκειν εἰς τὸ κρείττων ... εἰς τὸ ἄρρητον. 20 Κυριακῶν δεῖτον. 23 Παραλαβέων ἄπο. ... Paul uses παραλαβέων παρά, Gal. i. 12; 3 Thess. iii. 6. 24 Τὸ σῶμα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον. 25 Μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι ... Paul no where uses μετὰ before the Inf. mode preceded by τό,— ἡ κακὴ διαλέγει ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν αἴματι. 27 Ἑνοχὸς ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ.
OBSERVATIONS.

κυρίων. 29 Κρίμα ἐσθενείς καὶ πίνεις τινὶ — διακρίνεις τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίων. 30 Ἀσθενεῖς, sickly — ἱκανοὶ, many ....... Paul uses it in the sense of able, sufficient; 2 Cor. ii. 6, 16; iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2. 31 Διακρίνεις, to examine. 34 Διατάσσομαι, to set in order, arrange ....... Paul uses it for command, Tit. i. 5.

XII. 3 'Εν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλεῖν — λέγεις ἀνάθεμα Ιησοῦν — εἰπεῖς κύριον Ιησοῦν. 6 'Ενεργεῖς τὰ πάντα ἐν τᾶσι. ....... Paul, ἐνεργεῖς τὰ πάντα, Eph. i. 11. 7 Φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος. 10 Διακρίσεις, powers of distinguishing ....... Paul in a different sense, Rom xiv. 1 — γένος, kinds ....... Paul uses γένος for descent, lineage, Phil. iii. 5. 13 Εἰς ἐν σῶμα βαπτισθεὶς — εἰς ἐν πνεύμα ποιταθεὶς. ....... Paul uses ποτόζω no where, except in a quotation from the Old Testament, Rom. xii. 20. Vs. 15—17. Where is any representation like this, in all the Pauline epistles? Paul introduces the same general image, in Rom. xii. 4, 5, as is found in 1 Cor. xii. 12—14; but he does not pursue it into detail. 23 Τιμήν περιτέθεν. 24 Διδόναι τιμή. ....... Paul, ἀποδοθὸν, τιμή, Rom. ii. 7 — τὸ αὐτὸ μεριμνῶν. 28 Μέλος διεξεταί — συγχαίρω used absolutely, without any dative following it ....... Paul employs the dative after it, Phil. ii. 17, 18. 27 'Εκ μέρους; Paul uses ἀπὸ μέρους, Rom. xi. 25; xv. 15, 24; 2 Cor. i. 13; ii. 5. 28 Τιθέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, to constitute officers in the church. 28 Where else are such officers of the church mentioned, as ἀντιλήπτεις, κυβερνήτεις, δυνάμεις?

XIII. 1 Γλώσσαι αἰγών掀. 2 Εἰδέναι μυστηρίων — ὅρη μεστα-νιών. 3 Ψωμίζειν τὰ ὕπαρχοντα. 6 Στέγειν, to cover over. 8 Γλώσσαι παύοντον, the idea of speaking in a variety of languages, is not found attached to γλώσσα, in any of the Pauline epistles. 12 Βλέπεις δὲ ἐς τὸν πρό—ποιησθην — πρὸς πρόσωπον — γινώσκειν ἐκ μέρους.

XIV. 2 Πνεύματα λαλεῖν μυστηρία. 3 Λαλεῖν ρξικοδομημ. ....... παράκλησιν. ....... παραμυθίαν. 5 Οἰκοδομήν λαβείν. 6 Λαλεῖν ἐν ἀποκάλυψις κ. τ. λ. 7 Φωνήν διδόναι — διαστολὴν διδόναι. 9 Εἰς ἄξια λαλεῖν. 10 Τυγχάνω, to happen to be; ....... Paul in the sense of obtaining. 2 Tim. ii. 10. 11 Δύναμις, force of, in the sense of meaning — εἰναι βίαρβαρός τιν. 14, 15 Προσεύχομαι γλῶσσα. ....... πνεύματι ....... νοτ — ψάλλων πνεύματι ....... νοτ. 16 Εἰς λογογραφοῦν τῷ πνεύματι. 19 Λαλεῖν διὰ νοσός. 20 Παιδία γίνοσθαι ταῖς φρεσκ. — ταῖς φρεσκ. τέλειοι γίνοσθαι. 22 Εἰς σημείον εἶναι ....... Paul, σημεῖον ἐστι, 2 Thess. iii. 17. 27 Καθαρίζω, ἢ τρεῖς. 32 Πνεύματα προφητῶν προφθαίσιν ὑποστάσσεται. 34 Αἰκαταστασίας θεῶς.
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de ἀνθρώπος ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. Vs. 24—28. a passage altogether sui generis. 29 Βαπτιζόμενοι υπέρ τῶν νεκρῶν. 38 Σῶμα διδόναι. 40 Σῶμα τίγειον. 42 Σπειροὶ δόλον εἰς φθορὰν — εὐεργεσίαν — σπειροὶ δόλον εἰς αἰματίαν — εὐεργεσίαν εἰς δόσιν κ. τ. λ. 44 Σῶμα ψυχικὸν — σῶμα πνευματικὸν. 47 Ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος, ὁ κύριος ἐς σῶμαν. 49 Φορεῖν εἰκόνα. 50 Σάρξ καὶ αἷμα, κ. τ. Λ. 51 Μυστηρίων λέγειν . . . . Paul, μυστηρίων λαλῶν, Col. iv. 3. 52 Εσχάτη σάλπηξ. 53 Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθάρτον, κ. τ. Λ. 56 Κέντρον Θανάτου, ἡ θανατία — δίναμις, ἀμαρτίας ὁ νόμος. 57 Διδόναι νῖκος.

ΧVII 2 Μίαν σαββάτων — τιθέναι παρ’ ἑαυτῷ. 7 ἐν παράδειγμα ἰδεῖν. 9 Θύρα ἀνεώρυφη μεγαλύτερα καὶ ενεργή. 22 Ἡτὶς ἀνάθεμα, μυρᾶν ἅθα. 24 Ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ, κ. τ. Λ. The whole closing salutation is sui generis.

Such is the almost incredible mass of peculiar phraseology, in the first epistle to the Corinthians. It is possible, that there may be instances among so many, where I may, through the tedium of such an examination, have overlooked some phrase of the same kind in Paul's other epistles. If this be so, the student, who has in his hands a Greek Concordance, will be able easily to detect it. In the meantime, I venture to affirm with entire confidence (having repeated my investigations a second time), that the number of such mistakes, at most, is not sufficient to affect in any degree, the nature of the argument, or the force of the appeal. I remark only, that where I have appealed to Paul, as not having employed a particular word or phrase, or as not using it in a like sense, I mean, of course, that Paul has not done this, in his other acknowledged epistles.

If any one is disposed to object to this array of phrases sui generis in the first epistle to the Corinthians, and to aver that many of them are nearly like those used by Paul, and that others are occasioned by the peculiarity of the subjects of which the writer treats, and that in general they are collected with an unspiring hand; I have only to reply, that in all respects they are as fairly and as sparingly collected as those brought forward by Schüll and Seyfarth. For the correctness of this, I make the appeal to every unprejudiced man, who has read attentively and critically the essays of these authors, in which they have brought forward their objections against the genuineness of our epistle.

As a counter-part for the appalling list of 118 ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the epistle to the Hebrews, which Seyfarth has presented, I offer,

II. The ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the first Epistle to the Corinthians.

"Ἀγαμοῦς, ἀγιοῦς, ἀγιωτάτα, ἀδάπανος, ἀδηλός, ἀδηλως, ἀδηλας, ἀξιωμα, αἰνιγμα, ἀκακιαλῆτις, ἀκολουθεῖ, ἀκρασία, ἀκών, ἀλαλίς, ἀμάτιμον, ἀματικιντος, ἀμπελῶν, ἁμα, ἀνακρῖναι, ἀναμνησθείς, ἀνάξιος, ἀναξίωμα, ἀντιλέψεις, ἀπάγω, ἀπελευθεροῦμαι, ἀπειροπάτω,
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ἀποθεῶσαι ἄπολαυσαι ἀποφέρω ἀργορος ἀρτωρῶν ἀρταξ ἀρβαστος ἀρχιτέκτων ἀρσενάτερος ἀστήρ ἀστατεῖ αὐχημονεῶ ἀσχήμων ἀτμος ἀτομος αὔλεω αὔλος αὖρον ἀφωνος ἀψυχος

Βρόχος βιωτικός γαλα γεώργιον γογγύζω γραμματευομαι δειπνεω δείπνων διαίμεσες δίδακτοι διεμενεντής διερμενευον διοπερ δουλαγωγεω δράσσομαι ἐγκοπη ἐγκατενζομαι εἰδωλεῖον ἐῖδωλοῦν ἐἰτακώῃ ἐκβαινῃ ἐκαμῖζω ἐκδέχομαι ἐκνήμῳ ἐκπεράζω ἐκτρωμα ἐλευσὸν ἐνέργημα ἐνυμος ἐνχως ἐντροπη ἐξαίρω ἐξεγερω ἔξετε ἔξονσαίζω ἔσταζε ἔτανεω ἐπιβαλλω ἐπιδαινώς ἐπιλαμμηνη ἐπισταομαι ἐπισωμην ἐρμηνευ ἐσπαρτων ἐτερογλωσσο ἐγενητη ἐνυματευον ἐνυμησομαι ἐνυμησόμην ἐνυχομαι ἦγεω τὸν ἄρα ἦτω ἀπὸ εἰμι ἢπτων ἢταρον ἠθρωμαχεω ἢυῳ ἰαμα ἰαχυρότερος καλαρα καϊmalı κατακαινα κατακαλύπτο μαι κατάκειμαι καταστρώνυμι καταγράφομαι κελη κέντρον κεδαρα κεδαριζω κεδυνευο κλαω κλαζο κοκκος κομη κομαω κορανιμαι κρείσωσον ἐν τῷ σεντὶ τῆς ἀδελφος ἀδελφων τῆς 58 κριτήριων κτίριων κυβνεριον κύμβαλον κυριάκος

Διαβάζω λογία λοιδορέω λοιδορος λύεω μαίνομαι μάκελλον μακραντέρος μαλακός μαραν ᾣδα μεθυσος μέλει μετέχω μηνυο μοχυς μολύνω μοριος μωρια νη νικος νηπιαζω νυξαζω νυκτηρυτης νεω νομια νοσσάς δοσφερης ουαι οδόποτε οδόπω οῦν οφελος παιδινω παίζω παναγος παραγινοι παραμενω παραμυθα τάραζον παροξυνοι πάοχα πειρός περιάγω περιβολαιον περικάθαρα περισσότερον περισφημα περιψήμα περιπετευμαι πενεματω κοινοι πομαίνω ποιμην πόμα πορευον πορην ποτηριον προσκεδυον προφητεύω πτηνον πυκτεω πυλεω ραβδος ραποτιαζω σεληνη στις σταδιον συγγνωμη συγκεραινυμι συζητηθησαι συμμερίζομαι σύμφωνοι συνέρχομαι συνάγω συνεδριασι συνήθεια συντέλλω συγκαταζω σάγμα σιγησι τοιον τυπτω υπειρεται υποσταζω φιλόνεικος φορη φωτεινω χαιλος χοικος χορτοις χορταεσθαι ψευδομαστυρ ψυχικος ὁσπερκη

In the whole, 230 words.

Now in the Bible lying before me, the epistle to the Corinthians occupies thirteen pages, the Hebrews ten; i. e., the former, in respect to length, is to the latter as thirteen to ten. Now in the epistle to the Hebrews, are found 118 ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, according to the reckoning of Seyfard; in the epistle to the Corinthians, if I have reckoned rightly (I have repeated, a second time, the whole examination), there are 230. Consequently, in the epistle to the Hebrews, the average number of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα is a little short of twelve to a page; while the average number in the first epistle to the Corinthians, is (within a small fraction) eighteen to a page. Certain is it then, that if the number of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in our epistle proves that it was not from the hand of Paul, it must be more abundantly evident that Paul cannot have been the author of the first epistle to the Corinthians, which has a proportion of one half more ἀπαξ λεγόμενα than our epistle.

Such is the basis of the arguments so confidently adduced by
Schulz, Seyffarth, Bleek, and others. But the maxim that "what proves too much, proves nothing," may well be applied to the case before us; for the very same means used to overturn the opinion, that Paul was the author of our epistle, would overturn the opinion that he wrote any other particular epistle which is universally acknowledged as coming from his hand.

But what shall we say, when in addition to all the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα of words, we reckon up the phrases of the same sort, which have been adduced above? Is here not a mass of evidence apparently overwhelming? Surely, if the first epistle to the Corinthians had been anonymous, the whole body of modern writers, who have attacked the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, must with one unanimous voice have disclaimed the first epistle to the Corinthians as belonging to Paul. In all respects which have any reference to the number of peculiar phrases and words that are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, the first epistle to the Corinthians presents far stronger evidence of not being Pauline than our epistle does.

But further, the argument against the genuineness of the first epistle to the Corinthians could be easily amplified, by appealing still farther to the same kind of arguments as are adduced against our epistle. For example; how easy to ask, "If the first epistle to the Corinthians be Paul's, how is it possible that, in so long a letter, there is no discussion of Paul's favorite topics in which he was so deeply interested? How comes it to pass, that we have nothing about justification by faith without the deeds of law; nothing of the vanity and folly of Jewish rites and ceremonies; nothing which asserts the equal rights of Jews and Gentiles, and blames the Judaizing teachers and zealots who refused to acknowledge this? Where has Paul ever descanted, as here, on the subject of spiritual gifts; on the marriage relation, conditions, habits, and dress of women; on the Lord's Supper; on the support of preachers; on the comparative value of spiritual gifts, and of faith, hope, and love; and above all, on the controverted and speculative questions of his time, respecting the manner in which the bodies of the saints would rise from their graves, when the last trumpet should sound? Where else has Paul or any other sacred writer intimated, that the regal power of the Messiah would cease after the day of judgment, and that he would be subjected to the Father? Is there any parallel to this epistle, either as to matter or manner, in all the acknowledged writings of Paul?"

I might proceed still further, and collect a large number of favorite expressions often repeated in this epistle, but which seldom or never occur in the other Pauline epistles. Many such I have noticed, in the course of my investigations; many more than Schulz has been able to collect from the epistle to the Hebrews. And if the ἄπαξ epistles to the Corinthians were to be the subject of investigation, instead of the first only, the list of ἄπαξ λεγόμενα and ἄπαξ λογιζόμενα, and
of favorite idioms, and peculiar ideas, might be swelled to an enormous catalogue. I have observed, as I feel quite well satisfied, more ἀπεξ λέγομεν in the second epistle to the Corinthians, in proportion to its length, than in the first; and quite as many peculiar phrases. In a word, after such an investigation as I have been through, I am bold to say, that there is not a single epistle of Paul's which may not be wrested from him, by arguments of the very same kind as those by which the genuineness of our epistle is assailed, and in all respects of equal validity.

"But," it will be asked, "can we never reason, in any case, from dissimilarity of language in different compositions, to different persons as authors?" No doubt we may, in some cases. But not unless the difference be greater than in the case before us. It has been shown above, how many striking traits of resemblance to the other letters of Paul there are in our epistle. While these remain, the discrepancy can never be made out to be great enough to build a sound argument upon it. If the question were to be asked, Whether the author of the epistle to the Romans could have written the first epistle of John? the answer would be easy, nay almost absolutely certain, from internal evidence. But after all the striking resemblances which can be shown between our epistle and Paul's letters; after proving from actual examination, that the list of peculiarities in one of his most conspicuous and acknowledged epistles is much greater than in our epistle; after making all the reasonable abatements which must be made, from the peculiarity of the subjects which are discussed in our epistle, and of the condition of those to whom it was addressed; after reflection upon the acknowledged fact, that every writer's style is more or less altered by advancing age, by the circumstances of haste or leisure in which he writes, by the topics themselves which he discusses, and by the degree of excitement which he feels at the time; above all, taking into consideration the fact, that every writer who travels to many different countries, resides in many different places, and is conversant with a great variety of men and dialects, is much more liable to change his style somewhat, than he who always resides in the same place, and is conversant with the same men and books; after taking, I say, all these things into consideration, can any man have reasonable grounds to be satisfied, that the peculiarity of style and diction in our epistle is such, that its Pauline origin is to be rejected on account of them? I will not undertake to answer for others; but for myself, I can say with a clear and abiding conviction, I do not feel that such an argument can stand before the impartial tribunal of criticism.

§ 15. Hebraisms and Non-conformity to Classic Usage in the Epistle.

All the writers who have declared against the Pauline origin of
our epistle, have appealed to Origen's declaration, Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ Ἑβραϊκή συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικά τερά, the epistle [to the Hebrews] in the texture of its style is more conformed to the Greek idiom, or is better Greek [than the epistles of Paul]. Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Ziegler, Schulz, Seyfarth, DeWette, Boehme, Bleek, and others, have one and all urged this consideration, and insisted upon it that Origen's judgment on this point must be considered as decisive.

In respect to the general principles of criticism which are to regulate our investigation of such a matter, I have already said all which I wish to say, p. 171 seq. The actual comparison of our epistle with the acknowledged epistles of Paul, has also been made, p. 155 seq. above. It may however be of some importance to add, in this place, a list of some of the Hebraisms and of the examples of non-conformity to classic usage, which occur in our epistle, in order to meet the very categorical assertion of DeWette, Boehme, and others, that "the style of our epistle is not only very different from that of Paul, but that it is composed in purer Greek, and with a far more oratorical diction."

In making out these, I acknowledge the difficulty of the task in some of the cases which occur. It may happen, that what we are on the whole bound to regard as non-conformity with Greek classic usage, in the present state of information on that subject, may turn out, on further examination, to be actually conformed to this usage. Thus, for example, Winer, in his new and laborious investigation of the classics for the sake of illustrating the syntax of the New Testament Greek, has struck out not a few phrases from the list of Hebraisms, Hellenisms, etc., that had before been generally classed as such. Still, I can aver in relation to this subject, that I make use of the best means in my power; and if I sometimes err, I shall rejoice to be corrected in every instance of this nature.

It is proper here, before proceeding to exhibit examples of the kind in question, to say a word on the principles by which we ought to be guided in selecting and judging of such examples.

Hebraism I understand to be, either an imitation of Hebrew phraseology in the expression of an idea, which might have been differently expressed, i. e., by other phrases or forms of the Greek that were more conformed to classic usage; or else the assigning to a Greek word a sense which does not belong to it in classic usage, but which does belong to the corresponding Hebrew word. For an example of the first kind, I would produce ἐσχάτον τῶν ἣμερῶν, Heb. הָעַטְּפָּנָא, as having a form and sense that are peculiar; as an example of the second kind, one may name κληρονόμος, possessor, lord, ruler (as used in Heb. 1. 2), like the Hebrew הַנַּעַר; but in classic Greek it designates one who takes an estate, etc., by lot, or by testament. In both these cases, the Greek affords other words by which the idea of the writer might have been conveyed. The choice of these, then,
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employed in such a way as they are here employed, shows the influence which the Hebraistic usage had upon him.

Besides the two classes of words here adverted to, I may name two more, which show departure from classic usage; viz. (1) Such as offer a new or unclassical meaning; and (2) Such as are new, i.e. not classical, in point of form. If, now, any of these four classes of words can be found in our epistle, so far as they go they are the opposite of the φράσις 'Ελληνικότερα which Origen and modern critics assert of the epistle. These are fair subjects of investigation, then; and to these we may also add, combinations of words, i.e., phrases, which, although the words of themselves are proper Greek words, yet the combinations are such as are discrepant from any classic examples.*

Having thus marked out the ground which we mean to survey, let us proceed to the task.

Words and Phrases used in a Hebraistic Sense, or in a Way different from what is usual in the Greek Classics.

CHAP. I. (1) Πατράσι, ancestors of old time, ἡ οἰκία. Seldom or never does classical Greek so employ this word. Besides ηὗτῳ (which we might naturally expect) is here omitted; such is the custom of Paul, see Rom. ix. 5; xi. 20; xv. 8. 'Εκ' ἑσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, the time of the Messiah, the last age of the world, ὅπατράσια; purely Hebrew. (2) Κληρονόμος, lord, ruler, πρέσβης; in classic Greek, one who takes by lot, or by testament. (3) Δόξα, splendor, brightness, radiance, η αμηθία, in Greek, opinion, sentiment, maxim, fame, honor. Ἑποργάσεως αὐτοῦ, of his substance, i.e. of himself, ἡ νήσυ, ἡ οἰκία. ἐξ ἐπερήμων, expiation for sin, παρέμικτος (Sept. Καθαρισμὸς ἐξ. xxix. 38; xxx. 10); see Comm. in loc. Μεγαλώσις, majesty, excellence, ἡ αμηθία, ἡ φυλή; not found in the classics. Ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ, in heaven, in the world above, ἡ ψυχή, Sept. ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ. (4) Κεκληρονομηκε, obtained, ἐπέλεξε; Greek, to acquire by lot, to inherit. Same word in i. 14.

I omit purposely all the quotations which follow here, and all throughout the epistle, which are made from the ancient Scriptures; because, as they were doubtless made, in general, from the Septuagint version, they cannot be justly considered as properly belonging to the style of our author. If the Hebraisms in all these quotations were to be added to the list of those in the rest of the epistle, it would make it to appear something very different from 'Ελληνικότερα.

* It cannot in candor be denied, that Davidson is unjust to Stuart in his remarks upon the following collection of words and phrases. He would convey the impression that they all are quoted as proper Hebraisms, whilst in fact they are represented as deviations from strict classical Greek usage. In some few cases it may be doubted whether parallels could not be found in good classical authors.—Ed.
Whether Origen did, or did not, mean to exclude them, no one, so far as I know, has yet attempted to show.  

Chap. II. (2) Διόγος, commination, command, or revelation, אֶתָנ phenomenons, the Christian religion with its threats and promises; certainly not a classical sense of the word. (4) Δυνάμεως, miraculous powers, miracle s, ἐβόλυ, ἐμ, ἐμάκειω, all of which the Septuagint translate by δυνάμεις; in the classics, not so. Θελησμος, a word unknown to the Attics. (5) Οἰκουμένης μελλειστα, the gospel dispensation, אֱלֹגִּית; purely Jewish. (10) Δικαίως, future happiness, a glorious condition in another world; peculiar to Hellenistic Greek. Ἡλεωσίαι, to advance to glory, to bestow on one the rewards of piety or obedience after the close of life; and passively, to be glorified, to be made happy, or to be rewarded in the upper world, after the Christian struggle on earth is finished; see and comp. v. 9; vii. 28; xi. 40; xii. 23. See also and comp. Phil. iii. 12, there being no other like example in the New Testament, unless, indeed, Luke xiii. 32 affords one. The classical sense of this word is to accomplish, to complete, to render complete, to bring to an end, to finish, etc.; a sense which gave occasion, no doubt, to a peculiar use of τελεσθ in our epistle; but which still is different from it. (11) Ἁγιάζων and ἁγιαζόμενον, making atonement for, and those for whom atonement is made, or who are expiated, שִׁפָּטָן and שִׁפָּטָה are both rendered by ἁγιαζε in the Septuagint, comp. x. 10; in the classics, ἁγιάζω means to consecrate, to make or declare sacred. (12) Ἐκκλησία, public religious assembly, בָּנָא, ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἡ ἐκκλησία; in the classics, public civil assembly. (14) Σαρκός, καὶ αὐτοτος, human nature, corporeal state, or condition, מְצִיל, מִזְיָבְה, see Gen. ix. 4, and in the New Testament 1 Cor. xv. 50; Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16, al.; not so used in the classics. Καταργησίας, to destroy, to render null, or inefficacious: classics, to be idle, to remain sluggish or inactive. Διάμβολος, Satan, מֶשֶׁחַ; classics, a slanderer, an accuser. (16) Ἁγγέλων, angels, heavenly messengers, מְשַׁפֵּר; in the classics, ἅγγελος means simply, messenger or message. Σπέρματος, progeny, offspring, מַעַר, frequent in the New Testament, and three times in our epistle; rarely, if ever, has it this sense among the classics. The frequency of it is Hellenistic.  

Chap. III. (1) Ἀδελφοὶ ἁγίων, מְשַׁפֵּר, Ps. xvi. 3 et seq., professed people of God, worshippers of God; in a sense different from the ἁγίος of the classics. Κλησίσεως ἐπεράτινως, initiations or privileges of the gospel; no parallel in common Greek. Ἁπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερεία τῆς ὁμολογίας; such a combination is utterly foreign to the classics Moreover ὁμολογίας, profession, professed religion, has no parallel in classic usage, where it means agreement, accord, promise, engagement, contract, etc. (2) Οἰκε in the sense of worshippers of God, the assembly of the faithful, מִשְׁפַּר, מִשְׁפַּר, peculiar to Hellenistic Greek. Παρθένοι, boldness, confidence undaunted profession; in the classics, free speech, frankness, openness, impartiality.
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speaking, judging, etc., Comp. iv. 16; x. 35. (12) Ζωντος, living, i. e. everlasting, eternal, everliving. Heb. יְהִי לִבְּנֶּךָ, יְהוָה לִבְּנֶּךָ; in the classics, ζωή, means to live as an animal, etc.; or to live figuratively, i. e., to be happy, to be prosperous, etc. The phrase Ἰησοῦς ζωή is purely a translation of יְהִי לִבְּנֶּךָ. (13) Καὶ έκάστην ἡμέραν, continually, constantly; in the classics the same phrase would mean daily, each day. Σχηματίζω, shaped, applied to the heart or mind; only literally used in the classics. (14) Υποστάσεως, confidence, stable and settled disposition of mind. But here it may be doubted, whether the classic use of the word in the sense of steadfastness, boldness, courage, is not sufficiently near to exempt the word from peculiarity. (16) Παρεσκευάζω, prepare, not of classic usage. (17) Προσωπική, personal, not a classic word. 'Αμαρτίσανσαι, σωματικόν, sinners, violators of divine precepts; classic usage, to miss the mark, to fail, etc.; the sense of sinners or offenders, as in our epistle, is seldom and doubtful in the classics. Κόλα, carcasses, corpses, σώματα; in common Greek, members, limbs. (18) Κατάπαυσις, rest, future rest or happiness; Greek, a causing of rest, stilling, quieting. See also iv. 10.

Chap. IV. (1) Εὐτελείων wants the usual τού before it, which is employed in the like cases by the classical writers. (2) Εὐσυγγελισμόν, used here in a more appropriate and peculiar sense than in the classics. Ο λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, τῆς, τῇ, found in Paul, 1 Thess. ii. 13; the words are classic, but the combination is altogether diverse from any in the classics. (3) Καταβολής κόσμου, foundation, i. e. beginning creation, of the world, Heb. יְהוָה לִבְּנֶּךָ (comp. 2 Sam. xxii. 16; Ps. xviii. 7, 15; Job. xxxviii. 4; Ps. lxxxii. 5; civ. 5; Prov. viii. 29; Is. xxiv. 18; xl. 21; li. 13, etc.). But where, in the classics, is such an expression used for such a purpose? See also ix. 26. (7) Απολείπεται, it remains, i. e., it must be so that; a sense foreign to the classics in such a way as it is here employed, viz., before the apodosis of a sentence, and as a kind of ergo or sequitur of the logicians. See also v. 9. (9) Σαββατισμός is of course a mere Hebrew word with a Greek ending. Ibid., τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Heb. יְהוָה יִבְּנֶּךָ, a combination foreign to the Greek, and purely Hebrew. (10) Κατάπαυσις, to rest, neuter verb; in the classics, to cause to rest, to make quiet, transitive verb. (12) Ζων, perpetual, as before. (13) Οὐκ ... κτάσις, Μέλεη, Μέλεη, Greek οὔ, η, no creature, nothing; κτάσις, in the classics, means the act of creating. Τοῦ δεδομένου αὐτοῦ—γενέσθαι, be born, i. e., to him, before him; for although the sense of eyes here would come well after γενέσθαι, yet it does not at all agree with εἰ παράληπται, with neck outstretched and bent back. The writer plainly had in his mind the meaning of one of the Hebrew expressions mentioned above. (14) Οὐρανοῦ, the Hebrew idea of the firmament above. 'Ομολογίας, religion, professed subjection to Christ, Sept. for Ἰους. νουμ. (15) Αποστείαν, moral weakness, Sept. for πάθους, stumbling, and Ἰους, claudicatio; classics, physical weakness, with vari-
ous shades. (16) Ὄρον τῆς χάριτος, without a parallel in the classics.

Chap. V. (2) Ἡμετεράσειν, to be compassionate, to show kindness to; in the classics, to moderate one’s passions of grief, anger, etc. (3) Προσφέρειν, to offer gifts and sacrifices to God, γὰρ τῇ ἁγιᾷ, ὧν ἐπιθυμεῖ; in Greek, not appropriate to this sacred rite. (5) Εὐαυτοῦ ἐδόξασε, did not arrogate to himself the honor, did not claim for himself the honor; classics, to believe, suppose, praise, celebrate. (7) Τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, of his incarnation, of his mortal condition or state, τὸ ἀνθρωπός, object of fear, that which he feared, like the Heb. נְאָשׁ, Is. viii. 12, 13; Ps. lxxvii. 12; classic sense, fear, terror. Εἰσακουσάεις, delivered, saved, Sept. for ἵππος, ἔτη. (12) Τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἁρκῆς τῶν λόγων; such an expression is wanting in the classics. Γάλακτος . . . τρυφεῖν, not a classical metaphor. (13) Λόγου δικαίωσις, Christian or religious doctrine; without an example in the classics.

Chap. VI. (1) Νεκρῶν ἀργῶν, deadly, destructive works, שׁוֹר אֲרָגָו, νεκρον; see also ix. 14. (2) Βαπτίσματων σώσεως, τῷ ζήτεσθαι τε χεριῶν, foreign to the classics; as is κρίματος αἰωνίως. (4) Πνεύματος ἀπώλειας, οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν; an expression and an idea foreign to all the classics. (5) Καλεῖν . . . ρῆμα, promise of good, so ἔσται νῦν often in Hebrew; classics, declaration, anything uttered. Δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰώνος, miraculous powers under the gospel dispensation; an utter stranger to the classic authors. (7) Βοσάννα, any kind of fruit which the earth produces, ποιμνία; in Greek simply herbage, vegetation. (8) Εἰς καίνου, ἔτη; would not the classical Greek be καίνως? (10) Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, toward him, toward his cause, for his sake (ἅπαξ), ὄνομα being pleonastic, as in Hebrew. (11) Ιησοῦ φοροῦν, a word found only in the New Testament and ecclesiastical Greek. (12) Μικροφυώματα, patient waiting, ἔτη, prolongatio, Sept.; which I cannot find in the classics. Κληρονομιστῶν, obtaining, Heb. שׁוֹר; see on i. 2. (15) Ἡς εἰκονεία, the promised blessing; classical sense, promise. (17) Ἐμφατείσασθε, interpolated; classics, to act the part of a mediator.

Chap. VII. (1) Συνῷ ποιεῖται, γῦναί; the words are classic Greek, but the combination is Hebrew. κοπῆς, slaughterer, πυρὶ; Greek, hewing, cutting out. (3) Ἄπατος, ὑπὸ ὁμοῦ, without any genealogy of parents; the classic writers apply these words to their gods, and to orphan children, in quite a different sense. (4) Αἰχμολωσίας, spoils in general (see Gen. xiv. 20); classics, first fruits, part of the spoils of war presented to the gods. Πατρίκαρχᾶς, κακῶς, ἐκτός; I cannot find any trace of this word in the classics. (5) Αποδεκατῶν, to take, to take a tenth part, ἀρχαῖς; peculiar to Hebrew Greek. Ἐξελεφαντασάντας ὑπὸ τῆς οὐρανοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, πρῶτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων; the Greeks said γενονείαν ὑπὸ τῶν in such a case, so that the above expression is purely Hebrew. (6) Δεκατῶν, as ἀποδεκατῶν in v. 5. (10) Ἐν
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τῇ δόσφιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, see above on v. 5. (11) Τελειωσις, in a sense sui generis, and foreign to the classics. (16) Σαρκισθη, perishable, short lived, ἐστι; not found in the classics in such a sense. Δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, where δύναμις has the meaning of precept, ordinance, arrangement (like διότι in the preceding clause), and ζωῆς that of perpetuity; both of which meanings are foreign to the classics. 'Τελειωσις, see τελειωσις in v. 11 above. (20) Ὄρκωμοςια, peculiar to our epistle; the classic ὀρκωμόσια (with antepenult accent) is an adjective, ἄνω being understood after it; see also v. 28. (22) Διάλογος, in the sense of the Hebrew רָאָבָא.

Chap. VIII. (1) Ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ Ἱρώνου τῆς μεγαλοσύνης, where μεγαλοσύνη; is not only a word which is not employed by the classics, but an abstract noun designating the Divinity; comp. Heb. רָאָבָא, רָאָבָא, and רָאָבָא, רָאָבָא. The whole phraseology is altogether of a Hebrew cast; at least it is not classical. (2) Ἀγών, plural ἀγώνιη, ἀγώνιη; classics, ἀγών. Ἐνθρώπος, the divine ἄνθρωπος; classics, a common tenant or dwelling. (6) Μεσίτης; in a different sense from what is usual in the classics. The long quotation from the Septuagint that follows, is not more Hebraistic than the surrounding context.

Chap. IX. (1) Δικαιώματα, ordinance, arrangements, δικαίωμα; classics, sentence of justice, decision, just action or requisition. (8) Ἄγων, Ἰβ. ἁγωνίη, ἁγωνίη, a φράσις which is an entire stranger to the Greek classics, and purely Hebraistic. (4) That μάνα, at πλάκει τῇ διαλογίης, and Χερουβίμ ὁμοίωσις (v. 5), are forms or phrases purely Hebrew, will not of course be questioned. Δοξά, in the sense of splendor (as here), is not classic, but is the Heb. רָאָבָא. (5) Ἑλετριός, Ἰβ. Ἐλετριός, Septuagint word; classics, λαστρίνος -ια, -α, adjective. (9) Παραβάλη, symbol: classics, comparison, similitude in speech or writing. Τελειωσις, to expiate, to render pure, in the sense of ἄνω or ἄνω; a sense foreign to the classics; comp. x. 1. (10) Βαπτισμός I take to be a Hellenistic, not a classic word; for this appears to be βάπτισμος or βάπτισμα. See also vi. 2, βαπτισμόω. (11) Ἀληθεύω μελλόντων ἑγερών, unlike anything in the classics. (12) Τιτᾶς τῆς κτίσεως, of the present world; κτίσις in the classics means the act of creating. Εὐδοκίαν, form sui generis. (13) Κεκυρωμένοι, the unclean, ἄνωθεν, ἄνωθεν; Greek κοφών, to communicate, to share, to render common. Ἀγαθεία purifies, ἱερόν; Greek, to consecrate, to devote. (16) Φέρω σαΐ, accidere, to happen; it is sui generis.

(18) Ἐγκεκαίωσθαι, was ratified; classics, to renew. (22) Αἰματεχνοῦσα, sui generis. (24) Ἐμφανισθῆναι, to appear in behalf of, to appear as an advocate or patron; in the classics. to show, to reveal. Jb. τῷ προσώπῳ, before, ἰπτόμησιν; unknown to the classics. (26) Καταβαλέας κόσμον, a combination unknown to the classics; comp. iv. 3. Συντελεῖα τῶν αἰώνων, the end of the former dispensation; nowhere in
common Greek. (28) ἀμαρτίας, sin-offering, sacrifice for sin, ἁμαρτήσας, ἁμαρτάς; not in the classics.

Chap. X. (1) Εἰκώνα, complete image, perfect delineation (in distinction from σκία, an imperfect sketch), τὸ ἔθνος; the Greek εἰκὼν is simply, image. Τελειόσα, see on ix. 9. (10) Ἑναμένων, comp. ii. 11. (13) Τὸ λαοῦ, thenceforth, as to future time; in the classics, for the rest, in fine, accordingly, etc. The sense here given to τὸ λαοῦ is not inconsistent with the classical use of the word; but would a classic Greek have expressed the idea, "thenceforth expecting," by τὸ λαοῦ ἔδεικνυμεν;? Is this a φράσεις Ἑλληνικήτερα? Τελείσαντι οἱ ἐκβολοὶ αὐτῶν ὑποτόμων τῶν π.δ.ων αὐτῶν, a phrase purely Hebraistic in its hue; see Ps. cx. 1. [2]. (14) Τετελείωκε, see on ix. 9; x. 1. (19) Παρθησίαν, free access; classics, free speech, openness, impartiality. (20) Ζωανών qualifying such a word as ὁ ὅδος, is a combination unknown to the classics. (22) Ἐρραντιομένων τὰς καλ- δίας, altogether Hebrew in its hue; in the classics, sprinkled. (24) Παροξυσμόν, excitement in a good sense; the Greeks used the word for excitement of anger or other passions, and to designate the ex- a erbations of fever, etc. (25) Ημέρα, the day of the Lord, the day of terror, ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα, altogether in a Hebrew sense. (27) Πυ-γοίς πεταλευ, ἡμέρα, just Hebrew. (29) Κοινόν, an unclean thing; see under ix. 13. (31) Ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χείρας θεοὺς ζωτος; the classic Greek is, εἰς χείρας ἐπίγειος — ἐναυ — ἐκείνως — ἐπίκεισα — συνέ- ναι. The form ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χείρας is evidently a copy of the Hebrew, יְבִּיא יְבִּיא. (32) "Ἀθησίων . . . . παθημάτων, a method of expression foreign to the classics. (35) Παρθησίαν, confidence, Christian trust; classics, boldness or freedom of speech. Μισθαπλασίων, reward, sui genera. (36) Ἐπαγγελίαν, promised blessing; classics, promise. (39) Εἰς αὐτόλεκτον, like the Heb. ἐν ὑπνῷ, that we should be destroyed; and so εἰς περιστροφήν; in both cases an evident imitation of the Heb. Inf. with ὑπ'.
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Chap. XII. (7) Pαδελάω, chastisement, ἐπικρίνει; the meaning here given to this word, is seldom, if ever, given in the classics. (9) Ἰη: σκωπος ἡμῶν πατέρας, a Hebrew, not a classic combination of ideas; σκωπος meaning the physical man, in distinction from the mental one. Το ταρτή τῶν πνευμάτων, Heb. ἐπικρίνει, Numb. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16; foreign to all the classics. (10) Ἀγωνίασθαι can hardly be found, I believe, in the classics. It is a Hellenistic term, corresponding to ἐπικρίνει. (11) Καρπόν εἰμινικάν, peaceful fruit, i. e. happy fruit, ἀνάπτυξις ὑμῖν; εἰμινικάν here manifestly bearing the Hebrew-Greek, and not the classic sense. (14) Οἰδίες οὐκ εἶσαι τῶν κριῶν, so ὑπόθεσις ἑαυτοῦ γένεις, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐπικριῶν ἁλί; the whole form of expression is manifestly Hebraistic. (16) Προκότος μᾶς, one meal; classics, the act of eating, or food. The certainty that meal is the idea here, arises from the adjunct μᾶς. Προκοτόκως, Heb. ἡ ὑπέρβα; not used in the classics. (19) Μη προστρεθήκατε αὐτ. ις λύγων, ἀνεπερήκτητα ἡπικρίνει, a Hebrew and not a Greek mode of expression. (22) Μυρώσατέ, ἠδύνατα, ἡμῖν, the usual Hebrew (not a classic, expression for a large indefinite number. (23) Προκοτόκως, first-born in the sense of pre-eminent, like the Heb. כּוֹלֵב; a sense not attached to the classical use of this word. 'Απογεγραμμένας τῆς οἰκίας, ἡ ὑπέρβα ὑπόθεσις ἡ ὑπερβά ὑπερβά Is. iv. 3; Comp. Ex. xxxii. 32; Ps. lxix. 28. Dan. xii. 1; Luke x. 20, etc., an expression altogether Hebraistic.

Chap. XIII. (1) Φιλαδελφία, mutual Christian love; in the classics (e. g. Lucian), in its literal sense. (3) Ὀνείρος ἐν σοφίᾳ, in a frail dying state; not so expressed in the classics. The mode of expression comes from the Hebrew, ὑπέρβα. (7) Ἠγιασμένοι, teachers, spiritual guides, ἱσπραττότων; classic sense never that of teachers. (8) Χριστός καὶ σύμμετρα, ἡ διδασκαλία κατά τρόπον; where in all the classics is the like of this, in order to designate all past and present time? (9) Πεπαρατατότες, who are conversant with, who practise using, from the Heb. χελέων; the classics use the word only in its literal sense. (15) Θυσίαν αἰνέοις . . . κατόν χελέων; the idea, sacrifice of praise, is Hebrew, Lev. vii 12, ὡς ἔσοβον οὖν, comp. Ps. l. 14, 23. As to κατόν χελέων, there is nothing in the classics like it. Plainly it has its original in the Hebrew χελέον τοῦ προφήτου, Hos. xiv. 3, we will render to thee the calves [i. e. the offerings, the fruit] of our lips, or rather, we will render to thee calves with our lips. (16) Θυσίας, as applied to εἰσδοθάς καὶ κοιμώμας, is purely a Hebrew application. (17) Υἱὸς τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, for you ὑπέρβα τῶν; the Greeks, υπερβά ν. (20) ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, God who bestows happiness, who secures our welfare; a mere imitation of the Heb. כּוֹלֵב, the classics never using εἰρήνη in such a sense. (21) Εἶς τοῖς αἰῶναῖς τῶν αἰῶνων, from the Hebrew ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, or ἐν ἡμέρίᾳ. (25) Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, Hebrew בִּקְרָבֶנָה, the Greeks said, χαίρετα, χαίρετα, or διαφωνεῖ, Acts xv. 29.

In this selection, I have aimed at taking only the more obvious 20
words and phrases. It might be enlarged, by more strenuously urging the principle, in all respects, of dissimilarity to the Greek classic writers. That an idea is peculiar to the Christian dispensation, and unknown to the classic authors, has not been the basis of my selection in any case, unless at the same time there is a phraseology, or a combination of words, which is as foreign to the Greeks as the idea itself. If all the ideas which are not classical, were to be the guiding principle in our selection, there would be no end of examples. But this would not be a fair and proper method of proceeding. It is the diction and phraseology, and combinations of words, and the sense which is given to the words employed, that I have endeavored to show are not Ελληνικότερα, i. c. not better Greek, or more classical Greek, than the epistles of Paul exhibit. The reader has now the result before him.

With such a result in view, what matters it how often or by whom we are told that our epistle is almost classical Greek, and that all runs smoothly and oratorically on? It has been asked, “how a Christian writer of Jewish origin could avoid using Hebrew phraseology, in order to designate religious objects?” I answer at once, that he could not, and did not; and that nothing can be plainer, than that our epistle is filled with it. The question now in hand is not concerning the absolute but the relative state of Hebraism and unclassical usage, viz., whether our epistle is more free from it than the acknowledged epistles of Paul.

To make the proof in all respects perfect, I ought perhaps to take some of Paul’s epistles, and actually show that the departures from classical usage are not more frequent there. But I content myself, for the present (after more than one examination of some of them in respect to the point in question), with denying that they are less frequent in our epistle. The burden of proof that they are less frequent, rests on those who assert the fact that our epistle is more classical Greek. I wait for them to prove this allegation by facts produced, not by assertions. These last ought not to go current any longer.

Bleek suggests, also, that “the writer of our epistle was a diligent reader of the Septuagint Version, and this must have had an influence on his style,” Rev. p. 27. Indeed? And what sort of Greek does the Septuagint consist of? Is it purer than that of Paul? And if the writer of our epistle modelled himself after this, must his φθάσεις be Ελληνικότερα than that of Paul? A singular argument truly it is, to allege that the influence or imitation of the most corrupt of all Greek extant, will save a writer from the imputation of being as Hebraistic and unclassical as Paul.

Bleek intimates, that “to produce such words as ἔγγελος and ἐγγατον τῶν ἑλερίων as Hebraisms is hardly fair, because it would be a mere affectation of Purism in a writer, not to employ these words in a
sense which the corresponding Hebrew words had," Rev. p. 26. But
may not the same remark be made of all the other Hebraisms of the
New Testament, or of the Septuagint? The question about Hebra-
ism or unclassical usage lies, after all, in a narrow compass. When a
writer who is a Hebrew, employs the word ἄγγελος to designate (like
πνεύμα) a heavenly messenger, did he not give to this word a shade of
meaning which of itself it had not in the Greek language? This
will not be denied. Then, secondly, did the meaning which he gave
to ἄγγελος, originate, in his mind, from the meaning of the Heb.
ףֶּלֶח קָצָרָן? This seems equally certain. What is this, then, but Hebra-
ism, true, genuine Hebraism? When a form of expression is em-
ployed that is unknown to classic Greek, or a sense given to a word
which the Greek does not give, and in these cases the writer is plainly
influenced by Hebrew idiom; what is Hebraism, if this be not?
And does not ἄγγελος belong to the latter class just named?

Does not ἐσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν also belong to the first? Would a
mere Greek reader even conjecture what the writer of our epistle
meant by the phrase in Heb. i 1? He would very naturally have
inquired, "In the last of what days?" And when told that the
phrase means in the last times, viz., the times of the Messiah, and that
the Hebrews so understood בֵּית הַמֵּשֶׁה, he could well say, "This is
very different from our Greek phraseology. Why not say, ἐν τῷ
καιρῷ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ or ἐν ἡμέραις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, בֵּית הַמֵּשֶׁה?"

After all, too, the use of ἡμέραις itself in such a sense, and in such
a connection, is Hebraism; the Greeks seldom or never employing it
just in this way. The Greeks would of course have employed καιρὸς
or χρόνος.

In either of these cases what room is there for the allegation that
"the ideas are so peculiar, and so connected with the religious views
of the author of our epistle, that he could not avoid using the words
which he has employed?" What difficulty was there in saying ἄγγελος σώματος, in a classical way, just as the Greeks said Σωμάτω
σώματος; or in saying σώματος or σώματος? And why not say,
ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ; or ἐν χρόνῳ ἐσχάτῳ τοῦ κόσμου? I
can see no difficulty; and if none, then the writer of our epistle
might, with entire facility, have expressed himself here in a classical
way, without any affection of Purism.

The same, now, may be shown to be true respecting the greater
part of the words which I have included in my list of Hebraisms and
of unclassical usage. For example: I take the words as they offer
themselves, without selecting for my purpose; Heb. i. 2, κληρονόμοι,
lord, ruler, rightful owner and disposer; the classic sense of the word
is, one who receives anything by lot, or by testament. Now, was it
not easy for the writer of our epistle to say here, κύριον πάντων?
Comp. Gal. iv. 1. So in v. 8, could not δόξα, splend-r, have been
with perfect ease exchanged for a classical word? Could no word
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be found in the classics for the idea expressed by the newly coined word μεγαλωσύνη, v. 3? And was it not easy to express in a classical way; the idea conveyed by τεν μόριλος-δινωτι? Was there no convenient word in Greek besides λόγος (ii. 1), to express the idea of commination or command? And does the Greek furnish no word for designating miracles or miraculous powers, except δύναμις, v. ii. 4? And could any mere Greek reader possibly understand οἰκουμένη μέλλοντας, in ii. 5? It were easy to proceed in the same way through the list, with questions of the like import; but I forbear.

Still further to contend against the view which I have given above, Bleek produces several words, such as ἰποστάσεως, αἰτῶν, καθαριμοῦν... τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν, μεγαλωσύνη, etc., and asks, "whether, because they are not classical, they are therefore to be reckoned as Hebraisms?" But in this question, he leaves entirely out of view one professed object of the list of words in question. It professes on the face of it to be a list, not of Hebraisms only, but of unclassical words, i. e., of words used in an unclassical way. Has Mr. Bleek, by his interrogation points, shown the classical usage of these words, as employed in our epistle? If not, then the subject remains in statu quo. This is yet to be done, before the φράσεις Ἐλληνικώτερα of our epistle is established; for surely this expression of Origen means nothing less than purer Greek, better Greek, more classical Greek.

After a renewed examination of this subject, I make again the appeal with boldness, and call upon all those who assert the almost classic style and manner of our epistle to produce more true Hebraisms, and more words or idioms foreign to the Greek classics, in any of Paul's acknowledged epistles. I will even venture to make another offer; which is, that I will show that some at least of his acknowledged epistles exhibit less Hebrew coloring, when they shall have shown that some of them exhibit more.

Assertions are one thing; facts are another. If Origen and all the Greek fathers were to assert, that our epistle is Ἐλληνικώτερα than Paul's, it could not make it so. "To the work of examination," would be my reply; and the result will be an abiding conviction, that Origen had as little reason for the assertion in question, as he had for the adventurous remark which he made on the use of the Greek article by the sacred writers.

The list of Hebraisms and unclassical usage, in our epistle, would have been much more swelled, if I had not omitted, for the most part, to repeat the same words, so often as I found them repeated and used in a Hebraistic or unclassical manner. Such words are ἀδελφός, ἄγος, ἁγάζω, ἁμαρτία, ἁπλῶς, ἰδιωμα, ἰδιώτης, ἰπογελιμα, καὶ ἡμέραν, κληρονόμος, κληρονομιόω, κατάπαυσις, λόγος, ἀρχή, μοθαπωσοσία, μεγαλωσύνη, μεσίτης, νεκρός, οἴκος, σάρξ, τελειώματι, and others.

I have one more remark to make, before I quit this topic. The
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Hebrew coloring of the Septuagint version, and the unclassical Greek of it in general, will be admitted by all critics of any taste or discernment. There is, indeed, a very great difference between different parts of this version, some of it being absolutely barbarous Greek, while some other parts, e.g., the book of Proverbs, is much nearer to the classic style. But in nearly the whole of it, certainly in all the prophets and historical books, the Greek, even at the best, is palpably different from that of the classics.

With this fact in view, I ask that an impartial critic, laying aside all preconceived theories with regard to the style of our epistle, would read the whole continuously through, without stopping to see whether it is possible to invent some distinction between the style of the epistle itself, and that of the quotations from the Septuagint. If he do this, I venture to predict, that he will not be able to perceive any difference that would ever strike the attention, between the Greek of Septuagint extracts, and the surrounding Greek of the author himself. All runs smoothly on. No transition is perceived merely from the style. Were it not for the formulas of quotations, and the recollection of the Old Testament passages quoted, the reader would never imagine that the nature of the element was changed in which he was before moving. And if this be so, then where lies the proof that our epistle is better Greek than that of Paul? Is Paul less pure than the Septuagint in general? Surely this will not be affirmed. That the fact is as I have stated it, I fully believe. But then the satisfactory evidence of its correctness must be derived from the impartial reading itself of the epistle, by every man who is capable of judging with respect to the matter before us. I venture to believe that Bleek himself will not refuse his assent to the statement just made.

I cannot conclude the present section, without adverting once more to another topic connected with the preceding one, which seems to me to have been treated in a very singular way, by some of the opponents of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews. I refer to the alleged style and manner of the epistle. We are often reminded of the oratorical manner, of the well rounded periods, of the nicely adjusted phrasing, and particularly of the almost classical use of the connectives and particles, which our epistle exhibits. All is said to run on smoothly, easily, with little or no ellipsis, without sentences being suspended, or change of construction made in them. In short, the whole is a tolerably near approach to the manner of well reputed Greek classics.

One part of this subject I have already examined. It would be well for the reader to review this in connection with the present remarks. He will there see how often interrupted and suspended sentences occur in our epistle, after the manner of Paul. As a sufficient reply to all the remarks which have been made on complete, well rounded, and flowing periods of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the
easy, perspicuous manner of it, I must beg the reader to consult, and attentively study the passages now to be pointed out. I begin with Heb. i. 1—4. Which is the main object of assertion, in this complicated and protracted sentence. "God has spoken to us by his Son; his Son is Lord and Creator of all things; he is the very image of the Father and endowed with almighty power; he made expiation by the offering up of himself for our sins; he is seated on a throne of glory above; and he is far superior to the angels:" such are the affirmations all contained in this one complex, involved sentence. Which of all these is the writer's main point, and in what does the "rounding off" of this period consist?

Heb. ii. 9, ὅτως χάριτι κ. τ. λ.; to what does this clause relate, or with what part of the preceding context is it connected? Does the writer mean (as he appears to say), that Jesus was crowned with glory and honor, that he might by the grace of God taste of death for every man? And if so, what can be the idea conveyed by such a sentiment? Or if he does not mean this, but means to say that Jesus was made a little lower than the angels, that by the grace of God, etc., i. e., he was endowed with a human nature, in order that he might suffer, etc., then why was not ὅτως κ. τ. λ. arranged after Ἰησοῦν or after ἁγγέλουσιν?

Will the advocates of special perspicuity and rounduity of style in our epistle, tell us what the object of iii. 4 is, and what the sentiment actually contained in it, and how it contributes to forward the design of the writer, i. e., to aid the sentiment of the context?

Will they show us with what ἐν τῷ λεγένδαι is connected, in iii. 15, and what is the occasion of repeating this quotation?

In iv. 2, καὶ γὰρ κ. τ. λ. is an unfinished comparison; where is this completed? In iv. 3—9 is a series of involved sentences, of unfinished comparisons, of incomplete and suspended sentences, which scarcely has an equal in all the New Testament. Let the reader try his own skill at reading and interpreting it, and deciphering the connection of thought and reasoning; and then he will need neither Bleek nor myself to aid him in giving his opinion concerning it.

Is there not a large ellipsis in v. 5? And to whom does δι' (in v. 7) relate, and to what verb is it the Nominative? If to ἐξακρίβων in verse 9, as Dr. Knapp and others make it, then he must allow at least that "interrupted" sentences are found in our author. Then again, what is the sentiment and object of v. 7?

Is there no difficulty in vi. 1, 2, 4—6, and 17, 18? What sort of a sentence does Bleek call that in vii. 1—5? And where are the rounded periods, the connection and the perspicuity of vii. 8—17? In viii. 4, to what does the εἰ μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ. refer? The writer had just affirmed, that Christ (being a priest) must, like other priests, have some offering to make, verse 3. One would naturally expect, that the writer was going on with his εἰ μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ. to show
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this; but if this be the case, is it not a difficult matter to render it plain?

In what way is the sentence in ix. 6—10 to be characterized? It consists of as many distinct parts as it contains verses; and as to verse 10, it seems almost to set at defiance the efforts of all commentators satisfactorily to point out its connection, or even to make out its grammatical construction. I call upon the advocates of the classic style of our epistle, to produce anything from the writings of Paul, that is more obscure or apparently disconnected in construction, than this. And what shall be said of ix. 15—18? Does all run on smoothly here?

In ix. 27, 28 is a comparison by καὶ δόσω . . . . οὐτω καὶ κ. τ. λ. In the latter member of this, the principal stress lies upon εν δεινάρων χρῆται δύναται κ. τ. λ.; but where is the antithesis to this in the first member of the comparison?

In x. 5—10 is a sentence, or sentences, which in point of involution and obscurity may be compared with any that the reader pleases to collate, which he can find in the epistles of Paul. Let him inquire specially as to the "rounding and finish" in vs. 9, 10, with their connection.

Examine the sentence beginning with x. 19, which Dr. Knapp has pointed as ending with v. 25; and rightly if the grammatical series, προσερχόμεθα . . . . κατέχουμεν . . . . καὶ κατανοοῦμεν be regarded as determining the boundaries of a sentence. But then, the "rounding off" and the "oratorical finish" of this sentence, and the perspicuity of it (particularly of v. 20), is what yet remains to be exhibited.

In xii. 25, how is the τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς the proper antithesis of τῶν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν?

In xiii. 11, one would expect δὲ γὰρ κ. τ. λ. to be an introduction to something confirming the preceding verse; but he finds the matter of the eleventh verse entirely foreign to the subject of the tenth.

It were easy to increase the list of difficulties, such as I have now touched upon, and such as are presented in the preceding part of this section. I might show that the classical rules of the article are not always observed; e. g., Heb. i. 1, ἐν νῷ where Chrysostom and Theophylact have filled up what is manifestly wanting, by saying, διὰ τοῦ νῦν. So in the use of καὶ of γὰρ, or πάλιν, and in some cases of μὲν and δὲ, it were easy to point out passages the classical vindication of which would occasion trouble enough.

But I forbear. While the testimonies above produced remain, every one can judge for himself who has ability to judge.

The difference between my mode of proceeding and that of some others, relative to the point before us, is this: I appeal to facts; they deal in categorical assertions, and in exclamation and interrogation points affixed to the sentiments of their opponents. And so long as the controversy rests in this position, I cheerfully submit it to the
public. Having spent the best part of my life in explaining the epistles of Paul, I still confess myself unable to find in him more Hebraism, more departure from classical usage as to the choice of words or the meaning given to them, more involved "unperiodic" sentences, or more obscurity in any respect, than are to be found in our epistle.

§ 16. Alexandrine Hue of the Epistle.

Eichhorn and others, who have strenuously insisted that Paul is not the author of our epistle, have endeavors to show that it is probably of Alexandrine origin. But the arguments adduced for this purpose, seem to me incapable of standing the test of a critical examination.

(1) "The author of the epistle to the Hebrews treats the ancient Jewish Scriptures as containing a mysterious and secret sense concealed under the words. He also regards the various ritual observances of the ancient law, only as types and shadows of things under the Christian dispensation, Heb. x. 1; ix. 8. Philo of Alexandria expresses the same views, De confus. Lingg. p. 348. Eich. Einleit. p. 442."

That the general views of the author of our epistle in regard to the meaning and object of Jewish rites, coincided with those of Philo, I should not be disposed to deny. But who is going to show us that these were not founded in truth? If, as I believe, the Jewish dispensation had its origin in divine communications and directions, there can be no rational doubt that it had some important end in view. Surely now the sacrifices and various rites of external purification, could never, in and of themselves, be deemed an object worthy of special divine interposition and command. Their connection with some higher and more spiritual object and end, was what stamped their highest real value upon them. In any other point of view, they could scarcely be thought worthy of the character of Him who requires men to worship him in spirit and in truth.

That a man of such enlarged views as Philo should have seen and felt this, and that Paul should have done the same, is not a matter of wonder to any one, who considers the tendency of an enlightened mind to look on the spiritual design of religion as infinitely the most important and interesting part of it.

What can be more diverse, however, than the particular form which Philo gives to his speculations on this subject, and that in which the ideas of our author are developed? Philo allegorizes on everything, and everywhere, almost without distinction. The historical facts in the book of Genesis, the connection of Abraham with Sarah and Hagar, and all other occurrences related in the Pentateuch, are, if occasion presents an opportunity, converted into allegory, and made the theme of exuberant speculative mysticism. Neither is there one word in all, which has any relation to the Messiah or to his atoning sacrifice.
ALEXANDRINE HUE OF THE EPISTLE. 237

How very different the types and shadows presented by our epistle are, the intelligent and critical reader need not be informed. All is brought to bear on one single point — the death of Christ, the propitiatory sacrifice for sin made by it, and the effectual reconciliation to God accomplished in this manner.

To reason, then, as Eichhorn has done, is just the same as to bring forward the allegation, that Philo believed in the existence of one supreme God; that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews did the same; and then draw the inference, that the writer of this epistle must therefore have lived, or at least been nurtured, at Alexandria. I venture to say, that there never has been so rational an account of the object of the Jewish ritual, as the author of our epistle gives; nor one so worthy of the great Author of the old and the new dispensations, nor so consonant with the fundamental maxim that “God is a spirit and requires men to worship him in a spiritual manner.”

(2) “Philo intimates, that the higher mysteries of the Jewish religion are only for the initiated, μιστασ. In like manner our epistle, v. 11—vi. 3; Einleit. p. 444.”

I can find no trace of reserve in our epistle, in regard to the διακονοι or uninitiated. The expression of deep regret, that those whom the writer addresses had not made higher acquisitions of religious knowledge, I can easily find. Severe reproof for such negligence, I see; but not a word about any distinctions between μιστασ and διακονοι, initiated and uninitiated, am I able to discover. Philo, in respect to this, is more than half a Grecian Platonist; but the writer of our epistle practises no concealment at all.

(3) “The Alexandrine author of the book of Wisdom has praised wisdom on account of its nature and qualities, and then adduced historical examples to illustrate all this, Wisd. i—ix. x. 1—xvi. 1. So the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, after urging and eulogizing faith, adduces historical examples of it, in chap. xi., in order more strongly to impress its importance, p. 445.”

To which one may reply, that from the days of the author of our epistle down to the present time, almost every practical writer on religion, and every preacher on the subject of faith, has done the same. But does this prove that every such writer and preacher was born or nurtured at Alexandria? Can a thing so obvious to the common sense of all men as the appropriate method of treating a subject, be adduced to establish a special relation between any two men as to country or education?

(4) “Many thoughts and expressions, in the epistle to the Hebrews, resemble those of Philo,” see Eichhorn, p. 446 seq., and Schulz and Bleek.

First it should be remembered, that the author of our epistle and Philo were contemporaries. At least, the former must have come upon the stage before the latter left it. Then, both were educated as
Jews; both were deeply read in the Jewish Scriptures, above all in the law of Moses. Both thought, reasoned, and expressed themselves as Hebrews, writing in Greek. Both had the same views, fundamentally, of the great points of the religion of Moses. Both had high moral feelings, and a deep interest in them. Could it be possible, now, that there should not be points of resemblance between Philo and our author, when writing on similar subjects? Surely not, any more than that there should not be points of similarity between the sentiments of a Christian divine in any particular age and country, and those of another of the like views, near the same age, and in a different country.

Both Philo and our author often appeal to the Jewish Scriptures. And because they deduce from them like sentiments, does this prove that our author must have been of the Alexandrine school? Why is not the argument just as good the other way, viz., to prove that Philo must have belonged to some other country, i. e., to that in which our author lived? All that such resemblance can prove, is, that both belonged to the Mosaic school; and who will deny this?*

Nearly all the striking parallels in Schulz's list, p. 265 seq. (abridged and extracted by Bleek, p. 398 seq.), are of the kind just mentioned; i. e., they have their origin either in the words of the Old Testament, or in the facts which it relates. E. g.

Heb. iv. 14 ἀρχιερεά µέγαν; Philo, µέγας ἀρχιερεύς; both from the βασιλεία of the Hebrew Scriptures. So in Heb. v. 2, 5, Moses πατήσας ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ ὀφείλει αὐτῷ, which is twice produced by Schulz from Philo, in order to show that our epistle has an Alexandrine hue. So again in the parallels to Heb. iv. 14; vi. 13, 19; viii. 1; viii. 5, etc.

In many other passages, there is merely a coincidence of thought, in some one particular or on some important subject, while the generality of expression is as diverse as in any writers whatever. E. g. Heb. i. 3, φέρων . . . τὰ πάντα τῷ ἰματί τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ; Philo, ὁ τὰ μὲν οὖσαν φέρων, καὶ τὰ πάντα γεννών, and ἰματι ὁ Θεὸς πάντα ποιεῖ. Heb. iv. 12 is cited, and as a parallel of it several passages in which the word of God is spoken of as τοµείς; in both authors the original is Is. xlix. 2 comp. xi. 4; in all other respects, the course of thought and language in Philo is exceedingly diverse from that in our epistle.

So in iv. 13, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν κτίσις ἀφάντης ἐν εορτὶν αὐτοῦ, the parallel of which, in Philo, is made to be, ὁ Θεὸς λόγος διδακτάς ἐστιν, ὡς πάντα ἐφορὰν ἐνια ἰκανόν κ. τ. λ. As to language, the resemblance is faint enough; as to thought, the idea is common to the two writers, that God, or his word, is omniscient. Must a man be brought up at Alexandria, in order to say this?

* Hug, in his Introd. to the N. Test., well says, in reference to these parallelisms: "The uniformity of the objects is here the ground of mutual resemblance [in style]," p. 463.
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In other passages of Schulz, the resemblance consists merely in appeal to the same facts related in the Scriptures; e. g., Heb. vii. 1—4, and the passages from Philo, all of which, like the passage in our epistle, are deduced from the narration in Genesis. So in respect to Heb. vii. 27, δ [Χριστός] οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην κ. τ. λ.; the parallel in Philo is said to be, ἀρχιερείς . . . κατὰ τοὺς νόμους εἰράξε τε καὶ Ἰωάννης τελῶν καὶ ἡμέραν κ. τ. λ.; the common source of both writers being the Mosaic statutes in regard to this subject; and surely the diction here is diverse enough to render the imitation of the one by the other quite incredible.

Of this nature are nearly the whole of the instances produced by Schulz. Who now can gather from such a passage as the following, any evidence that the writer of our epistle belonged to Alexandria, and was conversant with the writings of Philo?

Philo: τῆς κιβωτοῦ ἐπίθεμα . . . τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βιβλίοις ἱλαστήριον . . . τὸ ἐπίθεμα πρὸς παγορεωμένον ἱλαστήριον, βάσις ἕξιν τῶν πτερυγίων διεύθυν, αἱ . . . προσαγορεύεται Ἑρουβιμί κ. τ. λ.

Epistle to the Hebrews: ὑπαράγω δὲ αὐτὴς Ἑρουβιμί τῆς δόξης, κατακαίεται τὸ ἱλαστήριον.

And must a man, then, have lived at Alexandria, and have read Philo, in order to speak of the ἱλαστήριον and of the Ἑρουβιμί? And if these two technical words, which every Jew on earth that could utter a Greek sentence, and had heard of the Hebrew tabernacle or temple, must have known, are taken out of the parallel in question, where is the "quid Philoneum" which is so anxiously sought for?

Put now out of consideration all the necessary resemblances, which, treating of the same subjects, receiving substantially the same education, living in the same age, belonging to the same peculiar people, and (above all) appealing to the same divine book as the source of ideas and expressions and facts—leave all these things out of sight, and then, I venture to ask, what is the special resemblance left between Philo and the writer of our epistle? Can any man read a page of Philo's Greek, and then a page of our epistle, without saying that the difference is as striking (with the exceptions made above)

* Davidson, Introd. III. 172, in reference to the argument most relied upon by Bleek, says: "Why an Alexandrine hue and coloring should be attributed to the epistle (to the Hebrews) by German critics, it is not easy to perceive. That it is the production of a Jew is evident; but that he received an Alexandrine education, the effects of which are visible throughout his composition, is exceedingly questionable. Why should he be pronounced an Alexandrian because he shows so much of the typical character of the Jewish dispensation? Could not a Palestinian have done the same? And what real light does a comparison with Philo throw on the author of the epistle, except a separation be first made between peculiarities derived from his Jewish and those derived from his Alexandrian education—a separation which the researches of Dähne, Gfrörer, Schweigler, Schwarz and Grossmann show to be impossible?"
as between our epistle and any of the later Greek classical writers? What can be more remote from our epistle, than the swollen, forced, mystical, and frequently unnatural and bombastic periods of Philo Judaeus?

The writers whom I am now controveiting, are indebted to J. B. Carpzoff (Exercit. Sac. in Pauli epist. ad Hebraeos, ex Philone, Alexandrino, Helmst. 1750) for the materials which they have wrought up into the form of an argument for the Alexandrine origin of our epistle. Let another apply the same diligence to the acknowledged epistles of Paul in the same way, and as large a harvest of resemblances might be gathered, and it might easily be shown that Paul himself must have been an Alexandrian, and been educated in the Philonean school. In regard to allegory, for example (which is a main point of alleged resemblance), what could be more obvious, than to appeal to 1 Cor. x. 1—6; x. 11; Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45—47; 2 Cor. iii. 13—18; Gal. iv. 22—31; also to Col. ii. 16, 17; Gal. iii. 23—25; iv. 1—5? May it not be said of these passages (as Jerome has often and erroneously been represented as saying of our epistle, and which has so often been appealed to with confidence), "spirant quid Philoneum?"

For the present I tender the laboring oar to those who deny that as frequent resemblances between Philo and Paul may be found, as between Philo and our epistle. I make this exception only as to the position (and every candid man will allow me to make this), viz., that from the very nature of the subject in our epistle, which ex professo treats of Levitical ordinances, etc., more frequent recurrence must necessarily be made to those ordinances, than in epistles where such a subject is not treated of. Now, as Philo often handles the same topics (the same in various respects), of course there must be a frequent analogy between the two writers who appeal to the same source. But as to all which does not come under this category, I call on Bleek, or any other opponent of the Pauline origin of our epistle, to show that there is less resemblance in Paul to the writings of Philo, than in our epistle.

One hint more, and I dismiss the subject. Is not the Septuagint, Alexandrine Greek? Are not the Apocryphal books connected with the Old Testament, Alexandrine Greek? Does not the whole New Testament Greek bear a resemblance to the style of these two classes of books? Are not Paul's epistles Hebrew Greek, like all the rest? How can it be shown, then, that the author of our epistle was an Alexandrian, because he writes Alexandrine Greek? If the argument be valid for this purpose which Eichhorn and Schulz employ, then may we prove that all the New Testament writers were Alexandrians. Quod nimium probat, nihil probat.
Result.

The conclusion to be deduced from the whole of the preceding examination, seems to be, that the arguments drawn from the style and diction of the epistle to the Hebrews, are not to be relied on as deciding the question against the Pauline origin of it. Cases of this nature cannot be determined by assertion. Allegations made for such a purpose, if found to be contradicted by facts, cannot fail, in the end, to pass for nothing more than allegations.

One other thing may be said with truth, which has an important bearing on this question. If the internal evidence is altogether insufficient to decide the point at issue in the negative, the external is equally so. Indeed, the historical evidence against the Pauline origin of our epistle is, as we have seen, so little, so vague, and for the most part so indirect, that we may well say, "the objections have never been of a historical nature, but of a conjectural one." They have arisen more from taste and feeling, than from tradition or testimony. Accordingly, in all the objections of the western churches, we do not find a single instance of appeal to ancient tradition or historical evidence as the ground of them; as Hug has most truly and forcibly remarked. The objections evidently belong to that class which arise from feeling and taste, or from the exigencies of religious dispute. Why then should we attribute much weight to them?

On the whole, I must acquiesce in the opinion of Origen, which I repeat as the general voice of antiquity; it is not without reason the ancients have handed it down to us that this epistle is Paul's. Nor should I differ materially from those, who (with Eusebius) can say: Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρὸ δῆλον καὶ σαφείς αἰ δικαιώματα, fourteen epistles are clearly and certainly Paul's. I consider, however, the form of the proposition, as stated by Origen, to be the most becoming in regard to a point so controverted, and to contain for substance all which it is necessary or expedient for us to assert and to believe.

§ 17. (1) Was Barnabas the Author?

Those who are satisfied with the arguments in favor of the Pauline origin of our epistle, may dispense with the examination, whether any other person than this apostle has a title to be considered, as the author. But, since unanimity upon this point is not yet to be expected, it seems necessary briefly to examine the claims of some others who have been reputed as its authors.

The doubts raised in ancient times, whether Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, occasioned conjectures with regard to several other persons. Among the remains of ancient Christian writings, we find some hints that Barnabas was the author of our epistle, though all of these can be traced to Tertullian, de Pudicitia, c. 201. "Extat," says
he, "enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos," i. e., _there is extant an epistle of Barnabas, inscribed to the Hebrews_. He gives no reasons, and does not intimate whether he gathers it from tradition, or assumes it as a matter of mere opinion. We find no mention of this opinion again until the end of the 4th century, when Jerome, plainly relying upon the assertion of Tertullian, says: "Most [of the Latins] believe that the epistle to the Hebrews belongs to Barnabas, or Clement;" see Berth. p. 2953, and Jerome in his epist. ad Dardanum. Again, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, under the word _Paulus_ he says: "The epistle to the Hebrews is thought not to be his, on account of the discrepancy of the style; but to belong to Barnabas, according to Tertullian; or to the evangelist Luke, according to some; or to Clement of Rome." The same thing Philastrius (A. D. 380) repeats, Haeres. c. 89. And in modern times Cameron, Schmidt, Twesten, Ullman, and Wieseler, have undertaken to defend the hypothesis, that Barnabas was the author of this epistle.

This is all the evidence which history gives us in respect to this subject; and this surely is too slender to build an opinion upon, which can lay claim to critical confidence.

But all hope of defending this opinion with any degree of plausibility is removed, by a comparison of the epistle to the Hebrews with an epistle of Barnabas still extant, and undoubtedly the same that was extant in the days of Tertullian, as the quotations from it by the ancient Christian fathers evince. I produce here a few short extracts from this epistle, to enable every one to judge for himself, whether the author of the one epistle can be rationally supposed to have written the other.

Chap. IX. Μάθετε οὖν, τέκνα, περὶ πάντων πλούσιως, ότι Ἀβραὰμ, ὁ πρῶτος περιτομῆν δοῦσι, ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς τὸν νῦν περιτέμεν, λαβὼν τριών γραμμάτων δόγματα: λέγει γὰρ: Καὶ περιτέμενον Ἀβραὰμ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄδρασα, δέκα καὶ δεκατριάκοσιν. Τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεώτα τούτων, γνώσις; Μάθετε τοὺς δεκακοσίων πρῶτος, εἰς τοὺς τριακοσίους. Τὸ δὲ δέκα δόκω, ὥτα, δέκα, ἦτα δεκατριάκοσις Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Τ ἐμελλεν ἔχει τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ, Τριακοσίους. Δηλὸν οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ γράμμασι. καὶ ἐν ἐν, τὸν σταυρὸν. Οἶδαν ὅ τιν ἐμφατον δορεάν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ Ἰσμαήλος ἐν ἡμῖν. Οὐδεὶς γνωστῷ ἔμαχεν ἐξ ἐμοῦ λόγον: ἄλλα ὡς ὅτι ἔστω ὡς εἶπος· i. e., children, learn abundantly in regard to all things; for Abraham, who first instituted circumcision, practised this rite, looking forward in the Spirit to the Son, receiving the doctrine of the three letters. For [the Scripture] says, And Abraham circumcised, of his household, three hundred and eighteen men. What instruction is imparted by this? Learn as to the first eighteen, then as to the three hundred. As to eighteen, ὥτα signifies ten, and ἥτα eight; this means Jesus. And because the cross, signified by T, would possess grace, it says three hundred. It points out Jesus, therefore, by
the two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this, who has con-
ferred upon us the engraven gift of his doctrine. No one has learned
more genuine doctrine of me; but I know that ye are worthy of it;" Cotelierus, Pat. Apostol. Tom. I. p. 28.

So then, because Abraham circumcised three hundred and eighteen
persons (which by the way is not said in the Scriptures, see Gen. xvii.
23—27, comp. Gen. xiv. 14, which gave occasion to the mistake), the
system of gospel truth is disclosed in this mysterious number; and
this because लोरा stands for ten, यां for eight, and ताव for three hun-
dred, i. e., here is Jesus, and he crucified. Where in all the New
Testament is anything like such egregious trifling as this?

See now, how the same Barnabas can explain the ceremony of the
red heifer, the ashes of which were sprinkled upon offenders. After
stating the ceremony, and that the ashes were sprinkled by three
children, he thus proceeds: 'Ὁ μόσχος αὐτὸς ἔστω ὁ Ἰσαάκ; οἱ προ-
φέροντες, ἄνδρες ἀμαρτωλοί, οἱ προσέγγικαντες αὐτὸν ἐτί σφαγήν;
ἐπα οὐκέτι ἄνδρες, οὐκέτι ἀμαρτωλοί ἡ δόξα. Οἱ δὲ βαντίζοντες
παῖδες, εὐαγγελίζομεν ήμῖν τὴν ἁφασίν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄγνω-
μὸν τῆς καρδίας, οἷς ἐδωκε τοῦ εὐαγγέλου τὴν ἐξουσίαν (οὐκι δεκαδοῦ
εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν, ὅτι δεκαδοῦ αἱ φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ), εἰς τὸ
κράτοςεως. Διὰ τί δὲ τρεῖς παῖδες οἱ βαντίζοντες; Εἰς μαρτύριον
ἀβαραίμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ιακώβ, ὅτι οὕτωι μεγάλου τῷ Θεῷ. Ὡτι δὲ
tὸ ἐρωτευτό ἐν τῷ ζύλῳ; Ὅτι τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τῷ ζύλῳ; διὸ
ὁ ἐκτίζοντες εἰς αὐτὸν ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Διὰ τί δὲ τὸ ἐρωτεύ-
το καὶ τὸν ἔρωτον; Ὅτι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἔρχονται τοιχοί,
καὶ ἄνθρωποι, εἰς οὓς ἡμέρας σωθησόμεθα; ὧτι καὶ ἄλγων τὴν σάρκα διὰ
tοῦ πόνου τοῦ ἐστώτου λάθους. Καὶ δὲ τοῦτο οὕτω γενόμενα, ἡμῖν
μᾶς ἑτοὶ φανερὰ, ἵνα δὲ σκοτεινά ὅτι οὐκ ἠκούσαν φωνῆς τοῦ
κυρίου.

But enough. If all were cited, which betrays a feeble and puerile
mind, the whole epistle must be transcribed. Let him who needs
further argument on this subject, peruse the whole epistle to the
Hebrews, and then read through the epistle of Barnabas. The dif-
fERENCE between this writer and him who wrote the epistle to the
Hebrews, in respect to style, precision, clearness, energy, brevity —
in a word, everything which characterizes any writing — is heaven-
wide. The most obtuse perception cannot fail to discern it. It is a
hopeless case to plead the cause of a hypothesis like this.

The question whether the Barnabas who is said to be the author of
the epistle from which quotations are made above, was the same that
is mentioned in the acts of the apostles, and in the epistles of Paul,
is one about which critics are divided. The majority seem to be in
favor of the negative. The principal reasons are of an internal na-
vore, the contents of the epistle; which seem to be unworthy of
him who stood in such a near and dear relation to Paul. One almost
spontaneously adopts this opinion, from the mere reading of the epis-
tale. But whether Barnabas, the companion of Paul, wrote this epistle or not, whoever did write it, he surely was not the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. A greater difference in writing can scarcely be even imagined.

If the apostolic Barnabas were not the author in question, then we have no writing of his with which we can compare our epistle, and of course no means of judging in this way. And as to the testimony of Tertullian in respect to Barnabas, it appears at most only to give the opinion of the churches in Proconsular Africa; inasmuch as Origen and Eusebius know nothing of such an opinion. The arguments of Wieseler and Ullmann are too feeble and trifling to demand a repetition here. See Davidson, Introd. III. p. 165, seq.

(2) Was Luke the Author?

The first suggestion among the ancient fathers, that Luke had any part in the composition of the epistle to the Hebrews, is found in a fragment of Clement of Alexandria preserved by Eusebius (Ecc. Hist. VI. 14), in which Clement asserts, that "Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, and that Luke carefully translated it into the Greek;" see note p. 88. The same opinion or tradition Origen mentions thus: "If I may give my opinion, I should say, The thoughts are the apostle's; but the phraseology and composition belong to some one who relates what the apostle said, and as it were comments on the words of his master. But who wrote [i.e. wrote down] the epistle, God only knows. Report which has come down to us, says, either that Clement of Rome wrote it, or that Luke the Evangelist did," p. 87 supra.

Both Bährholdt and Eichhorn have adduced Origen as asserting, that report attributed the epistle to the Hebrews to Luke as the real author; which the context in Origen by no means allows. I cannot but understand him as saying merely, that "the ancients had a report, that either Luke or Clement wrote down the epistle;" which corresponds with the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, Origen's teacher in early life. We have seen that afterwards, among the Latin churches, either Luke, or Clement, was regarded as the real author of this epistle; for so the testimony of Jerome and Philastrius, cited in the preceding section, would seem to indicate.

We have no historical ground, then, on which we can build the opinion that Luke was the author of this epistle. An uncertain tradition of the fourth century is surely insufficient. And even if Origen be understood as asserting, that tradition, in his day, assigned the composition of our epistle to Luke; he also asserts, at the same time, that traditionary testimony was at variance with itself, as one party assigned it to Clement of Rome. He evidently credits neither the one nor the other; at least, not in such a way as to be fully per-
suaded in his own mind; for he says, "Who wrote down the epistle, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς ἔστω ὑμῖν?"

The same uncertainty both Jerome and Philastrius exhibit, in the testimony to which allusion has just been made.

It is no doubt true, that the style of Luke approximates much nearer to that of the epistle to the Hebrews, than the style of the epistle attributed to Barnabas; so that a comparison in this respect, does not lead to so clear and satisfactory a result in this case as in that. But the situation of Luke (born and educated abroad, as he was, and never having resided long in Palestine), would hardly lead one to believe that he was so deeply versed in Rabbinical lore, and in Jewish feelings and modes of thinking, as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews must have been. Besides, it is certain (at least it would seem to be so), from the whole tenor of our epistle, that the author of it must have been a Hebrew. But from Col. iv. 14, comp. iv. 10, it appears plainly that Luke was a Hellenist.

The main difficulty, however, is the want of any external evidence that Luke was the author. And as there are, at least, no internal circumstances or evidence from style which speak much in favor of such an opinion, it must be abandoned as improbable and altogether unsupported.*

(3) Was Clement of Rome the Author?

Origen is the first who mentions Clement as the possible writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. In what sense he does this, has been already considered. Jerome and Philastrius, long afterwards, mention that some in the Latin churches attributed the epistle to the Hebrews to Clement of Rome. The evidence of this from testimony, then, is not entitled to any degree of credit, sufficient to create serious doubts whether Clement may not have been the author.

The internal evidence, drawn from a comparison of the epistle to the Hebrews with Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians, by no means favors the supposition in question. Clement has often cited the epistle to the Hebrews. The manner in which he does this, seems to afford pretty good evidence that he did not write that epistle himself; for, as we have already seen, he appeals to it as Scripture, in order to establish and confirm the sentiments which he is inculcating, and in the same manner as he does elsewhere to the other Scriptures. Is this to be supposed, in case he himself wrote that epistle? Did Clement attribute scriptural authority to his own epistle? Or did the church whom he addressed, attribute scriptural authority to any epistles but to those of an apostle? Does he any where in his letter appeal to other epistles than such? The obvious answer to these inquiries

* Koehler in his Versuch über die Verfassungszeit u. s. w., p. 905, defends the claim of Luke.
determines the question, whether Clement wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in the negative.

But further. The discrepancy of style is so great between the epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews, as to make it sufficiently evident that both did not proceed from the same pen. I refer not merely to the choice of words (although this might be easily shown to be considerable), but to the general spirit and manner of the execution: There is an energy, originality, vividness of conception, and intensity of feeling, displayed everywhere in the epistle to the Hebrews, which is wholly wanting in Clement’s epistle. This is plain, kind, faithful, practical; but it is moderate, comparatively tame, made up of many extracts from the Old Testament and from Paul, and of imitations as close as they could well be of the latter. But what a wide difference there is, after all, between the original writer and the imitator, every one must feel who reads both. The one is a feeble rivulet gliding gently along, which, but for the occasional contributions it receives from other streams, would become absorbed by the earth over which it passes, and cease to flow; the other a mighty stream, overflowing all its banks, supplying with water and fertilizing all the country through which it passes. It really seems to me, that a man might as well mistake a canal on the banks of the Nile for the noble river itself, as mistake Clement for the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.

(4) Was Apollos the Author?

A supposition never made by any of the ancient churches, and first ventured upon, I believe, by Luther, Comm. in Gen. xlvi. 20. Postill. Ecc. Test. S. Johann. Evang. p. 44. But this opinion has since been applauded or defended by Le Clerc, Heumann, Müller, Semler, Ziegler, Bertholdt, Dindorf, Bleek, Feilmoser, DeWette, Credner, Roeth, Reuss, and Tholuck.

The difficulties attending the supposition are, (1) We have no external evidence in favor of it; no voice of antiquity being raised to testify that Apollos has left one single line of any written composition behind him, much less such an epistle as that to the Hebrews. (2) We have no internal evidence of such a fact; for there is no testimony of this nature in the epistle itself; and there can be no evidence drawn from the style of it compared with the style and diction of Apollos, inasmuch as we have no writing of Apollos with which the comparison can be made.

Bleek however urges, (1) That Apollos was “a Jew of Alexandria, eloquent, and well versed in the Scriptures, Acts xviii. 24; 1 Cor. i.—v. His eloquence will account,” he thinks, “for the oratorical manner of our epistle in distinction from that of Paul. He being an Alexandrian, will explain his attachment to types, allegory,
and mystical explanation, etc." But was such a mode of explanation, at that time, limited to Alexandria? And as to "being mighty in the Scriptures," how could a man be called so, who committed so gross and obvious a mistake as Bleek attributes to the writer, in ix. 3, 4 of our epistle? (2) "Apollos was a very zealous advocate for Christianity in opposition to Judaism, Acts xviii. 28." Ans. So was Paul, and so were many others. (3) "Apollos appears to have been intimately connected with Paul, Tit. iii. 13." Ans. So was Timothy, and many others.

The paragraph of Bleek, on this subject, is closed by high commendation of Luther, for "correct critical tact" in making the discovery in question; and in his Review, Bleek has expressed the hope that his view of this subject in his Commentary, § 91, may win more of my regard than I have manifested for it in the first edition of my work.

One thing I very readily concede, viz., that of all the men who have been supposed to be the authors of our epistle (Paul excepted), Apollos appears to have been most peculiarly qualified. The possibility that Apollos wrote it, who will deny? The probability is what most concerns us. How then, among all the conjectures of the ancients (Barnabas, Luke, Clement of Rome), comes it that none of them should ever have hit upon the fortunate conjecture of Luther; and specially when this would seem to be so obvious a one? Why did not Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, vindicate this honor to a native of their own beloved city? Or if you say that Pantaenus and Clement did not do this because they had a preconceived opinion that Paul was the author; why did not Origen (whom Bleek represents as so doubtful about the author of our epistle) hit upon this happy conjecture in respect to his native townsman? And how could it be, that not a trace of such a belief can be found ever to have existed at Alexandria, the native place of Apollos, provided he were really the author of our epistle? Of all the places in the Christian world, at that time, this was the most likely to preserve and perpetuate the honor due to him. And how could it be, that the report of Apollos as being the author should never have reached that place? Somebody certainly did once know who wrote our epistle. The greetings, etc., at the close of it, make it certain that the church to whom it was addressed must have known this. Would not the fame of this have reached Alexandria, the second metropolis of the world? And would not the memory of it have been perpetuated in the noble school there, down to future ages? I do not aver all this to be so; but I must confess, that in the light of such questions, I am obliged to regard the conjecture of Luther as far less probable and happy than it appears to be to Bleek; nay, to believe that it is altogether improbable.

If Bleek should ask, whether the same or the like questions may
not be urged in regard to Paul as the author, I answer that for the most part they may. But then the reply to them will be a different one; and this is, that the churches at Alexandria were uniform in their belief that Paul was the author. I hope he will not take it amiss, therefore, that I feel obliged still to regard the happy conjecture of Luther, as without adequate support, and even against probability.∗

§ 18. In what Language was the Epistle originally written?

On this question there has been a difference of opinion among critics, both in ancient and modern times. Clement of Alexandria says, that “Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke carefully translated it into Greek.” Euseb. Hist. Ecc. VI. 14. Eusebius in the same manner says, that “Paul wrote to the Hebrews in his vernacular language, and that, according to report, either Luke or Clement translated it,” Euseb. III. 28. So Jerome also: “Scripterat ut Hebraeus Hebraeis Hebraice (Catal. vir. illust. voc. Paulus);” and then he adds, that “this epistle was translated into Greek, so that the coloring of the style was made diverse, in this way, from that of Paul’s. Of the same opinion in respect to this, was Clement of Alexandria, Theodoret, Euthalius, Primasius, Johannes Damascenus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others. Origin, as we have seen above, supposes that the thoughts contained in the epistle were Paul’s, while the diction or costume of it must be attributed to the person who wrote down the sentiments of the apostle.

By the Hebrew language, no one can reasonably doubt, these fathers meant the later Hebrew or Aramaean vernacular in Palestine in the days of the apostles.

It is quite plain, also, that these fathers were led to the conclusion that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in the dialect of Palestine, from their belief (so universal in ancient times) of its having been addressed to some church, or to the churches in that country. It was very natural to draw such a conclusion; for would not an epistle addressed to Hebrews, in all probability be more acceptable if written in their own vernacular language? Moreover, Paul was well acquainted with that language, for he was brought up at Jerusalem, and “at the feet of Gamaliel;” and when he visited there, he had addressed the Jewish multitude, who were excited against him, in their native tongue, Acts xxii. 1, 2. Why should it not be supposed, that if (as is probable) our epistle was originally directed to Palestine, it was written in the dialect of that country? So the fathers above quoted evidently thought and reasoned; although

∗ That Silvanus or Silas was the author, has been advocated by Mynster and Boehme, but there is too little probability in their arguments to call for any discussion here.
other fathers have said nothing on this point, and do not appear to have coincided in opinion with those to which I have just referred. Among the moderns, also, several critics have undertaken to defend the same opinion; and particularly Michaelis, who has discussed the subject quite at length, in his introduction to this epistle.

I do not think it necessary minutely to examine his arguments. To my own mind they appear altogether unsatisfactory. Some of them are built on an exegesis most palpably erroneous, and which, if admitted, would deduce a very strange meaning from the words of the epistle. Yet assuming such a meaning, he thence concludes, that the original writer must have expressed a different idea, and that the translator mistook his meaning. He then undertakes to conjecture what the original Hebrew must have been. In other cases, he deduces his arguments from considerations wholly a priori; as if these were admissible, in a question of mere fact. He has not adduced a single instance of what he calls wrong translation, which wears the appearance of any considerable probability.

On the other hand, Bolton, a sharp-sighted critic, and well acquainted with the Aramaean language (who has gone through with the New Testament, and found almost everywhere marks, as he thinks, of translation from Aramaean documents), confesses that, in respect to this epistle, he finds not a single vestige of incorrect translation from an Aramaean original, and no marks that there ever was such an original. This testimony is of considerable importance in respect to the question before us; as it comes from a critic, who spent many years on the study of that which is most intimately connected with the very subject under consideration, viz., the detection of the Aramaean originals of the various parts of the New Testament, Berth. p. 2976.

The principal arguments in favor of a Hebrew original, are deduced from two sources. First, that Hebrews are addressed in our epistle, to whom the Hebrew language would have been more acceptable and intelligible, and many of whom, indeed, could not understand Greek, certainly could not read it. Secondly, that the diversity of style in the epistle to the Hebrews is so great, when compared with Paul's epistles, that, unless we suppose the Greek costume did in fact come from another hand, we must be led to the conclusion that Paul did not write it.

Both of these topics have been already discussed above. I merely add here, therefore, that in case the writer of the epistle designed it should have a wide circulation among the Jews, to write in Greek was altogether the most feasible method of accomplishing this. Besides, if Paul did address it to the church at Cesarea, it is altogether probable that he wrote in Greek, as Greek was the principal language of that city. Even if he did not, it was not necessary that he should write in Hebrew; for in every considerable place in Palestine, there
were more or less who understood the Greek language. Whoever wishes to see this last position established beyond any reasonable doubt, may read Hug's Einleit. in das N. Test. Vol. II. § 10.

When Paul wrote to the Romans, he did not write in Latin; yet there was no difficulty in making his epistle understood, for the knowledge of Greek was very common at Rome. If Paul understood the Latin language (which is nowhere affirmed, and he had not resided, when he wrote our epistle, in any of the countries where it was commonly used), still he understood Greek so much better, that he would of course prefer writing in it.

For a similar reason, if no other could be given, one may regard it as more probable, that he would write the epistle to the Hebrews in the Greek language. At the time of writing it, he had been abroad probably as much as twenty-five years, in Greek countries, and had been in Palestine, during all that period, only a few days. The Jews abroad whom he everywhere saw, spoke Greek, not Hebrew. In Greek he preached and conversed. Is it any wonder, then, that after twenty-five years incessant labor of preaching, conversing, and writing in this language, he should have preferred writing in it? Indeed can it be probable, that, under circumstances like these, he still possessed an equal facility of writing in his native dialect of Palestine?

I cannot think it strange, therefore, that although the epistle to the Hebrews was in all probability directed to some part of Palestine, yet it was written by Paul in Greek, and not in Hebrew. But, whatever may be the estimation put upon arguments of this nature, there are internal marks of its having been originally composed in Greek, which cannot well be overlooked. Let us examine them.

Some of the arguments, produced by those who maintain that the original language of our epistle was Greek, it must be acknowledged, do not seem to be well founded. To such belong the following: viz., "Instances of paronomasia occur in this epistle; which necessarily implies, that it was originally composed in its present language." For example; Heb. viii. 8, ἐὰν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐν πάση τῆς ἡμέρας. v. 14, πρὸς διάκρισιν καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας. vii. 3, ἀπάτωρ, αμύθωρ. ix. 10, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς ἡμέρας. xii. 14, ὅπως ἐξέκομεν διὸ ἐν τῷ σῶμα πόλεως, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν ἑλληνικὴν ἑπίσκεψιν ἐπιτίθεται. vii. 22, κρατέρων διαδήλωσις γέγονεν ἐγγὺς Ἰησοῦς, comp. v. 19, ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ θεῷ. x. 34, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ὑπὸ μι- χρῷ μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ Χαμάν προσδεόμενος, γινώσκων ἐκεῖν ἐν ἐνα- τοῖς κρατέρων ὑπὸ ἀρχιερέως ἐν φυλακῇ. See Eich. § 270. Bertholdt, p. 2987, who has only repeated the same things which Eichhorn had before said.

Of these instances, that only from x. 34 seems to betray any real marks of design; and even here, the marks are by no means of a decisive nature. Every one who will examine any Greek writing whatever, may find in it more or less of apparent paronomasia in the
same way, without any difficulty; and this, where the author had no intention of exhibiting it. Whether an author really designed to exhibit paronomasia or not, will in general be very apparent. I cannot perceive that any one of the alleged paronomasias in question, really appears to be the effect of design. If they are altogether accidental, they must have occurred in the Hebrews, even if its present language is merely that of a translation. In fact, even designed paronomasias may, not unfrequently, occur in a translation. The argument in favor of the Greek being the original language of the epistle to the Hebrews, built on such instances of paronomasia as the above (where, in most cases, it is a mere homophony of like tenses or cases), is too uncertain and too slender to be rested on, as a proper support of the opinion in question.

But there are better arguments than such, to prove that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Greek. They are derived from the manner in which the quotations from the Old Testament are made and employed in our epistle.

(1) The author has, nearly throughout, quoted the Sept. version, and followed it in some cases, even where it differs somewhat from the Hebrew. This, indeed, might be done to a certain extent by a translator. For example: if Paul had appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures, and cited passages from them, the translator might have taken the corresponding passages in his Greek Bible. It might easily be supposed that it would have been very natural for him to do so, in all cases where there was no considerable difference between the original Hebrew and the Greek version. This argument, therefore, cannot be much relied on. But it is further alleged,

(2) That the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has cited and employed the Sept. version, in order to illustrate his positions, in cases where the Septuagint does not correspond with the original Hebrew. For example; Heb. i. 6, Let all the angels of God worship him, is quoted, in order to show that the Son of God is superior to the angels. If this be quoted (as is more generally supposed) from Ps. cxlvii. 7, the context there seems to indicate, that the subject is the superiority of Jehovah to idol-gods, not of Christ to the angels. Instead of “Let all the angels of God worship him,” the Hebrew runs thus, “Worship him, all ye gods;” and so our English translation has it. If the quotation be made from Deut. xxxii. 43 (as some have supposed), then is the argument still stronger; for in the original Hebrew there is not a vestige of the passage quoted; it is found only in the Septuagint. In either case the force of the appeal seems to rest on the Sept. version, rather than on the original Hebrew. Of course the writer must be supposed to have used that version, in his original composition, by all those who hold that he appeals in this case to a passage of the Old Testament. Such is the usual form of this
argument; but as I have doubts whether the Psalm is not *Messianic*, I cannot attribute so much to dependence here on the Septuagint.

(3) It is said that the writer, in Chap. ii., appeals to Ps. viii., in order to prove that the Son of God must possess a human nature, which should be exalted above that of angels, and placed at the head of the creation. But the phrase in Hebrew, *Thou hast made him a little below the Elohim*, is rendered by the Septuagint, *Thou hast made him for a little time [or a little] lower than the angels*; rendering ἄγγελοι angels, which, to say the least, is an unusual sense of the word. Yet on the sense of the version in the Septuagint, turns the force of the proof that Christ was, in his human nature, superior to the angels. But as it has now come to be conceded, that ἄγγελοι may mean angels (see Ges. Thesaurus Ling. Heb. in voc.), I should not lay much stress on this argument.

(4) In chap. vii., the writer has translated the appellations, Melchizedek, king of Salem, and told at length what they mean in Greek. It is possible that such a thing might be done by a translator; but then the explanation, in this case, appears to be interwoven with the discourse itself, and to be a prima manu.

(5) In chap. ix. 16, 17, Christ is said, in reference to the old covenant under Moses, to be the mediator of a new and better covenant, רבי, in Greek διαθήκη. But from the double meaning of διαθήκη in Greek, viz., covenant and testament, the writer takes occasion, having mentioned the death of Jesus, to observe that the new διαθήκη has received its full confirmation, viz., as a testament, by the death of the testator; and that he may the more effectually remove all offence at the death of Jesus, he goes on to say, that a διαθήκη, i.e., testament (for now he uses the word in this sense), has no force while the testator is living. Of course the death of Jesus was necessary to ratify the new διαθήκη; and it did in fact ratify and establish it, to all intents and purposes.

Now this reasoning seems to depend on the two-fold sense of the word διαθήκη in Greek; for the original רבי, in Hebrew, never has the sense of testament or will. The Greek word διαθήκη has, indeed, been adopted into the Rabbinic Hebrew, and sounds רבי. But that it belonged to the Hebrew language in Paul’s day, there is no certain proof; and even if there were, רבי must have been the only word to which he referred, for רבי is an appropriate word to designate the Abrahamic and Mosaic dispensations or the old covenants. Of course the writer’s illustration seems to depend on the two-fold meaning of the Greek word διαθήκη; and consequently his language must have been Greek.

(6) In chap. x. 3 seq. the writer undertakes to show that the sacrifice of Christ was not only necessary, in order to make expiation for sin, but that it was predicted in the Psalms that he should make such an offering. In proof of this, he quotes the Septuagint version,
A body hast thou prepared for me, Ps. xxxix. 6; (xl. 7), viz., a body for an offering or expiatory sacrifice. Compare now Ps. xl. 7, where the Hebrew runs thus, תְּמֹאֵת כְּפָרָה, mine ears hast thou opened or bored, i.e., thou hast made me obedient. But it is the Septuagint version which appears to give direct occasion for the specific allegation of the writer, viz., that Christ had made an offering of himself as a propitiatory sacrifice.

Other instances of a similar nature have been produced by critics from our epistle; but as they are less striking, and may admit of some doubt, I have thought it best to exclude them. These are sufficient to show, that as the nature, or at least the form, of the proof or argument which the writer brings forward, depends, in some respects, on the form of the Septuagint version, so it is probable that he must have written in Greek and appealed to the Greek version; for it is improbable to the last degree, that if the epistle had been written in Hebrew, he would have appealed to any but the original Hebrew Scriptures when addressing those who were acquainted with them.

Whatever difficulties the theologian or the interpreter may find, in reconciling these facts with the method of arguing which he may suppose appropriate to an inspired writer, it cannot alter the facts themselves. These seem not to be matters of conjecture. And admitting this, we are compelled to draw the conclusion, that the original language of our epistle must have been Greek.*

I would add, that the vivid coloring and animation of the whole epistle, the impassioned and energetic expression of it, and its native, unconstrained appearance, all contribute to prove that it was originally written in the same language in which it now appears.

* Ehrard well says: "There is nowhere the faintest trace of an Aramaic original of the epistle to the Hebrews; and our Greek epistle to the Hebrews is, in fine, so original throughout, so evidently thought in Greek both in form and import, that the supposition of its having arisen from an Aramaic original becomes at once an impossibility."—App. Chap. iii. p. 392.
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SUMMARY OF WHAT IS CONTAINED IN THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS.

The writer of this epistle is a Hebrew, and addresses his Hebrew
brethren who had made a profession of the Christian religion. Nothing
can be plainer, than that those addressed are considered as being
in danger of apostasy from that religion. To warn them against this
danger is the principal object of our epistle. In order to do this, the
writer proceeds to lay before them the aggravated guilt and the awful
doom of those who make defection from Christianity; to direct their
views towards that crown of glory which fadeth not away, and which
is reserved in heaven for all who persevere, even to the end of life, in
their fidelity to Christ; to put them on their guard against the various
enticements of sin which might allure them from the path of Christian
duty; and especially to guard them against relapsing into superstiti-
ous views, respecting the importance and necessity of ceremonial
rites and sacrifices of the Levitical institutions, and against being in-
duced by these to relax their confidence in Jesus and in his atoning
sacrifice.

To these last sources of danger the Hebrew Christians were particu-
larly exposed. Nothing could well be more magnificent and imposing
than the temple worship, as practised by the Jews of the later age.
The temple, built after their return from the captivity, was not, in
deed, so rich in ornament as that which Solomon had built. But it
had, at a vast expense, been greatly extended and beautified by
Herod. It was regarded by all the Jews as the peculiar dwelling-
place of Jehovah—the only one in which he designed to manifest
himself on earth. The Jewish nation, also, habitually regarded them-
selves as the only one to whom God had made a special revelation.
The worship practised in the temple had been instituted by Moses
under divine guidance, and continued with but partial interruptions
for about 1500 years. All the exterior of this worship was adapted to strike the eye and impress the mind of the beholder. The awfulness of the place in which it was celebrated, the magnificent costume of the priests, the spacious and lofty apartment in which they officiated, the solemn part which he who offered any sacrifice was himself called to perform, above all, the apprehension that full pardon for sin and reconciliation to God were obtained by the rites and offerings which the law prescribed, contributed to make deep and lasting impressions on the mind of all Hebrews, who seriously exercised their thoughts on the subject of religion and paid their devotions in the temple. All their education, from the first dawning of the youthful mind, had a direct tendency to confirm and strengthen those impressions. Never was a nation more enthusiastically attached to its customs, rites, and country, than were the Jews. They looked abroad upon other nations as outcasts from God, and unworthy of his paternal kindness and blessing.

The New Testament is full of evidence adapted to show the correctness of this statement. The disputes which the extension of Christian privileges to the Gentiles occasioned among the first Jewish converts, the reluctance with which the former were admitted to participate in them, and the repeated, violent, and long protracted opposition that was made to abandoning the peculiar rites of the Mosaic institutions, all contribute to evince how deeply engraven upon the mind of every Jew was the impression, that the laws of Moses were never to be changed, and that the Messiah himself was rather to restore and modify than to repeal them.

In such a state of mind had the Christian converts, whom the writer of our epistle addressed, once been. What wonder, now, if they were exposed from this quarter to be shaken in their attachment to the new religion which they had professed, and which confessedly gave up all confidence in the religious rites of the Levitical institutions? Temptations from without also assailed them. Their unbelieving Hebrew brethren argued with them, opposed them, ridiculed them, made powerful appeals to all the feelings with which their birth, education, and former worship had inspired them, persecuted them, traduced them to the heathen magistrates, and excommunicated them. They suffered the loss of property, and of liberty. Their lives were threatened. The coming of Christ, which they had supposed would speedily take place for their deliverance, was delayed. How could it be, that human frailty, joined with former prejudices and present sufferings, should not exercise a dangerous influence upon them?
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In this state the apostle saw them to be, and set himself about the important and difficult work of correcting their errors, and encouraging their desponding minds. How was this to be done with the greatest probability of success? Plainly arguments and considerations of such a nature as were best adapted to meet the difficulties with which they were contending, were those to which he would most readily resort. And throughout the whole epistle it is manifest that he has done this, with consummate skill, judgment, and force.

As the greatest of all the dangers to which the Hebrew converts were exposed, was that which resulted from their former religious attachments and prejudices, excited and augmented as they daily were by the efforts of their unbelieving Jewish brethren; so the writer of our epistle employs his principal force, in order to preclude or avert this danger. Other topics are subordinate with him. Although they are often touched upon, and with great skill and power, yet they are so interwoven with the main object before him, that they are in a measure concealed from the first view of a hasty reader.

The general plan of the epistle may be briefly represented. It consists in a comparison of the new dispensation with the old, and in pointing out the various grounds of preference which belong to the new. From this superiority of the new dispensation various arguments are deduced, in order to show the importance of cleaving to the Christian profession instead of reverting back to Judaism, which latter could not now be the means of saving those who embraced it. Considerations of such a nature are repeated, as often as the comparisons introduced afford occasion for them. This accounts for the repetition of hortatory addresses, so often found in our epistle.

The Jews gloried in their dispensation, because angels had been employed as mediators of it when the law was given at Sinai. In their view, this stamped a high and heavenly honor upon it. Our author does not attack their views of this subject, but he commences his epistle by showing that Christ, the mediator and head of the new dispensation, as it regards his name, his rank, his dominion, his creative and eternal power, is superior to the angels, 1:1—14. On this ground, then, Christianity may claim a precedence; and hence he exhorts them to give their most earnest attention to it, 2:1—4.

Nor can they object to the superiority of the Messiah, that he possessed a human nature, while the angels are spiritual and heavenly beings. For in his human nature he is Lord of the universe, 2:5—10. It was this nature, too, which gave him a nearer and more endearing sympathy with his followers; and by taking this upon him,
he was enabled to make an expiatory offering for sin by his death; so that he is now fitted not only to exercise compassion toward men, but to save them from the bondage of sin and from its condemning power, 2:11-18.

Having thus disposed of this topic, he next proceeds to compare Jesus, the head of the new, with Moses, the head of the ancient dispensation. Like Moses, he was set over the house of God and entrusted with it, and was faithful to his trust. But the honor due to Jesus is as much more than that due to Moses, as the builder of a house is worthy of more honor than the house itself. Christ, too, was set over God's house as a Son, but Moses only as a servant, 3:1-6.

If now the Israelites of old were solemnly admonished to hearken to the precepts given under the Mosaic dispensation, then surely believers in Christ may be more solemnly urged to beware of disobedience to his injunction, 3:7-19. And this warning holds good, and is applicable in all respects, because the rest which was promised to believers in ancient times, and was lost through unbelief, is still proffered to all who believe in Jesus and persevere in their profession, and only to such, 4:1-10. Awful commination is indeed still uttered against those who are guilty of apostasy, 4:11-13.

Thus much for the comparison of Christ with Moses. Next, the writer proceeds to compare Jesus, as a priest, with the Jewish priesthood, and particularly with the high priest, the most dignified of all who were invested with the sacerdotal office.

He first introduces Christ as a compassionate high priest, and exalted to the highest dignity in the heavens, 4:14-16. Next, he states the various things which are attached to the priesthood, as existing among the sons of Levi. (1) A high priest must present oblations and sacrifices, 5:1. (2) He must be compassionate and sympathetic towards others, and especially so, as he is himself frail and erring, 5:2, 3. (3) He must be appointed of God to this office, 5:4.

In all these respects he now goes on to make a comparison of Jesus, the high priest of Christianity, and to show his superiority to the Jewish priests.

First, Christ was divinely appointed a priest, and that of the highest order, 5:5, 6.

Secondly, Christ, our great high priest, was encompassed with human infirmity, like other priests, but by this he was fitted to exercise compassionate sympathy, 5:7, 8. After he had suffered, he was exalted to glory, and became a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, 5:9, 10.
The difficulty of the subject now suggested, affords an occasion for the writer to advert to the state of religious ignorance in which those were whom he addressed, 5:11—14; to exhort them to come out of it, and to warn them against the fearful danger that would result from not doing so, 6:1—8. To this he subjoins commendation, as to some things, and powerful motives of encouragement to go on in their Christian course, 6:9—20.

He now resumes the subject of Melchizedek, shows the superiority of his priesthood over that of the sons of Levi, 7:1—10, and then argues that Christ, who was a perpetual priest of the like order with Melchizedek, must of course be superior to the Jewish priests, 7:11—25.

Christ, too, as high priest, differs in one important respect from the Jewish priests, namely, in that he needed no sacrifice for himself as an erring sinful man like the sons of Levi, but was sinless and perfect, yea, even exalted to a state of supreme glory, 7:26—28.

The great object, however, at which the writer aims in the sequel of his epistle, is to show that the high priest of Christianity officiates in heaven for his followers, 8:1, 2. The Jewish priests perform their functions in a temple, which is merely an image of the heavenly, 8:3—6.

The new covenant, of which Jesus is mediator, is altogether superior to the old, 8:6—13. The ordinances and apparatus of service attached to this, were all mere types of heavenly things, 9:1—10. The services themselves were imperfect as to the end attained by them, since they accomplished nothing more than external purification; but the blood of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, sanctifies internally, and procures eternal redemption and an everlasting inheritance, for all the chosen of God in every age of the world, 9:11—15. (If the new covenant be examined in another light, namely, one in which another signification of the word בִּשְׁמַש, testament, might occasion us to examine it, it may be regarded as made valid by the death of Jesus, and thus securing an inheritance to the people of God, 9:16, 17). Because the blood of Christ was to sanction the new covenant, therefore the first covenant (בִּשְׁמַש), with all the apparatus attached to it, was sanctioned by blood (which is the emblem of death), 9:18—22. If the earthly sanctuary was thus consecrated, then the heavenly one must be so by a sacrifice of a still higher nature, 9:23, 24. Sacrifices in the earthly temple must be often repeated; but the sacrifice of Christ did once for all accomplish the great purposes for which it was offered, 9:24—28.
Indeed, no legal sacrifices could make any real atonement for sin, 10:1-4; therefore Christ voluntarily offered himself as a sin offering, entirely and forever to effect this, 10:5-18.

Thus is completed the comparison of Christ, and of his functions as a priest in the heavenly tabernacle, with the Jewish priests and their functions in the earthly tabernacle. In all respects, Jesus, the high priest of the Christian religion, appears greatly superior.

The writer now proceeds to various bold and powerful exhortations, mixed with awful warnings against defection from the Christian religion, 10:19-31. He sets before them the effects of persevering faith in the ancient patriarchs, prophets, and distinguished worthies, 11:1-40. This he follows up with continued exhortations and encouragements and warnings, 12:1-29; and then closes his epistle with divers practical directions, cautions, and salutations, 13:1-25.

Such is the brief view of the course of thought and reasoning in our epistle. It is plain that there are three great points of comparison in it, which constitute the main object at which the writer aims, in order that he may show the superiority of Christianity over Judaism.

I. The superiority of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, over angels who were employed as mediators when the old covenant was established, chap. I. II.

II. The superiority of Christ, the head of the new dispensation, over Moses, the head of the old, chap. III. IV.

III. The superiority of Christ as high priest of the new dispensation, and of the services which he performs, over the priesthood of the Mosaic institution, and all the services which were appropriate to their office, 5:1-10:18.

Exhortations, warnings, reproofs, and encouragements, are intermixed in some manner with the main discussions, e.g. 2:1-4; 3:1; 3:7-4:16; 4:11-6:20; but from 10:19, to the end of the epistle, nearly all is of the nature just described; so that about one half of the epistle is of a parenetical or hortatory nature.

In judging of the relevancy and importance of the subjects discussed in our epistle, it is very plain that we are not to make up an opinion deduced merely from viewing the present necessities and condition of Christians. We were not born Jews, nor educated as such. We have none of their prejudices, peculiar sympathies, temptations, and trials. What was adapted to them, in the days of Paul, and under the circumstances above described, — nay, what was absolutely indispensable for their instruction, reproof, and confirmation, — may, in many respects, be scarcely appropriate to us in our condition and circumstances. Such
is indeed the fact, in regard to many of the things introduced into the epistle to the Hebrews, as I shall have occasion hereafter repeatedly to notice. But who that judges with any good degree of candor and fairness, would ever think of bringing it as an accusation against our author, that he has inserted in his epistle that which was altogether appropriate to those whom he addressed, although it may not and does not have an equal bearing upon all times and nations? Surely the last ground of just accusation which can be advanced against any writer, is, that "he has written in a manner peculiarly adapted to accomplish the end for which he wrote." In what a different plight would the world of authors be, if all of them were justly liable to such an imputation!

Of necessity, now, many things addressed to the Jews of Paul's day, are comparatively inapplicable to us. So far, however, as our circumstances agree with theirs in any respect, just so far the spirit of what was said to them will apply to us. So far as what was said to them was founded in general Christian truths and principles, just so far we may be instructed and guided by it. Consequently the epistle, while it contains many things appropriate only to the Hebrews of early times, also contains many which can never cease to interest the church of God while Christianity exists in the world.

These general views may serve to aid the critical student, in commencing the exegetical study of our epistle. The more particular detail of what is here hinted, is reserved for the introductions to various parts of the epistle, which are inserted (pro re natâ) in the body of the Commentary which follows.
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CHAPTERS I. 1—II. 4.

Christ as the author of the new revelation which God had made to men, and in contrast with the revelations by the prophets, I. 1; is Lord of the world, which indeed he also created, I. 2; the true image of God, and the representative of his glory and perfections to men; and having made atonement for the sins of men, is exalted to the highest majesty in the heavens, I. 3. This mediator of the new is exalted above angels, who were the mediators of the ancient dispensation. The name, Son, by which he is addressed, has never been bestowed upon them, I. 4, 5. He is the object of worship by the angels; while they are employed only as the swift and ready messengers of God, I. 6, 7. The King Messiah has an eternal and righteous dominion; and is elevated, on account of his love of righteousness, to honor and happiness above all other kings, I. 8, 9. He, too, is addressed by one of the sacred writers, as the creator of the heavens and the earth, and as immutable and imperishable, I. 10—12. But no exaltation to such dominion is conferred upon angels, I. 13; they are only ministerial agents, employed for the good of those who are to be heirs of the salvation which Christ bestows, I. 14.

If such be the dignity and elevation of the Messiah, then surely the attentive consideration of all which he addresses to his followers, may be justly demanded. Obedience to the ancient revelation was enforced by just and unavoidable penalties; how can the neglect of the new and more perfect one go unpunished, II. 1—2. Especially must this be the case, since it was promulgated by Christ himself, in person, and was confirmed, on the part of God, by a great variety of wondrous miracles and gifts, II. 3, 4.

CHAP. I.

Ἡ πρὸς Εβραίων ἐπιστολή. Respecting this title, see p. 15. 1. seq.

(1) Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, literally in many parts and in various ways. Of the Greek commentators some give a different sense to each of the words; e. g., Theodoret, πολυμερῶς —τὰς παντοδαπὰς ἀκομνής σημαίνει, τὸ δὲ πολυτρόπως, τῶν θειῶν ὅπποιν το διάφορον, i. e., πολυμερῶς signifies the various dispensions, but πολυτρόπως the diversity of divine visions. Theophylact interprets the words in question, by διάφορος καὶ πολυτρόπως, diversely and in various ways. But Chrysostom expresses the sense of both words, by διάφορος simply. Modern commentators are divided in the same manner. The Greek idiom allows either mode of interpretation; and precedents may be found for each. See Schleusner on the words; and compare Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 4. p. 331. V. 6. p. 667, ed. Potter; also VI. 7 where the words in question are used respecting a revelation. If the two words be construed separately, then πολυμερῶς
should be interpreted as referring to the matter of ancient revelation, given in different parts and at different times, thus conveying the idea of the gradual development of truth in different ages and by different persons; and πολυμερός must be understood as indicating the various ways in which these revelations were communicated, i.e., by dreams, visions, symbols, Urim Thummim, prophetic ecstasy, etc. But if both words were regarded as being used only to designate with intensity the variety of ancient revelations (and such a mode of phraseology is very common both in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures), then the whole may be paraphrased thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications in many different ways by the prophets to the fathers, hath, etc.' The word πολυμερός does not, of itself, signify sundry times; but still, the idea of various parts or portions, which it does properly signify, may very naturally be understood as implying diverse times at which, or occasions on which, the different parts of revelation were communicated; or the idea of πολυμερός may be simply that of repetition, so that it may be translated by often. But some critics refer both words merely to the variety of matter or doctrines comprised in ancient revelation. But what becomes of the antithesis with the latter part of the verse, in this way of interpretation? Is there a less variety of subjects touched on by the New Testament, than by the Old?

The writer evidently designs to present an antithesis between the manner of the ancient and the Christian dispensation. This antithesis is rendered more striking, if we understand the first clause in the verse thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications to the fathers by the prophets, in sundry parts and in various ways, has now made a revelation to us by his Son;' i.e., he has completed the whole revelation, which he intends to make under the new dispensation, by his Son only, and not by a long continued series of prophets, as of old. The apostles, and other inspired writers of the New Testament, received their communications from the Son, who gave them the Holy Spirit, Matt. xi. 27, comp. John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; and facts show that the Christian revelation was completed, during that generation which was contemporary with the Saviour, when he dwelt on earth.

Πᾶλαι, in ancient times; for communications by prophets to the Jews had ceased, since the time of Malachi and his contemporaries, i.e., for the space of about four hundred years. Hence the writer avoids using an expression which would imply that revelations had been continued down to the time then present. By πᾶλαι he evidently means to designate the whole time, during
which communications of the divine will were continued under the former dispensation.

Δια λαλήσας most commonly designates oral communication. But since the writer here affirms, that God had spoken (λαλήσας) ποιητρόπφες, it must of course be understood (as indeed it is often used), to designate the more general idea of communication made in any manner, by visions, symbols, etc., as well as by voices, see ii. 2; ix. 19, etc.

Ancestors, τοῖς πατράσι. We might naturally expect that ἡμῶν would be subjoined; but Paul commonly uses the word πατράσι in the sense just quoted, without the pronoun annexed. See Rom. ix. 5; xi. 28; xv. 8.

By the prophets, Ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. The frequent use of ἐν with the Dat. instead of διά with the Gen., in the N. Test., is Hebraism; for ἐν corresponds to the Hebrew רְשַׁע, which is employed with great latitude of signification, and in cases of the same nature as that in question; e. g., Hosea i. 2, the word of the Lord by Hosea, יְשַׁע. Only an occasional use of ἐν in this way is found in classical Greek writers, e. g., Thucyd. VII. 11, what has been done before, γε ην ὄλλας πολλάς ἐποιεῖτο, by many other letters.

Προφήταις in the language of the New Testament means, not only those who predict future events, but all who are employed by God to make religious communications of any kind to his people, and here, all of those by whom the O. T. revelation was made.

Ἐν τοξάτω τῶν ἡμῶν—many copies read ἐν τοξάτω τῶν ἡμῶν. The Seventy use both forms of expression, as a translation of the Hebrew בְּהָעִיסָים, and it is a matter of indifference, as to the sense of the text, which reading is adopted.

In the Old Testament, בְּהָעִיסָים, בְּהָעִיסָים, בְּהָעִיסָים, are often employed synonymously; and all of them to designate the general idea of hereafter, at a future time. Whether this future time be more or less remote, depends entirely on the context and scope of the passage; see Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30; Prov. xxxi. 25. But בְּהָעִיסָים, in particular, is used to denote the future period in which the Messiah (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) was to appear; Is. ii. 2; Hos. iii. 5; Micah iv. 1, Joel iii. 1 [ii. 28], κεῖται. This phrase (as it would seem from the usage in these places), early passed into a kind of technical designation of the time of the Messiah, or the New dispensation. Thus Rabbi Nachmanides on (Gen. xlix. 1) says, “All our doctors agree, that בְּהָעִיסָים means the time of the Messiah.” That this use of the phrase was already an established one in the time of our Saviour, is abundantly evident from the frequent
for about 1500 years. All the exterior of this worship was adapted to strike the eye and impress the mind of the beholder. The awfulness of the place in which it was celebrated, the magnificent costume of the priests, the spacious and lofty apartment in which they officiated, the solemn part which he who offered any sacrifice was himself called to perform, above all, the apprehension that full pardon for sin and reconciliation to God were obtained by the rites and offerings which the law prescribed, contributed to make deep and lasting impressions on the mind of all Hebrews, who seriously exercised their thoughts on the subject of religion and paid their devotions in the temple. All their education, from the first dawning of the youthful mind, had a direct tendency to confirm and strengthen these impressions. Never was a nation more enthusiastically attached to its customs, rites, and country, than were the Jews. They looked abroad upon other nations as outcasts from God, and unworthy of his paternal kindness and blessing.

The New Testament is full of evidence adapted to show the correctness of this statement. The disputes which the extension of Christian privileges to the Gentiles occasioned among the first Jewish converts, the reluctance with which the former were admitted to participate in them, and the repeated, violent, and long protracted opposition that was made to abandoning the peculiar rites of the Mosaic institutions, all contribute to evince how deeply engraven upon the mind of every Jew was the impression, that the laws of Moses were never to be changed, and that the Messiah himself was rather to restore and modify than to repeal them.

In such a state of mind had the Christian converts, whom the writer of our epistle addressed, once been. What wonder, now, if they were exposed from this quarter to be shaken in their attachment to the new religion which they had professed, and which confessedly gave up all confidence in the religious rites of the Levitical institutions? Temptations from without also assailed them. Their unbelieving Hebrew brethren argued with them, opposed them, ridiculed them, made powerful appeals to all the feelings with which their birth, education, and former worship had inspired them, persecuted them, traduced them to the heathen magistrates, and excommunicated them. They suffered the loss of property, and of liberty. Their lives were threatened. The coming of Christ, which they had supposed would speedily take place for their deliverance, was delayed. How could it be, that human frailty, joined with former prejudices and present sufferings, should not exercise a dangerous influence upon them?
In this state the apostle saw them to be, and set himself about the important and difficult work of correcting their errors, and encouraging their desponding minds. How was this to be done with the greatest probability of success? Plainly arguments and considerations of such a nature as were best adapted to meet the difficulties with which they were contending, were those to which he would most readily resort. And throughout the whole epistle it is manifest that he has done this, with consummate skill, judgment, and force.

As the greatest of all the dangers to which the Hebrew converts were exposed, was that which resulted from their former religious attachments and prejudices, excited and augmented as they daily were by the efforts of their unbelieving Jewish brethren; so the writer of our epistle employs his principal force, in order to preclude or avert this danger. Other topics are subordinate with him. Although they are often touched upon, and with great skill and power, yet they are so interwoven with the main object before him, that they are in a measure concealed from the first view of a hasty reader.

The general plan of the epistle may be briefly represented. It consists in a comparison of the new dispensation with the old, and in pointing out the various grounds of preference which belong to the new. From this superiority of the new dispensation various arguments are deduced, in order to show the importance of cleaving to the Christian profession instead of reverting back to Judaism, which latter could not now be the means of saving those who embraced it. Considerations of such a nature are repeated, as often as the comparisons introduced afford occasion for them. This accounts for the repetition of hortatory addresses, so often found in our epistle.

The Jews gloriéd in their dispensation, because angels had been employed as mediators of it when the law was given at Sinai. In their view, this stamped a high and heavenly honor upon it. Our author does not attack their views of this subject, but he commences his epistle by showing that Christ, the mediator and head of the new dispensation, as it regards his name, his rank, his dominion, his creative and eternal power, is superior to the angels, 1:1—14. On this ground, then, Christianity may claim a precedence; and hence he exhorts them to give their most earnest attention to it, 2:1—4.

Nor can they object to the superiority of the Messiah, that he possessed a human nature, while the angels are spiritual and heavenly beings. For in his human nature he is Lord of the universe, 2:5—10. It was this nature, too, which gave him a nearer and more endearing sympathy with his followers; and by taking this upon him,
he was enabled to make an expiatory offering for sin by his death; so that he is now fitted not only to exercise compassion toward men, but to save them from the bondage of sin and from its condemning power, 2:11—18.

Having thus disposed of this topic, he next proceeds to compare Jesus, the head of the new, with Moses, the head of the ancient dispensation. Like Moses, he was set over the house of God and entrusted with it, and was faithful to his trust. But the honor due to Jesus is as much more than that due to Moses, as the builder of a house is worthy of more honor than the house itself. Christ, too, was set over God's house as a Son, but Moses only as a servant, 3:1—6.

If now the Israelites of old were solemnly admonished to hearken to the precepts given under the Mosaic dispensation, then surely believers in Christ may be more solemnly urged to beware of disobedience to his injunction, 3:7—19. And this warning holds good, and is applicable in all respects, because the rest which was promised to believers in ancient times, and was lost through unbelief, is still offered to all who believe in Jesus and persevere in their profession, and only to such, 4:1—10. Awful commination is indeed still uttered against those who are guilty of apostasy, 4:11—13.

Thus much for the comparison of Christ with Moses. Next, the writer proceeds to compare Jesus, as a priest, with the Jewish priesthood, and particularly with the high priest, the most dignified of all who were invested with the sacerdotal office.

He first introduces Christ as a compassionate high priest, and exalted to the highest dignity in the heavens, 4:14—16. Next, he states the various things which are attached to the priesthood, as existing among the sons of Levi. (1) A high priest must present oblations and sacrifices, 5:1. (2) He must be compassionate and sympathetic towards others, and especially so, as he is himself frail and erring, 5:2, 3. (3) He must be appointed of God to this office, 5:4.

In all these respects he now goes on to make a comparison of Jesus, the high priest of Christianity, and to show his superiority to the Jewish priests.

First, Christ was divinely appointed a priest, and that of the highest order, 5:5, 6.

Secondly, Christ, our great high priest, was encompassed with human infirmity, like other priests, but by this he was fitted to exercise compassionate sympathy, 5:7, 8. After he had suffered, he was exalted to glory, and became a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, 5:9, 10.
THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The difficulty of the subject now suggested, affords an occasion for the writer to advert to the state of religious ignorance in which those were whom he addressed, 5:11—14; to exhort them to come out of it, and to warn them against the fearful danger that would result from not doing so, 6:1—8. To this he subjoins commendation, as to some things, and powerful motives of encouragement to go on in their Christian course, 6:9—20.

He now resumes the subject of Melchizedek, shows the superiority of his priesthood over that of the sons of Levi, 7:1—10, and then argues that Christ, who was a perpetual priest of the like order with Melchizedek, must of course be superior to the Jewish priests, 7:11—25.

Christ, too, as high priest, differs in one important respect from the Jewish priests, namely, in that he needed no sacrifice for himself as an erring sinful man like the sons of Levi, but was sinless and perfect, yea, even exalted to a state of supreme glory, 7:26—28.

The great object, however, at which the writer aims in the sequel of his epistle, is to show that the high priest of Christianity officiates in heaven for his followers, 8:1, 2. The Jewish priests perform their functions in a temple, which is merely an image of the heavenly, 8:3—6.

The new covenant, of which Jesus is mediator, is altogether superior to the old, 8:6—13. The ordinances and apparatus of service attached to this, were all mere types of heavenly things, 9:1—10. The services themselves were imperfect as to the end attained by them, since they accomplished nothing more than external purification; but the blood of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, sanctifies internally, and procures eternal redemption and an everlasting inheritance, for all the chosen of God in every age of the world, 9:11—15. (If the new covenant be examined in another light, namely, one in which another signification of the word σπαρακλησία, testament, might occasion us to examine it, it may be regarded as made valid by the death of Jesus, and thus securing an inheritance to the people of God, 9:16, 17). Because the blood of Christ was to sanction the new covenant, therefore the first covenant (σπαρακλησία), with all the apparatus attached to it, was sanctioned by blood (which is the emblem of death), 9:18—22. If the earthly sanctuary was thus consecrated, then the heavenly one must be so by a sacrifice of a still higher nature, 9:23, 24. Sacrifices in the earthly temple must be often repeated; but the sacrifice of Christ did once for all accomplish the great purposes for which it was offered, 9:24—28.
Indeed, no legal sacrifices could make any real atonement for sin, 10:1—4; therefore Christ voluntarily offered himself as a sin offering, entirely and forever to effect this, 10:5—18.

Thus is completed the comparison of Christ, and of his functions as a priest in the heavenly tabernacle, with the Jewish priests and their functions in the earthly tabernacle. In all respects, Jesus, the high priest of the Christian religion, appears greatly superior.

The writer now proceeds to various bold and powerful exhortations, mixed with awful warnings against defection from the Christian religion, 10:19—31. He sets before them the effects of persevering faith in the ancient patriarchs, prophets, and distinguished worthies, 11:1—40. This he follows up with continued exhortations and encouragements and warnings, 12:1—29; and then closes his epistle with divers practical directions, cautions, and salutations, 13:1—25.

Such is the brief view of the course of thought and reasoning in our epistle. It is plain that there are three great points of comparison in it, which constitute the main object at which the writer aims, in order that he may show the superiority of Christianity over Judaism.

I. The superiority of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, over angels who were employed as mediators when the old covenant was established, chap. i. II.

II. The superiority of Christ, the head of the new dispensation, over Moses, the head of the old, chap. iii. iv.

III. The superiority of Christ as high priest of the new dispensation, and of the services which he performs, over the priesthood of the Mosaic institution, and all the services which were appropriate to their office, 5:1—10:18.

Exhortations, warnings, reproofs, and encouragements, are intermixed in some manner with the main discussions, e.g. 2:1—4; 3:1; 3:7—4:16; 4:11—6:20; but from 10:19, to the end of the epistle, nearly all is of the nature just described; so that about one half of the epistle is of a parenetical or hortatory nature.

In judging of the relevancy and importance of the subjects discussed in our epistle, it is very plain that we are not to make up an opinion deduced merely from viewing the present necessities and condition of Christians. We were not born Jews, nor educated as such. We have none of their prejudices, peculiar sympathies, temptations, and trials. What was adapted to them, in the days of Paul, and under the circumstances above described, — nay, what was absolutely indispensable for their instruction, reproof, and confirmation, — may, in many respects, be scarcely appropriate to us in our condition and circumstances. Such
is indeed the fact, in regard to many of the things introduced into the epistle to the Hebrews, as I shall have occasion hereafter repeatedly to notice. But who that judges with any good degree of candor and fairness, would ever think of bringing it as an accusation against our author, that he has inserted in his epistle that which was altogether appropriate to those whom he addressed, although it may not and does not have an equal bearing upon all times and nations? Surely the last ground of just accusation which can be advanced against any writer, is, that “he has written in a manner peculiarly adapted to accomplish the end for which he wrote.” In what a different plight would the world of authors be, if all of them were justly liable to such an imputation!

Of necessity, now, many things addressed to the Jews of Paul’s day, are comparatively inapplicable to us. So far, however, as our circumstances agree with theirs in any respect, just so far the spirit of what was said to them will apply to us. So far as what was said to them was founded in general Christian truths and principles, just so far we may be instructed and guided by it. Consequently the epistle, while it contains many things appropriate only to the Hebrews of early times, also contains many which can never cease to interest the church of God while Christianity exists in the world.

These general views may serve to aid the critical student, in commencing the exegetical study of our epistle. The more particular detail of what is here hinted, is reserved for the introductions to various parts of the epistle, which are inserted (pro re natā) in the body of the Commentary which follows.
COMMENTARY.

CHAPTERS I. 1—II. 4.

Christ as the author of the new revelation which God had made to men, and in contrast with the revelations by the prophets, I. 1; is Lord of the world, which indeed he also created, I. 2; the true image of God, and the representative of his glory and perfections to men; and having made atonement for the sins of men, is exalted to the highest majesty in the heavens, I. 3. This mediator of the new is exalted above angels, who were the mediators of the ancient dispensation. The name, SON, by which he is addressed, has never been bestowed upon them, I. 4, 5. He is the object of worship by the angels; while they are employed only as the swift and ready messengers of God, I. 6, 7. The King Messiah has an eternal and righteous dominion; and is elevated, on account of his love of righteousness, to honor and happiness above all other kings, I. 8, 9. He, too, is addressed by one of the sacred writers, as the creator of the heavens and the earth, and as immutable and imperishable, I. 10—12. But no exaltation to such dominion is conferred upon angels, I. 13; they are only ministerial agents, employed for the good of those who are to be heirs of the salvation which Christ bestows, I. 14.

If such be the dignity and elevation of the Messiah, then surely the attentive consideration of all which he addresses to his followers, may be justly demanded. Obedience to the ancient revelation was enforced by just and unavoidable penalties; how can the neglect of the new and more perfect one go unpunished, II. 1, 2. Especially must this be the case, since it was promulgated by Christ himself, in person, and was confirmed, on the part of God, by a great variety of wondrous miracles and gifts, II. 3, 4.

CHAP. I.

Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίον ἐκτακτή. Respecting this title, see p. 15. 1. seq.

(1) Πολυμηρῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, literally in many parts and in various ways. Of the Greek commentators some give a different sense to each of the words; e. g., Theodoret, πολυμηρῶς — τὰς παντοδαπὰς οἰκονομίας σημαίνει, τὸ δὲ πολυτρόπως, τῶν θεών ὑπατοῦν τὸ διάφορον, i. e., πολυμηρῶς signifies the various dispensations, but πολυτρόπως the diversity of divine visions. Theophylact interprets the words in question, by διάφορος καὶ πολυειδος, diversely and in various ways. But Chrysostom expresses the sense of both words, by διαφόρως simply. Modern commentators are divided in the same manner. The Greek idiom allows either mode of interpretation; and precedents may be found for each. See Schleusner on the words; and compare Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 4. p. 331. V. 6. p. 667, ed. Potter; also VI. 7 where the words in question are used respecting a revelation. If the two words be construed separately, then πολυμηρῶς
should be interpreted as referring to the matter of ancient revelation, given in different parts and at different times, thus conveying the idea of the gradual development of truth in different ages and by different persons; and πολυτρόπως must be understood as indicating the various ways in which these revelations were communicated, i. e., by dreams, visions, symbols, Urim Thummim, prophetic ecstasy, etc. But if both words were regarded as being used only to designate with intensity the variety of ancient revelations (and such a mode of phraseology is very common both in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures), then the whole may be paraphrased thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications in many different ways by the prophets to the fathers, hath, etc.' The word πολυτρόπως does not, of itself, signify sundry times; but still, the idea of various parts or portions, which it does properly signify, may very naturally be understood as implying diverse times at which, or occasions on which, the different parts of revelation were communicated; or the idea of πολυτρόπως may be simply that of repetition, so that it may be translated by often. But some critics refer both words merely to the variety of matter or doctrines comprised in ancient revelation. But what becomes of the antithesis with the latter part of the verse, in this way of interpretation? Is there a less variety of subjects touched on by the New Testament, than by the Old?

The writer evidently designs to present an antithesis between the manner of the ancient and the Christian dispensation. This antithesis is rendered more striking, if we understand the first clause in the verse thus; 'God, who in ancient times made communications to the fathers by the prophets, in sundry parts and in various ways, has now made a revelation to us by his Son;' i. e., he has completed the whole revelation, which he intends to make under the new dispensation, by his Son, — by his Son only, and not by a long continued series of prophets, as of old. The apostles, and other inspired writers of the New Testament, received their communications from the Son, who gave them the Holy Spirit, Matt. xii. 27, comp. John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; and facts show that the Christian revelation was completed, during that generation which was contemporary with the Saviour, when he dwelt on earth.

Πάλαι, in ancient times; for communications by prophets to the Jews had ceased, since the time of Malachi and his contemporaries, i. e., for the space of about four hundred years. Hence the writer avoids using an expression which would imply that revelations had been continued down to the time then present. By πάλαι he evidently means to designate the whole time, during
which communications of the divine will were continued under the former dispensation.

Ἀλήθεια most commonly designates oral communication. But since the writer here affirms, that God had spoken (Ἀλήθεια) πολυτρόπως, it must of course be understood (as indeed it is often used), to designate the more general idea of communication made in any manner, by visions, symbols, etc., as well as by voices, see ii. 2; ix. 19, etc.

Ancestors, τοῖς πατράκιν. We might naturally expect that ἤμων would be subjoined; but Paul commonly uses the word πατέρες in the sense just quoted, without the pronoun annexed. See Rom. ix. 5; xi. 28; xv. 8.

By the prophets, Ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. The frequent use of ἐν with the Dat. instead of διὰ with the Gen., in the N. Test., is Hebraism; for ἐν corresponds to the Hebrew ע, which is employed with great latitude of signification, and in cases of the same nature as that in question; e. g., Hosea i. 2, the word of the Lord by Hosea, יִשָּׁהוּ. Only an occasional use of ἐν in this way is found in classical Greek writers, e. g., Thucyd. VII. 11, what has been done before, ἔτη γνώμεν ἐν ἄλλαις πολλαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, by many other letters.

Προφήτας in the language of the New Testament means, not only those who predict future events, but all who are employed by God to make religious communications of any kind to his people, and here, all of those by whom the O. T. revelation was made.

Ἐν ἔσχατον τῶν ἔρεμων—many copies read ἐν ἔσχατον τῶν ἔρεμων. The Seventy use both forms of expression, as a translation of the Hebrew-טִיפִּיָּה, and it is a matter of indifference, as to the sense of the text, which reading is adopted.

In the Old Testament, עִבְרֵי תִּירֵי, עִבְרֵי תִּירֵי, עִבְרֵי תִּירֵי, עִבְרֵי תִּירֵי, are often employed synonymously; and all of them to designate the general idea of hereafter, at a future time. Whether this future time be more or less remote, depends entirely on the context and scope of the passage; see Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 80; Prov. xxxi. 25. But ἔτη γενόμεν ἔρεμοι, in particular, is used to denote the future period in which the Messiah (ὁ ἔρχόμενος) was to appear; Is. ii. 2; Hos. iii. 5; Micah iv. 1, Joel iii. 1 [ii. 28], τί ἔρεμοι. This phrase (as it would seem from the usage in these places), early passed into a kind of technical designation of the time of the Messiah, or the New dispensation. Thus Rabbi Nachmanides on (Gen. xlix. 1) says, “All our doctors agree, that מִצְוָה מַעֲשֵׂה means the time of the Messiah.” That this use of the phrase was already an established one in the time of our Saviour, is abundantly evident from the frequent
employment of αἱ ἡμέραι in the New Testament, to designate the period of the Christian dispensation. Like other appellations brought into use in a similar way (comp. Luke vii. 20), it continued to be employed after the "last days," i.e., the Christian dispensation, had commenced; and it is employed to designate any part of the time which this dispensation comprises; being limited only by the context, in the same manner as the Hebrew יהושע, etc., as exhibited above. In John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, and xi. 24, ἡ ἡμέρα is indeed used to denote the end of time, when the resurrection of the dead will take place. But in each of these cases ἀναστήσωs or ἀνάστασις accompanies it, so as to save all doubt in respect to its meaning. In all other cases, it designates the period of the new dispensation. Many synonymous expressions are also employed to designate the same idea; e.g., ὁ ἡσυχασμός καιρός, οἱ ἡσυχασμοὶ καιροί, ἡ ἡσυχασμὸς ἡμέρα, and ὅστις καιρός.

The Jews, it is said, divided the periods of the world into ἡ ἡμέρα, the present age or world, i.e., the period of the Mosaic dispensation, and η οἰκομένη, the age or world to come, i.e., the time of the Messiah's reign. The former is called, in the New Testament, ὁ αἰών αὐτός, ὁ νῦν αἰών τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, ὁ αἰών ὁ ἐκεῖνος, ὁ καιρὸς αὐτός, and ὁ αἰών; the latter, ὁ αἰών ὁ μέλλων — ἐκεῖνος, οἱ αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπαρχόμενοι, η οἰκομένη η μέλλουσα. This latter class of expressions, thus understood, are equivalent to the phrases ἡ ἡμέρα, ἡ ἡμέρα, ἡ ἡμέρα, etc.

So Wahl, Bretschneider (Lex.), and other critics. But that this explanation is not in all respects well founded, is quite clear from the very authority to which Wahl refers; i.e., Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. sub voc. בָּרָא. The Rabbins—certainly used בָּרָא בָּרָא for mundus hic, mundus habitabilis, the earth; also for mundus medius, i.e., the regions of the air, stars, firmament, etc.; and for mundus supremus, i.e., of angels and spirits. It is equally certain, that they employed בָּרָא בָּרָא for mundus post resurrectionem mortuorum, mundus animarum a corpore solutum, as well as for the age of the Messiah. Buxtorf merely says: Qua–dam per בָּרָא בָּרָא intelligunt נְבַיִם וּלְוִי, dies Messiae.” It would seem, then, that Wahl, Bretschneider and others, have made an excessive use of the supposed Rabbinic sense of the word αἰών.

Be this, however, as it may, still, from the Old Testament usage we may easily make out (as I have endeavored to do), the sense of ὁ ἡσυχασμός τῶν ἡμέρων. The phrase in Heb. i. 1, appears to mean during the last dispensation, or under the last period, viz., that of the Messiah.

These last days, τούτων, is as much as to say, 'The period in question has already commenced.'
To us, ἧμιν, by a κοίνωνι, a figure of speech, or mode of speaking, in which the writer joins himself with those whom he addresses. The meaning is, to Christians, to the church; not excluding others, but intending still to designate, in this place, particularly himself and those to whom he wrote. So Luke uses ἧμιν for Christians, in chap. i. 1; and Paul in like manner, often in his epistles. If we insist here that ἧμιν is to be literally and strictly taken (as those do, in respect to ii. 3, who argue against the Pauline origin of our epistle from ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκοινώνων ἐσ τῷ ἀσ ἤκασ ἡμᾶς ἤκασ ἡμᾶς ἤκασ ἡμᾶς), then this passage would be a direct contradiction of the sentiment in ii. 3, inasmuch as it will contain a declaration, that the Son himself spoke to the writer of our epistle, and to those whom he addressed.

Ἐν νῦν, i. e., δὰ τῷ νῦν. So Chrysostom and Theophylact; for ἐν here is used as above, in ἐν τοῖς προφηταῖς. The article is here omitted as often in appellations denoting kindred. See Köhn. Gr. § 244, 2 R. 3; Buttm. § 124, N. 7. Or νῦν may be employed as a kind of proper name (just as we now use it); and on this account it omits the article, by a license usual in respect to proper names. So Bloomfield in his N. Test.

The Christian fathers, and many modern expositors, maintain that the Son of God made all the revelations to the ancient prophet; and that all the theophanies mentioned in the Old Testament, are to be ascribed to the Logos. But others suppose that both this verse, and ii. 1—4 (where the aggravated guilt of those who reject the gospel which was revealed by the Son of God, is urged, and the writer grounds the fact of its being aggravated, upon the assumption that the law in ancient times was spoken only by the mediation of angels); are opposed to this view. Still, it should be remembered, that the writer is in these passages, speaking of the Son of God as incarnate, as possessing our nature and addressing us in it. In this manner he did not address the church in ancient times; and the emphasis may lie upon this circumstance; comp. John i. 14. For that the Logos, or Christ, in his divine nature, did make revelations to the ancient church, seems to be an obvious deduction from John xii. 41. 1 Cor. x. 4; x. 9. and other like passages.

(2) Whom he has constituted Lord of all, i. e. of the world, ὢν ὡθηκεν κληρονόμων πάντων. ὡθηκε, constituted, appointed, ordained; so ὡθηκε, is often used.

Lord, possessor, κληρονόμων, in accordance, perhaps, with the Heb. idiom. In classic Greek, κληρονόμως means, (1) One who acquires anything by lot. (2) One who inherits anything after the death of the possessor. The Son inherited the world in neither of these ways: consequently κληρονόμως here is employed in the
manner of the Hebrew בּי, which means to take into possession in any manner, or simply to acquire. To inherit is only a secondary sense of בּי. The Latins employed haeres in a sense like that here assigned to κληρονόμος. Thus Justinian, Inst. II. 19 § ult., Pro haerede gerere, est pro domino gerere; veteres enim haeredes pro dominis appellabant. So Festus, Haeres apud antiquos pro domino ponebatur; comp. Gal. iv. 1. Acts x. 36; ii. 36; Ps. lxxxix. 27 [28]; John xvii. 10, which confirm the interpretation here given.

By whom Δι' οὗ. Δι' with the Genitive, many designate instrumental cause (so called), or, as here, the efficient cause. There is also a philological possibility of the sense which Grotius gives it here, viz., on account of whom; see Wahl No. 2, and to the instances there adduced of δι' used with the Gen., and signifying on account of, add Rom. v. 19 bis., viii. 3, and perhaps, 2 Cor. ix. 13, and 2 Pet. i. 3. δι' σος. But this sense is unsupported by usage. In all these cases, δι' does not properly denote the final cause or end for which a thing is done; but only a motive for doing it, an instrument as it were in bringing it about. If the meaning of the author had been here, on account of whom, he would probably have used the Acc. Δι' δι', since, as Kuinoel says, "Δι' οὗ and Δι' δι' are not confounded in this epistle.”

He, [i.e. Θεός] made the world, τοὺς αἰῶνας τροιών. So, beyond any reasonable doubt, αἰῶνας is to be understood in xi. 8, and in 1 Tim. i. 17. The singular (αἰὼν) is also occasionally employed to designate world; e.g. Matt. xiii. 40, 49; xxvii. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 18; Eph. i. 21; 1 Tim. vi. 17. The classical use of αἰὼν is,(1) Age, period of time. (2) Age of man, time of life, life itself. Αἰῶναs, then, is used here (like γῆ, λίβανος, in the Chaldee and later Hebrew), for world or worlds. The plural and singular form of αἰὼν are used in this sense without distinction of meaning. So also a great number of words in Greek and Hebrew; s. e. γῆ, λίβανος, ἱλαρόν, etc., also σάββατον, ὄβρος, etc. The Hebrews do not appear to have had the idea of any other habitable world besides the earth. Hence if αἰῶνας be designed to have a plural meaning in the instances in Heb. i. 2; iii. 1. Tim. i. 17, then the meaning must be present world and future world. But I apprehend the meaning of the writer to be simply, that ‘God made the world by his Son,’ in which, however, is involved the idea, that he made all things.

Theodoret explained these words as meaning, ages; and so others have since done. But what is the sense of the asser-
tion, that God made the ages by his Son? But whether we understand this of the common periods of the life of man, or (with Theodoret) of the ages of the world; or of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, with others; what is it to the writer's purpose to assert this, in a passage which is evidently designed to show the exalted preëminence of the Son of God? For the sense of aión, comp. my essay on this word in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, Aug. 1829, pp. 428, 447 seq., and Ess. on Fut. Punishment, p. 29 seq.

(3) *Who being the radiance of his glory, etc.* "Ως δὲν ἄκαρμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαράκτηρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. The ancient Greek commentators, and after them most of the modern ones, have applied these words to the divine nature of Christ. An examination of the imagery which they present, is necessary in order to develop their real meaning. ἄκαρμα means radiance, light flowing from a luminous body, and is a derivat of ἅραγάω, i. q. ἁράγαξα, to shine, to emit splendor. Δόξα in classical Greek means, (1) Opinion, sentiment, supposition, maxim. (2) Fame, honor, reputation. But in our text, it plainly means the same as the Hebrew ḥıḇb often does; viz., splendor, brightness; comp. Luke ii. 9; ix. 31. Acts xxii. 11; vii. 55. Matt. vi. 29. 1 Cor. xv. 41.

Χαράκτηρ is properly an engraving or stamping instrument, or a person who engraves or stamps; but it is very commonly employed for the figure itself or the image engraved or stamped, e. g. upon coins, stones, metal, wood, or wax. So our English version, express image, i. e. image expressed or stamped. Hence, because the resemblance between the figure enstamped and the instrument by which it is enstamped is so exact, χαράκτηρ also means exact image, resemblance or delineation.

Ὑπόστασις, in the classical sense antecently attached to it, means, (1) Foundation, substratum, substruction. (2) Steadfastness. (3) Purpose, resolution, determination. (4) Substance, essence, being. In the sense of person, it first began to be used by the Greek writers after the Arian controversy commenced. It was employed particularly in this way by Athanasius, in order that he might make a distinction between oória and ὑπόστασις, while he maintained that the persons (πρόσωπα) in the Trinity were of one oória, but yet were three ὑπόστασις. This sense, which was not attached to this word until long after the New Testament was written, cannot, of course, be properly assigned to the word here. It plainly retains the more ancient meaning of substance or essence.

The nature of the imagery presented by the two phrases in our verse, may be thus explained. If God be represented to us
under the image of splendor, or of a luminary or source of light, then is Christ the radiance of that splendor, or the light emitted from that luminary. That is, as a luminous body becomes perceptible in consequence of the light radiated from it, so God has manifested or exhibited himself to us in the person of his Son. To the same purpose John says, “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him, John i. 18.” So again, “He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, xiv. 9;” and again, “He that seeth me, seeth him that sent me, xii. 45.” In Col. i. 15, Christ is called “the image of the invisible God,” i. e., he by whom the invisible God is, as it were, presented to our inspection. In him God has exhibited to man the perfections of his character, i. e., has exhibited τῷ δόξαν αὐτοῦ, which word is figuratively used to designate the divine perfections. So 2 Cor. iv. 6, δέξης τοῦ Ἁνῶ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, i. e., the divine perfections as displayed by Jesus Christ; a phrase of the like nature with that which I am endeavoring to explain.

Again; if God be represented under the image of ὑπόστασις, substance, essence, then is Christ the development of that substance to our view; he is the image, representation, or delineation of it. As an image upon a coin presents the exact lineaments of the stamp which made it, so does Christ present the χαρακτήρ of the Father; he presents us with his likeness, i. e., reveals to us, in his person and work, just and proper views of the perfections of the Father. In accordance with these views, the old Syriac version renders ὑπόστασις αὐτοῦ by a word equivalent to his substance.

In the opinion, that the verse now under consideration relates to the incarnate Messiah, and not to the Logos in his divine nature simply considered, I find that Scott and Beza concur; not to mention others among the most respectable commentators. See EXCURSUS III.

Sustaining, the universe by his own powerful word, φέρων ... τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, i. e., guiding, managing, controlling. So Chrysostom: φέρων, ποιῶν κυβερνῶν, τὰ διαφαντοῦσα συγκρατῶν, governing, holding together that which is ready to fall asunder or preserving that which is ready to perish. So Paul says of Christ, as εἰκὼν τοῦ Ἁνῶ, that he is before all things, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνίστασθαι, Col. i. 17. Φέρων thus employed corresponds to the Hebrew אָשָׁר as used in Is. xlvi. 3; lxvi. 9, in the sense of cura, conserve, to sustain, to preserve. as a mother does her child. The Greeks sometimes joined φέρων and ἀγων in the same phrase, in order to express the administration of affairs. Τὰ πάντα is a common expression in Greek, for the universe.
By his own powerful word, τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δύναμις αὐτοῦ. Such a mode of expression is not, as Ernæus names it, properly Hebraism; for it is very common in all languages, although more frequent in the oriental than in the occidental tongues. Αὐτοῦ, sc. ἐπαινεῖ (not αὐτοῦ), i. e., by his own powerful word, viz., the word of the Son, and not by the word of God as αὐτοῦ would mean. The meaning of the whole phrase is, 'He directs and controls the universe by his own omnipotent word.' It seems to be evidently an expression of the like nature with "God said, Let there be light, and there was light, Gen. i. 3;" also, "He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast, Ps. xxxiii. 9." In other terms, 'The Son has the universe at the control of his mere word;' an expression signifying omnipotent, irresistible control. But inasmuch as the universe was created by him. (verse 2), it surely cannot appear strange that he who made it should control it.

Having by himself made expiation for our sins, δι᾽ ἐναντίον... τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. Ἐκκαθαρισμός usually means purification; but in Hellenistic Greek it is also employed for expiation; e. g., in Ex. xxix. 36; xxx. 10, the Seventy use it for the Hebrew ναόν, atonement, expiation. Δι᾽ ἐναντίον, i. e., as in ii. 14, διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ; in ix. 12, διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αἵματος; and more fully in ix. 26, διὰ τῆς ἁγιότης αὐτοῦ.

After he had thus, by the sacrifice of himself, made expiation for sin, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης ἐν υψηλόν, he sat down at the right of the majesty on high, i. e., of God. in the highest heavens, οὐρανοῦ being understood after υψηλόν; or of supreme majesty (see Wahl's Lex. on οὐρανός). The verb ἐκάθισε here corresponds to the Hebrew בֵּית, which applied to God and to kings, does not mean simply to sit, but to sit enthroned, to sit on a throne; e. g., Ps. ii. 4, and often. To sit on a throne, or to sit at the right hand of one on a throne, implies commanding, ruling, judging. Μεγαλοσύνης, majesty, magnificence, ὑψόστασις, ὑψηλόν, τιμὴ, ἀνδριάς. Here it is the abstract (as grammarians say) used for the concrete, i. e., on the right hand of the majestic One or the magnificent One, viz., τιμῆς, τιμοῦσι, τιμῶσι, προερωμένοι, parencióntes, constituted, rendered, etc. It is here applied to the elevation of the Son to the mediatorial throne, after his death. Διαφοροποιήσας, more eminent, more distinguished; τὰς αὐτοῦς, than they, i. e., than the angels. Παρά after the compar-
ative degree, is not common out of this epistle; but the like examples are in Luke iii. 13; 3 Esd. iv. 35. It makes of itself a comparative degree, as used in Luke xiii. 2. Rom. i. 25; xiv. 5. Heb. i. 9; ii. 7. Κεκληρωμένη, obtained, acquired, as in verse 21. Ονόμα, either name, i. e., title as viōs, or rank, dignity. Commentators are divided in opinion, respecting which of these meanings should be preferred. But the argument in the sequel shows, that the title SON is the ground on which the superiority of Christ over the angels is proved. If it be objected that angels are also called sons, and men too, the answer is easy. No one individual except Jesus, is ever called by way of eminence the Son of God, i. e., the Messiah or the king of Israel, John i. 49.

The appeal is here made to Jewish readers of the Old Testament, who applied Ps. ii. 7, and 2 Sam. vii. 14 to the Messiah. In such a sense as in these passages, namely one that imported supreme dominion and authority, neither angels nor men were called sons of God. But Jesus bore this title, which according to the Jewish Scriptures was indicative of supreme dignity; and consequently he had an appellation of a more exalted nature than that of the angels, who are servants (i. 14), not lords.

(5) For to which of the angels, said he at any time, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee, τίν γὰρ ... γεγένηκα σε; Γεγένηκα σε must of course be figuratively understood. But how? In Ps. ii. the context shows that the expression here quoted has reference to Christ as king, as constituted king or lord over all; see v. 6, 8, etc. To beget is metaphorical language suited to the name Son; but as Son here plainly means the Messiah or the anointed King, dropping the metaphor we come of course to the meaning, constituted, made, appointed, substantially like that of γεγένηκα above.

In regard to σημερον:, which has often been construed as meaning from eternity, Theodoret has plainly expressed its true sense; ὁ τίν ἀδῶνον δηλοὶ γεγένησον, ἀλλὰ τίν τῷ χρόνῳ συνεξεγερμένων, it does not express his eternal generation, but that which is connected with time. For surely Christ was exalted to the mediatorial throne in time, i. e., after his resurrection; and such an exaltation is the subject of description in the second Psalm. Such a view of the meaning the context also demands, where his acquired condition is the particular subject of comparison with the rank and condition of the angels. So Chrysostom, after quoting v. 5, says: ταύτα ἐφημα μὲν εἰς τὴν σάρκα, this is spoken concerning his human nature. And so Paul (Acts xiii. 33 seq.) explains the passage in Ps. ii. 7, quoted in the present verse.

Εγὼ οὖσα ... εἰς νιῶν. In common Greek it would be, ἐγὼ
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καὶ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ... νῦν μου. The form of expression αὐτῷ ἐστὶν πατέρα, corresponds altogether to the Hebrew בֵּיתוָ, 15; and μου ἐστὶν, to הָיוֹת בַּיִת, 2 Sam. viii. 14, whence the quotation is taken. The term Son, seems here to designate one who should be entitled to all the rights and privileges of a Son; and in particular, one who should be an heir to the throne of his Father. This same figurative expression, heirship, being heir, the writer has applied to the Son in the context, vs. 2, 4. Now as the angels are not entitled to such privileges, the appellation Son (which implies a right to them in this case), shows that he to whom it is applied, is elevated above the angels. And this is the position which the argument in Heb. i. is designed to establish.

If we may credit Abarbanel, the ancient Jewish doctors held that the Messiah would be exalted above Abraham, Moses, and the angels. However this may be, the apostle in applying this and the following quotations to the Messiah, must have supposed himself addressing those who would readily concede that they ought to be thus applied. Otherwise we cannot suppose that he could have regarded this mode of reasoning as at all efficacious, or adapted to convince those to whom he wrote.

(6) In the phrase Ὅταν δὲ πάλιν ... λέγει, πάλιν is sometimes rendered contra, ex adverso, im Gegenteile, on the other hand, on the contrary; but incorrectly here there does not seem to be any antithesis to the sentiment which precedes, but accession, i. e., a new argument is here added in order to show the dignity of the Son. Others join πάλιν with εἰραγάγη, and render the phrase thus: when he again introduces his first begotten into the world. This seems to be the plainest and most obvious construction of the Greek as it now stands; but the difficulty with this interpretation is, that no introduction into the world has been before mentioned; to what, then, can a second introduction here relate?

I must therefore prefer another sense of πάλιν here, viz., at another time, or rather, on another occasion; a sense which the reader will see very clearly exhibited in John i. 35; viii. 12, 21; Acts xvii. 32. I would separate πάλιν here from the rest of the verse by commas, and then the whole runs on smoothly thus: moreover when, on another occasion, he introduces his first begotten into the world, he saith, etc. In this way of construing the phrase, I do not feel the need of seeking to vindicte a transposition or metathesis of Ὅταν and πάλιν, by a reference to Rom. i. 20; v. 6; 1 Cor. i. 2 (with Kuinoel), or to Acts xii. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 6 (with Abresch), for examples of transposition. It is true that καὶ πάλιν is, in this epistle, the usual mode of designating repeated quotations from Scripture; see i. 5; ii. 13 bis, x. 30. But in all these examples, the quotations are in-
timately connected in respect to oneness of design, i. e., they relate very intimately to one and the same subject or position. But in the case before us, a new argument is introduced in order to establish or illustrate the dignity of Christ; and this is very appropriately introduced by employing δὲ instead of καὶ which is used in the other examples just noticed; for δὲ is often employed in such a way, although it never begins a sentence. I apprehend that the writer, in choosing ἐκαὶ δὲ πάλιν instead of πάλιν δὲ ἐκαὶ, meant plainly to distinguish his transition to a new topic, or rather, a new argument; for πάλιν δὲ would naturally have indicated the same connection as καὶ πάλιν, which would not comport with the object of the author, who now passes to a new subject of consideration. This circumstance, which seems to be overlooked by the critics, so far as I know, appears to render any effort to account for a supposed metathesis, quite unnecessary.

Only one difficulty remains. What can be the meaning of εἰραγάγη . . . οἰκουμένης? The most simple and best established sense of οἰκουμένης is world, meaning (pro re natâ) either habitable world, or world of men. But what is it to introduce the first begotten to the world, or into the world? Does this relate to the birth of Christ, or to his mission as a teacher? So far as the language merely is concerned, it may be interpreted in either way. And in respect to historical facts one might say, after comparing Luke i. 11 seq.; i. 26 seq.; ii. 8 seq., that the writer of our epistle probably referred in his own mind, to the homage which angels paid the infant Saviour. But a reëxamination of this whole subject has now led me to believe, that the laws of exegesis here require us to understand the writer as referring to something said in the Old Testament concerning Christ, inasmuch as he classes the words that follow, with other citations from the same Scriptures. On the same ground, also, I must now understand εἰραγάγη as referring to an introduction of the Saviour into the world, which is described in the Old Testament Scriptures, and not to his actual introduction itself, considered simply as a historical fact. Most evidently the writer means to appeal to a passage of Scripture, which he regards as having relation to the introduction of the Messiah among men. He means, therefore, to say, that 'on another occasion [different from those he had just named], God says, when speaking of the Messiah as introduced into the world, Let all the angels, etc.' The usage of the sacred writers in speaking of that which is declared to be done or predicted, as being done by the prophets who make such declaration or utter such prediction, is well known; e. g., Jer. i. 10; Is. vi. 10, etc.

Πρωτότοκος, so far as the etymology is concerned, may mean
first-born, or first-begotten. The latter is the sense here, because
the Son is here considered as related to the Father. But the
title first-begotten I do not regard as having reference here to
time merely or principally, but, like the Heb. יִשְׂרָאֵל, meaning the
Son, who has the preëminence above all things, and is destined
to the throne of the kingdom.

There is scarcely room for any doubt, moreover, that the
writer means to quote here from Ps. xcvii. 7. The Jews, as
Kimchi declares, construed Ps. xciii.—ci. as having relation to
the Messiah. Whatever may be true in regard to this, however,
as to most of these Psalms, it is clear that there is nothing in
Ps. 97, which contradicts the exegesis that Paul here puts upon
it. The whole Psalm may very well be understood as referring
to the ushering in of the gospel-dispensation, the new and glori-
ous reign of Jehovah, the true kingdom of God; and this by
means of the Messiah whose reign is now to be established, and
who is to be acknowledged as Lord of all. I concede that this
is not a necessary interpretation, so far as the mere words of the
Psalms are concerned; but, with such a leader as Paul, we may
well follow the interpretation given in the verse before us, since
no important objections can be raised against it in the way of
philology. Some difficulties not here noticed, are touched upon
in the Excursus VI.

Let the angels, etc., καὶ . . . ἵκος. Καὶ here exhibited does not
appear in Ps. xcvii. 7 (xcvi. 7). I regard it, therefore, as an
intensive particle here, added by the apostle with the design of
expressing strongly the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל. I have not expressed
it in the translation; but one might render the phrase thus: let
all the angels of God indeed worship him, or even pay him obei-
sance or adoration. Whether the worship here spoken of is
spiritual, seems to be in some good measure determined by the
nature of the beings who are commanded to render it. Civil
homage can hardly be predicated of angels. Still the worship in
question is, no doubt, the homage paid to him who is constituted
King and Lord over the new and universal empire, the kingdom
of God, which the 97th Psalm celebrates as being established.

Calvin's view of the whole, exactly coincides with the inter-
pretation above. In respect to Ps. 97 he says: Si... totum
Psalmum percurras, nihil aliud videbis quam regnum Christi . . .
nec aliud est argumentum Psalmi, quam veluti solenne diploma,
quae ejus regni possessionem mittitur Christus. Of εἰσαγάγη he
says: Apte hic apostolus, quum dicit ipsum introduci in or. em,
quia scilicet illis ejus ad homines adventus des-rbitur.

(7) With respect to the angels, also, he saith, Who make'ch his
angels winds, and his ministering servants flaming fire, καὶ πρὸς
Καὶ...πους, i.e., who maketh his angels that serve him the ministers of his will, as the winds, and the lightning are. The Hebrew וְקַז הַנֶּבֶר, and Greek πους φλογα, often means lighting; as plainly they do here. The whole phrase is susceptible of another interpretation; viz., who making his angels winds, i.e., swift as the winds, and his servants lightning, i.e., rapid, or resistless as the lightning. But this does not suit the design for which the apostle quotes it, so well as the first interpretation. His object is to show, that the angels are employed simply in a ministerial capacity; while the Son is Lord of all. Our English version, which has rendered רוח אסר (Ps. civ. 4) by spirits, gives an erroneous view of the meaning of the original.

Others construe the Hebrew original thus; who maketh the winds his messengers, and the lightning his servants; and they defend this by alleging, that the context in the Psalm shows the design of the writer to be only to declare the glory of God as displayed in the visible creation; consequently it is inapposite to suppose him here to be speaking of the angels as an order of invisible intelligent beings. But in Ps. civ. 1—3, the invisible as well as visible majesty of God is described; and it is natural that the writer should proceed, and augment the force of his description, by introducing the angels as the ministering servants of the Deity. Besides, the Hebrew does not allow us properly to translate, who maketh the winds his angels or messengers. In order to mean this, the Hebrew must be written וְקַז הַנֶּבֶר, and not (as now) וְקַז הַנֶּבֶר; comp. Ps. civ. 3, יִנְשָׁפַע הָעָלָם רַבִּים; which surely cannot be rendered, “Who maketh his chariot clouds.”

The καὶ here, I take to be a continuous (as it often is), and equivalent to moreover, also, etiam. As to καὶ it stands here as the sign of protasis in the sentence to which it belongs, but (as is very often the case in such instances) is incapable of being translated; see Bretschneider Lex. καὶ, II.

The Nom. to λέγει here cannot be ὡς, for then the quotation would naturally be in the first person, as it is in v. 5 above, but ἡ γραφή or ὃν νομον. Δέγει may be rendered in the passive voice, to avoid expressing the Nom., since the writer has not expressed it; and so Storr and Schulz, heisset es, it is said. So the usual appeal in the Mishna, ויהי. Compare also φησι, in 1 Cor. vi. 16. The quotation in our verse is from Ps. civ. 4.

(8, 9) But respecting the Son [it is said], Thy throne, Θ nike, is eternal, ἐνθεόν γε τον νουν...αιωνος. Ωρων is plainly the emblem of dominion; because kings, when acting in their capacity

* Ehrard says: “the Greek words can be rendered in no other way than this: who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire.”
as rulers, were accustomed to sit on thrones. ὁ ἡσύς is not the Nom. case, as some have maintained, but the Vocative. It is the usual Voc. and nearly the only form of it throughout the Septuagint; e. g., Ps. iii. 7; iv. 1; v. 10; vii. 1, et passim. The Attic, moreover, frequently retain the form of the Nom. in the Voc. of the second declension; Buttman's Gram. § 36. Note 2. To translate thus, God is thy throne, would be to introduce a mode of expression foreign to the usus loquendi of the Scriptures; for where is God ever said to be the throne of his creatures? And what could be the sense of such an expression? Throne is the emblem of dominion, not of support. So Theoph., ἕσυς ἡμῶς γὰρ . . . δ θεολείας σύμβολον. Figuratively used, as here, it is of the same import as sceptre, βασίδος. Gesenius formerly rendered the phrase, thy God's throne is eternal, i. e., the throne which God gives thee. But must not the Hebrew then be נְניַיָּ֖ה אָם? the pronoun following the second of the two nouns in regimen, according to the usual custom, Heb. Gramm. § 473. a. A different construction is possible, perhaps, as Ps. lxxi. 7; Ezek. xvi. 27; Lev. vi. 3 may lead one to believe. Gesenius,* in the last edition of his Lex. makes it elliptical for נְניַיָּ֖ה אָם הָמוּנָֽם, but no parallel to this sense, I believe, can be found.

A sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom, βασίδος εἰσὶν-τός . . . σου, i. e. thy reign is just. The former clause declares the perpetuity of the Son's reign; the present one, its equitable nature. Both speak of the future. The two clauses are a poetic parallelism, as they belong to Ps. xlv. 7; and the subject of both clauses is the same, viz., the dominion or reign of the Son or Messiah.

Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, ἡγάπησας . . . ἀποκαίριον, i. e. thou hast been "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" thou hast been perfectly innocent and upright, altogether obedient to the divine law; comp. Phil. ii. 8, seq. Such a negative form of expression as καὶ ἡγάπησας ἀποκαίριον, following an affirmative one, is very common in the Scriptures, and is designed to give intensity to the affirmative assertion which precedes it; comp. John i. 3, 20, et al. saepe.

Because of this, O God, thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladness, διὰ τοῦτο . . . διαλλάσσως. But the phrase is equally susceptible of the rendering, God, thy God, has anointed thee, etc.; and this without any alteration of the general sense of

* So Robinson well says: there is here no philological ground for taking נְניַיָּ֖ה in any other than its simple and direct sense: Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. In respect to the perpetuity hero indicated, this verse may be compared with Luke i. 23; or better, with 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. See also Ebrard's Commentary on this passage.
the passage. Theophylact, however, thought otherwise; for he says, "ὁ Ἰός ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁ Ἰς ἔτοι, as our enemy Symmachus (here a credible witness) affirms, who renders the Hebrew thus, Ἰς, ὁ Ἰς σοῦ." "Ἡλαυον ἀγαλλαίαρεως, i. e. καὶ Ἰανον. Kings were anointed with oil, in order to consecrate them to their office; see Acts iv. 27. Ps. ii. 6. 1 Sam. x. 1; xvi. 13. Sirach xlvi. 13. Perfumed oil or precious ointment was often employed, also, on festive occasions; and honored guests at an entertainment were frequently bedewed with it. But Ἰανον ἀγαλλαίαρεως here appears to mean the oil of consecration to office, viz., the office of king, to which the Messiah was promoted in consequence of his obedience, comp. Phil. ii. 8 seq. As to the phrase oil of gladness, it means perfumed or odoriferous oil, which was exhibited and used on occasions where there was much festivity and gladness. A joyful occasion would be the coronation season of the king Messiah, when the most precious and costly oil would be used to anoint him for his office.

In comparison with thine associates, παρὰ τοῦ μετόχου σου, i. e. in office, viz., kings. God has bestowed a higher reward, a greater honor on the king Messiah, than on any other kings. He has made him 'King of kings and Lord of lords.'

That the whole 45th psalm, from which these words are quoted, relates to the Messiah, has been generally believed by Jewish and Christian commentators; and it is at last acknowledged by Rosenmueller, in the second edition of his Comm. in Psalmos. All other explanations seem liable to insuperable difficulties; and this, one may hope, will soon be universally felt and acknowledged.

That the whole Psalm relates to the Messiah, however, as mediatorial king, can scarcely be doubted by any one who compares together all its different parts. This king is called Ἰανος, Ἰανος. Does the word Ἰανος here denote the divine or the kingy nature or condition of the Messiah? Most interpreters, who admit the doctrine of the Saviour's divine nature, contend for the first of these senses; as I have myself once done in a former publication. But further examination has led me to believe, that there are grounds to doubt of such an application of the word Ἰανος in this passage. The king here called Ἰανος, has for himself a Ἰανος; "thy God hath anointed thee." The same king has associates (μετόχου), i. e. others who in some respects are in a similar condition or office. As divine, who are the μετόχοι with the Saviour, to whom he is preferred? Besides, his equity, his government, his state, as described in Ps. xlv., are all such as belong to the king Messiah. Now as E olim is a title sometimes given to kings or magistrates (see in Ps. lxxii. 1, 6, comp. John
x. 35, for in Ex. vii. 1 and iv. 16 it is a different case), although no one individual king or magistrate is ever called simply Elohim, may not this title be applied in a sense altogether peculiar and preëminent to the Messiah as king, designating his great superiority over all other kings, and distinguishing him as σῶν Ἰδρονος with God, as 'King of kings, and Lord of lords?' Rev. xvii. 14; Comp. Heb. i. 8, and the note on ἐκκλησίας ἐν δοξῇ κ. τ. λ. Such an explanation, to say the least, removes some of the difficulties which attend the usual one; while the following verses leave no just room to doubt what was the opinion of the writer of our epistle, in regard to the divine nature of the Messiah.

(10) Also [it is said], Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth, καὶ οὖ καὶ ἄρχας . . . ἡμελίωσας, This verse is, by construction, necessarily connected with those which precede; v. 7, καὶ πρὸς μὲν τούς ἄγγελους λέγει — v. 8, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς οὐν [λέγει] — v. 10, καὶ [i. e. πρὸς τοὺς οὐν λέγει]. An address to Jehovah here, considered simply as creator, is utterly irrelevant to the scope of the writer, and to the object which he evidently has in view. Both the grammatical construction and the plain design of the passage, unite in declaring this.

In the beginning, καὶ ἄρχας, for which the Heb. (Ps. cii. 25) has יְשֵׁרָת, of old, formerly equivalent to וּרְשֵׁמוּ in Gen. i. 1. קְצָרָה, in the New Testament and Septuagint, corresponds both to קִירָה and וּרְשֵׁמוּ in the Hebrew. Here it corresponds to סֹפְרָה, in Ps. cii. 24, Sept. ἡμελίωσας, thou hast laid the foundation; ἡμελίωσας, applied to a building, has this sense. But here it is, of course, applied in a figurative manner, to designate the original and primary act of creation, which is equivalent to laying the foundation of a building. The Son, therefore, did not merely arrange or set in order the materials of creation already brought into being, but performed the original act or first work, viz., that of bringing it into being.

The work of thy hands, Εἰργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, הֶנְךָ נַעֲמָה, i. e. thy work. The hands as the instruments are often put for the person who performs a work; and this is like other human operations and affections, figuratively transferred to God. Of σοφάνωτι means all parts of the creation except the earth; see Gen. i. 1. The Hebrews designated the sun, moon, and stars, i. e. all the visible creation besides the earth, by the word נַעֲמָה, heavens.

(11) They, αἱροι, i. e. the heavens and the earth. Σῦ δὲ διαμενεῖς (Hebrew רֶשֶׁם), thou shalt continue, be permanent, stand fast. It is the opposite of παλαιοῦνταί. Παλαιοὐσονται, shall wax old, a word which, applied to a garment, (the image here used, means to go into a state of decay or desuetude, to become unfit for use. Hence the metaphorical language that follows.
(12) And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, καὶ ὄψεῖταί . . . ἀποστρατεῖν. Ἑλείζας means to fold up, to roll together. The heavens are often represented as an expanse (ὁ ἐπάνω), and rolling them up means, of course, to remove them. The language, however, in the case before us, is borrowed from the custom of folding up and laying aside garments which have become unfit for use. The Hebrew word (for which Ἑλείζας is put) is וְּשָׁבַד, thou shalt change, remove. Ἀλλαγῆσωσαί, they shall decay, they shall be changed, i. e., be removed, taken away, or shall pass away, Hebrew וְשָׁבַד, Ps. cii. 26; Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 10; Is. ii. 6, al-o xxxiv. 4, where the image is fully presented. Σὺ δὲ ὁ αἰῶν ὁ (Heb. הָאָלָה בָּטָן), thou art he, viz., he who liveth forever, thou art always the same. So the sequel leads us to interpret this. Τὰ ἐκ τῶν οὐκ ἔκλειψαν, thy years shall never cease or fail, i. e., shall never come to an end.

This would be true, if it was spoken merely with reference to the future, and should be construed as having respect only to eternity a parte post, as it is technically called, i. e., eternity to come. But as it stands here, in connection with having created the heavens and the earth καὶ ὅποια it can hardly be understood to mean less than absolute eternity, or eternity a parte ante et a parte post. See Excurso VIII.

(13) But unto which of the angels has he ever said, Sit at my right hand, πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἁγγελίων . . . δεξιῶν μου. That is, where is any example of his addressing any one of the angels, and asking him to sit at his right hand, i. e., to be συμφρονος with him? See on δεξιὰ μεγαλοπνήη under v. 3 above.

Until I shall make thine enemies thy footstool, ἵνα ἔν τῷ ἁπλαῖο . . . τοῦ δόξα σου, i. e., reduce them to the most entire subjection. These words are quoted from Ps. cx. 1 (Sept. cix. 1), and are applied to the Messiah. To make enemies a footstool, is an expression borrowed from the custom, in ancient times, of treading upon the necks of captives and captive kings, in the occasion of celebrating a triumph over them, and in token of their complete prostration and subjection; see Joshua x. 24, and often so in Homer. Enemies signifies all such as are opposed to the doctrines or duties of the Christian religion. In Ps. cx. 1, the Messiah is invited to sit at the right hand of God (i. e., at his right hand on his throne, comp. Rev. iii. 21), until (ὑπ' ἑώς ἅρ) his enemies should be utterly subdued. But what follows this period, when they shall have been thus subdued? The apostle has told us. It is the mediatorial throne to which the Messiah is exalted; it is to him as constituted king, that his enemies are to be brought in subjection; and when this is accomplished, the mediatorial throne and reign, as such, are to cease. So 1 Cor. xv. 24—28 seems to assure us.
(14) How different the station and employment of angels from those of the Messiah! He is σύνοδος with God, and commands the universe; they are spirits employed merely as ministers to execute his will. Are they not all λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα? Comp. 1 K. xxii. 19; Zech. iii. 5—7; Dan. vii. 10; Is. vi. 1; Luke i. 19. By the Rabbins, the angels are frequently named μέταφαται, angeli ministerii. Eis διακώνια, for ministering, in order to serve, for the aid of. Διακώνια means any kind of service or assistance whatever. It is here said to be performed διὰ τῶν μέλλοντας κληρονομάν σωτηρίαν, on account of those who are to obtain salvation, i.e., on account of Christians who are the heirs of future glory or happiness, or who will obtain it.*

It appears quite clear that the writer of our epistle believed in the real existence of angels as intelligent beings. To have instituted a comparison between the Son of God on the one hand, and mere abstract qualities or imaginary beings on the other would not seem to be very apposite, at least not apposite to any serious purpose. And if the writer looked upon angels as only imaginary beings or personifications of qualities, with what propriety or consistency could he represent them as worshipping the Son of God, or as ministering to the saints? But Ps. cii. 3 is first erroneously translated, he maketh the winds his angels, and flaming fire his servants, λειτουργοὶ ἁβροῦ, and it is then used as a proof that the elements themselves are called angels. Hence it is concluded, that it is unnecessary to suppose angels to be an order of real intelligent beings. But as this translation is not well grounded (see on v. 7th), any such conclusion built upon it cannot be stable. That the sacred writers everywhere regard angels, and speak of them, as intelligent beings having a real existence, appears so plain, that it would seem as if no one, who is not strongly wedded to his own a priori and philosophical reasoning, could venture to deny it. See article II. Bib. Sac. No. 1, 1848, p. 88, seq.

CHAP. II.

(1) On this account, διὰ τοῦτο, i.e., since Christ, who is at the head of the new, is so much exalted above the angels who were

* Ebrard says that Christ is represented as standing in a threefold relation above the angels: "He is the absolute revelation of God and therefore himself God; the angels are only servants. He is King of an imperishable kingdom; the angels execute only periodic commands; he rules in a moral way as founder of a kingdom of righteousness, and his whole dignity as Messiah is founded directly on his moral and spiritual relation to man; the angels are only mediators of outward appearances of nature, by which a rude, unsusceptible people are to be trained for higher things." Comm. on v. 9.
the mediators of the old dispensation (see v. 2), it becomes us, etc. Ημᾶς, us by κοίνωνις, i. e., a method of speaking in which the writer includes himself with those whom he addresses. See Introduction.

To give heed to, προσέχειν, i. e., προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, attendere. Abresch thinks it is here equivalent to ἀντέχειν, retinere, tenaciter adhaerere; which Dindorf also favors. But evidently this is unnecessary, inasmuch as περισσότερον is connected with it, and designates the intensity of mind with which attention should be paid to the things that the Son of God reveals. Ἀκούσθειον, things heard, are the truths and doctrines of the Christian religion which had been declared to them; see vs. 3, 4.

For παραβάωμεν two senses have been principally claimed; (a) To fall, to stumble, or to perish. So Chrysostom and Theophylact: παραβάωμεν, τυπεστι, ἀπολύσωμεν, ἐκπέσωμεν. Both illustrate it by the proverbial saying, addressed to a child, γις, μὴ παραβάωμεν, Prov. iii. 21, in order to guard him against stumbling. In like manner Theodoret represents the word as spoken here, όν μὴ των ὄλων ὑπομαίνωμεν, so that we may not suffer a lapse, or may not stumble, fall. So Suidas explains it by παραπέσωμεν; Hesych by ἐκπέσωμεν; Lex. Cyrilli, μὴ παραβάωμεν, μὴ ἐκπέσωμεν; μὴ παρασέβομεν. The Syriac and Arabic interpreters have rendered it, that we may not fall. Alberti and Matthiae, with many modern critics, assign to it the same sense. The idea connected with stumbling, falling, by this class of commentators, is not that of transgression, but of punishment, of destruction; as is evident from the whole of their illustrations, when compared each with himself and with the others.

But none of the passages adduced from the Greek writers, and alleged to justify this meaning, seem adequate for this purpose. Wetstein has collected a large number of passages. But most of them are only such as designate the well known senses of the word παραβαίνω, viz., to flow, to flow by; as το το πολύν παραβαίνειν τοιαύτα (Plutarch); πεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραβαίνου τοιαύτα (Xen.); to flow in or, as παραβαίνειν . . . . eis to στόμα ὥριον (Galen); in all which cases the word is applied to the flowing of liquids; to flow out, as εἰ τις ἄφροδιτος λόγος παραβαίνη (Διον.). In some cases the word is figuratively applied to locomotion in men; as παραβαίνεις γὰρ ἀνθρώπου eis τῶν νεῶν [νοῦν] τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ (Plutarch). None of these instances justify the sense of perishing, falling into ruin.

(b) The other sense contended for, is that of suffering to flow from the mind or memory, i. e., to forget. Παραβαίνειν is frequently applied to things that glide or pass away from the mind, e. g., "Many who seem to be believers . . . . need, for the sake
of remembering ... examples drawn from objects of sense ... 

... ἢν μὴ τέλεον παραβάθη, so that they will not entirely escape, i. e., from the mind, Origen contra Celsum, p. 393.” “That τὰ καλὰ may not be merely temporary, καὶ μὴ παραβάθη λήπθη βιωθῶν ἀμαυρώθενα, and may not escape [flow away], being obscured in the abysses of forgetfulness, Greg. Nazianz.” So Lucian: εἰ τί ἐν τῷ ποιήματι δρόμῳ παραβάθη λάθη, οἱ anything flowing away [escaping] in the poetic course is forgotten; Diss. cum Hesiod. 5. So in Latin, “frustra docemur, si quidquid audimus praeterfluit [παραβάθη]. Quinctil. XI. 2.” “It cannot enter into the mind of the judge, ante enim praeterlabitur quam perpecta est, for it slides away before it is apprehended, Cicero de Orat. II. 25.”

But none of these examples meet the case, since παραβάθη is applied only to things, and not to persons, as in our text. That a thing παραβάθη should escape from me, and that I should be said παραβάθη in respect to that thing, are two very different expressions.

In the classics, I have been able to find no example which is in point for our case. The Septuagint have used the word but once, Prov. iii. 21, υἱὸς, μὴ παραβάς τὸ ἔργον ἐκ μητρὸς τινὶ καὶ ἐννοια, σοι, do not pass by [neglect], but keep my council and advice. This is the very proverb to which Chrysostom and Theophylact appeal, as an illustration of the word in question; but the true sense of this word, in Prov. iii. 21, they do not seem to have apprehended. Παραβάς here plainly does not mean to perish, to fall, but it is the antithesis of τῷργον, keep, attend to, practise, and consequently means to pass by, to neglect, to transgress. In like manner Clemens Alex., speaking of women, says, “They are bound by virtuous modesty, οὐ μὴ παραβάσω τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ χαυνότητα, not to neglect [pass by or transgress] the truth on account of effeminate weakness, Pedagog. III. p. 246.” These two instances seem to meet the wants of our case, as παραβάθη is here applied to persons.

Plainly, then, μὴ παραβάσω may here mean lest we should pass by, viz., the things which we have heard, lest we should neglect them, lest we should transgress [pass beyond] them; for so the writer himself seems to have explained it in the context. For if, says he, every παραβάσω and παρακοή received a due reward [under the law of Moses], how shall we escape punishment, διὰ μὲν ἡσαντεῖς, having neglected so great salvation. That ἀμελήσατε, here refers to the same thing which is designated by παραβάς, appears on the whole to be probable; for first the writer exhorts them ‘to attend diligently to what they had heard, lest they should pass by or neglect it,’ and then he says, ‘if they do neglect it (ἀμελήσατε), punishment will be the certain consequence, a
punishment more severe than that inflicted on transgressors under the law. So Calvin: *Attendere et praeterfluere sunt opposita... neque enim eorum opinionem probo, qui pro interius accipiant [παραβαύματε]. Consideranda est antithesis inter retentionem et profusionem.

The same sentiment is obtained, if we compare παραβαύματε with the preceding περισσοτερός... προσέχειν. Now, as προσέχειν means to attend diligently, to give heed, so παραβαύματε would seem to mean to treat with neglect, to be ἀμηλήσαντες, as it is expressed in the following verse. In a word, the sentiment is, 'diligent attention to the truths of the gospel is necessary to guard us against neglect or transgression; which neglect is followed by certain and aggravated condemnation.' Kuinoel attributes to παραβαύματε the twofold sense of apostasy and destruction, p. 45. But is it not the fact, that the παραβαύς and ἀμηλήσαντες of v. 2, are expository of παραβαύματε? I acknowledge it is possible that πῶς ἐκφεύγομεν μὴ, may be the exegesis of it; and in this case, παραβαύματε must have the sense which Chrysostom gives to it, viz., lest we perish.

(2) *If the communication [revelation] made by angels, El γάρ δὲ ἄγγελων λαλήσας λόγος. The Jewish law is undoubtedly the λόγος, δὲ ἄγγελων λαλήσας, in this case. The meaning is, that angels were present and assisted at the giving of the law. See EXCURSUS VIII.

Was ratified, was made firm and stable, 'Εγένετο βέβαιος, i.e., its threatenings and promises were exactly fulfilled; nothing which the law declared was null, or failed of being carried into execution. Compare Rom. iv. 16; Heb. ix. 17; 2 Pet. i. 19. *Every transgression and act of disobedience, Καὶ τάσα παράβασις καὶ παρακολ. The words are nearly or quite synonymous by usage. Παράβασις (from παραβάων) literally means going beyond, passing by any thing; but it is here applied to moral action. So παρακολ comes from παρακολοῦω, which means, (1) To hear in a careless or negligent manner. (2) To disobey, i. e., it is the opposite of ἀκούστω to hear, or to obey. Παράβασις καὶ παρακολ, taken together, mean every kind of transgression, or every kind of offence against the law. —"Ενδικὸν μοιδαισοδιαί, just retribution, or condign punishment. Μοιδαισοδιαί designates the reward of retributive justice, i. e., punishment, as well as the reward for virtuous conduct; and this, in heathen as well as sacred writers.

(3) *How shall he escape? Ἡώς ἡμῶν ἐκφεύγομεν, viz., escape the μοιδαισοδιον reserved for transgressors; compare Heb. xii. 25. So Rom. ii. 3, ἐκφεύγαν τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. So Aesch. Eumen. v. 756, ἐκφεύγαν αἵματος δικην.—Τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας,
i. e., the Christian religion; for so the word σωτηρία sometimes signifies; comp. Jude v. 8, perhaps Rom. xi. 11, and Heb. vi. 9. The full phrase would seem to be δόγμα τῆς σωτηρίας, which is found in Acts xiii. 26. It is, however, the Christian religion with all its promised blessings and tremendous threats, which is here designated by σωτηρία. How can we escape with impunity if we neglect [ἀμελήσαντες] them? Ἀμελήσαντες here, however, is plainly emphatic, and means to treat with utter disregard or contempt, such namely as would be implied in an apostasy.

The phrase, Ἡ τε ἀρχὴ λαβώσας λαλήσῃ, is equivalent to ἐν ἀρχῇ λαλήσωσιν, which was at first declared or published. The Greeks often use the phrase ἀρχῇ λαβῶν, to signify at first, or taking its rise, commencing its origin. Τοῦ Κυρίου, viz., Christ.

Was confirmed unto us by those who heard [him], i. e., the Lord, ὕπό τῶν ἀκούσαντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, or by those who heard [it], i. e. the gospel, σωτηρίαν. Ἐβεβαιώθη here means delivered or declared with confirmation to us, i. e., Christians. So Theophylact, διαφορκείσθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαιώσα καὶ πιστῶς, was propagated to us surely and faithfully. Because the writer here says εἰς ἡμᾶς, some critics, as we have seen, draw the conclusion that Paul could not have been the author of this epistle, since he received the gospel immediately from Christ himself, Gal. i. 12, and not from those who heard the Saviour declare it. But Cicero says, in one of his orations, NOS PERDIDUS REMPUBLICAM. Shall we conclude that he did not write the oration, because he did not himself destroy the republic? See on ἡμᾶς, under v. 1, and see also Introduction.

(4) God attesting, being co-witness, viz., to the truth of what was preached, by various wonderful events, Σωτηρισμαρτυρητοίς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σημείως τε καὶ τέρατος. Σημείων, as used often in the New Testament and in the Septuagint, means any extraordinary sign or miraculous event, designed to show the certainty that something which had been promised or predicted should take place, or that a prophet was what he professed to be. Τέρας, portentum, prodigium, miracle, has nearly the same meaning, and is very commonly joined with σημείων in the New Testament. Both connected mean various extraordinary events, or prodigies, designed to confirm, establish, or render credible, any prediction or declaration of Christ, or of his messengers. Heathen writers sometimes employ both words in connection; e. g., Aelian, Var. Hist. XII. 57. The corresponding Hebrew phrase is, פִּיצֶת נְשָׁרָה, signs and wonders, i. e., wonderful signs or proofs of anything. Such the people of God often required, and such were often given. See Gen. xv. 8—18; xxiv. 12—
27; Judges vi. 17, 21, 36—40; 2 K. xix. 29; Is. xxxviii. 7, 8; vii. 14—16, et alibi. Comp. Matt. xii. 38; xvi. 1—3.

And various miraculous powers, Καὶ ποικιλὶς δυνάμεως. Sometimes δύναμις is put for miracle, as Matt. vii. 22; xi. 20, 21, 28, et alibi. But as σημείως καὶ τέρατι denote miraculous events, in our verse, I understand δυνάμεις as referring here to the miraculous powers which were imparted to the primitive teachers of the Christian religion. In such a sense the word is employed, in Mark vi. 14; Acts vi. 8; x. 38. The Septuagint do not employ this word to translate either ἔσχατον or ἱστομεν, but always use σημείον and τέρατα.

What follows is connected with the phrase just explained; viz., καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίων μερισμοίς, literally, and distributions of the Holy Spirit, i. e., the imparting of divine influence; which refers particularly to the various species of this influence which consisted in the power of working miracles; see 1 Cor. xii. 6—11. Compare also John vii. 39; Acts i. 5, 8; ii. 17, 18, 33; v. 32; viii. 15, 19; x. 44—47; xix. 1—6. Ποικιλὰς δυνάμεις . . . καὶ μερισμοίς, if considered as a Hendiadys (ἐν διὰ δυνών), may be thus rendered, various miraculous powers imparted by divine influence.

As it seemed good in his [God’s] sight, Κατὰ τὴν ἀντιθέτησιν, i. e., as he pleased, or the Holy Spirit pleased; which last is favored by 1 Cor. xii. 6—11, and to this I have conformed the pointing of my translation.

The sum of the whole warning (vs. 1—4) is, ‘Beware that you do not slight the gospel, whose threatenings are more to be dreaded than those of the law: inasmuch as the gospel is a revelation of a higher nature, and has been confirmed by more striking and more abundant miracles wrought by divine power.’

CHAP. II. 5—18.

The writer, after having stopped for a moment to warn his readers against the consequences of defection from Christianity, returns to his subject, viz., the comparison of Christ with the angels. Having established by appeals to the Old Testament (i. 5—14), the superiority of the former over the latter in several points of view, he now proceeds to show that the new or Christian dispensation was not ordered or arranged (like the Mosaic) by angels, but that the Son of Man, the Messiah, was, in his human nature, placed at the head of it. Now, as the Jews, one and all, conceded that the dispensation of the Messiah would be of a higher order than that of Moses, proof that Jesus was the sole mediator or head of the new dispensation, and that angels were not employed as mediators or intercessors in it, would satisfy them that Jesus was superior to the angels; since the place which he holds in the new economy, is higher than that which they had under the old, because the new economy itself is of a higher nature than the old. At the same time, an objection which a Jew, weak in Christian faith and strong in his attachment to the Mosaic institutions, would very naturally feel, is met and tacitly answered by the apostle in what follows. The unbelieving Jews doubtless urged upon those who professed attachment to Christianity, the seeming absurdity of renouncing
their subjection to a dispensation of which angels were the mediators, and of acknowledging a subjection to one of which the professed head and mediator appeared in our nature. The history of the objections made by the unbelieving Jews (see especially the account of the sect of the Eulamites) to the claims of Jesus as being the Son of God (John 10: 30—38 et alibi), shows how very repulsive it was to their feelings, that one, to all appearance like a man, and consisting of flesh and blood in the same manner as themselves, should advance a claim to the exalted honors of a superior and divine nature. We shall see, however, that the author disposes of this difficulty, so as to further the great purpose of his general argument.

It is conceded that Jesus had a nature truly and properly human, v. 6—18 But there is abundant evidence in the Old Testament Scriptures, that man, or the human nature in the person of the Messiah, should be made Lord of the universe. Consequently, the possession by Jesus of a nature truly and properly human, does not at all prove either his inferiority to angels, or the inferiority of the dispensation of which he is the head (v. 6—9); which meets an objection strongly urged upon the Hebrew Christians by their unbelieving brethren.

Nay, more; it was becoming that God should exalt Jesus, in consequence of his obedience unto death, a death necessary for the salvation of Jew and Gentile, v. 9, 10. To suffer this death, he must needs take on him a nature like ours; and, as his object was the salvation of men (and not of angelic beings), so he participated in the nature of men, in order that by experience he might know their sufferings, temptations, and trials, and thus be prepared, in a peculiar manner, and in their own nature, to be compassionate, faithful, and ready to succor them, v. 11—18.

The sum of the whole is, that the possession of a human nature by Jesus, is far from being a reason why the ancient dispensation (of which angels were the intermediaries) is preferable to the new one; for (1) This very nature is exalted far above the angels. (2) Without participating in this nature, Jesus could not have made expiation for sin by his death. And (3) The possession of such a nature did contribute, in a peculiar and endearing manner, to constitute him such a Saviour as men could approach with the greatest boldness and confidence, in all their wants and all their woes.

(5) However, Γάρ, Germ. doch. The reference is to v. 2, and the clause contains what is distinguished from the assertion there. Oδ γάρ is in its own nature adversative, and the relation here to something already mentioned, is indicated by the γάρ.

The world to come, ἡ ἡκομμένη τῆς μαθωνον, equivalent to ὁ αἰων ὁ μεγάλων, the world under the Christian dispensation, i. e., as it will be in future, ὁ μεγάλων, i. e., the world as under the reign of Christ. The addition of περὶ γῆς λαοῦμεν, shows that such is the sense of the phrase; for it is Christianity, to which he had just been urging the Hebrews to pay the strictest regard.

(6) One in a certain place, Διεμπρότατο δέ που τίς, i. e., passage of Scripture, bears this testimony. The writer speaks to those who were supposed to be familiar with and to acknowledge the authority of the Jewish Scriptures. The passage quoted here is Ps. viii. 4—6, exactly according to the version of the Seventy.

What is man that thou shouldest kindly regard him? Τί τινω... αἰτή. The secondary sense of μανήσκω is, to remember with affection, to regard with kindness. So the Heb. יִשָּׂע; and so μανήσκες, in Heb. xiii. 3. Or the Son of man, that thou shouldest regard him? 'If viō... αἰτή. The phrase viō ἀσφαλέω, is here equivalent to ἀσφαλέω; just as in Hebrew, יִשָּׂע יִשָּׂע is equivalent to יִשָּׂע. The subject is evidently the same as in the preceding clause, and viō ἀσφαλέω is employed merely for the sake of giv-
ing variety to the mode of expression. ἐπισκέπτομαι, to visit, usually means to inspect or look upon favorably, to watch over one for his good, to succor him, to assist him; see Matt. xxv. 36; Luke i. 68; James i. 27. In the New Testament, it is used only in a sense which designates inspecting with an eye of favor. But in the Septuagint, it is also used for visiting in order to punish; as in the Hebrew נָעַב, e. g., Ex. xxxii. 34; xxxiv. 7, et alibi. Our English word regard (taken in a good sense), answers well to ἐπισκέπτομαι. The classical use of the word sometimes, though rarely, accords with the sense in which it is here employed.

(7) Thou hast made him but little inferior to the angels, Ἡλαύνως αὐτῶν ... ἄγγελοι. Παρά here means in comparison with; as in i. 4, παρ' αὐτούς. Βραχύ τι may signify either a little time, or a little in respect to degree or rank; in which last case, it would be equivalent here to our English word somewhat. In the Septuagint it is employed in both these senses; as is also the Hebrew word נַעַב, which is here rendered by βραχύ τι. In Ps. viii. 6, נַעַב seems pretty plainly to refer to inferiority of rank or station, and not to time. But in our text, most recent commentators have maintained that it refers to time; and consequently that the apostle has merely accommodated the passage in Ps. viii. to an expression of his own views. But such a mode of interpretation is, at least, unnecessary here. The object which the writer of our epistle has in view, is not to prove how little time Christ appeared in our nature; but that, although he did possess a nature truly human, still in this nature he was exalted above the angels. Ἡλαύνως αὐτῶν βραχύ τι παρ' ἄγγελοι, then, simply designates the condition of man, as being in itself but little inferior to that of the angels. Man is made in the image of God, Gen. i. 26, 27; ix. 6. It is plainly the dignity of man which the Psalmist intends to describe, when he says, מֵאֲבָט נָעַב שֶׁחָרָה נַעַב. To such a view of his design, the context of this passage in Ps. viii. leads us. The Psalmist looks abroad and surveys the heavens in all their splendor and glory, and then, with deep sensations of his own comparative insignificance, he exclaims, "What is man that thou shouldest be mindful of him! Or the son of man that thou shouldest regard him! Yet [but, yet] thou hast made him little inferior (נַעַב אֲרָמָא) to the angels, thou hast crowned him, etc." The nature of the case and the nature of poetic parallelism here require such an interpretation of the passage in the original Psalm; and the very same interpretation of it is altogether opposite to the purpose of the writer, in Heb. ii. 7. What is his design? To prove that Christ, in his human nature, is exalted above the
angels. How does he undertake to prove this? First, by showing that this nature itself is made but little inferior to that of the angels, ἐξαντωσες αἰτῶν βραχο τι παρ᾿ ἀγγελους; and next, that it has been exalted to the empire of the world, "Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and set him over the work of thy hands."

The words Παρ᾿ ἀγγελους, are equivalent to ו병 in the Hebrew. See on this use of ו병, = ἀγγελου, i. 6. If we insist that the usual meaning of the Hebrew word Elohim should be retained, the argument would be still stronger to prove the dignity of the Messiah in his human nature. Thou hast made him but little inferior to Elohim, would represent him at least as ἐσαγγελος, if not above the angels. See Gen. i. 26, 27, from which the language here and in the sequel appears to be borrowed.

But how could the apostle use παρ᾿ ἀγγελους, as conveying the sense of ו병? In answer to this, we may say, (1) It conveys no meaning that is untrue, even if we insist that ו병 in Ps. viii. must be understood as meaning God. If man is but little below Elohim, surely he is not much inferior to the angels. (2) As angels are here compared by the writer with man, or rather, the angelic with the human nature in the person of the Saviour, the passage, as it stands in the Septuagint and as the apostle has quoted it, is apposite to his purpose; although it claims, in fact, less for the argument, than would be claimed by insisting that the word ו병 should be interpreted God. As the writer was addressing those who used the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, nothing could be more natural than to quote that version as it stood, unless it conveyed an idea that was essentially erroneous. This is just what we do, every day, with our English version of the Scriptures, without suspecting that we are violating any rule of propriety.

Like to the Seventy, the Chaldee has rendered וبيب by אב, i. e., παρ᾿ ἀγγελους. With this rendering Aben Ezra agrees; as do Mendelssohn, Michaelis, Dathe, and others; and Gesenius, in his recent Thesaurus, acknowledges that the word is susceptible of such a meaning. Still the apostle, by using the version of the Seventy (παρ᾿ ἀγγελους), has, as I have already said, assumed less in the argument than the original would have given him, supposing וبيب to mean God. At the same time he has taken a version, which in its present shape is exactly apposite to his purpose, i. e., to show that if a comparison of Christ with the angels be made, it will be seen, that even during his humiliation he was but little inferior to them; while in a state of exaltation in the human nature, he is far above them.
Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, or with exalted honor, Δόξα καὶ τιμὴ ἄστιμπον καὶ αὐτῶν. Δόξα καὶ τιμὴ are nearly equivalent or synonymous; and two synonymous nouns, thus constructed, are expressive of intensity, agreeably to the well-known usage of the Hebrew language from which this idiom is borrowed. In the original, ἱψιστὸς καὶ ὕψιστος τῶν χαρῶν σου, thou hast set him over the works of thy hands, i. e., thou hast given him dominion over the creation. ἔργα τῶν χαρῶν σου means simply, the works which thou hast made, i. e., thy works. The form of expression is borrowed from the mode of human operations, in which hands are the most conspicuous instrument. Καθιστοῦ, siste, coloque, statuo. It should be noted, however, that this clause is omitted in some Codices of good authority; such as D. B. and several others.

(8) Thou hast subjected all things to him, Πάντα ... ὁδοὺ αὐτῶ, i. e., given him universal dominion. The phrase to put under one’s feet, denotes, to put in a state of complete or entire subjection. See Exegesis IX.

The writer proceeds to comment on the quotation just made. Εν γὰρ τῇ ὑποτάξει αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὕτως ἀφιέρων αὐτῷ ἀνυπότατον, i. e., the expression is one of universality, it makes no exception but only of God himself; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27.

For the present, indeed, we do not see all things yet subjected to him, Νῦν δὲ ἀνα κριμαν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτελείσταν. Ὑποτελείσταν, subject to his ordering, arrangement, or disposal. In other words, ‘This prophecy of the Psalmist is not, as yet, wholly fulfilled; but so much of it has been accomplished, that we may regard it as a pledge, that a fulfilment of the rest will certainly follow.’ So the sequel.

(9) But we see Jesus, who is little inferior to the angels, on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, after that by the grace of God he had tasted of death for all, i. e., for Jew and Gentile, Τὸν ἰδικῶς τι . . . γενόμενος Ἰδανᾶν. Two objections against the superiority of Christ over angels, were very naturally urged by the unbelieving Jews upon the believing ones. (1) Christ was a man. (2) He suffered an ignominious death. To these the apostle replies in the quotation which precedes v. 9, and on which he is now commenting. In doing this he suggests the consideration, that the death of Jesus, so far from proving his condition to be inferior to that of the angels, was immediately connected with his exaltation to glory, and with the salvation of the world.
Some of the varied constructions put upon this passage are the following: (1) Beza: We see crowned with glory and honor Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, but by the grace of God he might taste of death for every man. (2) Valckenaer: We see Jesus for a little while made lower than the angels, through the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace, etc. (3) Pierce, Michaelis, Dindorf, Wakefield, and others: Jesus, who was made lower than the angels in order that he might suffer death, that by the grace of God he might taste of death for every man, we see crowned with honor and glory. (4) Carpzoff, Boehme, and Cramer, include in a parenthesis διὰ τὸ πάθημα ἐντεφυμένον, and join ὑπὸ χάριν κ. τ. τ., to the first part of the verse. (5) Haenlein, Morus, Kuinoel: We see Jesus, etc., on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that it might be made apparent that his death, through divine benevolence, was destined for the salvation of all.

All of these explanations seem to me to be more or less forced. Plainly it is not the apostle's principal object, to show that Jesus had a nature in which he might suffer death; but to show that his death, so far from degrading him, was a ground of his supreme exaltation and of the salvation of the human race; and so, the fact that he was human, and that the died, would afford no just ground for ranking him, in his present condition, beneath the angels. His humble condition and sufferings are most intimately connected with his supreme elevation. And he who keeps this in mind, will need no other aid in deciding upon Nos. 1—3 above. No. 4 is certainly a possible explanation, perhaps not an improbable one; but there is also the like objection to this which has just been made, viz., that it does not appear to be the object of the writer to assert that Jesus took on him the human nature in order that he might suffer. It may, however, be said in favor of this exegesis, that the idea of taking on him a nature lower than that of the angels, in order that by divine mercy he might die for a perishing world, was worthy of the supreme dignity and excellence of Jesus, and could in no way be construed as rendering him inferior to the angels. The idea which Kuinoel and others deduce from ὑπὸ χάριν κ. τ. τ., does not appear to lie in the text; for how was it, that Jesus was crowned with glory and honor, in order that he might suffer death for all? He had already suffered death, before he was crowned. If the writer had said: In order that he might save, deliver, or redeem all, then we might adopt this exegesis; for redemption would be subsequent to the glorification of the Saviour. But how Jesus was exalted in order that he might taste death for all, I think
these interpreters (with whom Bloomfield agrees) have not sufficiently explained.

I must on the whole, adopt a different method of explanation, as given above, and one which renders no metathesis of the text necessary, and (as I trust) does no violence to the usus loquendi. The first part of the verse has already been explained. The second clause I construe thus; *crowned with the highest honor on account of his suffering death, δόξη καὶ τιμή . . . . Ιακώβου. See the same sentiment in Phil. ii. 8—11. Heb. xii. 2. Comp. John xvii. 4, 5. Heb. v. 7—9. Eph. i. 20—28. Rev. iii. 21. That I have rightly construed this phrase, moreover, appears from the latter part of v. 10, to advance to glory through sufferings, διὰ παθημάτων τελείωσα. The Acc. with διὰ in v. 9, shows that the interpretation I have given is grammatical. That it is analogical with other parts of Scripture, the texts referred to will sufficiently evince.

"ὢρος is rendered by almost all the critics and lexicographers, ut, eum in finem ut, that, so that, in order that, etc.; just as if the word had, or could have, no other meaning.* That this is its general meaning, and particularly that it has this meaning in most instances where it occurs in the New Testament, there can be no reasonable doubt. But ὢρος also means, as an adverb, cum, quando, postquam, when, after, after that. So in Acts iii. 19, although Wahl has overlooked the passage. So also in Aristoph. Nub.60. Soph. Oedip. Col.1638. Homer. II. XII. 208. Odys. III. 873. XXII. 22. Eurip. Phoenix. 1155. 1464. Herod. I. 17. VII. 119; see Passow's Lex. ὢρος, A. 2. 6. This sense also Hoogeveen, Zeunius, Ernesti, Schleusner, Schneider, and Donnegan, assign to it. "ὢρος is construed more usually with the future Ind., or with the Subj. 1st or 2d Aorist, in case these tenses are found in any verb. In the instance before us it is followed by γειώτατα, in the Subj. first Aorist, of the middle voice. It may then be rendered by the past time (as I have translated it); just as in the cases where the formula ὢρος πληρωθη occurs, it is often rendered, or should be rendered, so that there was an accomplishment. See Wahl on ὢρος, ii. 6. The only difference in the latter case is, that the voice is passive; which however does not affect the question about the mode of rendering the tense. It will be noted, that the particle ὢρος demands the Subj. mood after it, when employed in the sense of postquam; see Passow, ubi supra. But this does not require a future sense of the verb

* It should seem to be far more philologically correct to make ὢρος here eulogize in sense: "so as that (with the result that) by the grace of God he might taste death for every man." Robinson's Lex. The idea is: that he was crowned, etc., so as that his death might be effectual for all.
itself, I mean future in respect to the time when the author wrote; but it demands merely a conditional sense in regard to the event connected with it. E.g., in this case, the tasting of death was the condition, on which the glory and honor were to be conferred.

To the objection to this exegesis, that there seems to be a repetition of the same sentiment by the apostle in immediate succession; for first he says, διὰ πάντημα τοῦ ᾿Ιανάτου, κ. τ. λ., and then διόκσεις... γενόμεναι ᾿Ιανάτου; it may be said, there is merely an apparent, not a real repetition. The one expression states that the death of Jesus was one of the grounds of his advancement to glory: the other, that he tasted of death in order that the whole human race might be brought into a state of salvation. Here, then, are two distinct reasons why the death of Jesus was not derogatory to him, and therefore could not be appealed to as showing that he was not exalted above the angels. The explanation which I give of the words, represent the sentiment to be the following, viz., 'When Jesus, by the benevolent purpose of God towards men, had tasted of death for them, he was crowned with glory and honor on account of his high and holy act of obedience.' By the suggestion of such views respecting the death of Christ, it is plain that the writer removes the objections which he is tacitly laboring to remove; and therefore it seems consonant with the nature of the case to represent him as thus speaking.

By the goodness, kindness, and mercy of God,* Χάρις Ἰσσώ. ᾿Υπερ πάντος means all men without distinction, i.e., both Jew and Gentile. The same view is often given of the death of Christ; see John iii. 14—17; iv. 42; xii. 32; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 3, 4; Tit. ii. 11; 2 Pet. 3, 7. Comp. Rom. iii. 29, 30; x. 11—13. In all these, and the like cases, the words all and all men, evidently mean Jew and Gentile. They are opposed to the Jewish idea, that the Messiah was connected appropriately and exclusively with the Jews, and that the blessings of his kingdom were appropriately if not exclusively theirs. The idea is, that there is no difference at all in regard to the privileges of any one who may belong to his kingdom; and that all men, without exception, have equal and free access to it. But the considerate interpreter, who understands the nature of this idiom, will never think of seeking, in expressions of this kind, proof of the final salvation of every individual of the human race. Nor do they, when strictly scanned by the usus lo-

* Some critics, upon rather slender evidence, read here: ἔφυτε Ἰσσώ, and translate, "forsaken of God" (Paulus of Heidelberg), or "except God," i.e., "Christ tasted death for every one, God himself alone excepted." See Ebrard's Comm in h. 1.
quendi of the New Testament, decide directly against the views of those who advocate what is called a particular redemption. In all these phrases, the subject evidently respects the offer of salvation, the opportunity to acquire it through a Redeemer; not the actual application of promises, the fulfilment of which is connected only with repentance and faith. But whether such an offer can be made with sincerity to those who are reprobates, (and who, the Saviour knows, are and will be such), consistently with the grounds which the advocates for particular redemption maintain, is a question for the theologian rather, than for the commentator to discuss.

Γεώντρα Ιανάρον, taste of death, i. e., experience death, suffer it. So the Hebrew writers use the word שֶׁבֶג for experience; and classic Greek authors, the word γεώντρα in the same sense. E. g., Ps. xxxiv. 9; Sibyll. Orac. I. p. 164, Ἀδὰμ γεώντρα διήγεγμενος Ιανάρον. Eunapius de Porphyriio: "Porphyrio praised the spell of purity, καὶ διὰ πέτρας γεώντρας, and first tried [tasted] it himself;" Philo (de vita Mosis p. 632), ἡ διάνοια τῶν γεωντρῶν δούλωτος the mind of those who have experienced [tasted] holiness.

(10) For it became him, for whom all things [were made], and by whom all things [were made], Εὑρηκε γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τὰ πάντα καὶ διὸ τὰ πάντα, i. e., it became the supreme Lord and Creator of all things. The writer leaves his readers to feel and acknowledge the truth of this assertion, without stopping to offer proof of its correctness. The force of the appeal seems to lie in the tacit acknowledgment of all, that reward is properly consequent upon trial and approbation, and is not to be bestowed without them. Now as Christ possessed a nature truly human; and as all men are, by the universal arrangement of a wise and overruling providence, subjected to trial; so it was proper or becoming in God, that Jesus should be subjected to trial in our nature, before he was advanced to glory in it.

The last part of the verse; Πολλοὶ νῦν ἄγαγόντα, κ. τ. λ., contains an involved construction of the words, in respect to their order. The arrangement of the sense is generally taken to be as follows: Εὑρηκε γὰρ αὐτῷ . . . διὰ πατησάμων τελεώσαι τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, ἄγαγόντα πολλοὶ νῦν αἰς δόξαν. But Kuinoel and some others connect ἄγαγόντα with the preceding αὐτῷ, and apply it therefore to God the Father. The regular laws of grammatical construction would require ἄγαγόντα (Dat. case so as to agree with αὐτῷ); but still this is not an in dispensable rule. The anacolutha of the participle in particular are well known (See Winer's Gramm. § 64. 2, edit. 3), i. e., the participle not unfrequently differs in case from the noun or pronoun to which it belongs; e. g., Eph. iv. 2, ὡμᾶς . . . ἀνεχόμενον.
Col. iii. 16, ὑμῖν . . . διδάσκοντες. 2 Cor. ix. 10, 11, ὑμῖν . . . πλουτιζόμενοι. Acts xv. 22, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις . . . γράφαντες. Comp. also Rom. ii. 8; viii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 17; Eph. iii. 17. Such anacolutha are by no means uncommon in the best Greek authors; e. g., Thucyd. iii. 36, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐπικαλοῦντες' iv. 42, τοῖς Σωρακούσιοι . . . ἀρέστητε: i. 93, τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις . . . καταβάντες: vi. 24, τοῖς ἐν ἰλικίᾳ . . . εὔληπτες. Hom. IIiad. II. 350, Κρονίωνα . . . ἀστράπτων. See Kuinoel on Acts xv. 32, and Winer ut supra. We may then (so Kuinoel asserts) refer ἀγαγόντα to the preceding αὐτῷ, without departing from the usus loquendi; and on the whole, with him I should prefer this construction, if the Part. ἀγαγόντα were in the Nom. case; for such is the fact with all the anacolutha produced above, and it seems to be essential to the irregular construction itself, that the participle should be in the Nom. case. But Kuinoel has overlooked this nicety, and consequently has adopted what seems to be an erroneous construction.

It became him τελειώσασι τὸν ἄρχηγόν. The word τελειός means full grown, of mature age, either literally or figuratively. In the latter sense it is employed in 1 Cor. ii. 6, however, we speak the doctrines of wisdom, ἐν τοῖς τελειοῖς. So Heb. v. 14, comprehending as it were both the above senses where it is opposed to νήπιος. See also 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 3, et alibi. Τελειός also means, mature in a moral sense, i. e., integer, just, free from vices, perfect. It is also very naturally used in a secondary sense, to denote a consummation or maturity of our nature and happiness in a better world, e. g., 1 Cor. xiii. 10. Hence the verb τελειόω, formed from the adjective τελειός, is often used to designate exaltation to a state of reward or happiness in a future world. Among the Greeks, this verb was employed to designate the condition of those, who, having run in the stadium and proved to be victorious in the contest, were proclaimed as successful ἀγωνισταί, and had the honors and rewards of victory bestowed upon them. So τέλος is used by the Greeks for reward, i. e., consummation; see Schleusner on τελειός. Such persons were τετελευμένοι. In a sense like this is τελειώσω usually employed, with reference to Jesus, throughout the epistle to the Hebrews; e. g., v. 9, τελευσώσετος, being advanced to a state of glory; vii. 28, τετελευμένον, id. The same sense the word has in the verse under examination. In ver. 9 the writer had said, that on account of the suffering of death Jesus was δόξα καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένον. Here he says, διὰ παθημάτων τελειώσας, through sufferings to exalt to glory, or to bestow the highest honors. As the writer evidently says this in commenting on the preceding expression, it is plain that διὰ παθημάτων τελειώσας is merely an equivalent for διὰ τῶν
The author of salvation, Τὸν ἀρχηγὸν σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, auctor salutis; so it is usually interpreted. So Chrysostom: αὐτός, ὁ τῶν σωτηρίας τεχὼν. The phrase ἀρχηγὸν σωτηρίας αὐτῶν may mean here the same as ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα in Acts v. 31, i. e., their Prince and Saviour. But in Acts iii. 15, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς is applied to Jesus; and in Heb. xii. 2, we have ἀρχηγὸν τῆς πίστεως; which would rather favor the first interpretation. The sense, however, seems to be substantially expressed if we render thus, viz., on account of sufferings to exalt to a state of glory their Prince and Saviour. Thus understood, the passage contains admirable matter of exhortation to the Hebrew Christians, to persevere in their adherence to Christianity amid all their trials and sufferings; for Jesus their Prince and Saviour himself suffered, and was exalted to glory by his sufferings. If Jesus himself, then, exalted as he was, endured suffering, how could they expect to be exempt from it? Yet if they persevered in their adherence to him, like him they would be τεσσερεμώνιοι.

(11) In the phrase, "Ο, ἐγαλικον...πάντες, I find in the γαλ an intimation of a second illustration or confirmation of the sentiment in ver. 5; for here is proof subjoined, that Christ had a human, not an angelic nature. Then after this, as in the case above, the writer turns the very humanity of Christ to the advantage of his subject and of his general design, instead of leaving the matter in the hands of an objector; see in vs. 14, 15. The word ἀγαλκω corresponds to the Hebrew שֵׁגֶל, שֶׁגֶל, which often means, to consecrate to God as an offering; e. g., Lev. xxii. 2, תֵּسبقֶל, Sept. аγαλκον μοι; xxii. 3, שֵׁגֶל, Sept. агάλεω; Ex. xiii. 2, שֶׁגֶל, Sept. агίασον μοι, et alibi. The verb שֶׁגֶל also means, by a natural association of ideas, to expiate, to make atonement for; e. g., Job i. 5, שֵׁגֶל, he made atonement for them, where however, the Sept. has ἐκαθαρίσαν αὐρῶς; so Ex. xix. 10, 14 and Josh. vii. 13, according to Gesenius, where the Sept. has аγάλων, ἤγιασε, and аγίασον; comp. also Ezek. xlv. 19. The verb агαλκω also corresponds in the Septuagint to the Hebrew שֶׁגֶל, which is the appropriate word to designate the making of an atonement, to expiate; e. g., Ex. xxix. 33, they shall eat those things שֶׁגֶל שֶׁגֶל, with which expiation was made, Sept. εις ἄγιασθησαν εις αὐρῶς; Ex. xxix. 36, and thou shalt purify the altar, תֵּسبقֶל, when thou makest an expiatory sacrifice upon it, Sept. εις τῷ аγαλκω σε εις αὐρῶ. From the usus loquendi of the Hebrew and the Sept., then, it is plain that агαλκω may mean to make expiation, to atone.

The use in our epistle seems to justify if not demand this
sense: e. g., x. 10, according to which will ἡγιασμὸν ἔσμεν, we are atoned for, i. e., expiation is made for us. The writer immediately subjoins, διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ; which necessarily refers ἡγιασμὸν to the propitiatory offering of Christ: Comp. also x. 14, 29. So xiii. 11, 12. Both of these passages, as well as that now under consideration, predicate ἐγιασμὸς of the sufferings and death of Christ; for in our context, in the very next preceding clause, the writer has spoken of Christ as τετελειωμένων διὰ παθημάτων; and he had just declared, that "Jesus by the grace of God had tasted of death for all men." Comp. also ver. 17. We may then render ὅτε ἐγιασὼς καὶ οἱ ἐγιασόμενοι, both he who makes expiation for sin, and they for whom expiation is made, γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. So also Ernesti, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others.

All of one, Ἐξ ἐνός πάντες, i. e., all have God for their common father. So most commentators; and perhaps rightly, for the phrase many sons (in ver. 10) has reference to God as their Father, and the present verse seems to allude to this fact. Some say, 'have Adam for their father;' others, 'Abraham;' others make ἐξ ἐνός more general and equivalent to ἐξ ἐνός γενός, i. e., possessed in common of the same nature, see ver. 14. The reasoning of the writer, understood in this way, or as was first stated, is altogether apposite. It seems to be this; 'That Christ had a nature truly human, is no objection to regarding him as a Saviour exalted above the angels, and altogether adapted to the wants and woes of the human race. In the human nature he suffered, and was advanced to glory; in it he made atonement for men; in it he sustains a most endearing relation to those for whom he made expiation, for he sympathizes with them, vs. 17, 18, and they are united to him as brethren having one common nature, or being of one common father, ἐξ ἐνός πάντες, κ. τ. λ., vs. 11—13.

On account of which, i. e., because he possesses the same nature in common with them, he disdains not to call them his brethren, Δι' ἐν αἰρίαν . . . καλεῖν. Οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται Chrysostom says, is used with regard to a person of higher rank, who condescends to associate with those of a lower standing. But if Christ were merely a man, and nothing more, where (we may ask with Abresch) would be either the great condescension or particular kindness manifested in calling men his brethren? If however he possessed a higher nature, if ἐκείνως εἰστὶν, μορφήν δούλου λαβὼν, Phil. ii. 7; if ἐπαινώσεις εἰστιν, Phil. ii. 8; then was it an act of peculiar kindness and condescension in him, to call men his brethren. It is this high privilege to which men have attained. that the apostle is endeavoring to establish and illustrate;
and all this affords additional reason not to think diminutively of Jesus, as possessing a human nature.

Having introduced the proposition that 'Christ, possessing a nature truly human, regards men as his brethren,' the writer appeals, as is usual with him, to the Old Testament, in confirmation of this sentiment, and to show the Hebrews that it is no new doctrine respecting the Messiah which he inculcates.

(12) Saying, Ἀγως, i. e., since he (Christ) says; ἀπαγγέλω, κ. τ. λ. The passage is quoted from Ps. xxii. 28 [xxi. 22], where, for the Hebrew מֶנֶס, the Seventy have δηλησμαι; instead of which our text employs its equivalent or synonyme, ἀπαγγέλω. Such departures from the Septuagint are very common in the New Testament quotations.

That the 22d Psalm relates to the Messiah, the Jews themselves confess, (see Dindorf in loc.) ; and the history of his death seems, indeed, to be a kind of practical commentary upon it. I can find nothing in the Psalm which forbids the application of it to the Messiah; although I can find enough to satisfy me that it is quite inapplicable to David. The general conversion of the nations to God (vs. 28—32) accords well with the gospel dispensation, but not with the Jewish, which from its very nature could not be a universal religion; for how could all nations, from the extremities of the earth, ever go up three times in a year to Jerusalem, in order to worship and to offer sacrifice there? And can it be rationally supposed, that David uttered such words as those to which I have just adverted, in reference merely to Judaism? The whole object of the present quotation is merely to show, that Christ is exhibited in the Jewish Scriptures as having recognized men in the quality of brethren, ἀδελφοῖς.

Among the assembly I will praise thee, Ἐν μετο ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε, q. d. in or among the assembly of my brethren, i. e., of men, will I celebrate thy praise. In the Hebrew, the words שישך and ביסך נרבח correspond to each other, and are equivalent to each other. The first part of the apostle's quotation, is most directly to the point which he is laboring to illustrate and confirm; the second part (as in many like cases) appears to be cited principally because of the intimate connection which exists between it and the preceding parallelism, and because the memory of those whom he addressed would be assisted by a quotation at large of the whole verse. Still, in the second part the implication is, that he who 'sings praise in the midst of the assembly,' must be like them and one of their number.

(13) And again, Καὶ πάλιν [he says], I confide in him, or I will confide in him, Κυρ ύπομαζ πεπωλεὶς ἐν αὐτῷ. Some critics maintain that this passage is quoted from Ps. xviii. 3, where the
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Hebrew has ἐλπίζω, which the Seventy render ἔπισταν ἀπείρος; or from Sam. xxii. 3, the same Hebrew words occur, which they render according to the phraseology of our text, πεπροσδοκημένος ἐρωματικὸς ἀπείρος. But as these passages are plainly not Messianic, most agree that Is. vii. 17 is quoted, the Hebrew of which is כֹּלְהַלִּי, the Septuagint version of which is the same as our quotation. The quotation immediately following also, (which is taken from Is. viii. 18), renders it altogether probable that the writer had this place of Scripture in his mind. The Hebrew כֹּלְהַלִּי may be rendered I will wait for him, or I will trust him. The latter is adopted by the Septuagint, and by the apostle. The argument in this case appears to be this. 'It is men, who exercise trust or confidence in God. This is predicated of them as dependent, and possessing a feeble nature. The same thing is predicated of the Messiah; and consequently he possesses a nature like theirs, and therefore they are his brethren; οὗτοι των τιμίων.'

And again, etc., Καὶ πάλιν ἵδον, κ. τ. λ., has been erroneously adduced as an argument, that the passage quoted here must be from a different part of Scripture from that previously quoted. But this does not follow; for in this same epistle, x. 30, a quotation is made from Deut. xxxii. 25, and another from xxxii. 36, with καὶ πάλιν between them as here. In such a case καὶ πάλιν is to be rendered and further, or and moreover. In regard to the design of the writer here, in making the citation, one may say that there are two intimations in it of like condition and nature, on the part of the speaker and those to whom he alludes. (1) He and they are in like condition; for both are signs and wonders to the people of Israel. (2) 'The children given to him by God,' show that the like relation of dependence may be predicated of both; and consequently, that the children in this case are of the like nature with the father. The main point is, that both depend on God; and so both being his children, they stand in such a relation that he [the Saviour] can call them brethren. See EXCURSUS X. for further illustration.

(14) Participated in flesh and blood, Κεκομώνηκε σαρκός καὶ αἷμαρος, i. e., possessed a nature human, a body made up of flesh and blood. See 1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. vi. 12; and comp. Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16; Sirach. xiv. 18. The children (πανδια) here mentioned, are the same that are described in the preceding verse, viz., the disciples, the spiritual children of the Messiah. In the phrase Καὶ αὐτοῖς παραπλησίως μετέχει τῶν αὐτῶν; μετέχει is a synonyme of κεκομώνηκε, participated in. Παραπλησίως is equivalent to ὅμοιως, in the same manner, as well as. TheDocetæ exchanged παραπλησίως here for ὅμοιως, and then construed
that by his death he might subdue him who has a deadly power, that is, the devil. 'Iva διὰ Ἰαβάτον... τὸν δάβδολον. Καταφέω is scarcely used by the Greek writers, and when it is employed, it has the sense of delaying, rendering inactive, hindering, i. e., ἔμποδεῖων, which is used to explain it by the Scholion on Eurip. Phoeniss. 760. In this sense it is often used in the Apocrypha. In the New Testament, the word is not unfrequently used, and with some latitude of signification. Here it means to render ineffectual, or to subdue, viz., Satan the spiritual enemy of man, who has a deadly power; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24—26; 2 Tim. i. 10. I understand τὸν τὸ κράτος τοῦ Ἰαβάτον ἔφορτα in this plain and simple manner, which renders all the speculations about the power of the devil to inflict the sentence of natural death upon men, unnecessary; and equally so, all the efforts to show what the Rabbins have taught about Sammael the angel of death, γρήγορα τῆς. That a deadly power, i. e., a power of leading men to sin and consequently bringing them under sentence of spiritual death, is ascribed to Satan in the New Testament is sufficiently plain; see John xvi. 11; xii. 31; xiv. 30; Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12; Col. ii. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 4, et alibi. In 1 John iii. 8, is a passage altogether of the same tenor as ours. To render not the deadly power of Satan, is to prevent the effects of it when it leads men to incur the sentence of spiritual death, i. e., to redeem them from the effects of such a sentence, or to redeem them from the curse of the law, Gal. iii. 13; compare Rom. v. 9 seq.; 1 Thess. i. 10. Even the temporal consequences of death are removed by Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 26, 45, 52, seq. Thus interpreted, we have a plain sense of the passage, and one analogous to that in many other parts of the Scriptures.

(15) And free those [from condemnation], who during their whole lives, through fear of condemnation, had been exposed to a state of bondage, Kai ἀναλακαίγεται τούτοις... δουλείας. Ἀναλακαίς means primarily to remove, to depel, to depart. But here (as sometimes in classic authors) it means to free, to liberate. So Theophylact ἕλεος ἡπρόμενα. It may be connected with δουλείας, understood, but I have preferred to connect it with Ἰαβάτος, because of the sentiment in the preceding verse which respects the Ἰαβά-
through their whole lives, Διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζην, i. q., διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς, the Inf. mode being here used (often so in the Greek classics) as a mere noun. But it is not the usage of the older Greek writers, to put the Inf. nominascens after an adjective, as here. We may, therefore, understand χρόνου as implied after παντὸς. The later Greek, however, affords examples like ours; e. g., τὸ διάκρινον ζην, τὸ διαιρήσαν ζην ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου ζην, Ignat. Ep. ad. Trall.

Had been subjected [obnoxious, exposed] to servitude, "Ἐνοχοὶ ζοαν δουλείας, i. e., subject to a depressed and miserable condition, like that of slaves under a tyrannical master. Ἐνοχοὶ comes from ἐνόχομαι, adstringo, and so means adstrictus, alligatus. It usually governs the Dative, as Matt. v. 21, 22 bis; and thus in classic writers. But it also governs the Genitive, as here; e. g., Matt. xxvi. 66; Mark iii. 29; xiv. 64; I Cor. xi. 27; James ii. 10. Δουλείας means the servile and depressed condition of those who are exercised with the fear of death, i. e., of future misery; or perhaps Ἐνοχοὶ δουλείας means exposed to the bondage of Satan, whose power had just been mentioned. It is the death of Christ which delivers them from either or both. Comp. John viii. 32—35, where, however, the δουλεία referred to is the servitude of sin. The deliverance spoken of is accomplished in part here, Rom. viii. 14—17, but fully and finally in another world, where the pious are admitted to a state of confirmed happiness. Διὰ παντὸς . . δουλείας seems to imply, that the whole time of life had been more or less exposed to bondage; which is the case with Christians. From such bondage Christ delivers, and will deliver them, i. e., he will save them from future misery, and from the power of the devil; and this is the simple sentiment of the text.

(16) Moreover he doth not extend aid, or afford succor, at all to the angels, Ὁ γὰρ δὴπον ἄγγελον ἐπιλαμβάνει, another reason why he took on him a nature that was human. He came to the aid of man; he became like him, so as the more intimately to sympathize with him and to help him. Τάπω, moreover or or.
It stands as a sign of introducing an additional illustration or argument, which is connected (like ver. 11 seq.) with ver. 5, and is designed to exhibit another reason why Jesus took upon him a nature that was human, and also to be turned to the same account as before. ἄνω, profecto, certe, strengthens the affirmation, i.e., gives intensity to it. ἐπιλαμβάνειν, lit. to grasp, or, to take hold of, with the hand. Hence figuratively, (1) To assert one’s right to a thing; to lay hold of it as one’s own; and (2) To aid, help, succor, to take hold of when falling or in danger. In the Septuagint it answers to the Hebrew נתן, נתיק, נתן. The Christian Fathers have applied it to the assumption of an angelic nature, which they suppose the writer here denies. But the usus loquendi is against this; and the context also; for the apostle had just asserted above, that Jesus took on him a nature human, and it would be a mere repetition of the same sentiment here, if we construe ver. 16 as meaning thus: ‘He did not assume the angelic nature, but that of the seed of Abraham.’ But if the argument be, that ‘Jesus assumed the human nature, because he was to aid men and not angels,’ then the 16th verse contains a reason why the Saviour did and should take on him the nature of a man; viz., that it was altogether accordant with the great object of his mission.

Progeny of Abraham, Σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ. In such a sense, profane as well as sacred writers use σπέρμα. Is it the natural or spiritual seed of Abraham, which is here meant? Either will make good sense, and agree with the object of the writer. Believers are the children of Abraham, Gal. iii. 7; and Gentiles as well as Jews, Rom. iv. 12—18; ix. 7, 8; iii. 29, 30. So the assertion that Christ died ἐν πάντοις (ver. 9), does not disagree with the assertion that he helped the seed of Abraham, who are both Jews and Gentiles. So Kinoel and others. But although this interpretation may be sufficiently justified to render it worthy of acceptation, I am inclined to believe that it does not give the original sense of the writer.

(17) Whence, Ὁδε (an illative particle), i.e., because he was to help the seed of Abraham. Ὄψεις... ὁμωφυλαῖ, he must needs be made like unto his brethren, i.e., to men, vs. 10—12. Καὶ ἀνά, i.e., in all things requisite to constitute a nature truly human. The meaning is, that he should be wanting in none of the innocent infirmities, and in none of the sympathies, of man’s nature. To deduce more than this from the expression now in question, would be to do what the writer plainly never designed should be done.

But why must he be made like to his brethren? That he might be a compassionate and faithful high priest, ἵνα ὀλεθρον γίνηαι...
καὶ πιστῶς ἀγαπητεῖν. Ἐλεήμων, merciful, sympathizing with those who are in distress. As those are best adapted to do this, who have themselves been sufferers; so Jesus took on himself our nature, in order that he might suffer in it. Πιστῶς means either faithful or worthy of trust and confidence. In the former sense I take it here; Kuinoel in the latter. Jesus assumed our nature, that he might qualify himself in a peculiar manner to exercise compassion toward us, and that he might discharge with fidelity the duties laid upon him as our high priest. What were those duties? They were τὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἱερόν, things which had respect to God, i. e., services of a religious nature. So Xen. Rep. Laced. 13. 2 seq., 11, τὰ πρὸς Ἰερόν, is elliptical. In full it would be thus; κατὰ τὰ πράγματα τὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἱερόν, faithful as to things, etc.

Instead of ἄλασκονια τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, ἠξιλάσωσθαι περὶ τινὸς occurs in Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35; and ἠξιλάσωσθαι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τινός, in Lev. v. 13; iv. 35. Ἐξιλάσωσθαι ἁμαρτίας is also found in Dan. ix. 24; 1 Sam. iii. 11; Sirach xxviii. 5. Πιστοκυμα means to render propitious, to appease. But this sense it can have directly, only when the person appeased is expressed or understood after the verb. Hence ἄλασκονια ἁμαρτίας must mean the same as ματαίον ἢ, to make appeasement for sin, to cover sin, to make atonement for it. The Septuagint sometimes translate ἢ, by ἄλασκομα. Christ then, as high priest, was faithful to perform the peculiar duty of that office; which was, on the great day of atonement, to make a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the people. How he did this, is shown in the sequel of the epistle. Here, only so much is asserted as was requisite to enforce the considerations which the writer had immediately in view.

(18) For since, Ἐν χρήσει, i. e., ἐν γάρ, Hebrew וּכְרָא, because that, inasmuch as. He himself suffered when exercised with trials, Πέπνυθαν αἰτίας παραδόθη. Πεπνύω means to try, to put to the proof in order to ascertain the disposition, purpose, capacity, etc., of any one. This trial may be, (1) For a good purpose; by subjecting one to any evils or dangers, as God tried (יוֹעֵב) Abraham, Gen. xxii. 1; or by placing him in circumstances either prosperous or adverse that are of a peculiar nature, as God did Israel, Ex. xvi. 4; Judg. ii. 22. Trial may be, (2) For an evil purpose; as the Pharisees ἐπείρασαν Ἰησοῦν, by proposing to him ensnaring and subtle questions, Matt. xix. 3 seq.; xxii. 18, 35, et saepe; or by laying before any one inducements to sin, as Satan does before the minds of men, 1 Cor. vii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 5; comp. James i. 13, 14. In both of these senses Christ was tried. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to
put him to grief,” Is. liii. 10; also, “It became him, for whom and by whom are all things, to advance to glory our Prince and Saviour,” διὰ παθημάτων, Heb. ii. 10. The same Saviour was solicited by Satan to sin, Matt. iv. 1, 8; Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2. Understood in either way, then, the Saviour was tempted in like manner as we are (κατὰ πάντα, καθ’ ἰμοῦντα, Heb. iv. 15), though without sin. That he did not yield to any excitement to sin, was owing to the strength of his virtue and holiness, not to the weakness of the temptation in itself considered. Temptation, in the second sense, is that which is presented to the mind as an inducement to sin, and does not relate to the actual state of the mind or person to which it is presented. Men tempt God. They tempt Christ; and so did Satan; but there never was any disposition in Christ to yield to it.

Πειράζω occasionally seems to imply a yielding to sin, i. e., the effect of πειρασμός upon any one; e. g., Gal. vi. 1, perhaps James i. 14; comp. ἀπαραστός, not induced to sin, in James i. 13. But this is an unusual sense, and altogether inapplicable to the Saviour, who was “separate from sinners,” Heb. vii. 26. Christ then, πειρασθεῖς, being proved, both by sufferings and by solicitations to sin, δύναται τῶν πειρασμένων βοηθηθαι, is fitted in a peculiar manner to succor those who undergo either kind of trial. He is not only possessed of a merciful regard for them (ver. 17), but he has direct and immediate sympathy with them, the result of his own personal feeling and experience.

Wonderful condescension of redeeming love! Here is the great mystery of godliness, God made manifest in the flesh. And while Jesus sits on the throne of the universe, as Lord over all, the Christian is reminded that he does this in his nature, as his brother, ver. 11. In the person of Jesus, man is exalted above the angels: yea, he himself is to attain a rank superior to theirs; for while Jesus passed them by (ver. 16), he laid down his life for us, in order to exalt us above them, 1 Cor. vi. 3. Deeper and deeper still becomes the mystery. The debt of gratitude appears boundless, when viewed in this light; and the baseness of our ingratitude and disobedience as boundless too. What can we do less than to lie down in the dust, overwhelmed with a sense of our guilt, and exclaim with the prophet, “Who is like unto thee? A God forgiving iniquity, and passing by the offences of thine heritage!”

HEBREWS III. 1.

CHAP. III.

Next to the consideration that the "law was διαταγής δι' αγγέλων," the grounds of its preeminence in the estimation of the Jews were, the exalted character of Moses, and the dignity and offices of the high priest, who was the instrument of reconciling the people to God, when they had lost his favor by sinning. In respect to both these points, the apostle undertakes to show that the gospel has a preference, because that Jesus if compared with Moses as ἡγεμόν, ἀρχηγός, curator aedis sacer (ὁσιου, v. 2, 3), or the high priest will be found to excel him. The first comparison is made in iii. 2-6, and the warning against defection from the gospel that immediately follows it, is continued through iii. 7-19 to iv. 18. The writer then proceeds with the comparison of Christ as high priest, and extends it through the remainder of the doctrinal part of the epistle.

(1) Whence, ὅπερ, i. q., διὰ τοῦτο. It refers to place, in common usage; but it is also an illative in argument, particularly in our epistle. The manner in which the writer makes his transition here from one topic to another, is deserving of notice. He had just been showing how and why Christ was a "merciful and faithful high priest, and able to succor all who are tempted." He now adds, ὅπερ, i. e., allowing these things to be true, it follows that we are under peculiar obligation to contemplate and well examine the Saviour's character, before we venture to reject him.' But in making this suggestion, the writer at the same moment introduces new topics for discussion, viz., the comparison of Christ with Moses, and with the high priest under the Jewish dispensation. The transition is almost insensible, as it is actually introduced under the form of a deduction from the preceding discussion.

Ἄδελφοι, as applied by Christians to each other, means one of the same faith or profession, with the adjunct idea of possessing a friendly, brotherly feeling, Acts ix. 30; xi. 29; 1 Cor. v. 11, al. Ἀγιος, consecrated, devoted, i. e., to Christ, set apart as Christians; or professing to be holy, pure. Holy, in the sense of actually possessing internal purity, the apostle did not mean to affirm that all were whom he addressed; for surely when the ancient prophets called the whole Jewish nation ἄγιος (ἁγιος), or ἁγιος ἱερ (λαός ἁγιος), they did not mean to assert that every individual among them was spiritually sanctified. But, to remind his brethren (brethren in a double sense here, as they were also the writer's kindred according to the flesh) that they had been consecrated to Christ, and set apart as his disciples, and that they professed to be pure, was altogether adapted to prepare them for the exhortation to fidelity which ensues.

Partakers of the heavenly invitation, Κλησεως ἐπουρανίου μέρος. Κλησις is the invitation given on the part of Christ and
God to men to partake of the blessings freely proffered by the Christian religion. It does not appear, however, to designate the offers of the gospel generally considered, and in reference to all men without discrimination; for it is applied, in the New Testament, only to those who by profession are Christians. The epithet ἐπορεύονιον may mean, like τὴς ἁπόλυτος, Phil. iii. 14, that the blessings proffered are of a celestial nature, i. e., a more spiritual nature than those offered under the law. It may also mean, that the κληρον was given from heaven, i. e., by one from heaven; viz., Christ; comp. xii. 25 and ii. 3. Understood in either way, it is apposite to the purpose of the writer, and well adapted to urge upon his readers their obligation to adhere to the Christian religion.

Consider attentively, Κατανοήσατε, i. e., ad animum revocate; and this, in order that one may not be tempted to swerve from their fidelity to Christ, out of excessive regard for the Mosaic institutes; for Christ, as the writer proceeds to show, was in all respects superior to Moses.

The apostle and high priest of our religion, Τὸν ἀπόστολον . . . ημῶν. The appellation ἀπόστολον (which is an ἄπαξ λεγόμενον as applied to Christ), has given rise to much philological and critical discussion. The word itself may convey two ideas, which are nearly related, but not identical. (1) Ἀπόστολος is equivalent to ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος; as Thomas Magister explains it, quoting Demosthenes as employing it in this manner. So Origen: ἀπεσταλμένος τῶν πεμπόμενων ἀπό τινος, ἀπόστολος ἐστι τοῦ πεμπόντος, in Johan. p. 398, ed. Col. It means, then, any messenger, any person commissioned or sent to perform duties of any kind for another, and particularly to make known his will, desire, or command; in which sense it is commonly employed by the New Testament writers. (2) The Jews applied the term משל (from משל mittere) to the minister of the synagogue, i. e., the person who presided over it and directed all its officers and affairs, aeditis, negotii aedis sacrae curator; see Buxtorf Lex. Chald. verbum משל, and Vitringa de Vet. Synag. Lib. III. P. 2. c. 2. In either of these senses it may be understood in the passage under consideration. Interpreted agreeably to the first sense of ἄποστολος, the meaning would be, that Christ is the messenger of God to men, in order to communicate his will, and accomplish the business to be done for the establishment of the new dispensation. But the particular reason why he is called ἄποστολος here, lies probably in the comparison which the writer is about to make of Jesus the head of the new dispensation with Moses the head of the old. When Moses received a divine commission to become the leader and head of the Israelites, God says to
him, I have sent thee; which idea is frequently repeated, Ex. iii. 10, 12, 14, 15. Moses was then ἀπόστολος, in respect to this important business. Jesus, as sent on an errand of the like kind, but of still greater importance, by the Father, John iii. 34; v. 36, 37; vi. 29; x. 36, is very naturally called ἀπόστολος, i. e., one sent or commissioned of God, because Moses was thus sent; as the passages above cited prove.

We might acquiesce in this explanation, as most interpreters have done, were it not that one still better may be found, in the supposition that ἀπόστολος is here employed in the second or Jewish sense, as explained above. The apostle proceeds immediately to speak of Moses and of Christ as presiding over, and administering the affairs of, the οἶκος committed respectively to them (vs 2—4); i. e., each was a ἅγιος ἐκκλησίας, curator aedis sacrae, ἀπόστολος in the Jewish sense. This certainly gives a meaning more apposite to the context, and indeed a sense which, in connection with it, seems to be a necessary one. The general idea of being sent of God, or divinely commissioned, is retained; inasmuch as Moses was thus sent and commissioned, and with him the comparison is made. The meaning, then, is, that if the curator aedis sacrae et novaæ be compared with the curator aedis sacrae et antiques, the result will be such as the sequel discloses.

High priest, Καὶ ἀρχιερέα. Two reasons may be given for this appellation; the one, in Ps. cx. 4 the Messiah is so named: the other, that the writer, in the sequel, compares the propitiatory sacrifice which Christ offered, with the expiation made by the high priest of the Jews. The latter I regard as the principal reason of the appellation here.

Of our profession or confession, Τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν; i. e., the apostle and high priest whom we have confessed or acknowledged as ours. This they had done when they became Christians. Ὅμολογίας is used here as an adjective or participle; and the phrase is equivalent to ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέα ὁμολογοῦμεν, i. e., the apostle and high priest τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν (as Chrysostom paraphrases it), in whom we have believed, or whom we have acknowledged as ours. Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 13, Ἰποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, your professed subjection; Heb. x. 23; iv. 14. Others take ὁμολογίας in the sense of covenant (κανόν), which the word sometimes has in profane writers; see Lex. in verbum. This sense of the word would not be inapposite, inasmuch as it would convey the idea of an engagement or covenant made with Christ, by those whom the apostle is addressing. But as this use of the word is not found in the New Testament, it would hardly be proper to admit it here.
The writer now proceeds to show the reason why the Hebrews ought attentively to regard Jesus, in respect to the two great points of comparison which he had hinted at, by applying to him the epithets ἀπόστολος and ἀρχιερεύς.

(2) Faithful, Πιστός, i. e., he fully and truly performed the duties of his station. So in ii. 17, he is called πιστός ἀρχιερεύς. Others interpret πιστός, less appositely, entrusted with, or worthy of trust. To him who constituted or appointed him, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, viz., as ἀπόστολον; to him who sent him, John x. 36, i. e., to him who made him ἁγιός, curætor aedis sacrae. So εἴσοδος, Mark iii. 14. Τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, his house, i. e., family, meaning the Jewish nation, or his worshipping people. Οἶκος not temple here, for that was not built in the time of Moses; nor tabernacle, for over that Aaron presided and not Moses; but the spiritual house committed to Moses, i. e., the Jewish nation who were to be guided, regulated, and instructed in spiritual things, by the revelations which he gave them. So Chrysostom, who uses λαόν as an explanation of οἶκον. So in English we use house for family, and church (οἶκος ἱεροῦ) for the worshippers in it. Moreover it is only in this way that a comparison can be made between Moses and Christ; as the latter was not the minister of any literal house, but Curator aedis Dei sacrae et spiritualis. Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 5, οἶκος πνευματικός. Eph. ii. 20—22; Heb. iii. 6.

The sentiment of ver. 2 is, that with regard to fidelity in discharging the duties of his office, as head of the new dispensation, Christ yields not in any respect to Moses, who (as the Scripture testifies, Num. xii. 7) was faithful in respect to all his duties toward the people of God that were committed to his care. In another respect, indeed, Christ may justly claim great superiority over Moses; as the writer now goes on to show.

(3) Honor, dignity, regard, Δόξα, governed in the Gen. by ἡξίωσα. Ἡξίωσα, is worthy, deserves, is counted worthy. Ἀξίωσο also means, not unfreely, to obtain, to acquire; e. g., οἱ καταξιωθέντες τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος χάριος, those who have obtained the grace of the Spirit, Chrysostom I. p. 780; τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ ἄντως μὴ καταξιώθημενος, not having obtained a knowledge of what is real, Basil. I. p. 515. In a similar way it is also used in the classics; as τῶν μεγάστων ἀξιώματος, having obtained the greatest honors, Lys. Orat. p. 101, ed. Taylor. But still, this is not the usual sense of the word; nor does it so well fit the passage under consideration, as the other and usual meaning, although many commentators have preferred it. Δόξα παρὰ Μωυσείῳ, glory in comparison with Moses, as in Hebrew נ сентון. See on i. 4, 9, where παρὰ is employed in the same way. Καὶ
δοῦν may signify in proportion as, as much as, and may have relation here to πλεῖονος in the first member of the verse. The usual Greek method of expression in such cases is τόσο... δοῦν, etc. But I prefer the rendering in as much as, because the nature of the proposition seems to require it. So Schulz, Eng. Version, al.

He who builds a house, has more honor than the house, Πλεῖονα τιμήν, κ. τ. λ., i. e., the difference between the honor due to Moses and that due to Christ, is as great as between the honor due to the founder of a house [family] and that which should be paid to the family which he founds; or between the honor due to the architect that framed a building, and that due to the building itself. It is difficult to say in which of these senses the writer meant that the words should be taken. Either fits his purpose. Either is designed to show that Christ, at the same time that he is the head of the new spiritual house, is also the founder of it; while Moses, who was at the head of the ancient spiritual house, was himself only one of the household. As a steward or overseer of a house, while he is curator of all in the house, is still but a servant; so Moses (as is asserted in ver. 5) was but a servant, while Christ, who was curator, was also Σῶν, and therefore, “heir and lord of all.” The point of comparison between Moses and Christ, in which the latter appears to have a decided preference, is not the being at the head of God’s house or family (for such an office Moses sustained); but it consists in this, viz., that while Moses was curator, he was also ἴηρατος; but while Christ was curator, he was at the same time νιός, and κατασκευάστης οἴκου.

The verb κατασκευάζω means to furnish, to fit up, to make ready, i. e., for use; also to construct, prepare, build, condere, exstruire. In some cases it seems to combine the idea of constructing and furnishing, both of which, indeed, are included under the general idea of preparing or making ready for use; e. g., Heb. ix. 2—6. The Seventy sometimes used this word in order to translate τιμή, e. g., in Prov. xxiii. 5; 2 Chron. xxxii. 5; sometimes they employed it as corresponding to κατασκευάζω, as in Is. xl. 28, xliii. 7. So the book of Wisdom, ix. 2, “By thy wisdom κατασκευάσας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, thou hast created [formed] man.” In our text, κατασκευάσας αὐτὸν seil. οἴκου, is equivalent to the Latin condere domum. But as οἴκου here means family, household, so κατασκευάσας must be taken in a sense that will correspond to this, viz., that of establishing, instituting, founding.

Others far less naturally and forcibly render the last clause of the verse thus: inasmuch as he who founded the household hath greater honor from the house, understanding τιμήν οἴκου to be the
honor which the house renders, and thus making ωἶκον dependent
on τιμήν instead of πλείωνa. Besides, it may be asked, did Christ
receive honor, or contempt and scorn from the house of Israel?
Interpreted in any other way, the whole force of the comparison
seems to vanish. In this way it is (to say the least) intelligible,
if not quite simple. If the reader wishes to see the endless discrep-
ancies among critics about this and the following verse, he
may consult Wolfii Curiae Philol., or Dindorf's edition of Ernesti
in Ep. ad Hebraeos.

(4) This verse has been a kind of offendiculum criticorum in
past ages, merely from the difficulty in discovering and explain-
ing its connection with the context. The verse might be entirely
omitted, and the third verse immediately connected with the fifth,
without injury to the general idea of the whole passage. But
there is no evidence that the verse in question is a mere gloss; at
least none from manuscripts or versions, which is of any value.
We must receive it, then, as a part of the text, the integrity of
which (however difficult the passage may be) cannot be made to
depend on our ability to explain it.

We may translate Ἡς γὰρ οἶκος . . . . Ἰεῶς, thus: every house
is built by some one; but he who formed all things is God. But
what are the all things (tὰ πᾶρα) which are formed or built?
The universe? Or all οἶκος, all dispensations, viz., both the Jew-
ish and Christian? The context seems to demand the latter
meaning; the former has common usage in its favor. Is it
appropriate to construe it agreeably to this usage? It is directly
to the writer's purpose, to show that every dispensation must of
necessity have some founder, and that this founder was Christ.
But how is this shown? To say that God, simply considered,
was the author of all things, would not be to show that Christ
was the founder of the Jewish and Christian οἶκος. Indeed, I
can see no possible connection of this proposition with the object
which the writer has in view. Nor can I see how Christ is
shown by him to be a founder at all, unless I understand him to
assert this to be the fact, because Christ is divine, or is Ιεῶς.
The argument would then stand thus: 'God is the author of all
things, i. e., of the Jewish and Christian οἶκος; Christ is God;
of course he must be regarded as the original author or founder
of these dispensations.' The fact itself that Christ is Ιεῶς, it
would seem the writer could not hesitate to assert, after what he
has said, chap. i. 8—12; John (i. 1) asserts the same thing; and
Paul, in Rom. ix. 5, and in other places. I must regard the
expression here, as predicated on what the writer had said in
chap. i. respecting the Son. The amount, then, of the reasoning
seems to be: 'Consider that Christ, as Ιεῶς and the former of
all things, must be the author, too, of the Jewish and Christian
dispensations; which shows that a glory belongs to him, not only
in his mediatorial office and as being at the head of the new dis-
pensation, but also as the founder both of this and the Jewish
dispensation in his divine character; while Moses is to be hon-
ored only as the head of the Jewish dispensation, in the quality
of a commissioned superintendent, but not as author and founder.

I admit the difficulty of the passage, and could hardly venture
to build principles of theology upon it, until the illustration is
clearer and more certain. It must say, however, in accordance
with the sentiments of Cramer (whose exposition agrees with
that which I have given above), that I cannot help wondering
that any interpreters should come with confidence to such differ-
ent expositions. I am aware that the interpretation which I
have given, implies that the sentence of the apostle in ver. 4 is
an enthymeme; it wants the conclusion, viz., Christ is God.
But if Christ is the founder of all dispensations, and he who
founds all is God, I do not see why this is not sufficiently implied.
The expositions which differ from this, are largely canvassed and
solidly refuted by Cramer.*

(5) In all his house, ἐν οἴκῳ ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν, not ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἀνδρῶν
over his house, as it is expressed in the following verse,
where the writer speaks of Christ. The writer seems to make
a distinction by these different modes of expression, between the
relation of Moses to the house in which he was Ἰσραήλ, and
that of Christ to the house over which he was as νομιστ. The
former was ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ in the house, i.e., he himself belonged to
the family of God; while the latter was ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ over the
house, i.e., lord of the house, founder and proprietor of it.

His, ἀνδρῶν, i.e., God’s house, both in ver. 2 and here. God’s
household means, those who profess to be his worshippers, to be-
long to him. In both cases ἀνδρῶν might refer to Christ (by writ-
ing it thus, ἀνδρῶν), were it not that in Num. xii. 7 (from which
the passage is quoted), the language is my house (τῷ ἡμῶν); and it is

* Although it be true that Christ is sometimes represented as the author
of all things, yet it does not seem to me to be so in this passage. If it be
claimed that he is here represented as God, all necessity for any further ar-
gument to show his superiority to Moses would be entirely unnecessary, and
especially would the following comparison between the servant and Son be
unnatural. The apostle had spoken of Christ in ver. 2, as “faithful to him
that appointed him;” and again, in ver. 3, as the “builder” of a house.
To obviate any objection that might arise from these apparently contradictory
statements, he says: It is true that God is the author of all things (all
dispensations), still there are heads of particular dispensations; but the head-
ship of Moses is only that of precedence in the house, that of servant of the
Maker of all things; whilst Christ’s is that of a Son over the house; and
hence his superiority. — Ed.
God who says this. The sense, however, would not be materially changed by referring αὐτῶν to Christ. The scope of the sentence does not depend on this; for whether you say οἶκος αὐτῶν is the family of God, or of Christ, the same persons are designated by the word οἶκος in both cases.

According to general usage, Ἰεράπων differs from δοῦλος and οἰκέτης, as being a more honorable appellation. E.g., the correlate of δοῦλος and οἰκέτης is δεσπότης; but Ἰεράπων is related to πατήρ, κύριος, or βασιλεὺς. In English, we should call the former a servant or a slave; the latter an assistant, a helper, etc. The Heb. יִרָאִי, however, means servants of every or any rank. But יִרְאָב יִרְאָב, servants of Jehovah, is always an appellation of honor. In the East, courtiers of the highest rank pride themselves in the appellation of king's servants. The word Ἰεράπων is very happily applied by the Seventy, and after them in the present case by our author to Moses, who was a servant of Jehovah in a highly honorable sense; comp. Josh. i. 1, 2. After all, the Ἰεράπων is inferior to the πατήρ or κύριος of a family. Moses, therefore, was inferior to Christ, who was κύριος οἴκου Ἰεωῦ.

For the testifying of those things which were to be declared, ἕν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀληθησουμένων, i.e., to make disclosures to the Israelites of those things which were to be revealed under the ancient dispensation, or during the Mosaic period. The meaning is, that Moses was a Ἰεράπων of God, for delivering to the people the ancient oracles. Μαρτυρίαν may signify either instruction, or declaration, publication; just as μαρτυρίῶν signifies in the New Testament, docere, instituere, and also declarare, notum facere; as may be seen in the lexicons. Αληθησουμένων may also mean, either things to be announced, published, or things to be inculcated, taught. The sense will not be materially altered by either method of translation. The meaning will still be simply, that Moses was to be the instrument of delivering to the people divine communications, or he was to teach them in matters of religion.

(6) But Christ as a Son, over his house, whose house we are, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ... ἐκτεῖνον ημῶν, i.e., to whose family we belong, we who have made a Christian profession; meaning himself and those whom he addressed. This is as much as to say: 'We now belong not to the house over which Moses was placed, but to that which Christ governs or administers.' Αὐτῶν, his, i.e., God's, our English translators have rendered as if written αὐτῶν, sc. ἡμῶν; so Beza, Vogel, Erasmus, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others. But Stephens, Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Knapp, and Titmarr, read αὐτῶν, as I have translated.

The writer adds, however, that we really belong to the house
which Christ governs, εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν... κατάχωμεν, pro-
vided we hold fast unto the end our confidence and joyful hope. 
Παράδοσις means originally the liberty of speaking boldly without 
fee or restraint; and comes etymologically from παρά and δός. 
The secondary sense is, boldness, confidence. Καύχημα primarily 
means, gloriatio, the act of glorying, or that in which we glory or 
joy; secondarily it means, joy, glory, etc. I take the phrase as 
a Hendiadys. Εὐλογος is the subject, and καύχημα qualifies it; 
as is often the case with similar constructions, in many parts of 
the sacred writings, e. g., 1 Tim. vi. 17; Philem. 6; Rom. vi. 
4; Col. ii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 7; Gal ii. 14; i. e., the Gen. is the 
principal noun, and the other noun joined with it (whatever 
case it may be in), serves only in the office of an adjective. 
More usually, indeed, the noun in the Gen. serves the office of 
an adjective, both in Hebrew and in Hebrew-Greek. See 

The confidence and joyful hope here mentioned, is that which 
the Christian religion inspires. This must be held βασίαν, firm, 
steadfast. Βασίαν here agrees, in respect to grammatical con-
struction, with παράδοσιν the remotest noun (as frequently in such 
cases), but it is related to the whole phrase in meaning. Εἰς τέ-
λοος ἐκ της ἐν θεῷ, i. e., of life; in other words, 'We must persevere 
to the last, in maintaining our Christian profession; we must 
ever abandon the confident and joyful hope which it inspires, if 
we mean to be considered as belonging to the family of Christ.'

(7) Wherefore, Διό, i. e., because Christ is superior to Moses 
and has higher claims upon us, hearken, Christian brethren, to 
the admonitions which I give you, in the words by which the 
Israelites of old were warned. — Καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἁγιόν, 
i. e., as the divine word (Pē. xcv.) given by the influence of the 
Holy Spirit, saith; comp. Acts i. 16; xxviii. 25. This is one 
of the various ways of appealing to the Scripture, which was 
usual in the time of the apostles; and which is still practised by 
our churches. It involves the idea, that the Holy Scriptures are 
given by divine inspiration, are Σατηνορεῖς.

Το—νῦ, Σήμερον, i. e., now, at present, like the Hebrew בָּנָי, 
to which it corresponds. 'Εάν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, when or 
whilst ye hear his voice. So, perhaps, διά may be rendered, like 
the Hebrew בָּנָי, to which it corresponds; comp. John vi. 62; 
xxii. 32; xiii. 20; xiv. 3; 1 John iii. 2. So Sept. for בָּנָי, Prov. 
iii. 24; Is. xxiv. 13, et alibi. But it is not material to adopt 
this rendering. If will give a good sense, viz., now if, i. e., in 
case, you are willing to hearken, etc. Τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, i. e., his 
warning voice, his admonition.

(8) Harden not, etc., Ἐκληρούντη τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. To
harden the heart, is to make it insensible; i. e., here, to remain insensible to divine admonition, to neglect it, to act in a contumacious manner. The form σκληρύνω is of the later Greek. The classical writers used σκληρώ, and this in a physical sense only.

The word Παραπασαμος = Hebrew רֶבָּרֶעָס, strife, contention, is not classical; but it is employed by the Septuagint. The meaning of it is, exacerbation, provocation, embittering, from ποιανω, to be bitter, to embitter. It is here applied to designate the conduct of the Israelites, who provoked the displeasure of God; in particular, it signifies their unbelief and murmuring at Mas-sah or Meribah, Ex. xvii. 7, and afterwards at other places.

When they tempted [God] in the desert, Κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν . . . ἐρήμως. Κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν, Hebrew סומע (for סומע), as in the day that, when. Πενασαμοι, of temptation, i. e., their unbelief and murmuring put the patience of God to a trial (speaking after the manner of men). Πεπάλω means, to solicit to do evil, but also to prove, to assay. When the Scriptures speak of men as tempting God, the meaning is, that men do that which puts the divine patience, forbearance, goodness, etc., to a trial, i. e., they make it difficult, as it were, to preserve a strict regard to these. Dindorf is mistaken; when he asserts here that πεπάλω is never used by the Greek writers in the sense of enticing to sin; for πεπάλω (i. q., πεπαλαζων) γναίκα is a very common phrase, in the best Greek writers.

(9) When, Οἴ, adverb, i. q., ἐνοχ, as Oecumenius remarks. Your fathers, Οἱ πατέρες ὅμως, i. e., the ancient Israelites. 'Επειρασάν με . . . ἐδοκίμασάν με, tempted me; they tried me, etc. i. e., they put me to a thorough trial; the repetition of a synonymous word denotes intensity. I put a semicolon, however, after ἐπείρασάν με, here, and so join ἐδοκίμασάν with τέσσαρακοντα έτη. So Knapp and Kuinoel.

Although they saw, Καί ἐδον. So καί in Luke xviii. 7; John iii. 32; xiv. 30; xvii. 25; Rev. iii. 1, et al. In the same manner the Hebrew ה, Gen. xviii. 27; Mal. ii. 14, et al. Τέσσαρακοντα έτη is joined (in the Hebrew) with the following verse, forty years was I grieved, etc. But this depends on the punctuation-system of the Masorites, which the apostle has not followed. In regard to the sense, it matters not with which the verb is joined. If they tempted God forty years, he was grieved by their conduct during the same time; and if he was grieved by them for that time, it was because they tempted him. The clause, they tried me, although, etc., is intended to designate the aggravated παραπασασμος of the Hebrews in the wilderness, which lasted during forty years.

(10) Wherefore, Διό, i. e., because they tempted me, etc.
This word is not in the Hebrew nor Septuagint. The writer has added it to the quotation, in order to render the sense of the passage more impressive or explicit.

I was indignant, was offended at, Προωνύξησα. The word is Hellenistic. The Greeks use δικαίωμα and δικαίωσα. According to etymology, it consists of προσ, to, against, upon, and δικαίωμα, bank, shore. It is applied primarily to a ship infringing upon the shore, or (as we say) running aground. It answers to the Hebrew יַּעַר, מָסָר, סַרְבָּה, etc.

The men of that age, Τῶν γενετ. ἰδεῶν, or as we say in English, the generation then upon the stage.

They do always err, etc., ἂν πλανώνται τῶν καρδίών, the corresponding Hebrew is, שָׁם. אֵלֶּה בִּלְבָּם יְרֵיחַ, a people of erring heart are they. ἂν has no corresponding word in the Original; but is plainly implied. To err in heart, may mean either to err in judgment, or in disposition, intention; for the Hebrew בִּלְבָּם, בָּם (and after it the Greek καρδία), means either animus, judicium, or mens, cogitation, desiderium. I understand καρδία here, however, as used according to the Hebrew idiom (in which it seems to us often pleonastic), so that the phrase imports simply, they always err, i. e., they are continually departing from the right way.

And they have not approved my doings, ἄπειρο δὲ οἴκη τύγανον τὰς ὁδοὺς μου. Γνώσις (like the Hebrew יָדַע, Ps. i. 6; xxxi. 11) means to approve, to like, to be pleased with; comp. Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14, 15, 27; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Ὅδος corresponds to the Hebrew יָדַע, which means counsel, design, purpose, also operation, manner of conducting or acting towards any one. In this last sense I take the word to be employed here. The meaning is: 'The Israelites had been discontented with the manner in which God had dealt with them in the wilderness; they disapproved his manner of treating them.' See, for an illustration of this, Deut. viii. 2—5; iv. 32—37, and particularly xxix. 2—4.

(11) So, so that, ὅσος; see Wahl, ὅς, II. 2. In my indignation, ἐν τῷ δριγγῷ μου, viz., that which their unbelief and contumacy had excited. Comp. παρακαταρασμὸς in ver. 8th, which means, the provocation given by the Israelites.

They shall not enter, Εἰς εἰδελεύσοντα. El borrows its negative meaning from the Hebrew כָּא, to which it corresponds. The Hebrews used כָּא in the latter clause of an oath, which ran thus: God do so to me, if (כָּא) I do thus, etc. See the full form in 1 Sam. iii. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 35; 2 K. vi. 31. The former part of this oath was sometimes omitted, and כָּא had then the force of a strong negative; see 2 Sam. xi. 11; 1 Sam. xiv. 45, et alibi; vide Ges. Heb. Lex. כָּא, C. 1. c. So in Ps. xc. 11, כָּא כָּא contains a strong negative, which the Septuagint (and our author
after them) have rendered, εἰ εἰσελεύονται. Comp. Heb. iv. 3, 5. The passage exhibits God as speaking after the manner of men, and as affected, like them, with feelings of indignation. The idea conveyed by such expressions plainly is, that God, as a measure of justice to the Israelites on account of their wickedness, gave solemn assurance that they should not enter into his rest.

Into my rest, Εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν μου, Hebrew וְגוֹיָם, my rest, means such rest as I enjoy, or such rest as I have prepared or provided. See more on the subject of this rest in Chap. IV.

(12) Lest there be in any of you an evil, unbelieving heart, Μὴ ποτὲ ἐστὶ ... ἀπωτίας. Ἀπωτίας, of unbelief, is here used as an adjective to qualify καρδία, according to an idiom very common both in the Old and New Testament.

In apostatizing from the living God, or rather, so that he may apostatize, etc., Ἐν τῷ ἀποστάτῃ απὸ Ἰσραήλ ἥττονα. Ἀποστάται is to revolt, to apostatize, to make defection from, to full away. Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, living God, either in opposition to idols which had no life, as in Acts xiv. 15; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 10; or living may mean immortal, eternal, as it does in Heb. ix. 14; x. 31; xii. 22; 1 Pet. i. 23, and often in the Old Testament. Thus perennial water is called ζων, John iv. 11; vii. 38. So the commentators and lexicographers. Possibly, in these cases, ζων may mean the author or giver of life; comp. John vi. 51, 57; vii. 38. The sense of the passage taken together is, ‘Beware, brethren, of an evil unbelieving heart, such as the Israelites possessed, lest like them you apostatize from the living God,’ lest you apostatize from the religion of Christ which he has required you to receive and maintain, and thus perish like ancient Israel who revolted from God.

(13) But admonish one another, Ἀλλὰ παρακαλίτε ἐαυτοῖς. Ἐαυτοῖς, in the New Testament and in the classics, is often, as here, used as the equivalent of ἄλλως.

Every day, Καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐναρκα, i. e., constantly, habitually, διότι. Ἀκριβοῦτο τοῦ σήμερον καλείται, either [καυροῦ] ou χ. t. λ., or ou may be an adverb of time, as in ver. 9th. Καλεῖται, like the Heb. ירא, רעפ, is; see Wahl’s lexicon, and Gesenius on ירא. The meaning is, ‘Daily, while you have opportunity, admonish one another. In τοῦ σήμερον, the article is joined (as it often is) with an adverb which expresses the sense of a noun; constructio ad sensum. So that no one may be hardened through sinful delusion, ἵνα μὴ σκληρωθῇ τις ... ἀμαρτίας. Ἀπάτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας, the sinful delusion which false teachers or Judaizing zealots might occasion; or that delusion into which they might be led by their oppressive condition arising from persecu-
tion, or by any allurements of a worldly nature; so that they
would become insensible to the warnings which they had received,
and might abandon their Christian profession. This would be a
delusion indeed, and be highly sinful. Mutual and daily admo-
nition, the apostle intimates, would tend to prevent this evil..

(14) For we are partakers of Christ, Ἄνω τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγοναμένον. Some understand this as meaning, that we shall be-
come partakers of the blessings which Christ bestows. I under-
stand by it a spiritual union with Christ, whereby we become
partakers of all his blessings; such a union as he describes in
John xvi. 21—23, and other like passages, and which is so often
designated by the expressions, ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν Χριστῷ, etc. So Cal-
vin; and Kuinoel says, very truly: Arettissima cum Christo
conjectio his formulis declaratur.

If we hold fast unto the end our first confidence, Ἄνω τῆς
ἀρχῆς . . . κατάσχομεν. Τὴν ἀρχήν τῆς ὑποτάσσων, i. q., τὴν
πρώτην πλοστίν, 1 Tim. v. 12. The sentiment is, ‘Continue, even
to the end of life, to exercise such confidence in Christ as you
had at first, and you shall obtain the reward which he has prom-
ised; see μέχρι τέλους, in ver. 6, above.

(15) While it is said, Ἄνω λόγους, τιμῶν in Ps. xlii. 4;
comp. ἄνω ἐπτι in 1 Cor. xv. 27. The writer means to quote
the passage in Ps. xcvi. 7, which he had already cited in ver.
7, above. It makes the interpretation much easier to suppose
(with Carpzoff, Rosenmueller, Heinrichs, Jaspis, Winer, and
Kuinoel), that the quotation in this verse embraces merely the
words σήμερον . . . ἀκούστε; the rest of the verse being the
exhortation of the writer himself, although expressed in the
words of Ps. xcvi. 8, as in ver. 8, above. The sense of the
whole stands thus: ‘While you are warned against the dangers
of sin, be not insensible to the warning, as the Jews of old were.’
Dr. Knapp and others have represented the whole of ver. 15, as
a direct quotation; but this embarrasses very much the interpre-
tation of it.

(16) Who now (or then) were they that when they heard did
provoke, τίνες γὰρ ἐκοινώνετε παρεξηγηκαν; So with Griesbach,
Knapp, Titmam, Kuinoel, and others, I prefer to accent and
punctuate this clause. The common editions have τίνες, some;
instead of τίνες, who, and omit the interrogation point after πα-
ρεξηγηκαν. According to this last mode of exhibiting the text,
it must be rendered (as in our English version), For some when
they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of
Egypt by Moses; which is altogether inapposite to the design of
the apostle. The object of this and the following questions is,
to lead the minds of the readers attentively to consider the spe
cific sin, viz., unbelief, which occasioned the ruin of the ancient Israelites, and which would involve their posterity in the like condemnation.

Were they not all, indeed, who came out of Egypt by Moses? Ἀλλ' οὖν πάντες . . . Μωυσέως. Αλλά in a series of questions, and standing at the head of a question, means, vero, porro; see Passow. It serves to connect, and to give intensity to the interrogation. So here; ἀλλά, truly, indeed, certe. The meaning is: 'Might I not ask, Did not all who came out of Egypt rebel?' He means to intimate by this, that the number who embrace error cannot sanction it; and that those who receive great blessing, may be refractory and unfaithful, and even perish. Consequently, that the great body of the Jews rejected the Messiah during the time then present, and urged the Christian converts to do the same, would be no excuse for apostasy. Πάντες is not to be taken in the strict sense here, any more than in multitudes of other places; e. g., 'all Judea went out to John, to be baptized, confessing their sins,' Matt. iii. 5, 6; 'all men came to Jesus, to be baptized of him,' John iii. 26: Phil. ii. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 2; and so often. Of the adults, only Caleb and Joshua among the Israelites are excepted, as not having taken part in the murmurings against the Lord, Num. xiv. 30. Of course there could be no scruples in the apostle's mind about applying the word πάντες in this case, just as it is applied in a multitude of others, viz., to designate great multitudes or the great majority. By Moses, Αιτ Μωσέως, means under his guidance, by his instrumentality. The intimation seems to be this, viz., Were not even those Hebrews contumacious, who were delivered from bondage by Moses himself?

(17) And with whom was he indignant for forty years? Τισ δὲ . . . καὶ. Above, in the quotation ver. 10, forty years is connected with ἐδοκιμασάν με. But the sense of the whole passage is not materially changed by the manner of expression in ver. 17. It is true that the Israelites put the Lord to trial for forty years; and also true, that he expressed his indignation against them during that time, until the generation who had rebelled were destroyed.

Was it not with those who had sinned? Οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσαν. Ernesti and Dindorf labor to show that ἁμαρτάνω means the same here as ἠμαρτάνοντο. Doubtless it includes the sin of unbelief; but it is of itself more generic than ἠμαρτάνοντο, and includes various sins of the Israelites, such as rebellion, murmurings, etc., the consequence of unbelief.

Members, ἀρά καλά, such as arms, legs. It is here put, however, by synecdoche, for the whole body, and corresponds to the
Hebrew רמות, corpses, in Num. xiv. 29, 32; to which passages the apostle here refers. Ἐν θανάτῳ in Greek, and the corresponding Hebrew בַּשׁוּדָה are both used to designate the prostrate condition of dead bodies, or falling down dead. The whole phrase may be thus paraphrased, 'Who perished in the desert.'

(18) To whom did he swear that they should not enter into his rest, except to those who disbelieved? Tάρα ἢ δοκοῦ... κατατάνουν αὐτῶν. In Num. xiv. 23, 28—30, is an account of an oath on the part of Jehovah, that the rebellious Israelites should not enter into the land, which he had sworn to their fathers should be given them, i. e., in case they were obedient. In Deut. i. 34, 35, there is another mention of a like oath, viz., that they should not enter into the goodly land pledged by oath to their fathers. But in neither case is the word rest employed. The reasoning of the apostle, however, in the chapter before us, would lead us to suppose, that the manner in which the unbelieving Jews were declared in the above passages to be excluded from the goodly land, and the reasons stated for that exclusion, necessarily implied exclusion from the heavenly Canaan also, or from the rest of God.

(19) We see then, or thus we see, or and so we see, that they could not enter in because of unbelief, Καὶ ἐλέγοντο... δι' ἀπορίαν. Καὶ, then, so, and so, in the apodosis of a sentence, or in a connected series of reasoning. See Wahl on καί, II. 2, and comp. Gesen. Heb. Lex. on καί, no. 5; comp. also καί in Matt. xi. 19, καὶ λέγοντα, and so they say; xi. 29, καὶ εἴρητο, and so ye shall find; also in xv. 6; xxvii. 64, καὶ ἀπετείκα, Luke xi. 26, καὶ γίνεται, and so shall be; 1 Cor. viii. 11.

CHAP. IV. 1—15.

The writer having thus appealed, for the sake of warning, to the example and consequences of unbelief among the Israelites of old in the wilderness, proceeds now further to confirm the application of what he had been saying to those whom he addressed, and to remove objections which might be raised against this application. First, it might be objected that the rest spoken of in the Old Testament, meant only a rest in the land of Canaan, or the quiet possession of the promised earthly inheritance; and then, that the ancient Israelites were excluded from the promised rest on account of murmuring and rebellion, crimes not charged upon those whom the apostle addressed. Both of these objections he proceeds to answer.

The promise of entering into the rest of God still remains, and is addressed to the Hebrew Christians as it was to the Israelites of old, who failed to obtain the proffered blessings through unbelief vs. 4, 2. These declarations involve two propositions; the first, that the blessings in question must be of a spiritual nature; the second, that unbelief is the cause of that sin which excludes from the enjoyment of them. The evidence of the last of these propositions had already been exhibited in the quotation in chap. ii. 7—11; for it is there affirmed, that after a while which the Israelites had seen of the works of God in the desert, they still tempted and provoked him, i. e., they gave no credit to all the testimonies which he had set before...
them, of his fidelity toward his promises and of his love and pity for them; nor did they believe his communications against the disobedient. Consequently, they were excluded by this unbelief from rest.

But what is the rest in question? This of course involves the inquiry, whether the blessings in question are of a spiritual nature. Is it quiet possession of the land of Canaan? No, says the apostle. Believers now enter into the rest (ver. 3), i.e., the same kind of rest as was anciently proffered. Moreover, God calls it κατάρασιν μοι, My rest, i.e. (adds he), such rest as God enjoyed after he had completed the creation of the world; consequently, spiritual, heavenly rest. This is plain (as he goes on to show in ver 4) from what the Scripture says, Gen. ii. 2, concerning the rest of God. Again, it is involved in the very form of expression in Ps. xcv. 11, viz., My rest, ver. 6.

'Now,' continues he (ver. 6), 'as some must enter into the rest in question' (for surely God would not provide and proffer a rest altogether in vain); 'and since they to whom it was offered, lost it through unbelief, it follows that believers only can attain to it.' But this last idea the author has not expressed in a positive way. He has left the reader to supply it; as he may do without any difficulty, from what the writer had already said in vs. 2, 3. The illustration and confirmation of this truth is plainly one of the objects which the writer has in view (as was stated above); and while vs. 3-5 show that the rest spoken of is of a heavenly nature, the object of ver. 8 is, to intimate that unbelief was the sin which excluded from it.

But, lest there might still be some doubt about the nature of the rest to which the ancient Scriptures refer, the writer resumes the topic respecting the nature of it, and adduces other considerations to show that it must be spiritual and heavenly.

Moreover, he adds (ver. 7), I will not himself say (he lived only five centuries after the land of promise had been occupied by the Israelites) — David speaks of a definite time then present, in which he warns his contemporaries against losing the rest which God had promised to the believing and obedient [a rest of the same nature as that from which the Israelites of old had been excluded, as may be seen in Ps. xcv. 1]. If Joshua, who gave Canaan to Israel, obeyed God, and the fanners of Canaan, had given them the rest to which the Scripture refers when it speaks of God's rest, then the Psalmist could not have spoken, so many centuries afterwards, of a rest that was still proffered to Israel, and from which the unbelieving would be excluded, ver. 8. Hence, he concludes, 'it is evident, since the rest which is spiritual and heavenly, is a temporal nature, but of a spiritual enduring nature, that there remains a rest for the people of God, i.e., believers.'

That the main object of the writer, in chap. iv 1-9 is to prove the spiritual and abiding nature of the promised rest, is stated so explicitly in ver. 10, that there can be no reasonable doubt left in respect to his intention; 'for since he addresses himself to his (God's) rest, rests from his own labors, as God did from his.' That is, he who attains to the rest proffered to Israel in the time of David, and to the more ancient Israelites in the wilderness, attains to a rest like that of God (described in Gen. ii. 2); i.e., he will rest from the toils and trials, and sorrows of a probationary state, and enjoy a happiness beyond all comparison.

The writer then proceeds, in his usual manner, to close the topic by adding exhortations diligently to seek the rest in question, and awful warnings against incurring, by unbelief, the righteous indignation of that holy and omnipotent Judge, unto whom their account must be rendered, vs. 11-18.

If, without Kaul's and others, regard the passage which we have just considered as a mere accommodation (a somewhat forced one too) of promises and threatenings addressed to Israel of old, that had respect only to the land of Canaan; nor as a mere fanciful application of things ancient, to the Hebrews whom our author is addressing, I cannot help believing, at all events, like he regarded the rest spoken of in Ps. xcv. 12 and Gen. ii. 2, as a spiritual and heavenly rest. Consequently an appeal to the examples contained in the Old Testament, is more to the point, and more forcible, when thus understood, than it would be in any other mode of explaining the views and design of the writer.

The mode of reasoning, in order to establish the positions which the writer has in view, is quite different. Indeed, from that to which we now resort, who have the whole New Testament in our hands, in which 'life and immortality are brought [so fully] to light.' We need to take but very little pains, in order to prove that promises of rest in a future world, promises respecting a spiritual and heavenly country, are made to Christians. But Paul was writing to those who had no New Testament, and accommodates his reasoning to their condition. He had asserted, in writing to them, that a promise of the same nature was proffered to Christians, as was proffered to the ancient Israelites, iv. 1, 2. The consequence he adduces from this is, that as unbelief with respect to this promise occasioned their ruin, so the like unbelief would now produce the like consequences. Nothing could be better adapted to his purpose, when writing to the Hebrews, than to produce an example of the consequences of unbelief, that was taken from their own progenitors, and recorded in their own Scriptures which they acknowledged as the word of God. The whole argument is, indeed, in some sense, argumentum ad hominem; I mean, that it is
appropriate to the time and to the circumstances in which the apostle wrote, and
to the people whom he addressed. But who can, with any propriety, make it a
matter of accusation against the writer, that he consulted the good of those whom
he addressed, by arguing with them in a manner that was most appropriate to
their condition? Did not the Saviour constantly do the same? And ought we not
to follow his example?

It is wholly unnecessary to maintain, with most of the recent commentators,
that Paul allegorizes the rest of Canaan here, in such a way as to accommodate
himself to the spirit of the age in which he lived, and the taste of the Jews who
were his contemporaries. So far am I from embracing this view of the subject,
that I am quite persuaded he has designedly undertaken to show, that the interpreta-
tion his contemporaries put upon the passage which respects exclusion from the
rest of God was an erroneous one. Plainly he labors to show, that rest in the land
of Canaan could NOT possibly have been meant by the Psalmist. Where then is
the allegorizing of the apostle here, of which so much has been said? Who can say
confidently, against the reasoning and the decision of Paul, that the rest of which
David spake, was not spiritual? I content myself, whatever others may do, with
the exegesis of the apostle; and do fully believe that he is in the right. If he is
correct in his views, then it follows, that the future punishment of the unbelieving
Israelites is clearly intimated, by the exclusion from spiritual or heavenly rest
which is threatened. This is a necessary inference from the reasoning and conclu-
sions of the apostle.

(1) Let us beware, φοβηθοῦμεν, lit. let us be afraid of. As
fear, however, in its literal sense, is not applicable in this case,
the exact shade of meaning is, caveamus, let us beware.

A promise being still left, Καταλοιπομένης επαγγελίας. Κατα-
λείψα, according to both sacred and classic usage, may mean to
forsake, desert, neglect; e. g., in Acts vi. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 15, et. al.
In this sense many critics have understood it, in the passage now
in question. The sense then would be, 'Let us beware, lest by
neglect of the promise made to us,' etc. But I much prefer the
other sense of the word, i. e., to leave behind, and (passively) to
be left behind, to remain, to be still extant; e. g., in Acts xxiv.
27; Luke xx. 31; Mark xii. 19, al., and especially comp. ver.
9, below. The meaning then is, that the promise, which was
implicitly made to believers among the ancient people of God, is
still in being, and is made to us, i. e., to Christians. This the
next verse so directly asserts, as to render the interpretation just
given nearly certain.

Declaration, Ἐπαγγελίας, promise, i. e., annunciation of the
reward offered to the believing or faithful.

Lest . . . any one of you may fail of obtaining it, Μὴ ποτὲ . . .
υστερηθῆναι. By sacred and classical usage, δοκέω is frequently
joined with other verbs, without making any essential addition to
the sense of them. It is said, therefore, to be used pleonastically;
by which, however, can be meant only, that it is incapable of
being precisely rendered into our own language, and apparently
adds nothing essential to the sense of a phrase. But even this is
not exactly true of δοκέω. In many cases, it is plainly designed
to soften the expression to which it is attached, and is equivalent
to may, may be, can, etc.; e. g., 1 Cor. vii. 40, Paul says, δοκᾶ ἐὰ
καὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ τῶν ἑαυτῷ, I seem to myself to possess the spirit of
God; a modest way of asserting the fact, instead of speaking categorically. In a similar way δοκεῖ is employed, in 1 Cor. xiv. 37; x. 12, ὁ δοκεῖ εὐτύχαν, he who seems to himself to stand; iii. 18; iv. 9. In a few cases, it is difficult to distinguish exactly what addition is made to the phrase, by the use of δοκεῖ; e.g., Luke xxii. 24, τὸς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων ἢ, τὸς εἶναι. So Luke viii. 18, ὁ δοκεῖ ἐχεῖν, is expressed in Luke xix. 26 by ὁ ἐχεῖ; 1 Cor. xi. 16, ἐς τὸς δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι. So Theophylact understood the words δοκεῖ τίς ὑστερηκέναι. "Τούτων, μητρὸς ὑστερήσῃ, lest he may come short—and fail to enter into the promised rest. The writer uses a mild and gentle address, not saying μητρὸς ὑστερήσῃ, but μητρὸς ὑστερηκέναι." This, I apprehend, is hitting the exact force of the phrase here; an imperfect view of which is given in the lexicons.* Ἐξ ὑμῶν, in some manuscripts and fathers, ἡμῶν; which would better accord with the usual κοίνωνις of the writer; e.g., i. 1; ii. 1, 8; iii. 1, 6, 19, al. But it is not an unusual thing for Paul to change or intermingle different persons in the same passage; e.g., Rom. xiv. 13; Heb. x. 24, 25.

The verb ὑστερέω, lit. means to come afterwards, to come late. In the secondary sense it means, to fail, to come short of; as he must fail of obtaining a thing, who comes too late for it. If the exhortation here be regarded as having a special reference to the time (σήμερον) when the offers of the rest were made, μήποτε . . . ὑστερηκέναι may be rendered happily, as in Wahl, lest . . . ye come too late, i. e., after σήμερον. But I prefer the more simple method; lest . . . ye fail of obtaining the promised blessing.

(2) For to us also the offer of blessings is made, or we are evangelized, Καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς εὐχαγιελαμάμει, i. e., the promise of blessings is declared or made known to us, as well as to them. Ἐναγγελίζω is used classically in the same sense, i. e., to announce joyful tidings, to proclaim proffered good. The proffered blessing implied in the text, is the rest of which the writer had been speaking, and of which he continues to speak.

But the promise or declaration which they heard, was of no benefit to them, ἈΛΛ' οὖν ὠφέλησαν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς. ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς may be equivalent to ὁ ἀκοουσθεὶς λόγος, i. e., the word heard by them; or it may be like the Hebrew רַעֲשָׁבָּה הַשְּׁמַעְיָה word of announcement or re port, i. e., word announced or reported. The sense is not materially changed, whichever of these interpretations is adopted.

* Some Commentators understand δοκεῖ to have here its more common meaning, and translate: Lest any one of you shall think he has come too late; i.e., after all the promises have been fulfilled, and no further salvation is to be looked for. See Ebrard, and others referred to by him.
Not being joined with faith in them that heard it, Συγκεκραμένος... ἀκούσας, or not being united to faith, i.e., faith not accompanying it or associating with it. Συγκεκραμένος is less simply and naturally explained by many commentators, as being tropically employed here; and the metaphor, they allege, is taken from food, which when digested unites with the corporeal system and becomes aliment to it. So here, the word, if duly received, would have incorporated itself (so to speak) with the internal, spiritual man; but as it was not received, it did not so incorporate itself. Many manuscripts and editions read συγκεκραμένος, and some συγκεκεραμένος; which some critics and interpreters adopt. But the common reading is much preferable. Τοῖς ἄκουσας, equivalent here to the Gen. τῶν ἄκουσαντων. The meaning is, that the λόγος was not associated with the faith of those who heard it. The Hebrews usually designate possession by the Dative with ב; e.g., the Song of songs יִתְנָךְ נְשָׁה, which is Solomon’s. So frequently in Greek; e.g., ὁ πατὴρ ὁι πατὶς, Pind. Olymip. 1:91. Neither do thy children ἵστανται see the light. Eurip. Phoeniss. 1563. Μὴν ἄρα κτήματοι τοῖς Ἱεόοις, of the possessions of the gods, Plato. Phaed. See Matt. Gr. Gramm. § 392, g. 1, et seq. Such cases are elliptical, e.g., κτήματων [ἀπετὶ] τοῖς Ἱεόοις.

The sense of the whole verse is simply this: ‘A promise of rest is made to Christians now, as well as to God’s ancient people. But they received no advantage from it, because of unbelief;’ the implication is, φοβηθήσαντες (as he had just said) μή τις δοκῇ, κ. τ. λ., i.e., guard well then against unbelief.

(3) For we who believe do enter into the rest, viz., God’s rest, Ἐσπερχόμενον γὰρ... πρωτεύεισιντες. The γὰρ here and in ver. 2, I regard as γὰρ illustrantis. By changing the form of the propositions a little, the connection will be quite apparent. First he says: ‘Let us beware lest we should fail of attaining to the rest which is promised.’ Then he proceeds: ‘[This we may do], for (γὰρ) we have the like invitation with them, and they failed of the promise through unbelief.’ Again; ‘[This we may do] for (γὰρ) it is only those who remain believers, that enter into God’s rest.’ The γὰρ at the beginning of ver. 4, has respect to the illustration of ver. 3 by the quotations that follow. Ἐσπερχόμενον, the present tense, is needlessly changed by some critics, into ἔσελευερχόμενον (Fut. tense). In the Bible the present tense is very often used as a universal tense, embracing time past, present, and future. So in Hebrew, it is very common to use present participle for the same purposes as the Latins use their future in esse.
tion that unbelievers should not enter into his rest, implies of course that believers should enter into it. See on iii. 11. So Calvin: Argumentum est a contrariis. Sola incredulitas accet; ergo fide patet ingressus.

To wit, or namely, [rest from] the works that were done when the world was founded, Kaiou τῶν ἔργων ... γεννηθέντων. The meaning of Kaiou here has been much controverted. There is no doubt that it often has the meaning of although, but its principal signification is, et quidem, et sane. So Xenophon (Cyrop. III.), kaiou, εἰτί ἑκείνους μὲν φοβερωτέρους ποιήσωμεν, κ. τ. λ., and truly if we shall make them somewhat more timid, etc. Thucyd. IV., 60, kaiou γνώμαι χρή, κ. τ. λ., and truly we ought to know. Aristoph. Plut. 1179, kaiou τάτι ὡς ἔχον οἰδέν, and indeed then when they possessed nothing. Cf. Hoog. Doctrina Part. Graec. ed. Schütz. vocab. kaiou. I have given the sense by rendering kaiou to wit, or namely, which is equivalent in many cases to et quidem, et sane. So Devarius (de Partic. Ling. Graec.) explains kaiou, and after him Carpzoff. (Comm. in. loc. nostrum); and so Kypke and Kuinoel. nempe, et quidem iche. The sense will be substantially the same, if kaiou be rendered and truly, and indeed; but the other mode of translating is more explicit, and makes the connection more facile.

Kuinoel solves the difficulty of the last clause in this verse, by supplying εἰρήκε. He construes thus: "And this (kai τοι) [he said], the works being completed," etc. This comes substantially to the same sense which I have given above. But I think it more simple to supply the εἰρήσις from the preceding expression and from vs. 4 and 10, viz., κατάπαυσιν ἀπό; as we shall see in the next paragraph.

That κατάπαυσιν is here to be understood before ἔργων, seems to be clear from vs. 4 and 10, where the same sentiment is repeated. The ellipsis may be either κατάπαυσιν τῶν ἔργων, or κατάπαυσιν ἀπό τῶν ἔργων; more probably the latter, for ἀπό, though not absolutely necessary here, is supplied after the verb κατάπαυσιν, both in vs. 4 and 10.

Done (completed or performed), when the world was founded. ἀπὸ καταβρολὴς κόσμου γεννηθέντων. ἀπὸ καταβρολὴς, at or from the foundation, i. e., at the beginning; in a sense like ἀπὸ ἄρχης at first, in Matt. xix. 4; and in Luke xiii. 25, ἀφ' οὗ μενος, when. Josephus uses καταβρολὴ for beginning; e. g., Lib. II. 17, Bell. Jud. he says: "This was καταβρολὴ πολέμου, the beginning of the war," viz., with the Romans. The sense of the passage requires ἀπὸ καταβρολῆς to be rendered 'at the time of the beginning,' i. e., when the beginning was; 'just as we say in English, from the first,' i. e., at the very commencement.
(4). The writer now proceeds to cite a passage of Scripture, in order to show what sort of rest is designated by the phrase my rest. In order to do this, he adverts to that Scripture which shows the rest that God enjoyed after the work of creation was finished. Ἐκείνη γὰρ, for [the Scripture] says, or [the Holy Ghost] says; a frequent mode of appealing to the Old Testament. In a certain place or passage, Ποῦ. Chapter and verse are no where cited in the New Testament; and very rarely is any particular book named, unless indeed it bears the same name as its author. An appeal to Scripture, by merely saying ποῦ shows that the writer must have supposed his readers to be familiar with the contents of the Jewish Scriptures. The passage cited may be found in Gen. ii. 2. So Clement of Rome appeals to Scripture, now saying λέγει ποῦ, and then λέγει ποῦ γραφέων.

God rested, Καὶ ἐπάνω ὁ Ἰχθύς. The rest here spoken of, is of course to be considered as described ἀναποτελεῖται, i. e., in accommodation to the capacities of men. It surely does not imply that God was wearied by his work of creation, but that he simply ceased from it, and enjoyed a holy and delightful quiet, in the pleasing contemplation of the works which had been accomplished. Comp. Gen. i. 4, 10, 18, 25, 31.

(5) Such then was the rest of God, of which the Scripture speaks. To such rest, the apostle says, the writer of the 95th Psalm refers. Καὶ εἰ τούτῳ πάλιν, again in this passage also, viz., in the passage which he had already quoted from Ps. xcv. 11, i. e., the passage which he is now going to mention, the Scripture represents God as saying, my rest, i. e., such rest as I have, or such as I enjoy. In other words, both Gen. ii. 2 and Ps. xcv. 11, speak of a holy and spiritual rest, since they speak of a rest which God himself enjoys. Comp. πάλιν here, as to position, with πάλιν in i. 6.

(6) Since then it remains that some must enter into that [rest], and [since] they to whom the blessings were proffered, did not enter in because of unbelief, Ἐπεὶ δὲν ἀπολίσθηται... δι' ἀπειθεῖαν; [it follows that believers only can enter in], comp. ver. 3; or rather [it follows that a rest remains for believers], comp. ver. 9.

This verse seems to be a resumption of the subject in ver. 3, after the explanations of rest which vs. 4 and 5 contain. There the writer says, ‘Believers enter into the rest of God.’ How is this proved? ‘Because he has sworn that unbelievers shall not enter into it;’ which necessarily implies that believers shall enter into it. Then, after delaying a moment in order to show what the nature of the rest in question is, viz., that it is God's rest, i. e., such rest as God enjoyed after the work of creation was
completed (vs. 3—5), the author resumes the consideration of
the proposition advanced on the first part of ver. 3, and avers,
that as some must enter into God's rest (or God could not be
supposed to have provided one in vain), and as unbelievers can-
not enter in, so it is necessarily implied, that believers, and they
only, will enjoy the rest in question. See the illustration of the
reason prefixed to the present chapter.

Others construe the verse in this manner: 'Since then some
must enter his rest, and unbelievers of former days did not enter
in; therefore he defines again (πάλιν) a particular day, etc.;'
construing vs. 6 and 7 as one connected sentence. But this
makes the sentence very much involved, and obscures the de-
sign of the writer. His object certainly is, to show that the rest
proffered in ancient times, in the 95th Psalm, still remains for
the people of God; see vs. 9, 10. But how can this be proved,
by merely showing that David spake of a definite time when he
wrote the 95th Psalm, in which the offer of rest was then made?
On the other hand, I understand it to be the particular object of
the writer in ver. 7, seq., to exhibit further proof that the pro-
ffered rest is of a spiritual nature, and therefore not to be limited
by assigning to it a merely temporal sense. See the illustration
referred to above. If any one is desirous of seeing what con-
jecture can make out of this verse, let him read the commentary
of Kuinoel upon it.

(7) Again, when speaking by David so long a time afterwards,
he designates, or definitely names, a certain day, to-day; as it
is said, 'To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts,
Πάλιν τῶν ὄρισεν ἡμέραν, κ. τ. λ. See above, on chap. iii. 7, 8, par-
ticularly iii. 18. The sentiment runs thus: 'In David's time, nearly
500 years after unbelievers in the wilderness were threatened with
exclusion from the promised inheritance, the Psalmist makes use
of the commination which has been quoted, in order to deter
those whom he addressed from hardening their hearts as the
ancient Israelites did, and so losing the rest (as they did) which
God had proffered to the obedient and believing. The rest, then,
could not be merely the land of Canaan (as the Jews of Paul's
time understood it to be), for this both believers and unbelievers,
living in the time of the Psalmist, already enjoyed. Conse-
quently the rest spoken of by the Psalmist, was of a spiritual
nature, pertaining only to believers.' All this is plainly implied;
and in the next verse it is explicitly declared.

(8) Now if Joshua had given them rest, El yap αἰῶνως Ἰσραήλ
. . . . ὡμέρας, i.e., the rest of God concerning which the Scripture
speaks, he [David, or the Spirit of God by him] would not have
spoken afterwards of another time, viz., another time when rest
was to be given or to be obtained. That is, 'If the rest of God be only the rest of Israel in Canaan, or the quiet possession of the promised land, then the Psalmist could not have spoken of it as still proffered in his time, after it had been in fact given to Israel by Joshua nearly five centuries before.' The other time (ἀλλὰς ἡμέρας) here spoken of, is the same which is designated by the word σήμερον in the quotation; which implies a time different from that, and subsequent to that, in which the Israelites obtained the rest of Canaan.

That Ἰσραὴλ means Joshua here, there can be no doubt; for the object of the writer is to prove, that Jesus does bestow the rest spoken of, viz., that which the Ἰσραὴλ here named did not bestow. Κατέβασεν, caused to rest, exactly as the Hiphil conj. in Hebrew is used; e. g., מנוח (from נוח) in Deut. xii. 10, in the same sense as κατέβασε here. In the classics this verb has the like sense, viz., Diod. Sic. p. 716. A. Arrian. Exp. Al. III. 9. Herod. I. 27. Hom. IIad. XV. 105.

(9) Consequently there remaineth a rest for the people of God, Αρα διάφορεται . . . τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, i. e., for believers, see ver. 8. Here the object of the preceding argument is plainly developed; so plainly, that we are not left at liberty to doubt concerning it. Here is fully expressed, what is plainly implied in ver. 6, although in an elliptical manner, as has been already noticed. Such a manner is not unfrequent with Paul. Comp. Rom. v. 12 with v. 18, 19; and see Introduction.

Σαββατισμός (Heb. שבת, נרות, rest, sabbatism), holy, religious, spiritual rest, is a mere Hebrew word with a Greek ending; and it is here employed as equivalent to κατάβασεν, but with special reference to the Heb. expression מנוח (from נוח) in Gen. ii. 2, which there describes the rest of God. The Heb. נרות is a kind of intensive noun, formed from נחל, and means sabbath by way of eminence. Σαββατισμός, which stands for נרות, seems to be a word coined by the writer purposely for the occasion, and is very appropriate to his design.

That believers do enter into the rest of God, i. e., a rest like his, is further shown by the next verse.

(10) For he who enters into his [God's] rest, will also cease from his own labors, as God did from his, 'Ὁ γὰρ εἰσέλθων . . . δ Ἰσραήλ. As God ceased from his work on the seventh day, and enjoyed holy delight in the contemplation of what he had done, (see on verse 4 above), so the believer, in a future world, will cease from all his toils and sufferings here, and look back with holy delight on the struggles through which he has passed, and the labors which he has performed, for the sake of the Christian cause.

In other words, 'As God enjoys a most pure and perfect
rest or happiness in heaven, so the believer will enjoy the like happiness there." And surely there is no more difficulty in calling that rest which is promised to believers, the rest of God, than there is in saying that man "was formed in his image," that Christians "are made partakers of the divine nature," or that "we shall be like him when we shall see him as he is." The rest of God, is rest like that which God enjoys. The illustration of the nature of this rest, by a comparison with that rest of God which followed the work of creation, was well adapted to take hold of the minds of those to whom he was writing, and who were exposed to many hardships and trials. Having now shown that there is a promise of spiritual rest to believers, implied in what the Jewish Scriptures say, the apostle repeats the caution, which lay so near his heart, against unbelief in the Saviour and the consequences of it.

(11) Let us earnestly endeavor, then, to enter into that rest [the rest of God], lest any one should perish in the same manner through unbelief, Σουδαστορετον δὲν . . . Ἀραχίας. 'Εν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδιήγημα, lit. after the same example, in the same manner, viz., as they (the Israelites) perished. Πέρεν is often used in this way, in an intransitive sense. 'Αραχίας I take to be the Gen. of means, instrument, etc., as grammarians say.

The awful nature of the of commination, that unbelievers should not enter into the rest of God, the writer now describes, in order to leave a deep impression on the minds of his readers, and to guard them more effectually against unbelief and apostasy.

(12) For the declaration of God is active and of a mighty power, Ζῶν γὰρ . . . ἐνεπνήθη, or is enduring and powerful, i.e., has an efficiency that never ceases. The meaning according to the latter interpretation is, that the commination (comp. Is. ix. 8) uttered in ancient days against unbelievers (and which had been repeated above by the writer), has abated nothing from its force or efficacy, even at the present time; it still lives, and unbelievers are still subject to its power. In defence of this interpretation, it might be said that Ζῶν is applied here to the divine word, i.e., commination, in a manner like that in which it is applied to God in the phrase ἰδος Ζῶν (Iēōs Ζῶν) often used in the Scriptures, which designates him as eternal, immortal, never dying, endowed with unfailing life, in opposition to idols destitute of a living principle, and made of perishable materials. It is evident, too, that the sense perpetual or perennial, may be considered as appropriate to the passage before us. But others interpret Ζῶν as meaning active, a sense which is common to this word and to the Hebrew וֹ. I understand both terms as conveying the idea of active and mighty energy; which is altogether
appropriate to the writer’s purpose, whose object it is to persuade his hearers, that the comminution uttered against the unbelievers of former days, and which is still in force, has a dreadful power, at which they ought to shudder.\*  

*And sharper than any two-edged sword,* Καὶ τομώτερος . . . δίστομον, i. e., it has a more efficient power to inflict wounds than a sword with two edges. The efficacy of divine commination is often compared to a sharp sword; e. g., the Son of man is represented by John as having, when he appeared to him in a vision, a sharp two-edged sword issuing from his mouth, i. e., his words cut, as it were, like a sharp sword, or his reproof, commination, wounded deeply, Rev. i. 16; ii. 12, 16; xix. 15, 21. Comp. also Is. xlix. 2; xi. 4, in which last passage the expression is, *with the rod of his mouth,* and in the parallel ἀτιξος, *with the breath of his lips* [with his words] *shall he slay the wicked.* Language, then, of reproof, of severe threats or commination, or of condemnation, is by the sacred writers called the *sword* or *rod of the mouth.* So in our verse, the divine commination is represented as terribly efficacious, by resorting to the same species of imagery in order to make a comparison.

*Piercing even so as to separate life and spirit,* Καὶ δικνύομενος . . . πνεύματος. The writer continues the description of the efficacy of the divine threatening, by carrying on still further the description of the effects produced by a sharp sword upon the natural body. Ψυχή, when used as here in distinction from πνεῦμα, means the animal soul or principle of animal life in man; as πνεῦμα in such a case means the rational or intellectual soul, the immaterial principle within man. See 1 Thess. v. 23, where σῶμα is added in order to designate the merely physical or corporeal part of the human system. In the phrase under consideration, *piercing so as to divide, or separate, life and spirit,* plainly means inflicting a wound so deep that it shall prove deadly. We may paraphrase both expressions thus: *a sharp sword that inflicts deadly wounds.* Ἄρμων τε καὶ μυκλόν [piercing so as to divide] *joints and marrow,* i. e., so as to divide the joints or limbs from the body (which was often done in the severer kinds of punishment); and so as to pierce through the very bone to the marrow, or to separate the marrow from the bone, by perforating it; a tremendous image of the sharpness of the sword and the effects it produces. The sense is, that the divine commination is of *most deadly* punitive efficacy. After μυκλόν a colon should be placed.

* The word of God, here, some refer to the New Testament revelation; and then the idea is, that this is powerful, and not defective as was the Law of Moses; so that there is no longer to us the same excuse that those under the law had, and our unbelief is wholly without excuse. See Ex. 6:24.
He also judges [takes cognizance of] the desires and purposes of the heart, Kai kritikos . . . karbías, i. e., ICODE kritikos ἵστ. That kritikos, aptus ad judicandum, here applies to God, and not to λόγος, seems evident. That there is somewhere here a transition to ICODE, is quite certain from ver. 13, where ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, ὡφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, and πρὸς δὲν, one cannot well doubt, are to be applied to God. The nature of the case seems to show, that the appropriate place for this transition is at kai kritikos.

In the preceding part of the verse, λόγος ICODE, divine commandation, is represented (very forcibly and properly) as punitive. This idea is consummated by the phrase which ends with μυλῶν; and ICODE comes in as the subject of discourse in the sequel. In this view of the passage, Dindorf, Kuinoel, and Bloomfield agree. God is here represented as one who scans the whole of man's internal character, and sits in judgment upon it. Consequently, as the writer intimates, no secret act or purposes of unbelief, or defection from the Christian cause, will remain unnoticed or unpunished. Ἐνθυγίμνοις and ἐννοια are nearly allied in meaning. They are both employed here, merely for the purpose of designating universality, i. e., the whole of men’s internal thoughts and purposes.

(13) Ye or nothing is, or nor is there anything, concealed from the view of him [i. e., God], Kai oik ἐστι . . . αὐτοῦ. Ktis means any created thing; literally act of creation, but it follows the Hebrew נְגוֹר. Οὐ κτισ means nothing (בְּאֶדֶם = οὐδέν) or נְגוֹר נְגוֹר.

But all things are naked and exposed to the view of him, to whom we are accountable, Πάντα . . . τερακηλησία. Τερακηλησίω is best explained here, in the sense which the Greek classical writers attach to it. It means (1) To lay bare and bend back the neck, so as to expose the throat in order to its being cut open or dissevered. Hence (2) To expose, to lay open; which is the idea of the word in the phrase before us, as it is given in the translation above. ὡφθαλμοῖς, eyes, i. e., sight, view, cognizance; for the word is often used in this sense.

With whom [i. e., before him, in whose power, or at whose disposal] is our account, Πρὸς δὲν ἄγκεν ὁ λόγος. The sense of account, λόγος often has. The common way of rendering λόγος here, is, concern, dealing, business. This sense the word will bear; but it is less in conformity to the usus loquendi, and less opposite to the design of the writer. Chrysostom understands it as I have translated it. And so the preceding clause requires it to be rendered; for this speaks of God (or λόγος if you please), as κριτικός, i. e., judicantes, aptus ad judicandum; the clause now under consideration, represents men as actually accountable to him who is the omniscient Judge.
CHAPTERS IV. 14—X. 18.

The author had already compared Christ as ἰδρυτής ἀλλήλοις (ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) προφετικῶς δόμου Δρόμου with Moses, iii. 2—6; and then built upon the result of this comparison, the very solemn and affectionate warning against unbelief which follows, iv. 7—19. For the encouragement of the Hebrew Christians, he had also taken occasion to represent the promises still held out to believers of enjoying that rest. Such was the case under the ancient dispensation, and such, he argues, is still the case; there remains a σάββατος αἰώνιος for the people of God. He then, as we have seen, concludes the subject, as usual, with an exhortation; in which he calls on them not to fail of this rest, iv. 11, nor to incur the awful penalty attached to unbelief, iv. 11—13. He now proceeds to compare Christ as ἀρχιερεύς, with the Levitical order of priesthood; which comparison, with its various subordinate parts, and the occasional warnings and cautions that now and then are intermixed, extends to chap. x. 18; which is the end of what may be called the doctrinal part of our epistle.

The mind of the writer plainly appears to have been more intensely engaged in comparing Christ's priesthood to that of Aaron and the Levites, than with any other subject in his epistle. The comparison, for example, of Christ with the angels, in chap. 1., is short. The comparison of him with Moses, in chap. iii. still shorter. But the comparison of the Aaronic priesthood, as to dignity, duties, offices, and utility, with that of Christ, and of their functions with his, makes up, in fact, the Body of our epistle. The only reason seems to be, that the writer regarded this part of the Saviour's office and work, as being in a comparative sense by far the most important. As a priest, he made atonement for sin by the sacrifice of himself; in regard to which, no angel, no prophet, no teacher, no Aaronical priest, could bear a comparison with him. The most prominent part of all his character, as a Saviour of sinners, is, that he is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."

The division of chapters made in some cases in our epistle, is quite inappropriate. Chap. iii. most plainly ought to be united with chap. iv. 1—13; thus comprising all that properly belongs to one and the same subject. Chap. iv. ought to begin at iv. 14, and to terminate at the end of chap. v., where there is a transition from doctrine to exhortation.

The method of argument pursued through this leading portion of our epistle, is as follows: The apostle introduces the topic (to which he had adverted in iii. 1 by calling Christ the ἄρχιερα τῆς διαλογίας θεοῦ), by calling Jesus ἄρχιερα μέγας, and exhorting the Hebrews to hold fast the profession (διαλογίας) which they had made, iv. 14. He again hints, very briefly, an encouragement for them to persevere, although subjected to trials and afflictions, because of the sympathy that the Saviour would feel for them, as having possessed a nature like theirs exposed to trial and suffering, iv. 15 16. But as he had already dwelt at large on this topic (v. 5—18), he merely adjoins to it here, and passes on to suggest the points of comparison between the Levitical priesthood and that of Christ. (1) Every priest is appointed in behalf of men, in order that he may superintend and direct the concerns which men have with God, and may present their oblations and sacrifices before him, v. 1. (2) Every priest, being himself "compassed with infirmity," is prepared by his own experience to sympathize with others in like condition; and because of his own sins and imperfections, it becomes his duty to offer expiatory sacrifices for himself as well as for them, v. 2, 3. (3) No priest appoints himself to the sacred office; his appointment is by divine direction, v. 4. In making a comparison of Christ, as high priest, with the Aaronical priests, in regard to the point here stated, the apostle inverts the order in which they are brought forward, and shows: (1) That Christ was constituted high priest by divine appointment. This he proves, in vs. 5, 6, by quotations from the second Psalm, and from Ps. cx. 4. (2) He then passes to the second topic of comparison viz., the infirmity of the nature which Christ our great high priest possessed, and which qualified him in a peculiar manner to sympathize with the infirmities of his people. He represents Christ as facing, during his incarnate state, uttered vehement supplications on account of his trials and distresses, and as experiencing, like other men, deliverance from them. v. 7. Even though he was clothed with the dignity of the Son of God, he required a practical knowledge of what it is to obey in the midst of sufferings, v. 8. Thus he was fitted μετριοτάτος τοῖς ἄγγελοις; and having thus obeyed and suffered, in consequence thereof he was exalted to κληρία (καθαιροέσθαι), where, as κυρίας high priest after the order of Melchizedek, he is an all-sufficient Saviour to those who believe and obey him, v. 9, 10.
As one of the proofs that Christ was exalted to an all-sufficient Saviour, the writer has again (ver. 10) produced the passage, which asserts him to be a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, I. e., a king and priest, whose office is not of limited extent or temporary duration. But having thus introduced a topic attended with an unwieldy length of Scripture and of the nature of Christianity in order to be righteously and fully comprehended, the apostle stops short in the prosecution of his subject, in order to admonish those whom he was addressing, with regard to the little progress which they had made in such knowledge as would render them adequate fully to comprehend the discussion concerning the topics in question, in which he was at the moment, in reply for their comparative ignorance, he pursues through vs. 11-14. In vs. 1-8, he warns them against the awful danger which would result from stopping short or turning back in their course, in order that he might thus excite them to more diligence and exertion respecting religious improvement. Notwithstanding the seeming severity of his remarks in regard to this topic, he assures them that he has an affectionate confidence in their good estate, vs. 9; and this, because God will have regard to the benevolent character which they had before exhibited, vs. 10. He then exhorts them to press forward in their Christian course, vs. 11; and assures them that the promise and oath of God are pleaded, that believers who persevered shall attain to salvation, vs. 12-19.

After this digression (if that may be called digression which is so directly concerned with the main object of the writer), he proceeds to descant upon the topic of Christ's priesthood, as instituted by God and compared with that of Melchizedek; and begins to view by and confirms his views respecting it. He begins by giving an account of the dignity of Melchizedek. He was king of Salem, and priest of the most high God; his superiority was acknowledged by Abraham, when he paid him a tithe of the spoils which he had taken, vs. 1-2. The same Melchizedek was not consecrated from priests (and therefore hisoffice did not fall by descent), but was right of such superior-origin as to be appointed by God; he has no genealogy assigned him in the sacred writings, nor any limited term mentioned in which his priesthood began or expired; like Christ's priesthood, his is unlimited, vs. 3. Abraham himself, exalted as this patriarch was, acknowledged the superiority of Melchizedek; and the Levitical priests descended from him did not keep their consecration the same, by their own hands or to whom they must be counted inferior, vs. 4-7. Besides, the Levitical priests who receive tithes, hold their office only for a limited duration; while Melchizedek is a priest for an unlimited time, vs. 8. Indeed (if one may venture so to express himself), the Levites themselves paid tithes to Melchizedek, through Abraham their priest, vs. 9-10.

Thus much for the superiority of Melchizedek over the Levitical priests. The conclusion in this case is left to be supplied by the reader's mind, after the manner in which Paul often writes. The reasoning is thus: 'Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek; Melchizedek is superior to the Aaronical priests; consequently, Christ is superior to the Aaronical priests.'

The writer next proceeds to another topic of great importance, and which very naturally connected itself with the consideration of Christ's priesthood, as compared with that of Melchizedek. If, says he, the Levitical priesthood was adequate for all the purposes of atonement and for the purification of the conscience of sinners, then what necessity that the appointment of another priest should be made, as is predicted in Ps. cx. 4; vs. 11. Now another order of priesthood necessarily demands a change of former laws respecting the priesthood, vs. 12; and that another order is introduced, follows, from the fact that Christ (the priest after the new order) was to spring from the tribe of Judah, vs. 13. Still more evident must it be, that the order would be different, because the new priestly office is to be perpetual, vs. 15-17. Consequently, the old order of things gives place to a new and better one, vs. 18, 19.

Besides, the new priest is appointed by the solemnity of an oath, while the Aaronical priests were not, vs. 21: consequently, we must suppose the new order of things to be superior, vs. 22. This superiority appears specially in the fact that the priesthood of Christ is perpetual in his own person; while that of the Levites was constantly changing by succession, vs. 23, 24. Christ, therefore, is an adequate and never-failing helper to all who come unto God through him, vs. 25.

It is thus that a new reign has been thus enlarged his views respecting the subject introduced in v. 6, 10, by a quotation from Ps. cx. 4, respecting the priesthood of Christ. The amount of the argument is, that by the oath of God Christ was appointed to his priesthood, while the Aaronical priests were appointed without such a solemnity; that the priesthood itself being of the order of Melchizedek, i. e., not of descent, not limited, not temporary, did by far more dignity. That of Aaron Christ must be regarded as altogether superior to the order of Jew-lish priests. The inference, of course, is, that the Hebrews ought not to forsake him who was a superior priest, in order to attach themselves to those who were inferior.

Having thus completed what he had to say respecting the comparison of Christ...
and Melchizedek as priests, the writer resumes the topic which he had begun in v. 7, 8, viz., that of Christ's sympathy with those "who are compassed with infirmity." He had already suggested tuere, that Christ possessed all the common sympathies and innocent infirmities of our nature, in common with other priests. But, not to leave it uncertain whether in all respects Jesus was "compassed with such infirmities" as the Jewish priests, he now proceeds to point out one important difference, viz., that the high priest of the new dispensation is altogether superior to the priests of the old, in regard to the moral purity and perfection of character. He is holy, and altogether without sin, v. 26; and therefore, needs not, like them, to offer any sacrifice on his own account, v. 27; for he has no such infirmity as renders this at all necessary, since he is priest in a state of perfection and glorious exaltation, v. 28.

Having thus shown the superiority of Christ over the Levitical priests, in respect to the second particular, viz., the qualification for sympathizing with erring men, the writer next proceeds to the most important topic of all, viz., the office of Christ as a priest, in directing the concerns of men with God, and in presenting a propitiatory sacrifice for them.

He begins by averring that the principal thing (κεφαλαμω) in respect to the matters which he is discussing, is the priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, v. 1, 2. He then re-introduces the topic which he had before stated in v. 1. Taking for granted the truth of the sentiment there stated, he now draws the inference from it, that Christ (being a priest) must also have an offering to present, v. 1–3. But if Christ were on earth he could not be a priest; for priests, whose office it is to perform duty in the earthly sanctuary, are already constituted by divine appointment, v. 4; and those perform their office in a temple that is merely a copy or semblance of the heavenly one, v. 5. Christ's ministry is as much superior to theirs, as the new covenant is to the old, v. 6; and the Scripture itself predicts that the old covenant should be abolished, and the new introduced in its stead, v. 7–13. Of course the new covenant must be superior; and Christ, who ministers in the holy temple, must be superior to those who serve merely in the earthly one.

Next, the writer proceeds to consider the manner and design of the sacerdotal service, and the ends which could be accomplished by it.

The earthly temple consisted of various apartments, and contained a variety of utensils, ix. 1–5. The priests performed daily service in the outer temple, ix. 6; while the high priest entered the inner one (where God dwelt) only once in each year, when he presented the blood of the great atoning sacrifice, ix. 7. Permission to enter only so seldom into the inner sanctuary, showed that free access to God at all times was not yet granted, while the first dispensation lasted, ix. 8. Indeed, these rites, with all their appurtenances, were merely a symbol of what was to be effected under the gospel, ix. 9, 10.

Christ, on the other hand, the heavenly high priest, entered the eternal sanctuary with his own blood, procuring everlasting redemption for sinners, ix. 11, 12. The blood of bulls and goats, presented by the Jewish high priest, effected nothing more than ceremonial, external purification, ix. 13; while the blood of Christ purifies the conscience and renders the worshipper truly acceptable to God, ix. 14.

Even such is the efficacy of the propitiatory sacrifice made by the death of Christ, that it extends back to the sins of former ages; so that all who are called of God to partake of the blessings of the gospel, attain, through his death, to a heavenly inheritance, ix. 15.

The mention of Christ's death here, in connection with the assurance effected by it of a heavenly inheritance for believers, affords occasion to the writer to compare the new διασκήνη ratified by the death of Christ, with the διασκήνη which are ratified by the death of testators. The Greek word διασκήνη not only answers to τάκτα, but also means such an arrangement as is made by a man's last will or testament, and is, employed, not unfrequently, in this latter sense. Hence our author, after asserting (ix. 16) that Christ's death made sure an inheritance to believers, falls very naturally upon comparing the διασκήνη thus ratified by the death of Jesus, with the διασκήνη ratified by the death of testators. Such, says he, is the custom among men in regard to testament, that the death of the testator must supervise, in order to give them full effect and confirmation. ix 16, 17. Even the first διασκήνη (τακτά) (although it could not be so appropriately called a testament) was sanctioned in a manner not unlike that in which the new διασκήνη is sanctioned; for blood (the emblem of death) was applied to almost every thing which pertained to the ancient covenant or διασκήνη, in order either to ratify or to consecrate it, ix. 18–22. Now, since this was so extensively done in regard to things here which are mere resemblances or types of heavenly things, these heavenly things themselves, being of a nature so much more exalted, must be consecrated by a corresponding sacrifice of a higher nature than any offered in the earthly temple, ix. 23. For it is in a heavenly temple that Christ discharges the functions of his priestly office, ix. 24; yet
not, like the Jewish priests, repeating expiatory offerings frequently, but once for all performing this sacred rite, ix. 25, 26. As men die but once, and Christ in his human nature and by dying in it made an expiatory offering, so he could make this but once; therefore, when he shall make his second appearance, it will not be to repeat his sin-offering, but for the deliverance of all who wait for his coming, ix. 27, 28.

Having thus compared various particulars, which have respect to the priesthood of the descendants of Aaron, to those which relate to the priesthood of Jesus, the writer comes, last of all, to treat more fully of the inefficacy of the Jewish sacrifices, and of the perfect and everlasting efficacy of that propitiatory offering, which was made by the high priest of the heavenly sanctuary. He had, indeed, already hinted at this several times, in the preceding parts of his epistle, e.g., vii. 11, 15; viii. 7, 13; ix. 8–10, 13, 14; but as it was the most important topic of all, and the most difficult to be urged on the minds of Jews, he reserved it until the last, in order that he might give it a more ample discussion.

He begins by declaring, that the rites of the law were designed to be typical, and that the yearly sacrifices which were offered under it, never could quiet and purify the consciences of men, x. 1; otherwise the offerings need not have been continually repeated, x. 2. The remembrance of sin is constantly renewed by them, x. 3. Indeed, it is plainly impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin, i.e., remove the penalty of it, or lessen its power, x. 4. In accordance with this sentiment, the Scripture (Ps. cxlviii.) represents the sacrifice as representing his work, as saving that sacrifices and offerings are of no value in the sight of God, x. 5, 6. The Messiah represents himself as doing what God requires, viz., what God requires in order that he may exercise his clemency, x. 7. Of course (so our author reasons) sacrifices and offerings are rejected (in respect to making real propitiation for the guilt of sin, and purifying from the presence of God, or, as the word is, x. 8, 9). This sacrifice is truly efficacious for moral purposes, x. 10. The Jewish priests repeated continually their sacrifices; but the offering of Christ, once made, is of everlasting efficacy, x. 11, 12. Having once made this, he may expect the effect, for he made it to be efficacious, x. 13; for he offered it once, and it was made by Jesus, is all-sufficient; its effects are never to cease, x. 14. To such an efficacy of Christ's offering, the Holy Spirit has testified in the Scriptures, by declaring that under the new covenant sin should be forgiven, and iniquity no more remembered, x. 15, 16. Consequently, offering for sin needs not to be repeated, after it has been obtained, x. 16, 17.

With this consideration, the author closes the comparison of Jesus, as a priest, with the Jewish priests under the Levitical dispensation. This comparison, in all its parts, however, occupies the greater portion of his epistle, viz., from iv. 14 to x. 18. He then proceeds to exhortations, warnings, and various arguments drawn from these considerations, in order to urge upon his Hebrew brethren the importance of persevering in the Christian faith.

If the question be asked, why the apostle should resort to comparisons of this nature in order to illustrate the office of Christ, or rather, the virtue and efficacy of his mediatorial priesthood, it may be answered as follows: the apostle, in the condition and feelings of those whom he addressed, led him to do so. The Jews of that day regarded the office of high priest as the most honorable of all offices then sustained. The authority and dignity of this office were very great, in earlier times, under the Jewish kings; but after the captivity, the offices of king and high priest were frequently united in the same person. This, of course, would tend to elevate the esteem in which the Jews held the rank of high priest. When the Romans reduced Judea to a tributary province, the civil power was transferred to the Procurator set there by them; but the supreme ecclesiastical power still remained in the hands of the high priest, who was supreme judge of the land and president of the Sanhedrin. The high priest was, moreover, the only person who could enter the most holy place on the great day of the national expiation, and make atonement for the people. On all these accounts the Jews cherished the greatest degree of reverence for their office. They looked upon it as their glory, and expected from the functions of it, pardon for sin and acceptance with God. How difficult it was to wean them from these views, even those of them who had embraced Christianity, the Acts of the Apostles and almost all the apostolic Epistles abundantly testify. But this must necessarily be done, however difficult, if Christianity was to be fully admitted and practised by them.
(14) Moreover, since we have a great high priest, Εξοντες οὖν ἄρχιερεῖα μέγαν. It is doubtful whether these words convey the exact shade of meaning which should be attached to the original. In the apostle’s day, ἄρχιερεῖν no longer designated merely one man, the single head of the whole priesthood, but it was applied also to his deputy (ὑπό); to those who had quitted the office of the high priesthood (εὐαυξητορία); and also to the priest at the head of each of the twenty-four classes of the priesthood. The word ἄρχιερεῖς, of itself, then, without any adjunct, did not, in the time of Paul, designate the high priest by way of eminence, who was the only person that could enter the most holy place and make atonement for sin. Hence the apostle says, not simply ἄρχιερεῖς, but ἄρχιερεῖς μέγας; which designates a specific individual. This corresponds exactly to the idea conveyed by the Hebrew הַנֵּלָע, which was applied only to him who was actually Pontifex Maximus. Οὖν is here the sign of resuming the subject in chap. iii. 1, for thus it is often used; or it may be a mere continuation of discourse, and so I have rendered it. In the other sense it is equivalent to as was said, ingam, then, etc. Passed through the heavens, Διελκυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς. Wahl and others, passed into the heavens; interpreting διελκυθότα as equivalent to εἰσερχόμενον, entered into. But they seem to me plainly to have mistaken the force of the writer’s expression here. According to the Hebrew idiom, God dwells above the visible firmament, ויהי, οὐρανοὶ, i. e., in the third heavens; comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2. Through this firmament Jesus passed, when he ascended to take his “seat at the right hand of the majesty on high,” i. 3. There is a plain allusion, too, to the high priest of the Jews, who once in a year went into the most holy place, passing through the vail which screened the residence of divine majesty from the view of men, ix. 7, 8. So our great high priest has passed through the heavens, into the immediate presence of God, into the “holy of holies” in the upper world. So Bengel, Owen, Kuinoel, and others. Ἡγοῦν τὸν νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ is added, to show specifically whom he means to designate by ἄρχιερεῖα. Κρατῶμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν, let us firmly hold [tenaciously adhere to] the religion which we have professed, viz., Christianity. Κρατῶ takes either the Acc. or Gen. after it.

To encourage them to follow this advice, the writer sets before them the assistance which they may expect in their efforts so to do.

(15) For we have not a high priest, who is incapable of sympathizing with, or of being compassionate towards, our weaknesses, Οὐ γὰρ . . . ἀφενεῖος ἕμω. The form of expression is negative, but, as often, is equivalent to an affirmative. “We have
a high priest who will sympathize with our weaknesses.” So “John confessed, and denied not, but confessed,” etc., John i. 20. In most cases, however, there is some speciality of coloring designed to be given, when this negative form of expression is chosen in preference to simple affirmation.

*Tempted, Πεταρασμένος,* see on ii. 18. *Δέ, but,* for so the sense requires here. *Κατὰ πάντα, in all respects;* not to be metaphysically or mathematically taken. The meaning is, that he, like us, was subjected to trial and suffering on account of the truth; he, like us, was solicited to sin, e.g., when Satan tempted him, and often when the Scribes and Pharisees tempted him.

Who was tempted like us, Ἡλιθ ὀμοιότητα, scil. ἡμῶν; παραπλησίως ἡμῶν, says Theophylact; ὀμοίως ἡμῖν, Origen. This surely does not imply, that temptations had in all respects the same influence upon him as upon us; but only that he was exposed to be attacked by them in like manner as we are. He possessed a nature truly human, ii. 14, 17; he was therefore susceptible of being excited by the power of temptations, although he never yielded to them. So the writer:

*Without sin,* Χωρὶς ἀμαρίας; i.e., although assailed by temptations of every kind, he never yielded in any case to their influence. He remained sinless. But why is this asserted here? Principally, I apprehend, to guard against any mistake in respect to what the writer had just said. To show the Hebrews that they might depend on the sympathy and compassion of their high priest (comp. ii. 17, 18), to help them in all the trials and difficulties to which an unshaken adherence to Christianity would subject them, he declares that Jesus was himself subject to the like trials in all respects. But when he had so said, as if fearing they might conclude that in some cases at least he was (like others) overcome by them, the author immediately adds, χωρίς ἀμαρίας. It may be, that the expression implies an exhortation thus, viz.: ‘Jesus when tried did not sin; Christian brethren, follow his example.’ I prefer, however, the former explanation.

(16) *Let us, therefore, approach the throne of grace,* μετὰ παραπλησίως, lit. with freedom of speech; i.e., since we have such a sympathizing, compassionate high priest, to offer our supplications to God and to help us, let us go to God with confidence that we shall receive the aid that we need. “Ask and ye shall receive.” *Τῇ Ἰδίᾳ τῆς γὰρ ἡμῶν has reference to the mercy-seat in the temple, on which God is represented as sitting enthroned. There he heard the supplications of his people, which were presented by the high priest; there he accepted their oblations; and from thence he dispensed to them the blessings which they needed. Christians may now approach the mercy-seat in heaven,
by their high priest, and may come μετὰ παρθηνίας, with confidence.

That we may obtain mercy, Ἰνα λαβῶμεν δόγαν, i. e., that we may obtain compassion in our afflictions and trials. And find favor in respect to timely assistance, Καὶ χάριν ἑρωμεν . . . βοήθειαν. Χάριν does not here differ much from δόγαν, except that it is a word of a more generic nature. The sentiment is, that we may be helped opportuneoly, i. e., that now, when we are persecuted and sorely pressed by trials, we may obtain that aid which such seasons require. This is exactly the idea conveyed by εἰκαγον βοήθειαν auxilium opportunum. Literally the Greek runs thus, And find grace with respect to opportune assistance.

---

CHAP. V.

(1) Selected, taken from men, Ἔξ ἄνθρωπων λαμβανόμενος. So λαβὼν, in Acts xv. 14. In a similar sense παρθηνίας is often used in Hebrew; and λαμβάνω, not unfrequently in the classics. The meaning is, that priests appointed according to the usages of the Levitical law (in distinction from the great high priest constituted by the especial appointment of God), are appointed to have the oversight of the religious concerns of the people, specially to make their oblations and sacrifices.

Is constituted for the benefit of men, in relation to their concerns with God, Ὑπὸ ἄνθρωποι καθιστάται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Καθιστάται is often employed to designate an appointment to office of any kind; e. g., Matt. xxiv. 45; Luke xii. 14, et al. So also it is used by heathen writers. Ὑπὸ, for the benefit of, for the sake of, on account of; a frequent use of the word. Τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, for κατὰ τὰ, κ. τ. λ., there being an ellipsis of the preposition, which is very common in such cases. The idea is, 'In respect to their religious concerns, in regard to business which they have to transact with God,' particularly,

That he may offer [to God] both oblations and sacrifices for sin, Ἰνα προσφέρῃ . . . ἄμαρτίων. Δῶρα I take here to mean the various kinds of thank-offerings, etc., that were to be presented to God, agreeably to the ritual established by Moses; and ἄμαρτίων, derived from ἁμαρτίας, the various sin and trespass-offerings that were made from slain beasts. In all these and the like concerns, the high priest was to act the part of an internuntius, a mediator, between God and men; i. e., he was to aid men in regard to their spiritual or religious concerns. It should be remarked, however, that δῶρα sometimes includes the idea of
sacrifices; e. g., viii. 4, comp. viii. 3. Yet where δῶρα and ἱννία are both employed, they are not to be regarded as synonyms. Both together are employed to designate the universality of the idea intended, i. e., (in this case) offerings of every kind.

(2) One who can exercise gentleness or moderation, μετροποθείων δανάμενος. This classic or philosophic use of the word μετροποθείων may be briefly explained. The Stoics maintained that a man should be ἀπαθής, i. e., not subject to passions, such as anger, fear, hope, joy, etc. The Platonists, on the other hand, averred that a wise man should be μετροποθείως, moderate in his affections, and not ἀπαθής. The leading sense, then, of the word μετροποθείων is, to be moderate in our feelings or passions. In our text, the connection shows us that the moderation or gentleness was to be exercised by the high priest, toward those who were ignorant and erring, τοῖς ἁγνοῦσι καὶ πλανομένοις. In other words, he was to be lenient towards offenders, to treat them with gentleness and moderation, with kindness, and not with severity. The comparison of Christ as a priest, in respect to this point, is presented in v. 7—9.

The words ἁγνοῦσι καὶ πλανομένοις some have construed as a Hendiadys, and rendered the phrase thus: those who ignorantly offend, or who offend through ignorance. But surely the indulgence of the high priest on earth was not limited merely to this class of offenders; much less is the clemency of our great high priest in the heavens so limited. Ἀγνοῶ is repeatedly used by the Seventy, as a translation of the Hebrew יָנָשׁ, יָנָשִׁ, יָנָשְׁ, which signify to err, to commit sin, to render one's self guilty. So Sirac. v. 18, in a great or little thing, μὴ ἁγνοῦ, sin not. So Polyb. V. 11, 5, πολεμεῖν τοῖς ἁγνοῦσιν, to make war on those who have been faulty. But if any should think it preferable, in our verse, to retain the common sense of ignorance, then plainly it must be construed of voluntary criminal ignorance; and in such a case, πλανομένοις designates those who commit offences in consequence of such ignorance. But I prefer to understand ἁγνοῦσι καὶ πλανομένοις as an accumulation of descriptive words, in order to designate offenders of various kinds; and so, although I have rendered ἁγνοῦσι the ignorant, yet I mean this in the sense of being voluntarily, and therefore criminally, ignorant. This mode of explaining the expression comports with the office of the Levitical priest in the earthly, and with that of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary.

Since he himself is compassed with infirmity, Ἐστι καὶ . . . ἀσθένειαν, i. e., he is himself an offender, or he is exposed by his weaknesses to commit the like sins with those whose offerings he is called to present to God. Περίκεκας, in the passive is con-
strued with an Accusative after it. 'Ἀσφάλεια here means moral infirmity or weakness, not natural frailty of the physical system. The meaning, that the high priest 'hand ignarus mali, miseric succurrere discit.'

(3) And on this account [viz., because he himself is a sinner], he must present sin-offerings as well for himself as for the people, Kai δὲ ταύτην . . . ἄμαρτών. Προσφέρω, i.e., πρόσφοραν or ἱερατίαν, Hebrew נַעֲשׂ עַל. Προσφέρω is the common word employed to denote the presentation of an offering, gift, or sacrifice to God, and corresponds to the Hebrew נַעֲשׂ, or rather נָעַשׂ in Hiphil. See the superiority of Christ represented, in respect to the point here suggested, as to the duty or obligation of priests in general, in vii. 26—28.

(4) Moreover, no one can assume the honor (of high priesthood) to himself, but he is appointed by God, even as Aaron was, Kai οὐκ ἑαυτῷ . . . Ἀαρών. So Καλοῦμαι = δεῖ καλοῦμαι οὖν.

(5) Accordingly, Christ did not claim for himself the honor of being high priest, Οὖν καὶ . . . ἀρχιερεῖ, or Christ did not exalt himself to the honor of being high priest. Δοξάζω, to exalt, to claim honor for, John viii. 54; Rom. xi. 13.

But he who said to him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, Ἀλλ' ὦ θαλάσσας . . . γεγέννηκα σε, [exalted him, εὐδοκασαν αὐτόν]. So the ellipsis must be supplied. The meaning is, exalted him to the office of high priest, i.e., the Father, who hath given to the Son an exalted station, hath bestowed this honor also upon his Son (see on i. 5); or, in other words, Christ was divinely appointed to office.

(6) As also he saith, in another [passage of Scripture], Καθὼς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡγεμ. λέγει. The declaration is, that the Father constituted the Son a priest; for the writer has affirmed (in ver. 4) that a priest must be divinely constituted. The quotation is from Ps. cx. 4; a Psalm which, as I have before remarked, not only the apostle and most Christian commentators, but even the Jewish Rabbies in general, agree, has relation to the Messiah.

Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek, Σὺ οἰκεῖ ἔως . . . Μελχισεδέκ. 'Ιερέας designates here a priest generically considered. The Psalmist, and after him the apostle, does not say ἀρχιερεῖα, because the sequel shows that the personage referred to must be of the highest order of priests, viz., of the same order with that of Melchizedek.

After the order, Κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, Hebrew, יִהְיֶה בִּי. i.e., בִּי הָעִיר, for בִּי is paragogic here. This Hebrew phrase commonly means on account of, for the sake of; but such a meaning would be wholly inapposite in Ps. cx. 4. יִהְיֶה is there used as in Deut.
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xv. 9; xix. 4; 1 K. ix. 15, meaning manner, order, arrangement, kind. So in its classic sense τάξις means order, arrangement, place, office, rank. The simple meaning of the whole phrase, i.e., 'Thou art a priest of an order or rank like that of Melchizedek.'

When in ver. 10 the writer repeats the quotation here made, he uses ἀρχηγός instead of ιερός the word employed here in his first quotation. The object of the quotation in ver. 6, is simply to prove that the office of high priest was conferred on Christ by divine appointment; comp. vs. 4 and 6. The particulars of the comparison in respect to the priesthood of Christ and Melchizedek, are not immediately brought into view, but suspended until the writer has introduced other considerations relative to Christ as a priest, v. 7—9, and given vent to his feelings of concern for those whom he was addressing, by suggesting various considerations adapted to reprove, v. 11—14, to warn, vi. 1—9, as well as to excite and animate them, vi. 10—20.

Κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα, it is to be taken in a qualified sense here, as often elsewhere, e.g., comp. Luke i. 33 with 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. The priesthood of Christ will doubtless continue no longer than his mediatorial reign; for when his reign as mediator ceases, his whole work both as mediator and as priest will have been accomplished.

In respect to the application of Ps. cx. to the Messiah, see Matt. xxii. 41—45. Certain it is, from this passage, that Jesus considered and treated this Psalm as applying to himself.

The three following verses I take to be a comment on v. 2; or, to express my meaning more fully, a comparison of Christ as a priest, with the Jewish priests, who, being themselves compassed with infirmity, were taught by experience μετρωταῖς τῶν ἀγοροθήματος καὶ πλανυμένους. It is, however, only the innocent infirmities of one exposed to suffering that are brought to view here. There Christ possessed in full, so that he could, like o her priests, sympathize with those who are tempted and tried by suffering. None of his disciples are tried more severely than he was.

(6) Who, during the time of his incarnation, Ὁς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἡμέρας, like the Heb. ימות, means time, season. τῆς σαρκὸς I understand as designating the condition of the Logos incarnate, or ἐν σαρκί; comp. 1 John i. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16. The whole expression designates the period of the Saviour's humiliation, when "he was tempted in all points, as we are," iv. 15.

Offered up prayers and supplications, Δέοσεις καὶ ἰκετηρίας προσενέγκας. These two words are often joined by profane writers; e.g., ἰκετηρίας πολλὰς καὶ δέοσεις ποιούμενοι. Isoc. de Pace. Χωρίς δὲ ἰκετηρίας καὶ δέοσεως, Philo de Cherub. p. 116. So also
Lucian and Plutarch. Some critics have referred δεήσις to prayers proceeding from a sense of need; and ἱερυπίας to submissive intercession. But although in some cases the words may be so employed they are generally used as synonymous, or nearly so. The use of both these synonyms denotes intensive supplication or intercession; a mode of expressing intensity, which is very frequent in the sacred writings. Πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ Σαβάτου, i.e., to the sovereign Lord of life and death, the "God in whose hands our breath is, and whose are all our ways;" a periphrasis in this case which means, 'God who is possessed of supreme power, or the sovereign Lord of life and death.

With loud cries and with tears or weeping, ἤχος κραυγῆς καὶ δακρύων, voce aliā et lacrymis; see Luke xxii. 41—44; Matt. xxvi. 38, 39; xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34—36, and comp. Luke xii. 50; John xii. 27, 28. Κραυγῆς λογοφος denotes the intensity of the voice when raised high by agonizing supplication, Luke xxii. 44. The Evangelists do not mention the weeping of the Saviour; but who can doubt that he did weep, when he prayed in such an agony that he sweated as it were drops of blood, Luke xxii. 44?

And was heard in respect to that which he feared, or was delivered from that which he feared, Kai εἰσακοσιαίς ἄνευ τῆς εὐλαβείας. The classic sense of εὐλαβεία is fear, dread; and this is the sense in which it is commonly employed in the Septuagint. But as the Hebrew words הַשֵּׁר and נתי mean, reverence and to revere, as well as fear and to fear or to dread, so the Greek εὐλαβεία, εὐλαβής, εὐλαβώ, are sometimes employed to designate the idea of reverence, and consequently (like γῆς γνωτί) of piety, devotion, religion. But the usual classic sense of the word is to be preferred in our verse, viz., fear or object of dread, like the Hebrew פֶּתַח. Εἰσακοσία and εἰσακοσία are frequently employed, in the Septuagint, in order to translate the Hebrew verb נַעֲשָׁה; and נַעֲשָׁה very often means, to answer a prayer or request. To answer a request for deliverance, is to deliver or save from. This sense the verb נַעֲשָׁה sometimes has; Ps. xxii. 22, from the horns of the wild bull "נהוטי, deliver me" (the preceding parallelism has נַעֲשָׁה יִשָּׂא, save me) ; Job xxxv. 12, from the pride of the wicked נַעֲשָׁה, he [God] will not deliver. So Ps. cxviii. 5, et al. We may render εἰσακοσιαίς, then, was delivered. Still this is not absolutely necessary, inasmuch as he was heard in respect to the object of fear, gives the same sense, viz., 'from that which he dreaded Christ was delivered, or his entreaties were listened to in respect to that which he dreaded.' Ἀπό, like the πό, ἐστι, is sometimes employed in the sense of quod attinet ad, so that it
accords with the general meaning of τηρεῖ; e. g., in Acts xvii. 2. See Schleusner Lex. ἀπό, No. 18, Gesen. Heb. Lex. γαρ No. 4. If ἵππωσθεῖς be translated (as the Hebrew ἰππ in some cases should be rendered), was delivered, then the usual sense of ἀπό is perfectly appropriate; and on this account I have thought such a translation to be preferable, and made it accordingly. See Excursus XI.

(8) Although a Son, yet did he learn obedience by suffering, Ἐκτετεινωθεῖς . . . ἵππωσθεῖς, i. e., although he was God’s only and well beloved Son, a personage of the most exalted dignity, yet was he put to the trial of obedience in the midst of sufferings; or rather, he was subjected to learn, experimentally, what it is to obey in the midst of sufferings. I cannot suppose the object of the writer to be an assertion that Christ did not understand the nature of obedience, or recognize the duty of it, before he suffered; but that it pleased God to exalt him to glory, in the way of obedience by suffering as well as by action. Such is the sentiment in ii. 10. Of such an obedience our epistle speaks in x. 7, quoted from Ps. xl. 8, 9; and such is that mentioned in Phil. ii. 8, obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, which, in the sequel, is asserted to be the special ground of Christ’s exaltation to the throne of the universe. To mention such an obedience here, is altogether apposite to the apostle’s design; which was, fully to impress on the Hebrews the sympathizing and compassionate nature of the Saviour, and his fitness to succeed those who were under sufferings and trials; comp. ii. 17, 18; iv. 15, 16. The same is implied in v. 1, 2.

(9) And being exalted to glory, he became the author of eternal salvation [he procured salvation] for all those who obey him, Καὶ τελευωθέως . . . ἵππωσθεῖς. For τελευωθέως, see on ii. 10, where is the same sentiment as here, and where Christ (who is here said to be αἴτιος σωτηρίδος) is called τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας, which has the same meaning. The whole of the preceding context, there, is occupied with showing the exaltation or kingly dignity of Christ; to which state of exaltation τελευωθέως undoubtedly refers here. There is also conveyed, by ver. 9, an intimation that Christ’s very sufferings stand in an intimate and necessary connection with his exaltation to the kingly office, so that he is a kingly priest, as Melchizedek also was. There is evidently no necessity, however, of including the whole of vs. 7—9 in a parenthesis, as many commentators have done; nor of regarding them as an interruption of the apostle’s discourse. A new topic or head is introduced by them, which is broken off in v. 11, after the manner of Paul, and resumed in vii. 26.

(10) Being called by God [as I was saying], a high priest
after the order of Melchizedek; Ἰπροσαγορευθεὶς . . . Μελχισεδἐκ. Ἰπροσαγορευθεὶς means to name, to salute by calling a name, to greet. The meaning is, that Christ is greeted or saluted by the name or appellation, ἀρχιερεὺς, ἱερέας. In the Septuagint, Ps. cix. 4 [cx. 4], and above in ver. 6, it is iερεύς. But the Hebrew ḫרֵא means either ἀρχιερεὺς or iερεύς; see Lev. iv. 16, et al.; so that the apostle might render the original in Ps. cx. 4, by either Greek word. Accordingly, he has chosen ἀρχιερεὺς.

HAVING thus introduced the subject of Christ's exaltation as priest, the nature of the comparison introduced, viz., the comparison of Christ's priesthood with that of Melchizedek, occasions the writer to stop short in order to comment on this, and also to give utterance to his emotions of concern for those whom he addressed. The difficulty and obscurity of the subject which he is about to discuss, are, in his view, occasioned principally by the low state of religious knowledge in those whom he addresses. This he tells them very plainly, in order to reprove them for this, as well as to guard them against objecting to what he is about to advance.

(11) Respecting whom we have much to say, Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος . . . λέγειν. So Lysias in Panoc., πολὺς ἐν εἰ̄̂] μοὶ λό- γος δύνείσθαι. Dionys. Halicar. I. 23, περὶ ὧν πολὺς ἐν εἰ̄̂[λόγος. And difficult of explanation, Καὶ δυσερμήνευεινος. Critics often couple the word λέγειν which follows, with δυσερμήνευεινος; but the example above, from Lysias, shows that it should be associated with λόγος. The grammatical construction or arrangement I take to be this; περὶ οὗ λέγειν, πολὺς ἡμῖν [εἰ̄[λόγος; the Infinitive λέγειν being used as a noun in the Nominative, or as the subject of the sentence, according to a common usage.

Since ye are dull of apprehension, or slow in understanding, ἐπὶ νο̅̃οὶ γεγόνας ταῖς ἁκοί. Ταῖς ἁκοί, lit. in hearing. But ἁκόνι to hear, means often to perceive, to understand, like the Hebrew ḫחוח.

The reason why they are so dull in respect to understanding religious subjects, is next suggested by the writer; doubtless with the design of reproving those whom he addresses, for their neglect to make a suitable progress in Christian knowledge.

(12) For when ye ought to be even capable of teaching, as it respects the length of time, Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἐφιλογίαν . . . χρόνον, viz., length of time since ye made a profession of the Christian religion. The writer doubtless does not mean to say, that the whole church whom he addressed should actually be teachers; but that they ought to have made advances enough in the knowledge of spiritual subjects to be able to teach in them, or in other words, ought to have made very considerable acquisitions in religious knowledge, considering the length of time that had
elapsed since they professed to be Christians. * Διὰ τὸν χρόνον
may be rendered after the time, i. e., after so much time; comp.
διὰ in Matt. xxxi. 61: Mark xiv. 58; ii. 1; Acts xxiv. 17;
Gal. ii. 1.

Ye have need that one should again teach you the very rudiments of divine doctrine, Πάλιν χρηίαν ἔχετε . . . τοῦ Ἱωάν.
Στοιχεία, elements or rudiments of any science—Στοιχεία τῆς ἀρ-
χῆς, the rudiments of the beginning, is the same as Horace's ele-
menta prima, Serm. 1. The idea is expressed by the phrase,
very rudiments, or first elements, elementa prima. Τῶν λόγων
toῦ Ἱωάν, I should refer particularly to those parts of the Old
Testament which have a respect to the Christian religion, and
especially to the Messiah, were it not that in chap. vi. 1—3, the
writer has shown that he means the rudiments of Christian doc-
trine in its appropriate sense. Λόγων Ἱωάν then must mean
here, doctrines or communications of God, viz., which God has
revealed under the gospel, i. e., divine doctrine or doctrines of
divine original.

This feeble, imperfect, spiritual condition, the writer now
describes, by a very appropriate figure taken from the aliment
and condition of young children.

And ye have become [like] those who need milk, and not solid
nourishment, Καὶ γεγονάτε χρηίαν . . . τροφής, lit., ye have be-
come those who need, etc. But the particle of similitude is, in
such cases, very often omitted in the Old Testament and in the
New. The meaning is, 'Ye have, in spiritual things, become as
children are in regard to food, i. e., unable to bear or to digest
anything but the most light and simple nourishment, ye cannot
understand or bear the heavier and more difficult doctrines, ye
cannot properly apprehend them when they are proposed to you.'
Τροφή, nourishment, any kind of food, not meat only.

(13) Now every one who partakes of milk, is unskilled in the
doctrine of righteousness, for he is a child. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μικρός . . .
νηπίως γὰρ ἤστι. "Απερεπι, inexpert, ineptus ad aliquam rem, i. e.,
one who has not that skill or experience in regard to anything,
which is requisite to a due apprehension and consideration of it.
The sentiment is, 'As he who must be fed with milk, is yet a
child; so ye, who can bear only the lighter kinds of spiritual
nourishment, are yet νηπίως in religion.' Δόγου δικαστικὴς, doc-
trine of salvation, i. e., the gospel, or the Christian religion,
according to some; δικαστικὴ, meaning here, as they suppose,
what the Christian religion sanctions or ordains. See Schleus-
ner on δικαστική, no. 9. Others render δικαστική, grace,
favor, i. e., the gospel which reveals grace, favor, pardon.
Others translate it true doctrine, because γῆ and γῆς are some-
times synonymous. Others translate it *perfect doctrine*, as being the antithesis of τὰ στοιχεῖα, κ. τ. λ., above. So Abresch, Wahl, Ernesti, Kuinoel, etc. I would translate it simply, *the doctrine of righteousness*, i. e., of true uprightness in life, including piety towards God and integrity towards men. So, or to the like purpose, is δικαιοσύνη employed in Acts x. 35; xiii. 10; xxiv. 25; Matt. v. 20, v. 6; vi. 33; xxi. 32; Luke i. 75; Rom. vi. 16—22, et alibi saepe.

(14) *But solid food is for those of mature age, Τελείων δὲ ζωὴν ἡ στερεῶς γεφυρ. Τελείως, adult, grown up, i. e., those who have obtained completion in a physical respect; see on ii. 10; v. 9.*

Who possess organs of sense, exercised by practice for distinguishing between good and evil, Τῶν δὲ τὴν ζωὴν ... κακοῦ. The metaphor here, as in the preceding verse, is of a mixed nature; the latter clause being appropriate to moral τέλειον. The meaning is, that *solid food*, which is an image of the more difficult part of gospel doctrines, is appropriate to *full grown* men, i. e., to Christians who have come to a maturer state, and who, by experience in matters of religion, and frequent reflection upon them, have made advances so as to be able to distinguish what is right and what is wrong respecting them. Ἀυξήσεως here means the *internal senses* of Christians, their moral powers or faculties of distinguishing and judging; although the term itself, in its literal acceptance, designates the *external organs of sense*. Διάρκειας καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ is borrowed from the Heb. דַּקְתִּים יִתְמַר; see Gen. ii. 17; Deut. i. 30, and comp. Is. vii. 15, 16; Jonah iv. 11. It is applied by the Hebrews to designate a more mature and advanced state of knowledge in respect to anything, and not simply the mere perception of a difference between the moral nature of good and evil. So here, τέλειον does not designate those who are able to discern the difference between good and evil, simply considered: but that they were in such a state, as not readily to discern what was true or false in respect to the more difficult doctrines of the Christian religion; they were not as yet capable of rightly understanding and estimating them. From this state it was their duty speedily to extricate themselves; and this the writer now goes on and exhorts them to do.

---

**CHAP. VI**

(1) *Wherefore, leaving the first rudiments of Christian doctrine, let us proceed to a more advanced state [of knowledge], Δώ ἄφεν-***

* For Synopsis of the course of thought, see beginning of chap. v.
interpret here in the usual sense. I understand the reasoning of the apostle thus: 'Wherefore, i.e., since τέλων only are capable of στερεά τροφή, solid food, viz., of receiving, digesting, and duly appropriating the higher and more difficult doctrines of Christianity, and since ye are yet but νηπίων, although ye ought to be advanced in Christian knowledge, if regard be had to the long time that ye have professed the Christian religion, v. 12—14; δια, therefore it becomes you to quit this state of immaturity, this νηπιότητα, and advance to a maturer state, to a τελωνιότητα.' The reasoning is plain, when thus understood, and the connection palpable. The word ἀφέων is from ἀφέωμι = relinquo, abeo, discedo, relinquo post me, etc., is frequently, as here, applied to quitting a thing for the sake of going to some different place, or of engaging in a different employment; e.g., Matt. iv. 20, 22; v. 24; xviii. 12; xix. 27; John x. 12.

Others (and most commentators) understand ἀφέων here in the sense of omitting, and apply it to the apostle in the following way: 'Omitting now to insist on the first elements of Christian doctrine, let me proceed to the consideration of the more difficult principles of religion, not discussing at present the subject of repentance, baptism, etc.; which I will do, i.e., I will discuss the higher principles, if God permit;' or, as some interpret this last clause, 'Which [first rudiments] I shall discuss by and by, Deo volente; referring καὶ τούτῳ πυθομένου to the discussion of the doctrines just mentioned.

But this interpretation does not accord with the following context. The reasoning would be this: 'Omitting now all discussion respecting the first rudiments of Christian doctrine, I will proceed to disclose the more abstruse principles of the same; for it is impossible (ἀδιώναρον γάρ) that apostates should be again renewed to repentance.' Is there any coherence in such reasoning? If there is, it is at least very difficult to see it. But according to the other method of interpretation, the reasoning is plain: 'Christian brethren, who ought by this time to be qualified by your knowledge of religion to become teachers of it, quit the state of ignorance in which you are. Let it not be necessary any more to teach you the first rudiments of Christian doctrine. Such progress we must make, Deo volente. Stationary we cannot remain; we must either advance or recede. But guard well, I beseech you, against receding; ἀδιώναρον γάρ,' etc., vs. 4—8.

Two things, at least, must be admitted. The one, that the apostle taxes them with negligence in regard to an enlarged acquaintance with religious doctrine; the other, that he cautions
them against the awful consequences of *apo-stasy*. Now does it not follow, that he considers the state of comparative ignorance in which they were, as exposing them in a peculiar manner to apostatize; and consequently, that he connects the danger of apostasy with reproof in regard to religious ignorance, so as to rouse them to more effort in order to acquire a better acquaintance with the grounds and principles of Christianity? The admonition then is: 'Guard well against ignorance of Christian doctrines. For lapse is easy to the ignorant, and recovery exceedingly difficult or impossible.' And is not all this founded in the nature of things as they have always existed? Are not the ignorant most easily led away by impostors and heretical teachers? The men who have prohibited the use of the Scriptures by the people at large, and who labor to suppress the diffusion of general knowledge in order that the mass of the people may be kept in ignorance, and so be moulded by them at their will, have well understood the principle to which I have alluded.

The middle voice of *φέρω*, often signifies *to go, to come, to travel, to move* in any manner or in any direction. So *φέρωμαι*, here, to advance, to go forward. Not again laying the foundation with respect to repentance, Ἔναν τιλιν ἑμέλλου καταβαλλόμενον μετανοίας; not again commencing (as we once have done) with the first elements of Christian doctrine, e. g., the subject of repentance, etc. *Metanoia* here means, the subject or doctrine of *metanoia*, see ver. 2. The writer does not here speak of repentance as an act, but as a doctrine or subject of consideration; and so of the other subjects mentioned in the sequel. That *repentance* was inculcated as an initial doctrine and duty of Christianity, may be seen by consulting the following passages, Matt. iv. 17; Mark i. 15; Acts ii. 38; xvii. 30, and others of the same kind.

*From deadly works.* Ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων; i.e., in respect to works which cause death, misery, or condemnation; comp. ix. 14, and τοῦ ᾿Αβαταίν in ii. 14. Or *νεκρός* may be interpreted as meaning *sinful, vicious*; as in Eph. v. 14; Rom. vi. 13; xi. 15; Rev. iii. 1. It is not important which of these senses is adopted. The one implies the other.

*Faith in God* or in respect to God, Και πίστεως ἐπὶ Θεῶν. That this is an elementary principle of Christianity, is evident from the nature of the thing, as well as from Mark xi. 22; John xiv. 1; Heb. xi. 6, and many other passages of the New Testament. Here, however, by *faith in God* is to be understood faith in the declarations which God has made to men respecting his Son, the Saviour of the world; comp. Acts xvi. 31.

(2) *The doctrine of baptisms,* Βαπτισμῶν δώρων. Here the
διαχεί is supplied by the writer; and I regard it as implied, before the preceding μετανοιας and πίστεως. Some interpreters, however, without authority, point the text thus, βαπτισμόν, διαχεί, l. e., of baptisms, of [elementary] instruction. The only difficulty lies in the plural word βαπτισμόν; since we know of only one Christian Baptism, and the Jewish ceremonial rites cannot be brought into account here, unless the Jewish baptisms, or the baptism of John, are alluded to as being brought into comparison with Christian baptism, and adjudged; which is a possible, perhaps a probable sense; and so Vater, Kuinoel, Burton, and Bloomfield.

Another explanation is, that βαπτισμόν does not differ in any important respect from βαπτισμόν. So in John i. 13, stands the plural αὐμάτων; in 1 Cor. vii. 2, τὰς πορνείας; in 2 Cor. vii. 3, καρδίας; all with the same sense as the singular, in each case. See many like cases, in Glass. Philol. Sac. I. p. 62, seq. So the plural number of verbs is often employed, when the subject is indefinite and of the singular number; e. g., Mark v. 35, comp. Luke viii. 49. Comp. also Heb. ix. 17, ἐπὶ νεκρῶν. Storr supposes βαπτισμόν to be used here in a kind of distributive sense, as the Hebrew plural often is; so that the sentiment is, 'the doctrine that every believer must be baptized.' But however this may be, no great stress can be laid upon the use of the plural. Accordingly the Syriac version has the singular here. In regard to the doctrine of baptism being an elementary doctrine, there can be no difficulty. The rite itself was an initiatory one, for all who professed to be Christians.

Imposition of hands, Ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χερῶν. It is a very palpable mistake, into which many Christians fall, who are not well acquainted with the rites of the primitive church, to suppose that imposition of hands was practised only in the case of ordaining persons to the holy ministry. It was common for the apostles to bestow extraordinary gifts upon converts to Christianity, immediately after their baptism, by the imposition of hands. See Acts ii. 38, λήψεως τὴν δωρεὰν τῶν ἁγίων πνεύματος, comp. Acts viii. 14—19; xix. 1—6. Hence ἐπιθέσεως χερῶν is reckoned as one of the things, the knowledge of which was communicated at an early stage of the Christian profession.

Of the resurrection of the dead, Ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν. Storr and others understand this here, only of the resurrection of the pious. But I apprehend the sense is general; as in John v. 28, 29. Comp. Matt. xxii. 31; Acts iv. 2. A general resurrection of the bodies of men, is a doctrine, which, if not left undecided by the Old Testament, is at least left in obscurity. The Jews of the apostle's time were divided in their opinion respecting it.
Hence it was insisted on with great earnestness by Christian preachers, as belonging to the peculiar and elementary doctrines of Christianity. It was connected, by them, with the account which every man is to render of himself to God; and such an accountability is a fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion.

And of a judgment the consequences of which are eternal, Καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίων. In such a sense is λιτρωτις said to be αἰωνίων, in ix. 12; and διάθηκη to be αἰωνία, in xiii. 20. Both the resurrection and the judgment, in this case, pertain to the righteous and to the wicked. It is the general doctrine of a resurrection, and of responsibility and reward at the tribunal of God, which the writer means to describe. These doctrines were among those that were first preached, when men were to be instructed in the elements of Christianity; see Acts xvi. 31; x. 42; Rom. ii. 16; Matt. xxv. 31, seq. In regard to the eternal consequences of judgment, see Matt. xxv. 46; John v. 29; Dan. xi. 2; 2 Thess. i. 9; Matt. xviii. 8; Mark ix. 45, 48.

(3) And this will we do, if God permit, Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ Ἰησοῦς; i. e., we will advance in Christian knowledge, go on ἐπὶ τελειωτητα, should God be pleased to spare our lives and afford us continued opportunity of so doing. The frequency with which the writer of this epistle uses the first person plural (κοίνων), is worthy of remark. It gives a more delicate cast to his reproofs, his conminations, and his exhortations.

(4) Ἀδώναρον γάρ, for it is impossible, i. e., we will go forward in the attainment of what belongs to Christians, and not recede; for it is impossible, viz., that those who recede and apostatize should be recovered from their lapse, as the sequel avers. In this method of interpretation the meaning of γάρ is sufficiently evident. But does Ἀδώναρον here imply absolute impossibility, or only great difficulty? The latter, Storr and many other critics reply. To vindicate this sentiment, they appeal to Mark x. 25, 27, and to the parallel passages in the other evangelists. But this appeal is not satisfactory. In Matt. xix. 23, seq., Mark x. 23, seq., and Luke xviii. 24, seq. (all relating to the same occurrence). Jesus is represented as saying, "τῶς δυσκόλως shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of God!" He then adds, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." His disciples are astonished at this, and ask, "How is it possible, that any one [any rich man] can be saved, τίς ἐὰν δύσκολος σωθήσεται;" Jesus replies, "With men this is ἀδώναρον; but with God all things are

* The emphatic position of this word at the beginning of the sentence contained in vs 4—6, all of which is subject of a verb understood after which this is predicato, should not escape notice.
\(\delta\delta\nu\alpha\rho\alpha\)." Surely he does not mean merely that this is very difficult with men, but that it is absolutely beyond their power to accomplish it.

The other examples of the use of this word in the New Testament, are not all adapted to favor the exegesis of Storr; e. g., Acts xiv. 8; Rom. viii. 3; xv. 1, where the word, however, is figuratively employed. But if the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is to be compared with himself, then it is quite certain that \(\delta\delta\nu\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\) will not bear the qualified sense which Storr puts upon it. Comp. Heb. vi. 18; x. 4; xi. 6, all clear cases of absolute impossibility, not of mere relative difficulty. These are all the instances in which the word is found, in the New Testament. Nor will a resort to classic usage any better defend the interpretation of Storr.

Besides, if it could be shown that such a qualified sense were agreeable to the usus loquendi, in some cases, and therefore possible, a comparison with Heb. x. 26—31, would destroy all appearance of probability that such a sense is to be admitted here. If there "remains no more sacrifice for sin" (Heb. x. 26) for those who have apostatized, then is there no hope of salvation for them; as is clear from Heb. x. 23—31. Moreover, to say merely that it is very difficult to recover the lapsed Christians of whom the apostle is going to speak, would be at variance with the imagery employed to describe them and the fate that awaits them, in vs. 7, 8. For all these reasons, such an explanation of \(\delta\delta\nu\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\) cannot be admitted.

Those who have been once enlightened, \(\Theta\omicron\iota\tau\iota\varsigma\iota\varsigma\varsigma\mu\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigm
Hebrews vi. 4.

But when a full experience or perception of any thing is meant, γεύσασθαι is used simply; e. g., οί γεύσάμενοι τῆς ἀρετῆς, Philo. de Abraham. oper. l. p. 14. So τοῦ ἄνατον γεύσων γεύσασθαι, Clem. Rom. i. 38. In the New Testament, ἰατρός γεύσασθαι means, to experience death; e. g., Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; John viii. 52; Heb. ii. 9. Comp. also Luke xiv. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 3. So Herod. VI. 5, γεύσασθαι ἐλευθερίαν, to experience [to enjoy] freedom. Pindar, Ncm. Od. V. 596, τόνων γεύσασθαι, to undergo toils. Soph. Trach. 1108, ἄλλων τε μόχθων μωρίων ἐγευσάμην, I have suffered a thousand other evils. So the Hebrew אֶבוּ, Prov. xxxi. 18; Ps. xxxiv. 9.

But what is the heavenly gift which they have enjoyed, or the benefits of which they have experienced? Some have explained it as being Christ himself, by comparing it with John iv. 10. But it is doubtful whether δωρεάν there means Christ. It is more probable that it means beneficium, i. e., the kindness or favor which God bestowed, in vouchsafing an opportunity to the Samaritan woman to converse with the Saviour. Others have represented δωρεάν as being the extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians, in the primitive age of Christianity; and they have compared the phrase here with πνεύμα ἄγιον, in Acts viii. 19, which means the special gifts of the Spirit, and which in viii. 20, is called τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ Θεοῦ. But the objection to this is, that the sequel of our text contains a repetition of the same idea, once at least, if not twice,—For these reasons, I prefer the interpretation which makes δωρεάν ἐπουράνιον the same here as κλήσεως ἐπουράνιον in iii. 1, i. e., the proffered blessings or privileges of the gospel. The sense is then plain and facile; (1) They had been instructed in the elementary doctrines of Christianity, φωνεύσασθαι. (2) They had enjoyed the privileges or benefits of living under a Christian dispensation, i. e., the means of grace which the gospel afforded; and this is truly δωρεά ἐπουράνιος. I much prefer this mode of interpretation to any of the others.

And have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, Καὶ μετόχοις γεννήτορας πνεύματος ἄγιον. I understand this of the extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit, which the primitive Christians enjoyed, and which were often bestowed by the imposition of the apostles' hands. See above on εἰσῆλθεν τῷ χειρῶν, in ver. 2. Γεννήτορας is a more unusual word, in such a connection as the present, than γεννομένοις; but still there are sufficient examples to show, that occasional custom sanctions the use of it in such cases as the present.*

* There does not seem to be any necessity of confining it to the extraordinary influences of the Spirit. Some men are in a high degree participants of the Holy Spirit, and yet not of its regenerating and saving influences.
And have tasted the good word of God, Καὶ καλὸν γενσάμενος Ἰσω ῥῆμα, i. e., enjoyed the consolations administered, or the hopes excited, by the divine promises which the gospel proffers. Γενσάμενος (as above) experienced, known by experience. Above, it is construed with the Gen. after it; here with the Acc.; both according to Greek usage, although the former method predominates.

The divine promise, Καλὸν . . . Ἰσω ῥῆμα, i. e., of good. So בָּאָה יְשֵׂרֶי means, in Jer. xxix. 10; xxxiii. 14; also in Joshua xxii. 40; xxxiii. 14, 15, in which last verse it is opposed to רָאָה יְשֵׂרֶי, promise of evil, commination. Καλὸν ῥῆμα means the word which respects good, i. e., the promise of blessings or favors. So Paul calls the gospel, ἐπαγγελίαν Ἰσω ἐν Χριστῷ, 2 Cor. i. 20. I prefer this simple method of explanation to all others. The gradation, moreover, of the discourse is more perceptible, than if ῥῆμα be here construed as indicating merely ἐπαγγελίαν, which would make the whole clause to signify nearly, if not exactly, the same as ἀπαξ φωνίατας, or at least as γενσάμενος δωρεάς ἐπουρανίου.

Kuinoel and Bretschneider render Δόναμες τε μέλλοντος αἰώνος, bona aevi futuri vel imperii Messiæ; understanding δόναμες as meaning facultates in the sense of opes; which I should think to be a very doubtful sense of the word. Others give it the sense of miracles, etc.; for such a sense of δόναμες is frequent in the New Testament; see Matt. vii. 22; xi. 20, 21, 23; xiii. 58; Mark vi. 4; Luke x. 13; Acts ii. 22, al. But how will this differ much, if any, from the sense given to μετόχους . . . πνεύματος ἔνδον? It is truly a difficult phrase, and, on the whole, I feel inclined to give it the following sense, viz., the influences of the world to come, i. e., of the gospel dispensation; see on ii. 5. There can be no doubt that δόναμες means influence, i. e., virtue or power exerted, etc. I take it here in its most general sense, and so as comprehending whatever good or beneficial influence the particulars already named did not comprise.

Thus interpreted, there is a regular gradation in the whole passage. (1) They had been taught the principles or doctrines of Christianity. (2) They had enjoyed the privileges or means of grace, which the new religion afforded. (3) Various gifts and graces had been bestowed on them by the Spirit. (4) They had cherished the hopes which the promises of the gospel inspire. (5) They had experienced those powers or influences by which the gospel was shown to be a religion from God, and adapted to render them happy, comp. ii. 4. Thus they had the fullest evidence, internal and external, of the divine origin and nature of
the Christian religion. Consequently, if they apostatized from it, there remained no hope of their recovery.*

(6) And have fallen away, have made defection from, Καὶ παραπεθέντας, viz., from the gospel, or from all the experience and evidence before mentioned; παραπίπτω governing the genitive. The connection stands thus: 'Αδύνατον γὰρ τούς ἀπάξ φωτισθέντας . . . γευσάμενους τε . . . καὶ γενηθέντας . . . καὶ γευσάμενους . . . καὶ παραπεθέντας. In compound verbs, παρά is often taken to denote deterioration; e.g., παραφορέων, désipere; παραλογίζεων, male ratiocinari; παραψιμίζον, deformare; so παραπίπτων, deficere ab. The falling away or defection which is here meant, is a renunciation of Christianity and a return to Judaism. This implies, of course, a return to a state of active enmity and hostility to the Christian religion; for such was the Judaism of the times when our epistle was written. Cf. x. 26, 29.

Again to be renewed to repentance, Πάλιν ἀνακαυίζεων εἰς μετάνοιαν. Πάλιν should be joined to ἀνακαυίζεων, not only by common usage in respect to the position of an adverb when placed immediately before the verb which it qualifies, but the sense here requires it. For the writer does not, indeed, mean to say, 'Those who have a second time fallen away;' but that 'those who fall away cannot be again or a second time brought to repentance.' Many take ἀνακαυίζεων, here in the passive sense, as equivalent to ἀνακαυίζεον τὰς, and construe it in connection with what precedes in this manner: 'It is impossible for those who have been once instructed, etc., to be renewed to repentance.' The simple grammatical construction of ἀνακαυίζεων, as it now stands in the active voice, is thus: 'It is impossible again to renew by repentance such as have been once instructed, etc.

But it is natural to ask, Who is the subject of the verb ἀνακαυίζεων? i.e., who is the agent that is to produce this renovation? Is it God, i.e., the Holy Spirit; or Paul, or Christian teachers? Storr renders it indefinitely, 'Man kann unmöglich wiede bessern,' one cannot possibly produce another amendment. But

* In all this, is it necessary to suppose that all of the persons designated are true Christians? The apostle, it seems to us, intends to include all the professed Christians whom he addresses, and who under the special influences of the Spirit, had entertained hopes of the future blessedness promised in the Gospel. But how many of them were deceived, the apostle does not know. But he wishes them to feel that if they remain stationary in Christian attainment, they have nothing further to expect. All the instrumentalities, both divine and human, have been used with them; they have both been instructed and have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and now if they fall away or make defection from the Christianity which they have professed, 'they crucify the Son of God afresh,' and there is no hope for them.
instead of saying one cannot, in this case, I should prefer understanding ἀνακαυίζεων in an impersonal sense, and rendering it in English by our passive verb; since many verbs used impersonally convey a passive sense. See Heb. Gramm. § 500 Note 2.

There is still another construction which may be made of the passage, and which is a very common Greek one; viz., πάλιν ἀνακαυίζεων τούς ἀπελθοντας ... καὶ παραπεσόντας, ἀδύνατος, to renew, or the renewal of, persons once instructed ... and who have apostatized, is impossible. In this case the Infinitive ἀνακαυίζεων is used as a noun, and makes the subject of the proposition. This would afford the same sense as that which was last suggested above.

Εἰς μετάνοιαν, with respect to repentance; Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others, by repentance. Εἰς with the Accusative, sometimes signifies the manner or means, in which or by which a thing is done; e.g., Mark v. 34; Acts vii. 53. But here it may be translated, in respect to, with regard to, or to a sense which is very common to the word. Constrained as it is in the version which I have made, the sense will be, 'To renew them so that they will repent.' See EXCURSUS XII.

Since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God, Ἄναστασις τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν νικήτη τοῦ θεοῦ. Chrysostom construes Ἀναστασις as meaning πάλιν σταυροῖς; and so our English translators, and many others. But this is not conformable to common Greek usage. Ἄναστασις, in composition, frequently merely augments the intensity of a verb, and sometimes its force is hardly perceptible, e.g., ἀνακρίνεω, ἀναιδωρεῖται, etc. That the word in question is to be figuratively taken, is plain from the nature of the case. Actual physical crucifixion is out of the question. It means, then, to treat with the greatest ignominy and contempt.

But what does ταυροῖς mean? It is susceptible of two interpretations. (1) As Dativus incommodi, i.e., to their own hurt, shame, etc.; so Storr. See Winer's N. T. Gramm. § 31, ed. 3. (2) It may be construed as Hebrew pronouns in the Dat. frequently are, viz., as pleonastic; e.g., ἐπικρίνεται, go for thyself; i.e., go; ἢ ἄτροπος, he has fled for himself; i.e., he has fled; Heb. Gramm. § 545. I incline to the latter mode of explanation. Perhaps the shade of idea is, 'Crucifying, so far as they are concerned, or 'they themselves being concerned in the transaction of crucifying.'

Ἀναστασις του to public shame, Kαι παραδειγματικος;
comp. Matt. i. 19. By renouncing their adherence to Christianity, they would openly declare their belief that Christ was only an impostor, and of course that he suffered justly as a malefactor. By returning again to Judaism, they would approve of what the Jews had done; and thus they would, as it were, crucify Christ, and expose him to be treated by unbelievers with scorn and contumely. Every one knows that an apostate from a good cause gives new occasion, by an act of apostasy, for the enemies of that cause to utter all the malignity of their hearts against it. In this sense apostates expose the Saviour to public infamy when they renounce all regard for him, and join with those who view him as an impostor and a malefactor.

The two participles, ἀνασταυροῦντας . . . καὶ παραδειγματιζοῦντας, I regard as grammatically connected with those preceding thus: τοὺς ἄναψ φωνεῖντας . . . καὶ παραπεσόντας . . . ἀνασταυροῦντας καὶ παραδειγματιζοῦντας; the two latter being in apposition with the preceding, and added for the sake of giving intensity to the whole description. On this account καὶ is omitted before ἀνασταυροῦντας.

(7) For the earth which drinketh in the rain that frequently comes upon it, Γῆ γύρω . . . ἱερὸν. Γάρ here introduces a comparison in order to illustrate and confirm what had been said. Γῆ is used for land cultivated or uncultivated. Here it designates the former; as is evident from the sequel of the sentence. The image of the earth being thirsty and drinking in the showers, is common in many languages.

And produceth fruits, Καὶ τίκτονα δομάννι. Τίκτονα is often applied, by classical writers, to the production of fruits. Βοράννι, like the Hebrew בּוֹרָן, here means any kind of grain, any produce of vegetation, which is fitted for the service of man. But the use is Hebraistic. By classic usage βοράννι means herbage or vegetation, not including bread-corn.

Useful to those on account of whom it is cultivated, "Ἐνθαντος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τοῖς γεωργίασι. "Ἐνθαντος means, in its primary sense, well situated, well located; e. g., it is applied to a convenient harbor for ships, etc. Usefull, appropria'e, etc., are secondary meanings which the word frequently has. Δι' ὑμᾶς, on account of whom. That this is the usual signification of δι' with the Acc., all will acknowledge; and as the sense demands no departure here from the usual construction, it is better to retain it than to translate by whom.

Receiveth blessings from God, Μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. But what is the meaning of this? Is it that the earth is, when thus fruitful, contemplated with satisfaction or complacency by its Creator? Or does it mean, 'The earth which thus pro-
duces useful fruits, is rendered still more fruitful by divine beneficence? The latter seems better to accord with the Hebrew idiom. E. g., when Jacob approaches Isaac, clad in Esau's perfumed garments, Isaac says, The odor of my son, is like the odor of a field which God hath blessed, i. e., of a fruitful field with blossoming herbage. So, on the contrary, the curse of the earth in Gen. iii. 17, is explained in ver. 18, by adding, "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee." In Mark xi. 14, our Saviour says of the barren fig-tree, "Let no one ever henceforth eat any fruit of thee;" to which Peter afterwards alluding, says; "Lo! the fig-tree which thou didst curse," Mark xi. 21. In 2 Cor. ix. 6, Paul says, "He who soweth εἰς εὐλογίας, bountifully, shall reap εἰς εὐλογίας, bountifully." Agreeably to this idiom, the phrase in question might be explained, is rendered still more fertile, or productive, by God. Most commentators of note have adopted such an interpretation. I have hesitated to receive it, because the metaphor thus explained does not seem altogether adapted to the object for which it is used. The image of the fruitful earth, however, is designed to signify, 'Christians who bring forth fruits under divine cultivation.' Supposing, then, that such Christians are here designated (as plainly is the case), does the writer mean to say that they will be rendered still more fruitful in good works? Or does he mean that, when they thrive under the cultivation which they enjoy, they will obtain divine approbation and complacency? The latter interpretation would seem better to accord with the words of the apostle, at first view; but the former coincides better with his present design, which is, to urge Christians on to higher attainments.

(8) But [the earth] which bringeth forth thorns and briers, is refuse and near to utter rejection, its end will be burning, ἔκφερσις ἡ [sc. ὑποτρόφια] . . . ἐκφέρσις. Καραπά, essecratio, maledictio, extrema atque dríssima devínto. Such barren ground, producing nothing but thorns and briers, is not only useless to the owners, i. e., refuse land, but is given up, or devoted by them to be overrun with fire, and to have all its worthless productions consumed. As in the former case, blessing consists in rendering more fruitful, so here the curse consists in giving up to utter and entire barrenness—i. e., in relinquishing all efforts at cultivation—such ground as will produce nothing valuable. The blessing and the curse stand opposed, as well cultivating land and rendering it fruitful is opposed to giving it over to utter barrenness.

Whose end is burning, Ὁς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῖνων. Eis καῖνων is Hebraism, corresponding to the use of the Infinitive nominascens, with the prefix ὑ. Heb. Gramm. § 521, 522. So Is. xlv. 15, ἑττῶν . . . εἰς τρέφον, (LXX. ὑπὸ ἑττῶν ἐς καῖνων), and it shall be
burned. This interpretation represents the execution of barren land (καράπα) as ending in καίνος, i.e., the curse is carried into effect by burning the land over. On the whole I must refer ἡ to γῆ.

Thus construed, the whole passage affords a very striking image of the condition of the Hebrews. 'You,' the writer says, 'are enjoying abundant means of spiritual improvement. If you act in a manner worthy of such privileges, God will approve and bless. But if you disobey the gospel, and become wholly unfruitful in respect to Christian graces, then you are exposed to final rejection and endless punishment. The doom of all apostates is near, and the sequel will be tremendous.'

But, lest what he had now said might wear the appearance of too much severity, and seem to imply a great degree of distrust or want of confidence in respect to those whom he addressed, the writer proceeds to show what is the real state of his feelings towards them, and that he has, out of affection for them and solicitude for their highest welfare, so plainly and fully set before them the danger to which they were exposed.

(9) But we confidently hope for better things respecting you, beloved, even those connected with salvation, although we thus speak, Πεπείσμεθα δὲ... λαλοῦμεν. Κρείττονα [i.e., πράγματα] I understand as referring to what had just been said, in which the conduct and the doom of apostates had been represented. Πεπείσμεθα κρείττονα then means, 'I confidently hope that you will neither imitate the conduct nor undergo the doom of apostates, whose end is εἰς καίνον.'

Near to (conjoined with) salvation, Ἐξόμενα σωτηρίας. The form of expression appears as if it were designed to correspond with the preceding καράπας ἔγγος; i.e., as apostates are καράπας ἔγγος, so those who persevere in maintaining the true religion, are Ἐξόμενα σωτηρίας; i.e., their salvation is at hand, their time of deliverance from trials and their season of reward are certain, and will not be long protracted. To refer σωτηρίας here merely to the temporal safety of believing Hebrews, seems to me very foreign to the object of the writer; although some critics of note have done this.

(10) For God is not unkind, Οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, i.e., God is kind. Πάρα introduces a reason here why the writer hopes and trusts that those whom he addresses will be saved, viz., because God is so kind, and they have exhibited so many fruits of benevolence. The opposite of ἄδικος is δίκαιος, which, among other meanings, not unfrequently bears that of kind, benevolent, indulgent, merciful; see Matt. i. 19; John xvii: 25; 1 John i. 9. So in Hebrew פִּקְרָת and פִּקְרָת often mean kind, kindness, merciful,
mercy, etc. "Δωκε, therefore, may mean, unkind, unmerciful, etc.; and this sense of the word is most appropriate to the passage. Before the Inf. ἐκλάδεωςαι, δοστε is to be mentally supplied, in order to complete the construction.

Instead of τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, many Codices and most editions read, τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἀγάπης. Many critics of good reputation defend this reading, and ἔργων and κόσμος are not unfrequently joined by the sacred writers; e. g., 1 Thess. i. 3; Rev. ii. 2; xiv. 13. But Mill, Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Schott, and others, omit τοῦ κόσμου, and the weight of authority appears to be against its genuineness.

The comma after ὑμῶν may be omitted, thus, τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης; then τῆς ἀγάπης takes the place of an adjective in respect to ἔργον. Such constructions (i. e., Hendiadys-) are very common in the sacred writings. The translation would then be, your benevolent labor; or (if this be more agreeable) your labor and the benevolence which you have exhibited. On the whole, however, I prefer making ἔργον refer to the efforts which the Hebrew Christians had made, and ἀγάπη to the state of mind toward God which they had cherished. I have translated accordingly.

Towards his name, Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, i. e., toward him, or toward Christ. So ὄνομα is often used, viz., for person; e. g., Matt. vi. 9; John xvii. 26; Acts x. 43; John xx. 31; Acts iv. 10. So ὡς (name) in Hebrew, Ex. xxiii. 21; 1 K. viii. 29; iii. 2; Ps. xx. 1, et al. saepere.

In having performed kind offices to Christians, and in still performing them, Διακονησάντες . . . Διακονοῦντες. Διακονέω signifies not merely to supply the wants of others by pecuniary aid and by alms, but also to assist them in any way by offices of humanity and kindliness. In this enlarged sense, it seems natural to understand it here. 'Αγίως, i. e., those who are consecrated to God or to Christ, those who profess to be holy; comp. iii. 1.

(11) May exhibit the same diligence, respecting a full assurance of hope even to the end, Τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδεικνῦσαι σπουδὴν . . . τέλους, i. e., the end of life, or the end of their probationary state; comp. iii. 6. Σπουδὴν, strenuous endeavor, diligent exertion, sedulity. The meaning is: 'I wish you to continue your active efforts even to the end of your Christian course, so as to acquire or to preserve the full assurance of Christian hope. Πληρωφορία and πληροφορέω are not employed by the classics. Πληρωφορία means a full burden or lading. If applied to a fruit-tree, it would designate the fulness or large burden of the fruit; applied to the lading of a vessel, it would denote the fulness of the cargo. Phavorinus explains πληροφορώσθων by πληρώσων; and
in like manner πληροφορίαν here does not appear to differ from πλήρωμα or πλήρωσιν. The meaning of the writer is: 'I desire that your diligence in good works should be persevered in, so that you may continue to cherish a full or confident hope, viz., of salvation, even to the end of life.' In this way they would be most effectually guarded against apostasy; for he who, on true grounds, cherishes the hope of future glory and reward which the Christian religion encourages, will hardly be tempted to abandon his religion and exchange it for another.

(12) That ye may not be remiss. Ἰνα μὴ νοικροί γένησθε, viz., in the discharge of your Christian duties. Νοικροί, tardi, segues, is applied either to body or mind, to external actions or internal conceptions.

But imitators of those, who through faith and patient expectation have entered into the possession of promised blessings, Μιαρταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως . . . ἐπαγγελίας, i. e., who after continued belief (πίστεως) in the existence of those blessings, and patient waiting (μακροθυμίας) until the time of trial is finished for the possession of them, have at last realized the object of all their faith and patient expectation. Πίστις means here, belief in the reality of proffered future blessedness (see Heb. xi. 1, 2, seq.); and μακροθυμία the patient waiting for it, amid all the troubles and trials of life. Some make a Hendiadys of the words πίστεως and μακροθυμίας, and render them patient faith. I prefer the other method of explanation, as communicating a fuller meaning of the apostle's words. Κληρονομόω, to acquire, to obtain possession of; see on chap. i. 4. Ἐπαγγελίας in the plural, in order to indicate promises of various kinds both in respect to temporal and spiritual good, i. e., the proffered blessings which the ancient worthies did at last enjoy. How directly it was to the writer's purpose, to exhort the Hebrews to persevering faith, and patient waiting for future blessings proffered by the Christian religion, is too evident to need any illustration. Such a course would be directly opposite to that abandonment of faith and discouragement of mind, which led to apostasy.

(13) When, for example, God had made a promise to Abraham, Τῷ γὰρ Ἄβραμ . . . Ἰσός. Γάρ, introduced in such a connection, i. e., between the proposal of a doctrine or encouragement and the relation of a fact which is to illustrate it, may well be explained by the phrase, for example; as it conveys the same idea in Greek which these words do in English.

Seeing he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, Ἔξερα κατ' οἶνον . . . ἐν τῷ οἴνῳ. Ἐξερ, could, poterat; comp. Mark xiv. 8; Luke vii. 42; xii. 4; xiv. 14; John xiv. 30; Lucian, Dial. Mort. 21. 2, "Concerning all these things ἔτι οὖν ἦν ἔκοιμη, I could
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"Speak." Elian. Var. Hist. I. 25, "I honor thee ὑπέρ καὶ ὑπὸς ἐξω, in whatever way and whenever I can." The Gen. with κατὰ before it, as καὶ οὐδενός, usually follows the verb ὑμνεῖμαι, when the object is designated by which a person swears. So Aesop. Fab. 68, ἡ μὲν οὖς ὄμνεν κατὰ τὴς Ἀφροδίτης, swore by Venus. The Acc. with κατὰ, or the Dat. with ἐν, may also be used. "Ὅμοιος καὶ ἤνων, Hebrew יְהוָהָּבִּי, Gen. xxii. 16. The formula of an oath of this kind, is found in Num. xiv. 21, יְהוָהָּבִי. So in Num. xiv. 28, יְהוָהָּבִי יִנְשָׁא יִרְאֶה; and in Deut. xxxii. 40, יְהוָהָּבִי יִנְשָׁא יִרְאֶה, I live forever.

(14) Saying, I will greatly bless thee, and exceedingly multiply thee, Δέγων ἡ μην . . . πληθνώσῃ σε, i.e., I will give thee a numerous offspring. In Gen. xxii. 17, which is quoted here, in stead of simply πληθνώσῃ σε, the Hebrew runs thus, וְיִנָּשָׁא יִשְׁבֵּן, I will greatly multiply thy seed; but in Gen. xvii. 2, it is יְהוָה יִנָּשָׁא יִשְׁבֵּן, I will multiply thee exceedingly. The apostle appears to unite both expressions in the quotation before us. The obvious idea of both passages is, 'I will give thee a numerous posterity.' "Ἡ μην, certissime, profecto; both words are particles of affirmation, and being joined, they make the affirmation intense. Εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω . . . πληθνών πληθνώσῃ. Such a reduplication is very common in Hebrew, where, for the most part, it denotes intensity, Heb. Gramm. § 514. The great frequency of it in the Hellenistic writers, is Hebraism; but still, the formula itself is not without frequent examples in Greek writers. E. g., Lucian, Dial. Menel. sub fine, ἐδών ἐδον. Xen. Cyrop. V. πείδων ἐπεισε. VIII. ἐπακοινών ἐπηκουσα. Polyb. εὐχόμενος θυσιά τοῦ θεοῦ. Herod. IV. 23, καταφεύγων καταφεύγη. Diod. Sic. Tom. I. p. 717, καταπέμπας ἐπεμψε. That intensity is designed in our text, is clear from consulting the context in Gen. xxii. and xvii. Πληθνώσῃ, circumflex future.

(15) And so, having patiently waited, he obtained the promised blessing. Καὶ ὀντω μακροθυμήσας . . . ἑπαγγελίας. Καὶ ὀντω may be equivalent to καὶ τότε, or καὶ ἐπεί, and then, and afterwards. So ὀντω in Acts vii. 8; xx. 11; Rom. xi. 26; Thess iv. 17; Lev. xi. 5; see also Lexx. But better so here, i. e., in accordance with the promises just recited.

The promised blessing which he obtained, as designated in the preceding context, was a son from whom a numerous posterity was to descend. When Abraham was called by God out of Haran, and the promise of a numerous posterity made to him, he was seventy-five years old, Gen. xii. 1—4. Twenty-four years elapsed after this, while he was a sojourner in a strange land without any fixed place of abode, before the manner in which this promise would be fulfilled was revealed to him, Gen.
xv i. 1—16. It was only when he was an hundred years old, that the promised blessing of a son, from whom should spring a great nation, was obtained, Gen. xxi. 1—5. The preternatural birth of such a son, was deemed by Abraham a sufficient pledge, on the part of God, that all which he had promised respecting him would be fulfilled, Gen. xxii. 15—18; Heb. xi 8—12, 17—19; Rom. iv. 17—22. Other blessings besides that of a numerous posterity, were connected with the birth of Isaac and the faith of Abraham, Gen. xxii. latter part of ver. 17 with ver. 18. These blessings Abraham did not obtain, indeed, by actual possession; but by anticipation, confident hope, and unwavering faith in the promises of God; comp. John viii. 56.

(16) Now men swear by one who is superior, Ανδρωποι μὲν γὰρ
Δικαίωμα, i. e., men appeal to God, when taking an oath, as a witness of their sincerity, and as an avenger of falsehood and perjury. And the oath for confirmation makes an end of all dispute among them, Καὶ πάσης αἰτίας . . . δέρκος; i. e., an oath that the contesting parties will abide by the terms of amity and concord agreed upon, puts an end to the disputes which had existed, the parties relying upon an engagement of a nature so solemn. An oath, then, is the highest pledge of fidelity which a man can give. Αἰτίας is the Dative after αἰτίων, viz., αἰτίδος [ἡ δοτ.] αἰτίας.

(17) On account of which (i. e., because an oath removes all dispute or doubt), God, desirous of showing those to whom the promises are made, Ἐν ἐν περισσότερον . . . τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. Ἐν ὑπὲρ of on account of this; see Wahl on ὑπὲρ No. 5. Περισσότερον, abundantly, modo eximio, insigniter. Ἐπίθετος, to demonstrate, to exhibit so as to prove. Καθορισμός, i. e., to Christians; comp. iv. 1, 3, 9.

Interposed by an oath, Ἐπιθέτος ὄρκῳ. Μεσιτεύω means, according to classical usage, to act the part of a mediator, to be an internuntius, conciliator, between two parties. But here, this sense is impossible. God is not a mediator between himself and the heirs of the promise. The sense of interposing, then, becomes a necessary one. So the Vulgate, interpositum, justiûnum. He made a μεσιτής (so to speak) by an oath, interposed an oath between himself and the heirs of promise, i. e., he made an oath the means of removing all doubt or question on their part, whether he would faithfully perform what he had promised.

(18) So that by two immutable things, in regard to which it is impossible that God should prove faithless, ἵνα δὲ διὸ παραμὴν . . . οἷῶν; i. e., since men's doubts are removed by an appeal to an oath, God, in condescension to their weakness, has also made confirmation of his promises by an oath, so that there
might be no possible ground of doubt. But what are the two immutable things? His promise and his oath, answer almost all the commentators and critics. But there is room to doubt the correctness of this interpretation. The apostle in the preceding context has mentioned two oaths of God, which have respect to the salvation of believers. The one is the context immediately preceding, ver. 13; which, in Gen. xxii. 15—18, stands connected with the promise of a blessing to all nations (ver. 18) through the seed of Abraham, i.e., through the Messiah. The other may be the one implied in Heb. iii. 11; where the oath that unbelievers shall be excluded from the rest of God, implies, of course, an assurance of the same nature, that believers shall be admitted to it; comp. iv. 5, 6. Perhaps, however, it is more probable that the second oath is that by which the Messiah is constituted a high priest after the order of Melchizedek, Ps. cx. 4, and which had been twice adverted to by the writer in the preceding part of his epistle, v. 6, 10. This would best agree with the sequel, in vi. 20, where the writer recurs to the order of Christ's high priesthood, and thus shows that it was at that time in his mind. Here, then, are the two immutable things, in which believers may confide; viz., first, the oath that Abraham should have a Son (the Messiah), in whom all nations should be blessed, Gen. xxii. 18; secondly, the oath that this Son should be high priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek, Ps. cx. 4. These two oaths it is impossible God should disregard; and the salvation of believers, therefore, is adequately and surely provided for. In this opinion I find that Storr for substance agrees.

On the other hand, to represent the promise and the oath to confirm the same, as the two immutable things, seems to be inappropriate; for the writer here states that what is sworn to, even among men, must be regarded as fixed or established. More surely what God has once solemnly declared, can never be annulled. The two things, then, which are immutable, are those referred to in the two different oaths, viz., that in Gen. xxii. 15—18, and that in Ps. cx. 4. To these the writer had repeatedly adverted.

We, who have sought a refuge, might have strong persuasion to hold fast the hope which is set before us, Ἑλπίδος. That is, God has made adequate provision for the salvation of all, who prove faithful to the cause of Christ; and he has secured it by oaths, made at different times, and on diverse occasions. The certainty, then, of obtaining the reward promised to fidelity, constitutes a powerful motive to persevere, for all those who have sought a refuge from the power and penalty of sin in the religion of Jesus.
of comfort, consolation, is common in the New Testament; but according to classical usage, it means excitement, exhortation, persuasion, etc. So often in the New Testament; and in this sense I understand it, in the verse before us, although Kuinoel and Bloomfield prefer the former meaning. ἴσχυρῶν means powerful, i. e., having great force, proffering strong motives.

We who seek a refuge, Οἱ καταφυγόντες. Καταφύγω means to flee toward, to flee to, to flee under, viz., a place of refuge, an asylum; which latter is generally designated after the verb. It may be rendered hasten, i. e., are eager, to lay hold of, etc. So Kuinoel and Bretschneider. But here, οἱ καταφυγόντες seems to designate Christians who are seeking a refuge from sin and sorrow. In like manner σωζομένως is employed in Acts ii. 47.

To hold fast, Κρατήσω, or to take firm hold of, to grasp with tenacity, Hebrew בּרָכ. Εἰλίδος, hope, here means the objects of hope, i. e., the objects of Christian hope, or which they expect; just as ἔργαλα above means the objects promised, the things promised; and often so, in respect to many other words of a similar nature. Προκείμενος, proposed, set forth, is a word which was employed in respect to the ἔθνος or prize of victory, in the Grecian games. This was said προκείμενος to be proposed or set before the competitors. So in our text the object of hope, viz., future happiness and glory, deliverance from sin and sorrow, is set before all Christians, who are καταφυγόντες, seeking a refuge from their guilt and miseries. And the repeated oath of God assures them that such a refuge is to be found, and also affords a powerful excitement to seek it.

(19) Which we hold as an anchor of the soul, unfailing and firmly fixed, Ἐν ὑπὸ ἐγκυρῶν . . . βεσσαίων; i. e., which hope we are in possession of, ἐγκυρῶν, and it will prove to us, in our troubles and distresses, what an anchor of sound materials and firmly fixed will be to a ship in a tempest, i. e., it will keep us from “making shipwreck of the faith.” Many commentators refer ἡμῖν to παράκλησιν; but it seems to me quite contrary to the manifest object of the passage. Hope is often represented under the emblem of an anchor among the heathen writers. Ἀσφαλή means that which will not fail, i. e., like an anchor of good materials, which will not give way. βεσσαίον means firmly fixed, i. e., having a tenacious hold, which cannot be slipped.

And which enters into that within the vail, Καὶ εἰσερχομένη . . . καταπέτασματος; i. e., which hope enters into the inner sanctuary, the sanctum sanctorum where God dwells. Others refer εἰσερχομένη to ἐγκυρῶν. The meaning, as I explain the passage, is, that the objects of hope are in heaven where God dwells. The apartment within the vail of the temple at Jerusa-
lem, was that in which the ark of the covenant was placed, and also the Cherubim that shadowed the mercy-seat. There the glory of God appeared. This inner sanctuary was an emblem of heaven; see Heb. ix. 1—11, 23; x. 1. The phrase έσώτερον τού καταστάσεως, here designates that which is an image or symbol of heaven.

The sentiment of the writer, then, is as follows: 'Hold fast the objects of your Christian hope. These will keep you steady in adherence to your holy religion, and preserve you, like an anchor, from making shipwreck of the faith. These objects of hope are heavenly in their nature, ἡ θεία ... εἰς τό έσώτερον τού καταστάσεως. Consequently these objects are immutable, and so ἀσφαλείς καὶ βέβαιος, like a good anchor.

Whither Jesus our precursor has gone, on our account, ὅποιον πρόδρομον ... ἵσοντες. Πρόδρομος ... εἰς τό έσώτερον τού καταστάσεως. Theodoret makes an appropriate remark on this passage. "The writer designs to increase their confidence by calling Jesus πρόδρομος; for if he is their precursor, and has gone thither on their account, then ought Christians to follow after him, so as to attain the end of their cause," Theod. in loc.

The expression in the latter part of ver. 19, ἐν εἰρήνην εἰς τό έσώτερον τού καταστάσεως, seems to have been purposely chosen as a periphrasis of the heavenly sanctuary, in order to direct the minds of Hebrews to the priesthood of Christ; of which the writer now proceeds to treat, after having suspended the consideration of it from chap. v. 11 to chap. vi. 19, in order to introduce matter of warning and encouragement. It was lawful for the high priest only to enter, through the vail, into the inner sanctuary. So Jesus, as high priest of the new dispensation, entered the eternal sanctuary above, making an expiation of perpetual efficacy for sinners, Heb. ix. 11, 12, 22—26.

CHAP. VII

He here thus reproved them for the little progress which they had made in Christian knowledge, v. 11—v. 2; warned them against the dreadful consequences of abandoning the Christian religion, vi. 4—8; and encouraged them to hold fast their faith and hope even unto the end, as they had the example of Abraham, and the oath of God to assure them of an adequate reward, vi. 9—19; the writer now returns to make the comparison of Christ as high priest with Melchisedek, whose name in connection with that of Christ had been already more than once introduced, v. 6, 10. This subject he pursues to the end of vii. 26; where he again brings to view the topic broken off at v. 10, and completes what he had to say concerning it, in order to prevent its being misunderstood, vii. 26—28.
(1) Now this Melchizedek, Ὁβρος γὰρ Μαλχιζεδὲκ, i.e., the Melchizedek whom I have already named. Γὰρ is here the sign of resuming a topic which had been suspended.

Nearly all the Greek and Latin fathers held Ἰάλημ to be the same as Jerusalem; so Ps. lxvi. 2 [3], "In Salem is his tabernacle," comp. Gen. xiv. 18. The Ἰάλημ mentioned in John iii. 23, was probably a different place from that which our text names; if indeed Ἰάλημ is meant, by our author, to designate a place at all. Is it not rather an appellative? See the writer's own interpretation, ver. 2.

A priest of the Most High God, Ἰερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ του κυρίου, Hebrew יְהֹוָה בֵּן הֵילָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, Gen. xiv. 18. It was common among the ancients for a king to be priest also, thus uniting the two highest honors among men in his own person. The Jewish kings did not do thus so long as the race of David was upon the throne, because the priesthood was confined to the tribe of Levi. But the Maccabees did it; Joseph. Antiq. XIII. 19, comp. Macc. in the Apocrypha. Among foreign nations this was very common. In reference to this double honor, Peter calls Christians βασιλεῖας ἱεράσματα, 1 Pet. ii. 9; and John, in Rev. i. 6, says that Christ has prepared for his followers a βασιλεία and constituted them Ἰερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ.

How highly the Jews of the apostle's day estimated the honor of priesthood, may be seen from Philo; who says "The law of kingy office applies to priests εἰς σεμνότητα καὶ τιμήν, in regard to dignity and honor," de Legat. ad Caium, p. 832. In the same book he represents the Jewish people as regarding "the high priesthood to be as much above the kingly office, as God is more exalted than men." All this serves to show that the apostle, by exhibiting and proving the priesthood of Christ, not only pointed out the way in which pardon of sin had been effected, but also designed to contribute much towards raising the Messiah to be honored in the view of the Hebrews.

In calling Melchizedek a priest of the most high God, the Scripture designs to exhibit him as a true priest of the true God, who is maker and lord of heaven and earth, Gen. xiv. 19, 22.

Who met Abraham, etc., ὁ συναντήσας... ἐὐλογήσας αὐτῶν; see Gen. xiv. 17—20.

(2) To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all, Ὄμω καὶ δεκάτην... ἁβραάμ, viz., a tenth ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκορδόνων, of all the spoils (see ver. 4), which he had taken from the confederate kings whom he had discomfited, Gen. xiv. 14—16. Δεκάτην agrees with μοῖραν understood.

By interpretation [his name] means, first, righteous king, Πρῶτον μὲν Ἰομηνευόμενος, βασίλειος δικαιοσύνης. Βασίλειος δικαιο-
σώζει resembles the formulas, God of mercy, God of glory, etc., in stead of merciful God, glorious God, etc.; which are common indeed in all languages, but more especially in the Hebrew. But Ernesti, Kuinoel and others, construe the phrase here as meaning 'a King who renders his subjects righteous or upright.' But I doubt whether a Hebrew would have so understood it; and in fact Josephus says it means βασιλεὺς δίκαιος, Antiq. I. 10. 2.

And then king of Salem, which means, king of peace, Ἑσσαὼ δι καὶ βασιλεὺς . . . εἰρήνης, i. e., peaceful king, or king who is a peacemaker.

(3) Having neither father nor mother, Ἀπάτωρ, ἄμήτωρ, i. e., recorded in the sacred genealogies; or perhaps, whose father and mother were not of kingly or priestly rank. Those words were applied literally, by the Greeks, to some of their gods; then figuratively, to those who were orphans, and to those whose parents were obscure and of low origin. Thus Livy, IV. 3, "nullo patre natus," which he says respecting a person of ignoble descent. So Horace, Serm. I. 6, 10, "nullus majoribus natus." Philo calls Sarah ἄμητερα, probably because her mother is not mentioned in the sacred records. And in such a sense the apostle appears to call Melchizedek Ἀπάτωρ and ἄμητωρ. The explanation of these terms is to be found (as one may easily believe) in the word ἀγεναλόγητος, without any genealogy, viz., of whose genealogy no mention is made in the Scripture.

The Arabians say of a man who has by his own efforts procured an exalted place of honor, and who is descended from ignoble parents, ἢ ἦν, he has no father, i. e., he is not named from his father, or derives not his titles and honors from his father. But the previous explanation seems preferable, since the writer himself has added ἀγεναλόγητος. See Schleusner and Wahl on Ἀπάτωρ and ἄμητωρ.

Having neither beginning of days nor end of life, Μὴ ἦν ἄρχην . . . ἐγών, i. e., whose time of birth or death is not related; or rather, who as high priest has no limited time assigned for the commencement and expiration of his office, for so the following clause leads us to interpret this expression. The Levitical priests were limited in their service; see Num. iv. 3, 23, 35, 43, 47. (Comp. Num. viii. 24, 25.) ζωή, according to the latter mode of interpretation, refers to the life of Melchizedek as priest, i. e., the time of his priesthood. ζωή is often equivalent in sense to καρπός ζωῆς, the season or time which one lives. The meaning of the writer then is, that Melchizedek's priesthood was limited to no definite time, i. e., he was sacerdos perpetuus, a priest without limitation of office. So the Latins say, Dictator perpetuus, etc.
But like to the Son of God — remaineth a priest perpetually, Ἀφομοωμένος δὲ . . . δυνατός. The sacred writer, in Ps. cx. 4, says of the Messiah, that he is οὗτος Χριστός, Sept. ἐστι τὸν αἰώνα, i. e., εἰς τὸ δυνατόν; and then adds, "after the order of Melchizedek." First, then, Christ is asserted by the Psalmist to be a perpetual priest; and next, to conform or explain this assertion, it is added that he is so according to the order of Melchizedek. The implication is, of course, that Melchizedek is perpetual priest; for this is a special point of the comparison. The apostle means to say, in our text, that inasmuch as Melchizedek is understood to have a perpetual priesthood, and since the priesthood of the Son of God is affirmed, in the 110th Psalm, to be like his; so it follows, of course, that the priesthood of Christ is understood to be perpetual, or that Melchizedek, in regard to his priesthood, was like to, or could be compared with, the Son of God.

In the absolute sense, εἰς τὸ δυνατόν clearly is not to be understood, either of Melchizedek's priesthood or of Christ's. Melchizedek's priesthood terminated with his life; so Christ's priestly and kingly office as Mediator, will both cease when the work of redemption is fully accomplished, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. But in neither case is there any statute, which limits the specific time of accession to office or of egress from it. Of course the order of Christ's priesthood, and that of Melchizedek, differed greatly in this respect from that of the sons of Aaron, and was, as the writer goes on to declare, greatly superior to it. Dictator perpetuus among the Romans, for example, was surely a higher, or at least a more honorable office, than that of ordinary Dictator.

Our English version of Ἀφομοωμένος, made like to, does not seem to give the true sense of the passage. The apostle is not laboring to show that Melchizedek, in respect to his priesthood, was made like to Christ; but vice versa. He is seeking to illustrate and establish the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood, by comparing it with the well-known priesthood of Melchizedek. Hence, to say that Melchizedek was made like to the Son of God, is a νοτερον προτερον; for Ps. cx. 4 compares the Son of God, as a priest, to Melchizedek. This, too, is the order of nature and propriety; for as the priesthood of Melchizedek preceded that of Christ, it was something with which the Hebrews were already acquainted, inasmuch as the Scriptures had repeatedly spoken of it. Of course the apostle, in aiming to illustrate and establish the priesthood of Christ (a priesthood that was recent and not well understood by the Hebrews), would very naturally pursue the method of comparison offered to his view in Ps. cx. 4, i. e., a comparison of Christ's priesthood to that of Melchizedek.
'Aphomoumenos means, then, not made like to, but like to, or likened to, i.e., being compared to.

The whole passage, from ὁ συναυτής in ver. 1, to τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Ἰσωῦ in ver. 3, is plainly a parenthetic explanation, thrown in for the sake of suggesting to the reader's mind some considerations respecting the character and dignity of Melchizedek, which would be very useful in regard to a right understanding of the comparison that was to be made out in the sequel. Ὑπέρ γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, etc., in ver. 1, is the immediate Nom. to μνεῖ τετελεῖς εἰς τὸ διπλεῖκες in ver. 3. The construction of the whole sentence is thus: "This Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest . . . (who met Abraham . . . and blessed him . . . whose name first means righteous king, and then peaceful king . . . of a descent nowhere recorded, having a priestly office not limited, and being in respect to his priesthood like to the Son of God), is a perpetual priest." If it be objected, that the participles ἐρμαννόμενος, ἐκοι, and ἀφομουμένος have not, like συναυτής, the article before them, and therefore cannot be arranged in such a construction; the answer is, that nouns, participles, and adjectives, put in apposition, either take or omit the article, at the pleasure of the writer. E.g., in ver. 1, ὁ Μελχισιδεκ — βασιλεῖς . . . τετελεῖς, in apposition. Then ὁ συναυτής . . . εὐλογήσας . . . ἐρμαννόμενος . . . ἀπάτωρ, ἀκορμώ, ἀγεναλόγητος . . . ἐκοι . . . ἀφομουμένος — all in apposition with ὁ συναυτής; a mode of using adjectives and participles by no means unusual. See Gersdorf, Beitrag, etc., Th. V. Ueber die Stellung der Adjectiven, etc. See Excursus XIII.

(4) Consider now how great a personage this must be, to whom the patriarch Abraham gave a tithe of the spoils, Ὄεωρεῖτε δὲ . . . ταπαράγχες. Ὄεωρεῖτε, see, perceive, consider, δὲ, now, continuative, as this particle often is. Πηλίκος, of what exalted rank. Ἀκροδίων, in its literal sense, means summitas aceris frumenti, the top part of a heap of grain. It was usual to offer the primitiae or first fruits to God. But as offerings were made to their gods, by the Greeks, from spoils taken in war, ἀκροδίων came at last to signify, in the Greek language, any kind of spoils, from which an offering to the gods was taken. The Latins called such offerings, manusias. The word ἀκροδίων has the general sense of spoils here, and evidently refers to the spoils which Abraham had taken from the confederate kings, Gen. xiv. 16.

The object of the apostle in mentioning the circumstance here adverted to, plainly is, to exalt the dignity of Melchizedek. The high reverence which the Jews had for Abraham is well known. If now it could be shown to the Hebrews, that Melchizedek was superior to Abraham, then the superiority of Christ, who is like
to Melchizedek, is also shown. Moreover, since the patriarch or head of a nation was reckoned, in the East, as excelling in dignity all his descendants; so, if Melchizedek’s dignity exceeded that of Abraham, it would follow that it exceeded that of all his descendants—among whom were the Levitical priests. It is for the sake of establishing this last point, that the comparison of Melchizedek with Abraham is introduced in ver. 4, as the sequel plainly shows. This being established, it would follow, that Christ’s priesthood (which was like that of Melchizedek) was superior to the Aaronical priesthood; which is the point the writer designs to illustrate and establish.

(5) The sons of Levi, indeed, who obtain the office of the priesthood, Καὶ οἱ μὲν . . . λαμβανόντες, i. e., who are constituted priests. All the sons of Levi were not properly priests; but only the descendants of Aaron. Hence the writer adds, οἵ τε ἵσαρεῖαν λαμβανόντες. It was true, indeed, that the whole tribe of Levi had a right to tithes; Num. xviii. 28—30; Deut. xiv. 22, 27—29. But it is not material to the writer’s object here to mention this. He is concerned merely with the priests, who, as descendants of Levi, were of course entitled to tithes. If he could show that the priests, the most honored part of the Levites, who were legally entitled to receive tithes from the other descendants of Abraham, were still inferior to Melchizedek, then would he show that the priesthood of Christ was of an order superior to theirs. The payment of tithes is an acknowledgment of superiority, in regard to the rank of the person who receives them. If Abraham, then, paid tithes to Melchizedek, he acknowledged him as superior in respect to rank.

Have by the law a commission to tithe the people, ἔντολὴν ἔχουσα . . . νόμον. See the passages of the law just referred to. ἔντολη, direction, mandate, a precept that gives liberty or confers a right to do anything.

That is, their own brethren, although descendants from Abraham, Τοὺς ἐμένα . . . Ἀβραὰμ. Ἐξελεκτοθέτας ἐκ τῆς ὀρφος, a Hebraistic mode of expression; e. g., Gen. xxxv. 11, kings καὶ πρόετος; Gen. xlvii. 26, καὶ, ἀντί, Ex. i. 5, et al. The Greeks used γενναθήναι ὑπὸ τῶν in such cases. The meaning of the passages is, “The priests of the tribe of Levi, although descended in common with the other tribes from Abraham, have been so elevated to a rank above them by being made priests, that they receive the tribute of acknowledged elevation in the tithes which are paid them by the others. And yet this most honored part of the sons of Levi, the most honored tribe, were of a rank inferior to Melchizedek; consequently, their priesthood was of an order inferior to that of Christ.
(6) But he whose descent is not reckoned from them, Ὅ δὲ μὴ γεναλογοῦμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, i. e., Melchizedek, and at the same time the additional intimation is given, that he was of an order of priests different from that of the Levites. Tithed [received tithes from] Abraham, and blessed him to whom the promises were made, Δεκακάτωκε... εἰλόγηκε. Δεκακάτωκε is a Hellenistic word, being found only in the Septuagint and New Testament. The meaning is, that Melchizedek received from Abraham a tenth of the spoils; just as tithes were received by the Levitical priesthood. Καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, i. e., Abraham, to whom God had made promises of great blessings; comp. Heb. vi. 12—15.

(7) And beyond all controversy, the inferior was blessed by the superior, Ἡμῶν δὲ τάσης... εἰλογεῖναι. 'Ἀντιλογίας, gainsaying, dispute, doubt, comp. vi. 16. Εἷλαρτον here inferiority in point of rank, office, or station, merely; not inferiority in regard to moral or religious character, which it is not the writer's object to bring into view, as it is not to his present purpose. Melchizedek was both king and priest; Abraham was neither; at least he is not called by either appellation. He was indeed an Ἐμίρ, i. e., the head of a company of migratory shepherds (Nomades), and had a large number of dependants; as may be seen in Gen. xiv. 14. Abraham is also called ἀπεσταυρομένος, prophet, Gen. xx. 7; but he is not called ἁλί, although he repeatedly offered sacrifices; nor do the Scriptures call him ἡλιστός, king.

Κράτος is the antithesis or correlate of Δαιττῶν, and therefore means superior. Both adjectives are of the neuter gender, as is manifest from Δαιττῶν; but this gender in adjectives is employed to denote abstract quality, i. e., it is used in the same way as abstract nouns, which are very frequently employed by the sacred writers instead of concrete ones. E. g., Christ is the way, the truth, and the life, i. e., he is the guide, the instructor, and the author of life, to men. So here, the literal rendering would be, inferiority is blessed by superiority, i. e., the inferior person is blessed by the superior one. The apostle takes this as a position which will be granted by the Hebrews, from the simple consideration, that Abraham, by paying tithes to Melchizedek, did himself of course acknowledge his own inferiority of rank.

(8) Here also men who receive tithes die; but there, one of whom it is testified that he lives, Καὶ ὃδε μὲν... λαμβάνοντο. The literal sense of the words here would make nothing for the writer's purpose, since he is not speaking of the natural life of men; but of the duration of the priestly office. Ὁδε means here, i. e., in respect to the Levites; ἰδίω, there, i. e., in regard to
Mechizedek. But what is ἀποθέσκοντες? Is it the natural death of the body? But in this respect the Levites differed not from the king of Salem; both were mortals. In another world, too, they live, as well as he; i.e., both are immortal. ζῆν therefore, cannot refer simply to living in another world. Nor is there any ground for supposing the apostle means to assert that Mechizedek’s high-priesthood continues in heaven, as some have imagined. There is no intimation in Scripture of any thing in regard to any one but Jesus. I must therefore understand ἀποθέσκοντες as being used figuratively here, in order to denote the brief and mutable condition of the Levitical priesthood. The figurative use of ἱερόκω and ἀποθέσκω, in the New Testament, is very common; although no instance occurs, perhaps, where it has the same shade of meaning which it appears to have here. Schleusner, however, gives to ἱερόκω in 1 Tim. v. 6 the same sense, viz., quod officio suo non jungitur. But in the verse before us, he construes ἀποθέσκοντες as meaning mortales, and ζῆν as applying to Christ, not to Mechizedek—plainly against the context that follows.

The word ζῆν seems to me not to mean here either natural life or future immortality, but an enduring, unlimited time of priestly office; and to designate the same idea as μέχρι τοῦ ἐξής ἐτῶν τοῦ διασωτῆτος in ver. 3. A sense like this, viz., that of duration, perennitas, the word ζῶω often has, see Wahl’s Lex. ζῶω, No. 2. β, and ζωή, No. 1. γ. If this be correct, then its correlate ἀποθέσκοντες must of course have the sense of short-lived or deceasing, viz., as to office or the priesthood.

(19) Moreover, or besides, even Levi who receives tithes, was (if I may be allowed the expression) himself tithed, through Abraham, Kai, ὁς ἐστός εἰτεῦτ . . . δεδιακότως; i.e., not only is the office of the Levitical priests temporary, or limited in its duration (not so the office of Mechizedek, who was a type of Christ), but the Levitical priesthood itself. (if I may be allowed so to speak) paid tithes, through Abraham, to Mechizedek, thus acknowledging his superiority. Ὅμως ἐστος εἰτεῦτ is very common in the best Greek writers. It amounts to an indirect apology for employing an unusual, or unexpected, or hyperbolical assertion or phrase. It is very happily introduced here; as the subject itself is one which the writer did not intend to urge as capable of being scanned with literal exactness, but only as bearing a popular mode of explanation. Kai Levi, even Levi himself; Kai intensive.

(10) For he was then in the loins of his father, when Mechizedek met him, “Εὗ ἔκα ταῖ τῆς ἐγκυμονίας . . . Μεχιζεδίκ. “Εὗ, etiam nunc, even now, already, or etiam tunc, even then, then. The
meaning of the phrase ἐν τῇ ὀσφοίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς is not precisely as
dscribed in our English version, "He was yet to be begotten," i.e., he was not yet
born; but the apostle desires to say, and it is appropriate to his object to say, that even then, when Melchizedek met Abraham, Levi already (in a certain sense) existed, and, through Abraham, paid tithes to the King of Salem, i.e., acknowledged inferiority compared with him. This is the very point which the writer is laboring to illustrate. See Excursus XIV.

(11) Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις... ἤν, if now perfection were [attainable] by the Levitical priesthood. Μὲν οὖν, or μετώπων, is here used absolutely, i.e., without any corresponding οὔ following, and signifies now indeed; so that we may translate thus: if now, or if moreover, perfection was indeed [attainable] by the Levitical priesthood, etc., οὖν serve only for a mark of transition to another branch of the writer's subject; which plainly is made.

Τελείωσις is a word very variously understood and translated. Some render it accomplishment, viz., of the design of the priesthood; others, sanctification; others, consummate happiness; others, moral rectitude or perfection. It is best explained by a reference to corresponding passages in the sequel. In ix. 9 it is said, that "the Levitical sacrifices could not τελείωσαι the person who offered them;" which (if we compare ix. 14) appears plainly to mean, "to take away the burden of guilt, and to render pure or holy the minds of his worshippers." Again in x. 1, it is affirmed of the sacrifices, that "they could not τελείωσαι those who approached the altar," i.e., those who offered them; and by comparing x. 2—4 with this, it is plain the writer means to say, that "the sacrifices could not bestow peace of conscience — could not take away the burden of sin from the mind of the worshipper; but they left him filled with apprehensions that the penalty of the divine law might still be executed upon him." Here then is plainly the τελείωσις, which the Levitical priesthood could not effect. It could neither purify the mind or soul of the worshipper, nor free him from the burden of his sins, nor from the apprehension that they might be punished. Christ did both; and this is the τελείωσις here spoken of, which he accomplished, and which the law could not accomplish. Chap. x. 3, 14, is very direct to this purpose. The writer has explained τελείωσις by the sequel of his epistle; and in a manner, altogether accordant with the object of his reasoning here.

For the people received the law in connection with this, 'Ο λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοδέττα. This circumstance is evidently to be placed in a parenthesis. Νενομοδέττα, were subjected to the law, were put under the law; the prefix ἐ of the Pluperf. being
omitted. (as often among the Attics). Such a construction in the passive voice is peculiar; see Introd. and comp. Rom. iii. 4. "Εν αυτῇ, on this condition, connected with this, or under these circumstances; comp. Wahl on ἐν, II. 4. b. The meaning is, that the Levitical priesthood and the Mosaic law are closely and inseparably linked together, so that if one be changed, the other must of necessity be; as the writer proceeds to show in the sequel.

What further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron, Τίς ἐν ἁγίᾳ . . . λέγεται. That is, 'If the Levitical priesthood and the law connected with it, accomplished all in respect to purification from sin and the giving of quiet to the conscience, which was needed, then why should the Psalmist speak of a priest who was of an order different from that of Aaron, and who was yet to arise?' This would be unnecessary, if the priesthood of Aaron were adequate to the great purposes of salvation. "Εν, any more, any longer, further. Λέγεται, named, selected.

(12) But in case the priesthood be transferred or changed, there must needs be also a change of the law, Μετατρέπεται γὰρ . . . γίνεται. Μετατρέπεται means to transfer, to translate; and this corresponds well with the intention of the writer, whose design it is to show that the priesthood of the ancient dispensation had been transferred to Christ, though on conditions very different from those formerly attached to it; and that Christ not only was a priest in fact, but that his priesthood, coming in the place of the other ancient priesthood, superseded it. The sense is substantially the same, if we render it changed. Νόμος here means specially the law or statute which had relation to the Levitical priesthood, viz., the statute which determined that the priests must all be of the descendants of Aaron and of the tribe of Levi. This must of necessity be changed, in case a priesthood of a different nature is introduced, i.e., a priest of a different order. And that such a priest is introduced, the writer goes on to prove.

By adducing facts and declarations recorded in the Old Testament. (1) Christ sprang from the tribe of Judah, vs. 13, 14.
(2) He was to be a priest of the order of Melchizedek, vs. 15—17. Consequently, the law which had respect only to the Levitical priesthood, must also be changed.

With this view of the connection of thought, we may see that the γὰρ in the beginning of this verse, is a γὰρ confirmans, and may be rendered however, since. The object of the writer in this verse I take to be, to show that the other priest who was to
arise, was to be oú katá tìn tàξiν Ἄαρων. To establish this he says, 'If now there is a transfer of the priesthood to a person different from any of the Aaronic order of priests, then of course there must be a change of statutes or laws in respect to the priesthood; and consequently the new priest cannot be katá tìn tàξiν Ἄαρων. Having illustrated this latter proposition, namely, that the new priesthood is not katá tìn tàξiν Ἄαρων, he next proceeds to illustrate the other part of his affirmation in ver. 11, viz., that another priest must arise katá tìn tàξiν Μελχισεδέκ.

(13) He too concerning whom these things are said, belonged to a different tribe, none of whom served at the altar, Ἐφ, ὅν γάρ . . . Ἰουσαοτηρώ. The γάρ here refers to a suppressed clause: 'There is a change of a priesthood] for he concerning whom, etc. Ταῖρα means the things which concern his being an eternal priest, after the order of Melchizedek. Γάρ here connects the illustration or proof with the proposition in v. 12. Served, Προ- σέχα. Ἱσραήλ means to give heed, to apply the mind to, τὸν νοῦν being understood; also to give one's care to, to serve.

(14) Since it is manifest that our Lord sprang from Judah, in respect to which tribe Moses said nothing concerning the priesthood, ὁδῆλον γάρ . . . οὐλάλοις. The γάρ here introduces the reason or ground of the assertion in the preceding verse. The course of thought is; 'The newly appointed priest did belong to a tribe different from that of Levi, since (γάρ) or inasmuch as he plainly was a descendant of Judah; and of course he did not belong to the Levitical order of priests.'

(15) And still more evident is it [viz., that the priesthood must be changed]; if another priest has arisen [made his appearance], like to Melchizedek, Καὶ παρουσίατεν ἤτο . . . ἄτερον. Between ἐπήλον, πρόδηλον, καταδηλον, there is no important difference of significance. The two latter, however, seem naturally to render the word somewhat more intensive.

According to the likeness, Καὶ ἑρωτήτω, in the similitude of, resembling; in a sense like that of katá tàξιν, in v. 6, 10; vi. 20; vii. 11, Hebrew מַיִם לַיְלָה, Ps. cx. 4. Comp. ἀφωμομενοῖς in vii. 3.

(16) Who was not made [a priest] by an ordinance that was temporary, but by an authority which can never expire, ὡς oú katá νόμον . . . ἀκαταλίτου; i. e., he was not made a priest, under the Mosaic law which was to be set aside, vs. 12, 18, seq.; but by the oath of God, which is immutable, comp. vs. 20—24 and 28. Σαρκώμης, fleshy; hence, secondarily, frail, infirm, short-lived, temporary, quidquid caducum. So the Hebrew מַיִם, Gen. vi. 3; Ps. lvi. 5; lxxviii. 39; Job xi: 4; Is. 31: 3; comp. also ἀσθενεῖς and ἀνωφελεῖς in ver. 18. Ἐντολής means here, the πρε-
cept or command respecting the appointment of priests contained in the νόμος, i. e., the Mosaic law. Ἑν τοῖς σαρκίς is, then, preceptum caducum, a temporary command, an ordinance of a temporary, perishable nature. So vs. 12 and 18 require us to interpret the passage. Δύναμι, authority, authoritative appointment. So Acts iv. 7 ἐν ποια δύναμι; by what authority? see also 1 Cor. v. 4. ζωής, perennitas, perpetuity; see on ver. 8 above. ἄκαταλύτου, quod destrui neguit, indissoluble; hence, immutable, imperishable, perpetual. As it is here the antithesis of σαρκίς, so the meaning of σαρκίς must be such as is given above. ζωής ἄκαταλύτου means lit. a life that cannot end. That which cannot be dissolved, or cease, or perish, is said to have ζωήν ἄκαταλύτου. According to this sense I have translated the words.

So, for substance, Carpozoff, Heinrichs, Jaspis, and others. Kuinoel translates κατά δύναμιν, κ. τ. λ., by per vim vitae perennis; and he refers to vs. 23, 24 for explanation. His idea is, that Christ was made a high priest, in such a manner as comported with his endless life as a priest. But what is this except saying that he was made a perpetual high priest because he was appointed to a perpetual high priesthood? The other exegesis which I have given (although he calls it contorta) makes out a direct antithesis between the former and latter part of the verse; which, I must think, is the more significant mode of interpretation. This interpretation of the whole verse would seem well grounded, from the succeeding verse (17), which is adduced simply to prove the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood.

(17) Μαρτυρεῖ γάρ, viz., ὡς γραφή, or το πνεῦμα το ἐγνων; possibly ὡς may here be the Nominative. The Nom. in such cases would of course be supplied by the readers of the epistle. In the writings of the Mishnical doctors, the usual mode of appeal to the Scriptures is ἐκ της, i. e., quod dicitur, or λέγως γάρ, μαρτυρεῖται. The writer makes the appeal to Scripture, in this case, to confirm and enforce what he had just asserted. The force of the proof lies in εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The γάρ here is γάρ confirmantis, i. e., it stands before a clause introduced for the sake of confirming what he had just said.

(18) For there is indeed a setting aside, etc., 'Ἀθέτησα μὲν γάρ, κ. τ. λ. I understand the connection thus: 'Jesus is eternal high priest, according to a new arrangement, ver. 17; there is such an arrangement, for (γάρ confirmantis) the former dispensation is abrogated, etc.' 'Ἀθέτησα, rejection, setting aside, abrogation; a stronger word than ἀναλαγῇ. Προαγωγή, literally preceding, i. e., going before the Christian dispensation, i. q., the ancient law respecting the priesthood. 'Ασ-καί
ἀνωφελὲς are words of nearly the same import here. Ἀδήνεσ is said of that which has not power to accomplish any particular end proposed; and ἀνωφελὲς is said of that which proves to be neither useful nor availing for the purpose to which it has been applied. The meaning here is, that the ancient law, with all its priestly ritual, had proved to be altogether incompetent to effect the τελειώσεις mentioned in v. 11th, i.e., to effect the purification of the sinner, and give that peace of conscience which is inspired by the well grounded hope of pardon for sin; comp. ver. 19, and ix. 9, 14; x. 1—4. The two words Ἀδήνεσ and ἀνωφελὲς increase the intensity of the affirmation. The epithet σαρκικῆς, applied to ἐντολή in the 16th verse is of a similar nature.

(19) For the law perfected nothing, Ὅδεν γὰρ τελειῶσαι δὸ νῦνος. The γὰρ here introduces an expression which shows that the law is weak and unavailing. Οὐδὲν, is used here for οὐδανα, no one; just as τὸ Ἰατρον in ver. 2 means the superior person, i.e., Melchizedek. Τὸ πᾶν and πάντα are repeatedly used by John, for πᾶς and πάντες; and so of other adjectives. 'Ἐντολήσει means did not affect a τελειῶσαι, did not purify and pacify the consciences and minds of sinners. We have no one English word which corresponds at all with the force of the Greek original; and we must therefore content ourselves, either with a kind of literal rendering of it, or with a periphrasis (as I have done), leaving the explanation for notes.

But [there is] the introduction of a better hope, Ἐπισκοποῦσῃ δὲ ..., τῷ Ἰερ.; i.e., of a hope of pardon, that “purifies the conscience from dead works, so that men may serve the living God.” ix. 14. Ἐπισκοποῦσῃ, superinduction, is said of one thing which is introduced in place of another; e.g., in this case, of the new priesthood which was superinduced in the place of the old one. Ἔλξε κραίνω means a better source or ground of hope, viz., the new arrangement was a better ground of hope to the sinner than the old one. Δι’ ἓς, by which, by means of which, through which ground of hope, i.e., in the new way disclosed by the gospel, ἔγγίζομεν τῷ Ἰερ.; we draw nigh to God, or we have access to God. Under the ancient law, the high priest only entered the holy of holies to procure pardon for the people. Under the gospel, the way is opened by Jesus for all penitent sinners to “come boldly to the throne of grace,” iv. 16, in order to obtain the blessings which they need. Ἐγγίζω is frequently construed with the Dative, in Hellenistic Greek; see Sept. Gen. xxvii. 21; Ex. xix. 22. The latter part of the verse is marked by δι’ as a kind of antithesis to the first part, or the apodosis of the sentence. It is introduced in order to show that something better comes in the place of that which was abrogated.


(20) *Inasmuch, also, as not without an oath, Καὶ καὶ θὸν οὐ χεῖρις ὑπομονεῖας; supply ἱερεῖς γέγονεν Ἑγγούς, from the latter part of the following phrase, which is the antithesis of this. Καὶ θὸν in this case, refers to κατὰ τοσοῦτον in ver. 22; and the intervening phrases are added by the writer, only by way of explanation and comparison. It is difficult if not impossible, to give the exact features of the original here, in any copy. The argument of the writer stands thus: 'The gospel is a better source of hope; for as much (καὶ θὸν) as the appointment of a priest by an oath, exceeds in solemnity and importance an arrangement to take the office merely by descent, so much (κατὰ τοσοῦτον, ver. 22) does the new covenant of which Jesus is the sponsor, exceed the old.' *'Ορκωμοσία applies rather to the act of taking an oath, being derived from ὅρκος and ὅρμα.

(21) For they, i. e., the Levites, became priests without an oath. Οἱ μὲν . . . γεγονότες. Μὲν γὰρ often means indeed, in fact, verily; but here μὲν is only the sign of protasis. The Levites were priests in consequence of being the descendants of Aaron; Jesus became a priest only by special appointment, sanctioned by an oath; so it follows, viz.:

But he [Jesus, became a priest] with an oath, by him who said to him, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent; thou art a priest for ever of the order of Melchizedek;" Ὅ δὲ μετὰ ὑπομοσίας . . . Μελχισεδεκ, Ps. cx. 4. Μεταμεληθοποιεῖται signifies to regret, to alter one's mind or purpose through regret; and simply, to change or alter one's purpose.

(22) Jesus is the surety of a covenant so much the better, Κατὰ τοσοῦτον . . . Ἑγγούς. On κατὰ τοσοῦτον, see above. Διαθήκη (ἡγιαῖ) means covenant, promise, dispensation, arrangement, testament; consequently, when applied to the Jewish law, or to Christianity, it means dispensation, economy. Κραίτωνος means, better than the ancient διαθήκη, i. e., the hope inspired by the new διαθήκη, is as much better than the ancient διαθήκη could inspire, as the new διαθήκη is superior to the old. Ἑγγούς, sponsor, pledge, surety. Many critics have supposed, that this word is chosen here on account of its likeness to ἕγγιξαμεν in the 19th verse; so that it constitutes a kind of παρονομασία with it. However this may be, the word is altogether appropriate to the writer's purpose. He had spoken of a better hope in ver. 19. It was natural to ask, What is the ground or security that this hope will be realized? This is answered by the assurance, that Jesus is Ἑγγούς for the dispensation which supports it.
The writer now proceeds to add one more reason why the Levitical priesthood must be considered as far inferior to that of Jesus. As men in a frail and dying state are constituted priests under the Levitical law, the consequence is, that the priesthood is liable to continual change, and must necessarily pass from the hands of one to another in a short time. Not so in the case of Christ; who, being exalted above the heavens, and constituted high priest in the temple not made with hands, hath an immutable priesthood subject to no succession.

(23) Those priests, also, viz., the descendants of Aaron, are many, since by reason of death they cannot be permanent, Kai oi μὲν πλείονες . . . παραμένειν. Πλείονες refers to numbers constituted by repeated succession; not to the number of priests existing at any one time. Ὑπάρχω is put in the Dative, as signifying the means. The writer doubtless intends that the comparison here shall be referred to the high priest's office in particular; for he is all along considering Jesus as ἀρχιερεύς. The number of priests, in general, is stated by Josephus to have been 1500; contra Apion. I. 22.

(24) But he, because he continues forever, has a priesthood without succession, Ὅδε δὲ τὸ μὲν . . . ἵππονίνην. Formerly I adopted the explanation here which takes μὲνов αἰών as referring to the perpetuity of Jesus' priesthood. But Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others are strongly against this interpretation. On the whole, I now feel inclined to adopt their views, although with some doubts. These arise from the apparent antithesis demanded between κωλύθεναι παραμένειν of the preceding clause (which confessedly means forbidden to remain permanently in the priest's office) and μὲνον in the present clause. But these critics object that it would be mere tautology to say: 'Because he is a perpetual priest, his priesthood admits of no succession.' And although there are very many expressions in the Bible which are as near to tautology as this, yet on account of the πάντως ζων in ver. 25, which is applied to Christ, I am on the whole led to accede to their exegesis. I construe μὲνον, then, as referring to the perpetual and unchangeable condition of Christ, in the world above, where he is priest—and perpetual priest, because his life is never interrupted by death; all of which is an antithesis to the condition and circumstances of the Jewish priests.

Ἀπαράβαρον, with succession, is altogether an appropriate word here, and more significant than αἰώνον or ἄρελατον would be. The writer had just said, 'The Levitical priesthood admits or demands many (πλείονες) priests in succession, because death is continually removing them from office.' On the contrary, Christ being appointed to a perpetual priesthood, his office is here declared to be ἀπαράβαρον, i. e., it admits of no transition to another, no successor in his place, inasmuch as he never dies.
(25) Hence also he is able always to save those who draw nigh to God through him, "Οὖν καὶ σωζεῖν . . . Ἰσώ; i. e., approach the throne of grace (iv. 16) in his name or on his account, trusting in him as their priest and intercessor. "Οὖν, hence, i. e., because he is a perpetual priest. To save, Σωζεῖ, means here, to deliver from condemnation and punishment. This the high priest did, in regard to God's external government over the Jews, when he went into the most holy place, and made expiation for the sins of the people. But Christ, as a priest in the heavenly world, is able also to do this; and to do it εἰς τὸ παραλέγειν, unceasingly, always, so long as there are any who need pardon, and who can obtain it.

Ever living, Πάνω τις ζωή, i. e., his life in the heavenly world admits of no interruption or change.

To intercede for them, or, rather to interpose in their behalf, Εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνων ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. The proper meaning of ἐντυγχάνω is, to go to any one, to approach him, to meet him, for the sake of accusing, defending, convicting, or delivering any person, or of transacting any business which has respect to him. Here, it is plainly in the sense of aiding, defending, or delivering; as the preceding σωζεῖ clearly indicates. It means here, also, to do something, or to interpose in such a way as is appropriate to the priest's office. But to intercede in the sense of making supplication, was not appropriate to any part of the priest's office under the Levitical law; at least, not to any which the Scriptures have presented to our view. The reader will search in vain for any direction to the priests, under the Jewish economy, to perform such a duty as priests; and all the testimony we have to show us that the priests did make intercession, is the nature of the case, and what Philo says of their duties, Legat. ad Caium. II. 77. p. 591 (edit. Mangely); see on ver. 27. Even the passage in Luke i. 9, 10, seems to indicate nothing that solves the question. We must therefore understand ἐντυγχάνει here in a more general sense, and refer it to any aid which Christ as high priest extends to those who approach God confiding in him, iv. 16. He is able σωζεῖ αὐτῶν, because he is a perpetual priest ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, i. e., to interpose in their behalf, to procure for them such aid as they may need. So the priests under the Levitical dispensation were the internuntii between God and the people, and procured blessings for them, not only by presenting the offerings which they brought, but by inquiring of the Lord for them, or consulting his holy oracle.
The writer, having now commented on the priesthood of Christ as compared with that of Melchizedek, and having also made some deductions from the nature of Christ's priestly office as thus exhibited, which are much to his purpose, resumes the subject which he had dropped at v. 10, and which he had first proposed in v. 2, 3. In v. 7—8 he had shown the similarity between Christ and the Jewish priests, in regard to the power of sympathizing with the suffering, inasmuch as both he and they were sufferers themselves. But he did not intend that the ἀδινία of the Jewish priests should be predicated of Jesus in all respects. To guard against this, our author again introduces the topic here, and shows how far superior the priest of the new covenant is, in a moral respect, to the priests of the old.

(26) Now such a high priest was needful for us, Τόυτος γὰρ ἐπεξεργάζεται ἡ χάρα. Kuinoel says: γὰρ affirmat enimvero, utique. In questions and answers it is often an intensive particle; but not here. I must therefore make some such connection of sense as the following: 'Christ always lives, and will always be our helper; for such a high priest we needed.' The implication is, that God has provided help adequate to all our need, and therefore provided a perpetual helper. If this be not the connection, I cannot see how γὰρ is to be fairly explained. Πρῶτω ordinarily signifies, that which is becoming, proper, fit. But here ἐπεξεργάζεται seems plainly to be equivalent to τὸ ἀναγκαῖον; as in Matt. iii. 15. So Luther, sollem wir haben, we must have. So Ernesti, Calovius.

Holy, Ὅσιος, not merely ἱερός here, but ἴτης, ἰδιή, ἱερός; for moral internal holiness or purity of nature is intended. Ἀκακος, harmless, qui malum non fecit, whose external conduct towards others corresponds with internal ὀσωτής. Undevised, Αμιαντος, has reference to the ceremonial purity which was peculiarly required of the Jewish high priests. Αμιαντος has here, however, a moral sense, and expresses summarily and with intensity the ideas conveyed by Ὅσιος and Ἀκακος. Καθορισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄμαρτων, separated from sinners, i.e., removed from all that could contaminate or render impure, diverse from sinners, unlike to them. It is nearly synonymous in its meaning with ἀμιαντος, and is added (as is usual in such cases with the sacred writers) for the sake of intensity. Exalted above the heaven, Ὁ πλοτός τῶν σαρκῶν γενόμενος, i.e., seated at the right hand of the majesty on high, i.e.; Comp. Phil. ii. 9; Colos. i. 18; Heb. ii. 9; viii. 1; Rev. v. 12; Matt. xxv. 31. By these assertions the writer designs to show his Hebrew readers, that Christ was in all personal respects exalted above the Jewish high priests. They were "compassed with infirmities," but he was spotless; if they were ceremonially undefiled, he was morally so; if they were placed in an exalted station, he was infinitely above them, being, like Melchizedek, king as well as priest, inasmuch as he was raised to the throne of God above the heavens, i.e. 3. To finish the comparison, he goes on to say
that, in consequence of his perfect purity, he needed no expiatory offering for himself, as the Jewish high priest did.

(27) Who has not (like the high priests) any daily necessity of offering sacrifices, etc., ὁσὶν ἔχει ... λαοῦ. Many doubts have been raised by critics, about the meaning of καὶ ἤμελον here, because they have supposed that the high priest officiated in person, only on the great day of atonement. See Lev. vi. 19—22; Num. xxviii. 3, 4; which, however, do not render the daily personal service of the high priest certain. All that is necessary, as I suppose, in order to illustrate the real sense of the apostle's words here, is, the suggestion that he does not assert the daily sacrificial duty of the high priest in propria persona, but that the high priests, on account of their infirmities (sins), were under the necessity of having daily sacrifice offered for them; as were all the Jewish nation. See Num. xxviii. 3, 4. In this respect Christ differed entirely from them. Still, Philo, who was contemporary with the apostles, says, ἄριστεὶς, κατὰ τοῦτο νόμους, εὑρές δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ταλῶν καὶ ἐκάστην ἤμελον, the high priest, agreeably to the law, makes daily supplications and sacrifices, see on ver. 25. It happens in this case, as in all others of a like nature which occur in our epistle, that the deep and accurate knowledge of the writer, in respect to every thing which concerned the Jewish dispensation, becomes apparent, just in proportion to our knowledge of the usages which really existed under that dispensation.

For this he did, once for all, when he offered up himself, Τοῦτο γὰρ ... ἀναφέρω; i. e., he offered sacrifice for the sins of the people, once for all (but not for himself as a sinner). Ἀναφέρω is like the Heb. ῥῆβῃ. Προσφέρω is also used in a similar sense. Ἐφάραξ, lit. for once, einmal; but according to usage, it denies a repetition of the act or thing to which it relates, and so means once for all.

(28) For the law constitutes men high priests who have infirmity, ὁ νόμος γὰρ ... ἀσθένειαν. Γὰρ here refers to the preceding declaration, viz., the necessity of the high priests that daily sacrifice should be made for them. Why? Because (γὰρ) they were men who had infirmities, i. e., they every day committed sin. Ἐξοντας ἀσθένειαν here means, those who have infirmity of a moral nature, i. e., who commit sin, who are sinners; so also in verse 2.

But the word of the oath, which was subsequent to the law [constitutes as high priest] the Son who is forever exalted to glory, ὁ λόγος δὲ ὁρκομοσίας ... τετελεσμένον. The phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ὁρκομοσίας is the same as ὁρκος or ὁρκομοσία in ver. 20. The writer refers to Ps. cx. 4. The word of the oath, i. q.,
the oath that was uttered. Ῥόν εἰς τὸν αἶώνα τετελεομένου. As to τετελείωσα, see ii. 10 on τετελείωσα. I regard the expression as designed here to convey, for substance, the idea of a state of the highest perfection and exaltation, which forbids the supposition that Jesus can have such ἄσθενια as the Jewish priests.

____________________________________

CHAP. VIII.

For an illustration of the course of thought and reasoning in this and the following chapters, see Introd. to chap. V., seq., above.

(1) The most important thing, however, in regard to what we are now treating of, is, Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς λέγομένους. That κεφάλαιον has such a meaning as is here assigned to it, is beyond any reasonable doubt. So Suidas, referring to this passage, says: κεφάλαιον, ἐκι, τὸ μέγιστον. So Theophylact, on this verse: ἵνα εἴη τὸ μέγατον καὶ συνεκτικότερον, that I may say the greatest thing and the most comprehensive. So Theodoret understood κεφάλαιον; for he says, τὴν μὲν ἑγέρτην τὴν τελευταίαν κατέληπε, he reserved the greatest honor until the last. So Philo: τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πολεμοῦντων, the head of the warriors. So often in classic authors also; to which may be added many of the most distinguished among late critics on our epistle, such as Zachariae, Michaelis, Heinrichs, Storr, Dindorf, Schulz, Jaspre, and others. In the like sense, also, are the Hebrew בָּנִי and פֶּשֶׁנְךָ used. The context, moreover, renders it quite plain that such must be the meaning, and that κεφάλαιον does not here mean sum or summary, in the sense of recapitulation or contents, for what follows is no recapitulation of what precedes, but a new topic, exhibiting a different attitude or view of Christ’s priesthood. In the preceding chapter, the apostle has treated of the superiority of Christ’s priesthood in respect to duration and succession. He has shown, also, that Christ was made priest by the solemnity of an oath, while the Levites were not introduced to their office by such a solemnity. The priesthood of the latter was liable to continual interruption and vicissitude, from the frail and dying state of those who were invested with the office of priest; while the perpetuity of Christ’s priestly office was never exposed to interruption from causes of this nature. Finally, the Jewish priests were themselves not only peccable but peccant men, and needed to offer sacrifices on their own account as well as for the sake of others; while Christ was holy, and perfectly free from all sin, and exalted to a glorious state, in
which he was placed forever beyond the reach of it, so that his sacrifice would inure solely to the benefit of sinful men. He now comes, in chaps. viii—x., to the consideration of the duties themselves, the principal point, viz., the nature and end of the sacrifice which Jesus offers; the place where it is offered; the efficacy which it has to atone for sin; and the difference in regard to all these particulars, between the sacrifice offered by Christ, and that which was presented by the Jewish priests. The dignity of an office, and the particular qualifications of the person who is to be invested with it, are things which in their own nature are subordinate to the great end which is to be accomplished by the office itself. They are only subordinate means of bringing about the end of the office; while this end or design itself must, from its own nature, be regarded as the principal thing, κεφάλαιον.

In Ἔπι τοῖς λεγομένοις, in respect to, εἰς, as often, has this sense. Λεγομένοι (pres. Part. passive) means the subjects now spoken of or discussed. Τῶν ἀρχιερέων, such a priest, viz., such as has been described in the preceding chapter; see vii. 26.

Who is seated, etc., ὁς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξαμ. κ. τ. λ., see on 1. 8. It is quite possible that the writer, in using ἐκάθισε here, may intend tacitly to introduce a comparison between Christ as a priest performing the duties of his office and being seated on a throne of majesty, and the high priest of the Jews who in the discharge of all the duties of his function stood before the Lord. But I do not think the point clear enough to be insisted on. Thus much is clear, viz., that the writer means to show the very great difference between Christ and the Jewish high priest, by advertiting to the fact, that the one is seated on the throne of God in the heavens, while the other, only ministers on earth, a temple reared by the hands of men. This last idea he now proceeds more fully to develop.

(2) A minister of the sanctuary, Τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργῶν, i. e., of the adytum, sanctum sanctorum, ὕψος; in other words, the high priest of the temple above, having access to ὕψος, the holy or most holy place. Ἀγίων may also mean of holy things, i. e., ἁγίων ἅγιων, of the truly sacred or holy things in heaven. But I prefer the former sense; as the comparison thus becomes more direct with the Jewish high priest. Λειτουργῶν means a public minister, qui publicis officiis praestat, qui numerā publica praestat. Says Ulpian, the Scholias on Demosth. contra Septin. λειτον ἐκάθισεν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὁ δημοσιον, what was public the ancients called λειτον. The ending -ουργός comes from the verb ἤργον ope, officio fungor.

The true tabernacle, Kai τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἅγιώτητος, means that
which is spiritual, immutable, and eternal in the heavens; and which therefore is called true or real, in distinction from the earthly tabernacle that was made by the hands of men, and was of materials earthly and perishable. The tabernacle in heaven is the substance; that on earth, the image or type. Hence the former is, by way of distinction, properly named ἀληθινὸς, i. e., real, or that which truly and permanently exists. What is intimated by this appellation, is now more fully expressed. Ἡ κυρίων ἢ κύριος, καὶ ὁκ ἀνθρωπος, which the Lord constructed or reared, and not man; i. e., the true or heavenly tabernacle is not material, was not formed by human architects, but reared by the immediate hand of God. See ver. 5 and EXCURSUS XV.

(3) For every high priest is appointed to present both oblations and sacrifices, Πάς γὰρ ἄρξης ... καθαυτὰς; i. e., it enters into the very nature of such an office, that duties of this kind must be performed by him who sustains it; see the original proposition of this subject, in v. 1. The force of γὰρ here is not quite certain. The connection of thought in the εὐρετήριον’s mind appears to be as follows: ‘Christ is the minister of the upper sanctuary; for (γὰρ) every high priest must have sacerdotal duties to perform, etc.’ Some critics render γὰρ, igitur; others, autem; but this is taking great liberties with it. Δῶρα, oblations or gifts that were without blood, such as the first fruits of grain, vegetables, etc. θυσίαι, animals slain for sacrifice. Both were presented to God by the priest, who acted as the internuntius between Jehovah and the officer.

Whence it is necessary that this [high priest] also have some [offering] to present, ὡς ἄργακαιον ... προσενέγγυ; i. e., if Christ be high priest and if such an office is necessarily connected with the duty of presenting some offering, then Christ of course must present one. What the oblation made by Christ is, he tells us more fully in chap. ix. 11—14, 25, 26.

(4) The apostle proceeds to show the reason why Christ is a priest in the tabernacle above, and not in that on the earth. For if he were on earth, then he could not be a priest, because there are priests appointed by law who present oblations according to the law, Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἤν ... δῶρα. The γὰρ here I understand as introducing a second reason why Christ is a minister in the upper sanctuary. The μὲν here is in the protasis; the δὲ of the apodosis is in ver. 6. The argument of the passage stands thus: ‘The Scripture calls Christ ἵππος εἰς τὸν ἄνω αὐτοῦ; but this he could not be, while on earth, inasmuch as there are already ἱερεῖς there by divine appointment; consequently he is ἴππος in the temple above and must present his offering there.’ Δῶρα
means here oblations of every kind, comprehending the same things as δοσις τε και δωσις in ver. 3.

(5) The same who perform service in [that tabernacle which is] a mere copy of the heavenly [sanctuary], ὄντως ὑποδείγματι . . . ἐπουρανίων; comp. ver. 2 and ix. 24. Ὑποδείγμα means image, copy, resemblance, imitation; all designating the idea, that the earthly temple stands related to the heavenly, only as a painting or picture of anything, stands related to the object itself. The heavenly σκηνή is ἀγνώστος, the earthly one σκηνή σκηνή.

Shadow, Σκηνή, i.e., a slight and imperfect image, sketch; distinct from σκιώ, a picture completed, an accurate resemblance. It is also the correlate antithesis of σώμα, body; see Col. ii. 17. Σκηνή I have construed as qualifying ὑποδείγματι, and rendered both words mere copy, i.e., I have construed them as a Hendiadys. The meaning is, that it is only a resemblance; i.e., the earthly tabernacle is but a shadow, a mere imperfect copy of the heavenly. Consequently the office of priest in the latter, is far more elevated than the like office in the former. Τῶν ἐπουρανίων, i.e., ἀγνώστων, sanctuary. So in ver. 2, ἀγνώστον λειτουργός, i.e., ἀγνώστων λειτουργός, a minister of the holy of holies, or of the most holy place.

For Moses, when about to build the tabernacle, was divinely admonished: “See now,” said he, “that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount,” καθὼς χαρμάτωται . . . δὲ. The verb χαρμάτωται means to give oracular responses, or to make communications to men in any supernatural way. It is spoken actively of God and not of men. So Phavorinus, χαρμάτωται, λέγεται ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ δὲ διαλέγοντα, ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων. In the passive voice (as here), it means, to receive divine responses or communications of any kind. ἐπιτελέω, to make, to complete, finish. Φησί, viz., God saith, in Ex. xxv. 40; comp. Ex. xxv. 9; xxvi. 30; xxvii. 8; Num. viii. 4; 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 19; Acts vii. 44. The Hebrew word to which τῶν here corresponds, is רַענָּה, model, sketch, delineation, form. Τῶν means model or form here; as it often does. Ὁρα refers to mount Sinai; for it was during the theophany there that communications were made to Moses on the subject of building the tabernacle; see Ex. xxiv. 18, comp. xxv. 9, 40; xxxi. 18; xxxii. 1. See Exegese XV.

(6) But now has he obtained a service of a more excellent nature, Νῦν δὲ διαφορώτερα τενεχε λειτουργίας; i.e., since he is not a priest in the earthly but in the heavenly temple, he has an office [πόσω] διαφορώτερα, [so much] the more exalted, viz., than that of the Levitical priests.

As much more as the covenant of which he is the mediator, is
superior [to the ancient one], being sanctioned by better promises, "Ὅσος καὶ ἡμείς. Πῶς ἐπὶ must be understood in the clause preceding this, viz., τὸν διαφόρος δικαιώματα, in order to make out the comparison which its correlate δικαίωμα implies in the latter. Νέω- μονήται, is sanctioned, i. e., is promulgated and established with all the solemnity and stability of a law. The better promises follow, viz., in vs. 8—13. The imperfection of the first covenant, and the perfection of the second, is further disclosed in ix. 9—14; x. 2—22; xiii. 9—14. From these passages it appears, that the first covenant promised only external purification, together with the civil or ecclesiastical pardon of an offender who complied with the rites which it enjoined; but under the new covenant, real pardon of sin by God is to be obtained, with purification and peace of conscience, the hope of eternal life, and union at last with the assembly of the redeemed in a better world.

The sentiment of the apostle, then, in our verse, stands thus; 'The office with which Christ is invested as a priest, or his priestly function, is as much superior to that of the Levitical priests, as the covenant under which he holds his office, excels, in the blessings which it promises, the covenant introduced by Moses.'

(7) Moreover if that first [covenant] had been faultless, then no place for the second would have been sought, Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη . . . τόπος. Ἡ πρώτη, sc. διαθήκη, means here, the Jewish dispensation or economy. Ἀμέμπτος, without fault, free from defect. The meaning is not that the Mosaic economy had positive faults, viz., such things as were palpably wrong or erroneous; but that it did not contain in itself all the provision necessary for pardon of sin, and the rendering of the conscience peaceful and pure; which the gospel does effect. See on vii. 19 and comp. ix. 9—14, 23, 24; x. 1—3, 10—14. The law then was not τέλειος, i. e., ἄμεμπτος; nor was it designed to be any thing more than a dispensation preparatory to the gospel. Εἰς τοῦτο τόπος, no room had been sought, or no provision would be made for a second, i. e., for a new covenant or the gospel dispensation.

(8) But finding fault [with the first covenant], he says to them, i.e., the Jews, Μεμφωμένος γὰρ αὑτοῖς λέγει. The passage is capable of another construction, viz., finding fault with them, i.e., the Jews; in which way a majority of the commentators, with Chrysostom, have understood it. Μέμφωμεν can undoubtedly govern αὑτοῖς in the Dative; but still, I prefer to construct it here with αὑτοῦ referring to διαθήκη. The apostle says, "The former covenant was not ἄμεμπτος." He proceeds to prove this, by quoting a passage from Jer. xxxi. 31—34. But what does this passage contain? Μέμφεται, says the apostle, i. q., μεμφό-
μενος οὖς, i. e., it affirms that the law is not ἀμέτρος; for these two words are plainly connected as antitheses by the writer. If the ellipsis be supplied, then it will read μεμφάμενος αὐτῷ, sc. δια-

ήκος, and αὐτοῖς is governed by λέγει.

In addition to the argument thus drawn from the writer's purpose, I would also suggest, that the whole of Jer. xxxi, which precedes the passage quoted, is made up of consolation and promise, instead of reproof or finding fault. The imputation of defect, then, must be such an imputation, in this case, as is implied in the passage quoted. But in this, the declaration that a new covenant should supersede the old one, implies of course that the old had failed to accomplish all the objects to be desired, i. e., it was defective. The apostle evidently understands the passage quoted, as originally having respect to the gospel dispensation; nor can I perceive any good reason why it should not be so understood, unless we reject altogether the idea, that any truly prophetic declarations of such a nature can and do exist.

Behold the days are coming, etc., Ἰδοὺ ἡμέρας . . . καὶ ἡμέρας. Ἰδοὺ corresponds to the Hebrew רֶוֶשֶׁנְ, and is used to excite the particular attention of persons who are addressed to any thing or subject. It is rarely used as an adverb in classical authors, but is frequent in imitation of the Heb. in the writers of the New Testament. ἡμέρας ἡμεραίον is equivalent to the Hebrew יָשָׁנָה יָשָׁנָה, which is used indefinitely for any future period whether near or remote. The simple meaning of the expression is, 'At some future period I will make,' etc. Ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰουδαία, i. q., Hebrew בַּנִּשְׁוֹרָה יְהוָה יְשָׁנָה, i. e., house, family, tribe, or nation of Judah and Israel. The meaning is, "with all the twelve tribes," i. e., the whole of the Hebrew nation. Ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνομα, i. q., ἐπὶ τῷ οἶκῳ, see Wahl's Lexicon on ἐπὶ, note 8, a. In the Septuagint the passage reads thus: καὶ διαθήκας τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδαίᾳ διαθήκην καῦνην.

The word διαθήκη is commonly employed by the Seventy in order to translate מִלְקַם. The general idea of it is, disposition or arrangement of any kind, or in regard to any matter; and it is a derivate of the verb διατέρα, to dispose of, to arrange. Hence it is sometimes employed by classic writers in the sense of foedus, compact or covenant between two parties; but not so in the New Testament. Like the Hebrew מִלְקַם (to which according to the usus loquendi of the New Testament it generally corresponds), it often means law, precept; even particular precept, as in Acts vii. 8, the precept of circumcision; in Rom. ix. iv. 4, αἱ διαθήκαι, the tables of the law, i. e., the ten commandments, comp. Deut. iv. 13, where מִלְקַם is explained by בִּלְקַם מַשָּׁה, the ten commandments; comp. also Deut. ix. 9, 11. So Heb.
ix. 4, κατωτέρω τὰς διαθήκης, the ark which contained the διαθήκης, i.e., the two tables of the ten commandments (i. q., ἡ ἱδρυματική, Num. x. 33); and afterward, in the same verse, αἱ πλάκες τὰς διαθήκης, the [stone] tablets containing the ten commandments. The general idea of law, precept, statute, is very commonly annexed to διαθήκη in Hebrew, where the Septuagint render it by διαθήκη; e.g., Ex. xix. 5, et. al. saepe. Both in classic authors and in the new Testament, it has also the meaning of last will, testament; e.g., Gal. iii. 15; Heb. ix. 16, 17.

Most frequently of all is תְרֵיס in the old Testament, and διαθήκη in the New, employed to designate a promise, compact, or agreement on the part of God with his people, that on condition of doing thus and so, blessings of such and such a nature shall be bestowed upon them. It comes in this way very commonly to designate the whole Jewish economy (as we call it), with its conditions and promises; and by the writers of the new Testament it is employed in a similar way, in order to designate the new economy or dispensation of Christ, with all its conditions and promised blessings. Thus ἡ παλαιά or πρώτη διαθήκη means, the Jewish dispensation; and ἡ καινή διαθήκη means, the Christian dispensation. The idea often annexed by readers to the word covenant, viz., mutual compact, and a quid pro quo in respect to each of the parties, is not the Scriptural one. The meaning altogether predominant is an arrangement on the part of God in respect to men, in consequence of which certain blessings are secured to them by his promise, on condition that they comply with the demands he makes, i.e., obey his precepts. Διαθήκη, then, embraces both precept and promise; and may be used for either, or both at the same time, pro re nata; and it often is so used, both in the Old Testament and in the New. In our text διαθήκη καινή means, a new arrangement or disposition made by Christ, i.e., one which has in some respects new conditions and new promises.

(9) The clause οὗ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, κ. τ. λ., is explanatory of the word καινή in the preceding verse. The meaning is, "The covenant which I will make at a future period with the Jewish nation (i.e., the dispensation under which I will place them), shall be different from that which I made when I brought them out of Egypt."

The phrase ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένων μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, Hebrew יְחֵשֵׁנ, is governed by the force of ἐν in composition with λαβομένων; so ἐπιλαμβάνειν τῆς χειρὸς, to take by the hand, to lead, etc. Ἐφαγαγέων, to bring or lead out, εἰς τὸ being understood before the Inf. here. Both words together mean assisted or helped to come out. This clause
is added by the writer, in order to show plainly that he means the διαθήκη, which was made when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, through the wilderness, toward Canaan.

Because they did not keep my covenant, Ὄτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνεμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου. The Hebrew is יִבְדַּלֵי הָעָם, because they violated my covenant, i.e., failed to perform the conditions on which I promised to bestow blessings upon them. The Greek οὐκ ἐνεμειναν, is a version ad sensum but not ad litteram. Μενω or ἴμμενω means, among other things, to persevere, to be constant, to continue firm or steadfast in anything. The Greek expression οὐκ ἐνεμειναν is softer than ἰβδελοι; and as οὐκ ἐνεμειναν conveys for substance the same idea as ἰβδελοι, we may well suppose it was preferred to a stronger expression by the writer of our epistle, while he was addressing himself to his Jewish brethren. Ὄτι οὐκ ἐνεμειναν assigns a reason why a new covenant was to be made, viz., 'Because the old one is broken, and because it has not been kept on the part of the Jews, and will not be kept, therefore a new one, on different conditions and with better promises shall be made.'

And I rejected them, Καὶ ἐξελεξα παίδων, Hebrew יִבְדַּלֵי חַדָּד, (Eng. version) although I was an husband to them; Gesenius, although I was their Lord, in the earlier editions of his Hebrew lexicon; but in his last egoque eos rejecerem; and so in Jer. iii. 14. That the Septuagint have given a correct version here, and that the apostle adopted it in our text is very probable. The Arabic بُل (בּלּ בּלָּלָל) means to loath, to reject with loathing; see Castell Lex. on بُل. In this sense, it is probable, בּלָּלָל is used in Jer. xxxi. 32, and (as some think) in Jer. iii. 14. So Abul Walid, Joseph Kimchi, and Rabbi Tanchum understood the word in xxxi. 32; and in like manner many modern critics. The Greek ἐξελεξα means to neglect, to disregard, to treat with neglect, and is (like οὐκ ἐνεμειναν) a softer expression than the corresponding Hebrew one, while it conveys for substance the same idea. The Septuagint, in their rendering of יִבְדַלֵי, appear to have preserved an ancient meaning of the word בּלָּלָל, for the correctness of which the Arabic is a pledge at the present time. The disregarding or treating with neglect (ἐξελεξα) here spoken of, has reference to the various punishments inflicted upon Israel for their wickedness, instead of the blessings which they would have received had they been obedient.

(10) But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, Ὄτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη
... κύριον. "Or, but, so the Hebrew יְהוָה, Ps. xliiv. 23; cxxx. 4; Job xiv. 16, al.; or, if this liberty of rendering ὅτι be not allowed, it may be translated for. The reasoning of the passage would then stand thus: 'Not according to the old covenant, for this, etc., i.e., this new one is of another tenor.' ὁ Ἰσραήλ, house of Israel, in this verse, means the Jews in general, the Israelitish nation; for so the whole nation is often named, in the Old Testament and in the New.

I will put my laws into their mind, Διδοῦς κύριον μον εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, Hebrew בִּירְסַמִּי. For διδοῦς the Septuagint has διδοὺς δῶμω, meaning, I suppose, I will deeply infix. This sense of δῶμαι comes from the Hebrew יָּתְמָה; see Wahl on δῶμαι No. 8. Διδοῦς, like the present participle in Hebrew, is used for the future δῶμω. To put laws into their minds, of course means to inscribe or engrave them as it were, i.e., deeply to infix them. Καὶ εἰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐνγράψω αὑτοῖς, and I will engrave them upon their hearts, or inscribe them upon their hearts; an expression parallel to the preceding, and of the same import. The meaning of both is, I will give them a lasting spirit of obedience to my laws, so that they will no more violate them as they have done; i.e., the new covenant shall be distinguished from the old, by a higher and more permanent spirit of obedience in those who live under it.

And I will be their God and they shall be my people, Καὶ ἕσομαι αὑτοῖς . . . λαὸν; i.e., I will grant them peculiar protection and blessings, and they shall be peculiarly obedient and devoted to me; comp. Rev. xxi. 3, 4, 7; Zech. viii. 8. For the meaning of the Hebrew-Greek idiom, εἰς θεόν and εἰς λαόν, see on Heb. i. 5.

(11) No one shall teach his own fellow-citizen, nor any one his brother, saying, Know the Lord, Καὶ οὗ μὴ διδαχοῦσιν . . . κύριον. For τὸν πολτηρόν, various manuscripts and editions have τὸν πληροφόρον. The original Hebrew is, יִשָּׁאָה יִשָּׁאָה יְהוָה, which, interpreted agreeably to a well-known Hebrew idiom, means simply, one shall not teach another; for שָׁאָה and דָּחֵה simply denote each other or one another, when thus coupled together. Τὸν πολτηρόν, in our text, corresponds to the Hebrew וּלְךָ, and this word the Septuagint almost always render by πληροφόρον. This is the ground, probably, why the reading πληροφόρον has been preferred by Bengel, Carpzoff, and some other critics. But πολτηρόν is in the best manuscripts; and Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthiae, Rosenmueller, Knapp, Heinrichs, Tittmann, and others, prefer it. The Septuagint, moreover, render דָּחֵה by πολτηρόν, in Prov. xi. 9; xxiv. 28. Whether, however, πληροφόρον or πολτηρόν be adopted, the sense is not changed. The meaning of the whole phrase is simply what the Hebrew
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Idiom allows it to signify, viz., 'One shall have no need to teach another.' The repetition of the sentiment, by τὸν πολλήν αὐτῶν and τὸν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν, belongs merely to the poetic parallelism of the original Hebrew, which expresses the same thought in two different ways; as is constantly done by the synonymous parallelisms of the Old Testament.

For all shall know me from the least to the greatest, Ὠρι πάντες . . . μεγάλον αὐτῶν, i. e., all of whatever rank or condition, high or low, rich or poor,—all classes of people, shall have a knowledge of God. Μισροῦ and μεγάλον here refer to condition, rather than age.

The writer does not mean that religious instruction will be altogether superseded, when the happy period arrives of which he speaks; but that, inasmuch as the laws of God will be infixed upon the hearts of his people, and engraven upon their minds, none will be ignorant, as in former times, of his true character and the requirements of his law. The idea plainly is, that the knowledge of true religion or of God, should become universal under the new covenant, so that no one might be found who could properly be addressed as knowing nothing of the true God. Moreover the implication contained in this, is, that under the old covenant many had been thus ignorant; a fact highly credible, considering the frequent lapses of the Jews into a state of idolatry.

(12) For I will be merciful in respect to their iniquities, and their sins and their transgressions will I remember no more, Ὠρι Ἰλεως ἥνωμι . . . ἐν. Ἰλεως, propitious, mild, clement, governs the Dat. ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις, and (like ποιμήν to which it corresponds) designates the idea of readiness to pardon, or to deal mildly with, offenders. Τὸν ἁμομοῦν αὐτῶν is not in the Hebrew, nor in the common Septuagint, nor Vulgate, Syr. Copt. Ethiop. The Hebrew has only ἰδαμαρτίῳ, to which τὸν ἁμομοῦν αὐτῶν answers in our text. It is difficult, or rather impossible, now to determine whether τὸν ἁμομοῦν αὐτῶν was originally inserted by the writer of our epistle, or crept in afterward from some edition of the Septuagint which contained it. But whether it be admitted or excluded, it makes no difference in the sentiment of the passage; the first clause of which is the first member of a poetic parallelism, to which the second clause corresponds, echoing the same sentiment. Ἰλεως ἧνωμι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις means to be forgiving, ready to pardon; and ὦ μητρὶ τῶν ἁμομοῦν means to pass sins by unpunished, to treat offenders as though their sins were forgotten. The expression, when applied to God, is altogether anthropopathic; but so are most other expressions which speak of him as acting in relation to such subjects.
Thus far the quotation from Jeremiah, in order to prove that a new covenant, better than the Mosaic, was to be made with the people of God. The writer now adds, as a comment on what he had quoted,

(13) In saying a new [covenant], he represents the first [covenant] as old, ἕν τῷ λέγειν . . . πρώτην. Of course, if the new one is to take the place of the former one, the former is considered as obsolete. πεταλιάω, like the Hebrew Piel and Hiphil, means to represent a thing as old or as superannuated; for in no other sense did the words just quoted make the former covenant old. The deduction of the apostle from this follows: Τὸ δὲ παλαιόμενον . . . ἀφανισμοῦ, now that which has become old, and is advancing in age, is near to dissolution. Παλαιός is more usually applied to things, and γνωστῶ ἐκ to persons. The use of two synonymous words here, serves merely to strengthen the representation, and is equivalent to saying, 'that which is very old.' Ἀφανισμοῦ, lit. disappearing, vanishing. Applied to the law or dispensation, it means abolition or abrogation. The argument of the writer is thus: 'What is very old, is near dissolution; but the prophet Jeremiah has represented the former covenant as πεταλιαομένην; therefore it is near dissolution, or it is about to be dissolved or abrogated. Hence the necessity of a new covenant in its place.

CHAP. IX.

(1) Moreover the first [covenant] had both ordinances of service and a sanctuary of a worldly nature, Εἷς μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕν πρῶτη . . . κοσμικῶν. Μὲν οὖν, like μὲν δῆ, is often used in transition to a new subject, or to a new part of a subject; see Lexicons (on μὲν οὖν) and may be rendered now or moreover; see in Acts i, 18; ix. 31; xv. 30; xvii. 30; xxiii. 22. So we may render οὖν (which is a very common continuative) provided we take μὲν here as the sign of protasis, of which ver. 11 seq., is the apodosis. And this the nature of the discourse seems to require. Καὶ, as it now stands, seems to belong to ἕν πρῶτη; and if so, it must be construed only in its intensive sense. But what can be the object of intensity here, it is difficult to see. I have, on the whole, thought it more consonant with the object of the writer, to construe it as having relation to the τὲ which follows (although the natural order would be, τὲ . . . καὶ). Accordingly I have rendered it both. That καὶ and τὲ sometimes stand in the order here presented, and that they are separated by inter-
vening words as here, see Passow's Lex. τέ, 3. c. Ἡ πρώτη, i.e., διαθήκη, comp. viii. 6, 7, 13; not ἦ πρώτη σκηνή, as some critics have maintained.

Δικαίωματα λατρεία means a service arranged, conducted by rules, or ordinances. Λατρεία designates the public service of the temple or tabernacle; and δικαίωματα the rules or precepts which regulated it. Ἀγων usually means sanctuary or holy place, in a general sense; and so it may be taken here, viz., for the whole temple. But it may also be understood as referring to that spacious apartment of the temple, in which the various articles of sacred furniture were placed that are immediately mentioned; which, however, is called by the writer ἧγια, in ver. 2. If it be the same as ἧγια, it is distinguished from ἧγα ἧγίων in the third verse; which means the apartment behind the veil, where the ark, etc., were deposited. Κοσμοκόν (from κόσμος) means pertaining to this world, of a terrestrial nature, i.e., material, the opposite of οὐ χειροποιητόν in ix. 11, 24, and i. q., χειροποιητόν; the opposite also of Ἰηροσυνάγειται, πνεύματος, xii. 22, comp. Rev. xxii. 2. Some critics have explained κοσμοκόν by formosum, illustre, because κόσμος sometimes signifies, ornatus, elegantia, but that would be expressed by κοσμός, and not κοσμικός. The common laws of Greek classical usage would demand the article before κοσμικόν, Winer's N. Test. Gramm. § 19. 1 seq. ed. 3.

(2) For an outer tabernacle was constructed, Σκηνή γὰρ . . . . πρώτη. Κηνή evidently designates here only one apartment of the ἱερον or sacred building; comp. ver. 3, where another σκηνή is described. Ἡ πρώτη means that which first presents itself, viz., to the worshipper as he enters the outer court of the building, i.e., the outer σκηνή or apartment, the most holy place being the inner one. We might at first expect, that either σκηνή would have the article, or πρώτη would omit it. Constructions, however, of the like kind as σκηνή ἦ πρώτη, are not without example in the New Testament; e.g., Rom. ii. 9, ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἐργαζόμενου; ii. 14, ἐν τῇ τα . . . . μη ἤχοντα; v. 5, πνεύματος ἄγιου τοῦ δοθέντος. See Rom. viii. 33, 34; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Gal. iii. 21; 1 Thess. i. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 13; 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 14; Heb. vi. 7, etc., although all of these cases will not compare very exactly. See Gersdorf's Beiträge, p. 355 seq.; and Buttman's Grammar, § 125. 3, and Kühn. § 245, Rem. 1. Bloomfield puts a colon after κατεσκευάζεται, and throws ἦ πρώτη into another clause; which is well. Comp. Winer § 19. 4.

In which [apartment] was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, ἐν ᾧ ἦ τὸ ἄρθρον . . . . οὕτως. For a description of the candlestick, see Ex. xxv. 31—39; xxxvii. 17—24. The
Hebrew word answering to λυχνία, is נָרָן. The πρόσκυνης is described in Ex. xxxv. 23—29. The design of the table was, that the bread which was consecrated to the Lord might be placed upon it. Πρόσκυνης τῶν ἄρων, the exhibition of the bread, viz., before Jehovah, is described in Ex. xxxv. 30, and Lev. xxiv. 5—9. The earlier Hebrew name was בֵּית הָעֲנָן, presence-bread. It is also called בֵּית הָעֲנָן and בֵּית הַשָּׁבָת, the arrangement of bread, or the bread arranged, in reference to the manner in which it was exhibited upon the table; see Lev. xxiv. 5, 6.

The altar of incense is omitted in this catalogue of sacred utensils; as it is omitted in the draft for building the tabernacle by Moses, in Ex. xxv. But it is mentioned in Ex. xxx. 1, and xxxvii. 25—28; xxxv. 15. So also the altar of burnt offering is omitted in Ex. xxv., although it is mentioned in Ex. xxxv. 16; xxxviii. 1; and many other utensils of the tabernacle also are omitted in Ex. xxv., which are mentioned in Ex. xxxv. Our author expressly says (ver. 5), that he shall not attempt to mention all the particulars of sacred apparatus for the temple service.

Which is called ἡγία, i. e., ἡγία, ἡγία, the holy place, the sanctuary, Ἡγία λεγεσθαι ἡγία; a different apartment, in the ἑπον or sacred inclosure, from the ἡγία ἡγίων mentioned in ver. 3. "ἡγία in our text, is plural; for the singular fem. is ἡγία not ἡγία. The writer means to say that ἡ πρώτη ἁγίων, the outer apartment of the temple, was called ἡγία. The plural is used here in order to designate one apartment in the temple, just as it is in ἡγία ἡγίων (not ἡγία ἡγίων) v. 3; and both are conformed to a usage that is common in Hebrew, which not unfrequently employs the plural to designate the sanctuary. E. g., Ps. lxiii. 17, ἡ ἡγίαις δος, ἡ γίαι I. Ixviii. 36, ἡ ἡγίαις, ἡγίαι σου. Lev. xxv. 31, 36, ἡ ἡγίαι, ἡγίαι μου, etc.

(3) And behind the second vail, Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα. A description of this vail is given in Ex. xxvi. 31—33; xxxvi. 35, 36. As the inner vail is here called δεύτερον, the necessary implication is, that there was a πρῶτον also; and accordingly we find it described in Ex. xxvi. 36, 37, and Ex. xxxvi. 37, 38. The Hebrew name of the inner vail (which separated the most holy place from the ἡγία or common sanctuary), is נָרָן as given in Ex. xxxvi. 31—33, and in the corresponding Ex. xxxvi. 33, 36, also Lev. xvi. 2. The Hebrew name of the outer vail, which served as a door for the tabernacle, i. e., which covered the entrance-passage to the first ἡγίων, is נָרָן. The former is called καταπέτασμα by the Septuagint (as the apostle calls it in our text), in Ex. xxvi. 31, 33; Lev. xvi. 2; Ex. xxxvi. 35; and also by the evangelists, Matt. xxvii. 58;
Mark xv. 38; the latter, both κατανεμησεμα and επισωστρων, in the passages connected with those just cited. There was a third external covering or curtain for the tabernacle (called νάνα, ἡ θυσιά, in Ex. xxvi. 1, 2 seq.), which Dindorf says was a third vail; but which, manifestly, Paul does not reckon to be such; nor Moses, in the passages above cited.

The apartment which is called the holy of holies, ἡ λειψημένη ἁγα δαγος, i. e., the most holy place, i. q., ἡ ἱερατική, a common form of expression in Hebrew, in order to denote intensity. In regard to ἡ λειψημένη after σκηφή without the article, see Winer § 19. 4 seq. Κατασκευασθη is understood after σκηφή; see ver. 2, where it is expressed. The inner sanctuary was called most holy, because there was, the ark of the covenant, the mercy-seat, etc.; and there the presence of Jehovah (which the Jews in later times called ἐν θυσία) was peculiarly manifested, so that this was regarded as his particular dwelling-place, "

(4) Containing the golden censer, Κρυσοῦν ἤχωνα Ἄμαρτῆριν. See Excursus XVI. And the ark of the covenant, covered on every part with gold, Καὶ τὴν κυβωρίαν ἄρα χρυσίων. Κυβωρίας was a coffer or chest, made of wood, and covered with laminæ of gold; a description of which is given in Ex. xxv. 10—16; xxxvii. 1—5. It is called the ark of the covenant, because in it were deposited the two tables of the covenant, (ὅτι, see on δαναιηθη in viii. 8, and comp. Deut. iv. 13; ix. 9, 11); which tables are also called the two tables of testimony, i. e., of statutes, γράμματα ἄρα, Ex. xxxi. 18. Both the terms ἄρα and ἀρα ἄρα plainly mean laws, statutes or precepts, in this case, and both refer principally to the ten commandments; see 1 K. viii. 9, and Deut. x. 1—5; 2 Chron. v. 10; vi. 11.

In which [ark] was a golden pot containing the manna, ἔν ἂν στάμνων χρυσοῦ ἡ κυβορία ἄρα μανά. The fact to which this alludes, is described in Ex. xvi. 32—34; where the στάμνος is called simply ἄρα, i.e., pot, urn, vessel for safe keeping. Nothing is said, indeed, of its being golden in the Hebrew; but the Septuagint render ἄρα by στάμνων χρυσοῦ. Of the fact that it was so, no one will be disposed to doubt, who reads a description of the furniture of the most holy place, and finds that almost everything within it was either pure gold, or was overlaid with gold; e. g., the ark, Ex. xxv. 11; the mercy-seat, xxv. 17; the cherubim, xxv. 18; the pillars and hooks for the vail that separated the inner sanctuary from the other, xxvi. 31, 32. Who now can rationally suppose that the urn containing manna, and the censer used on the great day of atonement, were not also golden? See Excursus XVII. See Rosenm. on Ex. xvi. 15, for the various derivations of the word, and the various species.
of manna; also for the proof, that the supply of this food for the
Israelites in the wilderness, was understood by the writer of the
narration in Exodus to be miraculous.

And the rod of Aaron which budded, Καὶ ἦ ὁ βάςδος Ἄαρων ἢ
βλαστήσας. See Num. xvii. 1—10, and what is said respecting
this rod and the pot of manna, in ExcursoS XVII.

The tables of the covenant, Καὶ ἃς χάλκες τῆς διαθήκης, means
the stone tablets on which the ten commandments were inscribed,
and which were deposited in the ark, Ex. xxxi. 18; xxxii. 16;
xxxi. 28, where the words of the covenant are expressly said
to be the ten commandments; Deut. v. 1, 2. 1 K. viii. 9;
2 Chron. v. 10. The writer asserts, therefore, that the pot of
manna, the rod of Aaron, and the two stone tablets on which
the ten commandments were inscribed, were all laid up originally
in the κυβορός.

(5) And over it [the ark] were splendid Cherubim which overshadowed the covering of the ark, Ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβίμ
. . . . τῆς ἀλαττήρων. See the description of the Cherubim in Ex.
xxv. 18—20; 1 K. viii. 6, 7; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18. That Cheru-
ubim were symbolical images or representations, is quite plain
from comparing the various descriptions given of them in dif-
ferent passages of Scripture; e. g., Ex. xxv. 18—20; xxvi. 31;
1 K. vi. 23—29, 32, and Ezek. i. and x., particularly x. 20—22.
I understand the word δόξης as referring to the splendor of these
symbolical figures, which were covered with gold throughout,
Ex. xxv. 18—20; 1 K. vi. 28. Some understand δόξης of the
glory which was displayed under and around them; to which
they suppose a reference to be made in Ps. lxxx. 1 [2]. Κα-
tασκιάζοντα refers to the outstretched wings of the Cherubim
over the ἀλαττήρων, as described in the passages above quoted.
ἲλαστήρων here means, the lid or covering of the κυβορός, which
was pure gold, Ex. xxv. 17, 21. In Hebrew it is called יִשָׁמ, which the Seventy have rendered ἀλαττήρων in Ex. xxv. 17, 21.
As יִשָׁמ means to cover sin, i. e., to make atonement for it, so יִשָׁמ may very naturally be rendered ἀλαττήρων since it was
by sprinkling blood upon this ἀλαττήρων, by the high priests, that
atonement was made, Lev. xvi. 14. Ἡλαστήρων, understood in
reference to this, might be translated the place or instrument of
propitiation, or (with our English translators) mercy-seat. It
was over this that the divine glory was seen, i. e., a supernatu-
ral, excessive brightness; and hence God was supposed to be
seated on it as his throne, and from it to dispense his mercy,
when atonement was made for the sins of the people by sprink-
ling it with blood. Hence our appellation mercy-seat.

Respecting which things it is not my present design to speak
with particularity, Περί δὲ . . . μίρος. Ὡς here refers to the various articles of sacred furniture, which he had just been mentioning. He means to say that a particular description of these (and of all the various utensils of the sanctuary) and their symbolical uses, is not what he intends to give; i. e., he shall content himself with merely having suggested those which were already named.

(6) Now these things being thus prepared, Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατασκευαζομένων. Κατασκευαζω is also, to build or construct. But in our phrase it means more. It designates not only the fabrication of the various utensils above named, but the adaptation of them to their respective purposes, and the arrangement of them in the order which the rites of the sanctuary required.

The priests performing the services entered continually into the outer tabernacle, Εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην . . . ἐπιτελοῦντες. Ἐπιτελοῦντες, that which is first approached, i. e., outer, as in ver. 2 above. Διαπαντὸς, every day, without intermission, constantly and often. This the priest did, in order to make the morning and evening oblations and sacrifices; and also to present the private offerings of individuals. Τὸν is the usual sign of the protasis of a sentence; to which δὲ in the apodosis, ver. 7, introducing an antithetical clause, corresponds.

(7) But unto the second [viz., σκηνή, tabernacle, apartment] the high priest only [entered], once in a year, Εἰς δὲ τὴν δεύτεραν . . . ὃ ἄρξειται; comp. Lev. xvi. 2. Δεύτερας implies σκηνήν. Ἀπαξ means either simply once, as ἀπαξ καὶ ἦς, once and again; or it means (as here) once only, once for all, i. e., on one occasion, or on one day; for this is all that can be meant. Τοῦ ἐναντοῦ is the Gen. of time, the Gen. being commonly used in order to designate the time when or how often. On the great day of atonement, it appears that the high priest went thrice into the inner sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 14, 15; to which, perhaps, may be added once more, in order to bring out the golden censer; and this accords well with the Jewish tradition, viz., that the high priest entered the sanctuary four times on the great day of expiation. However, it is quite possible that fire might have been carried into the most holy place on another censer, and then transferred to the golden one which belonged there. Comp. with the above, Ex. xxx. 10.

Not without blood, Ὅδε χερὶς αἵματος. See Lev. xvi. 14, 15, by which it appears, that the blood of a young bullock (Lev. xvi. 3) and of a goat was brought into the most holy place by the high priest, on the great day of atonement, and there sprinkled seven times upon the mercy-seat and before it.
Which he presented for his own sins, and for those of the people, 
*O προσφέρα . . . ἁγνομάτων;* see Lev. xvi. 6, 11, 14—16. Προσφέρα designates the act of presenting the blood before the Lord as indicated in Lev. xvi. 14—16. That the priest was to make atonement for himself, as well as for the people, is expressely declared in the verses above referred to. *Ἁγνομάτων not necessarily sins of ignorance, but faults, errors, sins, generally considered;* so in Judith v. 20; Sirach xiii. 2; li. 19; Tobit. iii. 3; 1 Macc. xiii. 39. The LXX. have sometimes used it to express the Hebrew יְבָאָה, from יָפָה to err. In Lev. iv. 2, 18, 22, 27, sins יְבָאָה (through precipitancy) are mentioned, and atonement is directed to be made for them by sprinkling blood before the mercy-seat, Lev. iv. 6, 17. But this mode of making atonement, and this limitation of the kind of offences for which it was to be made in this peculiar way, seem to have been afterwards changed, and limited in a different way on the occasion of the death of the sons of Aaron, Lev. x. 1, 2; xvi. 1, 2. It would seem, from Lev. iv., as if the sins יְבָאָה had a special atonement made for them, in the inner sanctuary, *without limitation as to the number of times that the high priest might go there. But Lev. xvi. 2 restricted this custom; so that atonement for sin of any kind was made before the mercy-seat only once in a year, agreeably to Ex. xxx. 10.*

(8) *The Holy Spirit signifying this, that the way to the most holy place was not yet laid open, Τοῦτο δηλοντος . . . ἓδον. The Holy Spirit here mentioned, is that Spirit which guided the ancient prophets; which taught Moses what arrangements to make for the service of God; and which signified, by these arrangements, what the apostle here affirms. Some have construed τοῦτο with διὰ understood, and so translated by this, his rebus; Storr, wodurch, whereby. But must not διὰ, in such a sense, govern the Genitive? On account of this difficulty, it is preferable to render it as I have done.*

The phrase Τῷ τῶν ἄγιων ἓδον means the way to the heavenly or upper sanctuary. Through Jesus only, Jews and Gentiles have free access, at all times, to the mercy-seat of heaven; comp. Eph. ii. 18; Heb. iv. 16. This way was before obstructed by numerous ceremonial rites, and limited as to times and persons. Of necessity such was the case.

While the first tabernacle had a standing, "Ετι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐξοuding στάσιν; i. e., so long as the Jewish dispensation lasted. Πρώτης σκηνῆς is here used in the general or unlimited sense, for the tabernacle or temple with its services.

(9) Which [has been] a type down to the present time, "Ἡτις παραβολή . . . τῶν ἐμφατηκότα. Παραβολή means symbol, simili-
tude, image, i.e., symbolical representation of anything; which is also the meaning of τύπος. But in English, type is used not for similitude merely, but for something under the ancient covenant, which was specially designed on the part of God to be a symbol of some person or event, under the new dispensation. Here, the preceding verse shows that the ancient tabernacle or temple, was designed by the Holy Spirit to be a symbol expressive of some important truths that had relation to the New Testament dispensation; hence type is here appropriate to express the idea intended to be conveyed by παραβολή. Eis τον ἔνστρυχον, down to the present time; εἰς, ad, usque ad, see Wahl on εἰς, 2.a.

In which both oblations and sacrifices are presented, that cannot fully accomplish what is needed for the worshipper in respect to his conscience, Καὶ δι' δόσιν... λατρείους. — Καὶ δι' εἰς, in which, during which, viz., time. Δῶρα τε καὶ θυσίαι means, offerings of every kind which were presented to God. For τελειώσα, see on τελείωσα, vii. 11. The meaning is, 'To render the mind of the worshipper secure of pardon for sin, and to produce that quiet which was connected with a well-grounded persuasion of this, and that moral purification which must accompany it.'

The whole verse shows very plainly, that our epistle was written while the temple rites were still practised; consequently, before A.D. 70. But by the phrase τον καρπὸν τον ἔνστρυχον, the writer particularly alludes to the age then present, in which the new or Christian dispensation had begun. The whole sentence is as much as to say, 'The Jewish ritual, from the commencement of it down to the present moment, has never been, and still is not, anything more than a type of the Christian dispensation which has already commenced. All its oblations and sacrifices were ineffectual, as to removing the penalty due to sin in the sight of Heaven, or as to procuring real peace of conscience.

(10) Being imposed (together with meats and drinks and divers washings — ordinances pertaining to the flesh) only until the time of the reformation, Μόνον εἰς βρόμασι... εἰπικύρια. Many writers have referred δικαίωματι to the δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι mentioned in the preceding verse; and then have found difficulty enough in explaining how oblations and sacrifices could consist in meats and drinks and various ablutions. It seems quite evident, that ver. 10 is designed to signify something additional to that which is mentioned in ver. 9; while still it is to be regarded as connected with ver. 9, and a continuation of it. 'Επὶ βρόμασι... βαπτισμῶν, I understand as a clause qualifying δικαίωματι, i.e., these words stand in the place of an adjective designating
wherein the δικαιώματα consisted; while σαρκός supplies another qualification, denoting to what the δικαιώματα had relation, viz., to the flesh or external part of man. Meats and drinks have respect to food which was deemed clean and unclean, under the Jewish dispensation; and not (as some critics interpret the words) to the meats and drinks offered to the Lord. Most evidently βαπτισμοῖς refers to the ceremonial ablutions of the Jews, which were concerned with external purification; and βρώμασι καὶ τόμασι plainly have respect to the same kind of purity. All this agrees perfectly with the scope of the writer. He had denied that the penalty due to sin in the sight of God, could be removed by any of the temple offerings, ver. 9; and in this verse he denies that the moral expiation required could be effected by any or all of the rites pertaining to external purification. Consequently there was, according to him, nothing in the Jewish ritual which could effect an atonement such as the sinner needed.

The connection and arrangement of the whole verse, as I now view the subject, after repeated examinations, may be made out thus: the words ἐπὶ βρώμασι ... δικαιώμας σαρκός, are parenthetical, and thrown in to augment the effect of the declaration at the close, and μόνον ... μέχρι καρποῦ διορθώσως ἔπικείμενα is closely connected together in this sense. The whole will then stand thus: Oblations and sacrifices are offered, which cannot fully accomplish what is needed for the conscience of him who performeth the services, being imposed (together with meats and drinks and diverse washings — ordinances pertaining to the flesh) only until the time of the reformation. — That the words admit of this construction, is plain. Ἐπὶ, with, together with, in addition to (like the Hebrew בָּע, upon, concerning, with, i. e., in addition to, etc.), is a frequent and undoubted sense of the preposition; e. g., ἐπὶ τούτοις in addition to these things, besides this; ἄλλος ἐπὶ ἄλλη, one upon another; νεκρῶν ἐπὶ νεκρῶν, corpses upon corpses, i. e., in addition to corpses; see Passow's Lex. ἐπὶ, II. C. and Bretsch. Lex. ἐπὶ, II. 2. So in the New Testament: "O her five talents have I gained ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς, in addition to them," Matt. xxv. 20; and in the Sept.: "Lest coming he smite me even the mother ἐπὶ τίκνους, together with the children," Ex. xxxii. 11, (12). "They have devoured the mother ἐπὶ τίκνους, together with the children," Hos. x. 14. — In regard to the participle ἔπικειμένα (neut. gender), there is no serious difficulty. The immediate antecedent is δόρα τε καὶ Ἰωσία, which take first a fem. participle, viz., δυνάμειαν, agreeing with Ἰωσία (the last of the two antecedents); and then ἔπικειμένα (for so the best Codices read), which agrees in form with δόρα the first of the two antecedents. Yet,
although such a construction might be vindicated on this ground, I do not apprehend it is the true ground. I regard ἐπικεφαλήνα (neut. gender) as conformed to an idiom very common in the best Greek writers, e.g., in Plato and Thucydides, according to which, an adjective or participle, specially when separated by intervening words, may be put in, the neuter gender, let the antecedent be of whatever gender it may. So Matthaei, remarking on the change of ἐπικεφαλήνα into ἐπικεφαλεῖα, as made by some critics, says: "Nulla causa corrigendi erat; cum enim antecedenter δῶρα καὶ Ἰωσία, pluribus interpositis, ista omnia neutro genere complecti poterat Paulus per ἐπικεφαληνα. Plura loca similia apud Thucydidem reperias." He might have added, apud Platonem et multos alios. I add merely, that while Dr. Knapp and some other critics of name adopt the reading δικαίωσαν instead of δικαίωσας, yet most Codices and Versions have the latter; and the latter, on the whole, seems to be altogether preferable. The whole verse, indeed, is not without its difficulties, even at the best; but still, I think the construction now given to be the most facile and natural, and to be less liable to objections than any other; and in this Kuinoel and Bloomfield and others also unite.

Καιρὸς διορθώσεως plainly means, the time of the gospel dispensation, called χρόνος ἀποκατάστασις, in Acts iii. 21; Comp. Mal. iii. 1; iv. 5, 6; Is. lxvi. 22; lv. 17; li. 16.

Thus much for the description of the earthly tabernacle and its sacred utensils, together with an exhibition of the inefficacy of the whole in respect to meeting the wants of sinners, and also of an avowal of their temporary nature. They were intended only as the introduction to a new and better dispensation. If μεν in ver. 1 be regarded as a prothesis, then the correlate (§4) must be sought in ver. 11, which seems to be the sequel to ver. 1, and is nearly related to it. The writer now proceeds to show, that the tabernacle in which Christ officiates, is οὗ χειροτόνητος, not κοσμιμός like that of the Jews. The antithesis between the old and new tabernacles, their services, and the respective efficacy of them, is carried on by the apostle, through the remainder of chap. ix., and down to chap. x. 19.

(11) But Christ being come, the high priest of future blessings, Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος... ἀγάθων. Χριστὸς... παραγενόμενος is Nom. to the verb εἰσῆλθε in ver. 12. In accordance with the correlative use of δὲ with μεν in ver. 1, the whole arrangements of the first temple or tabernacle are here placed in antithesis to those of a spiritual or heavenly temple, with its high priest, offering, etc.: so the representation in the sequel.

A high priest of good things to come, Ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγάθων, i.e., of blessings then future. The meaning is, 'The high priest who procures blessings promised by the gospel.'
The principle of interpretation is the same that is adopted in such phrases as the following; viz., the God of peace, i.e., who procures or bestows peace; the God of consolation, i.e., who bestows consolation; the God of grace, i.e., who bestows grace; ἄρτος τῆς Διδος, i.e., ἄρτος τῆς Διδος, etc. The Gen. τῶν μελλόντων ἁγιαστάν, is Gen. auxorius. Christ is here called the high priest who procures future blessings, by way of comparison with the Jewish high priest, who was μεσορέτος (viii. 6) or ἔγγος (vii. 22) between God and the people, and was the medium through which blessings were procured from God.

Through a greater and more perfect temple, not made with hands, that is, not of this [material] creation, Διὰ τῆς μεγάλης . . . τῆς κτίσεως. Σκηνή here (as in ver. 2) most probably means, the outer apartment or court only of the heavenly temple. So we must understand it if we render διὰ through, as the best commentators and lexicographers do in this case. But to give it material form and shape, would be nothing less than to make it ἄρτοπολογοτος; although the writer of our epistle expressly says, it is οὗ τεροπολογοτος. It is unnecessary, then, to inquire precisely what there is in the heavenly world, which constituted materialiter this greater and more perfect outer sanctuary, through which Jesus passed when εἰσηγάγει ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, ver. 12. The comparison is made with the high priest of the Jews, who passed through the outer sanctuary when he entered into the inner one, upon the great day of atonement. The probability is, that the writer compared in his own mind the visible heavens (through which Jesus passed in his ascension on high, iv. 14; vi. 20; viii. 1, 2), with the vail which separated the outer sanctuary of the Jewish temple from the inner one; the clouds or sky (which conceal the temple above from our view) being resembled to the vail of the inner temple. Still, he explicitly declares that he does not mean a material sanctuary, visible to the natural eye, and corresponding in this respect to that upon the earth; for he says, 'it was οὗ τεροπολογοτος;' and to prevent misapprehension, adds, οὗ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, i.e., not of the visible material creation, or not [like this creation] visible and material; which is plainly implied by ταύτης.

The version διὰ by Dr. Schulz and others (vermöghe, by virtue of), I am not able to comprehend. In what sense can it be said that Christ εἰσηγάγει ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰώνιαν ἐνθρόνων εἰράμενος, by virtue of a greater and more perfect tabernacle that was not material? which is the same as to say, 'He entered into the adytum of the tabernacle above, by virtue of a more perfect tabernacle.' What or where was this?

Διὰ is sometimes put before the Genitive of a noun, which
indicates the manner or the circumstances in which a thing exists, or takes place, or is effected. In 2 Cor. v. 10, the apostle says, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, in order that every one may receive τὰ διὰ σώματος [according to] the things done in the body." Strictly considered, however, διὰ does not signify place here; for διὰ σώματος means, in a corporeal condition. Now, if we render the phrase in Heb. ix. 11 thus, in a greater and more perfect temple, we should make διὰ indicate the place where simply. This would afford a good sense, if we could philologically defend such a translation; but I find no sufficient authority for this; for διὰ is used before nouns of place only to denote the place through which or by which one passes; see Wahl on διὰ 1. 1. a. Besides, the circumstances in which Christ entered the most holy place, are noted in ver. 12; so that one would hardly expect to find them noted here. There, διὰ is used in a way that is not at all uncommon; e. g., 'Christ entered the eternal sanctuary, οὗ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόρφων, but διὰ τοῦ οἶκου αἵματος.' But I cannot see how διὰ μείζων καὶ τελεότερας σκηνῆς can be here construed as indicating the circumstances in which, or the means by which, Christ entered the eternal sanctuary. It is not associated by the writer with δι' αἵματος τράγων and διὰ τοῦ οἶκου αἵματος, as the particles before these phrases clearly show. Nor does the sense of the passage permit this; for what would be the sense of saying, 'By means of a more perfect tabernacle, Christ entered into the sanctuary of [the same] tabernacle?' I see no tolerable way, therefore, of construing the passage, but by joining διὰ . . . σκηνῆς with εἰσῆλθε, and construing it as I have done in the version. Compare the like usage of διὰ, in Matt. ii. 12; vii. 13; viii. 28; xii. 1, 49; Mark xi. 16; Luke iv. 30; y. 19; xvii. 11; Acts ix. 25.

(12) Not with the blood of goats and of bullocks, but with his own blood, he entered once for all into the sanctuary, ὄψις δι' αἵματος. . . τὰ ἁγα. The Jewish high priest, on the great day of atonement, carried with him into the inner sanctuary, (1) The blood of a bullock, which he sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 14. (2) The blood of a goat, which he also sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 15. Christ did not carry with him into the heavenly sanctuary the blood of bullocks and goats, but presented his own blood there in order to make atonement. This, however, is not to be understood literally; for as the sanctuary itself was ὁ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως or ὁ χειροποίητος, so the Saviour's blood which was shed upon Calvary, was not literally taken and carried by him into the heavenly temple. All that is material, is only a figure or emblem of that which is
spiritual or heavenly. That διά before αἵματος means with, cum, ἀ, is quite clear from the nature of the case; and that διά has such a meaning, is clear from comparison with Lev. xvi. 14, 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Rom. ii. 27; xiv. 20; viii. 25; Heb. xii. 1; comp. in vs. 22, 25 below, the equivalent phrase ἐν αἵματι. ΄Ε is adversative, but, when it follows a negative particle such as οὐδὲ is here. Ἑφάπαξ means here, once for all, once only.

Obtaining eternal redemption, ἀλωνίαν λίτρωσιν εὐράμενος. Eὐράμενος is not an Attic 1 Aor. Middle; but a later form of the 2 Aor. Middle; see Winer's Gramm. § 13. 1. ed. 3. Eὐπράσιν often means to obtain or acquire anything. Here the act of entering the eternal sanctuary and presenting his own blood, is considered as the means by which the eternal redemption of sinners is effected. Λίτρωσις, in the New Testament, means liberation or redemption; i.e. liberation from the penalty due to sin, or redemption from the bondage and penalty of sin. It is called αἰωνίαν, because the redemption obtained is eternal in its consequences, or because it is liberation from a penalty which is eternal, and an introduction to a state of endless happiness. The λίτρωσις effected by Christ needs no repetition; when once made, the consequences are eternal; as we may see in ix. 24—28; x. 1, 2, 11—14.

(13) For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, ΄Ε γὰρ τὸ αἷμα . . . . κεκούμενον. The γὰρ here introduces a clause, which assigns the reason why the blood of Christ should be so efficacious as to procure eternal redemption. The blood of bulls and of goats, as employed for the purpose of purification or expiation, is described in Lev. xvi. 14, 15. It was also shed on other occasions as a sin-offering, Lev. i. 2—5, 10, 11. Ταῖρων, in our verse, corresponds with μούχων in ver. 12. Both words mean a bullock or a heave; and the Septuagint employ both Greek words to translate the Hebrew ἁρυ καὶ μοῦ in Gen. xl. 6, and for μοῦ in Gen. xxxii. 16, [15]; μούχως ἁρυ in Prov. xv. 17, and for μοῦ in Lev. iv. 3—5.

See an account of the manner in which these ashes Σφόδρος σαμιλάεως, κ. τ. λ., were prepared, in Num. xix. 2—9. In the last verse, the ashes are directed to be kept for a water of uncleanness, ἅρως ἁρυ, i.e., to be mixed with water which was to be sprinkled on the unclean, that they might be purified. It is also called, in the same verse, τὰίρω, a sin-offering, or (as our English version has it) a purification from sin, meaning a means of purification. So in Num. xix. 13, 20, the person who had defiled himself, and neglected to have the ἅρως ἀρυ sprinkled upon him, is
pronounced unclean. Some apply παντικοῦσα to αἷμα, as well as to σποδός. But (setting aside the difficulty of the grammatical construction as to concord) it does not appear, that the sprinkling of blood upon the unclean was a usual part of the Levitical rites of purification. The blood was sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, and upon the horns of the altar, and poured out before the altar. See Bleek’s Comm. ‘Пαντικοῦσα is indeed feminine, and σποδός masculine. But such anomalies in concord are very common in Hebrew, see Gramm. § 189. 5, 6. Besides, as the latter noun here (δαμαλέως) is feminine, it happens, as in some other cases of the like nature, that the grammatical concord (as to gender) is regulated by the latter of two nouns in regimen.

Sanctifies in respect to external purification, Ἀγάζει ... καθαρόντα. —Ἀγάζει, used in respect to external rites, denoted that the person rendered ἀγαζόμενος was clean or purified from all ritual uncleanness, i. e., that he had performed all the necessary rites of external purification, so that he could draw near to God as a worshipper, in a regular manner. Thus much, our author avers, was accomplished by the ceremonial rites of the law. If so, then

(14) How much more shall the blood of Christ, who by an eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purify our consciences from dead works, Πῶσφ μάλλον ... ἄφων. In vs. 11, 12, Christ is represented as entering the heavenly sanctuary with his own blood, in order to expiate the sins of his people or to procure λυτρωσι for them, i. e., deliverance from the penalty of the divine law. It is then in the heavenly world, in the tabernacle not made with hands, that the offering of our great high priest is made. There he presented himself as the victim that had been slain, ix. 10—12; i. 3; vii. 27; Rev. v. 9; Eph. v. 2; and there his blood that had been shed, is virtually offered to make atonement; not literally but spiritually, i. e., in a manner congruous with the spiritual temple in which he ministers. Theophylact thus explains this difficult passage: Οὐκ ἀνερεύς τις προσήνεγκε τὸν Χριστόν ἄλλ' αὐτός ἑαυτόν· καὶ τῆς διὰ πυρὸς, ὥσις ἄμαλες, ὕπλα δι' πνεύματος αἰωνίου, ὡστε καὶ τῆς χάριν καὶ τῆς ἀπολυτρωσις διανοιξέων, i. e., ‘no high priest made an offering of Christ, but he of himself; and this, not by fire, as the heifers [were offered], but by an eternal Spirit, so that he might render grace and redemption eternal.’ Whether he means divine influence, or the divine Spirit, it would be difficult to decide. I am rather inclined to believe that he meant the former, and if so, he seems to have adopted the same sentiment with the more recent and able interpreters of our epistle. See in Excursus XVIII.
The apostle seems to use σῶμα, ἁυτόν, and αἷμα, as equivalent in regard to the sacrifice which Christ offered; see and compare Heb. i. 8; x. 10; ix. 12, 14; x. 19; ix. 26. The reason of these different expressions, may be found in the nature of the Jewish ritual. When the blood of an animal was presented before God, in order to make atonement, the body was also consumed by fire, so that the whole was offered in sacrifice. See Lev. iv. 6—12, 17—21. The use of either of the three words σῶμα, ἁυτόν, αἷμα, as designating the service of Christ, implies all that would be designated by employing the whole of them; i. e., when his blood was shed, his body was slain, i. e., he himself was slain.

In Ἁμώμον, spotless, there is an evident allusion to the Jewish victims, which were required to be without spot or blemish. No other could be accepted of God. So Christ, who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," vii. 26, was Ἁμώμον, i. e., a perfect victim, a lawful or acceptable one in the highest sense.

Shall purify our conscience from deadly works, Καθαρίζει τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀργῶν. Καθαρίζει is the Attic future for καθαρίζειν. Συνείδησιν does not mean simply the conscience as a faculty of the soul, but the mind or conscious power of man, i. e., the internal or moral man. Νεκρῶν in such cases usually means deadly, i. e., having a deadly, destructive, condemning power. This may be the meaning here; and so it is more usually taken, and so I have translated it. But as in ver. 13 the writer had made mention of the ashes of a heifer, as one of the means of effecting external purification; and since, in Num. xix. 11—19, these ashes are described as particularly intended to cleanse those who had been polluted by the touch of dead bodies; may it not be supposed, that there is an allusion in the term νεκρῶν here to that fact? Dead works, in this sense, would be such as pollute the soul, as dead bodies did the persons of the Jews. Dead works, then, may mean sinful works; for it is from the pollution of sin that the blood of Jesus cleanses. Any one who chooses, can adopt this sense, which is capable of philological justification.

So that we may serve the living God, Εἰς τὸ λαρυγμὸν Ἰησοῦ ζωρί; another allusion to the Jewish ritual. Before persons under the ancient dispensation could present themselves in the presence of the Lord acceptably, they must have been subjected to ceremonial purification. What this prefigured, the blood of Jesus effects. It takes away the sinner's moral pollution, i. e., Christ removes the penalty to which he was obnoxious, and sanctifies, by his Spirit, the soul of the penitent sinner; and thus he may draw
near to God, and offer him an acceptable service. He is clean in a sense as much higher than the Israelite was who had purified himself only externally, as the efficacy of Jesus' blood is greater than that of goats and bullocks.

(15) On this account, also, he is the mediator of a new covenant, \( \delta \alpha \tau \circ \nu \circ \ldots \varepsilon \tau \circ \nu \circ \). I understand \( \delta \alpha \tau \circ \nu \circ \) as referring to the sentiment in ver. 14. The sentiment stands thus: 'As Jewish sacrifices rendered the offerer externally clean, so the blood of Christ purifies the moral or internal man, and removes the consequences of sin. On this account (\( \delta \alpha \tau \circ \nu \circ \)), i.e., because the sacrifice of Christ produces an effect such as the Jewish sacrifices did not, he may be justly called the mediator of a new covenant, differing greatly from the old.' Comp. Heb. viii. 6—8, 15; vii. 15—19. \( \delta \alpha \theta \acute{\iota} \kappa \eta \varsigma \) \( \mu \varepsilon \iota \tau \iota \varsigma \) means the mediator of a new covenant, or the internuntius, \( \tau \circ \omega \rho \varsigma \), who (so to speak) negotiated such a covenant between God and man. See Gal. iii. 19, where Moses is called the \( \mu \varepsilon \iota \tau \iota \varsigma \) of the former covenant, in a like sense. And the use of the word \( \mu \varepsilon \iota \tau \iota \varsigma \) here shows that \( \delta \alpha \theta \acute{\iota} \kappa \eta \varsigma \) in the present verse must mean covenant, and not (as a few have maintained) testament; for what has a mediator (as such) to do with a testament? Let the reader turn back and compare viii. 6 seq., and he must be satisfied respecting the sense here given to \( \delta \alpha \theta \acute{\iota} \kappa \eta \varsigma \).

'But of what avail,' the Hebrews here would very naturally inquire, 'can this new covenant be to all those, who have lived in former ages under the Mosaic dispensation? You affirm that the ritual of the Mosaic law had no power to remove the spiritual penalty of guilt; do the patriarchs, then, and prophets, and just men of past ages, still lie under the imputation of the sins which they committed?' By no means, answers the apostle. A new and better covenant than the Mosaic has been instituted, under which real spiritual pardon for offences is obtained, which enures to them, as well as to us at the present time.
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who lived in the times which preceded the gospel dispensation or new covenant; as the antecedent member of the verse clearly shows. Τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας, as a Gen. depends on ἐπαγγελίαν, not on κεκλημένου, although such a separation is somewhat unusual; see on ver. 16, Ἰακώβων . . . διαθεμένου. Ἐπαγγελίαν is best translated here, as in vi. 12, 15, 17; x. 36; xi. 13, etc., promised blessings or proffered good. The inheritance is called eternal (αἰωνίου) because the blessings procured by a Saviour's blood for those who lived under the ancient dispensation, are of a spiritual, eternal nature; see ver. 12. Such blessings could not be attained by any of the rites of the old covenant; it is only by virtue of what is done under the new, by Jesus, that the ancient worthies came to the possession of them.

The sentiment which this verse contains, respecting the efficacy of atoning blood in regard to the sins of preceding ages, has an exact parallel in Rom. iii. 25; where the blood of Christ is declared, by Paul, to have procured τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων, the remission of sins committed in preceding times, as is plain from the antithesis (τῷ νῦν καθώς) in the following verse. Both passages compared, form a striking coincidence of a peculiar sentiment, which is no where else so clearly and directly asserted.

(16) For where there is a testament (i.e., where a testament becomes complete, ἵστατι, is valid), the death of the testator must take place, ὁ θνὼν γὰρ διαθήκης . . . διαθεμένου. The sense given to διαθήκη here, viz., testament or will, is beyond all doubt consonant with the usus loquentis of the Greeks; although in the Septuagint and New Testament no example of this usage occurs, excepting in the present passage. All the lexicons will supply proof that the meaning testament is common in classical Greek, and Kuinoel (in loc.) has quoted abundantly to this purpose; which, however, seems to be superfluous. The Hebrew יבשׂ, however, never has the sense of testament. The real generic and original meaning of διαθήκη is arrangement, disposition or disposal of anything. Hence secondarily, will, testament, also compact, covenant, league, agreement, etc. The γάρ here is before a clause introduced for additional confirmation or illustration. The occasion of here introducing διαθήκη in the new sense of testament is stated in the summary prefixed to chap. iv. 14, to which the reader is referred. The whole comparison of testaments (διαθήκαις) among men, which confer a valid title to an inheritance, vs. 16, 17, seems evidently to spring from the mention of Christ's death in the preceding verse, and of the confirmation thereby of the believer's title to a heavenly inheritance. It is as much as to say, 'Brethren, regard it not as strange, that the death of
Christ should have given assurance of promised blessings to believers—should have ratified the new διαθήκη of which he is the author; other διαθήκαι are ratified by the death of their respective testators, and only in this way. And then he goes on to show, that even the ancient covenant, though it could not be called a διαθήκη in all respects so well as the new one, was still ratified in a manner not unlike the new one, viz., by blood, the emblem of death, vs. 18—22. See the proof for the original language of this epistle from the use of διαθήκη here, in Intro.

Φέρων ἐν the sense of intervening, happening, taking place (which seems to be necessarily attached to it here), has, perhaps, no exact parallel either in classic or sacred usage. The old Latin version, and many modern critics, have rendered φέρων ἐν as given above; but Ernesti, Valckenaer, and Kuinoel, deny that this sense can be confirmed by any ancient testimony. Gro¬
tius renders it by the verb expecto; some others by in medium affecti; Kypke, annunciari, indicari; Bretschneider (in Lex.), ferri sermones, i.e., to be announced or shown; Carpzoff and Kuinoel, insequi. But although examples of exact conformity in usage may be wanting in the classics, yet, as it seems to me, there are cases sufficiently near to the sense which I have given to the word, to justify such a translation; e.g., εἴνακας φέρων ἐν means, to happen, turn out, or take place, well or ill; τὰ πράγματα κακῶς φέρεται, and εἴ πράγματα ἐγερήγα τὰ, things happen badly, the husbandry turns out well. Analogue with this is the meaning of τὸ φέρον destiny, τὸ φέρον sors, fortune. Or if one is not satisfied with these analogies, he may adopt the sense of φέρων ἐν in the passive, and render it should be suffered, borne, a common sense of the word; or should be introduced, i.e., be interposed; or be accomplished, i.e., happen or be brought about.

If the reader finds any difficulty in admitting, in ver. 15, the wide separation of ἑπεγείλαν and κληρονομίας, he will now perceive a separation of the same nature, in respect to Ἰαννίνων and διαθήκην, about the relation of which no possible doubt can be rationally entertained. This last word is a participle, Αor. 2. Midd. used as a noun, and means testator.

(17) For a testament is valid, in respect to those who are dead, διαθήκη γὰρ εἰπτε νεκροῖς βεβαια. 'Εἰπτε is not unfrequently employed to denote after, viz., in respect to time; e.g., Acts xi. 19, εἰπτε Σερεών, after the time of Stephen, as Wahl renders it; and so Mark vi. 52, εἰπτε τοῖς ἄροισ, after the loaves, i.e., the miraculous feeding of several thousands with them. But these cases are not altogether clear. In classic authors, however, εἰπτε τοῦτος means, postea; so εἰπτε τυφλὸ τῷ Δανδάμῳ, after Dandamis be-
came blind, Lucian in Tox. See Vigerus, p. 620. Matthiae, § 584. In accordance with this usage, many critics have translated the phrase under consideration thus: a testament is valid after men are dead, or after death. This, no doubt, gives the general sentiment of the passage; but after all, the explanation of ἐπὶ νεκρῶς in this way is somewhat forced, and I prefer that given in the translation, which conveys the like sense. Or the phrase may be construed in this way, viz., ἐπὶ νεκρῶς interventi mortis testatorum. So Kunoel; and this comes in effect to the meaning which I have given of ἐπὶ; which is often employed, when joined with the Dat., in expressing the condition in or under which anything takes place or happens; e.g., ἐπὶ νῆπιος ὡς μωυρίσκον ἐξελθειν, he died whilst or when I was a child. So here: 'a testament is valid when they [the testators] are dead.'

Those who render διαθήκη in vs. 16, 17, by the word covenant, construe νεκρῶς here as applicable to dead sacrifices, i.e., victims slain in order to confirm a covenant. But it is a conclusive objection to this exegesis, that νεκρῶς never means the dead carcase of an animal, but the corpse of a human being.

Since it is of no avail while the testator is living, Ἐπεὶ ... διαθήκης. Μὴ ποτὲ is stronger than the simple negative μὴ; and one might well translate, since it is of no avail at all. Ἀποκρίνει, here first expressed, seems to be implied after διαθήκη in ver. 16. The amount of the comparison in vs. 16, 17, is, as before stated, that as διαθήκας (testaments) among men are ratified by death, so did the death of Christ (which the writer had just mentioned, ver. 15) ratify the new διαθήκη which he made, and give a valid title to the heirs who were to receive the inheritance.

Not a few commentators of distinction have rendered διαθήκη covenant here, as well as in ver. 15; e.g., Pierce, Michaelis, Macknight, Steudel, Scholefield, and others; and Mr. Bloomfield in his recent work, pronounces this opinion probable. My difficulties in admitting it are insuperable; and they may now be very summarily stated. (1) It is yet to be made out, that no covenants were valid, except those made by the intervention of sacrifices. Most clearly these were exhibited only in covenants of a peculiarly solemn and important nature. See Ruth iv. 7; Deut. xxv. 7, 9; Gen. xxiii. 16; xxiv. 9, etc. The proposition is too general here (ὁπον διαθήκη) to admit of limitation merely.

* Several letters from three or four highly esteemed friends, have vindicated the like sense and commended to me a review of this subject. I thank them most sincerely for their suggestions and their kind feelings; and I trust they will see in the remarks now made, that I have investigated anew the whole subject. I trust also that they will be satisfied with my present views, when they have weighed my reasons for them.
to covenants of a special nature. Even in regard to them it remains to be shown that the sacrificial rite, specially in later times, was deemed to be necessary. Where is this seen, in solemn compacts and treaties so often made, as represented in the books of Kings and Chronicles? An oath is the general sanction. (2) Διεργημος and διαθέμενος cannot properly be rendered mediate and mediating sacrifice. They have no such meaning anywhere else. Διαθέμενος must mean either a testator, or else a contractor, i.e., one of two covenenting parties. But where is the death of a person covenanting, made necessary in order to confirm the covenant? (3) Νεκρος means only dead men; but men surely were not sacrificed by the Jews, as a mediating sacrifice in order to confirm a covenant. Of course it is impossible to support the exegesis of Pierce and others, in the way of philological argument.

If it be asked, how the writer could insert γάρ in ver. 16, unless he viewed it as closely connected with ver. 15, and as assigning a ground or reason of the sentiment there stated; my answer is, that there is a connection. Γάρ in ver. 16 introduces a clause, which is to illustrate and confirm what is stated in the preceding verse, viz., that the death of Christ secured redemption for the heirs of salvation. But this illustration is borrowed from a meaning of διαθέμενη different from that which the writer had already given, although equally well authorized, viz., testament. It is as much as if he had said thus: 'The death of Christ makes sure the promise; for (γάρ) if I should make the appeal to διαθέμενη in its other sense, that of testament as well as of covenant, we may say that the death of a testator confirms, instead of invalidating, the favors he designs to bestow. So it is with the death of Christ. Instead of frustrating the purposes of his διαθέμενη, it has fully ratified and established them.'

Verses 16, 17, I take to be a parenthesis, containing a forcible illustration of the efficacy of the death of Christ thrown in εν παρόσφι. Verse 18 I understand as resuming the subject, in the shape in which ver. 15 left it.

(18) Wherefore neither the first [covenant] was ratified without blood, 'Οδεν οἷς . . . ἓνεκαίνωσα. The course of thought, as it stands connected with ver. 15, seems to be this: 'The new covenant of redemption of sin, was sanctioned by the death of Jesus; consequently, or wherefore (Οδε), the old covenant, which was to be a type of the new, was sanctioned by the blood of victims. 'Οδεν wherefore, quare, qua ratione; but the usual meaning is whence, in respect to place. The verb ἓνεκαίνωσα usually means to renew, to consecrate, to dedicate, etc., but here, although the sense of consecrating would answer well, it seems
more appropriate to render it ratified; so Chrysostom, βεβαιά γέγονε; Theophylact, τὴν ἀφίην τῆς σύντασσας καὶ τῆς βεβαιώσεως λαβε; Syriac Version, confirmed. Thus the old covenant, ratified by the effusion and sprinkling of blood was typical of the new, which was ratified and made sure by the blood of Jesus its mediator. It was merely the blood of animals slain, which sanctioned the old and typical covenant; it was Jesus' own blood which sanctioned the new covenant, established upon better promises than the ancient one held out.

(19) For when, according to the law, all the commandment had been recited by Moses to all the people, ἠληθεύσε ὁ πάσης . . . τῷ λαῷ. Γὰρ introduces a confirmation of ver. 18. The πάσης ἐνολή to which reference is here made, means the statutes contained in Ex. xx—xxiii. These Moses first recited memoriter to the people, after they had been communicated to him by the Lord at Sinai, Ex. xxiv. 3. He then wrote them down, Ex. xxiv. 4; and afterwards, on occasion of solemnly renewing the covenant on the part of the people to obedience, he again recited them from the book of the law (ἡ θυσία ἡ προώρια), Ex. xxiv. 7. Κατὰ νόμον may mean here, according to the written law, i.e., just as the ἐνολή was in the book of the law. But νόμον more probably refers to the command received by Moses, to communicate to the people the laws given to him, although this command is not recorded in the Scripture; in which case the meaning would be, that agreeably to the divine command Moses read all the law to the assembled nation.

Taking the blood of bullocks and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book and all the people, Λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα . . . ἐφάντωσε. This passage has occasioned no small perplexity to commentators; inasmuch as Moses, in his history of renewing the covenant of the people in Ex. xxiv., has said nothing of the blood of goats; nothing of the water and scarlet wool and hyssop; nothing of sprinkling the book of the law with blood. Whence, then, did the writer obtain these circumstances? That they were not matters of new revelation to him, seems pretty evident; for he plainly makes an appeal to circumstances, which, he takes it for granted, are well known to the Hebrews whom he addresses, and about which if he were to commit an error of statement, all his readers would be revolted.

1. The blood of goats. In Ex. xxiv. 5, it is said that Moses sent young men who offered burnt offerings (יָסָג), and sacrificed sacrifices, which were peace offerings (שָׂרֵךְ שָׁלָחָה) to Jehovah, even bullocks (בָּעָל). Now, although goats are not mentioned here, yet it is quite possible, that the בָּעָל on this occasion were
goats; for ἔσκα is a holocaust, i. e., an offering entirely consumed by fire; while the ἐσκανοὶ were mostly eaten by the offerers. That goats were used for all kinds of sacrifices, as well as bullocks, is quite evident from mere inspection of the Levitical law.

E. g., goats are named as an ἔσκα, Lev. i. 10; iv. 24, 28, etc., et alibi. It is altogether probable, then, that the holocausts, or ἔσκα, mentioned in Ex. xxiv. 5, as offered on the occasion of renewing the covenant, were goats; and were of course understood by a Jewish reader to be such, inasmuch as the ἔσκα only are affirmed to have been bullocks.

2. The water, scarlet wool, and hyssop. That water was used as well as blood in order to sprinkle various things, is clearly implied in Lev. xiv. 4—7 compared with Lev. xiv. 49—52; Num. xix. 18; Ps. li. 7; Ezek. xxxvi. 25. The scarlet wool (ῥύγχος ῥυγός, scarlet), was connected with a branch of hyssop (ῥύγχος) in order to make a convenient instrument for receiving and sprinkling the blood and water. It is not, indeed, expressly mentioned in Ex. xxiv.; but it is doubtless implied; for this was the common instrument by which the rite of sprinkling was performed. So in Ex. xii. 7, direction is simply given to sprinkle the door posts of the Israelites with blood; and afterwards, in ver. 22, it is mentioned, that this was to be done with a bunch of hyssop. So in Lev. xiv. 4—7, the ῥύγχος ῥυγός (i. e., ῥύγχος κόκκινον) and the hyssop, are mentioned as employed in the office of sprinkling; and again, in Lev. xiv. 49—52. The hyssop is also mentioned in Num. xix. 18; Ps. li. 7. It may well be presumed, that the reason why the writer of our epistle and the Hebrews of his time supposed that Moses made use of the water and hyssop and scarlet wool in the lustration of the people when the covenant was renewed, was because these were employed in the lustrations whenever sprinkling was performed on other occasions. The convenience of the instrument in question, and the nature of the case, would very naturally lead to such an opinion; and who can doubt that it is well grounded?

3. The book of the law. Because nothing is said in Ex. xxiv. 3—8, respecting the sprinkling of the book, many commentators, e. g., Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, Storr, and others, construe αὐτῷ τῇ βιβλίῳ with λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα, i. e., taking the blood . . . and also the book of the law. So far as such a construction of the particle τῇ itself is concerned, this might perhaps be allowed; for τῇ is sometimes employed when it is not preceded by καὶ or δὲ in the clause immediately antecedent, as in Acts ii. 33. To justify the method of interpretation now in question, Storr appeals to Heb. ix. 1 and xii. 2. But in the former case, τῇ is preceded by καὶ; and the latter is a case where two verbs
are connected. But in our verse καὶ follows βεβλίων, and seems necessarily to connect it with πάντα τῶν λαῶν. Now, to say of Moses, λαβὼν . . . πάντα τῶν λαῶν, I suppose will not be contended for. Michaelis, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Ernesti, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others, agree with the interpretation which I have given. Indeed καὶ and τί seem to be as necessarily related here, as et and que are in Latin; and in fact they commonly sustain the same relation to each other. As to manuscripts, only one omits καὶ after βεβλίων; and we are obliged, therefore, by the laws of criticism to retain it, whatever difficulties it may occasion to the interpreter.

In regard to the fact itself, viz., that Moses did sprinkle the book with blood, no intimation of it is given in Ex. xxiv. 3—8. Yet nothing can be more probable than that such was the fact. Aaron and his sons and their garments were sprinkled with blood, when consecrated to the priest’s office, Ex. xxix. 19—21. The blood of sacrifices was sprinkled upon the altar, Ex. xxix. 16; Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 13; also before the vail of the sanctuary; Lev. iv. 6, 17; comp. Lev. vi. 27; vii. 14; viii. 15, 19, 24, 30; ix. 12, 18, et alibi. Philo (de Vita Mosis, p. 675 B.) has a passage which speaks of all the various apparatus of the tabernacle as being anointed with holy oil, and the vestments of the priests being sprinkled with blood. So Josephus, also, speaks of sprinkling the garments of Aaron and his sons with αἵματος τῶν θυσιῶν, the blood of the slain beasts, and with spring water, and holy chrism, Lib. V. 6. 6. p. 334, edit. Havercamp. All this serves to show, how common this rite of sprinkling with blood was in the Jewish ritual; so common, that the writer of our epistle seems, with those whom he addressed, to have considered it a matter of course, that when the people were sprinkled with blood, at the time of renewing their covenant to keep the precepts contained in the book of the law, Ex. xxiv. 8, the book itself, like all the sacred apparatus of the temple, was also sprinkled in like manner. Nothing could be more natural. The people were consecrated to observe the statutes of the book; and the book was consecrated, as containing that sacred code of laws which they were bound to obey.

If however, after all, one is not satisfied that Paul drew his conclusions from the analogies and probabilities just stated, he may easily suppose that tradition among the Jews had preserved the remembrance of the particulars described in our verse, on account of the very solemn and important nature of the transaction with which they are connected. It would be easy to suppose, with some commentators, that these particulars were sug-
gested in a miraculous way by the Holy Spirit to the mind of
the writer. But this solution of the difficulty is not a probable
one; because the writer evidently touches upon circumstances
here, which he takes it for granted his readers will recognize
and admit. If so, then these things must have already been
matters of common opinion among the Hebrews; and conse-
quently they were not now first suggested to the writer of our
epistle in a miraculous way. At all events, there can be no
serious difficulty in this case. The fact that Ex. xxiv. 3—8
does not mention the particulars in question, can be no more
proof that they did not take place, than the fact that the Evan-
gelists have not recorded the words of Christ, "It is more blessed
to give than to receive," would prove that he did not utter them.
Whether Paul and the Hebrews knew these things by tradition,
or believed them from analogical reasoning, cannot be important.
Enough that they were facts, and were appealed to as such by
the writer, with full confidence that they would be recognized by
his readers.

To illustrate the principle de minimis non curat lex, it may be
remarked, that Paul says simply λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα; Moses, that
"he took half of the blood," Ex. xxiv. 6. But surely if he
did the latter, he did the former. Such expressions, whether in
sacred or profane writers, are not to be tortured in order to ex-
tract from them a metaphysical exactness — ne reserenda ad
vivum.

In the like manner I interpret πάντα τὸν λαόν. How, it has
been asked, should he sprinkle three millions of people with the
blood of a few goats and bullocks? In such a way, I would
answer, as "all Judea and Jerusalem went out to John to be
iii. 5, seq. Must we understand by this, that all the infants, the
non compotes mentis, the mutes, the sick, the infirm, the aged,
all females, or literally all adult males, repaired to John in order
to be baptized? And did all (including infants and mutes?) con-
fess their sins to him? If not, then there is no difficulty in con-
struing πάντα τὸν λαόν, in the case now under consideration.
Moses sprinkled blood on the multitude of the people, I take to be
the simple meaning of the writer; not that all and every indi-
vidual was actually and personally sprinkled. Some were
actually sprinkled; and these, being of the multitude, were
representatives of the whole. Nothing is more common than to
attribute to a body of men collectively, what belongs, strictly
considered, only to certain individuals of that body. Thus what
the government of this country do, the Americans are said to do;
and so of all other countries.
(20) **Saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God has enjoined upon you, Δέχων τὸ νῦν τῇ αἵμα, . . . ὁ λαὸς.** Another instance in which the letter of the Old Testament is forsaken, and the sense merely retained. The original in Ex. xxiv. 8, is, γίνεται δέ, ἦν αἷμα τοῦ συναγόμενον, behold the blood of the covenant which God has made with you. But ἤν means see here or see this, and is equivalent to τὸ νῦν used as a demonstrative. The verb ἤν is rendered by the Seventy, διήθετο; by our author ἐντείλατο. The reason of this probably is, that ἤν in Ex. xxiv. 8 means statutes, laws, as it evidently refers to the preceding statutes, in Ex. xx—xxiii., God commanded that the people should observe these; and with reference to this injunction, our author says ἐντείλατο, which is preferable to the διήθετο of the Seventy. Τὸ αἷμα τῆς δικαίωσις means the blood by which the covenant (viz., the assent on the part of the people to the laws proposed, or rather, their promise to observe them, Ex. xxiv. 7) was ratified. So common had it once been among the Hebrews to ratify engagements by the blood of animals slain, that the usual idiom of the language was ἔκρυμ, to cut covenant, i.e., to sanction one by cutting an animal into two pieces, and passing between them; see Gen. xv. 10; xxxi. 54; Jer. xxxiv. 18. Ephrem Syrus testifies that the Chaldeans had the same usage, Opp. I. p. 161; as also Hacourt does, in respect to the Arabians, Histoire de Madagascar, p. 98, 360. The meaning of such a transaction seems evidently to be, that the persons who make the engagements by passing between the dismembered parts of the slain animal, virtually say, 'If we preserve not our engagement faithfully and without violation, then let us be cut in pieces like the animal between whose dismembered parts we now pass.' The sprinkling of blood on the people, Ex. xxiv. 8, was a solemnity of a similar nature. By it they were also ceremonially purified, and consecrated to God.

(21) **The tabernacle, moreover, and all the vessels for service, he sprinkled in like manner with blood, Καὶ τὴν ἑλένθιν . . . ἐκκάλυμμεν.** Καὶ, although a copulative here, still indicates another transaction different from that related in ver. 19; for when the people were sprinkled with blood, the tabernacle was not built, neither were the σκυῖα λειτουργίας yet made. The setting up and consecration of the tabernacle, with its vessels, is related in Ex. xl.; yet nothing is there related of sprinkling them with blood, but only of anointing them with holy oil, Ex. xl. 9—11. In like manner, the anointing only of Aaron and his sons is there spoken of, as a rite preparatory to entering upon the duties of their office in the tabernacle, Ex. xl. 12—15; while nothing is said at all of their being sprinkled with blood. But if we
compare Ex. xxi. 20, 21 and Lev. viii. 24, 30, we shall see it to be certain, that Aaron and his sons were sprinkled with blood, as well as anointed with oil. In like manner it is probable, that the tabernacle and its furniture were sprinkled with blood, although Moses has not mentioned it in Ex. xl. Josephus says, "Both the tabernacle and the vessels pertaining to it [Moses sprinkled and purified] with oil prepared as I have described, and of the blood of bulls and rams that were slain, one of each kind alternately, every day," Antiq. III. 8. § 6. This seems to indicate, that Josephus had the same view as Paul, in regard to purifying the tabernacle. The verbs in brackets, in the above translation, are drawn from the preceding clause, where we find ἐφάνεται ἐφαγγέλως, purifying he sprinkled. They belong to the sentence translated, by implication. Nothing more is necessary than the supposition that the tradition had conveyed the knowledge of this, as well as of many other facts, down to the time of Paul. The writer evidently appeals to facts, which were believed by the Hebrews in general whom he was addressing; and facts which, although not stated in the Old Testament, are by no means improbable, and which no one surely has it in his power to contradict.

(22) Indeed, according to the law, almost everything is purified by blood, Kai σφέδον εὶ αἵματι . . . νόμον. Kai, imo, vero, yea, indeed. Σφέδον πάντα, and not πάντα absolutely and simply; for some things were purified by water, Lev. xiv. 26, 28; Num. xxxii. 34; some by fire and water, Num. xxxi. 22, 23. But the exceptions were few, in which shedding of blood or sprinkling of blood was not required, in order to effect ceremonial purity; see on ver. 19.

And without shedding of blood, there is no remission [of sins], Kai ἡμείς αἵματες κυρίως οὐ γίνεται ἀφείας. See Lev. iv. 2—6, 13—17, 22—25, 27—30, and 31, 35. Under the Mosaic law, not every transgression could be atoned for; consequently, remission of the penalty which the law inflicted could not, in some cases, be obtained. See Num. xv. 30, 31. It was only he that sinned through a degree of ignorance or inadvertency, who could bring his sin and trespass-offering, Num. xv. 27, 29; for cases of a different nature, comp. Lev. iv. 2, 13, 22, 27. The ἁμαρτία and τιμία, sin and trespass, were atoned for in a civil and ecclesiastical point of view, by appropriate sacrifices which bore the like names. But in this case, the remission was only from a temporal penalty or calamity. It was not possible that such sacrifices could atone for sin, as viewed by the righteous Governor of the world. Such the nature of the case seems plainly to be; and so the writer of our epistle has expressly declared, in
chap. x. 4. God, as the king and head of the Jewish nation, granted remission of the penalty which the Jewish law inflicted in many cases, on certain conditions. But this had respect merely to the present world, and not to the accountability of transgressors before the tribunal of the universe in the world above. Even temporal forgiveness, however, could not be obtained χωρὶς αἰματεύχωρίας. It was thus that the νυσίδειματα shadowed forth, to the ancient church, the necessity of atoning blood which possessed a higher virtue than that of beasts, in order to remove the penalty against sin that was threatened in respect to a future world. So the writer proceeds to tell us, in the next verse.

(23) Since then the images of heavenly things must needs be purified by such [rites], the heavenly things themselves [must be purified] by better sacrifices than these; Ἀνάγκη ὑπὸ . . . ταύτας. Μέν is here the mere sign of protasis. Νυσίδειματα, copies, effigies, images, resemblances, likenesses; meaning the tabernacle and temple, with all their sacred utensils, etc., see on viii. 5. Τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπαροις means the spiritual objects of the heavenly world, of which the tabernacle with all its apparatus and services was only a symbol; see on viii. 5. Τούτως designates such things, i.e. such rites and means of purification, as had been described in the preceding context. ἦλειας χειροποιητώς refers to the ceremonial purification of the temple and its sacred utensils; e.g., of the most holy place, Lev. xvi. 15, 16; of the altar, Lev. xvi. 18; Ex. xxix. 36, 37; of the tabernacle, Lev. xvi. 33, 20. This was to be done, because the Israelites, sinful and impure, profaned these sacred things by their approach, Lev. xvi. 19; xv. 31; Num. xix. 19, 20. And this being done, God vouchsafed his presence in the tabernacle, and promised to dwell among the Israelites, Ex. xxix. 43—46. All this was symbolical of the heavenly sanctuary and sacrifice. God permits sinners to hope for pardon and to approach him, only when they are sprinkled with the atoning blood of Jesus; and what was done on earth as a symbol, has been done in the heavenly world in reality, i.e., so as actually to procure spiritual pardon and restoration to the divine favor.

In the phrase ἀπερίπτωτα δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια . . . ταύτας, δὲ, but, marks the apodosis. Ἐπουράνια means the σκυή Ἀλλήλων, ἦν ἐπίθεν ὃ κύριος, viii. 2, i. q., ἡ σκήνη ὑπὸ χειροποιητώς, ix. 11. But how could the heavenly tabernacle καθαρίζωσθαι, be purified? The grammatical construction of ver. 23 certainly requires us to supply this verb in the latter clause, since it is expressed in the former. But the word, of course, can be here used only in a figurative manner; for the ἐπουράνια are not in reality impure.
But as God was accessible to offenders in his sanctuary on earth only when atoning blood had been offered, so God in his heavenly sanctuary is accessible to sinners only through the blood of Jesus there offered, and there consecrating a new and living way of access to the throne of mercy. It is in this sense that the writer means to apply καθαρίζεσθαι, viz., that of rendering the sanctuary approachable by offenders, and affording assurance of liberty to draw near to God (iv. 16), rather than that of direct purification from uncleanness; which could not be predicated of the heavenly sanctuary. It is the effect of the purifying blood of Jesus in regard to giving access to the heavenly sanctuary, which the writer means to compare with the purification of the tabernacle and its utensils; for the most holy place of the earthly tabernacle could be properly approached by offenders, only when atonement was made.

(24) That better sacrifices than those offered on earth by the Jewish priests, were required under the priesthood of Christ, necessarily results from the nature of the sanctuary in which Christ ministers. For Christ entered not into a sanctuary made by hands, which is only a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, Οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποιητὰ ἄγα . . . σφαένων. It is the entrance of Christ, as a priest, into the heavenly sanctuary, of which the writer is here speaking. That Christ performs the office of priest in the heavenly sanctuary, the writer has already intimated several times; see ix. 9, 11; viii. 1—4. Ἀντίτυπον means that which is real, i.e., the original or heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly one is a mere copy. In other words, they stand related as substance and shadow or image. The reality is in heaven; the emblem or mere similitude of it on earth.

Thenceforth to appear before God in our behalf, Νῦν ἐμφανισθέναι . . . ἡμῶν. Ἕνω means, from the point of time when he entered heaven as our high priest, onward indefinitely; and it implies that his office was continued while the writer was then addressing his readers. Ἐμφανισθέναι means, among other things, to present one’s self before a tribunal, for the sake of accusing or defending. In the former case, it is followed by κατα, e.g., Acts xxiv. 1; xxv. 2, 15; in the latter, it takes ὑπὲρ after it, as in our text. The usual and full grammatical construction would be ὑπὲρ ἐμφανισθέναι. I have been able to find no similar usage of ἐμφανίζω among the Greeks.

The phrase Τῷ προσόπῳ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, = בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל, is altogether Hebraistic. The whole comparison is taken from the custom of
the Jewish high priest, who, when he entered the most holy place, was said to appear before God, or to draw near to God, because the presence of God was manifested over the mercy-seat, in the holy of holies, and God was represented, and was conceived of by the Jews, as sitting enthroned upon the mercy-seat. Now as the high priest appeared before God, in the Jewish temple, and offered the blood of beasts for expiation on the great day of atonement, in behalf of the Jewish nation; so Christ, in the heavenly temple, enters the most holy place with his own blood (ver. 12), to procure pardon (ἀλλοτρωσα) for us. This is what the writer means, by ἐμφανιζέναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

(25) But although there is a similitude between the atoning office of Christ and that of the Jewish high priest, yet there is a great difference, in some respects, between his manner of offering expiatory sacrifice and that of the Levitical priesthood. Yet not that he may frequently repeat the offering of himself, like the high priest, who every year enters into the sanctuary with blood not his own, Οὐδὲν ἐνα πολλάκις... ἀλλοτρίῳ. This refers to the entrance of the high priest into the sanctuary, on the great day of atonement. Ἔν αἰματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, with the blood of others, i. e., with blood not his own; in distinction from the manner in which Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary, which was with his own blood, ver. 12. Two points of difference, then, are here suggested, between the Jewish offerings and that of Christ; the one, that they were often repeated, while his was made but once; the other, that the high priest presented the blood of goats and bullocks, but Jesus his own blood. For the sense of ἐν here, see Bretsch. Lex. ἐν, 6, h.

(26) For then he must needs have often suffered since the world began, Ἐπεὶ δὲ... κόσμῳ. That is, since the blood of Christ is necessary to make atonement for sin, and to procure pardon for it from the righteous and spiritual Judge of men; and since the blessings procured by the death of Jesus, must inure as well to the benefit of the ages which preceded his coming, as to those which follow it (see ver. 15, and Rom. iii. 25, 26); it follows, that if his sacrifice had not been of a different nature and value from that of the Jewish priests, it must have been continually repeated, from the very beginning of the world down to the time in which the writer was addressing his readers. We may of course add, that it must have continued to be repeated down to the end of the world, for the same reason. This passage serves then to show, that when Heb. ix. 15 and Rom. iii. 25, 26 are construed as having relation to the retrospective influence of the death of Christ, no doctrine foreign to the con-
ceptions of our author is introduced; for the verse under consideration is plainly built upon the ground of such a retrospective influence.

*But now, at the close of the [Jewish] dispensation, he has once for all made his appearance, in order to remove the punishment due to sin by the sacrifice of himself, Νῦν δὲ ἀπέ... σεπανωτα. Νῦν does not relate particularly to time here, but is a particle of opposition, in contradistinction to ἐκεῖ. Συντελέσα τῶν αἰώνων, the close of the Mosaic economy or period. Αἰῶν singular and αἰῶνες plural, appear to be sometimes used in the same sense in the New Testament, like ὀφρανσ, ὀφρανοι, σάββατον and σάββατα, and some other nouns; see on i. 2. For the meaning given to αἰῶν see Wahl's Lex. on the word.

The noun Ἀφέσις signifies putting away, removal, abrogation, annulling, etc. Ἀφαίρεσις I understand here, as meaning the penalty due to sin; just as the Hebrew ṭūס means sin, and the punishment or consequences of sin; and ἁμαρτία means iniquity, and the punishment, i.e., consequences of iniquity. It is true, indeed, that Christ came to save men from the power as well as the penalty of sin; but most evidently his death is here considered, by our author, as an expiatory sacrifice by virtue of which the consequences of sin, i.e., the punishment due to it, are removed, and the sinner treated as though he were innocent. For the meaning of Διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ, comp. i. 3; ii. 14; vii. 27; ix. 12, 14, 15; x. 5—10.

The whole comparison stands thus: 'As the expiatory sacrifices under the law, which were annually offered, and therefore often repeated, procured remission of the temporal punishment due to offences under the Mosaic dispensation; so the sacrifice of Christ, and the blood which he presents, once for all, in the eternal or heavenly sanctuary, is effectual to procure spiritual pardon for all times and ages, past and to come.' Nothing could exhibit the great superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of the Jewish, in a more striking point of light than this. The latter, by its offerings and atonements, procured only a remission of temporal punishment in the present world; the former, a remission αἰωνίων κολάσεως (Matt. xxv. 46) in the world to come.

(27) For since it is appointed unto men to die once only, and after this [cometh] the judgment, Καὶ καὶ ὁ θάνατος... καὶ εἰρήνη. Καὶ ὁ θάνατος is sometimes equivalent to καθώς, since, as, in this epistle; e.g., viii. 20, comp. ver. 22; and here it is plainly the same as ὁ θάνατος. Απόκειται, repositum est, it is laid up for, i.e., by divine appointment, it is reserved, or it awaits men, once to die. The translation gives the meaning, but not with literal exactness. ἀπαξ is here, once for all, only once; for the object
of this comparison is to show that as men die but once, so Christ, who had a nature truly human, and was in all things made like unto his brethren (ii. 17), could die but once (and not oftentimes) in order to atone for sin.

Metà δὲ τούτοις κρίσεις, i. e., men, having once died, go after that to a state of reward or punishment, to a final state in which no more such changes as death makes, can be suffered. The clause in question is added to the former part of the verse, in order to show that dying more than once is impossible, inasmuch as judgment immediately follows, with which is connected the immutable state of men. The implication contained in this verse (viz., that a state of trial is not to be expected in a future world, like to that which is allowed to men in the present world) seems to be plain.

(28) So Christ, also, after having once for all offered up himself in order to bear the sins of many, ὅσως καὶ ὁ Χριστός . . . ἀμαρίας. The writer had been laboring, in the preceding context, to show that the offering of Christ needed not, like that of the high priest, to be often repeated. Vs. 27 and 28 are designed to show that a repetition of the death of Jesus (who suffered in our nature) would have been inconsistent with the nature which he sustained, and contrary to all analogy. So the author: 'Since men die but once, so Christ died or was offered up (προσευχεῖσι) but once.'

The 1 Aor. passive Part. Προσευχεῖσι, may be rendered offered up himself, or made an offering of himself, inasmuch as the 1 Aor. pass. frequently has a middle or reflexive sense, particularly when any verb lacks the 1 Aor. of the middle voice, Buttmann's Gramm. § 135. N. 1. Προσευχέον is a very general word in respect to offerings, and designates the action of the person who brings the sacrifice, or of the priest who presents it. As the sacrifice offered to God was first slain, and then presented; so the idea of an offering here necessarily involves the idea of the death of the victim offered. It is this implied idea of the death of the victim, that stands in comparison with the ἄναξ ἀμαρία of all men; i. e., as they die but once, so Christ died but once.

Many, Πάλλων, i. e., all nations without distinction, Jews and Gentiles, for ages past and ages to come, vs. 15, 26 and Rom. iii. 25, 26. See the like representation, respecting the universality of the benefits offered through the death of Christ, in Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28; Rom. v. 15, 19 comp. ver. 18; John vi. 51; iii. 16; 1 John ii. 2, etc.

To bear the sins, 'Ἀναστέφτων ἀμαρίας, means to bear the punishment, i. e., to suffer the penalty, due to sin. See Excursus XIX.
Shall make his appearance a second time without a sin-offering, for the salvation of those who wait for him, Ἐκ δευτέρου . . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν. Ἐκ δευτέρου has reference to ἀπαξ in the preceding clause. Christ appeared and died once for sin; but when he appears again, Ἐκ δευτέρου, it will not be to repeat his sufferings, i. e., to make again expiatory sacrifice, but for the purposes of bestowing rewards on those who trust in him and wait for his coming.

It is evident that the expression Χωρίς ἀμαρτίας has a direct reference to the preceding clause, i. e., either to προσευχής or to ἀνεύχεσθαι ἀμαρτίας. In the former case, ἀμαρτίας, in our clause, would mean sin-offering, like ἡμῖν, ἡμῖν, because προσευχής means he made himself an offering. The meaning would then be, 'but when Christ again appears, he will not make himself a sin-offering, i. e., his appearance will be χωρίς ἀμαρτίας.' So I understand the phrase. But if we construe χωρίς ἀμαρτίας, as referring to ἀνεύχεσθαι ἀμαρτίας, then the supplement to the phrase will be χωρίς τοῦ ἀνεύχεσθαι ἀμαρτίας. The meaning of this is, 'Without again suffering the penalty due to sin.' In either way the sense amounts to about the same; for either method of interpretation makes the writer say, that Christ would no more suffer on account of the sins of men, but that, by dying once he has perfectly accomplished the redemption of those who trust in him.

Those who wait for him, Τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀπεκδεχομένοις, means, those who, renouncing the world and resisting all the motives to swerve from Christian hope and faith which the times presented, patiently wait for the rewards which the Saviour will finally bestow upon his followers. There is a tacit admonition to the Hebrews in this; for it is as much as to say, 'Those only who do thus persevere, will be rewarded.' Εἰς σωτηρίαν has reference to the future salvation or blessedness which Christ will bestow upon his followers, at his second coming.

CHAP. X

The insufficiency of the Levitical sacrifices, in the efficacy of which the Jews put so much confidence, to procure spiritual pardon for sin, and the sufficiency of the sacrifice which Christ had offered, was one of the most important and interesting of all the points which the writer of our epistle had to discuss. Every person, who is conscious of sin, and knows that it subjects him to the penalty of the divine law, must naturally feel a deeper interest in the question, whether and how sin can be pardoned than in any other. The Jews, who had been educated in the full belief of the efficacy of the sacrifices instituted by Moses, clung to them as the foundation of their dearest and highest hopes, viz., the means of pardon and restoration to divine favor. This attachment to the Jewish ritual, naturally en-
dangered their adherence to a Christian profession. The pomp and solemnity of their rites also served to interest the feelings and delight the fancy of the worshippers. It is on these accounts that our author is so urgent in showing that real pardon with God could not be procured by any or all of these means. The blood of Christ only comeses from sin, and procures acceptance for sinners with God as their spiritual judge.

Accordingly, in Chap. IX., he declares that the tabernacle with all its sacred utensils and services, was only an image or symbol (παραβολή) of what is real and spiritual in the heavenly world, a copy merely of the σκηνή ὑπὸ χαιρετισμοῦ, ix. 9–11, or a mere ὑπόκουλον τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ix. 23. The Jewish sacrifices availed for nothing more than external purification, ix. 10, 18; while the blood of Christ purified the soul or mind (συνείδησις) from the uncleanness of sin, and rendered it capable of offering acceptable service to the living God, ix. 14. After adding various considerations to show how extensively the rites of the law, which required the exhibition and application of blood, prefigured that atoning blood which Jesus offered to make expiation for sin, and that his death, once for all, was sufficient for this purpose, he proceeds in Chap. X. more deeply to impress the great subject of atoning sacrifice by Christ upon the minds of his readers, knowing that very much depended on the conviction which might be attained in respect to this point. Could they be persuaded that Jesus had himself offered the only sacrifice which made real expiation for sin; and that this, once offered was an all-sufficient sacrifice; then there could be no rational inducement for them to abandon their spiritual hopes, and return to their confidence in the rites of the Levitical law.

The repetition of this subject, is for the purpose of suggesting some new arguments in order to enforce it; as may be seen in vs. 5–18.

(1) Moreover the law, which presented only an imperfect sketch of good things to come, and not a full representation of those things, Σκηνὰ γὰρ ἔχων . . . παραβολάς. The γὰρ here introduces a sentiment which serves to illustrate and confirm the preceding verse.

The reasoning stands thus: 'The death of Christ, once for all, is adequate forever to secure the pardon of sin [this must be so]; for the law with all its sacrifices could never accomplish this end. Σκῆνα and ἔχων are related, as the Latin umbra and effigies are. When contrasted, as here, the former designates an imperfect sketch, a mere outline (as we say), a slight representation or resemblance; the latter is a picture or image filled out or completed, and made in all its minute parts to resemble the original. The meaning of the writer is: 'The law did not even go so far as to exhibit a full image of future blessings, but only a slight adumbration. Ἐχων, having, affording, or (ad sensum) exhibiting, presenting, being (which gives the same sense), so as to accord with the nature of the image that follows. Νόμος here means the sacrificial ritual law of which he had before been speaking, the old νόμος (διανόησιν) which was to be abolished. The whole law of Moses, i. e., the moral code which it contains, is not the subject of consideration or assertion here. Μελλόνων ἄγαθων, the same as in ix. 11. Τῶν παραβολάς, i. e., τούτων, viz., the future blessings just before mentioned.

By the yearly sacrifices themselves which are continually offered, can never fully accomplish what is needed for those who approach [the altar], Καὶ ἐννυρῶν . . . τελείωσαι. By καὶ ἐννυρῶν φωτίας, the writer means particularly to designate those
which were offered on the great day of national atonement; which were considered the most sacred and efficacious of all, inasmuch as the high priest then entered the inner sanctuary and presented himself before the mercy-seat. Προσφέρων, with a Nom. not expressed, is equivalent to the passive voice here (as often elsewhere), agreeably to the Hebrew idiom.

Without cessation, continually, Ἐις τὸ δυναστεύειν, i. e., they were repeated each successive year. The word is peculiar to this epistle, so far as the New Testament is concerned, and Schneider has omitted it in his lexicon; but Elian, Appian, Diodorus Siculus and Symmachus, employ it. Τῶν προσφερομένων means the worshippers who approach the altar, or the temple, or the divine presence in the temple. The sense is for substance the same, whichever of these be understood. For τελευτᾷ see on Heb. ix. 9 and vii. 11. The sentiment of the verse corresponds very exactly with that in ix. 9, 10.

(2) For otherwise, i. e., if the sacrifices could have perfected those who presented them, would not the offerings have ceased, Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν ἑπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι. To προσφερόμεναι most critics subjoin εἶναι understood (which would be equivalent to the Inf. προσφέρεσθαι), and then they render the phrase thus: They (i. e., the sacrifices) had ceased to be offered. The sense of the phrase thus explained, is the same that I have given to it. But προσφερόμεναι [Ἰονίᾳ.] ἑπαύσαντο seems to me more facile than the other construction.

Because the worshippers once for all made clean, would have no longer been conscious of sins, Διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν . . . κακαθάρισμα. Αἰρωνιῶν designates those who brought the offerings or sacrifices and on whose account they were presented to God, i. e., the worshippers. Ἀπαξ denotes here, as in the preceding chapter, once for all; the nature of the argument demanding this sense. For if a worshipper at one time obtained pardon, or was made clean only in respect to past offences (and surely expiatory sacrifices were offered only with respect to the past), this would not prevent the dread of punishment at a future period, when new offences would have been committed. To be purified once for all then was necessary, in order to quiet the apprehensions of such a worshipper. Κακαθαρίσμα, purified, atoned for, i. e., those for whom expiation is made, those declared to be pure, or rendered pure; from κακαθάρισμα, which means, in Hebrew Greek, to make expiation for, to purify by expiatory offering, to pronounce or declare one to be pure.

Συνείδησις means not merely conscience, but consciousness, opinion, judgment, sentiment, apprehension. Σύνειδησις ἀμαρτίων is an apprehension of the consequences of sin, or a consciousness.
that one has subjected himself to them, a consciousness of guilt. ἀμαρτίων may mean here (as often before), punishment of sin, consequences of sin, like the corresponding Hebrew רLastError תפס, רפס; or it may mean sin, guilt, transgression. The writer, however, does not mean to say that the pardon of sin takes away, from him who obtains it, the consciousness that he has once been the subject of moral turpitude. This the blood of Christ does not effect; and in heaven, the consciousness of this will forever raise high the notes of gratitude for redeeming mercy. But pardon may and does remove the apprehension of suffering the penalty due to sin; or if by ἀμαρτίων we understand sin, guilt simply, then to be made clean (κεκαθαρμένον) from this so as to have no consciousness of it, is so to be purified as not to contract the stain of it, i. e., to be made holy.

(3) Nay, rather, by these [sacrifices] yearly remembrance of sins is made, 'Αλλ' ἐν αἵρεσι . . . ἐναρέων. 'Αλλά, but rather, nay rather, quin, quinimo; or (as I have rendered it in the version) on the contrary, but. Αἵρεσι agrees with Ἰούδας implied; see in vcr. 1. On the day of annual atonement, the sacrifices that were offered were of an expiatory nature, and being designed as propitiatory offerings, they were of course adapted to remind the Hebrews of the desert of sin, i. e., of the punishment or penalty due to it. As they continued to be offered yearly, so those who brought them must be reminded, through their whole lives, of new desert of punishment. The writer means, however, that a yearly remembrance of sin in a spiritual, not merely in a civil or ecclesiastical respect, was made; for in this latter sense, the yearly atonement procured pardon. In the other it did not; as he now proceeds to assert.

(4) For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should remove the penalty due to sin, 'Ἁδυνατον γὰρ . . . ἀμαρτίας. Γὰρ confirmantis, i. e., what follows assigns a reason or ground of the assertion which precedes. Ἀφαρεῖν ἀμαρτίας means to take away sin, in the sense of removing the penalty or consequences of sin; for this is the subject of which the writer is now treating. That the author has reference to the consequences of sin in a future world, or to the punishment of it which God inflicts as the spiritual judge of men, is evident from the whole tenor of his discussion. One so profoundly versed as he was in all the Jewish ritual law, surely was not ignorant of the fact, that civil and ecclesiastical pardon for offences of various kinds was every day procured by the blood of bulls and goats, and this, too, agreeably to divine appointment.

(5) Nothing could be more directly in opposition to Jewish prejudices respecting the importance and value of the Levitical
sacrifices, than the assertion just made. Hence the writer deems it prudent to make his appeal to the Scriptures, for confirmation of what he had advanced. This he does by quoting a passage from Ps. xli., which he applies to the Messiah and to the efficacy of the sin-offering made by him.

Wherefore, entering into the world, he [Christ] says, Δω εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, λέγει; i. e., because the blood of goats and bullocks is not efficacious in procuring pardon for sin, Chr. i., when entering into the world, is represented by the Psalmist as saying, etc.; see Ps. xli. 7, seq. In sacrifice and oblation thou hast no pleasure, Ὑποίαν καὶ προσφοράν ὅν κηλίδος. Ὑποία means a sacrifice of some slain beast, from ὑπάλλελος, to kill. So the corresponding Hebrew נִזְבָּהָה from נִזְבָּה, to sacrifice, is any thing offered or presented; and here it means, other oblations than those of sacrifices, such as thank-offerings, libations, etc. The corresponding Hebrew נְצוֹר, gift, present, comes from the obsolete root נָצַר, to present, Arabic جَنا, the same. ὅν κηλίδος, Hebrew נִזְבָּהָה, is capable of being translated, thou hast not required, or thou hast not desired, thou hast no pleasure in or desire for. The latter is, doubtless, the shade of meaning here. The sentiment is not that God had not at all required sacrifices and oblations, for this he had done; but that they were in a comparative sense of little value; they were insufficient in themselves to accomplish the higher purposes of his spiritual law, and therefore he had no pleasure in them.

But a body hast thou prepared for me, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ καρπίσω μου. A very difficult and much agitated expression. If we recur, in the first place, to the Hebrew in Ps. xli. 7, we find the corresponding words there to be, דָּבָר עֲנָשׁ, mine ears hast thou opened. The verb נָעָשׁ (from נָעָשׁ) means primarily, to dig, to hollow out, e. g., a well, Gen. xxvi. 25; a pit, Ps. vii. 16; or pitfall, Ps. lvi. 7; a sepulchre or grave, Gen. i. 5; 2 Chron. xvi. 14. The verb נָעָשׁ has also the meaning of purchasing or procuring, e. g., water, Deut. ii. 6; particularly of procuring a supply of food and drink, 2 K. vi. 23; also of other things, e. g., a wife, Hosea iii. 2, where נָעָשׁ has a Dagesh euphonic in the ע. These are all the meanings of this word which the Hebrew Scriptures present. In translating יָעָשׁ בִּנְכָר יְדֵי, then, we may render it either mine ears hast thou opened, which is only a small deflection from the literal sense (for to dig out a pit or well, is to open one); or we may render it ears hast thou provided for me, in which sense the Seventy seem plainly to have understood נָעָשׁ, when they rendered it by καρπίσω. The former sense seems to be more analogical with the nature of the subject,
with the Hebrew idiom. The Hebrews speak of opening the ears, or of uncovering them, in order to designate the idea of prompt obedience, of attentive listening to the commands of any one. E. g., Is. 1. 4, we have הֵעָפֵת אֲשֶׁר לִבְּךָ, he excited my ear to hear; and in ver. 5 is an equivalent expression יַעַנְתָּה יְבֹחֶן, he opened mine ear, which is explained in the corresponding parallelism by יֶבֶה יִצְחָק, and I was not refractory, i. e., I was obedient. It is true, that יִתְעַנֵּה means to uncover or disclose the ear, i. e., to communicate anything, or reveal it to another; e. g., I Sam. xx. 12, 13; xxii. 17. But that יִהְבַּנֵּה (in Ps. xl. 7) lit. thou hast opened mine ears, may mean thou hast made me obedient, or I am entirely obedient to thy service, seems to be sufficiently confirmed by Job xxxvi. 10, 15, and by vs. 8, 9 of Ps. xl., which follow the expression quoted in Heb. x. 5, and serve as a comment upon it.

Many critics render the clause mine ears hast thou bored through, and suppose the expression to be figurative, and to be borrowed from the Hebrew usage of boring through, with an awl, the ear of a person who became the voluntary servant of another; as described in Ex. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17. The phrase would then mean, 'I am through life thy voluntary servant,' or 'I will be perpetually obedient to thee.' This sense, it will be seen, agrees in general with that put upon the phrase by the other mode of explanation. But the source of explanation here adopted, does not seem to be admissible. In Ex. xxi. 6, the verb bore through is יָסָרֵב (not יָסָר as in Ps. xl. 7), and the instrument by which it is done is named יָסָרֵב, an awl, a derivative of the verb עָסָר. So in Deut. xv. 17, the instrument named is the same יָסָרֵב, and the action of boring through is expressed by יָסָר הָרָעָה, thou shalt put it through his ear (not נָסָר). That יָסָר and יָסָר indicate very distinct actions, is sufficiently plain; for to bore through anything, and to dig or hollow out a pit, grave, or well, are surely very different actions, indicated in Hebrew by verbs as different as the English dig and bore through. Moreover, in Ex. xxi. 6 and Deut. xv. 17 the singular יָסָר is used, and not as here יָסָרֵב, both ears.

The original, then, in Ps. xl. 2, יִהְבַּנֵּה יָסָרֵב, means mine ears hast thou opened, i. e., me hast thou made readily or attentively obedient; at least this seems to be the meaning, if we make Is. 1. 4, 5 and other places cited above, our exegetical guide. See Excursus XX.

(6) In whole burnt-offerings and [sacrifices] for sin thou hast no delight, 'Ολοκαυτώματα και . . . εὔκολησας. 'Ολοκαυτώματα means, such offerings as were entirely consumed upon the altar; so the corresponding Hebrew יָכְטֵב signifies. Πεπλήρωμα is
an elliptical expression, answering to the Hebrew original מזון, and which completed would be, חוּלָה פֵּרִי עָמַרְיוּס, sin-offerings. Ὅντε εὐδοκήσας, Heb. וַיָּשֶׂם יְה, requirest not, desirest not, demandest not, hast no pleasure in.

(7) Therefore I said, or then I said, Τότε εἴηνος. The first of these versions is approved by eminent critics. They suggest, that if τότε (Heb. וַיָּשֶׂם) be referred to time merely, it seems very difficult to ascertain what is the precise meaning; for at what particular time was it, that God did not delight in whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin? Gesenius renders וַיָּשֶׂם by ἀπροτερεα in Ps. xl. 8; Jer. xxii. 15. It may, however, be said, that the speaker here refers to the time when he is disclosing these views respecting sacrifices; or, with still more probability, the time referred to in the preceding context of Ps. xl. which relates the wonderful works of God. Supposing either to be the case, τότε would mean then, i. e., immediately after this sentiment was declared, or after the time of deliverance specified in the context. If τότε be rendered therefore, the meaning will be, 'because thou hast no pleasure in sacrifices, therefore I said,' etc. Strictly speaking, however, τότε is not illative. I prefer the other rendering.

Lo, I come, O God! to do thy will; in the volume of the book it is written respecting me, ἵδεν ηἰκω... ἡλιψά σου. ἵδεν ηἰκω expresses the readiness of him who speaks to obey the will of God. Εὖ κεφάλῳ βιβλίου is a much agitated expression. The Hebrew is simply בִּיבֹל, in the roll or volume of the book. But how does κεφαλῇ βιβλίου correspond to this? Κεφαλῆς denotes the end or extremity of anything, as being the head or summit of it. The Heb. בִּיבֹל, βιβλίου, was a manuscript rolled upon a cylinder of light wood, at the extremity of which were heads or knots, for the sake of convenience to those who used the manuscript. The knot or head, κεφαλῆς, is here taken as a part which is descriptive or emblematic of the whole. Κεφαλῆς βιβλίου means therefore, a βιβλίου or בִּיבֹל with a κεφαλῆς, i. e., a manuscript roll; which was the form of the Jewish sacred books, and is still retained in all their synagogues. It coincides, then, in regard to signification, very exactly with the Heb. בָּשֶׂם רִבְּרוֹ, of which it is a translation.

The volume of manuscript-roll here meant, is plainly the one which was already extant when the Psalmist was writing. If the Psalmist was David himself (as the title of the Psalm seems to affirm), the only parts of the Hebrew Scriptures then extant, and of course the only part to which he could refer, must have been the Pentateuch, and perhaps the book of Joshua. Beyond any reasonable doubt, then, the κεφαλῆς βιβλίου (בָּשֶׂם רִבְּרוֹ) was the Pentateuch.
But what is there written, and how, respecting the personage who speaks in the 40th Psalm? Rosenmüller (on Ps. xli. 7) translates the Hebrew יֶלֶדֶת בַּשָּׁר (γεγραμμένον προς τοῦ) by prescriptum est mihi, and appeals to 2 K. xxii. 13 for confirmation of this version. He compares also Gen. ii. 16, Ezra i. 2, where בָּשׁ is used after בִּשְׂרָה, verbs of commanding or enjoining. Gesenius approves this version, but produces no other instances to conform it which are of the same kind. He appeals, indeed, to Est. ix. 33, where בָּשׁ is used after בָּשׁ יָד; and to Hos. viii. 12; 2 K. xvii. 37, and Prov. xxii. 20, where בָּשׁ is used after the same verb, in order to confirm this interpretation. But the three last cases plainly denote nothing more than that the matter referred to was written for the use of another, or addressed to him. Such, too, is the case with the other example in Est. ix. 23; as may be clearly seen by comparing Est. ix. 20. With deference to the opinion of these very distinguished critics, I must still doubt, therefore, whether בָּשׁ יָד means prae Scribatur alicui. At most, there is only 2 K. xxii. 13, which is apposite to establish this signification; and even here the meaning in question is not necessary; for מַעֲשֶׂה יָדָהְיָרָם may be rendered with about equal significance, which was written in respect to us, or concerning us, i.e., for our sake or to regulate our duties. The Seventy, then, who translated יֶלֶדֶת בַּשָּׁר by γέγραμμεν προς τοῦ, translated it agreeably to the usual idiom of the Hebrew. The apostle, in our text, has evidently recognized the correctness of this version. The difference in meaning between prescribed to me and written concerning me, is a considerable one in this case. The first version would represent the speaker as saying: "I come, O God, to do thy will [i.e., my duty], as I am commanded in the Scriptures to do." The second: "I come to offer my body or myself in place of the legal sacrifices, for in the Scriptures (i.e., in the law of Moses) this is written concerning me." Now, as to a choice of versions here, it will not be doubted that the latter version accords with the reasoning and design of the apostle, or rather, that it is important to his purpose. The first version would not, indeed, contradict the design of the apostle; for he might say, It is prescribed in the Scriptures that the Messiah should do the will of God, i.e., make himself an offering for sin. Comp. Luke xxiv. 25—27, 46; Acts xvii. 2, 3; 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. But I apprehend the meaning of the writer to be, that the book of the law which prescribes sacrifices that were merely σκαί or παράβολαι of the great atoning sacrifice by Christ, did itself teach, by the use of these, that something of a higher and better nature was to be looked for than the Levitical rites. In a word, it pointed to the Messiah; i.e., some of the
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contents of the written law had respect to him. So Michaelis, Storr, and others. Still, γερανται περι ἐμοῦ may have respect to declarations, in the Pentateuch, of a different and more direct nature. That there are such, Jesus himself affirms, John v. 46. So Paul. Acts xxvi. 22, 23; Gal. ii. 16 seq. Constrained in either way, the amount of the phrase under consideration is this: 'In the law of Moses I am described as coming to do thy will,' i. e., to offer my body as a sacrifice, comp. v. 10.

That the Hebrews to whom the apostle addressed himself, would recognize such an affirmation and feel the force of it, seems to be nearly certain, from the fact that the writer, without any hesitation, addresses it to them, in order to produce conviction in their minds with respect to the point which he is laboring to establish. Certain it is, then, that both he and the Christian Hebrews to whom he wrote, believed that the Jewish ritual had respect to the sacrifice of the Messiah, and that he was virtually revealed in the law of Moses as a suffering Saviour, making atonement for the sins of his people. Were this not so, then the argument in Heb. x. 5—10 would be destitute of any real foundation, and consequently of any force as a proof of what the writer is laboring to establish.

O my God, O Ἱέως, Ἱερ. ἡρω. If the Messiah be considered as uttering this before his incarnation and as Logos, then would it be an embarrassing circumstance to explain how, in his simple divine nature, he could speak of "my God." But if considered as a prophetic anticipation of what he would say during his incarnation (and so, it clearly seems to me, the writer intends it should be considered), then ὁ Ἱεώς or ὁ Ἱεώς μου, accords with the usage of the Saviour in addressing the Father, as disclosed in the gospel, Matt. xxvii. 46, al.

Τὸ ἡματία σου. What this will is, see in ver. 10.

(8) First saying, "Sacrifice, and oblation, and whole burnt-offering, and [offering] for sin thou desirest not, nor hast pleasure in them," Ἀνώτερον λέγων... εὐδοκήσας. Ἀνώτερον, lit. above, which is equivalent here to first, or in the first place.

Which are presented according to the law, Ἀνώτερος κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέροντα. This is a parenthetical explanation, added by the writer in order to show that the same legal sacrifices in which the Hebrews were in danger of placing their confidence, were those which must be superseded by the death of Christ.

(9) He then says, "Lo, I come to do thy will," Τὸτε εἰρήκεν... τὸ ἡματία σου. We might expect αἰτοῦν here, instead of εἰρήκεν, for the regular construction of the sentence would seem to require it. But here is a sentence constructed in the Hebrew manner which not unfrequently begins with a participle in the
first clause, and then uses a verb in the second, when both stand in the same relation to the sequel of the sentence, see Heb. Gramm. § 564. It is evident here, that διαφέρων λέγων, κ. τ. λ., and τῶν εἰρηκέ, κ. τ. λ., both bear the same relation to διαφερεῖ, κ. τ. λ.; the sense of which, I may add, is rendered obscure, by the period which most editors of the Greek Testament have put before it. 'Διαφερεῖ...στήγη, he abolishes the first, viz., the sacrifices, etc., that he may establish the second, viz., the doing of the will of God, or the offering of himself as a sacrifice for sin, ver. 10. That is, 'Doing the will of God, or obedience to him even unto death, or the offering up of his body, is represented by the Psalmist as a substitute for legal sacrifices, and as an arrangement which would supersede them.'

It is quite plain that διαφερεῖ, κ. τ. λ., is an inference, drawn from the two declarations recited in the context immediately preceding; for πρὸς κ. τ. λ. certainly refers to the legal sacrifices, and διαφερόν to the obedience of the Messiah. But the construction of the sentence (for it seems certainly to be but one sentence) is Hebraistic, as noted above, and not according to the rules of classical Greek; and it affords a notable example, how far the style of our author is from the easy, rhetorical, flowing method, of which so much has been said by late critics, and from that Ἐλληνικῶτας which even Origen ascribes to him.

(10) The writer proceeds to explain what is meant in this case by doing the will of God, and what is the efficacy of that obedience. 'Ἐν Ἰς Ἱερομαρτ...ἐφάραξ, by which will expiation is made for us, by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all,' Ἐν Ἰς Ἱερομαρτ means, by doing which will, i. e., by whose obedience. 'Ἱμασμένον ἐσπέρν, expiati sumus, conciliati sumus, purificati sumus; in a classical sense it would mean, we are consecrated, viz., to God; see on ἀναφώσιμος under ii. 11. The latter part of the verse leaves no doubt, that the writer meant to refer the obedience in question, or the doing of the will of God, to "obedience unto death," to the voluntary sacrifice for sinners which the Saviour offered upon the cross; comp. Phil. ii. 8.

Once for all, Ἐφάραξ. The idea conveyed by this is carefully repeated again here, because it concerns a point in respect to which the Hebrews would be very prone to raise objections. "You affirm," they would naturally say, "that there is a resemblance between the sacrifice of Christ and the annual expiatory sacrifices by the high priest. But there is evidently a great dissimilitude; for the expiation made by the high priest was repeated every year; while Christ suffered only once." The apostle meets this difficulty by showing, from various considerations, that being once slain as an expiatory offering was alto-
gether sufficient to satisfy the demands of the case. Compare Heb. ix. 9—14, 25—28; x. 1—3, 10—14. Indeed Christ, from the nature of the case, could die but once, ix. 27, 28.

(11) Now every priest stands performing daily service, and oftentimes presenting the same sacrifices, Kai πᾶς μὴν ἵππεις ... ὰνοσ. The writer now pursues the confirmation of the thought introduced by the εὐναξ in the preceding verse. Kai is used here, as often elsewhere, in order to designate a transition to an additional view of the subject which the writer is discussing. Πᾶς ἵππεις, every or any Levitical priest. Ἐστηκε, stands, denoting the attitude of those who are in waiting or attendance upon another and keep the position of standing both as a token of respect and as a state prepared for ready service. It is only the Perf., Pluperf., Aor. 2 act., and Aor. 1 pass. of the verb ἐστηκε, that have the intransitive meaning to stand. The other tenses are transitive, and mean to set, place, station, etc. See Buttmann, § 107, and compare (for a sense of the word like that above) Rev. vii. 9, 11; viii. 2. Τὰς αὐτὰς ... ᾠσίας. The same daily sacrifices were repeated without intermission; see Num. xxviii. 2—6. Αἱρεύεις ὁδέποτε ... ἄμαρται, which can never remove the penalty due to sin; comp. vs. 1—3. That ἄμαρται here means penalty due to sin, is plain; and that it may be properly so construed, no one will deny who understands the full meaning of ἄμαρται, ἄμαρται, and ἄμαρται.

(12) But this [priest], or he, having offered a sacrifice for sin of perpetual efficacy, sat down at the right hand of God, Οὗτος δὲ μιᾶν ... Θεοῦ. In ver. 11, we have πᾶς ἵππεις, i.e., every priest of the common order, every Levitical priest; the antithesis is οὗτος which refers to Christ, and which (if the ellipsis be supplied according to the grammatical construction of sentences), must mean οὗτος ἵππεις. The best copies read αὐτός, which gives essentially the same sense, and honoris causa (for so was αὐτός employed by the Greeks) is to be preferred. Εἰς τὸ διαρκεῖς may be joined with ἰναν (so Dindorf, Valcknaer, Knapp, Boehme, and others); or with ἐκάθισαν (so Carpzoff, Kuinoel, and most commentators). On the whole, I now prefer the latter method. The writer apparently designs an antithesis between ἐστηκε καὶ ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν of ver. 11, and εἰς τὸ διαρκεῖς here; and so between τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων ἰναν in ver. 11, and μιᾶν ... προσένεγκας here. Ἐκάθισαν ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, see on Heb. i. 3. Ἐκάθισα here is opposed to ἐστηκε in the preceding verse. The latter denotes the attitude of a servant; the former, that of a master or lord.

(13) Thenceforth waiting until his enemies be made his footstool, Τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ... ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Τὸ λοιπὸν means
for the rest, viz., of the time; therefore the idea conveyed by λουτών here is, afterwards, thenceforth. ἔκδεσεμένος designates the attitude of waiting or expecting. The idea is, that the Messiah is seated on his throne, quietly expecting that his enemies will in due time be all subdued. Of ἔξωποι designates all those who are opposed to the character, doctrines, or reign of Christ. To make them his footstool means, thoroughly to subjugate and humble them; comp. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28. See the origin of this phrase in the custom described in Josh. x. 24.

(14) For by one offering he has forever perfected those for whom expiation is made, Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ ... τοὺς ἀναζωμένους. Πάρ here introduces a confirmation of what is said in ver. 12. Μιᾷ προσφορᾷ, viz., the offering of his own body, ver. 10. Τετελέωσε, see on ix. 9, and x. 1. The meaning is: 'He has forever removed the penalty due to sin, and procured for those who were exposed to it, that peace of con-cience which the law could never give; comp. vs. 1—4. Ἀναζωμένου, see on ii. 11; ix. 13; x. 10.

(15) Moreover, the Holy Spirit also bears testimony to us, Μάρτυρις δὲ ἡμῖν ... ἁγιον. Δὲ, moreover, a continuative of the discourse, here marking the transition to a new paragraph, in which appeal is made by way of confirming what the writer had said. The Holy Spirit means, the Holy Spirit who speaks by the Scriptures; as the sequel shows, which is a quotation from the Scriptures. Ἡμῖν, to us, means, that the sentiment which the writer had been inculcating, the truths which he had declared, and confirmed by what the Holy Spirit says to us, i.e., to us and to all, in the Scriptures of truth.

Merà γὰρ τὸ προσευχήκεναι, for after he had said, viz., had said, first in order or in respect to time.

(16) Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, κ. τ. λ. See on chap. viii. 10, where is the same quotation. It is worthy of note, however, that even here, where the same passage is appealed to, the words are not all the same. In viii. 10, we have τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ; in x. 16, αὕτως: in the former, διδότας νόμον μού εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν; in the latter, διδότας νόμον μοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν; in the former, εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράφω αὕτους; in the latter, εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἐπιγράφων αὐτοῖς. Non referunt verbum, sed res ipsa. The meaning of both is the same. D: minimis non curat lex, say civilians in construing human laws; and the maxim applies as well to the manner of diction in the Scriptures as in any other book.

With Beza, Lud. de Dieu, Storr, Boehme, Knapp, Kuinoel, and others, I now regard μετὰ τὸ προσευχήκεναι, κ. τ. λ., down to ἵκεινας, as protasis; and λέγει Κύριος, κ. τ. λ., as apodosis. This
gives a better and more connected sense than to make the apo-
dosis begin with ver. 17, as I did in the first edition of this work.

(17) Καὶ τὸν ἀμαρτίων, κ. τ. λ.; see on viii. 12. Καὶ here
merely connects the clause quoted in the preceding verse from
viii. 10, to the clause in ver. 17 which is quoted from viii. 12.
We might say, perhaps with almost equal probability, that καὶ
stands before λέγει implied, i. e., he also saith. Comp. Heb. i.
10, καὶ for καὶ λέγει.

(18) The writer now sums up the reason why, under the
new covenant or gospel dispensation, absolute and final pardon
is obtained. Now where there is remission of these, there is no
more offering for sin, Ὅπως δὲ ἀφεῖναι... ἀμαρτίας. Ἀφεῖνας
here means spiritual pardon or remission, on the part of God
as judge and ruler of the world. Τοῦτον, i. e., τοῦτον ἀμαρτίων
καὶ ἀνομίας mentioned in the preceding verse. Ὅπως, i. e.,
offering is no more needed, is no more presented.

This circumstance makes a great difference between the new
covenant and the old one. Under the latter, sacrifices must be
perpetually repeated; and after all, only civil and ecclesiastical
pardon was to be obtained by them. Under the former, one
sacrifice is sufficient, and avails to procure, for all nations and
all ages, spiritual pardon or remission of the penalty threatened
to be inflicted in a future world. Well might the apostle call
this a new covenant.
(19) Having then, brethren, free access to the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, εὐχρήστε σὺν... Ἰησοῦ. Οὐ, then, sometimes a particle of transition and resumption of a subject that has been suspended; and so here. The writer now resumes the admonitions which it was his highest purpose to urge. Ἑλπίσια, in its first acceptation, means boldness of speech, or the liberty of speaking without restraint; and then, freedom from restraint generally considered; which is plainly the meaning here. Ἑλπίσια εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον, lit. freedom in respect to entrance, i. e., free access, unrestrained liberty of approach. Ἁγίον, i. e., ἅγιον, the heavenly sanctuary, or the presence of God, comp. ix. 24. Επὶ τὸ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ denotes, the means by which this access is procured, agreeably to what has been shown in chap. vii.—x.; comp. particularly ix. 22—26.

(20) In a new and living way which he has consecrated, Ἦν ἐνεκαίνιωσεν... ζωαν. Οὖν may be taken as the Acc. of manner, and construed with κατὰ understood; or it may be considered as a repetition of εἴσοδον and in apposition with it; which latter I prefer. Πρόσφατον means recent, and has reference to the way then lately opened by the new covenant or gospel dispensation. The way is called new, however, not merely because of this, but also because those who draw nigh to God in it, have liberty of access in their own persons to the mercy-seat, and there obtain pardon by means of a sacrifice altogether different from that which was offered for worshippers by the Jewish priests.

Leading to life, i. e., conferring life or happiness, ζωαν, i. q., ζωοποιῶσαν, i. e., εἰς ζωὴν ἁγιασμαν. So ζωα is often used in the New Testament. But it may mean here, perennial, perpetual (a frequent sense of ζωα in the Hebrew Greek); and this would be altogether congruous with the preceding context, which insists on the perpetuity of the sacrifice of Christ. But on the whole I prefer the former sense. So Theophylact, who assigns the following reason for the epithet ζωα σαν, viz., ὅτι ἡ πρωτῇ ὁδῷ Ἰσαακηφόρος ἦν, i. e., because that any one who entered the inner vail of the temple, was punished with death. But here, viz., under the gospel, it is the way to life.

Consecrated, Ἐνεκαίνια. To consecrate a way, is to open it for access, to dedicate it to use. So Jesus opened the way of access for sinners to the eternal sanctuary, in which, if they go, they may obtain free access to God, and pardon for all their offences.

Through the vail, that is, his flesh, Διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος... σαρκὸς αἵμα. I translate these words literally, because I am not well satisfied that I understand their meaning. The
opinions of all the commentators it would be tedious, if not useless, to recite. The principal interpretation in which the most distinguished of them unite, is, that as the vail of the temple must be removed in order to enter the inner sanctuary, so the body of Jesus must be removed (by death), that we might have liberty of access to the sanctuary above. So Kuinoel and Bloomfield. But this is an exegesis which, while the facts to which it alludes are true, still presents a comparison incongruous at first sight; and seemingly it requires one to do violence to his imagination, in order to recognize it with any degree of satisfaction.

I could more easily acquiesce in the idea, that there is a kind of paronomasia here in respect to the word διὰ. The form of it may be thus expressed. 'As the most holy place in the earthly temple, could be approached only through (διὰ) the vail, i.e., through the aperture which the vail covered; so the heavenly sanctuary is approached only through (διὰ implied) the flesh or body of Jesus.' In this last case, διὰ (if employed as here supposed) would mean, by means of, because of, on account of, viz., by means of the body of Jesus sacrificed for sin, see ver. 10, the paronomasia would consist in using διὰ, in the first case, in the sense of through with respect to place; and in the last case, in the sense of through with the signification, by means of. Instances could easily be accumulated, where the same word is employed in different sense in the same sentence. E.g., 'Let the dead (νεκροῖς) bury their dead (νεκροῖς),' Luke ix. 60; where νεκροῖς in the first place means morally dead, in the second, physically dead. So 2 Cor. v. 21, 'He made him to be a sin-offering (ἀμαρτίαν), who knew no sin (ἀμαρτίαν).' In like manner the apostle might say: 'As the Jews had access to the inner sanctuary of the temple διὰ καταρατόματος, through the vail, so Christians have access to the heavenly sanctuary διὰ σαρκός, i.e., διὰ προσφοράς σαρκός Ἰησοῦ,' comp. ver. 10. And although I would not admit paronomasia, except in cases where there are urgent reasons for it, it seems to be more tolerable here, than the other method of interpretation suggested above, and is certainly in harmony with the principles of the usus loquendi of the sacred writer.

But, after all, the mind still seems to feel a want of definite satisfaction, in regard to either of the methods of interpretation above proposed. May I be allowed, in a difficulty of such a nature, to propose, at least for consideration, a third method of interpreting the expression τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ?

In John i. 14, it is said, 'The Word became flesh, σάρξ;' to which the writer adds, καὶ Ἰσχύσαν ἐν Ἰμὰν. In 1 Tim. iii. 16,
we have Ἰησοῦς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, supposing the reading to be
correct (and the evidence seems to me quite in its favor, and so
Dr. Knapp has judged). In Rom. i. 4, a broad distinction is
made between the nature of Christ κατὰ σαρκά, and his nature
κατὰ πνεῦμα δύσωσιν; and in Rom. ix. 5, Christ is said to have
descended from the Jewish fathers κατὰ σαρκά, while he is at
the same time, ὅ ἐπὶ πάντων Ἰησοῦ. In Phil. ii. 6, Christ, who
was ἐν μορφῇ Ἰησοῦ,—ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.
In all these, and in many more passages which might easily
be added, the human nature or body of Christ seems to be
regarded as a kind of temporary tabernacle, or vail of the di-
vine nature which dwelt in him. May not our author, in the
verse under consideration, have had such an idea in his mind,
when he wrote τοῦ καταπτέσματος, τοῦτὸ ἐστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ?
The idea would seem to be this; 'As the vail of the temple
concealed the glory of Jehovah, in the holy of holies, from the
view of men, so Christ's flesh or body screened or concealed the
higher nature from our view (which dwelt within this vail, as
God did of old within the vail of the temple).'
If, on this ac-
count, the apostle calls Christ's flesh a vail, then we may easily
make out the sense of the verse before us. It would stand
thus: 'As God dwells behind the vail in his earthly temple, so
God dwells behind the vail of Jesus' body in his spiritual tem-
ple, i. e., he is to be approached through the medium of this, or
by means of this.' So the context which precedes: 'free access
to the sanctuary is ἐν αἷμα τῆς Ἱερου.' That the writer had in his
mind a design to compare the vail of the Jewish temple, as the
medium between the worshipper and the visible presence of Je-
ovah, to the body of Christ (σάρκι αὐτοῦ) as the medium of
access to God, or what must interpose between God and him;
and this specially in reference to Christ's sufferings and death;
seems to be, on the whole, quite clear. But which of the ways
now proposed will best present this general idea, or whether any
of them are sufficiently grounded to be fully admitted, is a ques-
tion on which the reader must be left to judge for himself. My
own apprehension on the whole is, that the occasion of calling
Christ's flesh a vail, or of comparing it to a vail, lies in the views
stated under the last of the above explanations; while at the
same time, the actual comparison of the vail of the temple and
of Christ's body, is confined to the single point that each is a
medium of access to God. If you say, 'The comparison is, in
most respects, without grounds of analogy, and the two things
widely dissimilar;' my answer is, that there is as much congru-
ity in it as there is in the comparison between the physical death
of Christ, in Rom. vi., and the moral death of believers to sin,
to which the former is there compared. Indeed, between all objects of comparison, when God or Christ is one of these objects, there must of course be a dissimilarity that is exceedingly great in some respects, although there may be an analogy in some others.

In whatever light our passage is viewed, it will be conceded that its language is far from being in that easy and flowing style which has been so often asserted in our epistle.

(21) (Having) also a great high priest, Kαὶ ἵερεα ... Ἱεω, i. e., καὶ ἔχοντες ἱερεά, κ. τ. λ., the participle being supplied from ver. 19; comp. iv. 14; v. 10; vii. 17, 20, 26; viii. 1. Ἱερεά μεγαί is the same as βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, high priest, a Hebraism. Ἐπὶ τοῦ οἶκου τοῦ θεοῦ, comp. iii. 1—6. It designates here the spiritual house of God, i. e., Christians.

(22) Let us draw nigh, Ἡνεκέρχομεθα, i. e., τῷ θεῷ, which is implied. The manner of the expression is borrowed from approach to the most holy place in the temple, where God peculiarly dwelt.

With a true heart in full confidence, Μετὰ αληθινῆς ... πιστεύως. 'Αληθινὴς means sincere, faithful, true, and designates sincerity of Christian profession, faithfiul attachment to Christianity, in opposition to an insincere or an apostatizing state of mind. Πληροφορία means a full measure. Πληροφορία πιστεύω means unwavering, undoubting faith, a fullness of faith which leaves no room for apostasy or scepticism. How exactly this exhortation was adapted to the state of the Hebrews, it is easy to perceive.

Being purified as to our hearts from a consciousness of evil, ἔφραντομένοι ... πονηρᾶς, lit. being sprinkled as to our hearts, etc. The expression is borrowed from the rites of the law, agreeably to which very many ceremonial purifications, as we have seen, were made by the sprinkling of blood either upon persons or utensils. This was external. But when the writer says here, ἔφραντομένοι τὰς καρδίας, he designates spiritual, internal purification, and shows that he is not speaking of any external rites. This internal purification is effected by the blood of Jesus, with which Christians are figuratively said to be sprinkled. But the construction, ἔφραντομένοι ... ἀπὸ ... shows that the participle ἔφραντομένοι is to be taken in a secondary or metaphorical sense, i. e., purified from, cleansed from.

A consciousness of evil, Συνειδοθετεῖται πονηρᾶς, or a conscience oppressed with evil or sin. Perhaps both senses are included; for both are characteristic of Christian sincerity and full faith, which is incompatible with a consciousness of evil designs, and which frees men from an oppressive sense of past evil, by inspiring them with the hope of pardon.
(23) And having our bodies washed with pure water, Καὶ λελουμένοι ἐκαθαρῶ; another expression borrowed from the frequent washings prescribed by the Levitical law for the sake of external purification; see Ex. xxix. 4; xl. 31, 32; Lev. xvi. 4; also chap. vi., xiv., xv., et alibi. It seems to me that here is a plain allusion to the use of water in the initiatory rite of Christian baptism. This is altogether consonant with the method of our author, who is everywhere comparing Christian, with Jewish institutions. So in the case before us he says: 'The Jews were sprinkled with blood in order that they might be purified so as to have access to God; Christians are internally sprinkled, i.e. purified by the blood of Jesus. The Jews were washed with water, in order to be ceremonially purified so as to come before God; Christians have been washed by the purifying water of baptism.' So, Ananias exhorts Saul to be baptized and wash away his sins, Acts xxii. 16. In this latter case, and in that before us, the phrase is borrowed from the legal rite of washing for purification. In Heb. x. 23 no particular stress is to be laid on the mere external rite of washing the body; for the connection shows that the whole is designed to point out the spiritual qualifications of sincere Christians for access to God. But the manner of expression turns wholly upon a comparison with the Jewish rites.

On the whole, I prefer, with Kuinoel, Bloomfield, Storr, Cramer, Michaelis, and others, to join λελουμένοι in construction to the preceding ἐφανωμένος, κ. τ. λ., as the whole runs smoother, and the construction is more facile.

Let us hold fast the hope which we profess, for faithful is he who has promised, Κατέχουμεν τὴν ἰδιολογίαν ἐπιγεγελάμενοι. Ἰδιολογία means profession or confession of the Christian religion, which is here called Ἀπόδοσ, in reference to the hopes which it occasions or inspires. The idea is: 'Let us firmly retain our profession of that religion, which fills us with hope respecting future rewards and happiness, Πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπιγεγελάμενος,' etc., because God, the author of those promises which it holds forth, will certainly perform them; he is faithful, and altogether worthy of confidence in respect to his promises.

(24) And let us bear one another in mind, so as to excite to love and good works, Καὶ κατανοοῦμεν . . . ἔχον. Κατανοοῦμεν, consider attentively, have a regard to, think upon or bear in mind. The writer means, that it is the duty of the Hebrews to cherish a mutual spirit of interest or concern for each other; and this, in such a way as should be the means of mutually exciting each other to more distinguished benevolence and good works. The perils to which they were exposed, rendered such advice very
timely. I prefer the sense as thus given, to that adopted by Kuinoel and others, viz., κατανοοῦμεν, let us watch over others, i.e., for the sake of admonition, reproof, praise, etc.

(25) Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together (as the custom of some is), but adorning [one another], ἡ ἐγκαταλείποντες... παρακαλοῦντες. Ἐγκαταλείποντες agrees with the subject of κατανοοῦμεν in ver. 24, ἡμεῖς understood. Ἐπισκοπή is often rendered society of Christians, i.e., the church, and the precept applied to apostasy; but I cannot think this to be a probable interpretation. How could the apostle refer to apostasy by καθώς ἦσας τινί? To absence from public worship, or from Christian assemblies, this would very naturally apply. — Ἐνωρίζω relates to the first person plural here; as it does elsewhere; e.g., Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xi. 31; 2 Cor. i. 9; x. 12, 14. In like manner, παρακαλοῦντες requires ἄλληλοις to be mentally supplied after it, which is expressed after κατανοοῦμεν. Παρακαλῶ means to admonish, and the whole sentence is in the usual manner of the writer, who very frequently employs κοίνωνες in warnings and admonitions.

And this [do] so much the more, as ye see the day approaching, καὶ τοσοῦτο μᾶλλον... ἡμέραν. That is, be more earnest and constant in mutual admonition and efforts to excite each other to Christian diligence and perseverance, in proportion as the time draws near, when the judgments denounced against the Jewish nation by the Saviour will be executed. Ἡμέραν, day, is doubtless an elliptical expression for ἡμέραν κυρίων, ἡμέρας τῆς; a very common expression of the Hebrew writers for a time of distress, of chastisement, a time in which God executes the threats which have been uttered by his prophets; comp. Ps. xxxvii. 13; 1 Sam. xxvi. 10; Ezek. xxi. 25; xiii. 5; Job xviii. 20; xxiv. 1; Amos v. 18; Jer. xxx. 7; Joel i. 15; Is. ii. 12; Rev. xvi. 14; et alibi. Now, as Christ had foretold the destruction of the Jewish temple and nation (which could not be unknown to the Hebrew Christians), what could be more natural than for the apostle to say: 'Brethren, do everything in your power to guard against apostasy. And this the more, because a return to Judaism would now be very ill-timed; the season is near when the Jewish temple and state are to be destroyed.' All this is surely very apposite to the case in hand.

But if we should suppose (with not a few of the recent commentators) that the writer here alludes to the day when Christ should reappear and commence a visible reign on earth (which they suppose the apostles to have believed in common with many individual Christians of early times), then I could not perceive so much force in the apostle's argument. It would run
thus: 'Be very strenuous in using all means to guard against
defection from Christianity to Judaism; and this so much the
more, because in a little time Christ will commence his visible
reign on earth.' I will not deny that the hope of reward for
perseverance in Christian virtue, to be bestowed under this new
order of things, might be used as an argument to dissuade from
apostasy; but plainly the argument as stated above is more
cogent, and more to the writer's purpose. How any one can be
satisfied, after he has read and well considered Paul's second
epistle to the Thessalonians, that this apostle believed in the
immediate and visible advent of Christ, is more than I am able
to see.

For these reasons I hesitate not to apply the phrase ἡμέραν
ἐγκοιτοῦσαν, to the time in which the Jewish state and temple
were to be brought to an end; or at least to the time when the
individuals addressed were to render an account to their divine
Lord and master, for the manner in which they had improved
the privileges and blessings of the gospel.

(26) Moreover, should we voluntarily make defection from our
religion, after receiving the knowledge of the truth, no more sac-
ifice for sin remaineth, ἐκοινώσας γὰρ . . . Ἰωνία. Ἐκοινώσας,
I apprehend, is not to be construed here with metaphysical ex-
actness, but has reference to the common and acknowledged distinc-
tion in the Jewish law between the sins of oversight or
inadvertence (ῥήματα), and those of presumption. For the first
class, see Lev. iv. 2, 19, 22, 27; Num. xv. 27—29; for the
second, Num. xv. 30, 31, where the presumptuous offender is
described by the expression, ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐντολήν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, who acts with a
high hand. That this is the kind of offence to which the ap-
ostle alludes, is evident; for he distinguishes it expressly from the
sin of oversight or inadvertence (ῥήματα) by saying that it is com-
mitted after being enlightened by the gospel. Ἐκοινώσας means,
then, deliberately, with forethought, with settled intention or
design, and not by merely sudden and violent impulse, or by
oversight.

That ἀποφαίνεσθαι, in this case, refers to the sin of apostasy,
is quite plain from the context and the nature of the case, as
well as from the object which the writer has in view; comp.
xii. 1, 4; iii. 13; also παραπλησία in vi. 6; ἀποτιθεμένα in iii.
12; and ἀποφαίνεται in Ex. xxiii. 33; Hos. xiii. 2 of the Sept.
'Αληθείαι, true doctrine, i. e., the gospel, Christian instruction.

Ὅσοι ἤτοι . . . Ἰωνία, i. e., if you make defection from Chris-
tianity, and renounce your hope and trust in the atoning sacrifice
of Christ, no other is provided or can be provided for you, and
your case is desperate. The sacrifice under the new covenant
is never like the Jewish offerings, to be repeated. Apostasy from your present religion, then, is final perdition.

(27) But a certain fearful expectation of punishment, yea, of burning indignation [awaits us], which will consume the adversaries, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τις . . . ὅπεραν. ὅπεραν often means condemnation, and sometimes the consequences of it, i.e., punishment, as here; comp. James ii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 4. Ζῆλος πυρός is equivalent to the Hebrew יְצִי, Zeph. i. 18, which means vehement displeasure, fierce flames, i.e., severe punishment. Both ἐκδοχή and Ζῆλος are Nominatives to ἀπολείπεται understood. ἐσσωπά, consume, devour, destroy, like the Hebrew בָּשָׂ, Deut. xxxii. 22. So Homer, II. xxiii. 182, πάντας πῦρ ἐσσωπά. Ἄντερρίων designates all who oppose themselves to the character, claims, and kingdom of Christ.

(28) Whosoever dishonored the law of Moses, suffered death without mercy, in case there were two or three witnesses, Ἄντερρίως τις ἐτερατάκα. The meaning is not that every transgression of the Mosaic law was punishable with death, but that in all the cases which were of a capital nature, death without reprieve or pardon was inflicted where sufficient testimony could be had; see Num. xv. 30, 31. Possibly, however, the writer means here to describe only those who apostatized from the law of Moses; e.g., such as are described in Deut. xiii. 6 (comp. vs. 8—10); xviii. 20. Ἐνι δυοῖς ἡ τριώ μαρτύρων, see Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15. The Hebrew נבז is rendered ἔνι by the Seventy; and well, for ἔνι denotes in case that, on the condition that, anything is done or happens. The meaning plainly is: 'Provided two or three witnesses testify to a crime worthy of death.'

(29) Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be counted worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, Πώς, δοκεῖ . . . κακατοικεῖ. Δοκεῖ implies an appeal, on the part of the writer, to the conscience and judgment of his hearers, who, it is taken for granted, will decide according to his own views in respect to the point in question. Ἄξωσθετα is applied either to desert of reward or of punishment; just as we say in English, 'The man is worthy of reward,' or 'worthy of death.' Κακατοικεῖ signifies to treat with contempt, to spurn at, to treat with contumely. Apostasy from the Christian religion implies this; and the peculiar criminality of it is here argued, from the superior claims which Christ has, on every account, to regard and fidelity.

And has regarded the blood of the covenant by which expiation has been made as unclean, Καὶ τὸ αἷμα . . . ἡγάσκην. Some translate thus: blood of the covenant by which he hath been con-
secerated, i. e., to God or Christ. The explanation is then made, by regarding the mode of expression as taken from the Jewish rites. When the people of Israel renewed their covenant with God, Moses sprinkled them with blood, Heb. ix. 19, 20; Ex. xxiv. 8. This is called the blood of the covenant. So under the new covenant, when Christians are consecrated to the service of Christ, and make an open profession of his religion (as the people of Israel did of theirs), they are figuratively said to be sprinkled or cleansed with the blood of Jesus; comp. Heb. ix. 14; x. 22; xiii. 20; Matt. xxvi. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 25; 1 John i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 5. And as they enter into covenant with Christ at such a time, pledging themselves to obedience and fidelity, so the blood with which they are said to be sprinkled, is called the blood of the covenant. The sense of the expression, thus taken, is plainly spiritual, while the form of it is borrowed from the Jewish ritual.

But although this is an interpretation which makes a good sense and is allowable on the ground of philology, yet I must prefer the one given in the translation, because it better agrees with the idiom of our epistle. Comp. ii. 11 (ἀγαθίων, κ. τ. λ.), and the remarks there made; also x. 22, 26; ix. 14.

Regarded as common or unclean, Κοινὸν ἤγροθμένον, i. e., as blood not consecrated, but like any common blood; therefore as having no consecrating or cleansing power, as not having set apart those who were sprinkled with it, for the peculiar service of God in the gospel, nor laid them under peculiar obligations to be devoted to the cause of Christ.

And done despite to the Spirit of grace, Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνοικίσας. Ἐνοικίσας designates the idea of treating with spite, or malignity, or contempt; and is nearly equivalent to καταπατήσας above. Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος means, either the gracious Spirit, or the Spirit who bestows grace, i. e., religious, spiritual favors and gifts; comp. 1 Cor. xii. 4—11. Many commentators, however, interpret πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος as meaning simply grace or gospel blessings. But this does not accord with the idiom of our epistle; comp. vi. 4, where apostates are described as having been εὐρώχους πνεῦματος ἁγίου. Still the question whether πνεῦμα here means agent or influence, is not so easily settled; for the sense is good and apposite, interpreted in either way. Bloomfield thinks that the verb ἐνοικίσω is too strong to be applied to things, e. g., the influences, etc., of the Spirit of God; for he translates it insult. But is not the translation treat with disdain, contempt, or contumely, equally just? And may not this be said of those who became apostates? Still, I incline, with him, to the meaning, Spirit of God.
HEBREWS X. 30, 31.

(30) This warning the apostle follows up with a quotation from Scripture, descriptive of the tremendous nature of the punishment threatened. Οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . . κύρος, for we know him who hath said, To me belongeth retribution. I will render it. The passage is quoted from Deut. xxxii. 35, παντις ὁ βίος μου, to me belongeth punishment and retribution. ἐκδίκησις, like the Hebrew שפחת, literally means vengeance, revenge. But as this is evidently spoken of God only ἀνατρίσωνάω, the meaning is, that God does that which is analogous to what men do when they avenge themselves, i. e., he inflicts punishment. The idea is rendered intense by the subsequent intimation that the almighty and eternal God will inflict such punishment. Γὰρ at the beginning, stands after a sentiment implied in consequence of that which precedes, viz. [sorer punishment will be inflicted], for (γὰρ) we know, etc.

Λέγει κύρος are words of the apostle, not of the Hebrew Scriptures, and are probably added here, to show the end of the quotation made, and to enforce the threatening; for in the same way the Hebrew prophets often expressed themselves when they uttered comminations, adding to them רָאָשׂ יְהוָה, thus saith Jehovah.

And again, "The Lord will judge his people," Καὶ πάλιν . . . . λαὸν αὐτοῦ. This quotation may be either from Deut. xxxii. 36, or Ps. cxxxv. 14, both places containing the same expression. If it be from the former place, then it is on account of the clauses that intervene between the first quotation and this, that the writer says καὶ πάλιν. If from the latter, then the reason for subjoining καὶ πάλιν, is still more evident.

The original Hebrew נַעֲרָה, from which comes the rendering κύρος (found in Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. cxxxv. 14), means shall vindicate, viz., his people, i. e., by the punishment of their enemies. And so it may be understood here, viz., the Lord will vindicate his faithful servants by the punishment of apostates. And on the whole, as the apostle here uses λαὸν αὐτοῦ after κυριακός, I must think it more probable that κυριακός is here employed in the sense of avenge, i. e., the Lord will vindicate his people by punishing those who apostatize from them and treat them with contempt.

(31) It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, well may the writer add, Φοβερὸν . . . . ζωότος. Εἴμπεσον εἰς τὰς χειρὰς (τῶν ἗κολογίας) here means to be at the disposal of his vindictive power, i. e., of his punitive justice. It is a Hebraistic mode of expression; for the classic writers say, πεσοῦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Ζωότος probably means ever-living, as it commonly does elsewhere, when applied to God. This idea, more-
over augments the dreadful nature of the punishment; which is altogether opposite to the writer’s design.

(32) The writer now proceeds to enforce his admonition against apostasy, by holding up to the Hebrews encouragement to persevere from the experience of former days, when they remained steadfast amid many trials and sufferings. Call to mind, now, former days, in which after ye were enlightened ye endured a great contest with sufferings. Ἀναμμῆνεσθε δὲ τὰς πρωτέρων ... παθημάτων. That is, ‘Faint not, be not discouraged at the prospect of trials. Look back to the time when ye patiently endured severer trials than ye now suffer, and still persevered. Continue to do as you have already done.’ Ἡμεῖς, like the Hebrew ימי, is often used for time, season, indi- nitely. Φωτοθέτεστε refers to the illumination which they received, when the knowledge of the Christian religion was first imparted to them. What the δρόμος παθημάτων means, is explained by the verses which follow.

(33) Partly because ye were made a public spectacle both by reproaches and afflictions, Τούτο μὲν ... ἔστηριξαν. Τούτο μὲν ... τούτο δὲ correspond, and when thus related they bear the sense here given. Ὄνειδωμοις, refers to the reproachful appella- tions and language addressed to Christians by their persecutors; Ἔλησον, to the various sufferings inflicted upon them by the same. In this way they were exposed to public view, ἔστηριξαν, i.e., held up to the world as persons worthy of reproach and ill-treatment, or made a spectacle to the world as sufferers of these things, and thus loaded with disgrace. The phrase ἔστηριξαν is borrowed from the exposure and punishment of criminals before the assembly convened in the theatre; which was a common practice among the Greeks and Romans. Comp. 1 Cor, iv. 9.

And partly because ye were associated with those who were thus treated, Τούτο δὲ ... γενηθήσατα. It would be difficult to find a classical example of giving to the verb ἀναστήρεσαι a passive sense, inasmuch as it is commonly used in the middle voice, and employed as a verb neuter deponent. We may translate it, who were in like circumstances, qui ita se gerent; which seems at least to be ad sensum. Κοινώνοι I suppose here to designate participation by sympathy in the sufferings of others, and contributing of one’s substance to make up the losses of those who had been per-secuted.

(34) For ye did truly sympathize with my bonds, Καὶ γὰρ ... συνεπαθήσατε. Thus the received text of some manuscripts and editions, and several of the fathers, read δισμοῖς μοι. This reading is also preferred by Matthiae, Michaelis, Carpzoff, Noes-
selt, and many others; Bloomfield has given, as I think, ample reasons for his preference of δεσμοίς μου. That the Greeks used the verb συμπάσχομαι in connection with things as well as persons, there can be no ground to doubt; as Bloomfield has fully shown.

And cheerfully endured the plundering of your own property, Καὶ τὴν ἄρπαγην . . . . προσεδεξάωθε. This was a part of the Ἀλήσεως, which they had suffered in former times.

Knowing that ye have for yourselves in heaven a possession of a better and more lasting nature, Γινώσκοντες ἵχεω . . . . μένωνας. ἕαυτοι, Daivis commodi; the ἐν here inserted before ἐαυτοῖς, in some copies, seems plainly not to be genuine. Υπαρξίων, anything possessed, estate, property. Κρείττωνα, better than earthly possessions, i.e., spiritual, heavenly, not material and earthly. Μένονα, enduring, permanent, not perishable, fleeting, temporary, like all earthly possessions.

(35) Cast not away, then, your confidence, which will obtain a great reward, Μὴ ἀποβάλητε . . . . μεγάλην. That is, act as you have formerly done, and thus gain possession of the κρείττωνα καὶ μένονα ὑπάρξιν.

(36) For ye have need of patience, in order that when ye have done the will of God ye may receive the promised blessing, Υπομονής γὰρ . . . . ἐπαγγελμα. Τάρ introduces a reason why they should not cast away their παράδοσιν, but still hold out to cherish it. Patience they needed, because of the many trials and temptations to which they were still exposed. To do the will of God, here, is to obey the requirement to believe and trust in Christ. Ἐπαγγελμα, thing promised, reward proffered; for the promise itself they had already received. Ἐπαγγελμα here, and μοι σα-ποδοσὶν in ver. 35, both refer to the ὑπάρξιν κρείττου καὶ μένον- σων mentioned in ver. 34, and which is there represented as promised to them in case of obedience.

(37) For yet a very little while, and he who is coming will come, and will not delay, Ἔτη γὰρ μοιρῶν . . . . χρονῶν. The γὰρ here refers to a clause implied, viz. [ye shall receive the promised blessing], for, etc. Bloomfield has placed the implication farther back; I think the above method is more simple and easy. The sentiment of the verse is this: 'The Messiah (ὁ ἐπί-χόμενος) will speedily come, and by destroying the Jewish power, put an end to the sufferings which your persecutors inflict upon you;' comp. Matt. xxiv. Ὅσον δὲν is an intensive form of expression, which is applied either to things great or small, like ὅτι ἡ ταύτη. It is employed in the like way, however, by the classic Greek authors. The whole phrase resembles that in Hab. ii. 3, ὡς σωματικῶς οὐκ ἔστιν, for it (viz., the vision) will surely
come to pass, it will not delay. If, however, it be an actual quotation, the application of the words is different from that of the original, and the writer designed merely to use the language of the prophet to express his own ideas. In fact, the Septuagint version of the passage in Habakkuk differs slightly from the words used by the apostle. It runs thus: διερχόμενος ἕξει, καὶ οὗ μὴ χρονίσῃ. It seems quite probable (considering the quotation from Hab. ii. 4, which follows) that the apostle had the Hebrew expression above quoted in his mind. But it seems equally plain, also, that he has made use of it only as the medium of expressing his own particular idea, and not as a designed quotation used according to the exact idea of the original. I have marked it as a quotation, however, in my version, because the words appear to be quoted.

(38) The just, moreover, shall live by faith. O δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ἔχεται. Δὲ copulative and continuative; as often. In Hab. ii. 4, it runs thus, ἦσας ἐκ πίστεως ὑπακουή, which (if rendered according to the accents) will be, the just by faith shall live, i. e., the just man who has faith shall be preserved. The expression in our verse is capable of the same translation, and Dr. Knapp has pointed it so as to be construed in this way. But I apprehend, after all, that this is not the meaning of either the Hebrew or Greek phrase. Faith is put here as the means of preservation, in opposition to apostasy or defection in the other part of the verse, which is the means of destruction or disapprobation. ‘A persevering confidence or belief in Christ’ (the writer means to say), ‘will be the means of preservation, when the Lord shall come to execute his judgments upon the Jewish nation.’ So the Seventy understood the phrase, which they have rendered ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μοῦ ἔχεται; as if they read ἐκ πίστεως instead of ἐκ πίστεως. The meaning of ἐκ πίστεως μοῦ must of course be, by faith or confidence in me, which expresses the condition of being saved, rather than the peculiar character of the person who is saved. I understand the expression in Hebrew and in our epistle, in a similar way. If the apostle meant to quote here (which can hardly be doubted), it is evident that he has not adhered to the text of the Septuagint; Cf. Rom. i. 13, and Gal. iii. 11.

Also, if any one draw back, my soul hath no pleasure in him, Καὶ δὲν ἐποτεῖληται . . . ἐν αὐτῷ. Καὶ is probably an elliptical expression here, for καὶ λέγει, i. e., καὶ λέγει ὁ Θεός vel ἡ γραφή. The latter resembles the usage of this epistle; see i. 10; x. 17. This seems plainly to be a quotation from Hab. ii. 4. The apostle, however, has changed the order of the verse, quoting the latter part of it first, and the former part last. The original
Hebrew runs thus, ἴδρε ὅτι καταδυόμενος ἡ τύχη αὐτῆς; behold the scornful, his mind shall not be happy; or (as Gesenius translates) See! he whose soul is unbelieving, shall on this account be unhappy. The Seventy, who have rendered the Hebrew in exact accordance with the words of our epistle, must have read τὴν τύχη ὑπ' αὐτῆς here, as they did ἴδρε in the clause preceding. This is the more probable reading, but it cannot now be critically defended. We can only say, therefore, that the quotation of the apostle is, on general grounds, ad sensum but not ad literam. The sentiment of the Hebrew is, that the scorner or unbeliever of that day should be unhappy; the sentiment of the apostle, that the unbeliever, i. e., the apostate Christian who renounces his religion, shall incur the divine disapprobation. The same sentiment lies at the foundation, in both cases. Such disapprobation the last clause expresses, οὐκ εἰδόκει ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ, where the negative form of expression is employed (as often in sacred and also in classical writings) instead of the affirmative, i. e., he shall be an object of my displeasure.

(39) But we are not of those who draw back to destruction, Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ . . . . ἀπάλειαν. Ψυχοτολογίς is the abstract noun, shrinking back, timidity, withdrawing; and (as is common) the abstract is here put for the concrete, i. e., for persons who withdraw or shrink back, viz., from their Christian profession. The consequence of such withdrawing is ἀπάλεια; see vs. 26, 27. But of those who believe to the salvation of the soul, Ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς. Περιποίησις means lit. obtaining, acquiring, possessing. But as it is here placed in antithesis to ἀπάλειαν, it plainly means saving or salvation. Πίστεως, faith, belief, is an abstract noun used instead of a concrete, in the same manner as ψυχοτολογίς above; i. e., we belong to those who believe to the saving of their souls.

CHAP. XI.

Having mentioned faith, i. e., belief or confidence, as a peculiar and most important characteristic of those who persevere in the Christian religion so as to secure their salvation, the writer now proceeds, with great force and propriety, to make his appeal to the Old Testament Scriptures in order to show that faith or confidence in the divine promises has, in all ages, been the means of perseverance in true religion, and consequently of salvation. In x. 34—38, the apostle had exhorted his readers to persevere in waiting for the rewards of a future world, which he names, δοξα ἐν οὐρανοῖς κρίσιμον καὶ μένοσαν . . . μετακοσμός μεγάλην . . . τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. He now goes on to show more fully that the very nature of faith and the character of believers demanded this. All believers in every age have done so; and the Hebrews ought to follow their example.
HEBREWS XI. 1.

(1) The general nature of faith is first explained. Now faith is confidence in respect to things hoped for—evidence of things not seen, ἔστι δὲ πίστις . . . βελτίωσίν. Ὑπόστασις, confidence, confident expectation. Others with Chrysostom, 'Faith gives reality or substance to things hoped for.' The sense is good; but the shade of meaning is not exactly hit. If this were the idea of ὑπόστασις, we might expect the antithetic word to be ἀνωτάτων or ἀνίκων, incorporeal or immaterial things, instead of ἔλεγχος. The use of ὑπόστασις, in the sense of confidence, etc., belongs to the later Greek, and is frequent in the New Testament. This sense is evidently appropriate here. The writer had just been exhorting his readers not to cast away their confidence or boldness, which would insure a great reward, x. 35. If any one should object to this exhortation, that the objects of reward are all future and unseen; the reply is, that the very nature of belief or faith, implies confidence in respect to objects of this kind. All the patriarchs and prophets possessed such faith. ἔλεγχος means things future which are the objects of hope, and not of present fruition. The things future, are the rewards which have just been mentioned above.

Proof, ἔλεγχος, i. e., means of proving, evidence; it also means summary, contents; conviction, contradiction, reproof, etc.; but these meanings are not to our purpose. The idea here is, that faith in the divine word and promises, is equivalent to, or supplies the place of, proof or demonstration in regard to the objects of the unseen world, i. e., it satisfies the mind respecting their reality and importance, as proof or demonstration is wont to do. I have omitted the copula (and) before the word in the version which corresponds to ἔλεγχος, because the author has omitted it, and it is not necessary in order to render the version intelligible.

That the faith here brought to view and adverted to through chap. xi., is not specifically what some theologians call saving faith, viz., faith in Christ in an appropriate and limited sense, is evident from the nature of the examples which are subjoined by the writer; e. g., vs. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, etc. In this chapter faith is belief or confidence generally in divine declarations, of whatever nature they may be; for it does not always have respect even to promises, or to the future; e. g., ver. 3. Now the same confidence in what God declares, respecting subjects of such a nature as are brought to view in this chapter, would lead the person who exercises it to confide in all which God might declare respecting the Messiah; and consequently, to belief in Christ. It is then called by theologians, saving faith. But it should be remembered, that this is only a convenient technical phrase of
modern theology; not one employed by the sacred writers. The true and essential nature of faith, is confidence in God, belief in his declarations; and whether this be exercised by believing in the Scripture account of the creation of the world; or (as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, and others, exercised it) in respect to specific objects; or by believing on the Messiah; it is evidently the same disposition of mind in all cases. It is confidence in God. It is therefore with perfect propriety, that our author excites the Hebrews to persevere in their Christian faith, by various examples which exhibit the power of faith in the ancient worthies, as a principle of pious and virtuous belief and action.

(2) For by this were the ancients commended, ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ . . . προσβύτεροι. Μαρτυρῶ not unfrequently means to applaud, praise, commend, openly signify approbation; see Wahl's Lex. No. 2. This is evidently the sense of the word here. The γὰρ here is γὰρ illustrantis et confirmantis. It is as much as to say: [It is so] for the ancients, etc.

(3) By faith we perceive that the worlds were formed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made from those which appear, Πίστις νοούμαν . . . γεγονέα. Πίστις confidence in the account which the Scriptures (viz., Gen. i.) give of the creation. It is confidence in God, too; for there could be no other witness of what was then done; at least there could be none of the human race. Νοούμαν, we perceive, apprehend, attain to an apprehension of. Κατηρίσθαν, ordinare, disponere, not simply to create or bring into being, but also, to fit, prepare, form, i. e., reduce to form and order. Αἰῶνας, the world; see on Heb. i. 2, in respect to the plural use of this word. That αἰῶνας in this case cannot mean seculum or aenum, is sufficiently plain; for in what tolerable sense could the writer say, that seculum or aeum was not made εἰ φανομένων, i. q., was made εἰ μὴ φανομένων, i. e., out of nothing. The assertion in the negative form, is λατότης, a figure of speech frequent in the Scriptures and classics. ‘John confessed, and denied not, but confessed,’ John i. 20; where οὐκ ἐρήμωσα plainly conveys the same idea as ὁμολογοῦσε. In what sense, too, could seculum or aeum be called βλαστόμενα? This word means, objects visible to the sight or palpable to the senses, i. e., material objects. Φαινομένα means the same thing; there being no more difference between the two words in Greek, as characterizing objects, than there is between seen and apparent in English. The assertion of the writer then is, that ‘visible objects, i. e., the visible creation, did not spring from objects that were apparent,’ that the visible creation was not made out of matter before existing;
which is the same as to say that the world was created or brought into existence by the word of God simply, and was not a mere reducing to order materials that before existed; see on the succeeding clause of the verse, in the sequel. At all events, the idea of a seculum or aërum 'being framed (κατηγρισθείς by the word of God,' presents an incongruity of which no example can be found in the sacred writers. Equally incongruous would ἔτη τοῦ αἰῶνα in i. 2 be, if αἰῶν were to be rendered seculum. Ὄρματι Ἰεῶν, by the command of God; comp. Gen. i. 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 46; Ps. xxxiii. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 5.

If we construe Εἶς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φανομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γέγονέναι, as the text now stands, the μὴ is naturally joined with γέγονέναι, and rendered, so that things visible were not made of things which do appear. Pierce insists on this construction, and maintains that the sense is, 'So that things visible might appear not to have been made of things apparent, i. e., out of preexisting matter.'

Those who adopt a different construction of the passage, maintain that εἶς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φανομένων may be translated as if it were written εἶς τὸ ἐκ μὴ φανομένων. That such a metathesis of the negative μὴ, or of its equivalent οὐ, οὐκ, is allowable, or at least that it is not uncommon, they endeavor to show by appealing to examples; e. g., 2 Macc. vii. 28, δὲ τὰ οὐκ ἐξ ὑπνων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός, which plainly means, 'God made them [heaven and earth] from things that do not exist,' i. e., out of nothing. So Arrian, de Exp. Alex. VII. 23, 'These things I do not blame, unless that οὐκ ἐπὶ μὲν ἄλοις μεγάλως διεσπώσατο, he was too much occupied with small matters;' where οὐκ seems to qualify μεγάλως. Plutarch, Paedagog. IX. 15, 'I should say that promptitude of speaking on any matter is not to be altogether disapproved; nor, on the other hand, ταῦτα οὐκ ἔπι ἄλοις ἀσκεῖν, is it to be practised in respect to trifling subjects.' So the Greek οὐκ ἐπὶ ἄλοις, he said he would not come. Arrian, Anab. I. 5, 4. οὔ ἐπὶ τοῦτος ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλοις ἀσκεῖν, αὐθαίρετα, he said that the Autaricae were not to be put into the account. Polyb. p. 1331, τοὺς μὴ φάσκοντας ἀπαλῶν, saying that they were not to be absolved. If the examples where φημι is used, be abstracted from the others, there are still a sufficient number, they aver, to show that a metathesis of the negative particle μὴ, is not without parallels. So Chrysostom paraphrases it thus: ἐξ οὐκ ἀπαλῶν τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός ἐκ τῶν μὴ φανομένων, τὰ φανομένα, ἐκ τῶν μὴ υφεστώτων, τὰ υφεστώρα; and so the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Wolfius, and most of the later interpreters.

Still this metathesis of μὴ is unnecessary; for the phrase plainly has some meaning, when translated agreeably to its
present arrangement, if the nature of such a λατοργη be well understood. There is no need of understanding the examples cited from the classics, in a different way. And indeed, take them which way we will (either by way of metathesis in respect to the οὐκ or μη, or of joining the negative with the verb or participle that follows), the sense, all must admit, is plain, and is substantially one and the same. We may also compare phraseology of a like nature, to be found in other parts of Paul's writings. In Rom. iv. 17, he says, "God restores the dead to life, and calls τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὄς ὄντα," i. e., summons [to fulfil his own purposes] things that do not exist, as though they did exist. In like manner, Philo, in Lib. de Creat. Mundi, p. 728, says, τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλησεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἔσω, things which existed not, God called into existence. That μὴ φανωμένων is equivalent to μὴ ὄντων, needs not to be formally proved. So in Hebrew, נָבַּנְנַ, quod inventur, is a customary expression for ens or existens; and נָבַּנְנַה, for res non existens, nihilum.

On the whole, then, we must regard the phrase in question as equivalent to the expression in our language, 'The visible creation was formed from nothing,' i. e., it came into existence by the command of God, and was not formed out of any pre-existing materials. Deus ex nihilo mundum fecit, conveys the same idea. Such a phrase does not mean that nothing was the material (so to speak) out of which the world was constructed, for there would be no sense in this; but it merely denies that any such material existed. This entirely agrees with the preceding clause of the text, which asserts that the command of God brought the universe into existence; and this is altogether confirmed by Gen. i. Here Moses represents, in ver. 1, the heavens and earth as first brought into existence by divine power, and afterwards as formed and arranged into their present order; comp. Gen. i. 1, with Gen. i. 2 and the sequel of the chapter. In fact, if the manner of assertion in our text be strictly scanned, it will be found to be more exact and philosophical than the Latin ex nihilo Deus mundum fecit, or the English God made the world out of nothing. Each of these phrases presents the seeming incongruity of asserting that nothing was the material out of which the world was made. But our author is more strictly conformed to philosophical propriety, when he says, 'Things visible were not made out of things that are visible,' i. e., the visible creation was brought into existence by the word or command of God simply, and was not formed or fitted up out of any pre-existing materials. Exactly so do we find the assertion in 2 Mac. vii. 28, οἷον ἐὰν ἔτυνεν ἐπολύνετε σωτήρ ὁ θεός, God
did not make them [heaven and earth] out of things existing; i.e., he strictly created them.

Well may it be suggested, that faith in the divine word was requisite to believe this; inasmuch as Thales, Plato, Aristotle, and other eminent philosophers who followed not the divine word, indulged in speculations about the creation of the world, which were either very visionary, or quite different from the view which Moses has given.

(4) By faith Abel offered to God a better sacrifice than Cain, πίστις πληίων... τῷ Ἱερῷ. Πληίων, better, more excellent; so frequently, e.g., Matt. vi. 25; Luke xii. 23; Matt. xii. 41, 45; Mark xii. 33; Luke xi. 31; Heb. iii. 3; Rev. ii. 19. On what account the sacrifice of Abel was more acceptable, commentators have speculated much, and assigned a great variety of causes. But it may be asked: Does not our text contain a solution of this question? Abel made his offering in faith; the implication is that Cain did not, and therefore it was not accepted. On account of which [faith] he was commended as righteous, God himself commending his oblations, Δι' ἡς ἔργωρείη... Ἱερῷ. How this was done, is not said in Gen. iv. 4. But most probably it was by fire sent from heaven, which consumed the sacrifice; comp. Gen. xv. 17; Lev. ix. 24; Judg. vi. 21; 1 Chron. xxii. 26; xxvii. 1; 1 K. xviii. 38. The appellation δικαίος is given to Abel, in Matt. xxiii. 45; 1 John iii. 12.

And by it, though dead, he continues to speak, Καὶ δ' αἵτων ἀποδὸν ἐτὶ λαλη. Δι' αἵτης, viz., by his faith. Λαλη and λαληται are supported by good authorities. The former is preferred by Grotius, Hammond, Schmidt, Valkenaer, Michaelis, Storr, Rosenmueller, Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, Schulz, Schott, etc.; the latter, by Wetstein, Matthiae, Heinrichs, Tittmann, etc., and has the numerical majority of manuscripts, versions, and editions, in its favor. Where the balance of authority is on the whole nearly equal, I cannot well hesitate to prefer λαλη to λαληται. The sense of the latter would be equivalent to μαρτυρεῖα, sc. laudatur, is commanded. But this idea has been twice suggested before in the same verse, by μαρτυρεῖα and μαρτυροῦντο... ἱερῷ. It is hardly probable that it would be a third time repeated. But λαλη, I apprehend, has reference to Gen. iv. 10, where the 'voice of Abel's blood is said to cry to God from the ground.' In Heb. xii. 14, also, our author represents the blood of Christ and of Abel as speaking, λαλοῦντι. The form of expression only, in our verse, seems to be borrowed from the thought in Gen. iv. 10; for here it is the faith of Abel which makes him speak after his death, viz., he speaks by his faith to those who should come after him, exhorting and encour-
aging them to follow his example. In other words, his example of faith affords admonition and instruction to succeeding ages.

(5) By faith Enoch was translated that he might not see death, and he was not found, because God had translated him, II Peter 'Enôvχ...δα φαχ. Ταύτα μὴ ἰδεῖν is equivalent here to εἰς τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν or διὰ τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν. The Hebrew has יְהוּדָא רָא אִישׁ, God took him, where our author uses μετέτρεψεν. The original in Gen. v. 24 says nothing respecting the point, whether Enoch was translated alive or after death. Καὶ οὖν εὑρίσκειν is the Septuagint version of the Hebrew יְהוּדא, he was not, sc. he was no more among men; like to the expression of Livy (I. 16) respecting Romulus, "Nec dein deinde in terris Romulus fuit." The idea in the Hebrew and Greek, is for substance the same; for οὖν εὑρίσκειν means, he was no more to be met with, he was no more extant (καὶ έξῆς), among men. But all the Targumists, viz., Onkelos, Jonathan, and the author of the Jerusalem Targum, understand Enoch to have been translated without dying. So the Comment. Bereschith Rabba, parashach. 25. f. 28. So, probably, the Son of Sirach, xlix. 14. I may add, that this is a very natural deduction from the brief notice of Enoch's translation in Gen. v. 24. Early death is commonly represented, in the Old Testament, as the punishment of sin; and that "the wicked should not live out half their days," was the persuasion of most good men in ancient times. If, then, Enoch died before translation, how could his removal to another world have been regarded as an evidence of his extraordinary piety? The texts to which Dindorf has appealed, in his notes added to the commentary of Ernst, are very far from supporting the position, that the ancient Jews regarded premature death as a testimony of heaven in favor of him who was the subject of it. Nor is there any need of Rosenmueller's concession here, viz., that the apostle, in his account of Enoch's removal, has accommodated himself to the Jewish traditionary opinions. It may indeed be, that a tradition existed among the Jews, that Enoch "did not see death." But that this was founded in fact, seems to be plainly deducible from the manner of the narration in Hebrew, and from the state of opinion in ancient times respecting early death.

For before his translation he is commended, as having pleased God, Πρὸ γὰρ τῆς...τῆς θείας. The Hebrew says יְהוּדָא רָא אִישׁ, and Enoch walked with God, which denotes a state of communion and friendship with God, and implies, of course, a complacency in the divine mind with respect to him. The apostle, therefore, appeals to the sense of the Scriptures in this case, and not to the words. Nor does he mean to say that the testimony respecting Enoch's pleasing God was given before
his translation; but that the testimony given in the divine word, respects his having pleased God before his translation. The γὰρ at the beginning of the phrase, introduces a clause designed to show that Enoch must have acted under the influence of faith; he could not have pleased God without it.

(6) The writer now suggests the grounds on which he builds the conclusion, that Enoch was translated on account of his faith; viz., χαρίς δὲ πίστεως . . . εὐαρεστήσας, but without faith it is impossible to please [him]. The truth of this he rests upon his own declaration, and the common opinion on this subject which he expects all his readers to entertain.

For he who cometh to God must believe that he exists, and that he will reward those who seek him, Πρεσβέας γὰρ δεῖ . . . γίνεσθαι. Γὰρ here introduces a clause which confirms the necessity of faith in an acceptable worshipper. Ηροσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ designates him who worships God, Dei cultuere; see vii. 27. The phraseology is probably derived from going up to the temple to worship, in the sanctuary where God dwelt by his peculiar presence. Some have understood the phrase as referring to an approach to God in the invisible world, i. e., in heaven; but the idea here is like that expressed by the Hebrew phrases, going to God, returning to him, etc., which usually denote approach in the present world to his spiritual presence. Compare with Τοῖς ἐκλεγομένοις αὐτῶν, the Hebrew שְׁמֵיהֶם יָדוּ, שֵׁרְתָם יָדוּ, employed to designate the worship and prayers of those who are piously devoted to the service of God.

The two truths, fundamental to all that can properly be called religion, are here adverted to. The first is a belief that God exists; the second, that he is the moral governor of the universe, i. e., that he rewards those who are pious, and consequently punishes those who are not so. He who denies these, denies all that sanctions religion, and makes it binding upon the consciences of men.

(7) By faith Noah, being divinely admonished respecting things not yet apparent, with reverence prepared an ark for the safety of his household, Πιστε. . . . οἰκον αὐτοῦ. Χρησιμοθείς, comp. viii. 5 and Gen. vi. 13, 14; vii. 1—5. Μηδείς βλέπομένων, i. e., the future flood, no signs of which were as yet visible. The choice of expression, however, seems evidently to have been dictated by the of βλέπομένων in ver. 1. Εὐλαβεθείς may be taken either in the sense of fearing, viz., fearing the destruction which was coming, or it may be understood of the reverence which he paid to the divine admonition. I have translated it as bearing the latter sense, since this makes most directly for the apostle's object, which is to exhibit the faith which Noah exer-
cised with regard to the divine warning. For the saving or safety, 
Eis σωτηρίαν, often applied to temporal security or deliverance, 
like the Hebrew הָנָא.

By which [faith] he condemned the world, and obtained the 
justification which is by faith, Δι’ ᾖς κατέκρινε... κληρονόμος.
He I refer to πίστεως, as do Sykes, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Kuinoel, 
Bloomfield, and others. Κόσμων means wicked men, men of a 
mere worldly spirit; often so in the New Testament. Noah 
condemned these by an example of faith in the divine warnings, 
while the world around him remained impenitent and unbelieving. In other words, his conduct condemned theirs. Ἐγένετο 
κληρονόμος, i. e., κληρονόμον, i. e., obtained, acquired, became 
possessor of. So Abraham is, in like manner, said to be justified 
by faith or belief (Rom. iv.), viz., belief in the promise of God 
respecting a future seed. On account of Noah’s faith he was 
counted προς, ἰδιωτος (comp. ver. 4 above), or he was regarded 
or treated as ἰδιωτος.

From this verse, then, we may conclude that faith may be of 
a justifying nature, i. e., such as is connected with the justifica-
tion or pardon of the individual who exercises it, without being 
specifically directed to Christ as its object; for here, the object 
of Noah’s faith was, the divine admonitions and comminations 
respecting the flood. This only serves to show that faith, in 
its generic nature, has been the same in every age; and that it 
is essentially a practical belief in divine declarations.

(8) By faith Abraham obeyed, when called to go forth unto the 
place which he was to receive for a possession, Πίστει καλούμενος 
... κληρονομιάν; see Gen. xii. 1—4. Καλούμενος, summoned, 
invited, bid, ἐξέλθειν, viz., from his own country and kindred, 
Gen. xii. 1. Τόσον refers to the land of Canaan, Palestine, the 
future possession of which was promised to him. His faith in 
this case was manifested by believing in this promise.

Yes, he went forth not knowing whither he was going, ἦκα ἐξ-
ηλθε... ἔφησαν. In καὶ ἐξηλθε intensity is added by the καὶ 
to the phrase that follows. The meaning is, ‘he even went out, 
ignorant of the place to which he was going; which serves to 
give a higher idea of the strength of Abraham’s faith, than if 
we should suppose him to have been previously well informed 
respecting the land of Canaan.

(9) By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, while it be-
longed to strangers, Πίστει παρώνῃ... ἀλλόγριαν. Πίστει, 
by faith he did this, i. e., by confidence in the promises which 
God had made respecting the future possession of this land and 
respecting his offspring, he was moved to sojourn in Canaan 
while it belonged to foreigners. Eis γην for εν γη. Such a use
of εἰς with the Accus. before a noun of place in which one is represented as dwelling, is not unfrequent in the New Testament. See εἰς in Bretsch. Lex. 5. c. The idiom is found even in the classics. 'Ες before ἄλογος makes the predicate ἄλογος more emphatic. In sense the phrase differs not materially from ὑπὲρ ἣς.

Dwelling in tents, together with Isaac and Jacob who were likewise heirs of the same promises, ἔν σκοτάς κατοικήσας ἔτος. That is, the promise was made to Abraham and his seed. What was not fulfilled in him, was to have its accomplishment in them. Hence συγκληρονόμως, fellow-heirs, joint-possessors, viz., with Abraham; the same promise being made to them as to him, respecting the land of Canaan and their future posterity.

(10) For he expected a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God, Ἐξεθενούσα γάρ Ἰεώς. Θεολόγως ἐξουσιων, firmly built, well founded. The plural (Θεολόγως) augments the idea of firmness of construction. Δημονυργός means, originally, one who labors for the public good, from δῆμος publicus, ad populum pertinens, and ἔργων opus. Hence, secondarily, it is transferred to designate a laborer or artificer of any kind. It is often applied by the heathen writers to designate the Divinity; and by Philo, Josephus, and the Christian fathers, it is employed as an epithet of the true God. Here, however, it is used as nearly a synonyme of τεχνίτης; the latter conveying the idea of a builder skilled in the rules of his art, but δημονυργός meaning more simply maker, builder, fabricator.

The meaning of the whole verse most evidently is, that Abraham looked for a permanent abode in the heavenly country, the world to come. It was faith in this which was ὑπετόνος ὑπὸ βλεπομένων, and which moved him to obey the commands of God, and to do and suffer whatever he required. The fact, then, that saints under the old Testament were moved, in their conduct, by considerations that had respect to the invisible world or an immortal state of existence, is plainly implied here by the reasoning of the apostle. See vs. 14, 16.

(11) By faith, also, Sarah herself received the power of conception, Πίστις καὶ ἀνυ καὶ ἀνυ. By faith; how, or when? For when God announced to Abraham that he should have a son by Sarah (Gen. xviii. 10), she seems to have been in a state of unbelief, Gen. xviii. 12. But although it is true that Sarah laughed on that occasion, and it must be admitted that this was occasioned partly by her incredulity, as Gen. xviii. 13—15 shows; yet the same thing is affirmed of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 17. The truth seems to be, that the first annunciation that a child would spring from them, occasioned both in his and Sarah’s
mind a feeling of incongruity, or of impossibility that the course of nature should be so reversed. Subsequent consideration brought both to a full belief in the reality of the promised future blessing. The history of this is not expressly given in Genesis with respect to Sarah, but it is implied.

Sarah herself also, Kαὶ αὐτῇ Σάρα. Kαὶ αὐτῇ, in this case, refers particularly to the fact that Sarah was barren, Gen. xvi. 1, and that she was far advanced in old age, Gen. xviii. 11. The meaning is, that faith gave even to Sarah, unpromising as her condition was in respect to offspring, the power of conception, i.e., by faith she obtained this blessing. Εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος, words tortured to the disgust of every delicate reader, by some of the critics. Even Wahl says, "she received strength εἰς τὸ δέχεσθαι σπέρμα καταβεβλημένον (i.e., by Abraham) εἰς τὴν μυτήραν." Did this need any supernatural strength? I construe the phrase very differently. Καταβολή means foundation, commencement, beginning. Now what is the foundation or commencement σπέρματος, of offspring or progeny? Conception. The true idea of the phrase, then, appears to be fully given by the version above. In this view of the phrase, I observe, Dr. Schulz concurs, rendering δύναμις εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος by das Vermögen zur Empfängnis, the power of conception. Bretschneider translates: Problem facere, foetum edere, which does not essentially differ.

And this beyond the usual time of life, inasmuch as she regarded him as faithful who had promised, Kαὶ παρὰ καρόν . . . ἐπαγγελμένον. Kαὶ παρὰ καρόν, see Gen. xviii. 11. Ἐπεὶ πιστῶν, κ. τ. λ., which shows that the apostle considered it as quite certain, that Sarah, like her husband, did come to full confidence in the divine promise.

(12) Wherefore even from one who was dead as to such things, there sprang [a seed] like the stars of heaven for multitude, Δῶ καὶ ἄφ' ἐνός . . . πλῆθει. Δῶ, on account of which faith, viz., faith of Sarah, or perhaps of Abraham and Sarah. Kαὶ ἄφ' ἐνός, even from a single individual, is a designed antithesis to the multitude who are afterwards mentioned; consequently it heightens the description. Kαὶ ταῦτα νεκρωμένου means incapable [according to the ordinary laws of nature] of procreation; καὶ . . . νεκρωμένου, i.e., not only one individual, but one even dead; see the same description in Rom. iv. 19. Ταύτα is governed by κατα understood. Καὶ ὁ τὰ ἄστρα, κ. τ. λ., that is, a very great number; comp. Gen. xv. 5; xxii. 17. And like the sand upon the shore of the sea, which cannot be numbered, Kαὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος . . . ἀναρρήματος, i.e., an exceedingly great multitude. Χάλος θαλάσσης, lit. lip of the sea, which means the shore. So
the word is used by profane Greek writers also; as habinm is by the Latin ones. So the Hebrew יְבַשֶּׁה, Gen. xxii. 17; which compare.

(13) These all died in faith, not having received the blessings promised, קאָרָה πωτων .... ἐπαγγελίας. Οὐτοι πάντες — who? Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Sarah, mentioned in vs. 8—12; for οὖτοι cannot well be here extended to all who are mentioned in the preceding part of the chapter, because the "promised blessings" here named, are those which were assured to the Hebrew patriarchs. Ἐπαγγελίας, not promises (for these they had received), but blessings promised, according to the idiom of this epistle. What were these blessings, heavenly, or earthly? The sequel will answer this question.

But seeing them afar off, and joyfully anticipating them, they openly professed themselves to be strangers and sojourners on the earth, Ἀλλὰ πορφούκεν .... γῆς. The application of this whole verse to the expectation of the future possession of Canaan, and of a numerous progeny, would be admissible, were it not for the sequel (vs. 14—16), which plainly forbids such an application. In addition to the faith of Abraham and other patriarchs, in the promises of God which had respect to temporal blessings, I understand the apostle as here asserting, that those ancient worthies also exercised confidence in God's word respecting the blessings of the invisible world; i. e., theirs was ὑπόστασις ἔλαιομενών .... οὐ βλεπόμενον. Those things which are invisible to the corporeal eye, they saw with the eye of faith; and seeing them, they hailed them with joy (ἀναπαύμανι), welcomed them, greeted them or anticipated them with gladness, as we joyfully greet or anticipate the approach of a beloved friend or of some distinguished favor. And, looking forward to them as their chief source of happiness, they openly declared themselves to be only strangers and sojourners in the present world. That γῆς by itself might refer to the land of Canaan, is plain enough; but that it does so refer here, is rendered quite improbable by the sequel. The idea is plainly more general. Παρεπιδήμος means a temporary resident among any people, i. e., a sojourner.

(14) Now they who thus profess, show that they are yet seeking for a country, Οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα .... ἐπιζητοῦσι. Ταῦτα λέγοντες, viz., saying or professing that they were strangers and sojourners in the earth. Παρίδα, a fixed or permanent place of residence, i. q., πόλιν μένουσαν, xiii. 14, or πόλιν ξεμελιόντων ἐξουσιον in ver. 10 above. That this παρίδα was not of an earthly nature, the writer proceeds to show.

(15) For had they cherished the memory of that [country] from which they came, they had opportunity of returning [thither],
Kai ei μὲν ἔκανε... ἄνακάμψαι. That is, if their native country on earth (πατρίς) had been an object of affectionate desire, they might have easily returned thither and dwelt there. But this they did not.

(16) But now they were desirous of a better [country], that is, of a heavenly one, Νῦν δὲ ὁρεύονται... ἐπουράνιον. Νῦν, i. e., while they were strangers and sojourners, during the time then present. This explanation of the writer, in respect to the country which the patriarchs sought, is perfectly plain.

Wherefore God is not ashamed of them [nor] to be called their God; for he hath prepared a city for them, Διὸ οὐκ ἐπαυνχίνεται... πόλιν. Διὸ, wherefore, viz., because of the faith which they reposed in the promises of God respecting future happiness, or in regard to a πόλιν ἐπουράνιον or μύσοναυ. To be their God means, to be their protector, rewarder, benefactor; comp. Rom. iii. 29; Rev. xxi. 3, 7; Ex. iii. 6; Zech. viii. 8; Gen. xv. 1. Ἡροῦσας γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν, i. e., he will reward them, for he has in fact prepared a πόλιν [sc. ἐπουράνιον] for them. By ellipsis, οὐκ ἐπαυνχίνεται is omitted before ἦς ἤπεκαλείπτα αὐτῶν.

(17) By faith Abraham, when tried, made an offering of Isaac, Πίστει προσένειοχε... περαχόμενος. Προσένειοχε, made an offering of; for the act on the part of Abraham was essentially done, when he had fully resolved to do it, and was proceeding to the complete execution of it, Gen. xxii. 1—10. Περαχόμενος (like the Hebrew רפכ) means, either to put to trial, or to tempt, i. e., solicit to sin. Which of these senses the word must bear in any particular passage, depends on the character of the agent who occasions the trial or temptation, and the objects which he has in view. Beyond all question, רפכ in Gen. xxii. 1 and περαχόμενος in our verse, are to be understood in the sense of trial; for God is the agent, and "he tempts no man," i. e., solicits none to sin, James i. 13.

Yea, he who had received the promises, made an offering of his only son, Καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ... ἀναδεξάμενος; Gen. xxii. 2. This clause is designed to augment the force of the description of Abraham’s case. It was not simply, that Abraham in circumstances common to others, i. e., surrounded by several children and without any special promises, made the offering in question; but Abraham did this, to whom God had repeatedly made promises of a numerous progeny; and it was Abraham’s only son, i. e., only son of promise, who was the offering which he stood ready to make.

(18) Unto whom it had been said, after Isaac shall thy seed be named, Πρὸς δὲ... σφέρμα. Πρὸς δὲ, unto whom, and so
very frequently; e.g., Matt. iii. 15; Mark iv. 41; Luke xiv. 25, et al. The Hebrew in Gen. xxii. 12, is יְהַלֵּךְ אֶת הָאָדָם וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, which means literally, thy seed shall be named after Isaac, i.e., thy seed, viz., the seed which is promised to thee, must descend only from Isaac. Neither Ishmael, nor the sons of Abraham by Keturah, could be progenitors of the promised offspring, and give name to them. The Septuagint and apostle have rendered the Hebrew preposition ב in יְהַלֵּךְ, by εὐ; which may be rendered in with a good sense; viz., in Isaac shall there be [so יְהַלֵּךְ is often used in Hebrew] a seed to thee. The sense may be given more intelligibly by another version, viz., by Isaac shall there be a seed to thee. This is a third circumstance added, in order to augment the impression of the reader respecting the faith of Abraham. This patriarch to whom promises had been made, not only offered up his only son, born of Sarah his beloved wife, but his only son, on whom all the promises of God respecting his future progeny were suspended.

(19) Counting that God was able to raise him even from the dead, Δογκάμως ὑπὸ καὶ . . . ῃς, i.e., he believed, that in case Isaac should be actually slain and consumed as a burnt-offering, God could and would raise him up from the dead, so that the promise made to him would be fulfilled. This was indeed a signal example of the strength of faith, and it deserves the commendation which the apostle bestows upon it.

There are not wanting, however, critics of the present time, who attribute this whole transaction of Abraham to his superstition, or to his heathenish views of sacrifice, or to a dream which he erroneously considered as a divine admonition. And in regard to the interposition from heaven which prevented his resolution from being executed, they aver, that the accidental discovery of a ram, caught by the horns in a thicket, was interpreted by the superstitious patriarch as a divine admonition to refrain from proceeding with his design. How different all this is from the views of the author who wrote Gen. xxii., of Paul in Rom. iv., and of the writer of our epistle, need not be insisted on to any one, who does not make his own conceptions about the subject of religion and miracles, the standard by which the sacred writers are to be tried.

Whence, comparatively, he obtained him, or whence, as it were, he did obtain him, Ὁ Θαύματος ήσυχάτα . . . ἱεράρχα. A great variety of interpretations, which have been put on this somewhat difficult phrase. I will simply state those which appear to me to be the most probable.

The first is this: viz., Paul, speaking of the procreation of Isaac in Rom. iv., mentions Abraham as then ἑνεκρωμίνοι, and
the νεκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας of Sarah. In ver. 12 above, the same apostle speaks of Abraham as νεκρωμένων, and his description of Sarah in ver. 11 implies the same thing. Now, as Isaac sprang from Abraham and Sarah, both κατὰ ταύτα νεκρωμένων, what is more natural than to suppose that in our verse this fact is adverted to? The sentiment seems to be this: 'Abraham believed that God could raise Isaac from the dead, because he had, as it were, obtained him from the dead,' i. e., he was born of those who κατὰ ταύτα νεκροὶ ἦσαν. Then the whole presents one consistent and apposite sentiment. Abraham believed God could raise his son from the dead. Why? He had good reason to conclude so, for God had already done what was equivalent to this, or like this; he had done this ἐν παραβολῇ, in a comparative manner, i. e., in a manner that would compare with raising from the dead, or which was a significant emblem of raising from the dead, when he brought about his birth from those who were dead as to the power of procreation. Παραβολὴ means comparison, similitude; ἐν παραβολῇ, comparatively, in like manner, with similitude, as it were. It may be made a question, whether ἵκομισαρο refers to Abraham's having obtained Isaac from the altar of burnt-offering, where he was as if it were dead; or whether the word refers to Abraham's having originally obtained him, viz., at his birth. It may be applied to either; but the latter application seems to be more significant. In this way Hammond, Whitby, Newcome, Schulz, and others, explain the passage. Another explanation is that of Calvin, Limborch, Kuinöel, Bloomfield, and others. It is as follows: 'Filium recipit quasi mortuum, i. e., ac si ex morte resuscitatum ipsi reddidisset Deus.' The text will easily bear this explanation; and it agrees, on the whole, rather better with the verb ἵκομισαρο then the preceding one.

(20) By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in respect to the future Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων . . . Ἡσαὶ, lit. in regard to future things. The sentiment is: 'Pronounced a blessing upon Jacob and Esau, in regard to their future condition,' which accords with the facts as related in Gen. xxvii. 26-40. It was faith in the promises of God which enabled the dying patriarch to do this.

(21) By faith Jacob, when about to die, blessed each of Joseph's sons, Πίστει ἑαυτῷ . . . εὐλογησε; see Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. Ἡμέρας here, like the present participle in Hebrew, has the meaning of the Latin future in -rus. It was not in the act of dying that Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, as Gen. xlviii. 8-22 shows; but it was when on his death bed, that both they and the twelve sons of Joseph were blessed by him; see Gen. xlvii. 31; xlviii. 2; xlix. 33.
And bowed himself upon the top of his staff, καὶ προσκύνησε ... adroth. This last action did not accompany the blessing of the sons of Joseph; at least it is not related in connection with it, but as preceding it. See Gen. xlvii. 31, comp. xlviii. 1, 15, 16. I regard it, therefore, as a separate transaction. Προσκύνησε (Hebrew נזר) designates, as it would seem, the act of worship or reverence paid to God, and occasioned by the grateful emotions of the dying patriarch, on account of the promise which his son Joseph had just made to bury him with his fathers. That the Hebrew נזר, and the corresponding Greek προσκύνησε, are sometimes employed simply and merely to designate an act of religious worship, is plain from 2 K. v. 18; Gen. xxii. 5; 1 Sam. i. 8. That נזר generally means worship or reverence by bowing down towards the earth or even to the earth, is sufficiently plain; but that, in some cases, it also designates worship simply as a religious act, without necessarily implying a particular position of body, is sufficiently plain from 1 K. i. 47, where it is said of David, in extreme old age, and confined to his bed, נזר י떠ל, he worshipped upon his bed; a phrase constructed exactly like that in Gen. xlvii. 31; in both of which cases, Gesenius says, the act of worship is signified without bowing down. This is indeed clear, from the nature of the position, and from the infirmities of Jacob and David. If the reader wants evidence of a similar meaning of προσκύνεω, he may consult John iv. 20—24; xii. 20; Acts, viii. 27; xxiv. 11, etc.

The only question of difficulty that remains, is, whether the present vowel-pointing of the Hebrew, נזר נזר על, upon the head of the bed, is probably more correct than the Septuagint mode of reading the Hebrew, viz. נזר נזר על, upon the top of his staff. I have no hesitation in preferring the latter punctuation; for what is נזר נזר, the head of a bed, in the oriental country, when the bed itself is nothing more than a piece of soft carpeting thrown down upon the floor? And what can be the meaning of Jacob’s bowing himself down upon the head of the bed? For (1) There is no evidence that Jacob was upon the bed, when Joseph paid him the visit recorded in Gen. xlvii. 28—31. It was after this that Jacob was taken sick, Gen. xlviii. 1, and sat up on his bed when Joseph came to visit him, xlviii. 2. (2) An infirm person, lying upon a bed, if he assumed a position such as to bow himself, would sit on the middle of the bed, and not upon the head of it. (3) In all the Scripture, the head of a bed is not once mentioned; and for a good reason, as the oriental bed had, strictly speaking, no head. For these reasons I must regard Jacob as leaning upon the top of his staff for support when he conversed with his son Joseph; than which nothing
can be more natural for a person of very advanced years. In this position he was when Joseph swore to him that he would comply with the request which he had made in respect to his burial. This was so grateful to his feelings, that he spontaneously offered up his thanks to God for such a favor, q. d., he worshipped upon the top of his staff; i. e., leaning upon the top of his staff, he offered homage or thanks to God; just as David "worshipped upon his bed," i. e., did homage or paid reverence to God while on his bed, 1 K. i. 47. That the present vowel-points of the Hebrew do not, in every case, give the most probable sense of the original, will not appear strange to any one, who reflects that they were introduced after the fifth century of our present era. All enlightened critics of the present day disclaim the idea that they are authoritative.

The apostle says, that by faith Jacob worshipped. I understand this of that confidence in God which he entertained, and which led him to trust that all which Joseph had promised him would be accomplished.

(22) By faith Joseph, at the close of life, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel [from Egypt], and gave commandment respecting his bones, Ἰωσήφ . . . ἐνετέλαρο. See Gen. I. 24—26; Josi. xxiv. 32. Τελευτῶν, see on ἀποθνῄσκων in ver. 21. Εὐμνημόνευσα, made mention of, must mean a prophetic mention, as it long preceded the event. ἐνετέλαρο, i. e., he commanded that his bones should be carried up out of Egypt to the land of Canaan, when the Israelites removed thither. It was by faith in the promises of God, that Joseph spoke thus confidently respecting the future exodus of the Israelites, and gave directions respecting his bones, which could be executed only in case this exodus took place.

(23) By faith Moses, after his birth, was concealed for three months by his parents, Ποτηρίου Μωυσῆς . . . αἰτω; see Ex. ii. 2. What is attributed by our author to the parents of Moses, is there said to have been done by his mother. But doubtless it was with her husband's knowledge and concurrence; and even if it were not, there are many cases in Scripture, where what is done by one of any class or company of men, is attributed generally to the class or company; e. g., one evangelist says, that the thieves on the cross reviled Jesus; but another informs us that one of them did this. That παρέφθε applies to both father and mother, is well known, it being equivalent to our word parents.

Because they saw that he was a goodly child, and they did not fear the king's commandment, Δώτι ἔδωκεν . . . βασιλεὺς. Αὐτῶν, Heb. צדים, goodly, fair, beautiful. Διάγομα τοῦ βασιλέως, viz., the command of Pharaoh to destroy all the male children.
Ex. i. 16, 22. It was faith or confidence in divine protection, which led them to perform such a hazardous duty.

(24) By faith Moses, when arrived at mature age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, Πίτυα Μωυσής... Φαραώ. Μέγας γενόμενος means, become full-grown, become adult, having attained the stature of a man. Ἡρεμησα, refused, etc.; no express act of this kind is related in the sacred history; but the whole account of Moses' conduct shows that he had, at this period, fully resolved upon leaving the court of Pharaoh and embarking in the cause of the oppressed Israelites.

(25) Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, Μᾶλλον ἐλομένος... ἀπόλαυσιν. Αἱ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, i.e., the Israelites, to whom this name is often given. Πρόσκαιρον ἄμαρτιἀς ἀπόλαυσιν, viz. the pleasures of living at the court of Pharaoh in princely magnificence.

(26) Counting reproach, like that which Christ suffered, as greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, Μεῖλας πλοῦτον... τῆς Χρυσῆς. The simple sentiment is, 'Moses renounced pleasures and wealth, and endured suffering and reproach, because he believed in the promises which God had made of future good, and that he would deliver his people from the bondage of Egypt. So Christ, 'though rich, for our sakes became poor,' in order to redeem us from a bondage worse than that of Egypt.' That Moses, then, counted reproach like that which Christ suffered, ὡς ἔσθημεν τοῦ Χρυσῆς, as preferable to the pleasure and wealth which he might have enjoyed at the Egyptian court, is plainly the meaning of the writer. Compare ἁμαρτάμεθα Χρυσῆς, sufferings like those of Christ, in 2 Cor. i. 5. Such a use of the Genitive case is by no means infrequent, see Luke xi. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 10. Because he had respect to the retribution. Ἀπεθάνατο γὰρ εἰς τὴν μυστικὰς ἀποδοσίας. Ἀπεθάνατο means to look away from present, and to have respect to or look forward to future things. The retribution of the invisible world is doubtless meant here, by μυστικὰς ἀποδοσίας; comp. vs. 13—16 and ver. 27. By faith in the proffered happiness of a future state, Moses was led to the acts of self-denial here adverted to.

(27) By faith he left Egypt, not fearing the indignation of the king, Ναοτὶ καταλημνὲν... βασιλέως. It has been disputed, whether it was the first or second time that Moses left Egypt, to which the writer here adverts. The first is related in Ex. ii., and was when he fled to Jethro in Midian. But as he fled in this case to save his life, which Pharaoh sought to destroy, Ex. ii. 14, 15, this cannot be the leaving of Egypt to which the
apostle refers; although Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Occumenius, and some of the modern critics, have understood it to be so. It must be the occurrences related in Ex. x.—xiv., to which our author refers; for it was on this occasion that "he suffered affliction with the people of God." Τὸν Ἰππὸν τοῦ Βασιλέως, see Ex. x. 28, 29.

For he persevered, as seeing him who is invisible, Τὸν γὰρ ἄμαρτον ὡς ὄρων ἑκατέρποντες. Ἑκατέρποντες, fortiter vel patienter duravit, if it relate to perseverance in a time of trial and suffering, as here. It does not of itself indicate endurance of suffering, but holding out, persevering, in any state or condition, keeping up good courage and fortitude perseveringly or constantly.

'Αμάρτων, i. e., him whom "no eye hath seen," viz., the invisible God; an appellation frequently given to the Deity; e. g., 1 Tim. i. 17, comp. Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15, 16. In other words, a regard to that world, which is seen only by the eye of faith, led Moses to quit Egypt in defiance of Pharaoh's injunctions.

(28) By faith he observed the passover and the sprinkling of the blood, so that he who destroyed the first-born might not touch them. Πώτερε πεποίηκε ... αὐτῶν. Πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα, Hebrew πουξה γίνεται, which the Seventy translate ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα. This means (as we say) to keep or celebrate the passover. The Hebrew πουξα comes from πουασ, to pass over, to pass by. The Greek form πάσχα comes from the Aramean Hebrew word, נפס, which was the Jewish method of pronouncing נתי in later times, and to which the Greek word exactly corresponds. The account of the event to which the word πάσχα relates, may be seen in Ex. xii.; for the etymology, see vs. 11, 13. Ὅταν ὅψειν τὰ προοίμια, see Ex. xii. 12. Μὴ Πτην αὐτῶν, Ex. xii. 13; αὐτῶν in the Gen. is governed by Πτην, as verbs of sense (touch) govern the Genitive.

All this was done by faith, i. e., through confidence in the divine declarations; since Moses fully believed that what God had foretold would come to pass.

(29) By faith they passed through the Red Sea, as on dry land, Πώτερε διέβασαν ... ξηρὰς. The Νομ. to διέβασαν is of Ἰσραήλ, which the writer leaves his readers to supply from the tenor of the narration. Instances of the like kind are not unfrequent, both in the writings of the Old Testament and of the New. See the history of the event in Ex. xiv. Which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned, Ἡς πέταν ... καταπώθησαν. Ἡς πέταν means the attempt of which, viz., of passing through the Red Sea; so that Ἡς πέταν λαβόντες is equivalent to Ἡς διέβασαν περάσαντες, attempting the passage of which. Καταπώθησαν from κατατίθημι, to swallow up, to engulf, to overwhelm,
and hence to drown; see Ex. xiv. 27, 28. It was on account of confidence in the promise of God to bring the Israelites safely through the Red Sea, that they ventured to cross an arm of it, looking to him for protection from its waters. It is not to be supposed, that every individual of the Israelites possessed such confidence as here described; but their leaders had it, and (as in other cases of a similar nature) it is predicated of the nation.

(30) By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for seven days, Πίστει τὰ τεῖχη . . . . ἡμέρας; see Josh. vi. 12—20. It was in consequence of the promise made by God to Joshua, that Jericho should be taken after the Israelites had marched around it for seven days in succession, that these circuits were performed. It was confidence then in the divine word, which led to the event in question. Κυκλοφώρησα, Rosenmuller, Schleusner, Dindorf, and others, understand to have respect to circumvallation, or a siege of the city by surrounding it; altogether contrary to the meaning of the narration in Josh. vi. For what can be the meaning of Josh. vi. 15, on the supposition that their interpretation is correct? Did the Israelites lay seven sieges to it, in one day? Most evident is it that the sacred writer considers the whole event of the taking of Jericho as miraculous; and all attempts to explain it away by supposing a regular circumvallation, and that the city was stormed by the troops of Joshua on the seventh day, are glosses forced upon the Scripture by the sceptical philosophy of interpreters; not a simple explanation of the meaning of the sacred writers.

(31) By faith Rahab the harlot, having entertained the spies in a friendly manner, perished not with the unbelieving, Πίστει Ἦρας . . . . εἰρήνης. Οὐ συναρέσκει, i.e., was preserved, the affirmative idea being conveyed (as often elsewhere) by the use of a negative form of the expression. Ἁτρακτός refers to the inhabitants of Canaan, who treated the claims of the Israelites to that country with contumacy, and disbelieved what Jehovah had said respecting them. Ἀπειρούμενος, one who refuses to be persuaded, who is contumacious. The event to which this clause relates, is narrated in Josh. vi. 22—25.

Having received, Δέξασθαις, viz., entertained, in her house. Μεταεἰρήνης, with amity, in a peaceable manner; like the Hebrew נָצַר, friendship, e.g., Ps. xli. 10; Jer. xx. 10; xxxviii. 22; Oved. 7; Ps. xxviii. 3, comp. Est. ix. 30. It has been doubted whether πόρφυρα, the appellation given to Rahab here and in James ii. 25, means harlot, or hostess. For the latter Schleusner contends, in his lexicon; as do also many commentators. The corresponding Hebrew word is נָשָׂא, which they say comes from נָשָׂא, pascere, alere, so that נָשָׂא may well be explained merely as one
who furnishes others with nutriment, i. e., a hostess. But this
derivation is contrary to the laws of etymology; for ἁμαρτία must
come from ἁμαρτάω, to commit whoredom, and not from ἁμαρτή which
gives no such form; so that the whole argument on which this
interpretation is built, falls to the ground. Besides, the usus lo-
quentis both of ἁμαρτία and πόρνη, is against such an interpretation.

(32) And what shall I say more? Kai τί εἰπή λέγω; i. e., why
should I recount examples any longer? For time would fail
me, should I tell of Gideon, and Barak, etc. The history of these,
see in the books of Judges and Samuel.

(33) Who through faith subdued kingdoms, Οἱ διὰ πίστεως . . .
βασιλείας. That is, confidence in divine promises respecting the
deliverance of Israel, led them to war with and subdue the king-
doms of those who oppressed the Hebrew nation. Practised
justice, ἐπίσκεψαι δικαιοσύνη, Hebrew קְרֹם וָאר or קְרֹם וָאר did
that which was equitable and proper, carried the laws of justice
into execution; which latter seems to be the idea here. Ob-
tained promised blessings, Ἐπτυγχαν ἐπαγγελία, i. e., as the re-
ward of their confidence in God, Ἐπαγγελία means here, as
generally in this epistle, quod promissum est; and refers to the
various successes, which at different times attended the obedient
efforts and deeds of kings and prophets. The declaration
ἐφραίμ στόματα λέοντων probably refers to the history of Sam-
son, Judg. xiv. 5—9; of David, 1 Sam. xvii. 34—36; and of

(34) They quenched the violence of fire, "Εσβασαν δύναμιν πυρὸς;
see in Dan. iii. 19—26. They escaped the edge of the sword,
"Εφυγόν στόματα μαχαίρας. The expression στόμα μαχαίρας is frequent in
Hebrew, and the equivalent one στόμα μαχαίρας, is several times
used in the New Testament. The phrase is of a general nature,
and is therefore applicable to many cases in the Old Testament,
where escape from imminent danger is related. Were restored to
vigor from a state of infirmity, Ἐνεδυναμωσάν αὐτὸ ἀσθενείας.
"Ἀσθενεία refers to the infirmity occasioned by sickness or disease;
not to the weakness of one army compared with another, or of
one man compared with another. The case of Samson, then, in
Judg. xv. 15, 19; xvi. 19 seq., to which Dr. Schulz refers us,
seems not to be such as the writer had in view; but rather such
a case as that of Hezekiah, 2 K. xx.

Become mighty in war, overthrow, etc., "Ἐγενήθησαν ἱμάρτων ἐν
πολέμῳ, κ. τ. λ. Cases of this nature, the books of Jo-hua,
Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, supply in abundance.
Παρεμβολάς means, camps, encampments; hence, the persons
who live in them, i. e., armies. Ἀλλοτρίαν, ἠθικῶν, ἀθηναῖον, i. e., stran-
gers to the Hebrews and to the worship of the true God; hence,
foreigners, heathen.
very frequently; e.g., Matt. iii. 15; Mark iv. 41; Luke xii. 23, et. al. The Hebrew in Gen. xxi. 12, is יְשֵׁבֵץ לְאֵישׁ אֱלֹהִים, which means literally, thy seed shall be named after Isaac, i.e., thy seed, viz., the seed which is promised to thee, must descend only from Isaac. Neither Ishmael, nor the sons of Abraham by Keturah, could be progenitors of the promised offspring, and give name to them. The Septuagint and apostle have rendered the Hebrew preposition ב in יָדַע, by ἐν; which may be rendered in with a good sense; viz., in Isaac shall there be [so יָדַע is often used in Hebrew] a seed to thee. The sense may be given more intelligibly by another version, viz., by Isaac shall there be a seed to thee. This is a third circumstance added, in order to augment the impression of the reader respecting the faith of Abraham. This patriarch to whom promises had been made, not only offered up his only son, born of Sarah his beloved wife, but his only son, on whom all the promises of God respecting his future progeny were suspended.

(19) Counting that God was able to raise him even from the dead, Λογισάμενος δὲν καὶ ... Ἰησοῦ, i.e., he believed, that in case Isaac should be actually slain and consumed as a burnt-offering, God could and would raise him up from the dead, so that the promise made to him would be fulfilled. This was indeed a signal example of the strength of faith, and it deserves the commendation which the apostle bestows upon it.

There are not wanting, however, critics of the present time, who attribute this whole transaction of Abraham to his superstition, or to his heathenish views of sacrifice, or to a dream which he erroneously considered as a divine admonition. And in regard to the interposition from heaven which prevented his resolution from being executed, they aver, that the accidental discovery of a ram, caught by the horns in a thicket, was interpreted by the superstitious patriarch as a divine admonition to refrain from proceeding with his design. How different all this is from the views of the author who wrote Gen. xxii., of Paul in Rom. iv., and of the writer of our epistle, need not be insisted on to any one, who does not make his own conceptions about the subject of religion and miracles, the standard by which the sacred writers are to be tried.

Whence, comparatively, he obtained him, or whence, as it were, he did obtain him, ὅσεν αὐτὸν ... ἐκοµίσατο. A great variety of interpretations, which have been put on this somewhat difficult phrase. I will simply state those which appear to me to be the most probable.

The first is this: viz., Paul, speaking of the procreation of Isaac in Rom. iv., mentions Abraham as then οὐκ ἔκοµίσατο, and
the νεκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας of Sarah. In ver. 12 above, the same apostle speaks of Abraham as νεκρωσμένον, and his description of Sarah in ver. 11 implies the same thing. Now, as Isaac sprang from Abraham and Sarah, both κατὰ ταῦτα νεκρωσμένοι, what is more natural than to suppose that in our verse this fact is adverted to? The sentiment seems to be this: 'Abraham believed that God could raise Isaac from the dead, because he had, as it were, obtained him from the dead,' i. e., he was born of those who κατὰ ταῦτα νεκροί ἦσαν. Then the whole presents one consistent and apposite sentiment. Abraham believed God could raise his son from the dead. Why? He had good reason to conclude so, for God had already done what was equivalent to this, or like this; he had done this ἐν παραβολῇ, in a comparative manner, i. e., in a manner that would compare with raising from the dead, or which was a significant emblem of raising from the dead, when he brought about his birth from those who were dead as to the power of procreation. Παραβολὴ means comparison, similitude; ἐν παραβολῇ, comparatively, in like manner, with similitude, as it were. It may be made a question, whether ἔκομισαρο refers to Abraham's having obtained Isaac from the altar of burnt-offering, where he was as it were dead; or whether the word refers to Abraham's having originally obtained him, viz., at his birth. It may be applied to either; but the latter application seems to be more significant. In this way Hammond, Whitby, Newcome, Schulz, and others, explain the passage.

Another explanation is that of Calvin, Limborch, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others. It is as follows: 'Filium recipit quasi mortuum, i. e., ac si ex morte resuscitatum ipsi reddidisset Deus.' The text will easily bear this explanation; and it agrees, on the whole, rather better with the verb ἔκομισαρο than the preceding one.

(20) By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in respect to the future Πιστεὶ περὶ μελλόντων . . . Ἡσαίς, lit. in regard to future things. The sentiment is: 'Pronounced a blessing upon Jacob and Esau, in regard to their future condition;' which accords with the facts as related in Gen. xxvii. 26—40. It was faith in the promises of God which enabled the dying patriarch to do this.

(21) By faith Jacob, when about to die, blessed each of Joseph's sons, Πιστεῦ Ἰακωβ . . . εὐλογησε; see Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. Ἀπὸ ἀνήρκοις here, like the present participle in Hebrew, has the meaning of the Latin future in -rus. It was not in the act of dying that Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, as Gen. xlviii. 8—22 shows; but it was when on his death bed, that both they and the twelve sons of Joseph were blessed by him; see Gen. xlvii. 31; xlviii. 2; xlix. 33.
And bowed himself upon the top of his staff, Καὶ προσεκώνθη ἀνάει. This last action did not accompany the blessing of the sons of Joseph; at least it is not related in connection with it, but as preceding it. See Gen. xlvii. 31, comp. xlviii. 1, 15, 16. I regard it, therefore, as a separate transaction. Προσεκώνθη (Hebrew בָּשְׁמָה) designates, as it would seem, the act of worship or reverence paid to God, and occasioned by the grateful emotions of the dying patriarch, on account of the promise which his son Joseph had just made to bury him with his fathers. That the Hebrew בָּשְׁמָה, and the corresponding Greek προσεκώνθη, are sometimes employed simply and merely to designate an act of religious worship, is plain from 2 K. v. 18; Gen. xxii. 5; 1 Sam. i. 8. That בָּשְׁמָה generally means worship or reverence by bowing down towards the earth or even to the earth, is sufficiently plain; but that, in some cases, it also designates worship simply as a religious act, without necessarily implying a particular position of body, is sufficiently plain from 1 K. i. 47, where it is said of David, in extreme old age, and confined to his bed, "he worshipped upon his bed;" a phrase constructed exactly like that in Gen. xlvii. 31; in both of which cases, Gesenius says, the act of worship is signified without bowing down. This is indeed clear, from the nature of the position, and from the infirmities of Jacob and David. If the reader wants evidence of a similar meaning of προσεκώνθη, he may consult John iv. 20—24; xii. 20; Acts, viii. 27; xxiv. 11, etc.

The only question of difficulty that remains, is, whether the present vowel-pointing of the Hebrew, בָּשְׁמָה בָּשְׁמָה, upon the head of the bed, is probably more correct than the Septuagint mode of reading the Hebrew, viz. בָּשְׁמָה בָּשְׁמָה, upon the top of his staff. I have no hesitation in preferring the latter punctuation; for what is בָּשְׁמָה בָּשְׁמָה, the head of a bed, in the oriental country, when the bed itself is nothing more than a piece of soft carpeting thrown down upon the floor? And what can be the meaning of Jacob's bowing himself down upon the head of the bed? For (1) There is no evidence that Jacob was upon the bed, when Joseph paid him the visit recorded in Gen. xlvii. 28—31. It was after this that Jacob was taken sick, Gen. xlviii. 1, and sat up on his bed when Joseph came to visit him, xlviii. 2. (2) An infirm person, lying upon a bed, if he assumed a position such as to bow himself, would sit on the middle of the bed, and not upon the head of it. (3) In all the Scriptures, the head of a bed is not once mentioned; and for a good reason, as the oriental bed had, strictly speaking, no head. For these reasons I must regard Jacob as leaning upon the top of his staff for support when he conversed with his son Joseph; than which nothing
can be more natural for a person of very advanced years. In this position he was when Joseph swore to him that he would comply with the request which he had made in respect to his burial. This was so grateful to his feelings, that he spontaneously offered up his thanks to God for such a favor, q. d., *he worshipped upon the top of his staff,* i. e., leaning upon the top of his staff, he offered homage or thanks to God; just as David “worshipped upon his bed,” i. e., did homage or paid reverence to God while on his bed, 1 K. i. 47. That the present vowel-points of the Hebrew do not, in every case, give the most probable sense of the original, will not appear strange to any one, who reflects that they were introduced after the fifth century of our present era. All enlightened critics of the present day disclaim the idea that they are authoritative.

The apostle says, that by faith Jacob worshipped. I understand this of that confidence in God which he entertained, and which led him to trust that all which Joseph had promised him would be accomplished.

(22) *By faith Joseph, at the close of life, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel [from Egypt], and gave commandment respecting his bones, Πιστις Ἰωσήφ. . . . ἐντελέσατο.* See Gen. i. 24—26; Josh. xxiv. 32. Τελευτῶν, see on ἀποθανόντων in ver. 21. Εὑμνημόνευσε, made mention of, must mean a prophetic mention, as it long preceded the event. Ἐντελέσατο, i. e., he commanded that his bones should be carried up out of Egypt to the land of Canaan, when the Israelites removed thither. It was by faith in the promises of God, that Joseph spoke thus confidently respecting the future exodus of the Israelites, and gave directions respecting his bones, which could be executed only in case this exodus took place.

(23) *By faith Moses, after his birth, was concealed for three months by his parents, Πιστις Μωσῆς. . . . αἰτήσει;* see Ex. ii. 2. What is attributed by our author to the parents of Moses, is there said to have been done by his mother. But doubtless it was with her husband’s knowledge and concurrence; and even if it were not, there are many cases in Scripture, where what is done by one of any class or company of men, is attributed generally to the class or company; e. g., one evangelist says, that the thieves on the cross reviled Jesus; but another informs us that one of them did this. That παράπετασμα applies to both father and mother, is well known, it being equivalent to our word parents.

Because they saw that he was a goodly child, and they did not fear the king’s commandment, Διὰ τοῦ εἴδον . . . βασιλέως. Ἄστιον, Heb. בְּשׁ, goodly, fair, beautiful. Διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως, viz., the command of Pharnah to destroy all the male children,
Ex. i. 16, 22. It was faith or confidence in divine protection, which led them to perform such a hazardous duty.

(24) By faith Moses, when arrived at mature age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, Πίστει Μωυσῆς... Φαραώ. Μέγας γενόμενος means, become full-grown, become adult, having attained the stature of a man. Ἡρεμότατον, refused, etc.; no express act of this kind is related in the sacred history; but the whole account of Moses' conduct shows that he had, at this period, fully resolved upon leaving the court of Pharaoh and embarking in the cause of the oppressed Israelites.

(25) Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, Μᾶλλον ἐλπίδος... ἀπόλαυσιν. Λαβὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ, i.e., the Israelites, to whom this name is often given. Πρόσκαιρον ἀμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, viz. the pleasures of living at the court of Pharaoh in princely magnificence.

(26) Counting reproach, like that which Christ suffered, as greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, Μείκτων πλοῦτον... Χρυσοῦ. The simple sentiment is, 'Moses renounced pleasures and wealth, and endured suffering and reproach, because he believed in the promises which God had made of future good, and that he would deliver his people from the bondage of Egypt. So Christ, "though rich, for our sakes became poor," in order to redeem us from a bondage worse than that of Egypt.' That Moses, then, counted reproach like that which Christ suffered, ἀνείδομον τοῦ Χρυσοῦ, as preferable to the pleasure and wealth which he might have enjoyed at the Egyptian court, is plainly the meaning of the writer. Compare παθήματα Χρυσοῦ, sufferings like those of Christ, in 2 Cor. i. 5. Such a use of the Genitive case is by no means unfrequent, see Luke xi. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 10. Because he had respect to the retribution. Απέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισοθανατίαν. Απέβλεπε means to look away from present, and to have respect to or look forward to future things. The retribution of the invisible world is doubtless meant here, by μισοθανατίαν; comp. vs. 13—16 and ver. 27. By faith in the proffered happiness of a future state, Moses was led to the acts of self-denial here adverted to.

(27) By faith he left Egypt, not fearing the indignation of the king, Πίστει κατέλησε... βασιλέως. It has been disputed, whether it was the first or second time that Moses left Egypt, to which the writer here adverts. The first is related in Ex. ii., and was when he fled to Jethro in Midian. But as he fled in this case to save his life, which Pharaoh sought to destroy, Ex. ii. 14, 15, this cannot be the leaving of Egypt to which the
apostle refers; although Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Occumenius, and some of the modern critics, have understood it to be so. It must be the occurrences related in Ex. x.—xiv., to which our author refers; for it was on this occasion that “he suffered affliction with the people of God.” Tον Ἰηύαν τοῦ βασιλέως, see Ex. x. 28, 29.

For he persevered, as seeing him who is invisible, Τον χαράτων ὡς δρών ἐκαρτήρασε. Ἐκαρτήρησε, fortiter vel patienter duravit, if it relate to perseverance in a time of trial and suffering, as here. It does not of itself indicate endurance of suffering, but holding out, persevering, in any state or condition, keeping up good courage and fortitude perseveringly or constantly. Αὐράτων, i. e., him whom “no eye hath seen,” viz., the invisible God; an appellation frequently given to the Deity; e. g., 1 Tim. i. 17, comp. Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15, 16. In other words, a regard to that world, which is seen only by the eye of faith, led Moses to quit Egypt in defiance of Pharaoh’s injunctions.

(28) By faith he observed the passover and the sprinkling of the blood, so that he who destroyed the first-born might not touch them. Πίστει πεποίηκε . . . . αὐτῶν. Πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα, Hebrew פֶּשֶׁה, which the Seventy translate ποιήσω τὸ πάσχα. This means (as we say) to keep or celebrate the passover. The Hebrew פֶּשֶׁה comes from פָּסַח, to pass over, to pass by. The Greek form πάσχα comes from the Aramean Hebrew word, פָּסַח, which was the Jewish method of pronouncing פֶּשֶׁה in later times, and to which the Greek word exactly corresponds. The account of the event to which the word πάσχα relates, may be seen in Ex. xii.; for the etymology, see vs. 11, 13. Ὁ ἄλογοιν τὰ πρωτότοκα, see Ex. xii. 12. Μὴ Ἰγγα αὐτῶν, Ex. xii. 13; αὐτῶν in the Gen. is governed by Ἰγγα, as verbs of sense (touch) govern the Genitive.

All this was done by faith, i. e., through confidence in the divine declarations; since Moses fully believed that what God had foretold would come to pass.

(29) By faith they passed through the Red Sea, as on dry land, Πίστει διέβησαν . . . . ξηρᾶς. The Nom. to διέβησαν is of Ἰσραήλ, which the writer leaves his readers to supply from the tenor of the narration. Instances of the like kind are not unfrequent, both in the writings of the Old Testament and of the New. See the history of the event in Ex. xiv. Which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned, Ἦς πείραν . . . . καταπόθησαν. Ἦς πείραν means the attempt of which, viz., of passing through the Red Sea; so that Ἦς πείραν λαβόντες is equivalent to Ἦς διάβασαν περαύοντες, attempting the passage of which. Καταπόθησαν from καταπίνω, to swallow up, to engulf, to overwhelm,
and hence to drown; see Ex. xiv. 27, 28. It was on account of confidence in the promise of God to bring the Israelites safely through the Red Sea, that they ventured to cross an arm of it, looking to him for protection from its waters. It is not to be supposed, that every individual of the Israelites possessed such confidence as here described; but their leaders had it, and (as in other cases of a similar nature) it is predicated of the nation.

(30) By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for seven days, Πίστευ τὸ τεῖχος ... ἡμέρας; see Josh. vi. 12—20. It was in consequence of the promise made by God to Joshua, that Jericho should be taken after the Israelites had marched around it for seven days in succession, that these circuits were performed. It was confidence then in the divine word, which led to the event in question. Κυκλοφόρησε, Rosenmuller, Schleusner, Dindorf, and others, understand to have respect to circumvallation, or a siege of the city by surrounding it; altogether contrary to the meaning of the narration in Josh. vi. For what can be the meaning of Josh. vi. 15, on the supposition that their interpretation is correct? Did the Israelites lay seven sieges to it, in one day? Most evident is it that the sacred writer considers the whole event of the taking of Jericho as miraculous; and all attempts to explain it away by supposing a regular circumvallation, and that the city was stormed by the troops of Joshua on the seventh day, are glosses forced upon the Scripture by the sceptical philosophy of interpreters; not a simple explanation of the meaning of the sacred writers.

(31) By faith Rahab the harlot, having entertained the spies in a friendly manner, perished not with the unbelieving, Πίστευ 'Ρααβ ... εἰρήνη. Οὐ συναφῶλετο, i.e., was preserved, the affirmative idea being conveyed (as often elsewhere) by the use of a negative form of the expression. Ἀπετρήσας refers to the inhabitants of Canaan, who treated the claims of the Israelites to that country with contumacy, and disbelieved what Jehovah had said respecting them. Ἀπετρήσας, one who refuses to be persuaded, who is contumacious. The event to which this clause relates, is narrated in Josh. vi. 22—25.

Having received, Δεξαμένη, viz., entertained, in her house. Μετ' εἰρήνη, with amity, in a peaceable manner; like the Hebrew וְשָׁלוֹם, friendship, e.g., Ps. xii. 10; Jer. xx. 10; xxxviii. 22; Omed. 7; Ps. xxviii. 3, comp. Est. ix. 30. It has been doubted whether πασκεῖ, the appellation given to Rahab here and in James ii. 25, means harlot, or hostess. For the latter Schleusner contends, in his lexicon; as do also many commentators. The corresponding Hebrew word is נְני, which they say comes from נָנַה, pascere, alere, so that נְני may well be explained merely as one
who furnishes others with nutriment, i.e., a hostess. But this
derivation is contrary to the laws of etymology; for ψυχή must
come from ψυχή, to commit whoredom, and not from ψυχή which
gives no such form; so that the whole argument on which this
interpretation is built, falls to the ground. Besides, the usus lo-
quendi both of ψυχή and πόρος, is against such an interpretation.

(32) And what shall I say more? Καὶ τί ἐρι λέγω; i.e., why
should I recount examples any longer? For time would fail
me, should I tell of Gideon, and Barak, etc. The history of
these, see in the books of Judges and Samuel.

(33) Who through faith subdued kingdoms, Οἱ δὲ πιστεοὶ . . . .
βασιλείας. That is, confidence in divine promises respecting the
deliverance of Israel, led them to war with and subdue the king-
doms of those who oppressed the Hebrew nation. Practised
justice, ἔργασαν δικαιοσύνη, Hebrew ψυχή ἡ εἰπη or ψυχὴ ἡ εἰπη did
that which was equitable and proper, carried the laws of justice
into execution; which latter seems to be the idea here. Ob-
tained promised blessings, ἔπεταχον ἐπαγγελιάς, i.e., as the re-
ward of their confidence in God. Ἐπαγγελία means here, as
generally in this epistle, quod promissum est; and refers to the
various successes, which at different times attended the obedient
efforts and deeds of kings and prophets. The declaration
ἀπεραξαν στόματα λέοντων probably refers to the history of Sam-
son, Judg. xiv. 5—9; of David, 1 Sam. xvii. 34—36; and of
Daniel, Dan. vi. 16—24.

(34) They quenched the violence of fire, ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρὸς;
see in Dan. iii. 19—26. They escaped the edge of the sword,
ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαῖρας. The expression ἔφυγον is frequent in
Hebrew, and the equivalent one στόμα μαχαῖρας, is several times
used in the New Testament. The phrase is of a general nature,
and is therefore applicable to many cases in the Old Testament,
where escape from imminent danger is related. Were restored to
vigor from a state of infirmity, ἐνενενυμαζότησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας.
Ἀσθένεια refers to the infirmity occasioned by sickness or disease;
not to the weakness of one army compared with another, or of
one man compared with another. The case of Samson, then, in
Judg. xv. 15, 19; xvi. 19 seq., to which Dr. Schulz refers us,
seems not to be such as the writer had in view; but rather such
a case as that of Hezekiah, 2 K. xx.

Become mighty in war. overthrow, etc., ἔγενοτάρθησαν ἵππωροι ἐν
πολέμοι, κ. τ. λ. Cases of this nature, the books of Jo-hua,
Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, supply in abundance.
Παρεμβολάς means, camps, encampments; hence, the persons
who live in them, i.e., armies. Ἀλλοτριῶν, ἱππότων, ἰπποτῶν, i.e., stran-
gers to the Hebrews and to the worship of the true God; hence,
foreigners, heathen.
(35) Women recovered their dead, by a resurrection, Ἐλαβον . . . νεκροῖς αὐτῶν. Ἔξ ἀναστάσεως designates restoration to life from a state of death, a renewed subsistence or existence, a resurrection; which corresponds with facts as related in Scripture; e. g., 2 K. iv. 18—37; 1 K. xvii. 17—24. Toις νεκροῖς αὐτῶν, viz., their dead children; which is implied by αὐτῶν, their own.

Some were tortured and beaten, Ἀλλοι δὲ ὑμματισμήσαν. Τυμπανίζω, to tympanize, means to stretch upon an instrument called τύμπανον (the shape of which is not certainly known at present, but most probably it was of a circular form), for the sake of giving the body an attitude of peculiar exposure to the power of cudgels or rods. It involves the idea of scourging or beating in this peculiar way; i. e., torture by stretching upon the τύμπανον, and beating, were conjoined at the same time. Not accepting liberation, in order that they might obtain a better resurrection, Οὐ προδέχόμενοι . . . τύχωσαν. That is, they declined accepting liberation from their torments on condition of renouncing their religion; and they thus declined, in order that they might attain to a better resurrection. They looked to a resurrection of the body, which was of a higher nature than merely the redeeming it for a while from temporal death; and in view of this, they refused to accept of liberation from their torments on the condition prescribed. They persevered, because their faith enabled them to regard as a certainty the future and glorious resurrection of the just.

Better resurrection, Κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως. Better than what? Plainly, better than that which had just been mentioned, viz., resurrection to life in the present world merely; as in the examples of the children mentioned in 1 K. xvii. and 2 K. iv. It was not the hope of such a resurrection—the hope of merely regaining the present life and being again subject to death as before—which led the martyrs suffering upon the τύμπανον to refuse liberation. It was the hope of a resurrection to a life of immortal happiness and glory, that led them to refuse liberation.

(36) Others were tried by mockings and scourges, Ἐστροὶ δὲ . . . ὤλασον, lit. others were put to the trial of mockings and scourges. Ἐμπαιγμῶν refers to scorn, derision, and buffeting, which the victims of persecution experienced. Μαστίγων designates a method of scourging, different from that practised by the use of the τύμπανον; see 2 Macc. vii. 1; 2 K. ii. 28; 1 K. xxii. 24. And also by bonds and imprisonment, Ἐτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς; see 1 K. xxii. 27; Jer. xx.

(37) They were stoned, they were slain asunder, they were tempted, they perished by the murderous sword, Ἐλαβον . . .
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... ἀνεῖδαν. The instances of suffering and death, mentioned in this verse, are not distinctly recorded in the Old Testament; but were doubtless all of them realities, and often repeated under the terrible persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, and perhaps of Manasseh and others. The Jews have had a tradition, from time immemorial, that Isaiah was sawn asunder by the command of Manasseh.

The word εὐπράξις ἡσσαν has been a stumbling-block to the great body of critics, both in ancient and modern times. The difficulty lies in the fact, that a word of a mere generic signification, and of a milder aspect, should be inserted in the midst of such as designate specific sufferings, and those of a high degree. Accordingly it has been proposed to read εὐπράξις ἡσσαν, ἐπιμέλης ἡσσαν, ἐπίστροφος ἡσσαν, ἐπάρθησαν, ἐπερώτησαν, ἐπερώτησαν, ἐπερώτησαν, ἐπεφαυσάσαν, ἐπερεῖς ἡσσαν, ἐπεφαυσάσαν, ἐπερεῖς ἡσσαν, or ἐπερεῖς ἡσσαν; all of which are without any authority, while εὐπράξις ἡσσαν is well supported. In such a case, moreover, conjecture is out of question, so long as the established reading will make any tolerable sense. In respect to the contested word εὐπράξις ἡσσαν, it seems to me that the great body of critics have overlooked a very obvious and intensive meaning of it, viz., that of temptation to do evil; which in the case presented by ver. 37 here, must mean, ‘temptations presented by persecutors to the victims of their torture, in order to induce them to forsake their religion and worship the gods of idolaters.’ Such was a common practice among the heathen persecutors of Christians. Not only life, but wealth and honor were frequently proffered, in the midst of torture most agonizing to the human frame, in order to tempt the martyrs to forsake their religion. Such a temptation as this, is by no means to be reckoned, under such circumstances, among the lighter trials of good men; and to such a one it is plain, our text may refer. Is it not probable that it has such a reference? Compare the latter part of ver. 35. If so, this locus vexatissimus may be permitted to rest in quiet, not only as being supported by good authority, but as altogether significant and entirely consonant with the writer’s purpose.

They went about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, in want, afflicted, injuriously treated, Περηφανῶν ἐν... κακονυμένων. That is, driven out from the society of men, they were obliged to clothe themselves with the skins of animals; to undergo all the wants and distresses to which such a condition reduced them; and to submit to the injuries which were heaped upon them by their persecutors.

(38) Of whom the world was not worthy, Ὅν οἶκ Ἰν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος, i.e., with whom the world could not bear a comparison.
in respect to worth; in other words, 'who were of a character elevated far above that of the rest of the world.' This is a proverbial expression, and plainly is to be included here in a parenthesis, as it is an ejaculation of the writer, interrupting the regular series of the discourse.

Wandering about in deserts and mountains, in caves also and dens of the earth, Ἕν ἐφημίασ... γῆς. A further description of persons banished from society, and wandering hither and thither in order to find the means of subsistence, or to avoid the rage of persecution. Σπηλαίωσιν and ὀπαίσ include fissures of the rocks and holes in the earth; both of which were resorted to by these outcasts, for a shelter, when one was needed.

(39) All these, moreover, who are commended on account of faith, obtained not the promised blessing, Καὶ οἵτων πάντες... ἐπαγγελίαν. That is, they lived in expectation of some future good, of some promised blessing. They habitually, by faith, looked forward to something which they did not attain in the present life. Μαρτυρηγένετος, commended; as often before in this epistle.

(40) God having provided some better thing for us, so that without us they could not fully obtain what was needed, Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ περὶ... τελειωθῶσιν. Some refer the κραττόν τι to the happiness of the heavenly world. But how is heavenly blessedness vouchsafed to later, more than to ancient saints? And in what sense can it be affirmed, that the ancients could not, or did not attain it without us? The object of the writer, through the chapter, has been to show that the hopes of heaven, cherished by the ancient worthies, were firm and bright through faith in the word of God. That they did at last actually attain the object of their hopes, surely will not be doubted. The "better things reserved for Christians," then, is not a reward in heaven; for such a reward was proffered also to the ancient saints.

I must therefore adopt another exegesis of the whole passage, which refers ἐπαγγελίαν to the promised blessing of the Messiah; see Gen. xii. 1—3; xvii. 1—8. The idea is: 'The ancient worthies persevered in their faith, although the Messiah was known to them only by promise. We are under greater obligations than they to persevere; for God has fulfilled his promise respecting the Messiah, and thus placed us in a condition better adapted to perseverance than theirs. So much is our condition preferable to theirs, that we may even say, 'Without the blessing which we enjoy, their happiness could not be completed.' In other words: The coming of the Messiah was essential to the consummation of their happiness in glory, i. e., was necessary to their τελειώσις.
In ix. 15 (comp. ix. 26 and Rom. iii. 25, 26), the death of Christ is represented as having a retrospective influence upon past ages. The happiness then of the ancient worthies, is connected with Christ's coming and atonement. And to these the writer seems to me to advert, when he says \( \mu\eta \chi\nu\rho\varepsilonis \eta\rho\varepsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon\omega\zeta\omega\sigma\upsilon, \) i.e., without what has taken place in our days, their happiness could not be perfected, great and good as they were. This meaning is altogether apposite to his purpose; for, as he had shown that faith was the means by which the ancient worthies persevered and obtained happiness even before the coming of the Messiah, he might well argue, that since his coming there were more powerful motives to persevere in the faith which he had been commending. If the ancients did so, whose happiness was connected with something then future, and which was to happen only in later days; then surely Christians ought now to persevere, who have actually witnessed the performance of promised good for which the ancients only hoped. The \( \kappa\varepsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \) \( \tau\iota \) then seems to be, 'the actual fulfilment of the promise respecting the Messiah;' in respect to which later times certainly have a preeminence over the early ones, and on which the expected happiness of early times was really dependent.

CHAP. XII.

Having thus set before his readers the illustrious examples of ancient times, in respect to faith and persevering steadfastness, the writer now proceeds to represent those worthies as gathered around his readers in order to witness the manner and the event of the contest in which they were engaged, ver. 1. Above all, he exhorts them to look to the example of Jesus, who had subjected himself to the like trials, and had obtained a glorious reward, vs. 2, 3. He tells them, in order to animate them in their struggle, that they have not yet been called to trials of the greatest severity, ver. 4; and that they must consider, that their heavenly Father designs all their sufferings and trials for their good. They should receive chastisement, then, as adapted to promote this good; and therefore, with a willing and submissive spirit, vs. 5—11. On this account they should cheer their hearts, and mutually assist and encourage each other, vs. 12, 13. They should be very cautious in respect to all delusions from faith and zeal, lest, in case they remit their watchful efforts, they should be left, like rash and thoughtless Esau, to deplore the errors they had committed. When it was beyond their power to retrieve them, vs. 14—17. They have not come under a dispensation full of awe and threatening, like the law given at Sinai, but under one which profers all that is attractive and encouraging, vs. 18—24. So much the more grievous and criminal will be their apostasy, in case they should renounce Christianity, vs. 25, 26. This change of dispensations, and the introduction of a permanent one, was predicted even among the very threatenings of the ancient one; so that there is now abundant evidence of the stability of the new dispensation, and those who neglect it will incur the most signal and exemplary punishment, vs. 27—29.

(1) Since now we are encompassed by so great a multitude of witnesses, Τογαροις καὶ . . . ἐπιτριπτοις, i.e., by so great a multi-
tude of spectators. An allusion, as the sequel shows, is here made to the stadium of the Greeks and Romans, where the persons stood who were to engage in the exercises of their public games, surrounded by great multitudes of spectators. In a condition resembling this, the writer now places the Hebrew Christians whom he is addressing, and surrounds them with the multitude of worthies and martyrs, to whom he had been alluding in the preceding chapter. Νέφος is figuratively used for multitude. So the heathen writers also; e.g., Virg. Aen. VII. 793, nimbus peditum. Liv. XXXV. 49, peditum equitumque nimbus. Herod. VIII. 105, νέφος τοῦ ὅποιον ἄνθρωπον. Eurip. Phoeniss. 1321, νέφος πολεμίων. Hec. 907; τούτῳ ἦλθον νέφος, where the Scholiast explains νέφος by πλήθος. Aristoph. Avib. στρογ-γλῶν νέφος. Hom. II. ψ. 133, νέφος πέζων. Diod. Sic. III. 28, νεφέλη [i. q., νέφος] ἄριστων; comp. Sept. Ezek. xxxix. 9; Is. lx. 8.

The writer proceeds to exhort the combatants to prepare for the contest before them. Laying aside every incumbrance, Ὀγκον ἀποθέμενον πάντα. Ὀγκος means swelling, tumor, pride; also weight, weightiness. The reference here is to those who ran in the stadium, and who laid aside all superfluous clothing and disencumbered themselves of everything which could impede their progress. The simple word, weight, would not be of sufficient latitude to convey all which ὀγκος means in the passage before us. Every impediment or hindrance is to be laid aside, or every incumbrance is to be avoided.

Especially the sin which easily besets us, Καί τὴν εἰπερίστατον ἀμαρτίαν. Καί before the phrase τὴν εἰπερίστατον ἀμαρτίαν, is explicative, and is equivalent, in such a connection, to the English words specially or in particular. Ἐπερίστατον is a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, the meaning of which has been variously explained. In its composition it is analagous with εἰπερίγγαφος, εἰπερίστατος, εἰπερί-κυρος, etc. Περίστημι means to stand round, surround. hence Chrysostom explains εἰπερίστατον by ἡ εὐκόλως περίστασένη ήμῶς, which easily comes or stands around us. And thus many modern interpreters understand the word; which, on the whole gives an apposite sense. The ἀμαρτία which most easily beset the Hebrews, was undoubtedly apostasy or defection from their Christian profession; against which the whole epistle is directed. They were under peculiar temptations to this sin, in consequence of the persecutions which they endured, and of their former prejudices in favor of Judaism.

But other critics, ancient and modern, explain εἰπερίστατον in a somewhat different manner. Περίστατος, among other things, denotes, as Hesychius affirms, θλύσις, ἀνάγκη, μέριμνα. Hence Theodoret explains εἰπερίστατον, ἐν ἕπειρο-
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τὰς ἁμαρτίας, by which one easily falls into troubles or afflictions. That is: 'Lay aside the sin, which will easily bring you into a state of punishment or distress.' So some of the modern critics also explain the word; especially as the Greek ἄπειρος ταῦτα means not dangerous, free from vexation. Hence, they conclude, ἐπειρῶσας must mean the opposite of this, viz., full of danger or trouble; εὖ being intensive, as in εὐμεγέθης, εὐμήχας, etc. This seems to be a good sense, and pretty well supported by analogy.

Others, Ernesti, Doederlein, et al., prefer to render ἐπειρῶσας by quod patronos habet, quod homines favent; i.e., ἐπειρῶσας means, according to them, well surrounded, viz., by applauding multitudes. But the preceding senses are better supported than this, by analogy. Kuinoel says that πειρᾶσας sometimes means impediment, and so he renders ἐπειρῶσας here by quod cummaxime currum impedit. But the passage from Max. Tyrius, which he addsuces to support this, is not decisive. I find nothing to support this exegesis in Passow's lexicon. Besides, the sense thus constituted would be thus: 'Lay aside every impediment, and particularly special impediments;' a possible sense indeed, but hardly a probable one.

Let us run with perseverance the race set before us, Αἱ ὑπομνήσεις . . . . ἀγῶν. Ὑπομνήσεις refers, here, not so much to enduring patiently evils which might befall them, as to holding out in the race, persevering in their efforts until it was completed and the reward secured. Ἀγῶν means any kind of contest, any gymnastic exercise which was a trial of skill or in which there was a competition. Here, plainly, it is limited to designate a race by the accompanying τρέχωμεν. Πρόκειται is employed by the classical writers in the same way as here, viz., to designate the proposal of this or that ἀγών to the ἄγωντας.

The simple meaning of the whole verse, divested of metaphor, is: 'Since so many illustrious patriarchs, prophets, and martyrs, who preceded us, have exercised faith, persevered in it, and obtained the rewards consequent upon it, let us, in like manner, rejecting every solicitation to renounce our hopes and our holy religion, persevere in the belief and in the duties which the gospel requires.'

(2) That they may be excited to do this, he now refers them to the example of Christ himself. Looking to Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith, Ἀρχότας εἰς τὸν . . . . Ἰσραήλ. Ἀρχότας, author, leader, or pattern, example; here it means, 'Jesus who introduced the new religion or the Christian faith, who first taught it and led the way in it;' see on ii. 10. Τελεωτὴν, he who completed the system of faith or religion which he had introduced. So it is commonly explained. But there is another
view of the term here which seems to be more probable. This is, that it here signifies the same as βραβευτής, i.e., the distributor of the prize. This meaning would be quite analogical, when traced from the meaning that τελεω and τέλος sometimes have. The βραβευτής was commonly a person who had himself been a victor in the games. Hence ἄρχηγός would here mean, one who was by his own example a leader, and τελεωτής he who now distributed the prize. Hence we may render ἄρχηγον καὶ τελεωτήν, the pattern and rewarder. In this way the figure which the writer had begun, is carried through.

That πίστις often signifies the Christian faith or religion, hardly needs to be mentioned.

Who, on account of the joy that was set before him, ὁς ἀντὶ τῆς . . . χαρᾶς. This χαρὰ προκειμένη, was exaltation to the right hand of God in the world above, and the glorious reign which was to follow; as the last part of the verse shows. The joy that was set before him, was given him when he had finished his course. In προκειμένη there is an allusion again to the method of proposing the prizes at the public games.

Endured the cross, disregarding ignominy, and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God, ὑπέμενε σταυρόν . . . κεκάθηκε. Ἐν δεξιᾷ, κ. τ. λ., see on i. 3. Ἀιχμαῖς means the shame which others might heap upon him, i.e., ignominy, disgrace, or the ignominious punishment of the cross. Sentiment: 'Do as Christ the author of our holy religion did. For the heavenly reward proposed, he with patience and perseverance endured every kind of indignity and suffering, and has, in consequence of it, received a glorious reward. Follow in his steps, and participate in his glory.'

(3) Consider him, now, who endured such opposition against himself from sinners, Ἀναλογίασαθε . . . ἄντιλογον. Ἀναλογίασθε means reflect on his example, take his case into consideration. Ἀμαρωλῶν refers here to the persecuting Jews of the Saviour's time, who thus evil-entreated Jesus. Ἀντιλογίαν, ἢρμ, ἀντίπροσωπον, opposition, rebellion, contest against, contumely. Contra-diction is a term too soft to reach the full meaning.

Lest becoming discouraged in your mind ye grow weary, ἵνα μὴ κάμψη . . . ἐκλύμενοι. Ἐκλύμενα means to become discouraged or despondent. I join the participle ἐκλύμενα with ταῖς ψυχαῖς. So Wahl on ἐκλύμενα; and so Kuinoel. The verb ἐκλύω has the same signification, if the noun be omitted; e.g., ver. 5. Κάμω means to become wearied, to be tired out. The first step towards forsaking the Christian course, is to become disheartened in the pursuit of it. Next follows weariness in pursuing that, from which we do not hope or expect any certain
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(4) *Ye have not resisted unto blood in your contest against sin,* Ὄντω μέχρις . . . ἀντιγονεύομεν. We must not understand the phrase, *ye have not resisted unto blood,* to represent the Hebrew Christians as making, or preparing to make, active and hostile resistance to their aggressors or persecutors. This is not the meaning of the writer. It was figuratively a contest, in which the Hebrews were engaged; just as in vs. 1—3, he had represented it as a race, ἄγων. It was a contest with trial, temptation, affliction; the result of being persecuted by the enemies of the Christian religion. But the struggle had not yet proceeded so far that they were called to martyrdom, as others in ancient times had been. Many vexations had been suffered by them; but the shedding of blood had not yet commenced. This could hardly be said, indeed, in respect to the churches at Jerusalem; at least not without limitation; for there James and Stephen had actually suffered martyrdom, and others had been severely treated. Still, it might be said of the generation of Christians then living in that place.

The phrase Πρὸς τὴν δαμαρίαν is controverted. I understand it (simply in accordance with the nature of the context) as an abstract noun put for a concrete, i. e., δαμαρία for δαμαρίων; a usus loquendi very common both in the Old and the New Testaments. *Δαμαρίαν,* if explained thus, means persecutors, viz., those who inflicted injuries upon the Hebrew Christians; and probably these were their own countrymen or nation, i. e., the Jews. If there be a prosopopoeia here of δαμαρία, as Kuinoel and Boehme assume, the sense comes after all to the same point. Nothing more is won. Carpzoff, Bolten, Heinrichs, and others, have construed it as I have done above.

(5) *And have ye forgotten the exhortation, which is addressed to you as to children?* Καὶ ἐκλέγοντες . . . διαλέγεται. Most interpreters render καὶ ἐκλέγοντες without interrogation, and ye have forgotten, ye must needs have forgotten, etc. It seems to me more congruous with the apostle's manner of address in this hortatory part of his epistle, to render it (as Ernesti has done) interrogatively. It loses nothing of its force, and gains in respect to the manner of address.

*My son, do not slight the chastening of the Lord, nor be disheartened when reproved by him, *Υἱὲ μου . . . ἄφεγχωμας. Ὄλιγος (Hebrew ὀλίγος), contemn, slight, despise, disregard. Ἰαρίλον, in the sense of the Hebrew Ἰαρίλον, chastening, rebuke.
Classic usage employs πανδία in the sense of instruction, discipline. Ἐκλέγον, Hebrew יָשֵׁר from יָשָׁר, justly and also meta-ere, i. e., μὴ ἐκλέγον, be not timid, be not disheartened, viz., as to going forward in your Christian course; forsake it not, because you experience trouble in pursuing it. The quotation is from Prov. iii. 11, 12, and in the words of the Septuagint.

(6) For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. "Οὐ γὰρ ἄγατο ἀλλ' ἐπισκέπτεται. Μασαυοι δὲ, κ. τ. λ., is after the words of the Septuagint, Prov. iii. 12. The Hebrew, as now read, gives a somewhat different meaning. It is thus, המהו הָכָּנְס הַגָּדָה, and as a father [chastens] the son whom he loves. The Seventy appear to have read בְּכֵן, participle of בָּכֵן; or else בְּכֵן in Piel; or perhaps בְּכֵן in Hiphil. No example of a transitive sense of בָּכֵן in Kal, is to be found; it means only to be afflicted, to feel pain. Of the Piel form of this verb no instance is found in the Hebrew Scriptures; but the use of the Hiphil is common. In whatever way they read the Hebrew in order to make their version, as the version now is, and as the apostle has quoted it, it preserves the spirit though not the letter of the present Hebrew; or rather, we may say that it gives a preferable reading of it. That quotations are often made by the New Testament writers from the Old Testament, in a general way, ad sensum and not ad literam, I have had frequent occasion to remark before, in commenting on our epistle. No one who attentively studies the New Testament, can doubt this.

(7) If ye endure chastisement, God dealeth with you as children, εἰ πανδίαν . . . ο Ἰσός. Υπομένετε has the sense here of enduring, undergoing, suffering; and not that of supporting, bearing up under, persevering. Προσφέρεται (mid. voice) means tractare aliquem. So the classical writers also employ it. See Schneider and Schleusner on the word.

For what son is there, whom his father does not chasten? Τί γὰρ τοῦτο . . . τορήπ. That is: How can ye expect, although ye are children, not to receive any chastisement?

(8) But if ye are without chastisement (of which all children are made partakers), then are ye spurious and not [legitimate] children, εἰ δὲ χαρις τοτε . . . νοικ. Νόησι means, illegitimates children. Νοικ, which is here the antithesis, of course means legitimate offspring. The meaning is: 'If ye are not dealt with as all legitimate children are, it would follow that ye are considered as not belonging to them.' That is, if ye receive no chastening, then God does not acknowledge you as his spiritual children. The design of the writer, in thus applying this text of Scripture is plain. He means to tell the Hebrews, that so far from
being disheartened by their trials and afflictions, on account of their Christian profession, they ought to regard it as a matter of encouragement, and as an evidence that God is acknowledging by these their filial relation to him.

(9) Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh who have chastised us, and we have yielded them reverence, Exe τοὺς μέν ... ενερπομένα. Τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, fathers of our flesh, i. e., of our natural bodies. The idea is, 'fathers of our physical nature,' in distinction from our spiritual one.

 Shall we not much rather yield submission to the Father of [our] spirits, that we may live? Οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ... ζησομεν; That is, when God chastens us for our good, in order that he may promote our final happiness, when he has so important an end in view, shall we not bow to his will with cheerful subjection? Πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, an antithesis of τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, and therefore plainly ἡμῶν is implied after πνευμάτων. Num. xvi. 22, ἀ γέτας μητέρας ἐχομεν; the God of the spirits of all flesh, is a parallel expression; comp. also Zech. xii. 1. Ζησομεν has the sense here, as often elsewhere, of being happy; like the Latin vivere, in dum vivimus vivamus. I do not suppose that the apostle designs here to express his philosophical views respecting the metaphysical origin of the soul or of the body; but that he uses the terms father of our flesh and father of spirits in a popular way, to denote our natural parents and our spiritual Father. But that God is called the Father of spirits because he takes care of our minds or spirits, providing for them, etc. (so Kuinoel), is as I apprehend, quite aside from the original meaning of this phrase.

(10) For they chastened us a little while, according to their own pleasure, τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ... ἐκεῖδεν. The γὰρ here introduces a reason why we should submit to God when he chastises. Πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡμῶς, i. e., during our childhood, our minority; which seems to me a much more natural sense than to say, with Heinrichs and Dindorf, "the fruit of their chastisement was only temporary." Κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτῶς, according to their own pleasure, intimates that they sometimes erred in their chastisement, or that it was sometimes arbitrary; but it is not so with that which God inflicts. But he, for our good, in order that we might be made partakers of his holiness, Ὅ δέ ἔμπορε τὸ συμφαίον ... αὐτό. That is, God never chastises arbitrarily, but always to promote the real good of his children, to make them more holy, and so more like himself. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 4; Lev. xi. 44; xix. 2; xx. 7, 26.

(11) Now all chastisement, for the present, seemeth not to be matter of joy but of grief, Πάσα δὲ παθεῖα ... λύσις. Πρὸς μὲν
τὸ παρόν, during the present, i. e., while it continues. Μέν here corresponds to δὲ after ἵστερον in the next clause, i. e., there is a protasis and an apodosis.

But afterwards, it yields the happy fruit of righteousness to those who are exercised thereby, ἵστερον δὲ . . . δικαιοσύνης. Καρπὸν εὐγνωμονίας is a peculiar expression. Some resemblance to it may be found in James iii. 18; Is. xxxii. 17; Gen. xxxvii.

4. The meaning of εὐγνωμονίας is to be gathered by a comparison of it with the Hebrew שבע, which means good, happiness, welfare. Εὐγνωμονικός, is that which bestows happiness, or produces it. This corresponds with the writer's design; who means to say, that afflictions rightly improved will be productive of fruit that will confer happiness, such fruit as righteousness always produces. So remote a position of δικαιοσύνης from καρπὸν, seems to indicate almost the necessity of repeating this word before it.

(12) Wherefore strengthen the weak hands and the feeble knees, Διὸ τὰς παρεμάνας . . . ἀνορθωσάτε. Ἀνορθώσατε is often employed by the Seventy in order to translate the Hebrew יָשָׁה, which means to establish, to make firm, to strengthen. Παρεμάνας (from παρέλθων) means relaxed, let down; consequently, weak, enfeebled. One might (as many interpreters have done) translate ἀνορθώσατε παρεμάνας χειράς, by lift up the hands that hang down. But since the same verb applies to παραλεμάνω γύναικα, it is better to render it as to make the application to both congruous; which may be done without transgressing Hellenistic usage. The quotation is from Is. xxxv. 3, where the Septuagint has λυγώσατε instead of ἀνορθώσατε. The meaning of the verse is: 'Since all your afflictions are dispensed by fatherly kindness, be of good courage, do not indulge any despondency, but persevere in the course which you have begun.'

(13) And make plain the paths for your feet, Καὶ τροχίας ὅρθος . . . ἀναστήσατε. In Hebrew, נִבּוּ וַיִּבּוּ כִּלָּה make even, or level the path of thy feet; Septuagint ὅρθος τροχίας πολεῖ σὲ σῶς πορεύατε, Prov. iv. 26. If the apostle has quoted here, it is ad sensum, not ad verum. The meaning is: 'remove all obstacles, or disregard all obstacles, to your progress in the Christian course.'

That what is lame may not be sprained, but rather be healed, Ἐκτραπῇ τὸ χωλόν . . . μᾶλλον. Τὸ χωλόν is a neuter adjective, used for the abstract noun lameness, and therefore of a generic signification, designating that which is lame or the members which are lamed. Εκτραπῇ means to turn aside; which applied to the lame, means to dislocate, distort, sprain, wrench, the limbs which are lamed. Ἐκτραπῇ δὲ μᾶλλον, i. e., it is better to make the paths smooth and plain, so that those who are lamed may walk with ease and safety, than to let them be rough and uneven, so as to
endanger an increase of their malady. The whole is a figurative expression, used by our author to convey the idea, that to go straight forward in their Christian course, regardless of any affictions to which this may subject them, is the only way of safety for those who are in danger of halting.

(14) Studiously cultivate peace with all men, and holiness, ἐπιθέντω διώκετε ... ἀγασιμόν. Ἐπιθέντω means here a state of concord and amity, the opposite of contention and broils. To contentions the Hebrew Christians must have been much exposed at this time, in consequence of the frequent injuries inflicted upon them by their persecutors. Διώκετε, pursue with zeal or engagedness. Ἀγασιμόν, holiness, i. e., a pious, upright life, or a life of consecration to God.

Without which no one shall see the Lord, Ὅψ χαρίς ... κύριον. To see the Lord, Ὀπταθαν τὸν κύριον, denotes to come before him, to enjoy his presence, to be admitted to his favor. Comp. Matt. v. 8; and Wahl on δοξολογεῖ, 2. b. See also 1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; John xiv. 3, 4; xvii. 24.

(15) See to it that no one fail of the favor of God, ἔπισκοποῦντες μὴ τις ... Ἐκαβὰ. Ἐπισκοποῦντες, lit. seeing; but the sense is the same, and the translation more perspicuous, if a new sentence be made here by adopting, as I have done, the Imp. form of the verb to see. Μὴ τις, i. e., μὴ τις ἢ, the verb of existence being implied. Ὑστερῶω is differently rendered by different interpreters. Ὑστερῶ means to come late, to arrive after the proper or favorable time, and is so rendered here by some. But ὑστερῶ ἀπὸ ... is hardly capable of such a meaning, and plainly should be rendered, be wanting in respect to, fail of, come short of; lack. But what is χάρισμα? Some answer, the Christian religion; and construe the whole phrase thus, 'Guard well against the apostasy of any one from Christianity.' But this warning has been so often repeated, and in terms so awful, it may well be doubted whether χάρισμα has the sense thus put upon it; and specially so, as the writer appears (in ver. 14) to make a transition from his great subject to the consideration of other things particularly important to the Hebrew Christians. The writer had just said, that holiness is indispensable to that happiness which God bestows. I understand him as now saying, 'See well to it, that no one fail of obtaining that divine favor which is the result of holiness;' and so I connect it, as a hortatory adjunct, with the preceding sentiment.

Lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, Μὴ τις λία ... ἐνοχᾷ, i. e., see to it, lest any person of vicious life and example should rise up among you. Many commentators refer this to apostates. They are the more inclined to this, because a
similar expression is found in Deut. xxix. 17, which there characterizes those who turn from the worship of the true God to that of idols. But as it is not certain that our author designs to make a direct quotation in the present case, I should not consider this reason as in itself of any considerable weight. Even if the form of expression be quoted, the application of it must depend of course upon the context. This respects not apostasy in particular (as we have already seen), but other sins to which the Hebrews might be particularly exposed. No doubt the expression πιθα πικρίας comes from the Hebrew, יָדוֹ הֶבֶלִי, lest there be among you any root springing up [which is] poison and wormwood, Deut. xxix. 17. The expression there used to describe an idolater, viz., root of poison and wormwood, is here applied to any person of an unholy life and deleterious example, who is called πιθα πικρίας. The consequence is next described. Καὶ δὲ ταίγῆς μανασσαὶ τολλοὶ, and by this many be polluted. That is, the bad example of some, will have a pernicious and polluting influence on many. Guard well against it; for τιτικοπώτες is implied before μὴ τις πιθα, k. τ. λ. (16) Let there be no fornicator nor profane person, like Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright, Μή τις πόρος . . . αὐτοῦ. Πόρος is explained as meaning apostate, one making defection from the true religion to a false one, by those who construe the whole of our context as relating only to apostasy. God often taxes his ancient people with adultery and fornication, in consequence of their having turned to the worship of idols. The meaning thus given to πόρος μὴ, no doubt, be philologically supported; i. e., the word is capable of such an explanation. But as I interpret the context in a different way, it appears to be more consonant with it, to take πόρος as designating any person who indulges in gross and sensual pleasures, or who is of an abandoned character. So our Saviour often speaks of the Jews as a wicked and adulterous generation; not literally adulterous (although doubtless this was true of some), but adulterous in the figurative sense of the word, viz., sensual, vicious, abandoned, profligate.

Βῆθηλος is one who scoffs at religion, or sacred things, who disregards what is sacred in the view of Heaven. The appellations πόρος and Βῆθηλος may both be applied to Esau here, and probably are so. As to the application of πόρος, see Gen. xxvi. 34, 35 and Gen. xxxvi. 2. In regard to Βῆθηλος, see Gen. xxv. 29—34. His birthright was not, indeed, a thing of religion; but it was, in those days, a matter of great personal importance and advantage. The argument is from analogy. 'Let no one give up himself to the gratification of his lusts, as did Esau to
the great grief of his father, Gen. xxvi. 35; let no one despise the distinguished privileges which Christianity confers upon him, like Esau, who despised the privileges of his birthright, and parted with them for a mere morsel of food.' In the case of Esau, folly and unbelief were very conspicuous; for the land of Canaan, as he well knew, had been promised to his ancestors for a possession; and as the first-born son, he must, according to the custom of those days, have a peculiar title to it. So those who reject the proffer of the heavenly inheritance, and renounce their duty as Christians, may with more propriety still be called βέβηλοι.

(17) Those who conduct in such a manner, will hereafter weep with bitter lamentations, when it is beyond their power to recover what has been lost. Thus it was with Esau. For ye know that when he was afterwards desirous to obtain the blessing, it was refused, ἵστε γὰρ . . . ἀπεδοκιμάσθη. See Gen. xxvii. 34—40. Ἐθνοήλαν, viz., the blessing of his father Isaac. Yea, he found no place for a change of mind [in his father], although he sought for it with tears, Μεραβίας γὰρ . . . ἀδήλως. See Gen. xxvii. 35, 38, 40. Μεραβίας here refers to a change of mind in Isaac, who had given the blessing (appropriate to primogeniture), to Jacob. The writer evidently does not mean to say that Esau found no place for repentance in himself. Αδήλως, sc. μετάνοιαν. The sentiment of the whole is: 'Guard well against indulging any fleshly appetites; above all, against slighting the blessings and privileges which Christianity proffers; lest having done this, you come at last, when it is forever too late, bitterly to mourn over your folly and wickedness.'

(18) Moreover, ye are not come to the mount which could be touched, Οὐ γὰρ προσέχετε διὰ . . . ὅραι. He means mount Sinai, which was an object palpable to the senses. Ψηλαφωμένη, contractable, quod tangendum sit, i. q., αὐξηρω, quicquid sensu percipitur. So Tacitus, Ann. III. 12, oculis contractare; and Cicero, Tusc. III. 16, mente contractare. The idea of de coelo tactus, thunder-struck, is here assigned by some respectable expositors to ψηλαφωμένη; but without any good philological support. The Greeks use Ἰγναν and Ἰγγάνων to denote the striking of thunder. The Hebrews employ ἴγια, which the Seventy translate by ἀπερείαδι. But ψηλαφῶ answers to the Hebrew הָעֵד and הָהוֹ. Particularly in Talmudic and Rabbinic Hebrew, are קֵקֶקֶק and קֵקֶק used to designate quod contractabile est, quidquid sensu cognoscitur. But, philology apart, the object of the writer in the antithesis between Sinai and Sion, plainly shows that he means to designate the former as corporeal, material; the latter as spiritual, invisible, the object of faith, but not of
the senses. Chrysostom has well drawn the comparison, when he says of Sinai, πάντα τοῦτο αἰώνια, καὶ δῆμος, καὶ φωνή; of Sion, πάντα νοῦτα καὶ ἄραρα νῦν. If the reader has any difficulty about the above explanation of ψηλαφομένω, a comparison of Ex. xix. 12, 13 with it, will hardly leave any doubt as to the meaning of our author, who seems plainly to have had in his mind the strict injunction then made, not to touch the mountain.

And to flaming fire, and to thick clouds, and darkness, and tempest, Καὶ κακαυμένω τυφί ἢν. As to the particulars of the appearance at Sinai here mentioned, see Ex. xix. 16—18; xx. 18; Deut. v; xxii. 26. Κακαυμένω τυφί means not simply fire, but the burning of it, i.e., flame; see Deut. v. 28, 25. It may also be translated in connection with ὅρα, sc. the mount that burned with fire. But probably it was not the design of the writer that it should be so taken; for as he has arranged ψηλαφομένω before ὅρα while it qualifies it, in like manner he has arranged κακαυμένω before τυφί which it also qualifies. I do not perceive the absurdity which Kuinoel charges upon the expression flaming fire; and therefore I can accede to this arrangement of the words. Γνόψοφος is probably the Aeolic form of νέφος, for which the Aeolians use νόφος or νώφος. The Seventy use it to translate הָעָר, in Deut. iv. 11, et alibi. It is doubtless used by the writer of our epistle, to designate the thick dark cloud that surrounded mount Sinai when God appeared there. The word often means tenebrae. Here it means the cause of darkness, i.e., thick black clouds. Ξύνω, Hebrew הָעָר or הָעָרָה, the darkness or gloom itself, occasioned by the cloud upon Sinai and around it. ὢνυλη is designed, perhaps, to correspond to the Hebrew הָעָרָה. If not, it is descriptive of the tempest that accompanied the dark cloud, the thunder and lightning of Sinai, Ex. xix. 16; 18; xx. 18.

(19) And to the sound of the trumpet, Καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχω. See Ex. xix. 16, 19. Probably the meaning is, a voice like that of a trumpet, i.e., very loud. In Deut. v. 22, it is called a great voice; in Deut. iv. 12, it is called the voice of words, i.e., articulate sounds; and in Deut. iv. 38, the voice of God. From comparing all these passages together, it seems evident that the meaning is, an articulate voice loud like that of a trumpet.

And the voice of commands, the hearers of which refused that another word should be added to them, Καὶ φωνὴ ῥυμάτων ... λόγου. Comp. Ex. xix. 16, 19 and xx. 18, 19. Ῥυμάτων, lit. things uttered or said. But it applies to any sort of speech, and among other significations, it has that of command; see Luke iii. 2; Acts x. 2; xi. 14; Heb. i. 3; xi. 3. So הָעָר in Hebrew, e.g., Est. i. 19; Josh. i. 18; 1 Sam. xvii. 29; Is. viii. 10; Ex.
HEBREWS XII. 20, 21.

xxxiv. 28. So also ῥῆμα, to command, Est. i. 17; iv. 13; ix. 14; 1 Chron. xxi. 7. See Wahl θημα.

The exact shade of the writer's meaning in the last clause is, 'The hearers of which [voice] refused that a word should be added to them, viz., αὐτοῖς ῥῆμας, to those commands.' In other words, the exceeding loud sound of the voice inspired them with such terror, that they declined having any more commands addressed to them in this manner.

(20) For they could not endure the injunction, "Even if a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned," οὐκ ἢφερων γὰρ . . . λαμβανόμενα; see Ex. xix. 18. The Vulgate edition of the New Testament adds to this clause, ἢ βολῶι κατατεθήκοτα. But no manuscript of any authority exhibits this phrase; nor any ancient version; nor any of the ecclesiastical Greek writers, Oecumenius excepted. Beyond all doubt it is an addition of later times, taken from the Septuagint of Ex. xix. 13. οὐκ ἢφερων, they could not endure, means, 'they were greatly affected with the severity of this command, viz., so that they could not bear it without awe and terror."

(21) And—so terrible was the sight (lit. that which was seen) —even Moses said, "I fear and tremble," Καὶ—οὕτω φοβερῶν . . . ἄντρομος. οὕτω φοβερῶν ἴν τὸ φανταζόμενον seems to me, plainly, an expression thrown in by the writer, in order to augment the description of the scene, which interrupts the regular narration, and is therefore to be construed as if included in a parenthesis. But as the whole of vs. 20, 21, is evidently a parenthesis, I have avoided the insertion of the parenthetic marks a second time, and noted the words included within the inner parenthesis, by a dash at each extremity. Καὶ, which introduces the last clause here, καὶ . . . Μωϋσῆς, has the force of and even.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is this trembling of Moses expressly mentioned. It is implied, however, in Ex. xix. 16, where it is said that "all the people in the camp trembled;" and Moses was with them, comp. ver. 14. The fear mentioned Deut. ix. 19, was on a different occasion, though this passage has often been adduced as supporting the affirmation now in question. Boehme says: "The writer has transferred to his present subject a passage (from Deut. ix. 19) which does not belong to it, so that, by a rhetorical artifice, he might show, that the Mosaic dispensation was full of terror." "Cui sententiae," says Kuinoel, "subscribo." But it seems to me a very shallow artifice which would undertake to mislead Jewish readers, in regard to parts of their Scriptures so conspicuous as those which respect Moses and the legislation at mount Sinai. I should hardly know, however, which to wonder at most, the artifice, or the exegesis of
those who impute it to the author of our epistle. The particular history to which our author here alludes, was doubtless a matter of tradition among the Jews of his day; marks of which are still extant in the Rabbinical writings. See Wetstein on Gal. i. 19, and L. Cappel on Heb. xii. 21. Ἐκφοβοῦσ εἰμι καὶ ἐντρομοῦσ means, I am greatly afraid.

(22) Next follows the antithesis of all this scene of terror, which accompanied the introduction of the ancient law. Worshippers under the new dispensation approach a scene of a very different nature. Αἱ ἄρτοι καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἦταν ὁμοιάζει, but ye are come to mount Zion. Not the literal mount Zion, but the figurative, i. e., heavenly, one. This is made plain by the additional description which follows. Καὶ πάλιν Ἰςοῦ ζῶντος, Ἐκφοβοῦσ ἐντρομοῦσ, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. The epithet Ἐκφοβοῦσ here determines, of course, that a spiritual Jerusalem, a heavenly city is meant. Comp. Heb. xi. 14—16; xii. 28; xiii. 14; Gal. iv. 26; Rev. iii. 12; xxi. 2, 10.

And to myriads, the joyful company of angels, Καὶ μυριάς, διαγκέλων παρασκευή. So, beyond all reasonable doubt, this clause is to be pointed and translated; for παρασκευή is not to be joined (as some later critics have joined it) with ἐκφοβοῦσ, κ. τ. λ. The structure of the whole paragraph denotes this; for each separate clause of it (in vs. 18, 19, 22—24) is commenced by καὶ, and continued (where any addition is made to it) by nouns in apposition, without any conjunctive particle between them. E. g., καὶ πόλει . . . Τηρομαλάμα ἐντρομοῦσ—καὶ κρίνει Ἡγέων, etc. The same construction, therefore, beyond any good ground of doubt, is to be adopted in the clause under examination. Dr. Knapp has arranged it in this manner, in his able dissertation on Heb. xii. 18—24, in his Scripta varii Argumenti.

Myriads, Μυριάς, i. e., ten thousands, used by the Greeks to signify a great and indefinite number. In respect to the number of angels, compare Rev. v. 11; Matt. xxvi. 53; Luke ii. 13; Dan. vii. 10. Παρασκευή, among the Greeks, meant an assembly of men convened on a joyous and solemn occasion; e. g., on the occasions of their public feasts, etc. The mention of such an assembly of angels, shows that the writer intends to describe the objects of the invisible world as seen with the eye of faith, not things palpable, not the objects of sense. He has, moreover, a design to contrast this joyful solemn assembly of the angels, with that awful one who were present at the giving of the law upon Sinai. In respect to the presence of angels on that occasion, compare Ps. lxviii. 17 [18]; Deut. xxxiii. 2 (Septuagint). Joseph. Ant. XV. 3, 5; Gal. iii. 19; Acts vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2, with the note upon it.
Our English version joins μεταξφ with ἀγγέλων and renders, “to an innumerable company of angels.” It also joins πανγύρει with ἐκκλησία, and renders, “to the general assembly and church,” etc. But the latter is not permitted, on account of the manner in which the author has constructed the whole of his enumeration of particulars, in vs. 18, 19, 22, 23; which, as I have already observed, are each separated from the preceding one by καὶ. If it be said that “πανγύρει, in order to be constructed with ἀγγέλων, ought to precede it; the answer is, that in ver. 19, σάλπιγγος ἤχος is constructed in the same manner as ἀγγέλων πανγύρει here; as is also δία ἡκτῆς μεσίτη in ver. 24. The Greek admits no other correct grammatical mode of construction, but that which is given in the translation.

(23) And to the assembly or church of the first-born, enrolled in heaven, ἴν ἐκκλησία . . . ἐν οἰκρανός. Ἐκκλησία, convenus, a concourse or assembly of the people. It is not a mere ecclesiastical word, but designates (by usage) any kind of assembly, sacred or civil. Here it designates either the sacred assembly or church of the upper world, or else that upon earth. Πρωτόκων must not be literally understood here, but figuratively. Among the Hebrews, primogeniture conferred distinguished rights and privileges. Hence, figuratively taken, πρωτόκων means any one who enjoys distinguished rights and privileges, whether he is first-born in a literal respect or not. Thus Israel as beloved of God and highly valued, is called his first-born, Ex. iv. 22. In like manner Ephraim is named, Jer. xxxi. 9. So the Son of Sirach (xxxvi. 12) calls Israel. The same appellation of endearment is given to the predicted Messiah, in Ps. lxxxix. 27. In a similar sense ἅρπαγγί is used, in James i. 18. I understand it here of those who had been most distinguished for piety and usefulness, such as patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, etc. Storr understands it as referring to the angels, and as descriptive of them; but without any good support from the usus loquendi of Scripture.

Enrolled, Ἀπογεγραμμένων, a word employed by the Greeks to signify the inscribing of a person’s name in a record as a citizen, as a free man entitled to all the rights of citizenship. It here marks citizenship in the New Jerusalem or the heavenly Zion. The ἐκκλησία here is that with which Christians are to mingle, in the full and final enjoyment of their privileges. Saints, while on earth, are usually spoken of as having their names written (γεγραμμένα, γράφη, not ἀπογεγραμμένα) in the book of life; e.g., Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5; xiii. 8; xvii. 8; xx. 15; xxi. 27; xxi. 19; and Dr. Knapp and others interpret our text, as speaking of the saints on earth. They ap-
pearm not to have noticed the difference of the phraseology employed in reference to such; and certain it is, that the general tenor of the passage before us has respect only to the heavenly city and assembly. Still, I would not object to the exegesis which is grounded on the supposition, that the writer here means to speak of the church on earth in distinction from the inhabitants of the heavenly world. It has this advantage, viz., that it does not interfere with the πνεύματι δυνάων τετελεσμένων in the latter part of the verse. To be enrolled in heaven, is to be entitled to all the privileges of a member of the heavenly city.

And to the judge, the God of all, Ká τριγγ Ἰάων. Χριστός designates him before whose tribunal all must appear that enter a future world. But to Christians he is a merciful, not a condemning judge; and the design here doubtless is, to represent the judge as the βασιλεύς, the awardecr of the prize, to those who have successfully fought the battles of the Lord. God of all means here, God of all the πρώτοι, i. e., that God who acknowledges them with favor and approbation; comp. Eph. iv. 6; Rohn. iii. 29; Heb. viii. 10; xi. 16; Acts vii. 52; Ex. iii. 6; Zech. viii. 8; Rev. xxii. 37. In entering a future world, Christians must, indeed, present themselves before the tribunal of the eternal judge; but he is not a judge severe and rigid; he is in an appropriate sense their God; he will regard them with favor, he will treat them with kindness. Thus all is inviting with respect to the heavenly Zion. The transposition made by our English version, to God the judge of all, is against the arrangement of the text, and fails to give the appropriate sense of the words. The meaning of ὃ εἰς πάντων Ἰάων, Rom. ix. 5, is different from Ἰαων πάντων here, the former being "supreme God."

And to the spirits of the just made perfect, Ká πνεύματι δυνάων τετελεσμένων, i. e., exalted to a state of final reward. Τετελεσμένων, having completed their probation, and arrived at their mature state, viz., a final state of glory; see on Heb. ii. 10.

(24) And to the mediator of the new covenant, Jesus, Ká δια-στήματος . . . Ἰσραήλ. See on viii. 6; vii. 22, where the same idea is exhibited. And to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better [things] than [the blood of] Abel. Ká αἰματώ . . . Ἀβελ. Respecting the blood of Christ offered in the eternal sanctuary, see Heb. ix. 11—14, 23. In respect to sprinkling, see ix. 13, 19. Figuratively or spiritually, no doubt, this is to be understood. Sprinkled with Jesus' blood, the worshippers in the sanctuary above may approach the presence of God, i. e., the inner sanctuary, confident of a gracious reception. As the text now is, the literal version would be: speaketh something better than Abel, i. e., than Abel speaks. But the sense is plainly as
given above. Κρέιττον λαλοῦν, instead of κρέιττων λαλοῦντι, for the weight of authority is beyond all doubt on the side of κρέιττον. Literally rendered, κρέιττον would mean something better. But this is less grateful to the English ear, than the form of expression in the version. The meaning of the phrase seems to me quite simple and easy. The blood of Christ proclaims pardon and peace; the blood of Abel cried to God from the ground (Gen. iv. 10) for the infliction of punishment upon his murderer. Παρὰ τὸν (not τὸ) Ἀβγη, may be regarded as an elliptical expression for παρὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἀβελ. That the verb λαλεῖ is understood, in order to complete grammatical sense of the phrase, is quite plain. The form of the sentence, however, must be varied in order to express this verb. It would then be thus, ἦ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἀβγη λαλεῖ.

Such is the contrast between the former and latter dispensation. There all is awful, terrible, and threatening; here all is alluring, gracious, and animating. Who can now adhere to the former, and renounce the latter? Such is the nature of the argument presented by the writer. He next proceeds to warn the Hebrews in the most solemn and affectionate manner, against a renunciation of their Christian faith.

(25) Take heed that ye turn not away from him who addresses you, Βλέπετε, μη... λαλοῦντα. Παρατίασα means to deprecate, to decline, to endeavor to avoid, avertere, respuerre, reprehendere. But who is τὸν λαλοῦντα? The sequel of the verse clearly shows that Christ is meant, who came from heaven to instruct men and warn them of their danger, or rather (with reference to the preceding verse) 'who speaks to men by his blood.'

To give efficacy to this warning, he adds an example. For if they did not escape [punishment] who rejected him that warned them upon earth, Εἰ γὰρ ἵκενοι... χρηματίζοντα. That after ἤφυγον, either ὅκυτρ, ἀπὸλευσαν, or some such word, is to be supplied by the mind of the reader, is plain from the nature of the subject and of the context. But who is τὸν χρηματίζοντα? Moses, I answer. The two dispensations are here compared, in respect to the penalty to be inflicted on the contumacious and refractory. The legislator or head of each dispensation, is introduced as the person who addresses the laws or warnings of God to men. See the same sentiment, in Heb. x. 28, 29.

Much more shall we [not escape], if we turn away from him [who warns us] from heaven, Πολλῷ μᾶλλον... ἀποστρεφόμενοι. See a similar commination, in ii. 1—3; x. 28, 29. That χρηματίζοντα is implied after τὸν, results from common grammatical usage. 'Ἀπ' ὑπαρχὼν is meant to represent, either that Christ came from heaven and warned them, or that, being in heaven, he
now warns them, viz., by his messengers. It is possible, however, that God is here meant by the writer, as the one who warns them. But the antithesis between the head of the old dispensation and the new, hardly admits of this construction. The ellipsis of οὐ φευγόμενα after ἡμεῖς, is sufficiently plain from the nature of the sentence.

(26) Whose voice then shook the earth, Οὗ ἡ φωνή . . . τότε, viz., when, as with the sound of a mighty trumpet waxing louder and louder, he spake on mount Sinai so that the earth trembled; see on ver. 19 seq. Whose voice, i. e., the voice of Christ; so Michaelis, Storr, Cramer, Rosenmuller, Boehme, Kuinoel, and Bloomfield. It is one of the many passages in the New Testament, which ascribe to Christ the same things that are ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament.

But now he has promised, saying, "Yet once more will I shake not only the earth, but heaven also," Νῦν δὲ . . . οὐρανόν. Ἑβρ. Ἰησοῦς, has he promised, the Perfect Midd. Buttm. Gramm. § 89. 2. Εἰς ἀπαξ corresponds to the Hebrew יַעֲשֵׂה יִשָּׂא, yet once, after a little time, Hag. ii. 6. The citation is from the Septuagint, but οὐ μόνον is an addition by the writer of our epistle, and is designed to give emphasis to the declaration. That the passage has respect to the changes which would be introduced by the coming of the Messiah, and the new dispensation which he would commence, is evident from Hag. ii. 7—9. Such figurative language is frequent in the Scriptures, and denotes great changes which are to take place. So the apostle explains it here, in the very next verse. Comp. Is. xiii. 13; Hag. ii. 21, 22; Joel iii. 16; ii. 10, 31; Matt. xxiv. 29—31, comp. ver. 84.

(27) Now this "yet once more," signifies a removing of the things which are shaken, as so made that they might await things which are not shaken, Τοῦ δὲ, εἰς ἀπαξ . . . σαλευόμενα. The figurative language here, viz., the shaking of the heavens and the earth, the writer plainly understands as denoting a μετάθεσις, removal or abolition of the things changed, i. e., of the Jewish dispensation. The language which had been literally applied to the quaking of Sinai, when the law was given, is now figuratively applied, in the usual Scriptural way, in order to denote a great change of a moral nature.

'Os πεποιημένων is a locus vexatissimus. It would be of little use to detail the various opinions upon it; most of which seem to have sprung from a misapprehension of the meaning of the paragraph in which it stands. Even Michaelis and Storr interpret the passage as referring to changes in the natural world at the end of time; most evidently against the meaning of the writer. I understand πεποιημένων to designate either simply
things made or created, χερσωπία, caduca mutabilia (ideas necessarily implied by a term which designates things of a corporeal and created nature); or else I must construe the whole thus: so made that they should wait for the things that will not be shaken. It is clear that the writer means to say, that the ancient order of things, viz., the Jewish dispensation, will be changed, removed, abolished, in like manner as the objects of the natural creation. Either of the methods of interpretation just proposed, would convey this sentiment. According to the last mode of explanation, μείγν has a sense like the Hebrew רֶפֶל, רַפֶל, or רַפֶל; i. e., it means that the former things should be so circumstanced as to wait for or expect a change or removing. All this change or abolition of the old dispensation was to take place, in order that a new one might be introduced, which should undergo no change; οὐ μείγν τά μή σαλευμένα.

(28) Wherefore, having obtained a kingdom which cannot be shaken, Διὸ βασιλείας . . . παραλαμβάνετε, i. e., the gospel dispensation, the βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰεῶν or τοῦ χριστοῦ or τοῦ ούρανοῦ, a regnum immutabile. Plainly the βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον here, is the opposite or antithesis of σαλευμένων in the clause above, which must therefore mean (in such a connection) the Jewish dispensation. The new dispensation is not mutable, caducous, but ἀσάλευτον, immutable, not to be shaken, not to be changed.

The phrase Ἐξωμεν χάρω . . . εὐλαβείας, we must translate either let us manifest our gratitude (by which we may serve God acceptably), with reverence and fear, making Ἐξωμεν χάρω mean gratiam habeamus, i. e., let us express, manifest, exhibit gratitude, viz., for the unshaken kingdom which we have received, with all its privileges, preferences and blessings; or, let us hold fast that grace, i. e., the grace bestowed under the new dispensation, under “the kingdom that cannot be shaken.” For such a sense of Ἐξωμεν, see 1 Cor. xi. 16; Rev. xii. 17; John xiv. 21; Phil. i. 7; 1 Tim. i. 19; iii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 13; Heb. vi. 19. I have (on reviewing my work) preferred this latter sense, as the version will show; but I have some doubts whether τὴν would not be necessary before χάρω in order to support this interpretation. Ἐταφείσωσα, acceptably, i. e., we must serve God in the way of holding fast this χάρω, in order to render our services well-pleasing in his sight. Μετὰ αἰδῶς καὶ εὐλαβείας, with pious reverence, i. e., let us exhibit, in our service, pious reverence for his spotless and awful perfections. Εὐλαβεία means, piety, pious devotedness, the spirit of religious devotion; and αἰδῶς means reverence. I take the two words as designed to convey an idea of the intense pious reverence which ought to be paid to the great God whom the gospel exhibits. The principle, that one
of two synonymous nouns in such cases may be employed for the sake of intensity, hardly needs to be again stated; and that one of them may be employed in the room of an adjective is equally plain; so that (if we choose), we may translate, with profound reverence. For the reference in this verse to Ps. ii. 11, see Forster, p. 548.

(29) For our God is a consuming fire, Καὶ γὰρ . . . καταναλίσκων. If this be not a quotation, the image is drawn from the description of Sinai (ver. 18), which was still in the writer’s minds. The idea is, that God, if called to punish unbelief, is not only surrounded by flaming fire as he was on mount Sinai, but this is also πῶς καταναλίσκων, devouring, destructive, tormenting fire. The awful punishment of unbelievers and apostates is set forth by the expression in question, in a very striking manner. But probably the expression is a quotation of Deut. iv. 24, where it is employed by way of censure.

---

CHAP. XIII.

The writer now concludes his epistle, by various practical exhortations, adapted to the state and circumstances of his readers; and to the wants of the church in every age, where the circumstances are like those of the persons here addressed.

(1) Let brotherly love continue, Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέω, i. e., let it be constant, let it remain in exercise. I am on the whole disposed to believe that the writer means to say: ‘Let it continue to be as it has hitherto been;’ for he has repeatedly commended them, in our epistle, for their social sympathies and brotherly feeling. Φιλαδελφία is the mutual love of Christians as such.

(2) Cease not to practise hospitality, or forget not hospitality. Τῇ φιλοξενίᾳ μὴ ἐπιλανθάνως. This was peculiarly a duty in those times of persecution and distress, when many were suffering the loss of their means of subsistence, and were obliged to cast themselves on the charity of their brethren.

For by this, some have entertained angels unawares, Διὰ ταύτης γὰρ . . . ἄγγελος. Ἐλεağıν ξενίσαντες, a truly Attic mode of expression; for the Greeks were wont to join the verb λανθάνω with the participle of another verb, when they wished to express the idea that the action indicated by that other verb was done unconsciously, undesignedly, without foresight. Literally the phrase may be translated, some entertaining angels were ignorant, viz., that they were doing so. See examples of the kind referred to in Gen. xviii. 2 seq. and Gen. xix. 1 seq. The meaning of the whole is: ‘Continue to practise hospitality, since greater honor
and reward is consequent upon it, than you might be ready to suppose."

(3) *Remember those who are in bonds, as if ye yourselves were fellow-prisoners.* Μνημέσθεντες δὲ τὰς συνθέλεσιν. The writer had before adverted to their past sufferings under persecution, x. 32—34; and also to their present trials, x. 36; xii. 8—5. Here he exhorts them to *sympathize with those who are in bonds,* as if they themselves were in the like condition, because they were continually exposed to be thrown into prison. A high degree of sympathy is designated by the expression, ὡς συνθέλεσιν. [Remember] *those who are injuriously treated,* as [it becomes] *those who are themselves still in the body,* Τῶν κακοχοιρίσων . . . . σώματι, i. e., are themselves daily exposed to persecution and suffering, and therefore liable to need commiseration from others.

(4) *Let marriage be honored among all, and the bed undefiled,* Τίμουσα δὲ γάμον . . . . ἀμαρτόν. So it should be rendered, because the whole strain is hortatory. Still, it is perhaps capable of another version, viz., *marriage is honorable for all,* etc. Ἔν τὰς τίμουs may also be translated, is altogether honorable.

The fact that such an exhortation is here addressed to the Hebrews, shows, either that some of them were chargeable with a breach of the precept respecting chastity, or that they were in danger of becoming so. Polygamy and concubinage were practised by all around them, and had been from time immemorial. The demands of Christianity, then, in respect to these practices, might seem a grievance to some of the Hebrew Christians, and probably they were tempted not to regard them, and therefore needed caution. *But whoremongers and adulterers God will punish or judge,* Πόρνους δὲ . . . .  ἰερός, i. e., those who live in fornication while unmarried, or commit adultery after marriage, will not escape divine indignation.

(3) *Let your conduct be free from covetousness,* and be content with what ye have, Ἀθλητὰς γὰρ . . . . χαρακτήρα. "Εστι is understood after δ ὑπόστασας. Ὑπόστασας means behavior, the same as ἡ δομή, manner of life. Ἀρκούμενοι τῶν παροιμίων, i. e., indulge no greedy desires for earthly possessions, but cheerfully submit to the allotment of providence in respect to these things.

For he hath said, *I will never leave thee nor forsake thee,* Αὕτος γὰρ . . . . ἐγνατιναίω, i. e., God hath promised to provide for you in the best manner, and you should put your trust in him. The phrase here quoted, may come either from Deut. xxxi. 6; Josh. i. 5, or 1 Chron. xxviii. 20.

(6) So that we may boldly say, "The Lord is my helper and I will not fear; what can man do to me?" Ὑπὲρ ἡγεμόνων . . . . ἀδικωτώς. The quotation is from Ps. cvii. 6; where the He-
brew, which corresponds to κύριος ἐμι βοηθός, is ὃς ἂνα, Ἰησοῦς is for me. The verse is divided by the accents in Hebrew, as the translation above divides it. The apostle has given the sense exactly. ὁ δέος ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς, sc. ἰδίως, which is implied after ὡς. The meaning of the verse is: ‘Under whatever trials and difficulties we may be placed, we need not be filled with terror or painful apprehension, for God will help us.

(7) Remember your leaders, who have spoken unto you the word of God, Μημονενεχέστε ... Ἰησ. Ὑγοῦμαν, duces, praesides, leaders, guides, directors, which here means teachers, as the ex planatory clause that follows clearly shows. Δύον τοῦ Ἰησ., the gospel. And attentively considering the end of their manner of life, imitate their faith, ὃν ἦν ἀναθεωροῦντες ... ποτε. That is, calling to mind the peaceful and happy death of those religious teachers among you, who gave you instruction respecting the word of life, imitate their faith, i.e., persevere in your Christian profession, as they did, to the very end of life. Some refer ἐκβάλει εἰς ἀναθροφία, to the sequel or reward that ensued, in consequence of the manner of life which these teachers had led. But I cannot find reason enough to believe that ἐκβάλει may be properly understood in such a sense. It is not improbable that the writer refers here to the triumphant death of Stephen, Acts vii. and of James, Acts xii. He exhorts his readers to follow the example of those faithful Christian teachers, who had died a peaceful and happy death, although, perhaps, a premature one.

(8) Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ... αἰῶνας. That is, Christ is always the same, always ready and willing to aid you in all your trials; comp. vii. 9, 15—17, 21, 25, 28; also v. 6, 9; ii. 18; ix. 24; x. 12—14, 23. οἱ αἵρετοι corresponds with καὶ δό αἵρες, Ps. cii. 28 [Sept. ci. 27], in Hebrew נָשָׁה, which there designates immutability or eternity; for the parallel distich is, Thy years shall not come to an end. The absolute eternity of Christ (α. parte ante et a parte post) is not here directly asserted; but the simple object of the writer is, to show that ‘he ever liveth to aid his disciples.’ To refer the expression to Christian doctrine, and unite this verse with the one which follows, seems to me plainly a desert ing of the obvious intention of the writer. Dr. Schulz construes the passage as I have done. Χριστιανισμός καὶ σήμερον, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is a Hebraism, used to express the past, the present, and the future; and ἀἵρετοι, joined with these, denotes immutability.

(9) Be not carried hither and thither, by diverse and strange doctrines, Διδαχῶς ποικίλως ... παραδέχεσθε. Ποικίλως καὶ ξέναις designates doctrines different, diverse from true Christian doctrine, and foreign (strangers) to it. Such were the doctrines
of the Judaizing teachers respecting many of their ceremonial observances and traditionary rites; and to these the writer here adverts, as appears by the sequel. For παραφέρεσις some manuscripts and editions have περιφέρεσις, which Ernesti and some other critics prefer; but it is not supported by equal authority.

For it is good that the heart should be confirmed by grace, not by meats, by which those have not been profited who have been occupied therewith, Καλὸν γὰρ χάριν . . . περιφέρεσιν. Χάρις seems to me plainly to refer here to the gracious truth or doctrine of the Christian religion. The writer had just said: "Be not tossed to and fro by doctrines diverse and alien from Christianity." Next follows the assertion, "It is good to be established [settled, confirmed] in the gracious doctrines of the gospel, rather than to put confidence in meats," etc. Construed in this way, all is plain and congruous. Βράζωμαι indicates the various kinds of meats, which were distinguished by the Judaizing Christians into clean and unclean; the first of which might be safely and properly eaten, but the second must be avoided, on peril of losing one's character for piety, and incurring the displeasure of God. All attention to this subject the writer regards as useless, and avers that those who have been sedulously attentive to it, have reaped no spiritual profit from it. Περιπατήσομαι, like the Hebrew בָּרָפָס, means to be concerned with, to be occupied with, to bestow one's attention upon. In regard to the unprofitableness of such an attention to meats, comp. Heb. vii. 18.

(10) We have an altar, of which those have no right to eat who render their service to the tabernacle, Ἐξομαυ . . . λαρισόμεναι. A figurative expression, borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and accommodated to express the privileges of Christians. According to usages of sacrifice, in most cases, some part or parts of the victims offered were reserved for the use of the priests, and in some cases were to be eaten also by the offerer; see Lev. vi. 26; Num. xviii. 9, 10; Lev. vii. 33, 34; Num. vi. 19; Lev. vii. 15; xix. 6. But the γέβα was a holocaust, i.e., an offering which was to be entirely consumed by fire; particularly, the γέβα offered on the great day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 14–16, 27; Lev. iv. 3–12. But when he says that 'Christians have a sacrifice, of which those who pay their service to the altar have no right to partake,' he means, that the benefits procured by the atoning sacrifice of Christ, do not belong, or will not be granted, to such as rest their hopes of salvation on the ritual sacrifices of the Jewish law, i.e., to such as continue to be disciples of Judaism, or turn back from Christianity to Judaism, and thus renounce the blessings procured for believers by the death of Christ.
(11) Moreover, the bodies of those animals, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary as a sin-offering by the high priest, were burned without the camp, ἵνα γὰρ ἐισφέρεται . . . παρεμβαλέται. The γὰρ here introduces a second reason why Christians should not be carried hither and thither by divers doctrines, ver. 9. The first reason begins with καλὸν γὰρ; the second with ἵνα γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. I have translated it moreover, not because γὰρ strictly considered has this meaning, but because the connection of the discourse in this way becomes more facile in English. As to the offerings here alluded to, see Lev. xvi. 11, 14—16, 27. The construction of the verse is peculiar, and literally translated it would run thus: "The blood of which animals was brought into the sanctuary . . . the bodies of the same were burned," etc. To make the verse plain, the arrangement has been altered in the translation. Ἀμαρίας, sin-offering, or πεπί ἄμαρίας, [offering] on account of sin, which conveys the same idea. The object in offering the blood of goats and bullocks in the most holy place, was to make atonement for sin. Παρεμβαλέται, camp, refers to the time when the Israelites were in the wilderness, and lived in encampments.

(12) Wherefore Jesus also, in order that he might make expiation for the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate, Διὰ καὶ, Ἡρῴος . . . ἔκαθο. Ἀγοῦρη, might make expiation, see on ii. 11. Διὰ τοῦ ἱδίου αἷμας, comp. ix. 12, 14, 25, 26; x. 19; Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 5; v. 19. Ἠρῴω τῆς πύλης, viz., the gates of Jerusalem; for he was crucified on Calvary, which was then without the walls of the city, although it is now within them.

Vs. 11, 12, are designed as a comparison between the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, and the expiatory sacrifice of Christ. The blood of the former was presented before God, in the most holy place; the blood of the latter, in the eternal sanctuary above, ix. 12, 23, 24. The bodies of the beasts used for the former sacrifice, were consumed or destroyed without the camp; the body of Jesus was sacrificed, or destroyed, without the gate of Jerusalem. The atoning sacrifice of Christians is analogous, then, to that of the Jews, but of infinitely higher efficacy; comp. ix. 13, 14; x. 4, 12. The particular object, however of vs. 11, 12, is to introduce Christ as an example of suffering, in order to impress upon the Hebrews the necessity of perseverance in their Christian profession, amidst all their trials and difficulties. But the manner of introducing this example, is altogether in unison with the analogies which are so often repeated in other parts of our epistle.

(13) Let us then go forth to him without the camp, bearing reproach like his, Τοίνυν ἐξερχόμενα . . . φέροντες. That is:
'Since Jesus suffered persecutions and ignominy and distress, let us follow him, even if we endure reproaches like those which he endured. Let us adhere to the profession of Christianity, although it be counted as ignominious and worthy of reproach.' In respect to suffering with Christ, comp. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 10, 11; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 10; Rev. i. 9. That ὀνειδωροῦν αἰτῶν means reproach such as Christ suffered, is plain from the object of the writer. Comp. Col. i. 24, which is exactly in point; and see on Heb. xi. 26. The same sentiment that this verse contains, is inculcated in Matt. x. 38, where it is expressed by λαμβάνα τῶν σταυρῶν αἰτῶν.

(14) For here we have no permanent city, but we seek for one yet future, Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν . . . . ἐπικρομοῦν. Τάρ αντιπροσωπεύει a reason why Christians ought willingly to bear with reproaches and sorrows. — In xi. 14 the writer calls the heavenly inheritance which the patriarchs sought, παρίδα; and afterwards (ver. 16) πόλις. Here the appellation πόλις is used, because the writer had just been alluding to Christians being thrust out or going out of the city, viz., out of Jerusalem, to suffer ignominy as Christ did. The design of our verse is, to show the Hebrews that it could not be of any great importance, should they be exiled from their dwelling places and the habitations of their Jewish kindred; for in this world, no habitation, no place of abode, can be μένων, permanent, lasting. By profession, Christians, like the patriarchs, are seeking παρίδα ἑτομῶν; and consequently πόλις μέλλονον, an abode yet future, a residence in the world to come.

(15) By him, therefore, let us continually present to God the sacrifice of praise, Δι' αἰτῶν οὖν . . . . Ἰερ. Δι' αἰτῶν, viz., by Christ, i.e., let us present such an offering, by him who is our great high priest; not a sacrifice of goats or bullocks, but a sacrifice of praise. In other words: 'Let us, as Christians, offer praises to God for the blessings of the gospel vouchsafed to us.' That is, the fruit of our lips ascribing praise to him, Τούτων ἐστὶν καρπὸν . . . . ὀνοματε τοῦ αἰτῶν. The expression sacrifice of praise (᾿ομολογοῦντον), is found in Lev. vii. 12. A phrase similar to fruit of the lips, is used by Hosea xiv. 3, Hebrew נָחְשַׁם שָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל, where the Septuagint render it, καρπὸν χειλέων. The meaning of our phrase is, what the lips utter, viz., when they ascribe praise (ὁμολογοῦντι) to God. So Prov. xviii. 20, ἔτι τῷ λαῷ, the fruit of the mouth, i.e., what a man says, or his words. Ὀμολογοῦντι, like the Hebrew ῥῆτορ, means to praise, celebrate, publicly acknowledge. Ὀνόματι is here, as commonly, a periphrasis for the agent to whom the name belongs, viz., God; so that the sense is the same as τῷ Ἰερ. — What follows
τούτος ζητεί, is added by the writer, in order to guard against the apprehension of any one, that he was exhorting them to offer the ritual sacrifices prescribed by the law.

(16) *Forget not, moreover, kindness and liberality:* for with such sacrifices God is well pleased, Τῆς δὲ εἰσοδᾶς ... Σιῶν. Ἔπλαναν γὰρ governs the genitive εἰσοδᾶς and κοινωνίας. It was usual for the Jews, after making their thank-offerings, to invite the poor to the feast which followed; Jahn Archaeol. III. p. 396. So here, kindness and liberality were to follow the thank-offering of Christians; kindness toward the suffering, and liberality toward the needy are acceptable sacrifices, or such as God is pleased with. The sentiment is: 'Duties like these Christianity requires; not the blood of bullocks and goats.' As to δὲ at the beginning of the verse, it is a sign of transition in the discourse, and may well be rendered moreover.

(17) *Obey your leaders, and be subject to them, Πείθεσθε ... ὑπείκατε.* Ἡγούμενος, in ver. 7 above, is clearly used in the sense of teachers, who were in fact the guides or leaders of the Christian community. If there be any difference between ρείθος and ὑπείκατε, the first has reference to positive obedience in regard to any directions given them; the second prohibits any opposition to the teachers, in the measures which they might adopt to promote the improvement and the order of their religious community.

*For they watch over your souls, as those who must render an account, Ἄνωι γὰρ ἄγων σκότων ἀποδώσουσι.* The γὰρ here introduces a clause which shows the gravity and importance of the office of the ἡγούμενος; which was a reason why cheerful obedience should be yielded to them. Ἀγωνοῦσι, watch; the image seems to be taken from the practice of shepherds, who watch with solicitude over their flocks in order that they may preserve them from the ravages of wild beasts. See the like imagery employed respecting the prophet Ezekiel, Ezek. iii. 17. —Ὑπὲρ τῶν πυρὸς ὑμῶν, i. e., for you, ὑπὲρ τῶν πυρὸς. Ὁ λόγος ἀποδώτες, viz., to God, to whom “every one must give an account of himself;” particularly, every one put in a place of trust with regard to spiritual duties.

*That they may do this with joy, and not with grief; for this would be unprofitable to you,* ἵνα μετὰ χαρᾶς ... τούτο. The meaning, I now think after revision, is: 'Obey them that they perform their duty of watching with joy, and not be grieved by perverseness and disobedience. The watching seems to be the main thing, in the clause which precedes ἵνα μετὰ, κ. τ. λ. Not groaning, Μὴ στενάζων, i. e., not grieving, the effect being put for the cause. It is a negative form of expression here, designed
to repeat the same idea as is conveyed by μετὰ χαρᾶς, and to render it more intense. 'Ἀλλοτρεία γάρ, another negative expression, which means: 'This would be very hurtful or noxious to you; i. e., should their Christian teachers be compelled to groan on account of their unbelief and want of subjection in them, the consequences would be distressing to themselves as well as to their teachers.

(18) Pray for us; for we trust that we have a good conscience, being desirous in all things to conduct ourselves uprightly, Προσεύχετε ἕναν ἤλεγχον . . . ἀνατρέψοντες. The request of the writer that he may have an interest in their prayers, shows the friendly feelings and confidence which he entertained respecting them. He appeals to the sincerity and uprightness of his Christian deportment, as an evidence that he might claim a Christian sympathy for himself. Probably he has special reference, in what he says respecting a good conscience, to the accusations of Judaizers, who looked on those Jews as having violated their conscience, who had ceased to obey the ritual law. Ἐν πάσῃ, κ. τ. λ., augments, or renders intensive, the idea contained in the preceding clause.

(19) And I the more earnestly request you to do this, in order that I may be speedily restored to you, Περισοτέρως δὲ . . . ὑμῖν. This seems plainly to imply, that the writer was deterred from paying those a visit whom he addressed, by some adverse circumstances, viz., either by imprisonment, sickness, or some like cause. It also implies, that he is known to them, and they to him; for it indicates that he had formerly been among them.

(20) Now may the God of peace, that raised from the dead our Lord Jesus, who by the blood of an everlasting covenant has become the great Shepherd of the sheep, Ὅ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . Ἰησοῦν. The God of peace, i. e., the God who bestows happiness, auctor salutis. The Greek εἰρήνη, in the New Testament, like the Hebrew ἀλοιπόν, means every kind of blessing or happiness. Ὅ ἄναγαγὼν, who brought up, raised up, restored. Τὸν πατέρα . . . τῶν μεγαν., comp. John x. 11, 14—18.

Some join Ἐν αἰματι διαθήκης ἀλοιπών with ἄναγαγὼν. But what can be the sense of raising Christ from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant? Almighty power raised him from the dead; not the blood of the covenant. Beyond all reasonable doubt, then, Ἐν αἰματι, κ. τ. λ., characterizes the great Shepherd, who "laid down his life for the sheep," John x. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 25; and who sanctioned a new testament or covenant by his blood, Heb. ix. 16—23; Matt. xxvi. 28. The meaning is, that 'the great Shepherd is provided with, or (so to speak) carries along with him, blood sanctioning a covenant which is of perpet-
unal force.' So in Heb. ix. 25, the high priest is said to have entered yearly into the most holy place ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ αἴματι, i. e., carrying with him the blood of bullocks and goats. See also Wahl's Lex. & no. 2. The phrase is plainly an allusion to the preceding discussion in chap. ix. I have rendered it so as to prevent a mistake, in regard to its true meaning.

(21) Perfect you in every good word, ἐν εὐθείᾳ καθότι ἐννοεῖς ἐν ἀλήθειᾳ, i. e., make you in all respects to act worthily of the Christian name, enable you in all respects as Christians to discharge your duties; so that you may do his will, Εἰς τὸν θεόν, τὸ Σώφρονον, and so perform all he requires.

Working in you that which is pleasing to him, through Jesus Christ, Πασχάλιον, εἰς ἐννοεῖς . . . . Χριστοῦ. That is, enabling you to perform all your Christian duties, which will be acceptable, εὐδοκεῖτε, εἰς τὸν θεόν, pleasing in his sight, ἐν εὐθείᾳ. Εἰς τὸν θεόν, ἐν εὐθείᾳ, i. e., may he do this for Christ's sake, or through Christ.

To whom be glory forever and ever, Amen, Ω ἡ δόξα . . . . Ἀμὴν. The nearest antecedent to Ω, is Ι. Χριστοῦ; and to him, it seems to me, the doxology plainly belongs. Other examples of a similar nature, may be easily shown; e. g., Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 18. Doxologies introduced into the midst of a letter, in this way, are characteristic of the writings of Paul.

(22) Now I beseech you, brethren, to bear with this word of exhortation; for I have written briefly to you, Παρακαλῶ ἐν νῦν παρακλήσεως. Ἀνέχω means, to bear patiently with, to receive or permit with kind feelings, to put up with. Δόγον παρακλήσεως is simply, exhortation. Some refer this only to the last part of the epistle; but the whole is intermixed with hortatory admonitions. The writer, after speaking so plainly, and giving warnings so awful, endeavors to win those whom he addresses to a patient toleration of his plain dealing.

Briefly, Διὰ βραχέων, within a short compass. "But how," it is asked, "could Paul say this, when this epistle is longer than any one of his, that to the Romans and the first to the Corinthians excepted?" But is it to be supposed that those whom the apostle now addressed were acquainted with all of his other epistles, and that they would estimate the force of Διὰ βραχέων by a comparison of our epistle with them? It is much more reasonable to suppose that the writer means to say, that he had written briefly, considering the importance and difficulty of the subjects of which he had treated. And who will deny this?

(23) Know ye that [our] brother Timothy is sent away, Τιμόθεος . . . . ἀπολελυμένον. See on the meaning of this, Introd. § 11 (11).
With whom, if he speedily return, I shall visit you, Ἑραποντίας. 'Εὰν τάξιον ἑορθαὶ implies that Timothy was then absent. Of course, ἀποκαλυπτέντων cannot well mean set at liberty. But if the meaning be as I have rendered it, then is the reason plain why Paul should say εἷς ἑορθαὶ. If Timothy was imprisoned at Rome, and set at liberty there, why should the writer (at Rome) speak of his coming to him? If in some other place, how should he know of his liberation sooner than those could whom he addressed?

(24) Salute all your leaders, and all the saints, Ἀποστόλων πάντων . . . ἄγιως. Ἀποστόλων means: 'Present with my kind wishes, and my regard for their welfare;' Ἀγιώς designates those who are consecrated to Christ, professing Christians, saints. They of Italy salute you, Ἀποστόλων . . . Ἰταλίας; viz., the Italians, see Introd. § 11, 1. (4), p. 122, seq. This shows that the writer was in Italy, from which country he sends the kind greeting of Christians there.

(25) Grace be with you all, Amen, Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, Ἀμήν; a frequent form of benediction in the apostolic epistles. Χάρις means divine favor or blessing.

The subscription to this epistle runs thus: Πρὸς Ἐβραίον ἐγράφη ἀνὰ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθείου. Like most of the other subscriptions to the epistles, it is of no authority. It is demonstrably erroneous here; for how could Timothy write this epistle, when the author says, at its very close, that Timothy was then absent? The author of this subscription, one is tempted to think, had either read the epistle with very little care, or with very little understanding of its contents.
EXCURSUS I.

Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἴωνας ετοίμασε, Ἱερ. i. 2.

There still remains a difficulty in this passage (in common with Eph. lii. 9), as to the form of expression, or rather as to the object of the assertion. In John i. 3 it is said, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ [λόγου] ἐγένετο; in 1 Cor. viii. 6, δι' οὗ [Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] τὰ πάντα; in Col. i. 15, ἐν αὐτῷ [Χριστῷ] ἐκτίς ἐκ τὰ πάντα; in Col. i. 16, τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ [Χριστοῦ]... ἐκτίς; and in Heb. i. 10—12, οὐ κατ' ἐξουσίαν... τὸν γένος ἐπεμειξασαί, καὶ ἐργά τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. In all these passages, the creation of all things is simply ascribed to Christ; just in the same manner as in Gen. i. 1, God is said to have created the heavens and the earth.

The mode of expression in these passages should be specially noticed, in order to understand the difficulty which I am about to state. If the Scriptures had nowhere ascribed the creation to any other than to the Logos or Christ, and had employed in ascribing it to him only such language as that just quoted above, I cannot perceive that any interpreter of the sacred writings would have ever thought of ascribing creation, upon the authority of the Scriptures, to any other than to the Logos simply. There is, plainly, no difference in the mode of expression in the Bible, which asserts creatorship of God, or which asserts it of Christ. I must be understood of course to affirm this here, only of that class of texts which has just been quoted above. But do the sacred writers mean to ascribe it to him absolutely, in the highest sense, as his sole and independent act? Or do they represent him as creating by direction of the supreme God, and under his superintendence? In other words: Was the Logos the original author of the universe, or was he only the instrument by which the original author brought it into being? What do the Scriptures say on this point of all points in respect to the great question about the real nature of Christ? Is he Creator by virtue of his own, or by virtue of a delegated power?

If Christ were only the instrument, employed by the supreme God to bring the creation into existence, and to arrange it in its present order, the sacred writers might assert, and might truly assert, that πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, or ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίς ἐκ τὰ πάντα. It may be said, with equal truth, that the church of St. Paul's in London was built by Christopher Wren, and that it was built by the monarch who was the efficient cause or author of the structure, and by whose direction and at whose expense it was reared. Every day men familiarly employ language in this manner, ascribing the building of a structure either to the owner or to the architect, just as the nature of the case may require.
To prepare the way for an answer to the question whether Christ is represented as the original author of creation, we must make inquiry respecting a second class of texts.

In Heb. i. 2, the writer asserts that God made all things by his Son: and in Eph. iii. 9, τέλεσεν ἔργα κτίσας συν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, God created all things by Jesus Christ. The latter clause, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is indeed wanting in some Codices of good estimation, and is rejected by Griesbach from the text. But Knapp and Tittmann have inserted it, and the weight of authority seems to favor the admission of it. That the sentiment is not without a parallel, is clear from Heb. i. 2. Are these expressions, now, to be interpreted in such a way as to qualify all the first class of expressions ascribing creatorship to Christ, so that they must be understood as asserting nothing more than that he performed an instrumental or ministerial work only, and did not act as original author in bringing the universe into being?

Whatever may be the answer to this question, it is evident that nothing of importance can depend, either in respect to Heb. i. 2, or Eph. iii. 9, on the word διὰ. It has often been asserted that this preposition is employed before the Genitive only to designate a secondary or instrumental cause. But this is altogether incorrect, both in respect to sacred and classical usage; as even the common lexicons of the New Testament will show. The cause, whether principal or instrumental, may be, and often is, designated by διὰ before the Genitivē. Αἱ διὰ, then, might designate (by itself considered) the principal cause or original author of the worlds. This expression, however, does not involve the nodus of the difficulty in the case before us. The assertion is not here, that all things were made by (διὰ) the Son, but that GOD made all things BY him. In what manner, now, ought we to interpret this?

How did the most noted commentators of the Greek church understand this difficult passage? Chrysostom, in explaining it, says: "As the Father judgeth no one, but is said to judge by his Son, because he hath begotten him who is judge; so also he is said ἐκμικρύνεται δι’ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἐκμικρύνεων, to create by him, because he hath begotten him who is the Creator." He then proceeds: "Εἰ γὰρ αὐτῶς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τολμᾶ διὰ τὸν θεόν, διὰ αὐτοῦ γεγονομένων, for if the Father is the cause of him, much more of the things made by him," Hom. I. in Epist. ad Heb. p. 15. Vol. XII. Ed. Montfaucon. To the same purpose Theophylact: "Ἐξευθέν δὲ αὐτῶς ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, εἰκόνα τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ γεγομένων, seeing the Father is the cause of the Son, he must surely be of the things made by him," Comm. in Heb. Tom. II. p. 650, edit. Venet. 1755. Here also the generation of the divine substance of the Son is asserted, and the appeal is made to this doctrine as solving the difficulty of our text. But as the idea of self-existence, existence uncased, and independence, enters essentially into all our conceptions respecting a nature truly divine, and is a sine qua non in all our apprehensions of a Creator, it is difficult for us to conceive that the Father can be the cause (αἰτία) of the Son in his divine nature, without, of course, admitting that the Son (as divine) must be a dependent being; a δε-
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repos sedes only, as many have called him. The explanation of these fathers (who accord with most of the ancient ecclesiastical writers) seems then only to remove one difficulty by bringing forward another still greater. This explanation also is forced upon the text. The writer of our epistle does not say, nor intimate, that “God created all things by his Son, inasmuch as he is the cause (ατρός, ἀρχή, as Chrysostom calls him) of the Son.” This would be to force on the sacred writer a mode of metaphysical explanation, drawn from the philosophy of later ages, and foreign to the simplicity of the Scriptures.

In modern times, the mode of explaining our text is founded on what the systems of theology denominate “subordination in respect to the persons of the Godhead.” Thus Owen, on Heb. i. 2, says: “The joint working of the Father and Son doth not infer any other subordination but that of subsistence and order;” he means the hypostatical subordination of persons, or order of their existence in the Godhead. The amount of the explanation adopted by him and many others, is, if I rightly understand it, that God the Father, in the order of subsistence (not of time) preceding the Son, did, by the Son, create the worlds. But whether this explanation renders the text any more intelligible, may perhaps be well doubted. Especially so, as Owen (on the same passage) says: “The same individual creating act, is the word of the Father and the Son; whose power and wisdom being one and the same undivided, so also are the works which proceed outwardly from them.” But if the power and wisdom of the Father and Son are not only one, but the same undivided; on what, it may be asked, is founded the evidence that a subordination of subsistence and order exists in the Godhead? If the attributes of the Godhead are one and the same undivided, how can we come at the evidence of a physical or metaphysical subordination of subsistence or hypothesis? Can such a subordination of subsistence be in any way known to us, except through the medium of the divine attributes? But these are affirmed to be one and the same undivided. Are we able, then, to show what the distinction in divine essence is; or to define the mode in which the metaphysical essence of the uncreated Being exists? Where is the passage of Scripture which does this? I am aware that an appeal is here made to those texts which mention Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in connection; and particularly to the order in which they are mentioned. But of these texts there are only three. The first is in Matt. xxviii. 19, where the order just presented is observed. The second is in 2 Cor. xiii. 13, where the Lord Jesus Christ is placed first. The third is in 1 John v. 7; a text which, if not proved to be spurious, is at least thrown into a state so doubtful, that no considerate inquirer would at present think of appealing to it as authority. Consequently, if the order in which Father, Son, and Spirit are mentioned in Matt. xxviii. 19, proves that the Son and Spirit are subordinate to the Father, then the manner in which they are mentioned in 2 Cor. xiii. 13, will prove that the Father and Spirit are subordinate to the Son. How can that proof be valid, which establishes a contradiction?

Is then, we may well ask, the order of subsistence or hypostasis (which is so much insisted on and so often appealed to by the schoolmen), a doctrine
taught by the sacred writers? Or, rather, is it not one of the inventions of metaphysical philosophy, in order to remove apparent difficulties in the sacred text? Can any one point out the text of Scripture in which God is presented in a physical or metaphysical manner, so that his essence or mode of subsistence (in itself considered) is offered to our consideration? If not, —and if God only in his relations to us and the creation around us,—God as developed by his attributes and not as he is in himself or considered in respect to his internal essence, be revealed to us in the Bible,—why not be contented with what the Scriptures have taught, without forcing sentiments upon the sacred writers which have been excogitated only by metaphysicians of later days?

Owen himself, after going through a protracted consideration of our text, with that good sense and humility for which he was conspicuous, adds: "It is not for us to inquire much into or after the reason of this economy and dispensation. We cannot by searching find out God, we cannot find out the Almighty unto perfection." He means, that we cannot find out the economy of God's creating the worlds by his Son, and the doctrine of subordination which is implicated in this. Happy would it have been for the interest of humble and candid inquirers, had this sentiment produced a proper influence over all the writings of that author himself, and of many other eminent and excellent men!

Will not most of the sober and intelligent inquirers of the present day agree in saying, that the nature or modus of the distinction in the Godhead is not an object of revelation, and that it is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge? If so, then the ground which Owen and so many others have taken to explain the phrase in Heb. i. 2, is built on the assumption that we know what is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, and which, after much examination, I am compelled to believe is not revealed in the Scriptures.

The difficulty of our text, then, still remains. It would be presumption in me to promise a solution of it that would be satisfactory. But as the subject is so deeply interesting to all sincere and humble inquirers after the simple meaning of the sacred writers, I will venture to suggest a few considerations for reflection.

As words are merely arbitrary signs, employed by men to designate the ideas which they have in their own minds, when employed in their original sense, they can never signify more than the things for which they stand. But they may be employed figuratively. When we come, by reasoning or reflection, to the knowledge and belief that there exists a Being who created the world; who is himself uncreated, eternal, and immutable; who is not the object of perception by any of our senses, and for the description of whom none of the words of our language were originally formed; we are then obliged, in order to describe this Being, to apply to him words already in existence. But these words, it is plain, must in such a case be used nearly always in a sense more or less qualified, and differing from their original and literal sense. Even in expressing our ideas of the moral attributes of the Supreme Being, where there is a particular resemblance
between him and man formed in his image, we do not in reality apply to the Divinity the most common words, in exactly the same sense in all respects as we do to men. When we say, He is wise, we do not mean that he acquired his wisdom, or possesses it, or exercises it, just in the manner that men do. We mean, indeed, that there is in his wisdom something of the same nature as wisdom in men; something which selects the best ends, and chooses the best means of accomplishing them. But we do not mean to imply that the acts of the Divinity in selecting and choosing them are in all respects analogous to our own.

We say, God is omnipresent. But we do not mean that he is, physically, present everywhere, in the same manner as human beings are present at any particular place. We mean that he is so present that he can act anywhere or everywhere. Here is some analogy between him and us. But we must be physically present in order to act; he cannot be so, inasmuch as he is not material. As to the manner of presence, then, how exceedingly different is his from our own!

We say, God is mighty. But when we speak of might in him, we do not associate with it the idea of firm sinew, of vigorous muscle, of robust body, of mature age, of perfect health; all of which enter into our apprehensions of consummate strength in man. We content ourselves with one simple point of analogy. God has real power to do whatever he desires to do, i. e., he is almighty. In this respect his might or strength is like that in men, i. e., it is power to accomplish the objects which strength or might is adapted to accomplish. But the might of the Deity infinitely excels that of men in degree. Here is one point of dissimilarity. It depends, too, on very different causes for its exercise. Here is another. But still, we do and may speak of power in God; but who that has any reflection will say, that when we use this language in regard to God, we use it in all respects as we do when we apply it to men?

In the like manner we might proceed, in the consideration of every one of the divine attributes, whether natural or moral. In regard to them all we should find that there is only some one main point of analogy on which our assertion rests, when we apply human language to the description of God; and that the manner in which he possesses or exercises any of his attributes, physiologically considered, is utterly beyond the boundaries of human knowledge. For nothing can be more evident (I might say self-evident) than that the eternal, uncreated, uncursed, independent, infinite, and self-existent God, must, as to his mode of essence and existence, be unlike to temporary, created, cursed, dependent, finite beings, with a derived existence. The very fact that God is as he has been just described, and man as he has been represented, necessarily forces this conviction upon us. Nothing can be plainer, then, than that all human language, formed at first merely to express human conceptions of finite and created objects, must in itself be altogether incompetent fully to describe the Divinity. Nor could any language be formed by created beings adequate to this purpose; for the plain reason, that no infinite being could ever have a full conception of the infinite and uncreated Being. Could this be remem-
bered and rightly applied in all our discussions respecting the nature of the Supreme Being, it would save much of the difficulty and darkness which now embarrass this great subject.

From these obvious considerations we may now proceed to examine the language of the sacred writers in regard to the difficult point which suggested the subject of this Excurso. Two things seem to be equally the object of the assertion in the holy Scriptures. The first, that there is but one God; the second, that the Logos, or higher nature which dwelt in Christ, is truly divine, or is truly God. Of the first, it would be superfluous to produce proofs here. The Old Testament is full of them; and the New as distinctly recognizes the same doctrine; see John xvii. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6; 1 John v. 20; Luke xviii. 19; Matt. xix. 17. A formal proof of the second point would be out of place in an exegesis designed only for the explanation of a particular phrase. It must suffice merely to advert to John i. 1; Rom. ix. 5; Titus ii. 13; 1 John v. 20; the two former instances of which are so express, that no critical ingenuity can avoid the application of the term God to Christ; the third, when examined by the principles of grammar and of the usus loquendi of the New Testament, is scarcely less certain; and the fourth has never, so far as I know, been satisfactorily explained away.

But how can the Logos be truly God, and yet be with God, and be the agent by which God made the worlds? Here lies, it must be confessed, the very essence of all the difficulty which embarrasses so many minds; and on this point we must now venture to dwell with some particularity.

In the first place, our minds are embarrassed with the difficulty which such a statement respecting the Logos makes in regard to the divine unity. Let us see if the source of this embarrassment cannot be distinctly pointed out.

Trinitarians have been accustomed, for many centuries, to characterize the distinction in the Godhead by the word person. Whether this word was well or ill chosen, it is not my present object to inquire. Thus much is certain: many in Christian lands have incautiously attached to this word, when used in respect to the Godhead, a sense nearly (if not quite) the same as they attach to it in common usage. Not a few theologians and critics have, indeed, protested against such an application of the word; and some of those, who have been most eminent for their steadfast adherence to the belief that the Saviour possesses a nature truly divine, have raised their voice high against such an application of it; but, unfortunately for the cause of truth, this voice has been listened to only by some of those who were friendly to a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity. Others, with different views, have commonly thought proper to pay no attention to such a protest; but to take advantage, in their efforts to oppose the doctrine of the Trinity, of the arguments which might be put into their possession by taking the word person in its usual acceptation.

If, now, we speak of the Logos as a person, and of God the Father as a person, and attach to the word person the sense that is usual in common parlance, then it is certain indeed that the difficulty which lies in the way
of supposing the Logos to be truly God, and yet consistently maintaining the divine unity, is altogether insurmountable. "Person is an intelligent substance" (if I may use the language of philosophy for the sake of definition). "Substance" (as defined by Baumgarten, a divine of the old school, of high orthodoxy, and of great metaphysical acuteness) "is that which can exist by itself, or unassociated with another thing;" Substantia est id quod potest existere ita, ut ponatur extra alterum, Metaphys. 191, 136. 231—233. As defined by another logician and philosopher, famous for nice distinctions of definition, "Substance is that which exists, or may be supposed to exist, although it is connected with nothing else;" Substantia est id quod est, aut esse possesse putatur, etiam si nulli aliis sit junctum, Ulrich's Inst. Log. et Metaphys. § 316. To apply the word person, then, in the sense which such definitions necessarily afford, to the distinctions in the Godhead, inevitably leads to Tritheism, and of course to a virtual rejection of the divine unity. We may say in words that we believe God is one, although we assert that there are three persons in the Godhead, as just defined; but nothing is plainer than that in such a case we believe merely in a specific unity, not in a numerical one. Specific unity, however, might admit three thousand or three million divine beings, and yet consistently maintain that there is but one God; that is, it might do so, provided we allow the advocates of it that there is a γένος Θεον, genus divinum, or genus of divinities. Human nature, for example, is one; i.e., there is but one nature of man; yet the individuals of this genus are without number. That such is not the unity which the Scriptures assert of the Godhead, I need not stop to prove.

He who consistently holds the numerical unity of the Godhead, must, beyond all doubt, protest against the application of the word person to designate the distinctions of the divine nature, if that word is to be taken in its logical or metaphysical sense. For however one may hold to words and forms of expression, it is plain, that while he makes such an application of the word person to the Godhead, he in fact admits Tritheism, although he may be far from any design or any consciousness of doing so.

The views which have now been presented, may serve to explain the reason why many find it so difficult, or (as they think it) impossible, to admit the true divinity of the Logos. 'How can he,' say they, 'be the second person in the Godhead, and yet be one with the first? How can he be with God, and yet be God himself?'

And truly it must be confessed that this cannot be, provided the words in question are to be construed altogether more humano, i.e., in their logical, common, usual acceptation. But is it analogous, is it proper, to construe them thus? Does it develop a spirit of candid and fair inquiry, to insist that these terms shall be construed according to their common acceptation, when there is not, as we have seen above, a single term significant of a divine attribute, which we ever construe in such a manner?

If this be correct (and I may venture to say it cannot be reasonably disputed), then I see no very urgent reason why the use of the word person, in order to designate a distinction in the Godhead, should be rejected. It
is true, it is not a word which is applied by the Scriptures to the Godhead (for ὅρμος in Heb. i 3 does not mean person); it is also true, that many well-meaning individuals have been misled by it in regard to their conceptions respecting the Deity, and that those who reject the doctrine of the Trinity have made great use of this word in order to render the sentiments of Trinitarians obnoxious; so that one might almost wish the word had never been introduced into ecclesiastical usage. But when the matter is examined to the bottom, it will be found that objections of a similar nature might be urged against the application of any anthropopathic expressions to God. The simple and the untaught may be easily misled by them; and often are so. How many, for example, believe that God is really angry, repents, etc., more humane, because such expressions are found in the Scriptures? Shall all such expressions be laid aside, because they are misunderstood or perverted? And if so, where shall we stop? for we have seen that all language that is used in order to describe God, must be taken, of course and by necessity, in a qualified sense. The abuse of a thing is no valid argument against the use of it. Those, then, who believe in the existence of a real distinction in the Godhead, in case they are careful to protest against the literal application of the word person to designate this, may still continue to employ the word if they think best; for it is exceedingly difficult (as all will confess who have thoroughly studied this subject) to exchange it for a better one, or for one that will so well correspond with the representations of the Bible in regard to such a distinction. Certainly no term can be substituted for it, which will not, in like manner, be obnoxious to more or less objections.

If those who reject all distinction in the Godhead, will persevere still in maintaining, that to say there are three persons in the Godhead necessarily involves the doctrine of Tritheism; and if they will thus continue, at all events, to explain the word person according to its literal and common meaning, and to charge upon those who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity the absurd consequences derivable from this; then they may indeed display their strength of attachment to their own views, and perhaps their skill in logomachy; but where is that candor and fairness toward those who differ from them, which is becoming in all who are earnestly seeking to know the simple doctrines of the Scriptures?

Suppose, now, when one says that God possesses knowledge, he should be asked, in the tone of reproof: 'What! Do you mean to assert that God has physical organs of perception; that he studies; that he charges his memory with ideas; that he compares; that he deduces conclusions; that he summons them up by the effort of recollection when he needs them? Men do all this, who have knowledge; but can all this be predicated of God?' Would any considerate man think these questions very reasonable; or feel himself compelled by them to abandon his assertion that God has knowledge?

Apply now the principle concerned in this case to the idiom in question. The apostle John says, that the Logos was with God; was with him in the beginning; and repeats this asseveration, John i. 1, 2. Christ says of him-
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self, that he was with the Father, and partook of his glory, before the world had an existence, John xvii. 5. In another place, John asserts that the Son was with the Father, 1 John i 2; and the Saviour speaks of the Father as loving him before the foundation of the world, John xvii. 24. He declares that he came out from the Father, when he came into the world, John xvi. 28. In accordance with this idiom Paul says, that God created all things by Jesus Christ, Eph. iii. 9; and that he made the worlds by his Son, Heb. i. 2.

Now if such texts are to be considered altogether insulated, and the principles of analogy in other cases are not to be applied to the language which they exhibit, then the conclusion that Christ or the Logos is a being wholly distinct from God the Father, is clear and inevitable. But are these texts to be construed in an absolute and isolated sense, and without any reference at all to others which relate to the same connection between Father and Son? Certainly not, if we follow the analogy of exegesis in all other cases. When John says that the Logos was with God, he tells us at the very same time (as if to guard us against erroneously concluding that he is a distinct and separate and different substance) that he was God. When the Saviour spake of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, he had just been addressing the Father as the only true God, John xvii. 5, 3; so that no one could rationally suppose him to assert the existence of more than one true God. If Paul tells us that God created all things by Jesus Christ, and that he made the worlds by his Son, he also tells us that Christ is God over all and blessed forever, Rom. ix. 5; and that he is the eternal and immutable creator of the heavens and the earth, Heb. i. 10—12. Christ tells us that he who hath seen him hath seen the Father, John xiv. 9; that he is in the Father, and the Father in him, xiv. 10; and that all which the Father hath is his, xvi. 15. Now, whatever diversity between the Father and Son the first class of texts above quoted may seem to imply, it is plain that it is not of such a nature as to destroy the unity of the Godhead. Whatever the distinction in the Godhead may be, it is not that which makes plurality; it is not that which makes personality in a logical or merely human sense. But can we say what it is? Plainly not. A positive description is nowhere given in Scripture; and surely it would ill become us to pretend that we understand, without revelation, the uncreated substance and modus existendi of the Godhead. All that we can understand by such expressions as the Logos being with God, becoming flesh and dwelling among us, and God’s making the world by him, is, that there is a distinction in the Godhead of some kind, which amounts to more than merely the different modes or ways in which the Divinity discloses himself to us. It is something which is not merely nominal or logical; which is not to be predicated merely of the external relations of the Godhead. It is something which renders it possible to affirm, in some sense or other analogous to the usual meaning of the words, that the Son was with God, that God created the world by him, that he became incarnate, etc. all which cannot be predicated, in the same sense, of the Father. Yet all this must be true in such a modified sense, as not to infringe on the real unity of God.

Who now will undertake to decide what metaphysical distinctions or
relations there may be in the uncreated substance of the eternal God, and what are consistent, and what not consistent, with his unity? None, we may believe, but those who are either presumptuous, or destitute of cool and sober reflection. But although the nature of the distinction in the Godhead be truly beyond the boundaries of human knowledge (as plainly it is), yet the fact that there is a distinction of some kind or other, may be revealed. Indeed, that it is revealed, seems to be a necessary consequence of allowing the two classes of epistles above quoted to be true, and to modify each other. On the one hand, distinction is not to be so held or asserted as to infringe upon unity; and on the other, unity is not to be so held or asserted as to preclude the possibility of any distinction. Who has found out the Almighty unto perfection? Are not all these analogies from created, finite, temporal objects, utterly incompetent to convey adequate ideas of the infinite and uncreated God? Must they not from their very nature be so? Yet men will insist on applying all the analogy which language imports, to God in the same way as to themselves. We always conceive, for example, of different beings which have a finite nature, as separated by space, as existing in time, and as having their own peculiar properties. When therefore we read of the Logos as being with God, we very easily associate with this expression the analogy of one human being in company with another, or of some created thing associated with another that is separate. Then we are ready to ask: How can the Logos be God? One cannot, indeed, show that he is so, if we will insist that all language is to be applied to him, simply according to the common application of it to human objects. But is such an application to be made? Can it be? John says, he is God; and Paul says, he is God over all. Then human language, of course, can only approximate to a description of him; the literal and full application of it, in designating his relations to the Godhead, is out of all question. Only very inadequate views of this subject, or the spirit of party, or that of disputation, can maintain the propriety of such an application.

We may come then to the conclusion, that when the apostle Paul asserts that God made the worlds by his Son, there is nothing in reality more difficult in this expression, than there is in those expressions which are found in the Gospel and first Epistle of John. Whatever may be the economy of the Godhead, to which Paul refers, it is not one which denies, or virtually takes away either the unity of the same, or the supreme creatorship (so to speak) of the Son; for this he most fully asserts, in Heb. i. 10—12.

We have seen by the passages above cited, that the apostles John and Paul accord in their views, both with respect to the distinction and the unity of the Godhead, and to the divinity of the Saviour. As they held these truths in such a manner that they harmonized with each other, so ought we to do; and consequently, we should not give such an explanation to the one as to destroy the other. In a particular manner we ought to be guarded against making any assertions or definitions, which are built on the assumption that we know in what the distinctions of the Godhead consist. Some of the efforts of the school-divines on this awful subject, are
not only contradictory to each other, but their views are inconsistent with
the true nature of a divine and self-existent Creator, as well as repulsive to
the feelings of a cautious and impartial inquirer, who seeks after ideas of
things and not after mere words.

The suggestions now made, respecting the necessity of feeling that all
our language when applied to describe the Deity must be restricted to a
modified sense, are strengthened by an examination of the descriptions in
general of God, as given in the Bible by the sacred writers. They repre-
sent him, for example, as angry; as repenting; as being grieved at the
heart; as laughing at the efforts of the wicked; as mocking at their cala-
nities; as rejoicing; as weeping; as avenging himself; as possessing eyes, hands, feet, and all the parts of the human body; as descending and con-
versing with men; as appearing to Abraham, Moses, and many others;
as ascending; as riding in the whirlwind and the storm; as walking on
the sea; as shooting with a bow and arrows; as whetting his glittering
sword, and bathing it in blood; as clothed with the habiliments of a war-
rrior, or in those of royal magnificence; in a word, as possessed of all the
sympathies, and exhibiting all the phenomena, of a man. The most un-
practised reader of the Bible knows this is true, and that more or less of
it is to be found on nearly every page of it. Yet who that has any rational
views of the true spiritual nature of God, ever supposes that any part of
all this language is to be applied merely in its primary and literal sense to
God? Still, in every case of this nature there is some real meaning in the
language employed by the sacred writers. There is some point of analogy
between the literal meaning of the language as applied to men and the qual-
ified meaning of it as applied to God. When God is said to repent, the
meaning is, that he acts in a manner analogous to that in which men act
when they repent, i. e., he changes the course which he was pursuing.
When God is said to whet his glittering sword, to bend his bow, and to
take hold on vengeance, then he does that which is like what men do to
their enemies, i. e., he punishes, he inflicts distress, he makes retribution
for crimes. In all these and such like cases, the manner in which the divine
Being acts is not intended to be described; but the fact that he does act,
is what is asserted by the use of such language as has just been mentioned.

No one can justly say, then, that there is no real meaning in such lan-
guage when applied to God, unless it is taken in its primary and literal
sense. Such an affirmation would betray profound ignorance of the nature
of language as used in a qualified sense, and also of the true character of
God. For if all such language respecting him is indeed to be literally con-
strued, then have the Scriptures cast no additional light on the spiritual
nature of God, and he is still to be regarded as the heathen represented
him to be, viz., as one altogether like ourselves.

If it should be thought that the class of expressions which are men-
tioned in the two preceding paragraphs are essentially different from these
before considered; viz., such as God knows, God is mighty, etc., an exami-
nation of the whole matter will convince any one of his mistake. It is
ture, the former class of expressions are more obviously figurative. We
at once perceive, that, as God is not flesh and blood, they cannot be literally applied to him; i.e., we abstract from these expressions whatever pertains to modus, whatever is borrowed from our earthly material structure. But is it not equally true, that whatever pertains to modus is, in the other case also, to be in the same manner abstracted? For example; when God is said to know, does it any more imply the human modus of knowing, than it implies the human modus of acting, when he is said to lift up his arm in order to smite an offender? Most clearly not. The truth is, when sifted to the bottom it will be found that there is no essential difference as to the qualified nature of the language in both cases. In both you abstract the modus, before you apply it to God. In the one case, indeed, the metaphor is taken from our corporeal parts; in the other, from our mental powers; but this makes no difference in respect to the thing itself, except that in the former case the language is more obviously and strikingly to be qualified than in the latter.

If, then, such expressions as those which have just been considered, and all others which designate the natural or moral attributes of God, are, and must be understood in a modified sense, then why is not the assertion that the Logos was with God, to be understood in a similar way? The manner in which one created substance, as contemplated by us, is with another, can surely afford no perfect analogy to explain the manner in which the self-existent and uncreated Logos is with God. And yet the most specious of all the objections to the true divinity of the Logos, are grounded on the full and literal application to him of such language.

One word in respect to the unity itself of the Godhead. Is not this term, as well as all others applied to the Divinity, to be taken in a modified sense? If any one will, for a moment, put aside the veil of words, and come to the simple contemplation of things, he will probably find himself much less able to tell what unity in the Godhead is, than he suspected. In the substances around us, proximity of parts united by some common influence, or subserviency to some common purpose, is essential to our idea of unity. A tree is one, because its several parts are intimately connected, are under an influence common to all, and are subservient to a common purpose, i.e., the producing of fruit or foliage. Other trees, indeed, of the like kind, are under the like influence, and subserve the like purpose; but the want of an intimate proximity of parts to the tree in question, is the ground why they are not one with it. One man, in distinction from many, consists of a corporeal frame thus intimately connected, and animated by an intelligent spirit. Everything that has material parts is numerically one, only by an intimate conjunction of these parts.

But when we apply the term unity to spirit, and ask: What is that in which the unity of spirit consists? it will be found more easy to ask than to answer the question. A spirit we do not suppose to have parts; certainly not in such a sense as matter has, i.e., it is not divisible. God has no parts; he is a spirit. Proximity of parts does not constitute his unity. Nor have we, nor can we have, any proof that homogeneity of essence or simplicity of essence or substance constitutes his unity. For, in the first
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place, we have no distinct idea of what the essence or substance (if I may be allowed the expression) of the Godhead consists; and of course, we cannot predicate physical homogeneity or simplicity, of that respecting which we have no distinct idea. In the second place, as the most insignificant portion of matter has never yet, so far as we know, received an ultimate analysis from the highest efforts of chemical philosophy, so that any one can venture to affirm what its simple substance is, and confidently declare that it is homogeneous, and one only in regard to its component elements; will any one venture to say, that he has analyzed the divine substance (I speak it with reverence), so as to be able with certainty to predicate physical homogeneous simplicity and unity of the elements which compose it? How is it possible for us to make affirmations about the nature of that substance, of which, by our own confession, we are altogether ignorant?

The qualities, then, of the substance or essence of the Godhead, or (to speak in other terms) the physical or metaphysical nature of the Deity, is that of which we are profoundly ignorant. We know that there is one omnipotence, one omniscience; one Creator and governor of the universe; but do we know the internal relations and modifications of his substance? Confessedly not. How then can we with propriety reject the testimony of revelation, that the Logos is God, because of objections which our philosophy deduced from a priori reasoning may raise, in respect to the unity of the divine substance; all of which objections, too, are deduced from analogies that are taken merely from material and corporeal things? Truly if the nature of these objections be examined, and the whole matter sifted to the bottom, by putting mere words aside for a while, and looking at things, it will be found that we have less reason to confide in such objections than some are ready to imagine.

The Christian who holds that the Logos is truly divine (and of course that he is self-existent, eternal, and independent), holds to what Paul and John seem very plainly to assert; and he who admits that there is a distinction in the Godhead (the nature of which is not developed, but which is implied in such expressions as those in Heb. i. 2; John i. 1, 2), stands on scriptural ground, and on that, too, which is proof against all assault. For how can it be proved that there is not a distinction in the Godhead, the nature of which we confessedly do not understand? If it be asked: How can it be proved that there is one? The answer is: By a revelation. If such a revelation has been made (and the texts cited above, not to mention others, seem plainly to imply it), then we are either bound to receive it, or to reject the authority of the sacred writers. Consistency must oblige us directly and fully to do the one or the other.

We come, then, at the close of this protracted discussion, to the conclusion, that language like that in Heb. i 2, is subject to such modifications as other parts of the Scriptures and the nature of the case demand. In other words, we can rationally apply it to God and to Christ, only in a qualified sense; just as all other language must be applied to them, most obviously, in a qualified sense. Whatever depends on modus, must be
abstracted. Facts are aimed at by the sacred writers, not the modes of them.

The expression in our text, therefore, according to every just law of exegesis, must be so taken as to accord with other assertions of the apostle and other inspired writers. But these do not permit us to attribute the act of creating to any but God himself, i. e., the supreme God. To this act the ultimate appeal is made by the sacred authors, in order to distinguish the supreme God from all that is called God in heaven or on earth; see Rom. i. 20; Ps. xix. 1; Acts xiv. 15; Is. xl. 25, 26; xlii. 5—8; xliii. 15; xlv. 24; xiv. 18; xlv. 9; xlviii. 12, 13, etc. Nor is it possible for the human mind to appeal to any decisive evidence of supreme Divinity, unless the act of creation be such. The Deity can be known at all only by the development of his attributes; and no development ever made, or (so far as we can see) none which can be made, is so highly and decisively characteristic of "eternal power and Godhead," as the act of creation.

So thought Paul, Rom. i. 20; and so, until the whole structure of my mind is changed, must I think.

The Being, then, who created the world, is God to me; and from the nature of my moral and mental constitution must be so. This is a point that admits of no explaining away. If, therefore, Christ created the world, he must be what John asserts him to be, God; and what Paul asserts him to be, God over all. But in what sense God can be said to have created the world by Christ, i. e., what is the exact meaning of a phrase, which refers to an internal distinction (as it would seem) in the divine nature, is beyond the reach of our conception as to modes. Enough that it has matter of fact for its ground, viz., that the Logos was truly Creator. Enough that creatorship is so spoken of in the Bible, that we are not at liberty to predicate it of any independent being. This point fixed (and if it be not, we have no decisive evidence on which we can rely that Jehovah is God), the sense of Heb. i. 2, and other like passages, is to be understood in a qualified way, so as not to gainsay what is plain and certain. This is as much as can be said with safety; for the subject to which such passages refer, is plainly one that, in most respects, is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge.

That the subject is not without difficulties, even in its scriptural position, is what every candid and unprejudiced man will be very ready to confess. But it is a noble remark of Garve (on Cicero de Offic. Lib. I. p. 70): "The better part of men do not, because they may discover a few difficulties which they cannot solve, regard the whole system of acknowledged truth as uncertain. They can be aware that there is some darkness mingled with light in their knowledge, without being terrified by the one or blinded by the other."

The effort to explain everything, to define everything, has led to the unhappy consequence of introducing scholastic phraseology and definitions in respect to everything about the doctrine of the Trinity. This not only bewilders many, but makes others believe that they have a knowledge of things, because they can use abundance of technical words; while the opposition of
another class, who can detect the inconsistency and emptiness of these terms, is excited against the whole doctrine. The day however is coming, if not already arrived, when mere names will be regarded by the church as of little worth, provided they do not convey intelligible ideas. For the good of the church also it may be hoped, that the time is very near when men will learn to stop in making their inquiries, within the boundaries of human knowledge, and neither to assert nor deny that about which they know nothing and can know nothing. Well was it said by a very sensible writer: “He who will not undertake to explain what is incomprehensible, but will seek to know where the boundaries of this begin, and simply acknowledge them when and where he finds them—he does most to promote the genuine knowledge of truth by man.”

EXCURSUS II.

On Δι' ου καὶ τοῦ οἰκός αἰώνας ἐπλησε, Heb. i. 2.

It has been argued, that the expression God made the worlds by his Son, necessarily contains an implication of eternal Sonship or eternal generation; in other words, that Christ is the Son of God in his divine nature, and not simply considered as mediator. “How,” it is asked, “could God make the worlds by his Son, if he had no Son until four thousand years after the world was created?” The answer, however, is easy. How could “God create all things by Jesus Christ?” And yet the apostle asserts that he did, in Eph. iii. 9. Is not Jesus Christ the proper name of the incarnate Logos? of the Saviour as possessing our nature? How then could the world have been created by him? The answer is, that in both cases, and in all similar cases, the words which describe the person are used as proper names, and thus come to designate the whole person in whatever relation he is considered. The Logos who created the world, was united with the human nature of Jesus—with the human nature of the Son of God, i.e., the Messiah. And as the names Jesus Christ and Son of God, are evidently terms used to describe the complex person of the Saviour, so it is altogether accordant with the usages of language to say that ‘God created the world by Jesus Christ,’ or ‘by his Son;’ meaning, in either case, by the Logos or higher nature united to Christ or the Son. So we say, Abraham is dead, meaning that part of him which is mortal is dead; Abraham is alive, meaning that part which is immortal lives. We say too, Abraham was born in Ur of Chaldea; yet he did not receive this name until ninety-nine years after his birth there, for before this last period he was called Abram, not Abraham, Gen. xvii. 1, 5. This is anagogical with saying, God made the worlds by his Son; although the Logos did not
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receive the name Son (except by prophetic anticipation), until he appeared in the flesh. Nothing is more common than to employ proper names, when once acquired, in order to designate the whole person, in all its different stages or modes of existence, without any reference to the time or manner of acquiring the proper name. At all events, if to say that God made the worlds by his Son, necessarily proves that the Logos was then a Son when he made the worlds; the same reasoning will of course prove that he was then Jesus and Christ also, i.e., a complex person having a human nature, because it is said, God created all things by Jesus Christ.

In the same manner, the expression of our Saviour, What if ye should see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? John vi. 62, would prove, if the reasoning on which we are animadverting be correct, that the son of man existed in heaven before he dwelt among men, i.e., that the Word made flesh did not assume this incarnate condition at the birth of Jesus, but possessed such a nature before, viz., while in the heavenly world. Now, as neither fact justifies such a supposition, nor the usages of language demand it, so the doctrine of eternal Sonship can never be built upon a principle of reasoning which stands upon such a very insufficient basis.

In regard to the appeal which is made so often and with so much confidence to the early Fathers of the church, as avowing and defending this doctrine, it is evidently founded in mistake, or in a partial and imperfect investigation of their sentiments. The amount of the speculations of early ecclesiastical writers on this subject, may be summed up in the following propositions; viz. (2) Originally or at first, God was alone (μόνος), yet so that the Logos was in him (ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐνδιάθεσις) as his reason or intellect. (2) In this sense they of course affirmed the Logos to be eternal, inasmuch as God never could have been without reason or understanding. In this sense, also, they understood the Logos to have been concerned with the creation of the world; for surely the world was created by wisdom and intelligence. (3) As to the generation of the Logos, it took place when the world was created; so Tertullian expressly says: Tunc inicit ipsa Sermo speciem et ornamentum summum summum, somnum et somnum, cum dicit Deus, Fiat lux. Haece est anteperfecta Sermonis, dum ex Deo procedit; conditus ab eo primum ad cogitatum in nomine Sophiae, Lib. cont. Prax. p. 200, Tom. II. This they strenuously contended for, on the ground that the words which proceeded from God, when he said, Let there be light, must be substantia, ὁσια, not “quidnam inane vel vacuum” (4) The Logos thus generated was not merely like to God, but a communion of the same nature and attributes existed between them. In his assuming personality, there was no ἄνωτος, abolition, no μεταγενής division, in respect to the divine substance, but he was a ὅς ὁς words ἄδιον, a light kindled up by light and partaking of the same attributes. (5) This community of nature constituted the basis of the unity which exists in the Godhead.

So much for speculation on this awful subject. The reader can judge for himself, whether any advance is made by all this toward explaining the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the generation of the Son. If he calls in question the correctness of this representation, as it regards the early Fathers,
I refer him, for ample satisfaction, to a clear and masterly statement of the whole, with abundant proofs in the way of quotation from the early Fathers, contained in Keilii Opuscula, p. 483, seq.; also Martini, Geschichte des Logos.

**EXCURSUS III.**

*Ος δὲ ἀπαίδυσμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαράκτηρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, Heb. i. 3.

What can be plainer, than that the description in Heb. i. 3, necessarily applies to the incarnate Logos, to the Son of God as disclosing in our nature the Father to the world of mankind? A multitude of analogous texts might easily be appealed to; but those quoted in the commentary are sufficient. It is plainly the manifestation of God which the Son makes, that occasions the Son's being described as ἀπαίδυσμα and χαράκτηρ; both of which imply, of course, what is visible and perceptible. But the Logos before the incarnation, while simply divine, was neither visible nor perceptible. Nor can we, with any propriety of language, speak of him in that state in which he was simply the invisible God, as being only the image of God, or only the radiance of his splendor, or merely the likeness of his substance. Τὸ πάσης αὐτοῦ ἡ σταύρωσις, I regard as equivalent to him, himself as he really is; for this would seem to be the meaning of substance in the case before us, and not the designation of the physical or metaphysical nature of the divine substance, which neither Christ nor any of the sacred writers have represented to us, and of which the Logos is not an image, since he is ONE with the Father.

Others understand ἀπαίδυσμα in the sense of image, exact resemblance, and δόξα as meaning, divine majesty; thus making ἀπαίδυσμα δόξας and χαράκτηρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ synonymous. They appeal by way of supporting this to an expression in Philo, who calls the sanctuary of the temple οὗτος ἀπαίδυσμα τῶν ἀγίων καὶ μισθωμα τοῦ ἄρχετόνος, an image (as they translate it) of the [heavenly] sanctuary, and a resemblance of the archetyp. But here ἀπαίδυσμα may well be rendered radiance, i.e., light emanated from the heavenly sanctuary, in reference to the heavenly splendor which appeared in the most holy place Philo de Plantat. Noc L. II. p. 221. edit. Francofurt. The book of Wisdom calls wisdom, ἀπαίδυσμα φωτὸς ἀπόλου, καὶ εἰκών τῆς ἀναθήματος αὐτοῦ, the radiance of eternal light and the image of [God's] goodness, which, although cited by them, is still less to the purpose of defending their opinion.

Ancient and modern commentators, who have construed these phrases as having respect to the divine nature and condition of the Son, have understood them as asserting an exact likeness between the Father and Son, first in regard to attributes (δόξα), and then in regard to substance or essence.
(διότως). I must, however, regard the phrase in question as of the same nature in respect to meaning with the texts to which it has been compared in the commentary; and we may surely find, in the analogy of the Scripture and in the nature of the imagery, reason to justify this view of the whole. But as the explanation referred to has been so long insisted on, and so often repeated, it deserves at least some particular attention.

Theodoret has best exhibited the mode of argument, which is used to defend the sentiment in question. "Splendor (ἀμαρταμα)," says he, "comes from fire. It has fire as its cause, but is inseparable from the fire; for fire and splendor proceed from the same source. If now it is possible, in respect to objects of sense, that one thing should be derived from another, and yet coexist with that from which it is derived, you cannot doubt that God the Logos, the only begotten Son of God, is begotten as a Son, and yet that he coexists with him who begat him as Logos, which [Logos] is ἀμαρταμα δόξας. For the glory and the splendor have one common source. But the glory always existed; consequently the splendor. Fire and splendor are of the same nature; then the Son is of the same nature with the Father. Moreover, since the image of splendor abundantly shows the coeternal and coessential nature [of the Son with the Father], it has afforded occasion for the blasphemies of those who labor under the disease of Sabellius and Photinus. By another image, therefore, he [the apostle] refutes this blasphemy, since splendor does not exist in and of itself; for he adds, χαράκηρ τῆς θνοστάσεως αἰτοῦ, κ. τ. λ." Theod. Comm. on Heb. i. 3.

In a similar manner Chrysostom and Theophylact argue, calling the Son φῶς ἐκ φωτός. So the Nicene Fathers say, 'the Son is φῶς ἐκ φωτός, καὶ ἐδώκει ἐκ Δεσοῦ.' All these plainly borrow their phraseology from the expression, ἀμαρταμα μὲν δόξας αἰτοῦ which is referred by them to the divine nature of Christ.

But how incompetent any material objects are, to afford just analogies of the modus existendi of the divine and uncreated Nature, need not be again insisted on in this place. We might well ask, is not the sun the cause of light? And does not the cause exist before the effect? Again: Is light in all respects homousian with the source of light, the luminary from which it springs? Is the radiance of the sun the same thing as the sun itself?

Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Gregory Nyssen, moreover assert, that the expression χαράκηρ τῆς θνοστάσεως αἰτοῦ, necessarily implies an entire resemblance in all respects of the Son to the Father, with the exception of separate hypostasis: and this they maintain must be so, because the impression made by a stamp or die is exactly like the stamp or die itself. But it may be asked, first, Whether the writer himself of our epistle makes, as these commentators do, the exception of hypostasis from the completeness of the resemblance asserted? Next, whether an impression is indeed in all respects like the die which made it? For example: is the impression solid, or of the same material with the stamp; or does it possess the same physical attributes; or is it coeval with it? Such assertions, therefore, though they may be oratorical enough, and please the fancy of hearers or readers, vanish away before the tribunal of examination, and serve only
to show the incompetence of any earthly analogies to give a true representation of the *modus existendi*, or of the physical substance of the Godhead. They also show the imprudence, nay the danger, of employing such figures in regard to a subject of so awful a nature.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who carefully examines, that the Nicene Fathers and the Greek commentators, one and all, held that Christ as to his *divine nature* was derived from the Father. So the Nicene creed, *ἐν δόξῃ καὶ φόρμῃ*. So Chrysostom, commenting on the phrase in Heb. i. 13, *καθὼς ἐν δόξῃ καὶ φόρμῃ μοι*, affirms that "the apostle says this for no other reason, than that you may not suppose the Son to be ἄρχον καὶ ἐκαθιστών," i.e., *sine principio et sine causâ*; most evidently in the very spirit of the Nicene Creed. Yet we may ask the question, we cannot help asking it: Is then the Son, who is *God over all and blessed forever*—is he, in his *divine nature*, derived and dependent? Has he, as very God, an *aíris* and an ἄρχας? And is it possible for us to make the idea of true and *proper divinity* harmonize with that of derivation and consequent dependence? No; it is not. The *spiritual* views of the nature of God, which are now generally entertained by enlightened men, forbid this; in fact, they render it absolutely impossible. But not so in the days of the Nicene council and of the Greek commentators. That they believed in the *divine nature* of Christ, I consider as altogether certain; but that their views of what is necessary to constitute a rational and defensible idea of a nature *truly divine*, were correct, is what no one, I think, who has read their writings and judged for himself, will now venture to maintain. Their views of the divine nature were built on the metaphysical philosophy of their day; but we are not bound to admit this philosophy as correct; nor is it indeed possible, now, for our minds to admit it.

---

**EXCURSUS IV.**

*Ἐκδίουν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλουχίας, Heb. i. 3.*

To *sit at the right hand of one on a throne*, appears to have had two meanings, both in profane and sacred usage.

1. It denotes *honor, friendship, peculiar approbation, a reward bestowed* on any one. Thus Solomon, when on his throne, directed Bathsheba his mother to sit at his right hand, 1 K. ii. 19. Thus in Ps. lxv. 9, the queen is represented as taking her place at the right hand of the king her husband. The mother of James and John requests of Jesus, that her two sons may sit the one on his right hand and the other on his left during his reign, ἐν τῷ βασιλείᾳ σου (Matt. xx. 20—23, comp. Mark x. 35—40), i.e., that they may occupy the highest places of honor under him as king. In other passages, Christ promises his disciples that they shall have thrones
in the world of glory, Matt. xix. 28; nay, that they shall sit down with him on his throne, even as he sits down with his Father on his throne, Rev. iii. 21. So Christians are said to have a kingdom given to them, Rev. i. 6; they are a kingly priesthood, 1 Pet. ii. 9; they reign with Christ, or in life, 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rom. v. 17; James ii. 5; Matt. xxv. 34; Rev. v. 10. In all these and the like cases, honor, reward, an exalted state of happiness or glory, is represented by such expressions; but not actual participation in the supreme government of the universe.

2. To sit at the right hand of one enthroned, or to sit on a throne with one, also denotes participation of command, authority, or dignity. So the heathen often employed the phrase; e. g., Pindar represents Minerva as δεξάμενα καὶ χειρὶ τοῦ πατρὸς κοινωνίαν, sitting at the right hand of her father [Jove]; which Horace explains by her occupying proximos Iovis honores. Pind. Frugm. p. 55, ed. Schneider. Hor. Od. i. 12, 19. So Callimachus says of Apollo, that "he will honor the choir who shall sing what is pleasant to him, since he is able to do this, ἔσεί δὲ δεξαμενὸς ἢστας, because he sits at the right hand of Jove, Hymn. in Apoll. v. 28, 29." The Greeks called him who participated with another in the kingly authority, συνδικὴ, συνδικὸς, συνδικῶς; although they also applied these terms to any member of a council, or of a deliberative judicial assembly. In the New Testament, when Christ is represented as sitting at the right hand of divine majesty, Heb. i. 3; or at the right hand of God, Heb. x. 12; or at the right of the throne of God, Heb. xii. 2; participation in supreme dominion is most clearly meant. Compare Acts ii. 32—36; 1 Pet. iii. 22; Rom. viii. 34; Mark xvi. 19; Phil. ii. 6—11; Eph. i. 20—23. At the same time, the comparison of these passages will show most clearly, that Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God means, his being seated on the mediatorial throne as the result and reward of his sufferings (see particularly Phil. ii. 6—11, and comp. Heb. xii. 2); and that the phrase in question never means, the original dominion which Christ as Logos or God possesses. The sacred writers never speak respecting the Logos, considered simply in his divine nature, as being seated at the right hand of God; but only of the Logos incarnate or the Mediator, as being seated there. So in our text, it is after the expiation made by the Son of God, that he is represented as seating himself at the hand of the divine majesty. And that this mediatorial dominion is not to be considered simply as the dominion of the divine nature of Christ as such, is plain from the fact that when the mediatorial office is fulfilled, the kingdom of the Mediator as such is to cease, 1 Cor. xv. 23—28. Moreover, that the phrase, to sit at the right hand of God or of the throne of God, does not of itself mean original divine dominion, is clear from the fact that Christ assures his faithful disciples they shall sit down with him on his throne, even as he sat down with the Father on his throne, Rev. iii. 21. It is exaltation, then, in consequence of obedience and sufferings, which is designated by the phrase in question. See an excellent dissertation De Jesu Christi ad dextram Dei sedente, by the venerable Dr. Knapp of Halle (viv in ἀγλος), in Knappii Scripta variar Argumenti. Hal. 1824.
EXCURSUS V.

'Εγώ ἐσμέν αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ἀντὶς ἦτοι μοι εἰς γιόν, Ἡβ. i. 5.

A difficulty still remains, in regard to the application of 2 Sam. vii. 14 to Christ. In the very same verse which contains the quotation made by the apostle, is contained the following expression: "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men;" i.e., I will inflict such punishment as men receive on account of transgression. Can it well be said respecting the Son of God, "If he commit iniquity, etc.?" Where can any analogy in Scripture be found of such language as applied to him? The answer must be: No where. But by a nearer inspection of the whole prophecy, and by comparing it with other predictions of a similar nature, perhaps the difficulty presented may be diminished, if not removed. What hinders that God should promise both temporal and spiritual blessings to David, in consideration of his piety? See 2 Sam. vii. 1—13. Why could he not promise him that he should have successors on his throne, who should, like other men, fall into sin and be chastened for it? And yet, that among those kings who should descend from him, there should be one who was the Son of God in a peculiar sense, who was destined to a dignity — to a throne — of a most exalted nature. Such, at least, seems to be the exposition by the author of the eighty-ninth Psalm, vs. 29—37.

Compare this now with the promises made to Abraham, Gen. xii. 1—3; xv. 1—6; xvii. 1—8. These passages certainly contain assurances, that Abraham should have a literal numerous offspring, and that they should inherit the land of Canaan; see Gen. xv. 7—18. Yet they also contain assurances of a seed in whom all nations should be blessed, Gal. iii. 14—17; and of a seed who should be the heirs of Abraham's faith, i.e., resemble him in regard to faith or belief, Gal. iii. 6—8. It may be difficult for us to ascertain, in some cases, where the temporal promise ends and the spiritual one begins, and so vice versa; because both are couched, as usual, in similar language. But this does not show that there is any absurdity, or any improbability, in the supposition that God may have promised, and that he has promised, blessings both spiritual and temporal at the same time. Did he not engage that David should have successors on his earthly throne; and also that he should have a Son who would sit on a spiritual throne, and have a kingdom of which David's own was but a mere type? Luke i. 32, 33; Rom i 3, 4. Admitting this, our difficulty is diminished if not removed. The "iniquity committed" is predicated of that part of David's seed who might commit it, i.e., his successors on the national throne; while the more exalted condition, predicated of his successor, belongs to him to whom is given a kingdom over all.

If you say: 'Thus interpreted, the prophecy seems to be in a great measure general, and difficult to be definitely interpreted,' the answer is:
So it was designed to be. The general idea only was intended to be communicated of some future most distinguished progeny of David. Very much of our difficulty in interpreting most of the prophecies of the Old Testament, arises from aiming to make them more specific and definite than they were originally intended to be. When we shall have thoroughly learned, that "the Law made nothing perfect," we shall find less difficulty in the interpretation both of the Old and New Testament.

EXCURSUS VI.

Αἰτίᾳ προκατεστελλόμενων αὐτῷ πάντων ἄγγελων Σατανᾶ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραήλ.

ALTHOUGH nearly all the commentators on our epistle admit that the passage is actually quoted by the apostle, yet the difficulties to which this opinion is exposed, should not be passed over in silence.

In Deut. xxxii. 43 [Sept.] the very words are found which appear in our text. But (1) They are found only in the Septuagint version; the Hebrew and all the ancient versions omitting them. (2) The copies of the Septuagint itself are not agreed respecting them. The Codex Alex. reads υδαί Σατανᾶ instead of ἄγγελοι Σατανᾶ; and one Codex at Oxford omits the whole clause. (3) The subject connected with this command to the angels (if we admit the clause in the Septuagint to be a part of the sacred text), has no relation to the Messiah. The context celebrates the victory over the enemies of Israel, which God will achieve. After saying, that "his arrows should be drunk with blood, and that his sword should devour flesh with the blood of the slain and of captives, from the time when he begins to take vengeance on the enemy;" the Septuagint (not the Hebrew) immediately inserts, ἵψαρα γὰρ ἐστὶν θάνατος αὐτοῦ καὶ προκατεστελλόμενων αὐτῷ πάντων ἄγγελων Σατανᾶ. This, in the place where it stands, must needs mean: 'Let the inhabitants of the heavenly world rejoice in the victory of God over the enemies of his people, and let them pay their adoration to him.' But the Messiah does not seem to be at all alluded to, anywhere in the context; much less described as being introduced into the world. I should therefore think it very improbable, if the apostle meant to quote Scripture, that he meant to quote this Scripture, on the present occasion; for we have no knowledge (unless it be so applied in our text) that the Jews of his time were wont to apply this passage to the Messiah. Still, it is a possible case (I cannot say probable) that he quoted the words of Deut. xxxii. 43, merely as fitted to express the idea which he intended to convey; just as we now borrow Scripture language, every day, to convey our own ideas, without feeling it to be at all necessary to prove, in every case, that the same meaning was originally conveyed by the words which we employ, as we attach to them in our discourse. Such a use, it is well known, is not unfrequently
made of passages from the Old Testament by the writers of the New; and such a one, Storr maintains, is here made by the apostle of the words of the Septuagint in Deut. xxxii. 43.

The probability, all things considered, seems plainly to be in favor of a quotation from Ps. xcvi. 7 (Sept. xcvi. 7); where the Sept. has, προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἵγγελον αὐτοῦ, as a translation of the Heb. יִבְרָאֵל יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה שָׁם, worship him all ye Elohim. Here αὐτοῦ in the Septuagint, stands after ἵγγελον, but in Heb. i. 6 it is ὸς, and καὶ in our quotation is wanting in the Sept. Still, any one who has compared the quotations of the N. Test. from the Old, either with the Hebrew or Septuagint, must have seen that very few of them are verbatim. The variation here of the quotation from the original, is so small, and so entirely unconcerned with the sense of the passage, that the discrepancy will not be any hindrance at all to the supposition that Ps. xcvi. 7 may have been quoted.

It is certainly a possible case, that this Psalm celebrates the introduction of the Messiah to his mediatorial throne. His empire was to destroy idolatry, and fill the hearts of the righteous with gladness, Ps. xcvi. 11, 12. The Jews, as Kimchi asserts, were wont to apply all the Psalms, from Ps. xcvi. to Ps. ci., to the Messiah. If such an explanation was current in the time of Paul, as seems probable, it would give additional force to the appeal here made. And even if Paul himself did not regard Ps. xcvi. as originally designed to be applied to the Messiah, he might still use the words of it as descriptive of facts which took place at the time of the Saviour's exaltation. There is nothing, however, in the 97th Psalm which forbids our referring it to the regal inauguration of the Messiah; and so long as we know that the Jews did refer it to him, and that the apostle has here referred it to his introduction into the οἰκουμένη, this is sufficient to satisfy us that it should be so construed.

One question, however, still remains. How could the Seventy, and Paul after them, translate יִבְרָאֵל as meaning angels? It is admitted, that the great body of lexicographers and critics, in recent times, have rejected the sense of the word here given. But usage, after all, pleads in favor of it. The Septuagint render ὡς (God) by ἵγγελος, in Job. xx. 15; and יִבְרָאֵל by ἵγγελος, in Ps. viii. 6 (and so the Chaldee Targum here); xcvi. 7, (xcvi. 7); cxxxvii. 1 (cxxxviii. 1). Paul follows them, by quoting Ps. viii. 6 in Heb. ii. 7; and also by quoting Ps. xcvi. 7, in the verse before us, i. e., if we concede that he does actually quote it. Is not this sufficient evidence that there was a usus loquenti among the Jews, which applied the word יִבְרָאֵל occasionally to designate angels? It is admitted that kings and magistrates are called Elohim, because of their rank or dignity. Is there anything improbable in the supposition, that angels may be also called יִבְרָאֵל, who at present are elevated above men, Heb. ii. 7? Facts, and not suppositions, are evidences of the usus loquenti of the Jewish writers. Accordingly our most recent and distinguished lexicons acknowledge the sense of יִבְרָאֵל here advocated; see Gesenius Thesaurus on יִבְרָאֵל, who, though himself inclined to doubt or reject this sense of the word, still profess satisfactory evidence that no violence is done to the laws of interpretation, when such a rendering is given.
EXCURSUS VII.

In regard to the body of the Psalm (Ps. cii.) from which this whole quotation is taken, the majority of the late critics agree in the opinion, that it does not primarily relate to the Messiah, but to Jehovah absolutely considered. It is, no doubt, one of those Psalms, the internal evidence of which does not so clearly and distinctly determine the application of the whole composition, as does that of many others. Thus much also seems to be clear, viz., that there is nothing in the Psalm which forbids the application of it to the Messiah. Nay, there are several passages of it, which apply to him in a more apposite way than to any other personage. If we suppose the complaint (vs. 1—11) to be that of the church previously to the appearance of its Redeemer, then does the sequel well agree with the promised redemption. In particular, verses 15, 18, 20, 22, describe the propagation and prosperity of true religion among the heathen. But when was such a diffusion of the true knowledge and worship of God to take place? Under the Jewish dispensation, or under the Christian? Surely under the latter only. Compare, too, ver. 20 with Isaiah lxi. 1, which the Saviour applies to himself, Luke iv. 17—21. Verses 23, 24 of Ps. cii., renew the complaint of the church; and vs. 25—28 contain the answer, viz., that the Redeemer is the Creator and-immutable, and that the church shall be continued, and a godly seed be permanent. So I am inclined to explain the whole Psalm; and so, at any rate, the writer of our epistle seems to have understood it. Certainly there is nothing that forbids such an explanation, when it is once admitted that the Messiah was at all the subject of prediction in ancient times, and that some of the Psalms do actually contain such predictions.

But if any one prefers construing Psalm cii. as applicable merely to Jehovah, absolutely considered, then there is no serious difficulty with respect to our quotation. The application of the same words to the Son of God, which were originally spoken respecting Jehovah, is equivalent to saying: 'What was affirmed by the Psalmist of Jehovah, may be as truly affirmed of the Son.' As the writer applies the words in this manner, it shows that he considered those whom he addressed as being accustomed to make such an application of them, and that they were willing to admit it; otherwise he could not have expected the argument to be acknowledged by them as a forcible one.

Admitting now that the apostle has correctly applied this passage to the Son, either in the former or the latter method (and one of these must surely be admitted), then it follows that the Son possesses a nature truly
EXCURSUS VIII. ON HEBREWS II. 2.

divine. The act of creation is the highest evidence of such a nature, that is offered or can be offered in our minds: and the sacred writers appeal to it as such; see Rom. i. 20; Ps. xix. 1; Acts xiv. 14; Is. xl. 25, 26; xlii. 5—8; xliii 15; xlv. 24; xlv. 18; xlii. 9; xlviii. 12, 13. It is plain that the force of the proof in question is not altered, whether you suppose the 102d Psalm originally to relate to the Messiah or not. If it originally related to him, then the application is clear and unembarrassed. If it originally related to Jehovah simply considered, then the apostle asserts here, that what was said of Jehovah may also be applied in the same manner to the Son. Consequently, the weight of the argument is the same in either case, as it respects the divine nature of Christ. Either would show the opinion of the writer to be, that the Son is eternal and also the Creator of the universe; of course, that he is exalted beyond all measure above the angels, and is truly divine. For, as the same writer says: He who made all things, is God, Heb. iii. 4.

We may observe, too, that this last argument is the climax of the whole, and completes the proof which the apostle adduces to show the exalted dignity of the Son. He had intimated the same sentiment at the commencement of his epistle, ver. 2; but here he brings out into full light the nature of his views respecting this subject. Whatever, then, may be the economy according to which God made all things by his Son, it is not of such a nature as to exclude supreme creatorship and eternal existence as belonging to the Son; both of which are asserted to belong to him by the passage now before us.

EXCURSUS VIII.

El γὰρ δι' ἀγγέλων λαλήσει λόγος, Heb. ii. 2.

There are two methods of explaining this. (1) The apostle here speaks merely in the way of accommodation to the Jewish mode of representing this subject. The Jews attributed the giving of the law to angels, as mediators or internumci between Jehovah and them; and they were accustomed to make high claims on this account, with respect to the dignity and superior excellency of their law. The apostle here adverts to their views of this subject; and what he says amounts to this: 'If every transgression of the law which you regard as given by the mediation of angels, was punished,' etc. In like manner the same apostle says to the Galatians: "Who hath bewitched you?" without intending to teach us that he believed in the power of witchcraft. And so our Saviour may have spoken to the Jews, of the unclean spirit that goes out of a man and walks through dry [desert] places seeking rest and finding none, but afterwards it returns with seven other spirits and repossesses the same man (Matt. xii. 43), without
Intending to teach us that impure spirits actually wander about in deserts (although I doubt this exegesis). We are not, then, absolutely obliged to understand the apostle as meaning anything more by the expression in question, than a reference to the Jewish mode of speaking and thinking relative to the subject of angels. But,

(2) Another mode of explanation is, that the phrase contains a concession, on the part of the writer, of what was viewed by him to be matter of fact. This view I feel constrained to adopt, by a comparison of similar passages. In Acts vii. 53, Stephen says to the Jews: "Ye have received the law εἰς διαταγής ἁγγέλων, by the disposition [order, arrangement] of angels;" and Paul, speaking of the law, in Gal. iii. 19, says that it was διαταγής δι' ἁγγέλων, arranged [disposed], proposed by angels.

But here a difficulty is urged. God himself proclaimed the law to the Israelites, Ex. xx. 1, 19, 22; Deut. v. 4. How, then, can the law be said to be λατρείας δι' ἁγγέλων? Different ways of avoiding and answering this difficulty have been adopted. Some maintain that δ λατρείας here means not the law, but the different messages, which in the Old Testament are said to have been delivered by angels. Others have made a distinction between what was said directly to Moses by God himself, and what was promulgated [διαταγῆς, εἰς διαταγής], as they say, to the people at large by angels. That the law of Moses, however, is meant, is plain from a comparison of Heb. x. 28, 29 and xii. 25; as well as from the nature of the comparison here proposed between the old and the new dispensation. And that the tenuous distinction made in the second case is unnecessary, every one who reflects well on the usus loquendi of Scripture will concede. God is very often said to do that, which instruments under his direction, or under the general arrangements of his providence accomplish. Even evil is ascribed to him in this way by one phrase, which another passage shows to have been perpetrated by an inferior agent. E. g., in 2 Sam. xxiv. 7, it is said of Jehovah, רְצִית he moved [or excited] David to go and number Israel; which crime was followed by tremendous punishment. Yet in Chron. xxxi. 1 it is said of Satan, רְצִית he moved David to go and number Israel. So it is repeatedly said of Pharaoh, that he hardened his own heart, and that the Lord hardened his heart, in Ex. iv.—x. So, according to the prophet, Jehovah smites the confederate Syrians and Israelites, Is. vii.—ix; so in other passages, Jehovah is represented as smiting the nations of Judah, of Assyria, of Babylonia, of Egypt, of Tyre, of Moab, etc. Yet in all these cases, instruments were employed. Solomon built: the temple; but he did not lay and lay the stones with his own hands, nor carve the goodly architecture. Nothing can be more erroneous, then, in most cases, than to draw the conclusion, that because the Scripture asserts some particular thing to have been done by God, therefore he did it immediately, i. e., so that no instruments were employed by him. In interpreting the principles of human laws, we say: Qui facit per alium facit per se. Does not common sense approve of this, as applied to the language of the Scriptures? Nothing can be more evident than that the sacred writers have expressed themselves in a manner which recognizes this principle.
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If, then, we are pressed with the literal explanation of δ καὶ ἄγγελον λόγος, and any one insists that this can mean no less than that angels uttered audible sounds when the law was given; all this may be conceded, and still no contradiction be found in the representations of Scripture when its usus loquendi is well understood. God did that, which the angels performed by his direction. Yet such a literal interpretation of this passage is hardly to be insisted on. Stephen, in Acts vii. 53, and Paul in Gal. iii. 19, assert only that the law was διαγεγραμμένος δι' ἄγγελον; which well conveys the general meaning to be attached to an expression of this nature, viz., ‘the angels were ministering spirits, or assisted at the giving of the law.’ Such was the Jewish tradition in the apostolic age. Josephus says: “Our best maxims and most excellent laws we have learned of God, δι' ἄγγελον,” Archaeol. XV. 4. 3. Philo (Lib. de Decalogo) states, that “There were present at the giving of the law, voices visible, animated, and splendid, flame of fire, ἀρχαία χοραμμα, trumpets, and divine men running hither and thither to publish the law.” Yet in another place he states, that “God only spoke the law to Moses;” which, however, as we have seen above, is not at all inconsistent with the former representation.

In addition to all this, there is a passage in Deut. xxxiii. 2, respecting the legislation at Sinai, which seems to refer to the fact designed to be stated in our text. “The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them [the children of Israel]; he shined from mount Paran, and he came with holy myriads (ἁγία τρεις γάρ)”. By the holy myriads here mentioned, what can be meant except the angels? Moreover, in Ps. lxviii. 18, it is said: “The chariots of God are myriads thousands repeated; the Lord is in the midst of them, as on Sinai, as in his sanctuary.” Does not this evidently recognize the fact, that when God made his appearance on Sinai, at the giving of the law, he was surrounded by a multitude of angels? So, then, the Old and New Testaments agree, in representing the angels as present when the law was given, and as being ministering spirits on that occasion.

That the Jews, and a multitude of Christians after them, have carried speculation to a repulsive length on the subject of angelic ministration at the giving of the law, does not disprove the fact itself; much less are their extravagances to be imputed to the writer of our epistle. While some have maintained that the angels made circuits round the camp of the Hebrews; others, that they excited the thunders, and lightnings, and tempest; some, that they blew the trumpets; others, that they caused the quaking of the earth; some, that they delivered the tables of the law to Moses; others, that they uttered audibly the words of the law; and others still, that they were mere spectators of the awful scene; we may stand aloof from being thus wise above what is written, and content ourselves simply with what our author teaches us, and what the Scriptures confirm, viz., that angels did assist at the giving of the law, or were in some way employed as ministering spirits by Jehovah on the occasion of its being promulgated. This is all that the text can well be interpreted as meaning, and all that is requisite for the argument of the apostle.

45
EXCURSUS IX.

Thus far the quotation from Ps. viii. But how, it is asked, can this apply to Christ in particular, when the author of this Psalm evidently speaks of human nature, or man in general? Many of the later commentators reply to this question, by conceding that the apostle uses the words of the Psalm only in an accommodated sense, in order to express his own views of the superiority of Christ’s human nature. But this answer does not meet all the demands of the case. It is evident that the writer appeals to Scripture authority here, in support of the proposition which he had advanced, viz., that the human nature of Christ is superior to that of the angels. If now the passage contains nothing more than an assertion of that dignity which is common to all men, how would this tend to convince those to whom he wrote, that the human nature of Christ is superior to that of the angels?

It is difficult, then, to avoid the supposition, that the 8th Psalm was referred to the Messiah by those whom the apostle addressed. Was it rightly referred to him as being prophetic of him or not? Many commentators answer in the negative. But is there not some reason to adhere to the more ancient method of interpretation? Let the reader now peruse 2 Sam. vii. through, and then direct his attention to vs. 17—29, in particular to vs. 18, 19, 26, 29, compared with the prophetic declarations of Nathan in vs. 12—16. Does not the frame of mind in which David appears to have been on this occasion, correspond well with that described in Ps. viii. 5? Suppose now that David, in surveying the works of creation, is in the first place deeply impressed with his own insignificance in a comparative point of view; and then, in the next place, revolves in his mind the promises made to him as recorded in 2 Sam. vii. His mind is naturally led to dwell on the distinguished goodness of God, in exalting a creature so insignificant as himself to honor so great as the prophet had promised him. Among his pesterly was to be one who should be the Son of God, and an whom universal empire should be conferred, 2 Sam. vii. 12—16, compared with vs. 5, 11. In view of such honors, how natural would be the expressions of Ps. viii. 6—10! In the person of this illustrious descendant whom Nathan had promised to him, he could see, with a prophetic eye, that the human nature would be exalted to universal dominion. No created thing was be excepted from this dominion. As to the particulars enumerated in Ps. viii. 8, 9, they are plainly borrowed from Gen. i. 26 seq., and indicate nothing more than the universality of dominion. They amount to saying: ‘The dominion originally assigned to man over the creation around him, and abridged by his fall, is to be actually conferred on human
nature; and this, too, in a still higher sense, insasmuch as all things are to be subjected to the Messiah.' In other words, not only is man to have such dominion as by his original creation he was designed to have, viz., over beasts and fowls and fishes, but nothing in this case is to be excepted. With such views as these might not the royal Psalmist well add, "How excellent is thy name in all the earth!"

I am disposed, then, to believe that the course of thought in David's mind was something like the following: 'Lord, how insignificant art I, compared with the glorious works which the heavens display! Yet thou hast magnified they goodness toward me in a wonderful manner. Thou hast not only formed me in thine image, and bestowed many blessings upon me, but promised me a Son, on whom distinguished glory and universal empire shall be conferred. Can it be that human nature will be thus exalted? Adored be thy name through all the earth!'

What is there now in all this, which is any more improbable than any other prophetic declaration respecting a future Saviour, and Lord of the world? But if any one refuses to admit these views, there is still a sense in which all the saints are, through Christ, to be exalted above angels, and to have a participation in the dominion of the world. They are, as being united with the Messiah and as being his brethren (Heb. ii. 11), to judge, i.e., rule [κύριον ἐν] the world, 1 Cor. vi. 2; to rule over the angels, 1 Cor. vi. 3; to have power over the nations and rule over them, Rev. ii. 26, 27; to sit with the Redeemer on his throne, Rev. iii. 21; they are made kings and priests unto God, and reign over the earth, Rev. v. 10. All this, however, is plainly spoken in a qualified sense; and such privileges are bestowed upon them only by virtue of their union with Christ, to whom supreme dominion belongs. In like manner we say: 'The Romans held the empire of the world;' attributing to the nation what properly belonged to their prince.

Human nature, then, in the persons of the saints, in a special manner of course in the person of their head or leader, is exalted to a state of precedence above the angels, to a state of universal dominion. Consequently, that Christ possessed a nature which was human, did not make him inferior to the angels, but (since this nature was to be thus exalted) superior to them. And thus the Psalmist declared it should be.

If the whole passage be understood as limited principally to Christ, or as extending to the saints also, the point which the apostle aims to prove is established. But it is only by understanding the passage according to the first method of interpreting it, that we can well apply, in its full force, the sequel of the apostle's remarks. Indeed, what can be more evident, than that since the fall of our first parents, universal dominion even over all the animal creation, has never been actually possessed by man? Christ only has it in its full sense; and in him only have the words of Ps. viii had a πλήρωσις in all the extent of their meaning. When we once admit that prophetic anticipations of Christ were not only possible but matters of fact, is there anything which creates a serious difficulty in supposing them to have been actually entertained by David in respect to Christ, and to have been uttered in the Psalm just mentioned?
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But how does the passage quoted relate to the Messiah? In Is. viii. 17, 18, the subject spoken of is the prophet himself, who declares that he will keep himself in the attitude of constant waiting, i.e., in expectation that the prophecies which he had just been uttering would be fulfilled; and he appeals to the children, to which had been given symbolical names, and which God had given to him as pledges that these prophecies would be fulfilled. It would seem then at first view, that our author had accommodated this passage, merely for the purpose of expressing his views of the subject before him. There can be but little doubt, however, that when our epistle was written, the Jews in general construed a part of the chapter of Isaiah in question as having respect to the Messiah. Thus Paul, in Rom. ix. 32, 33, seems plainly to refer to Is. viii. 14, as a source of a part of his quotation; and this passage he treats as applicable to Christ. In a similar way, also, the passage under consideration with the clause that follows, appears to be treated. Indeed, unless the persons to whom Paul wrote would readily refer the passage quoted to the Messiah, it is difficult to perceive how the quotation, in the shape with which it is here introduced, would present any argument to them in favor of the position that men are the brethren of the Messiah. But still, the mode of reasoning, it must be owned, seems to be argumentum ad hominem, or argumentum ex concessis, rather than from the real nature of things, considered independently of the opinions of those to whom our author wrote. Critics, in modern times, have felt a difficulty in considering this species of argument as admissible by a sacred writer. The Christian fathers, however, had no difficulties of this sort; most of them freely admitted it.

The majority of Protestant critics have considered the passage of Isaiah now in question, as actually spoken in the person of the Messiah. This they have done, in order to avoid the necessity of admitting an argumentum ex concessis; which has been regarded by them as incongruous with the character of an inspired writer. But in avoiding one difficulty, they have fallen upon another equally great; for all the laws of exegesis, which bid us to connect text with context, and to interpret a writer so as to make him speak connectedly and directly to his purpose, are put at defiance, when we interpret the words in Is. viii. 17, 18, as originally having been spoken with direct and primary reference to the Messiah, or in his person. To admit such a violation, would be a more serious evil than to concede, with nearly all antiquity, that the apostles did sometimes employ the argumentum ex concessis, as in the case above stated.

One may liken this to that of a missionary in Hindostan, who, designing to show the possibility and probability that God might manifest himself in
the flesh, should appeal in the course of his argument, for the sake of silencing objectors, to the Shasters, which inculcate the doctrine that Vishnu became incarnate. Would such an appeal be morally wrong? And if not, then it may be asked: Might not the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews make use of the views of those whom he addressed, respecting a particular passage of Scripture (although those views might not have been exegetically well grounded), in order to confirm them in the belief of a truth that was well grounded, and which he knew to be certain by revelation, or by other Scriptures which had a direct bearing upon it? However one might decide this case by reasoning a priori, most men practically admit such methods of persuasion, and in other things are very ready to justify them. Whatever we are willing, however, or unwilling to admit the fact presented before us, can surely never alter the fact itself. Thus much we may truly say, viz., that those modes of explanation, which, in order to get rid of difficulty, set at rest all the fixed principles and fundamental laws of interpretation, cannot be admitted without the greatest possible danger to the Scriptures; yet, without the admission of such principles, the words of the passage in question do not appear susceptible of being construed as originally and primarily having had a direct reference to the Messiah.

After all, however, this view of the subject applies merely to the simple interpretation of the original words of Is. viii., but not to the typical design which may have been attached to the things or facts there related. We know that in the preceding chapter, the birth of a child to be called Emmanuel, who was to spring from a virgin, is predicted (vii. 14); which birth was to be a proof to Ahaz, that within some three years (comp. vs. 14 with 15, 16), the land of Judah should be delivered from the confederated kings of Israel and Syria who had invaded it. Originally and literally this seems applicable only to the birth of a child within that period of 3 years; for how could the birth of Jesus, which happened 742 years afterwards, be a sign (נַגְם) to Ahaz, that within three years his kingdom was to be freed from his enemies? Such a child, it would seem, was born at that period; for in chap. viii. 8, 10, he is twice referred to as if then present, or at least then living. In ver. 10, our English version has translated the proper name שֶם , and thus obscured the form of the original Hebrew. Yet in Matt. i. 23, the passage in Is. vii. 14 appears to be cited, as containing a prophecy relative to the Saviour’s being conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary. In what way, then, must we explain this? How was it a παλαιος of Is. vii. 14? To these questions two answers may be given. (1) It may have been a παλαιος, in the same sense as Christ’s being called out of Egypt (Matt. ii. 15) was a παλαιος, of Hosea xi. 1; i.e., the event, which happened in later times, bore a strong resemblance to the one which happened in earlier times; the later event, too, was of such a nature, that the words of Scripture, applied to characterize the early event, might be applied with a παλαιος, i.e., with more completeness, with more force, more propriety, more energy, to the later event than to the earlier one. Just so the application of a passage in the Old Testament is made to the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, in Matt. ii. 17, 18,
comp. Jer. xxxi. 15. In the same manner many other passages of the New Testament are to be construed, which refer in a similar way to the Old Testament.

But if this answer be unsatisfactory, it may be added, (2) That some of the extraordinary events themselves, related in Is. vii. and viii., may have been designed by God, and probably were designed by him, to be typical or symbolical of a future spiritual salvation and Saviour. Why is this any more impossible or improbable, than that there were other types and symbols, under the ancient, of things which were to exist under the new dispensation? The Immanuel then born in an extraordinary way, and then by his birth and name a pledge of temporal deliverance to Judah from their enemies, might well be a symbol of him who was to save his people from all their spiritual enemies, and to bring in everlasting redemption; whose name also was truly, in a much higher sense, בֹּחֵן יְהוָה, G O D W I T H U S. If so, then the prophet with his symbolical children (Is. viii. 18), giving assurance of temporal deliverance, may have acted a part that was symbolical of a future prophet who would proclaim spiritual deliverance. In all this, there certainly is nothing impossible. The laws of exegesis are not infringed by such a supposition. The words of the prophet have but one simple original meaning. They apply directly to the transactions with Ahaz. But the whole of these transactions may have been (may I not add, seem actually to have been?) designed to prefigure a greater prophet and a greater deliverance. Unless we deny the possibility of prophetic symbol, we must admit the possibility of this. Its probability is deducible from the use which the New Testament writers make of these facts. They seem to consider them as having a relation to Christ. I grant the possibility of the exegesis, which explains the whole as argumentum ad hominem. It might be justified by several appeals to the New Testament; and he, who wholly denies this principle, only shows that he decides upon the subject by reasoning a priori; for the examination of facts cannot fail to convince any one who will patiently and thoroughly make it. But still, it does seem to me more probable, taking the appeal in Matt. i. 23 to Is. vii. 14, and the appeal in our text and context to Is. viii. 17, 18, that the prophet and Immanuel here act parts which may be regarded as symbolic. The extraordinary birth of the child Immanuel, at that time, is the symbol of the future birth of a spiritual Saviour; and the prophet with his children announcing deliverance from the confederated enemies of Israel, is a symbol of him who was to "preach liberty to the captives," and whose spiritual children were to be the pledge that all his promises of good should be fulfilled. Is there anything unnatural or strange in all this?

If, now, this be admitted, then the words of our text may not unaptly be applied to Christ. For as the type put his confidence in God, so did the antitype. As the type had children who were pledges for the deliverance of Judah, so has the antitype "many sons and daughters," the pledges of his powerful grace, and sureties that his promises in regard to future blessings will be accomplished. As the type confided in God, because he possessed a nature that was dependent and human, so the antitype must have
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a like nature in order to use the same language; and as the type bore the relation of parent to children that were pledges of future blessings, and therefore possessed a like nature with them, so the antitype had a community of nature with those who were his spiritual children, and who were pledges that all his promises should be performed. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5.

Thus understood, the whole quotation may be regarded not only as justified, but as apposite. Still, if any refuse to consider it in this light, because, as they aver, they are unable to see how the words of Isaiah can be considered in the light of prediction; this reason cannot be regarded as in itself sufficiently valid. The words employed in Is. vii. and viii., have, in themselves, I freely concede, no direct reference to the Messiah; but to things and events, connected with the affairs of Ahaz and his people. Neither have the words a double sense; which can never be conceded without destroying the very basis of all stable interpretation. Yet the events themselves—events connected with the temporal deliverance of God’s people then—may be symbols of a subsequent and spiritual deliverance and deliverer.

But if any one refuses to admit even thus much, it will be difficult for him to show that the writer of this epistle might not use argumentum ex concessis here (i.e., appeal to those views of Scripture which they whom he addressed entertained), in order to confirm in them a belief of what he certainly knew to be true; as well as the Saviour could say to the Jews; “If I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out?” Luke xi. 19. The difficulty is in fact no greater with the quotation under examination, than with many others in the New Testament. Understood in any of the ways that have been proposed, it forms no important objection against the sacred writings or their divine authority; although, considered in the light of accommodation simply, it would interfere with some of the modern theories of inspiration. But, as has already been stated, the ancient churches, high as their views were on the subject of inspiration, had no hesitancy, in general, to admit the principle, that the New Testament writers have not unfrequently applied the Old Testament Scriptures merely by way of accommodation. While then, for myself, I must believe there is something more than accommodation in the passage under consideration, yet I should not feel it to be a just cause for want of charity towards another, who should adopt a different mode of explanation, and regard the passages cited to be merely an argumentum ex concessis.

It is a strong ground of confirmation with respect to the symbolic exegesis which has been above proposed, that the prophecy in Isaiah (which begins with the 8th chapter and ends with chap. ix. 7) contains, at the close of it, most indubitable proof that the birth of the Messiah and the “coming of his kingdom” were, on this occasion, distinctly before the mind of the prophet; see Is. ix. 1—7. The whole together, taken in connection with what appears evidently to be the views of the New Testament writers, seems to leave but little doubt, that such as at all acknowledge the existence of prophecy and symbol in respect to a Messiah who was to come, may recognize them both in the case before us.
<p>But what was that which Christ feared? And how can it be said that he was delivered from it? Questions which commentators, for the most part, have passed by, without any serious attempt to answer them.</p>

If now we turn to Luke xii. 50, we shall see that a view of the sufferings then future, produced in the mind of Jesus an oppressive anticipation, a sensation of distress and dread. As the scene of crucifixion approached nearer, these sensations were evidently increased, until they became almost overwhelming; as we may see by consulting Matt. xxvi. 36—39; Luke xxii. 40—44; Mark xiv. 34—36. What the agonies of the cross which Jesus endured actually were, we can never fully know: but we may draw the conclusion that they were very dreadful, if we read the account of the complaint which they forced from him, as it is recorded in Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34. It is indeed unaccountable that a character such as that of Jesus, pure, spotless, firm, unmoved by opposition and contumely and persecution, and unawed by threatenings and danger, during the whole course of his public ministry, should exhibit such a despondency, such an oppressive, overwhelming sense of pain and distress; I mean, it cannot be accounted for by any of the ordinary principles that apply to virtuous sufferers who possess fortitude of soul. That Jesus possessed this quality in a most distinguished manner, we know with certainty from the whole tenor of his life as portrayed by the evangelists. How, then, could he exhibit such an oppressive and overwhelming sense of dread at the prospect of crucifixion? Thousands of men, nay, thousands of the more delicate sex, in prospect of like sufferings, or apparently greater ones (such as the rack, the wheel, or flames occasion), have been perfectly calm, collected, and even triumphant. The very thieves on the cross at the same time with Jesus, exhibit no such signs of despondency and oppression. Thousands and millions of common men, without God and without hope in the world, have undergone sufferings greater than those of simple crucifixion, without even uttering a groan. Yet Jesus was not only supported by a consciousness of spotless innocence, but had before him the certain prospect of a speedy resurrection from the dead, of exaltation to the right hand of God, and of being a king and high priest forever unto all his people. Still, he was in such an agony at the prospect of the cross, as to sweat, as it were, drops of blood, Luke xxii. 44. And when actually enduring the sufferings which he had anticipated, his exclamation (Matt. xxvii. 46) shows that he had not over-estimated the dreadful hour.</p>

If Jesus died as a common virtuous sufferer, or merely as a martyr to the truth, without any vicarious suffering laid upon him, then is his death a most unaccountable event; i. e., in respect to the manner of his behavior.
while suffering it; and it must be admitted that multitudes of humble, sinful, weak, and very imperfect disciples of Christianity, have surpassed their Master in the fortitude and collected firmness and calm complacency, which are requisite to triumph over the pangs of a dying hour. But who can well believe this? Or who can regard Jesus as a simple sufferer in the ordinary way, upon the cross, and explain the mysteries of his dreadful horror before and during the hours of crucifixion?

Such, then, was the ἐλασσόν, ματία, object of dread, to which our text adverts. But how was Jesus ἐλασσόνεις, delivered from it? Pierce, in his commentary, says that he was delivered by being raised from the dead and advanced to glory. But this would make the object of fear or dread to be, that he should remain in the state of the dead. This fear we can hardly suppose Jesus to have entertained, inasmuch as he had often foretold to his disciples, not only his death, but his resurrection and exaltation to glory. Nor could it be the sufferings of the cross that he was delivered from, for he endured them to a dreadful degree. What, then, was it, in respect to which he was ἐλασσόνεις, heard or delivered? The context necessarily limits the hearing or deliverance to something in his petitions which appertained to suffering, which was an object of dread. What could it be, but the dread of sinking under the agony of being deserted by his Father? Matt. xxvii. 46. Great as his agony was, he never refused to bear it; nor did he shrink from tasting the bitter cup, Luke xxii. 42; Matt. xxvi. 39. And does not Luke xxii. 43, explain our ἐλασσόνεις ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας? “There appeared unto him an angel from heaven strengthening him, ἐν σαρκί αὐτῶν.” This was the only kind of deliverance he sought for, or on the whole desired; Luke xxii. 42, πλὴν μη τὸ δίστημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶν γενέσθω. The dread in question was, like all his other sufferings, incident to his human nature; and fact shows that he suffered under it to a high degree; but he did not shrink from it, and so he was heard or delivered in respect to the object of his petition in regard to it.

In the explanation of a passage so difficult, confidence would be unbecoming. I can only say: If this be not the right interpretation of it, I am ignorant of its true meaning, and will most thankfully receive from any one a more probable interpretation.

EXCURSUS XII.

Ἄρνοτον γὰρ τούτων ἐπαξ φανερώμενα, γενομένου τοῦ τῆς θυρεάς ἐπιφανειας καὶ μετέχους γενεθλίας πνεύματος ἀγίου, καὶ καλῶν γενομένους διὸν θημα, ἐννάμεος τε μέλλοντος αἰώνος, καὶ παραπέμποντας, πάλιν ἀνακαίνιζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, Heb. vi. 4—6.

But does the whole paragraph pertain to real Christians, or to those who are such only by profession? To the former, beyond all reasonable
doubt. For how could the apostle so solemnly warn those who were mere professors of Christianity, against defection and apostasy? Defection from what? From a graceless condition and from a state of hypocrisy. Such must be the answer, if mere professors (and not possessors) of Christianity be addressed. But mere professors, instead of being cautioned against defection from the state in which they are, are everywhere denounced in language of the severest reprobation. See Rev. iii. 15, 16, and the denunciations of the Saviour against the Pharisees.

Moreover, the language employed to describe the condition of the persons in question, shows that the writer is addressing those whom he takes to be real Christians. E. g., μετάχεως . . . πρεσβύταρος ἄγιος, καλὸν γενεσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ βήμα. Above all, διὰλυσάμενοι αἰών ἐκ μετάχων; for how could he speak of being again renewed by repentance, if he did not address them as once having been renewed by it?

The nature of the crime, too, and the awful denunciation with which it is threatened, shows that something peculiar is attached to the case which the writer is describing. Sinners, who have been taught the doctrines of religion, and yet renounce their external respect for it, are manifestly not without the pale of God's mercy; at least, they are not so considered in the Scriptures generally, and fact shows that they are not. It is a peculiar and aggravated case, then, which is here stated; and what other case can it be, than that of apostasy from a state of saving knowledge of Christ and his gospel? Nor is such a case at all without a parallel in the Scriptures. Manifestly such a one is stated in Heb. x. 26—32; also in 2 Pet. ii. 20—22; in Ezek. xviii. 24; xxxiii. 12, 13; iii. 20, and in many other passages of the Bible. It is implied in every warning and in every commination addressed to the righteous; and surely the Bible is filled with both of these, from the beginning to the end. What is implied when our Saviour, in his Sermon on the mount, urges upon his disciples, i. e., the apostles as well as other disciples (see Luke vi. 12—20), the duty of cutting off a right hand and of plucking out a right eye that offends; and this, on penalty of being cast into hell? Matt. v. 29, 30. Is this penalty really threatened; or is it only a pretense of threatening, something spoken merely in terrors? Can we hesitate as to the answer which must be given to this question?

But if we admit the penalty to be really threatened, then the implication is the same as in the passage before us, viz., that Christians are addressed as exposed to incur the penalty of the divine law by sinning. In our text, they are surely addressed as exposed to fall into a state in which there is no hope of a renewal by repentance. Whatever may be true in the divine purposes, as to the final salvation of all those who are once truly regenerated (and this doctrine I feel constrained to admit), yet nothing can be plainer, than that the sacred writers have everywhere addressed saints in the same manner as they would address those whom they considered as constantly exposed to fall away and to perish forever. It cannot be denied that all the warnings and awful comminations directed against cases of defection, are addressed to Christians, in the New Testament, which could be addressed to them supposing them to be liable every hour to sin beyond the
hope of being renewed by repentance. Whatever theory may be adopted in explanation of this subject, as a matter of fact there can be no doubt that Christians are to be solemnly and earnestly warned against the danger of apostasy, and consequent final perdition. What else is the object of the whole epistle to the Hebrews, except a warning against apostasy? In this all agree. But this involves all the difficulties that can be raised by metaphysical reasonings, in regard to the perseverance of the saints. For why should the apostle warn true Christians (and such he surely believed there were among the Hebrews, vi. 9) against defection and perdition? My answer would be: Because God treats Christians as free agents, as rational beings; because he guards them against defection not by mere physical power, but by moral means adapted to their natures as free and rational agents. Let every man speculate as he pleases on this subject, when he addresses Christians by way of warning, he will inevitably fall into the same modes of address. And plainly he ought so to do; for thus have all the sacred writers done, and thus did the Saviour himself.

EXCURSUS XIII.

Αντίθετος, ἀμέτρητος, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμέραν μὴτε γονὴς τέλος ἐνα, ἀφαμαμάνενος δὲ τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μενει ἵππος εἰς τῷ διηνέκες, Heb. vii. 3.

The description of Melchizedek in ver. 3, has been interpreted in a variety of ways, so as to give rise to many diverse opinions respecting the person introduced here by this name. I shall very briefly exhibit some of them, without delaying to examine them.

(1) The Hieracitae (so called from Hierax, Epiphan. Haeres. LXVII.) held Melchizedek to be the Holy Spirit. Jerome undertakes to confute them, Epist. ad Evagrium.

(2) The Melchizedeciani (the author of which sect was Theodotus or Thomas) held Melchizedek to be one of the Sündaeus of God, emanated from him, superior to Christ, and after the model of which Christ was formed.

(3) It is an ancient opinion (as Epiph. Haeres. LXVII. testifies) that Melchizedek was the Son of God, i.e., the Logos; the same who appeared to Abraham and to the patriarchs, etc. This opinion was held by Ambrose; and it has been defended in recent times, by Molinaeus, Cunaeus, Guillard, Outrien, Hottinger, Stark, Petersen, and others.

(4) Origen, and after him Didymus, held Melchizedek to be an angel.

(5) Others have held that Melchizedek was a man formed before the creation, out of spiritual and not of earthly matter.

(6) Melchizedek was Enoch, sent again to live on earth after the flood. So Iren. Hulsius.

(7) Melchizedek was Shem, the son of Noah. So Targum. Jon. and
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Jerus.; so also Lyranus, Tolstatis, Eugubius, Cajetan, Genebrard, Torriello, Villalpandus, of the Catholic Church, and among Protestants, Peucer, Pelargus, Brughton, Melanchthon, Rungiis, and others.

(8) Melchizedek was Job. So G. Kohlreis.

(9) It is unknown who he was. So Lyser, Gesner, Baldwin, Crenius, Buddæus, and others.

(10) Melchizedek was a righteous and peaceful king, a worshipper and priest of the most high God, in the land of Canaan; a friend of Abraham, and of a rank elevated above him.

This last opinion lies upon the face of the sacred record, in Gen. xiv. and in Heb. vii.; and it is the only one which can be defended on any tolerable grounds of interpretation. What can be more improbable than all the opinions above mentioned, with the exception of this? The most popular opinion among them all, viz., that Melchizedek was Christ, would of course force us to adopt this interpretation, viz., that 'Christ is like unto himself;' or that a comparison is formally instituted by our author, between Christ and himself; — ‘vivus mentio est refutatio.’

——

Excursus XIV.

Kai, ὃς εἶτεὶ, διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ λαμψα, ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων, δεκάτωτας:
ἐν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὁσιωτερίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν, οὐτὲ συνήμητας αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδεκ,
Heb. vii. 9, 10.

For a Hebrew, this assertion would less need an ὃς εἶτεὶ than for us, whose modes of thinking and reasoning in regard to genealogies, descent, and rank, are so very different from those of the oriental nations. Since Abraham was deemed, by his posterity, to be the patriarch and head of all his descendants, in such a sense as to hold a pre-eminence in rank above them, a proof that he acknowledged his inferiority to Melchizedek, by paying tithes to him, was a proof that his descendants must of course be inferior to Melchizedek. The statement in vs. 9 and 10, is built upon the oriental modes of estimating descent and rank. Since Levi, who was of the posterity of Abraham, might be reckoned as then virtually in the patriarch; and since he descended from him, and therefore could not be regarded as of rank above him; it would follow, according to the Jewish mode of reasoning, that the priesthood of Melchizedek was of a rank superior to that of Levi.

If it be said: ‘We do not need such considerations as these to establish the superior priesthood of Christ; neither do we, in this manner, count upon genealogy, and descent, and rank;’ I freely assent. But then I am not able to see why it should at all detract from the propriety or the weight of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the writer has fully met the exigencies
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of the case which called forth the epistle itself; and met them in just such a way as was adapted to the condition of his readers, and the modes of reasoning to which they were accustomed. If they attached high importance and dignity to the Levitical priesthood, because the Levites descended from Abraham (as they surely did), and this opinion served to fill their minds with difficulty in regard to admitting that the priesthood of Christ could supersede that of Aaron, then was it directly to the writer’s purpose to remove this prejudice, and to show them that, according to their own grounds of argument and computation, Melchizedek must be superior to the Levitical priests, and to Abraham himself. If, now, in doing this (which all must admit was necessary and proper to be done), the writer has met their prejudices with arguments specially adapted to this purpose, and the force of which they must acknowledge, if true to their own principles; and at the same time he has averred nothing which is adapted to inculcate error, or to mislead others who were educated in a different manner from the Hebrews; then he has done what every wise and prudent man ought to do, under circumstances like his. And if several of his arguments are not now needed by us, and cannot well be employed by us at the present time with any particular efficacy, this makes nothing against his discretion, or against the validity of his reasoning. We all enjoy the light which has been shed around us by the whole of the New Testament. Of this the Hebrews had little or nothing. We are educated with views and feelings entirely different, in many respects, from those in which they were brought up. We do not, therefore, need to be addressed and reasoned with in all respects just as they did. Many of their prejudices we have not; many of their doubts with respect to the superiority of Christianity over the Mosaic religion, we never entertained. Many things, then, which were said with great force and propriety to them, by our author, cannot be addressed to us with the same pertinency, nor felt with the same power.

Let the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews be judged of equitably, by taking into view such considerations as these, and all difficulties of any serious import will, as I am inclined to believe, be removed from the mind of a serious, candid, and intelligent reader. Such considerations, too, might have saved the many inveros (with which we meet in not a few of the recent commentaries on our epistle), that the writer has built nearly all his arguments upon allegory and accommodation; an accommodation which allows the whole force of all the erroneous methods of Jewish reasoning, and conforms to it merely in order to prevent the apostasy of professed Christians. I cannot acquiesce in the latitude of this opinion; nor can well admit that a sacred writer would make use of an argument which in its nature he knows to be wholly erroneous and destitute of force, for the sake of persuading men to embrace Christianity, or to continue in the profession of it. Would not this be “doing evil, that good might come?” But I feel no objection to admitting, that argumentum ad hominem may be employed, for the sake of confuting errorists, and exposing their inconsistency. The Saviour himself plainly resorts to this, in some cases; see Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 19. So in our epistle, it cannot be deemed
Irrelevant or improper, if the writer shows the Jews, that, from their own modes of counting descent and reckoning precedence in regard to rank, Melchizedek (and consequently Jesus) was a priest of an order superior to the Levites. For substance, this is done in the chapter under examination. Yet there is nothing conceded here which can in any way endanger the principles of truth. At the same time, after the explanations that have been made, it is hazardings nothing to say, that we have now more convincing arguments than those here used, to establish the superiority of Christ’s priesthood. But, let it be remembered, we owe them to the New Testament which we have in our hands, and which the Hebrews had not. Many things, therefore, needed by them in their condition, and with the greatest propriety urged upon them, are less applicable and less important to us, merely because our circumstances differ so much from theirs.

If the reader wants confirmation in regard to the statement above made, of the Jewish views respecting the precedence of Abraham, let him peruse Matt. iii. 8; John viii. 52—58; Luke xvi. 22—25.

---

EXCURSUS XV.

"Ὅρα γὰρ, φιλήμ, τοιὸν πάντα κατὰ τὸν τὸν τίτου τῶν δειχθέντων σοι ἐκ τῆς θρι, Ἱεβ. viii. 5.

It has been asked: In what way was this τίτου exhibited to Moses? Was it by ocular vision; or by suggestion to the mind; or by words communicated to Moses, descriptive of the form in which the tabernacle should be constructed? The answer to all such questions is very easy; viz., that the subject is beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, so that we can know nothing more respecting it than what Moses himself has told us. But this is merely an assertion of the fact, that the τίτου was exhibited to him. He says nothing at all of the manner in which it was exhibited. Consequently the fact is all that we can know; and surely it is all that we need to know; for of what importance to us can the manner be in which this revelation was made? The passage in Acts vii. 44, which speaks of the τίτου that Moses ἔποιηκε, determines nothing; as it is not said whether he saw in a bodily or mental manner, and the word ἔποιηκε is plainly applicable to either. In 1 Chron. xxviii. 19, David, after having drawn a plan for the temple, says: All which is in the writing from the land of the Lord, i. e., made by divine assistance, ἡμᾶς ἔδωκεν, he taught me, even all the words, τίτου, i. e., of the plan. Yet here was no ocular disclosure. Consequently, the words used in our text will not determine the manner of the communication to Moses; and therefore we are not to consider it as capable of being definitely determined.

It follows, of course, that the exhibition of a visible temple in heaven to
the view of Moses, of a temple having form and locality cannot be assumed, unless we build upon that which has no foundation to support it. The most that we can know of this subject is, that on Mount Sinai, the Lord revealed to Moses the τώνος of the tabernacle which he was to build; and that this is merely a δωδεκάμα and σχεδ of the heavenly one. Is it a δωδεκάμα then in a material sense, or in a spiritual and moral one? In the latter, without any reasonable doubt; for so the whole nature of the argument leads us to conclude. The apostle is not comparing one material tabernacle on earth, with another more magnificent one of the same kind in heaven; but a material earthly one, with one which the Lord made, which is οὐ χειροποιητὸς and οὐ ταύτης τὴς κτίσεως, ix. 11, i.e., which is spiritual and heavenly in its nature. The whole representation, then, comes to this: 'In heaven are truly and really all those things, which the Jewish tabernacle and temple, with all their rites and offerings, only adumbrated. What is there, is reality in the highest and noblest sense: what is here, is comparatively only shadow and ephity. Christ does really there, what the high priest has been accustomed to do figuratively and symbolically here. The temple here faintly represents (is δωδεκάμα and σχεδ of) real spiritual existences and occurrences there.'

The very nature of the heavenly world, and of the apostle's argument, is sufficient to show that this is all which can be rationally deduced from the language which he employs. It would be just as rational to maintain that God has a local habitation, and a corporeal form visible to the eye, because the Scriptures speak of his fixed dwelling-place in heaven (τῷ οὐρανῷ), and of his hands and eyes and face and heart, as it would be to suppose that the temple above, in which Christ ministers, possesses form and is composed of material substance, like that which was built by the Jews. This was merely σχεδ; that is ἀληθεία, ὑπόθεσις, i.e., of heavenly, spiritual, divine ἑνότης, not of earthly, visible, local matter.

How to build the earthly tabernacle, Moses was instructed on the mount. But whether a form of the same was given to his vision, bodily or mental; or whether he was taught by words what the τώνος should be, does not (as we have seen) appear from Scripture; nor is it important for us to know. Enough to know, that the earthly is related to the heavenly tabernacle, only as shadow to substance; and consequently that our great high priest above, is exalted to a rank unspeakably higher than that of the Jewish high priest.

All which Moses and the people of Israel saw upon Mount Sinai, the darkness and smoke, the fire, the cloud, and the lightnings; the voice of the trumpet which they heard, and the quaking of the earth which they felt (Ex. xix. 17—20; xx. 18—21; xxiv. 1, 2, 9, 10, 15—18; Heb. xii. 18—21); were manifestly symbols merely of the divine presence, adapted to inspire the people with reverence and awe. In the same manner, the ὑψόσ or τώνος of the tabernacle to be built, was a symbol of what is heavenly or divine. It may just as well be argued from the clouds and darkness and fire and lightning and thunder and earthquake of Sinai, that all these belong materially and formally to the heavenly world, as that the
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τέσσερα exhibited to Moses was an actually visible and material part of heaven.

If now the tabernacle built by Moses, the greatest of all the Jewish prophets, Heb. iii. 2, was nothing more than an ἄτριτρος of that in heaven, Heb. ix. 23, 24, a mere σωλήν of it, viii. 5; then the temple built by Solomon, which is only an imitation of this, 1 K. viii. 10—19; 1 Chron. xxviii. 19; and that in after-times, built by Zerubbabel, Ez. v. 1 seq., and which was less magnificent, Ez. iii. 12, 13; must also be merely ἄτριτρος and σωλήν of that temple, of which Jesus is the priest. Consequently, the greater dignity of his priestly office may be obviously inferred from this comparison.

EXCURSUS XVI.

Χρυσάον ἐξουσια Σωματῆριον, Heb. ix. 4.

There is great difficulty and much perplexity among commentators, in regard to the Σωματῆριον here mentioned. Moses makes no mention of such a sacred utensil, as appertaining to the most holy place; neither does the description of Solomon's temple (modelled after the tabernacle) contain any information respecting it. Σωματῆριον, in its general sense, indicates anything which contains Σωμαία or incense; so that it may be applied either to an altar of incense, or to any pot or vessel adapted for offering incense by burning it. Josephus applies Σωματῆριον to the altar of incense, Antiq. III. 6, 8; and so some have applied the word in the phrase under consideration. But it is a strong, if not conclusive, objection to this, that the altar of incense was before the vail of the most holy place, and not within it, Ex. xxx. 1—6; xl. 5, 26. Moreover, this altar is called, in Hebrew, נְצֶקֶת נַעֲקָב, Ex. xxxvii. 25; 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, 16; נְצֶקֶת נַעֲקָב, Ex. xl. 5; or נְצֶקֶת נַעֲקָב נָעֲקָב, Ex. xxx. 1. In Greek it is named Σωματῆριον, and Σωματηστήριον Σωματῆριον. On this altar, moreover, daily offerings of incense were to be made, both morning and evening, Ex. xxx. 1—8. The horns of it, once in each year, were to be sprinkled with blood, viz. on the great day of atonement, Ex. xxx. 10. But I am unable to find any place which declares that this altar was carried within the vail, on the day just named, by the priest who offered incense before the Lord. On the contrary, the incense offered on that day was strewed on a vessel of burning coals, or a censer, i. e., Pan or fire-pan which the priest held in his hand, and carried with him into the most holy place, Lev. xvi. 12—14. The name of the vessel was נְצֶקֶת, Lev. xvi. 12; Ex xxvii. 3; xxxviii. 5; 1 K. vii. 50; 2 Chron. iv. 22. In 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, this vessel is named נְצֶקֶת, and again in Ezek. viii. 11; in both which places the Septuagint have Σωματῆριον. Now, nothing can be plainer than that
the נרה and ריחן were different from the altar of incense, ריחן וירבש. Upon this, on the morning and evening of every day, offerings of incense were made; and this altar stood before the vail, Ex. xxx. 6—8. On the day of atonement, also, the horns of it were to be sprinkled with blood, Ex. xxx. 10; xl. 5, 26. But the incense before the Lord, which was to be offered in the inner sanctuary, was offered upon a נרה, pan of burning coals, Lev. xvi. 12. Uzziah was about to burn incense in this manner when the priests withstood him, 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—19. Comp. also the case of Nadab and Abihu, Lev. x. 1.

That the incense altar was stationary, is plain from the dimensions assigned to it in Ex. xxx. 1, 2, viz., a cubit (i.e., 1 8 foot) long and broad, and two cubits in height. The removal of this by the high priest, into the most holy place, is out of question, when we consider that it was made of solid materials, probably metal of some kind. But the censers (fire-pans) were hand-utensils, constructed for the very purpose of taking coals from the altar of burnt offering (where the fire was never suffered to become extinguished), for the various uses of the temple, Lev. xvi. 12. The whole difficulty then, in our verse, amounts to this, viz., whether the χρυσῶν δυματήρων here mentioned, was laid up or deposited in the most holy place. That there were several δυματήρια or 니ורת, is certain from Ex. xxvii. 3; xxxviii. 3. That the 니ורת or δυματήρων, which was employed by the high priest, was χρυσῶν, i.e., gilded, or (if you will) golden, is highly probable; indeed, one would suppose, quite certain, seeing that the altar of incense (which was designed only for the every day’s offering of incense) was to be overlaid with pure gold, Ex. xxx. 3. Much more may we well suppose that the censer (carried by the high priest into the ἵλιν on the most solemn of all days, viz., the day of atonement for the whole nation) was covered with gold, i.e., was χρυσῶν as the apostle calls it. Moses, indeed, has not given us any particular description of such a censer; nor is it mentioned particularly in the description of Solomon’s temple; nor is it anywhere said in the Old Testament that such a censer was laid up in the most holy place. But as nothing can be more probable, than that the censer was χρυσῶν, so nothing can be more probable than that it was deposited in the inner sanctuary. That a censer used for the most sacred of all the temple rites, on a day the most solemn of all the Jewish festival days, should be used for the common and every day occasions of temple service, is highly improbable; especially when we consider that everything pertaining to the service of the inner sanctuary, was regarded in a light that corresponded with the designation of that place, viz., ἵλιν or ἡ ἱερατική θέα. See further on this subject in the Introduction.
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Ex ἡ στάυρος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τῷ μίνι, καὶ ἡ βαθύς Ααρών ἡ βλαστήσασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαδήμης, Heb. ix. 4.

But there is another difficulty in regard to the phrase under consideration. It is said in 2 K. viii. 9, and 2 Chron. v. 10, that “there was nothing in the ark, save the two tables which Moses put therein at Horeb.” This, no doubt, is true; but our author is speaking, in Heb. ix. 4, of the tabernacle as constructed and furnished by Moses, and not of the temple built some five hundred years afterwards; still less, of the second temple, which, after the burning of the first by Nebuchadnezzar, must have lacked even the tables of the testimony or law. These were probably destroyed at the time the first temple was consumed; since we have no authentic intelligence respecting them afterwards. It is probable, too, that the first temple lacked both the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron; at least we have no account of their being deposited in it. The probability is, that the ark, during its many removals by the Israelites after it was constructed, and in particular during its captivity by the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv. 11; v. 1; vi. 1, 21, was deprived of these sacred deposits; for we hear no more concerning them. Be this as it may, our author is fully justified, when, in describing the tabernacle, he attributes to it what the Pentateuch does; and that the pot of manna and Aaron’s rod were laid up in the most holy place, and in the ark of the covenant, may be seen in Ex. xvi. 32–34; Num. xvii. 10 (xvii. 25). In both these passages, the Hebrew runs thus: Laid up ῶττγτης ἀγαθά, before the testimony, i. e., either before the ark containing the testimony; or (which is altogether more probable), before the testimony itself; i. e., the two tables which were in the ark. Consequently they were laid up with the testimony, i. e., the two tables; and the account given by our author is strictly correct.

It will be recollected, too, that it is the tabernacle made by Moses, that he is describing throughout. As this was patterned after that which Moses “had seen upon the mount,” and was built by workmen who had particular divine assistance, Ex. xxxvi. 1, it was of course regarded by the Jews as the most perfect structure of all that had been erected for the worship of God. Perfect as it was, however, the apostle labors to show that it was a mere shadow or image of the heavenly tabernacle in which Jesus ministers.

Excursus XVIII.


Διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is a difficult phrase, about the meaning of which a great variety of opinions have been formed. Some understand it of the
Holy Spirit, as the third person in the Trinity; and some manuscripts and versions read ἁγιόν instead of αἰωνιόν. But these are not of any considerable weight, and the reading αἰωνιόν is almost universally received. But ἁγιόν would seem to be indispensable to that sense of the passage which has just been mentioned; this appellation being everywhere given to the Holy Spirit in his hypostatical nature. Nor would the interpretation, impetus Spiritus Sancti, seem to accord with the many passages of Scripture which represent the death of Jesus as altogether a voluntary and freely-offering, made by his own benevolent Spirit; see John x. 17, 18; xiv. 31; x. 11, 15; Phil. ii. 8; Heb. ii. 9. Still, this would not exclude the idea, that the influence of the divine Spirit was efficacious in rendering Jesus a spotless victim, adapted to constitute an all-atoning sacrifice. Of this, more in the sequel.

Beza, Ernesti, Capell, Outrein, Wolf, Cramer, Carpzoff, Morus, Schults, and others, understand πνεῦματος of the divine nature of Christ. But although the offering of Christ might be rendered of the highest value, on account of the dignity of his person and in consequence of the higher nature which dwelt in him, yet the sacred writers represent him as having made atonement in his human nature, not in his divine; Heb. ii. 14, 17, 18; Col. i. 21, 22; Phil. ii. 6—8; Heb. x. 5, 10; 1 Pet. ii. 24. But independently of this consideration, instances are wanting satisfactorily to prove that πνεῦμα ἁγιόν or αἰώνιον, when applied to Christ, designates simply his divine nature as such. It will be seen, in the sequel, that this phrase thus applied, designates the glorified state of Christ, in distinction from his state of humiliation.

Others, as Grotius, Limborch, Heinrichs, Schleusner, Rosenmüller, Koppe, Jaspis, etc., consider πνεῦμα αἰώνιον as endless or immortal life, comparing it with vii. 16. They place this in antithesis to the perishable nature of the beasts that were slain in sacrifice, and which are mentioned in the preceding verse. The antithesis would then be thus: 'If mere perishable brutes, slain in sacrifice, effected external sanctification; how much more shall the offering of Christ, endowed with eternal life or with an immortal spirit, purify the conscience, etc.' But this view of the subject would represent the efficacy of the atonement made by Christ, depending on his endless life; while the Scriptures always represent it as depending on his sufferings and death. See vs. 15—28 in the sequel.

Doederlein, Storr, and others, represent πνεῦμα αἰώνιον as meaning the exalted and glorified person, or condition of the Saviour, in the passage before us. They appeal to other passages in support of this. Thus in Rom. i. 3, 4, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωτάτης appears to designate a state of distinction from κατὰ σαρκί, the human nature of Christ that was descended from David; εἰ σπíρατος δαίμον, κατὰ σάρκα ἐν δύναμις κατὰ πνεῦμα. Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωτάτης may then here designate the condition in which Christ was the exalted and powerful Son of God, εἰν δύναμις, comp. Phil. ii. 8, 9; Heb. ii. 9, 10; 1 Pet. iii. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iii. 18, 20; 2 Pet. i. 19.
μὲν σαρκὶ, ἵνα ἐν σώματι, ἵνα ἐγεῖναι, i. e., in his incarnate nature, subjected to sufferings and death; in his spiritual [heavenly] nature or condition, enjoying happiness and glory. So moreover in 1 Cor. xv. 45, the last Adam, i. e., Christ, is called πνεύμα ἀτομικών, in distinction from the ψυχή ζῶν attributed to the first Adam. This could not be because Christ had an immortal soul, and Adam had only a living animal soul; for Adam too was immortal. It would seem that πνεύμα and ψυχή, in this last passage, both designate a spiritual or immortal nature; but πνεύμα here designates such a nature of a higher order, and the antithesis is more fully made by applying ζων to the one, and ψυχή to the other, i. e., life-giving and living. With these texts, they suppose the one in our verse may be classed; and the sense must then be given to it which I have just expressed, viz., in his eternal pneumatic state or condition, i. e., in his glorified heavenly state, Christ presented his offering, etc. As to ζῶν, there is no difficulty in making such a translation of it. It is frequently used with the Gen. in order to denote the quality, condition, circumstances, or means, that have relation to anything or person; see on this usage, under ix. 12 in the notes above; also Matthaei's Gramm. § 580. a.

But although the sense which arises out of this exegesis is good, and quite to the purpose of the writer (whose object it is to show how much superior the sacrifice of Christ is to that of goats and bullocks), yet a doubt still remains whether ἵνα πνεύματος ἄγλωφον does not designate rather the means by which the sacrifice of Christ was ἄγλωφον, than, the state or condition in which such a sacrifice was offered. Does not the writer here design to say that the spotless nature of the victim, offered ἵνα πνεύματος ἄγλωφον, by an influence of the Spirit of God which was perpetual or which always endures, was the true means of efficacious atonement? It is difficult to decide this question; for one may truly say, that the exegesis of Storr, etc., agrees well with the tenor of vs. 11, 12, which represent Christ as making his offering in the temple above, and of course in his exalted and glorified state. And so, in the former edition of this work, I construed the passage under consideration.

On reconsidering the whole subject, I am now rather inclined (with Winzer, Kuinoel, and others), to construe ἵνα πνεύματος ἄγλωφον according to the common usus loquendi of the New Testament, a sufficient ground of preference; viz., as meaning divine influence. When I look at the passages which assert that Christ was filled with this, and acted under it, I can hardly refuse to apply the principle developed in them to the present case. Compare, for example, Matt. iv. 1; Mark i. 12; Luke iv. 1; Matt. xii. 28; Luke iv. 18; Matt. iii. 16, 11; Luke iii. 22; John i. 32, 33; John iii. 34. comp. i. 16; to which more texts of the like tenor might easily be added. There is no difficulty, then, in supposing the writer to assert here, that Jesus offered himself a spotless victim to God through or with a divine influence, and an influence not of a temporary and fleeting nature, but of eternal efficacy. The efficacy of the blood of goats and bullocks, and of the water of purification, was only temporary, and needed to be continually renewed. The πνεύμα by which Christ was filled, and filled ὑμῖν μέτρῳ
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(John iii. 34), in the first place rendered him perfectly holy, and so a spotless (ἅμανον) victim; and secondly, this influence was perpetual (αἰδών), i.e., it never ceased, and its efficacy therefore in preparing an appropriate victim for the great sacrifice, was such as made the sacrifice adequate, when once offered (comp ver. 12), to the accomplishment of all that was needed. It is plain, I think, that the epithet αἰδών is thrown in here in order to designate that the πνεύμα (divine influence) in question was of an enduring efficacy, in the sense already stated. In this way we can account for it, that αἰδών should be applied to πνεύμα, in this particular case, while ἀγαθός is the epithet in all others, where an epithet is applied.

EXCURSUS XIX.

Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπάν τροπονεχθης, εἰς τὸ πολλὰν ἀνεγκλεῖν ἀμαρτίας, Heb. ix. 28.

The importance of the phrase, and the many constructions put upon it that are inconsistent with the usus loquendi of the sacred writers, render it desirable accurately to determine its meaning. (1) To bear sin is to suffer the punishment due to it, i.e., to take upon one's self the consequences of sin, or to subject one's self to its consequences. The phrase is sometimes used for exposure to the consequences of sin; E.g., Lev. v. 17, 1, comp. vs. 3—5; vii. 18. To bear iniquity (ὤμος κακίας) means also, to be cut off from the congregation of God's people, Lev. xx. 17; Num. ix. 13; it means, to die or perish, Num. xviii. 22, 32; Ex. xxviii. 43; Lev. xxiv. 15, 16. So it is sometimes employed as a general expression, to designate any kind of sufferings borne or inflicted in consequence of sin; as in Num. xiv. 33, 34, where in the 33d verse, ye shall bear your whoredoms, means, ye shall bear the consequences of them; just as in ver. 34, ye shall bear your iniquities, means, ye shall bear or endure the consequences of them. Thus is the phrase employed, where the subject in question is one's own sins. But,

(2) To bear the sins of others, is to bear or endure the suffering or penalty due to them. So in Heb. ix. 26, ἀμαρτίας means the consequences of sin or penalty due to it. In Lam. v. 7, Jeremiah represents the afflicted people of Israel as saying: Our fathers have sinned and are no more, and we have borne their iniquities, ἀνακατέστησαν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. So in Ezek. xviii. 19, 20, to bear the iniquity of another, means, to die or perish on his account, ver. 20, comp. ver. 17; Is. iii. 4, he bore our distresses (αἰματικὸν ἐπηρείματα), he carried [or bore] our sorrows (ὑπέρ ἡμῶν τὰ μετάφερεν), is explained in ver. 5, by he was wounded for our transgressions (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτολόγων ἐπηρείματα), he was smitten on account of our transgressions (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτολόγων ἐπηρείματα). So αἰματικόν means to suffer, Prov. xix. 19; Micah vii. 9; as does the corresponding Greek word ἀμαρτίας in Gal. v. 10, and φίλος in Heb. xii. 13. Ἀμαρτίας has the same sense as φίλος and ἀμαρτίας, when
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used in such a connection, and corresponds to the Hebrew אֶת and בֵּן. So Peter says of Jesus, ἀναγεννοῦτο τῶν ἄγαγρας ἡμῶν. in his own body, on the cross, 1 Pet. ii. 24; to explain which he adds, by whose stripes ye are healed, i.e., Jesus suffered in his own body and on the cross, the penalty due to our sins; and by his sufferings, our obligation to the penalty ceases. The passage is quoted from Is. liii. 4, 5, which has the same meaning as liii. 11, 12; and here we have, He bore their sins (הָלַךְ הָטָבְעַנְו) he bore or carried the sins of many (אֶת הָנַךָנְו). A comparison of all these instances (more might be adduced), will serve to show how plain and uniform the Scripture idiom is, in respect to the sense attached to the phrase bearing the sin either of one's self or of others. It always means, either 'actual suffering of the consequences due to sin,' or 'exposure to suffer them, obligation to suffer them.'

That ἄγαγρας in Heb. ix. 28 may mean, and does mean, the consequences of sin or penalty of it, is plain (1) From the impossibility that the passage here can have any other sense. The moral turpitude of our sins Jesus did not take upon himself; nor did he remove it (as it is in itself considered); but the consequences of our sins he prevented by his own sufferings. (2) The corresponding Hebrew words, כָּרָה, כָּרָה, and כָּרָה, all mean punishment or penalty of sin, as well as sin or iniquity itself.

The sentiment of the clause, then, clearly is, that Jesus, by his death (which could take place but once), endured the penalty which our sins deserved, or bore the sorrows due to us. But this general expression is not to be understood as if the writer meant to say, with philosophical precision, that the sufferings of Jesus were in all respects, and considered in every point of view, an exact and specific quid pro quo, as it regards the penalty threatened against sin. A guilty conscience the Saviour had not; eternal punishment he did not suffer; nor was he ever in despair of deliverance. It is altogether unnecessary to suppose that the writer meant to be understood here with metaphysical exactness. But that vicarious suffering is here designated, seems to be an unavoidable conclusion, as well from the usus loquendi of the Scriptures, as from the nature of the argument through the whole of chapters ix. and x.

EXCURSUS XX.

καταρασόμενον μοι, Heb. x. 5. Ps. xl. 7, יִנְהֵךְ יְהָרְשֵׁבֵךְ, i.e., mine ears hast thou opened.

But how could the Seventy render the Hebrew expression here, by σῶμα καταρασόμενον μοι? And how could the apostle follow them in this rendering; and even build an argument on such a translation, in order to establish the proposition that the blood of goats and bullocks could not avail to take away sin?
Cappell, Ernesti, and some other critics, strive to maintain the probability that the Septuagint reading in Ps. xl. 7 was formerly ὁμοίον κατάρτισιν μοι, which by some accident has been changed, and the text of the apostle in the New Testament adapted to it. But of this there is no proof. Indeed, there is manifest proof that the apostle originally wrote σώμα in ver. 5, by a comparison with it of his expression in ver. 10. The difficulty cannot be met, then, by a change of the text; much less by such a change, when it is not authorized by any of the laws of sound criticism, and is against the context.

Were it not that the Septuagint contains the expression σώμα κατάρτισιν μοι, I should be inclined to believe that it is merely a parenthetic circumstance, thrown in by our author in order to explain the object of his quotation. In sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight, says the personage who is speaking. But what is to take their place? is the natural inquiry. What shall be substituted for them? Ζώμα κατάρτισιν μοι, is the answer, i.e., my body which I am to offer as a sacrifice, is to come in their place; this will be a sacrifice acceptable, efficacious. In short, if the Septuagint did not contain the expression, we might conclude that the writer of the epistle added it, in order to convey the sentiment of the whole passage in some such manner as the following: "In sacrifice and oblation I have no pleasure;" my body hast thou adopted, viz., for oblation, i.e., as if the writer had said: "The speaker means, that his own body is to take the place of sacrifice and oblation."

But, as the Septuagint text now is, we are compelled to believe that the apostle has quoted it, and applied it to his purpose. Has he, then, made any substantial part of his argument to depend on the clause in question? An important inquiry, which may go some way toward removing the difficulties that the clause presents.

In vs. 8, 9, the writer presents the argument deduced from his quotation, in the following manner: "First he says: Sacrifice and offering and holocausts and sin offerings thou hast no delight in, neither dost desire (which are offered agreeably to the requirements of the law); next he says: Lo! I come to do thy will. He abolishes the first, then, in order to establish the second." That is, he sets aside the efficacy of ritual sacrifices and offerings, and establishes the efficacy of a Saviour's obedience unto death; comp. Phil. ii. 8.

Now, in this conclusion there is nothing dependent on the clause σώμα κατάρτισιν μοι. The antithesis of legal offerings is, doing the will of God, ver. 9, viz., the obedience of the Saviour in offering up his body, ver. 20. This last verse describes, indeed, the manner in which the obedience in question was rendered. But the argument, as expressed in the 8th and 9th verses, is not made to depend on the manner of the obedience; for the object of the writer here is to show the nullity of the Levitical sacrifices for spiritual purposes, and the fact that the Old Testament discloses this and intimates their abolition.

I must regard, then, the use of σώμα κατάρτισιν μοι by the apostle, as rather an incidental circumstance than as an essential one. He found it in
the text of the Septuagint which he used. It was well adapted for the
particular purpose he had in view; for it turned the mind of the reader to
Christ as the true expiatory victim, rather than to the sacrifices prescribed
by law. It was altogether accordant with the general tenor of the passage
which he was citing, and the conclusion which he was to adduce from it.
But he does not make (as we have seen) the force of his argument to de-
pend upon it. Were this the fact, and were we to suppose (and we have
no critical evidence for believing the contrary) that the Hebrew text stood
in his day as it now stands, it would be a case in point to prove the ex-
tent to which the sacred writers have deemed it proper to employ the
argumentum ad hominem, and adapt their reasonings to the modes of explain-
ing the Scriptures practised by their readers. As it now is, I do not feel
that much dependence can be placed upon it, to establish a proposition of
this nature; for, on the whole, I must view the employment of the phrase,
thus found in the Septuagint, as rather incidental than essential to the
writer's purpose. Still, thus much is clearly decided by the case before
us, viz., that the apostles did not feel under obligation in all respects to
adhere to a literal use of the sacred text, but quoted ad sensum rather than
ad litteram. Even σῶμα κατηρτισμοῦ μου may be brought within the general
limits of an ad sensum quotation, as Storr has remarked; for preparing a
body in this case, is preparing it for an offering, i.e., to be devoted to the
service of God. Now, this is a species of obedience of the highest nature.
If a body were given to the Saviour which he voluntarily devoted to death,
Phil. ii. 8, then were his care indeed opened, or he was truly obedient. The
implication of the phrase σῶμα κατηρτισμοῦ μου, in the connection where it
stands, is, that this body was to be a victim instead of the legal sacrifices;
of course, a devotedness of the highest nature is implied. Ad sensum, then, in
a general point of view, the text may be regarded as cited; and this,
oftimes, is all at which the New Testament writers aim.

One more difficulty, however, remains. It is alleged that Ps. xl. cannot
well be applied to the Messiah. It rather belongs to David himself. How
then could the writer of our epistle appeal to it, for a proof that the obe-
dience unto death of the Messiah, was to accomplish what the Jewish
sacrifices could not accomplish, viz., a removal of the penalty due to sin?
That there are difficulties in the way of interpreting this Psalm as
originally having had direct respect to the Messiah, every intelligent and
candid reader must allow. For it may be asked: (1) What was the deliver-
ance from impending destruction, which Ps. xl. 2—3 [1, 2] describes? On
what occasion was the song of gratitude for deliverance uttered? vs.
4—6 [3—5]. (2) How could the impieties of him "who knew no sin,"
take hold of him? ver. 13 [12]. (3) How could the Messiah anticipate
such troubles, as are alluded to in vs. 12—14 [11—13]; and particularly,
How can he, who when suspended on the cross prayed that his enemies
might be forgiven, be supposed to have uttered such imprecations as are
contained in vs 15, 16 [14, 15]?

To avoid the difficulties to which these questions advert, some have sup-
posed that the first and last parts of the psalm in question relate to David,
while vs. 7—9 [6—8] contain a prediction respecting the Messiah; at least, that they are spoken concerning him. But it is not easy to conceive how more than one person can be spoken of throughout the Psalm, it being all of the same tenor, and throughout appearing to be made up of words spoken by a suffering person, who had indeed been delivered from some evils, but was still exposed to many more.

Others have maintained that the whole Psalm relates only to David; and consequently, that the writer of our epistle accommodates his argument to the Jewish allegorical explanation of it, probably current at the time when he wrote. Among these are some whose general views of theology are far from coinciding with those of the neological class of critics. But there is a difficulty in regard to this, which must be felt by every reflecting and sober-minded man. How could the apostle employ as sound and Scriptural argument adapted to prove the insufficiency of the Jewish sacrifices, an interpretation of Scripture not only allegorical but without any solid foundation? And how could he appeal to it as exhibiting the words of the Saviour himself, when David was the only person whom it concerned? If the Old Testament has no other relation to the Messiah than such as is built upon interpretations that are the offspring of fancy and ingenious allegory, then how can we show that the proof of a Messiah deduced from it, is any thing more than fanciful or allegorical? And was it consistent with sound integrity, with sincere and upright regard to truth, to press the Hebrews with an argument which the writer himself knew to have no solid basis? Or if he did not know this, then in what light were we to regard him, as an interpreter of Scripture and a teacher of Christian principles?

Considerations such as these questions suggest, render it difficult to admit the opinion under examination, without abandoning some of the fundamental principles on which our confidence in the real verity of the word of God rests.

Nor does that scheme of interpretation which admits a double sense of Scripture relieve our difficulties. This scheme explains so much of the Psalm as will most conveniently apply to David, as having a literal application to him; and so much of it as will conveniently apply to the Messiah, it refers to him. Truly a great saving of labor in investigation, and of perplexity and difficulty also, might apparently be made, if we could adopt such an expedient! But the consequences of admitting such a principle should be well weighed. What book on earth has a double sense, unless it is a book of designed enigmas? And even this has but one real meaning. The heathen oracles indeed could say: Aio te, Pyrrha, Romanos posse vincere; but can such an equivoque be admissible into the oracles of the living God? And if a literal sense and an occult sense can, at one and the same time and by the same words, be conveyed, who that is uninspired shall tell us what the occult sense is? By what laws of interpretation is it to be judged? By none that belong to human language; for other books than the Bible have not a double sense attached to them.

For these and such like reasons, the scheme of attaching a double sense
to the Scriptures is inadmissible. It sets afloat all the fundamental principles of interpretation by which we arrive at established conviction and certainty, and casts us upon the boundless ocean of imagination and conjecture, without rudder or compass.

If it be said that the author of our epistle was inspired, and therefore he was able correctly to give the occult sense of Ps. xl. 7—9 [6—8], the answer is obvious. The writer, in deducing his argument from these verses, plainly appeals to an interpretation of them which his readers would recognize, and to which, he took it for granted, they would probably consent. Otherwise the argument could have contained nothing in it of a convincing nature to them; as the whole of it must have rested, in their minds, upon the bare assertion and imagination of the writer.

May not the whole quotation, then, be merely in the way of accommodating the language of the Old Testament, in order to express the writer’s own views? Such cases are indeed frequent in the New Testament. God says, by the prophet Hosea: “When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my Son out of Egypt,” xi. 1. Now this is not prediction, but narration. But when Matthew describes the flight of Joseph and Mary and the infant Jesus, to Egypt, he says: ‘This took place, so that this passage of Scripture [in Hosea] had an accomplishment, ἵνα παλαιός ἄρη, κ. τ. ἀ.’ Now here is evidently nothing more than a similarity of events; so that what is said of Israel, God’s son in ancient times, might be affirmed of his Son Jesus in later times, in a still higher sense, and in a similar manner. May not the writer of our epistle have accommodated the language of Ps. xl. in a similar way?

This would indeed relieve in a great measure the difficulties under which the passage labors, if it could be admitted. But the nature of the writer’s argument seems to forbid the admission of it. He had asserted (which was entirely opposed to the feelings and belief of most Jewish readers) that “the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin.” What was the proof of this? His own authority, or that of the Jewish Scriptures? Clearly he makes an appeal to the latter, and argues, that by plain implication they teach the inefficacy of Jewish sacrifices, and the future rejection of them. Consequently, we cannot admit here a mere expression of the writer’s own sentiments in language borrowed from the Old Testament.

Another supposition, however, remains to be examined, in regard to the subject under consideration; which is, that Ps. xl. relates throughout to the Messiah. This is certainly a possible case. I mean that there is no part of this Psalm which may not be interpreted so as to render its relation to the Messiah possible, without doing violence to the laws of language and interpretation. To advert to the objections suggested on page 552; it may be replied to the first, that the enemies of the Saviour very often plotted against his life and endeavored to destroy it, and that he as often escaped out of their hands, until he voluntarily gave up himself to death. The thanksgivings in the first part of Ps. xl., may relate to some or all of these escapes. If it be replied, that the writer of our epistle represents the Psalm as spoken when the Messiah was síaçýav évenos éis τῶν αθανασίων, coming [i. e.,
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about to come] into the world, and therefore before his birth; the answer is, that the phrase by no means implies of necessity that the Messiah uttered the sentiments here ascribed to him before his incarnation, but during it. ἔγραψαν, entering, being entered, or when he had entered into the world, he said: Θεός, x. τ. λ. Enter ing into the world may mean being born; but it may also mean, and probably does here mean, ‘entering upon the Messianic office, coming among men as the promised Messiah.’ That the Saviour prayed to God, gave thanks, made supplications and deprecations, as men do, need not be proved to any reader of the Evangelists. On what particular occasion in the Messiah’s life, the words in Ps. xl. 7—9 were uttered, it is needless to inquire. Indeed, that they were ever formally and ad literam uttered, it is quite needless to show; inasmuch as all which the Psalmist intends by the expression of them is, that they should be descriptive of his true character; which would be such that we might well suppose him to utter them, or that they would be appropriate to him. In a word, the Psalmist represents the Messiah as uttering them, merely in order to exhibit the true nature of the Messiah’s character.

The second objection appears, at first view, more formidable. How could the sinless Messiah be represented as suffering for his own iniquities? Plainly, I answer, he could not. The iniquities of others might be laid upon him; as the Scriptures plainly testify that they were, 1 Pet. ii. 24; Heb. ix. 28; Is. liii. 4, 5, 12; i.e., he might suffer on account of the sins of others, or in their stead; but as to sins of his own, he had none to answer for. The whole strength of the objection, however, lies in the version of the word γῆς (Ps. xli. 13), which the objector translates my iniquities, sins, transgressions. But who that is well acquainted with the Hebrew idiom, does not know that γῆς means punishment, calamity, misfortune, as well as iniquity, etc.? David, when he was chased away from Jerusalem by his rebel son, calls his calamity his γῆς. Perhaps the Lord, says he, will look favorably γῆς, on my calamity, 2 Sam. xvi. 12; for his sin it was not, in this case. Comp. Ps. xxxi. 11; Is. v. 18. A Concordance will supply other cases, particularly cases where the meaning is penalty, punishment. Analogous to the case of γῆς, we have seen to be that of σκότης and τάφρος; see on chap. ix. 28, Excurs. XIX. In Ps. xl. 13, then, γῆς may, agreeably to the usus loquendi, be translated, calamities, distresses; and that these came upon the Messiah (יִהוָּה) will not be doubted.

So in 2 Cor. v. 21, ἁμαρτία ἐνόμισε, i.e., God made Christ a sin-offering or subjected him to calamity; and in Heb. ix. 26, ἀποκατάλαβε ἁμαρτία means a removing of the calamitous consequences of sin.

The third objection may be very briefly answered. Nothing can be easier than to suppose the Messiah might, at any period of his public life, have anticipated severe trials and have deprecated them; as we know full well how strongly he deprecated his final sufferings when he was in the garden of Gethsemane. That he should formally and literally use the identical words of the 40th Psalm, was not necessary; but that he should have been in a condition such as the language there describes, is all that is necessary to justify the application of the Psalm to him.
In regard to the last objection, which has respect to the *impræca tions* contained in the latter part of Ps. xli.; they may be, and probably are, viewed in a different light by different persons. Considered as simple *maledictions*, they would be unworthy of the Psalmist or of the Messiah. But as *denunciations* against the impenitent and persevering enemies of God and of David, or of Christ, they present themselves to the mind in a very different light. David did frequently utter denunciations against his enemies. So did Christ against his; e.g., against the Scribes and Pharisees, against Jerusalem, and against the Jewish nation. Yet who will say that this was for want of tenderness in him, or of benevolent feelings towards those who were his enemies? No one can say this, who considers the whole of his character as represented by the Evangelists. If, then, he might and did in fact utter denunciations against his enemies and persecutors, he might be represented as doing this by the Psalmist, without any error committed in so doing.

The objections, then, do not appear to be of a conclusive nature, which are made to the application of the 40th Psalm to the Messiah. Still I freely acknowledge, that had not the New Testament referred to this Psalm as descriptive of the work of the Messiah, I might perhaps have been satisfied, in general, with the application of it to David himself, or even to the people of Israel collectively considered. Yet a minute consideration of vs. 7, 8 [6, 7] certainly might serve to suggest some difficulty, in respect to such an application. *Obedience* is there represented as the *substitute* for sacrifices. So the writer of our epistle understood it. And it is said to be written in the sacred volume, that this would be the case respecting the individual whose obedience is there described. Is this anywhere written respecting the obedience of David? Is the obedience of the Jewish nation anywhere represented as a *substitute* for sacrifices? Rather, did not a part of their obedience consist in offering them?

After all, however, the whole passage might, perhaps, be construed as merely affirming that obedience is more acceptable to God than sacrifice; and this is so declared in other Scriptures, comp. 1 Sam. xv. 22; Micah vi. 6; Ps. l. 9 seq.; Is. i. 11 seq.; Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7. At least, this mode of interpretation must be admitted to be a *possible* one.

Let us grant, then, what cannot fairly be denied, that the 40th Psalm, according to general laws of interpretation, *might* be applied to David. Is it not equally plain, that there is nothing in it which may not, without doing any violence to the laws of language, be applied to David's Son, in a still higher and nobler sense? After what has been suggested in respect to this application, I shall venture to consider the application itself as possible.

Here, then, is presented a case of the following kind. A Psalm composed by an inspired writer, is (in itself considered, i.e., the words or diction being simply regarded) capable of an application to David, or to the Son of David, the Messiah. To whom shall it be applied by us? If there be nothing but simply the Psalm itself to direct our interpretation, the answer must be: 'To David;' for the natural application of the words of Scrip-
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ture (which in themselves are not necessarily predictions), is to the persons in being when they were written. But if we have a good reason for making the application of them in a prophetic sense to some future personage, then ought we to make such an application. Consequently the question in respect to the application of the 40th Psalm depends on the fact, whether we have sufficient reason to construe it as a prediction, i.e., as descriptive of a personage who was to appear at a future period, viz., of David’s Son. In itself it is capable of such an explanation. Paul has actually made such an application of it. The nature of the case shows, too, that the Hebrews of that time were accustomed so to explain it; for otherwise, the argument of the apostle would not have been admitted as of any force by his readers. Whence did the Hebrews derive such an interpretation? Or (which is of higher moment) how could the apostle appeal to Ps. xl. 7, 8, for proof of the efficacy of Christ’s obedience unto death, as well as of the inefficacy of ritual sacrifices? This appeal, then, under such circumstances as show that the stress of his argument lies upon the meaning he gives to the passage of Scripture which he quotes, settles the question how the 40th Psalm is to be interpreted; settles it, I mean, with all those who admit the authority of the writer of our epistle, either as a teacher of Christian doctrine, or an expositor of the word of God. At all events, it cannot be shown that the 40th Psalm has no original relation with the Messiah. To show that it is capable of another interpretation, is effecting nothing. The second Psalm, and all other Psalms relating to Christ, borrow their imagery — their costume, from the times when they were written, and the persons, manners, and customs then existing; and of course, in a greater or less degree, they appear at first view to relate only to them. In describing the future King of the Jews, the writers of ancient times would naturally borrow their imagery from the kings of that day. But to affirm that because they did this, they had reference and could have reference only to the kings of their times, would be a position as little consistent with the principles of language and interpretation, as it is with the numerous declarations of the writers of the New Testament.

It will be easily perceived, that in admitting the possibility of applying the 40th Psalm to David, I have admitted vs. 7 and 8 may be interpreted as expressing merely the general principle that obedience is better than sacrifices. But if we suppose, with the writer of our epistle, that David, when he composed this Psalm, meant to intimate that this obedience was to be “obedience unto death, even the death of the cross,” then must it follow, of course, that the Psalm is altogether inapplicable to David; for neither his obedience, nor death, nor that of any other person (the Messiah excepted) could supersede the ritual of the Mosaic law and prepare the way for its abolition. Supposing, then, the apostle to have rightly interpreted the words of Ps. xl. (and who shall correct his exegesis?) the impropriety of applying the Psalm to David is plain; and the propriety of referring it to the Messiah needs no farther vindication.

47*
THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Dignity of Christ. His superiority over the angels.

I. God, who in ancient times spake often and in various ways to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by [his] son, whom he hath appointed Lord of all things, by whom also he made the world; who (being the radiance of his glory and the exact image of his substance, and controlling all things by his own powerful word), after he had by himself made expiation for our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high; being exalted as much above the angels as he hath obtained a name more excellent than they. For to which of the angels said he at any time: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" And again: "I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son?"

Moreover, when on another occasion he introduceth his first-begotten into the world, he saith: "Let all the angels of God worship him." Concerning the angels also it is said: "Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministering servants a flame of fire." But of the Son: "Thy throne, O God, is eternal; a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Also: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands; | they shall perish, but thou shalt endure; even they all shall wax old like a garment, | and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall decay; but thou art the same, and thy years shall never cease." But unto which of the angels hath he ever said: "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?" Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth for the aid of those who are to obtain salvation?
Exhortation diligently to seek the salvation proffered by the Lord of glory.

II. It behooveth us, therefore, the more abundantly to give heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should slight them. For if the law communicated by angels was established, and every transgression and disobedience received a just reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which, being first declared by the Lord, was afterwards confirmed unto us by those who heard [him];

4 God also bearing witness with them, by signs and wonders and diverse miraculous powers, and communications of the Holy Spirit according to his will.

Further declaration of Christ's superiority over the angels. Objections against this, drawn from his human nature, removed by showing the elevation of that nature and the important objects accomplished by assuming it.

5 Unto the angels, however, hath he not put in subjection the world that was to come, of which we are now speaking.

6 But one in a certain place hath testified, saying: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him; or the son of man, that thou dost regard him? Yet thou hast made him but little lower than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and hast set him over the works of thy hands.

8 All things hast thou put under his feet." By putting all things in subjection to him, then, he left nothing which is not subject to him. But now we do not yet see all things subjected to him; we see him, however, who was made a little lower than the angels, Jesus, crowned with glory and honor on account of the suffering of death, when by the grace of God he had tasted death for all. For it became him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, through sufferings to bestow the highest honor upon the Captain of their salvation, who is leading many sons to glory.  

11 Moreover, both he who maketh expiation, and they for whom expiation is made, are of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying: "I will declare thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." And again: "I will put my trust in him." And again: "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me!" Since the children are partakers of flesh and blood, himself also in like manner partook of them, in order that by his death he might subdue him who had a deadly power, that is, the devil, and free those, who through fear of condemnation had during their whole lives been exposed to bondage.

1 Or, "as one who should bring many sons to glory."
16 Besides, he surely doth not succor the angels, but he helpeth the seed of Abraham. Hence it is necessary that in all respects he should be like his brethren, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest as to things which pertain unto God, in order to make atonement for the sins of the people. For inasmuch as he himself suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor those who are tempted.

Comparison of Christ with Moses. Warning not to disregard the admonitions of the gospel. The rest promised to believers in ancient times is still promised. The threatenings against unbelief remain in full force.

III. WHEREFORE, holy brethren, who have received the heavenly invitation, attentively consider Jesus, the apostle and high priest whom we have acknowledged; who was faithful to him that appointed him, even as Moses [was], in all his house. For he is worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as the builder is entitled to more honor than the house. For every house is built by some one, but he who built all is God. Now Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant, for the sake of testifying those things which were to be spoken; but Christ, as a Son over his house; whose house we are, provided we hold fast unto the end our confidence and joyful hope.

7 Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit saith: \textit{To-day, if ye will hear his voice, | harden not your hearts as in the provocation, | in the day of temptation in the wilderness, | when your fathers tempted me; they tried me, although they saw my works forty years. Wherefore} I was offended with that generation, and said: They do always err in their hearts, and they have not approved my ways. So I swears in my wrath: they shall not enter into my rest."

12 Beware, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, so that he may depart from the living God. But admonish one another continually, while it is called to-day, so that no one of you may become hardened through the delusion of sin. For we shall be made partakers of the blessings which Christ bestows, if we hold fast even to the end our first confidence.

15 While it is said: \textit{To-day, if ye will hear his voice,} harden not your hearts as in the provocation. Who now were they that when they heard did provoke? Were they not all, indeed, who came out of Egypt under Moses? And with whom was he angry forty years? Was it not with those who sinned, whose corpses fell in the wilderness? To whom did he swear that they should not enter into his rest, except
19 to those who did not believe? And so we see, that they could not enter in because of unbelief.

IV. Let us beware, therefore, since a promise is still left of entering into his rest, lest any one of you should fail of obtaining it. For to us also the offer of blessings is made, as well as to them; the word, however, which they heard, did not profit them, not being joined with faith in those who heard it. For we who believe do enter into the rest; as he says; "So I swear in my wrath [unbelievers] shall not enter into my rest," to wit, [rest from] the works which were performed when the world was founded. For in a certain place [the Scripture] speaketh thus concerning the seventh day: "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."

And again in this manner: "They shall not enter into my rest." Since, then, it remaineth that some must enter into that [rest], and they to whom the offer of blessings was formerly made did not enter in because of unbelief [it followeth that a rest remaineth for those who believe.]

7 Again, when speaking by David so long a time afterwards, he designateth a certain day, to-day; as it is said: "To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Now if Joshua had given them rest, he would not after this have spoken of another day. There remaineth, therefore, a rest for the people of God. For he who entereth into his rest will also cease from his own works, as God [did] from his.

11 Let us earnestly endeavor, then, to enter into that rest, lest any one should perish in the same manner, through unbelief.

12 For the threatening of God hath an active and mighty energy, yea, it is sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of life and spirit, and of the joints and marrow; he [God] even judgeth the thoughts and purposes of the heart, nor is there anything concealed from him, but all is naked and exposed to the view of him unto whom our account must be rendered.

Comparison of Christ with the Jewish high priest introduced. Reproof for ignorance respecting the higher doctrines of the Christian religion, followed by encouragement and exhortation.

14 Moorever, since we have a high priest who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast to our profession. For we have not a high priest, who cannot be compassionate to our weakness; but one who was tempted in all respects as we are, [yet] without sin. Let us, there-
fore, approach the throne of grace with confidence, that we may obtain mercy and find favor as to help in time of need.

V. Now every high priest, taken from among men, is appointed in behalf of men on account of things which pertain to God, that he may present both oblations and sacrifices for sin;
2 being able to deal gently with the ignorant and the erring,
3 inasmuch as he himself is compassed with infirmity. On account of this, also, he must present sin-offerings, as well for himself as for the people. Moreover, no one assumeth to himself this honor, but he is called [there to] of God, even as Aaron was.
5 Even so, Christ did not claim for himself the honor of being high priest; but he who said: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," [bestowed this honor upon him];
6 as also he saith, in another place: "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek."

7 The same, in the days of his flesh (having offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cries and with tears, unto him who was able to save him from death, and being delivered from that which he feared), although a Son, learned obedience by those things which he suffered; and being exalted to glory, he became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, being called of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.

11 Concerning him we have much to say, which it will be difficult to explain, since ye are dull of apprehension. For even when, on account of [so long] a time, ye ought to be able to teach, ye have need that one should again teach you the first elements of the oracles of God, and need milk rather than solid food. For every one who uses milk, is unskilled in the doctrine of righteousness; he is yet a child. But solid food is for those of mature age, who, by reason of practice, have faculties exercised for the distinguishing of both good and evil.

VI. Wherefore, leaving the first principles of Christian doctrine, let us advance toward a mature state [of religious knowledge]; not laying again the foundation of repentance from works which cause death and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms and of the laying on of hands, of the resurrection also of the dead and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible that they who have been once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the influence of the world to come, should be again
renewed to repentance; since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God, and openly exposed him to shame.

7 For the earth, which drinketh in the rain that frequently cometh upon it, and bringeth forth fruits useful to those for whose sake it is tilled, receiveth blessings from God. But that which bringeth forth thorns and briers, is reprobate and near to a curse, [and] its end will be burning: But, beloved, we confidently hope for better things respecting you, even those connected with salvation, although we thus speak. For God is not unkind, so as to forget your labor, and the love which ye have shown toward his name, in having performed kind offices toward the saints and in still performing them.

11 Moreover, we are desirous that every one of you should manifest the same diligence respecting a full assurance of hope, even to the end; so that ye may not be slothful, but imitators of those, who through faith and patient expectation have entered into possession of promised blessings. For when God made a promise to Abraham, seeing he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying: "I will greatly bless thee, and exceedingly multiply thee." And so, having patiently waited, he obtained the promised blessing.

16 Now men swear by one who is greater, and the oath for confirmation maketh] an end of all dispute among them.

17 Wherefore God, desirous of showing more abundantly to the heirs of promise the immutability of his purpose, interposed by an oath; so that by two immutable things, concerning which it is impossible for God to lie, we, who have sought a refuge, might have strong persuasion to hold fast the hope that is set before us, which we cleave to as an anchor of the soul sure and firmly fixed, and which entereth within the vail, where Jesus our forerunner hath gone, being made high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.

Comparison of Christ, as a priest, with Melchizedek. New order of things required by the appointment of such a priest; which appointment was made with the solemnity of an oath, and the office created by it was perpetual, allowing of no succession like that of the Jewish priests.

VII. Now this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God (who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; [whose name] by interpretation first meaneth King of Righteousness, and then also King of Salem, that is King of Peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy; who hath neither beginning of days, nor end
of life, but is like to the Son of God); remaineth a high priest perpetually.

4 Consider now how great he must be, to whom Abraham 5 the patriarch gave a tenth part of the spoils. The sons of Levi, indeed, who take the office of priests, have a command by the law to tithe the people, that is, their brethren, al-

6 though descended from the loins of Abraham; but he, whose descent is not counted from them, tithed Abraham, and blessed 7 him to whom the promises were made. And beyond all controversy, the less was blessed by the greater.

8 Here also men who die receive tithes; but there, one of 9 whom it is testified that he liveth. Besides (if I may so speak), even Levi himself, who received tithes, was tithed 10 in Abraham; for he was then in the loins of his ancestor, when Melchizedek met him.

11 If, moreover, perfection had been by the Levitical priesthood (for the law was given to the people in connection with this), what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be called after 12 the order of Aaron? If, however, the priesthood be changed, 13 there must needs be also a change of the law. [And the priesthood is changed], for he concerning whom these things are said, belonged to a different tribe, none of whom served 14 at the altar; since it is manifest that our Lord sprang from Judah, in respect to which tribe Moses said nothing concerning the priesthood. And still more manifest is it [that the priesthood is changed], if another priest hath arisen, like to Melchizedek, who hath not been made so by a law that was 15 temporary, but by an authority of endless duration. For 16 [the Scripture] declareth: “Thou art a priest forever, after 17 the order of Melchizedek.” For there is, indeed, a setting aside of the preceding law, because it was weak and unavail-

18 ing, | (for the law did not fully accomplish anything); but a better hope is introduced, by which we draw near to God.

19 Inasmuch also as not without an oath [Jesus was made a priest]. | (for they are made priests without an oath, but he with an oath, by him who said to him: “The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever, after the 20 order of Melchizedek”), | by so much hath Jesus become the surety of a better covenant.

21 Those priests likewise are many, because they are not 22 suffered to continue by reason of death; but he, because he continueth forever, hath a priesthood without any succession;

23 and hence, he is able always to save those who come to God by him, since he ever liveth to interpose in their behalf.
The subject of Christ's qualifications for the office of a priest (proposed in v. 23 and briefly discussed in v. 7-9) resumed. His superiority over the Jewish priests in respect to these qualifications.

26 Now such a high priest was needful for us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and exalted above the heavens; who hath not any daily necessity (like the high priests) to offer sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people; for this he did, once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests who have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, [maketh] the Son [high priest] who is exalted to glory for ever more.

Expiatory office of Christ as a priest. His functions, the dispensation under which they are performed, the place of exercising them, with the manner and effects of them, compared with those of the Jewish priests.

VIII. The principal thing, however, among those of which we are speaking, is, that we have such a high priest, who is seated on the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord hath reared and not man. For every high priest is appointed, in order that he may present both oblations and sacrifices; whence it becometh necessary, that this one also should have something which he may present. For if he were on earth, then he could not be a priest, seeing there are priests who present oblations according to the law; (the same who perform service in [that sanctuary which is but] a mere copy of the heavenly one; for Moses, when about to build the tabernacle, was divinely admonished: "See now," said he, "that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount"). But now, he hath obtained a service which is more excellent; as much more as the covenant is better of which he is mediator, and which is sanctioned by better promises.

7 Moreover, if that first [covenant] had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for the second. But finding fault [with the first], he saith to them: "Behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in my covenant, and I rejected them, saith the Lord. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and engrave them upon their hearts, and I will be their
11 God and they shall be my people. None shall teach his fellow-citizen, and none his brother, saying: Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least even to the greatest.

12 For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins and their transgressions will I remember no more.”

13 By saying “a new [covenant],” he representeth the first as old; now that which hath become old, and is advancing in age, is nigh to dissolution.

IX. Moreover, the first [covenant] had both ordinances of service and a sanctuary of an earthly nature. For an outer tabernacle was prepared, in which was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called the holy place.

3 And behind the second vail was the tabernacle, which is called the holy of holies, | containing the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid with gold on every part; in which [ark] was the golden urn that contained the manna, and the rod of Aaron which budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it were the Cherubim of glory, overshadowing the mercy-seat: of which things I design not, at present, particularly to speak.

6 Now these being thus prepared, the priests performing the services entered continually into the outer tabernacle. But into the inner, the high priest only [entered], once in each year, not without blood, which he presented for himself and for the sins of the people; the Holy Spirit signifying this, that the way to the most holy place was not yet open, while the first tabernacle had a standing; which had been a type down to the present time, in which both oblations and sacrifices are offered, that cannot fully accomplish what is needed for the conscience of him who performeth the services; being imposed (together with meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances pertaining to the flesh) only until the time of reformation. But Christ being come, the high priest of future good things, through a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this [material] creation, | he entered once for all into the holy place, not with the blood of goats and of bullocks, but with his own blood, procuring eternal redemption. For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, cleanseth as to the purification of the flesh, | how much more shall the blood of Christ, who by an eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purify our conscience from works which cause death, so that we may serve the living God! On this account, also, he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that, [his] death having taken place for
redemption from the sins [committed] under the former covenant, they who have been called might receive the promised blessing of the eternal inheritance.

16 Moreover, where there is a testament, it is necessary that 17 the death of the testator should take place; because a testament is valid in respect to those only who are dead, since it hath no force while the testator is living. Hence not even 18 the first [covenant] was ratified without blood. For when, according to the law, all the commandment had been read by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of bullocks and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled 20 both the book itself and all the people, saying: "This is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined upon you." The tabernacle, also, and likewise all the vessels for service, did he sprinkle in the same manner with blood. 21:

22 deed, almost everything is required by the law to be purified by blood; and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness.

23 Since then the copies of heavenly things must needs be purified in this manner, the heavenly things themselves [must be purified] by better sacrifices than these. For Christ did not enter into a sanctuary made with hands, which is only a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, that he might thenceforth appear before God for us. Yet not that he might frequently make an offering of himself, like the high priest who entereth into the sanctuary every year with blood not his own; 26 for otherwise he must needs have often suffered, since the foundation of the world; but now, at the close of the [ancient] dispensation, he hath once for all made his appearance, in order that he might remove the punishment due to sin by the sacrifice of himself. For since it is appointed unto men to 28 die but once, and after this [cometh] the judgment; so Christ, after having once for all made an offering of himself to bear the sins of many, will appear without a sin-offering, at his second [coming], for the salvation of those who wait for him.

X. Now the law, which was but an imperfect sketch of good things that were to come, and not the complete image of those things, can never, by the yearly sacrifices themselves which are continually offered, fully accomplish what is needed 2 for those who approach [the altar]. For if it could, then would not these offerings have ceased? because the worshipers, once for all made clean, would no longer have been 3 conscious of sins. On the contrary, by these [sacrifices]
4 yearly remembrance is made of sin. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin.

5 Wherefore [Christ] when entering into the world saith: "Sacrifice and oblation thou hast not desired, but a body hast thou prepared for me; in whole burnt offerings and [offerings] for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then said I, Lo! I come, O God, to do thy will; (in the volume of the book it is written concerning me)." First saying: "Sacrifice and oblation and whole burnt offerings and [offerings] for sin thou desirest not, nor hast pleasure in them," (which are presented according to the law); he then saith: "Lo! I come to do thy will;"

10 [thus] he abolisheth the first, that he may establish the second. By this will expiation is made for us, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

11 Now every priest standeth, performing daily service, and oftentimes presenting the same sacrifices which can never take away sin; but he, having offered up one sacrifice for sin, sat down forever at the right hand of God, | thenceforth waiting until his enemies be made his footstool; for by one offering he hath forever perfected those for whom expiation is made.

15 Moreover the Holy Spirit himself testifieth to us; for after he had said: "This is the covenant which I will make with them after those days;" the Lord saith: "I will put my laws upon their hearts, and engrave them upon their minds;" and "their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

But where there is remission of these, there is no more offering for sin.

Exhortation to perseverance from a consideration of the faithfulness of God, of the severe doom of apostates, and of the sufferings which the Hebrew Christians had already endured for the sake of religion.

19 Having then, brethren, free entrance into the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, a new and living way | which he hath consecrated, through the vail (that is, his flesh): [having] also a high priest over the house of God: let us approach with a true heart in full confidence, being purified as to our hearts from a consciousness of evil, | and cleansed as to our bodies with pure water; let us hold fast without wavering the hope which we profess, for faithful is he who hath promised;

24 and let us attentively consider one another, in order to excite unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together (as the custom of some is), but admonishing [one another]; and this so much the more, as ye see the day approaching. For should we voluntarily sin, after
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27 having received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful expectation of 
28 punishment, yea, of fiery indignation which will consume the 
adversaries. Whosoever dishonored the law of Moses, suf-
fered death without mercy, when there were two or three 
29 witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be counted worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of 
God, and regarded the blood of the covenant by which expi-
ation has been made, as unclean, and done despite to the Spirit 
of grace! For we know him who hath said: "Vengeance 
is mine, I will render it," saith the Lord; and again: "The 
Lord will avenge his people." It is a fearful thing to fall 
into the hands of the living God.

32 Call to mind, now, the former days, in which, after ye were 
33 enlightened, ye endured a great contest with sufferings; partly 
because ye were made a public spectacle both by reproaches 
and afflictions, and partly because ye were made partakers 
with those who were in like circumstances. For ye did truly 
sympathize with my bonds, and cheerfully suffer the plundering 
of your own substance; knowing that ye have for your-
selves a better and more enduring possession in heaven. Cast 
36 not away then your confidence, which will obtain a great re-
ward. For ye have need of patient waiting, in order that 
when ye have done the will of God ye may receive the 
37 promised blessing. Yet, in a very little while, "he who is 
38 coming, will come, and will not delay." "The just," moreover, "shall live by faith;" also: "If any man draw back, 
39 my soul hath no pleasure in him." We, however, are not 
of those who draw back unto destruction; but of those who 
believe unto the salvation of the soul.

Description of faith, and the effects of it in respect to the saints of ancient times.

XI. Now faith is confidence in respect to things hoped for —
2 evidence of things not seen. For by this, the ancients obtained 
commendation.
3 By faith we perceive, that the world was formed by the 
word of God, so that the things which are seen, were not 
made from those which appear.

4 By faith Abel offered to God a better sacrifice than Cain, 
on account of which he was commended as righteous, God 
himself bestowing commendation upon his offerings; and 
by the same, though dead, he still speaketh.

5 By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see 
death, and "he was not found, because God had translated him."
For before his translation he is commended, as having pleased
God; but without faith it is impossible to please him; for he
who cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is
the rewarder of those who seek him.

By faith Noah, being divinely admonished respecting
things not yet apparent, with reverence prepared an ark for
the safety of his household, by which he condemned the
world, and obtained the justification which is by faith.

By faith Abraham obeyed, when called to go forth unto
the place which he was to receive for a possession; yea, he
went forth not knowing whither he was going. By faith he
sojourned in the land of promise, while it belonged to stran-
gers, dwelling in tents, together with Isaac and Jacob, who
were heirs of the same promise; for he expected a city which
hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. By faith,
also, Sarah herself received the power of conception, and this
beyond the usual time of life, inasmuch as she counted him to
be faithful who had promised. Wherefore there sprang,
even from one who was dead as to such things [a seed] like
the stars of heaven for multitude, and like the sand on the
shore of the sea, which cannot be numbered.

These all died in faith, not having received the promised
blessings; but seeing them afar off, and hailing them with
joy, they professed themselves to be strangers and sojourners
on the earth. Now they who thus profess, show that they are
in quest of a country; for if they had cherished the remem-
brance of that from which they came, they had opportunity
to return thither. But now they were desirous of a better,
that is, of a heavenly [country]. Wherefore God is not
ashamed of them, [nor] to be called their God; for he hath
prepared a city for them.

By faith Abraham, when tried, made an offering of Isaac;
yea, he who had received the promises made an offering of
his only son; unto whom it had been said: "In Isaac shall
there be a seed to thee;" counting that God was able to
raise him even from the dead, whence, also, comparatively
[speaking], he did obtain him.

By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, in respect to the
future. By faith Jacob, when about to die, blessed each of
Joseph's sons, and bowed himself upon the top of his staff.

By faith Joseph, at the close of life, made mention of the de-
parture of the children of Israel [from Egypt], and gave
commandment respecting his own bones.

By faith Moses, after his birth, was concealed for three
months by his parents, because they saw that he was a goodly
child, and they did not fear the king's commandment. By faith Moses, when arrived at mature age, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; counting reproach, such as Christ endured, to be greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt; for he had respect to a state of reward. By faith he left Egypt, not fearing the anger of the king; for he continued steadfast, as seeing him who is invisible. By faith he observed the passover and the sprinkling of blood, so that he who destroyed the first born might not touch them.

By faith they passed through the Red Sea, as on dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned. By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for seven days.

By faith Rahab the harlot, having entertained the spies in a friendly manner, perished not with the unbelieving.

And what shall I say more? For time would fail me, should I tell of Gideon, of Barak also, and Samson, and Jephtha; of David too, and Samuel, and the prophets; who through faith subdued kingdoms, executed justice, obtained promised blessings, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were made strong from a state of infirmity, became mighty in war, overthrew the armies of foreigners. Women recovered their dead, by a resurrection. Some were tortured, not accepting deliverance, in order that they might attain a better resurrection. Others were tried by mockings and scourgings, and also by bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they perished by the murderous sword, they went about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, in want, afflicted, injuriously treated, (of whom the world was not worthy), wandering about in deserts and mountains, in caves also and dens of the earth.

All these, moreover, who are commended on account of their faith, did not receive the promised blessing; God having provided some better thing for us, so that without us they could not fully obtain what was needed.

Encouragement to persevere. Trials should not dishearten, for God sends them in kindness to his children. The gospel holds out more that is cheering and encouraging than the law. The voice of its author must not be slighted.

XII. Since now we are encompassed by so great a multitude of witnesses, laying aside every incumbrance, and especially the sin which easily beseteth us, let us run with perseverance
2 the race which is set before us; looking unto Jesus the pattern and reclaimer of our faith, who, on account of the joys set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath seated himself at the right hand of the throne of God.

3 Consider him, now, who endured such opposition against himself from sinners, lest becoming discouraged in your minds ye grow weary. Ye have not resisted unto blood, in your struggle against sin. And have ye forgotten the exhortation, which is addressed to you as children: "My son, do not slight the chastenings of the Lord, nor be disheartened when reproved by him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,

7 and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth?" If ye endure chastisement, God is dealing with you as children; for what son is there, whom his father does not chasten? But if ye are without chastisement, of which all [children] are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons.

9 Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh who have chastened us, and we have yielded them reverence; shall we not much more yield subjection to the Father of [our] spirits, that we may live? For they chastened us a little while, according to their own pleasure; but he, for our good, that we might be made partakers of his holiness. Now all chastening seemeth, for the present, not to be matter of joy but of grief; yet afterwards, it yieldeth the happy fruits of righteousness to those who are exercised thereby.

12 Wherefore "strengthen the weak hands and the feeble knees, and "make plain the paths of your feet," so that what is lame may not be wrenched, but rather healed.

14 Follow after peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man can see the Lord. See to it that no man fail of the favor of God; that no root of bitterness spring up and trouble you and many be defiled thereby. Let there be no fornicator, nor profane person like Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know that when he was afterwards desirous to obtain the blessing, it was refused; yea, he found no place for a change of mind [in his father], although he sought it with tears.

18 For ye are not come to the mount which could be touched, and to flaming fire, and thick clouds, and darkness, and tempest; nor to the sound of the trumpet and the voice of commands, the hearers of which refused that another word should be added to them; (for they could not endure the injunction: 20 "If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned;"

21 and — so terrible was the sight — even Moses said, "I fear and tremble"); but ye are come to Mount Zion: and to
the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem; and to
an innumerable multitude, the joyful assembly of angels; and
to the church of the first-born, enrolled in heaven; and to the
Judge, who is the God of all; and to the spirits of the just
made perfect; and to the mediator of the new covenant,
Jesus; and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better
things than [the blood of] Abel.

25 Take heed that ye turn not away from him who speaketh
to you; for if they did not escape who turned away from
him who warned them on earth, much more shall we [not
escape], if we slight him who [warneth us] from heaven;
whose voice then shook the earth; but now hath he prom-
ised, saying: "Yet once more I will shake not only the
earth, but heaven also." Now this "yet once more," denot-
eth a removing of the things which are shaken, as made so
that they must await the things which are not shaken.

28 Wherefore, having obtained a kingdom which cannot be
shaken, let us hold fast that grace, by which we may serve
God in an acceptable manner, with pious reverence. For our
"God is a consuming fire."

Various practical directions and cautions. Affectionate requests and salutations.

XIII. Let brotherly love continue. Forget not hospitality; for
by this, some have entertained angels unawares. Remember
those who are in bonds, as if ye yourselves were fellow-pris-
oners; those who are suffering evil, as being yourselves yet in
the body. Let marriage be honored among all, and the bed
undefiled; for whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.
Let your conduct be free from covetousness, and be contented
with what ye possess. For he hath said: "I will never leave
thee nor forsake thee;" so that we may boldly say: "The
Lord is my helper, and I will not be afraid; what can man
do to me?"

7 Remember your leaders, who have spoken unto you the
word of God; and attentively considering the end of their
manner of life, imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same,
yesterday, to-day, and forever. Be not carried hither and
thither by diverse and strange doctrines; for it is good that
the heart should be confirmed by grace, and not by meats, by
which those have not been profited who have been occupied
therewith. We have an altar, of which they have no right
to eat who render their service to the tabernacle.

11 Moreover, the bodies of those animals, whose blood was
carried into the sanctuary as a sin-offering by the high priest,
were burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that
he might make expiation for the people by his own blood, 
13 suffered without the gate. Let us then go forth to him with-
14 out the camp, bearing reproaches like his; for here we have 
15 no abiding city, but are seeking for one to come. By him, 
therefore, let us continually present to God the sacrifice 
of praise, that is, the fruit of our lips, ascribing praise to his 
name.
16 Forget not, moreover, kindness and liberality; for with 
17 such sacrifices God is well pleased. Obey your leaders, and 
be subject to them; for they watch over your souls, as those 
who must give an account. [So obey] that they may do 
this with joy and not with grief, for this would be unprofitable 
to you.
18 Pray for us; for we trust that we have a good conscience, 
being desirous in all things to demean ourselves uprightly. 
19 And I request you the more earnestly to do this, in order that 
I may speedily be restored to you.
20 Now may the God of peace, that raised from the dead our 
Lord Jesus (who is the great Shepherd of the sheep with the 
21 blood of an everlasting covenant), perfect you in every good 
work, so that ye may do his will; working in you that which 
is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom 
be glory forever and ever! Amen.
22 I beseech you now, brethren, to bear with this word of 
exhortation; for I have written briefly to you.
23 Know ye, that our brother Timothy is sent away; with 
whom, if he return speedily, I shall visit you.
24 Salute all your leaders, and all the saints. They of Italy 
salute you. Grace be with you all! Amen.